



NOTES, MEMORANDA AND LETTERS EXCHANGED BETWEEN  
THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND CHINA

JANUARY 1965-FEBRUARY 1966

WHITE PAPER No. XII

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

PRINTED IN INDIA BY THE GENERAL MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF  
INDIA PRESS, MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI AND PUBLISHED BY THE  
MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI, 1966. On 12th March 1965, the  
Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs presented to  
Parliament the Eleventh White Paper containing the notes, memoranda

and letters exchanged between the Government of India and the Government of the People's Republic of China for the period January 1964 to January 1965. This White Paper contains the notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the two Governments since January 1965. It also contains a few notes not included in the previous White Paper.

Ministry of External Affairs,  
New Delhi,  
4th March 1966.

## CONTENTS

### ***I. Sino-Indian Boundary dispute***

1. Note of the Indian Government, 10 March, 1965
2. Note of the Indian Government, 7 April, 1965.
3. Note of the Chinese Government, 17 May, 1965.
4. Note of the Indian Government, 19 June, 1965.

### ***II. Border Issues and Incidents***

5. Note of the Chinese Government, 18 January, 1965.
6. Note of the Indian Government, 2 April, 1965.
7. Note of the Indian Government, 21 April, 1965.
8. Note of the Indian Government, 14 May, 1965.
9. Note of the Chinese Government, 31 May, 1965.
10. Note of the Chinese Government, 7 June, 1965.
11. Note of the Chinese Government, 11 June, 1965.
12. Note of the Chinese Government, 14 June, 1965.
13. Note of the Indian Government, 13 July, 1965.
14. Note of the Chinese Government, 29 July, 1965.
15. Note of the Chinese Government, 7 August, 1965
16. Note of the Chinese Government, 27 August, 1965.
17. Note of the Indian Government, 2 September, 1965.
18. Note of the Chinese Government, 8 September, 1965.
19. Note of the Indian Government, 12 September, 1965.
20. Note of the Chinese Government, 16 September, 1965.
21. Note of the Indian Government, 17 September, 1965.
22. Note of the Chinese Government, 19 September, 1965
23. Note of the Chinese Government, 20 September, 1965
24. Note of the Indian Government, 21 September, 1965.
25. Note of the Indian Government, 21 September, 1965
26. Note of the Indian Government, 21 September, 1965
27. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 September, 1965

28. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 September 1965
29. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 September, 1965
30. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 September, 1965
31. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 September, 1965
32. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 September, 1965
33. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 October, 1965
34. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 October, 1965
35. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 October, 1965
36. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 6 October 1965
37. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 6 October, 1965
38. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 October, 1965
39. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 October, 1965
40. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 October, 1965
41. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 October, 1965
42. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 October, 1965
43. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 November, 1965

44. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 November, 1965
45. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 November, 1965
46. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 November, 1965
47. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 November, 1965
48. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 20 November, 1965
49. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 November, 1965
50. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 November, 1965
51. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 November, 1965
52. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 November, 1965
53. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 November, 1965
54. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 25 November, 1965
55. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 November, 1965
56. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 27 November, 1965
57. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 November 1965
58. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 November, 1965
59. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 November, 1965

60. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 November 1965
61. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 December, 1965
62. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 December, 1965
63. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 December, 1965
64. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 December, 1965
65. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 December, 1965
66. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 December, 1965
67. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 December, 1965
68. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 December, 1965
69. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 December, 1965
70. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 6th January, 1966
71. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 2 February, 1966
72. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 3 February, 1966
73. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 8 February, 1966

### **III. TERRITORIAL AIR SPACE**

74. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 November, 1965
75. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the

- Embassy of China in India, 23 November, 1965
76. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 December, 1965
77. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 December, 1965

#### **IV. Alleged Ill-Treatment of Chinese Representatives and Nationals in India**

78. Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 February, 1965
79. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 March, 1985
80. Memorandum given by the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 4 May, 1965
81. Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 June, 1965
82. Memorandum given by the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 3 August 1965
83. Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi, 24 November, 1965

#### **V. TREATMENT OF INDIAN REPRESENTATIVES AND NATIONALS**

84. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 14 April, 1965
85. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 15 September, 1965.
86. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 2 November, 1965

#### **VI. MISCELLANEOUS**

87. Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 June, 1964
88. Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the

- Embassy of India in China, 13 January, 1965
89. Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 27 March, 1965
  90. Reference the Chinese Foreign Office memorandum dated January 13, 1965.
  91. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the
  92. Embassy of China in India, 9 April, 1965
  93. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 April, 1965
  94. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 July, 1965
  95. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 14 September, 1965.
  96. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 26, September, 1965
  97. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 October, 1965
  98. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 October, 1965
  99. Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 16 November, 1965
  100. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the
  101. Embassy of China in India, 27 December, 1965
  102. Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4th January, 1966

#### **APPENDIX I**

Text of Chinese Government statement, 7 September, 1965.

#### **APPENDIX II**

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in Parliament, 17 September, 1965

#### **APPENDIX III**

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in Parliament, 20

September, 1965

**APPENDIX IV**

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in both the Houses  
of Parliament, 22 September, 1965

## **I. SINO-INDIAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE**

### **Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 March, 1965.**

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

2. The Sino-Pakistan joint communique signed on March 7, 1965, in Peking has announced that the so-called joint China-Pakistan boundary commission has completed the work of boundary demarcation of the China-Pakistan border and that a boundary protocol is shortly to be signed by the Foreign Ministries of China and Pakistan. The Government of India has also seen reports of the speech made by the Chairman of the People's Republic of China at a banquet given on March 2, 1965, in honour of the President of Pakistan. In his speech the Chairman of the People's Republic of China is reported to have praised the Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement describing it as not only conducive to the strengthening of friendly and good- neighbourly relations but also an important contribution to Asian and African solidarity and world peace.

3. It is common knowledge that Pakistan and the People's Republic of China have no common border, the two countries being separated by the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. The presence of Pakistan in the northern part of Kashmir is based on aggression and illegal occupation and Pakistan has no locus standi whatsoever to enter into negotiations or conclude agreements with any country regarding the boundary in this sector. The Boundary Agreement entered into between China and Pakistan in March, 1963, is, therefore, altogether illegal and invalid. The Government of India had on several occasions pointed out this fact to the Chinese Government and protested against the action of the Chinese

Government in concluding an agreement with Pakistan. Notwithstanding these protests, the Government of China has, under the pretext of entering into a provisional agreement with Pakistan, gone ahead with the appointment of a joint boundary commission and the demarcation of the boundary. These measures taken by the Chinese Government belie the Chinese claim that the so-called boundary agreement with Pakistan is a provisional one. Indeed, in the joint communique issued in Peking on March 7, 1965, it seems that even the pretence that the agreement is a provisional one has been abandoned. It is obvious that China's motive in concluding this agreement is to share the fruits of aggression with Pakistan and to exploit Indo-Pakistan differences in the pursuit of China's aggressive designs on India.

4. In the past, the Government of the People's Republic of China had declared in a joint statement issued by Premier Chou En-Lai and the Prime Minister of Poland in Peking on April 11, 1957, that the Kashmir issue "should not be allowed to be made use of by external forces to create new tensions". Again, in a note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Peking, to the Embassy of India in China on 31st May, 1962, the Chinese Government had stated that its attitude is one of "never getting involved in the dispute over Kashmir". Contrary to these declarations, China is making use of the Kashmir question in order to poison relations between India and Pakistan and to create tension in the region. The motive behind this volte face is obvious. Far from contributing to good neighbourly relations and to Asian and African solidarity, these actions of the Chinese Government are calculated to worsen relations and to create disunity amongst Asian-African countries. The Government of India strongly protest against these statements and activities of the Chinese Government and are constrained to point out that they are contrary to the principles of peaceful co-existence as well as the Bandung Principles to which China pays vociferous lip-service.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India 7 April, 1965**

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

On 10th March, 1965, the Government of India sent a protest note to the Chinese Government on learning that a so-called Boundary Protocol under the illegal Sino-Pakistan Boundary Agreement entered into by both countries in March 1963, was going to be signed during the visit of China's Foreign Minister to Pakistan. The Government of India have seen reports that this so-called Protocol has actually been signed on March 26, 1965.

The State of Jammu and Kashmir forms an integral part of India and the Chinese Government has neither right nor legality on its side in conducting the present series of negotiations with the Government of Pakistan. China has no common border with Pakistan and the territory referred to in the so called Sino-Pakistan Boundary Protocol is part of India's Jammu and Kashmir State where the occupying forces of Pakistan have entrenched themselves in defiance of international law. As has been pointed out repeatedly on earlier occasions by the Government of India, any such illegal arrangements involving Indian territory between parties that have no legal or constitutional locus standi in invalid and inadmissible. The actions of the Chinese and Pakistan Governments in holding talks between officials of the two countries, signing a so-called

Agreement and a Protocol, setting up boundary pillars on Indian territory etc. are illegal and no Government of India, present or future, will recognize the validity of these actions.

The Government of India strongly protest against the signing of the so-called Boundary Protocol. The signing of the so-called Boundary Protocol by the Chinese Government is final proof of the fact, that motivated solely by their hostility towards India, the Chinese Government and the Government of Pakistan are opportunistically making use of their unlawful seizure of parts of the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 May, 1965.**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tza No. 358

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and with reference to the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated March 10, and April 7, 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

1. In its two notes in question the Indian Government lodged so-called protests and repeated its unreasonable attacks on China in connection with the signing of the protocol by China and Pakistan on the demarcation of the boundary between China's Sinkiang and the contiguous areas the defence of which is under the actual control of Pakistan. The Chinese Government categorically rejects these protests

and attacks.

2. In the past three years the Indian Government delivered eight notes to the Chinese Government on the efforts of China and Pakistan to settle their boundary question and made endless anti-China clamours. It repeatedly shouted that "China and Pakistan have no common border" that "the Chinese Government has neither right nor legality on its side in conducting the present series of negotiations with the Government of Pakistan," that "China is making use of the Kashmir question in order to poison relations between India and Pakistan," that she was "exploiting Indo-Pakistan differences in the pursuit of China's aggressive designs on India," and so on and so forth. All these absurdities have long been completely refuted by the Chinese Government in its previous notes. The Indian Government can deceive nobody even if it repeats its slanders a thousand more times.

3. It is a well-known fact that China and Pakistan are neighbours with China's Sinkiang bordering on areas the defence of which is under the actual control of Pakistan. This boundary is several hundred kilometers long and was never delimited before. Both China and Pakistan are sovereign states which have every right to delimit this boundary through negotiations. The sole purpose of China and Pakistan settling their boundary question was to ensure tranquility on the border and develop good neighbourly relations. It is explicitly provided in the China-Pakistan Boundary Agreement that after the settlement of the Kashmir question the Chinese Government will reopen negotiations on the boundary with the sovereign authorities concerned. Everyone can see that China's stand is fair, reasonable and above board. How can it be alleged that China was making use of the Kashmir question to poison India-Pakistan relations or exploit India-Pakistan differences for the purpose of aggression against India?

4. The Indian Government has ceaselessly attacked China in connection with the settlement of the boundary question between China and Pakistan not because China has done anything wrong but because the Indian Government has been obstinately clinging to its anti-China policy. Unwilling to settle its own boundary question with China, India has made desperate attempts to prevent others from settling boundary questions with China. The Indian Government's great-power chauvinistic and expansionist position has become increasingly absurd as China settled her boundary question with one Asian neighbour after another through negotiations on an equal footing. That is why, in shame and anger it has fabricated all sorts of pretexts to attack China maliciously. Actually this will only further show up the awkward position and isolation it is in.

Now the boundary question between China and Pakistan has been smoothly settled. This is a very good thing, which is in the interests of Asian-African solidarity and world peace. It rejoices the peoples of Asia and Africa and all the peace-loving people of the world. It is futile for the Indian Government to spread slanderous news engaging in disruptive activities however energetically it may go about it.

5. The Chinese Government would like to advise the Indian Government: If it wants to deliver itself from isolation, it should change its stand of serving imperialism and undermining Asian-African solidarity, abandon its policy of great-power chauvinism and expansionism, and handle India's relations with other Asian-African countries and settle its boundary disputes with neighbouring countries in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and the Ten Principles of the Bandung Conference. There is no other way. Should the Indian Government continue to haggle over the China-Pakistan boundary question the Chinese Government will pay no more attention.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew

to the Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 June, 1965.**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Foreign Office note dated the 17th May, 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government has, in its note under reply, tried in vain to justify and uphold, through propagandist arguments and slanderous allegations, the legally invalid and politically mischievous boundary agreement and protocol concluded between China and Pakistan. This so-called boundary agreement and protocol is an integral part of the growing and carefully calculated collaboration and collusion between the Chinese and Pakistan Governments against India. To characterize it as a "very good thing which is in the interests of Asian-African solidarity and world peace" is to pass off evil for good and to underestimate the intelligence of those to whom this propaganda is directed.

2. The Chinese note makes the extra-ordinary assertion that "China and Pakistan are neighbours" because 'China's Sinkiang' borders on "areas the defence of which is under the actual control of Pakistan". How did Pakistan, one may ask, gain actual control of these area of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir adjoining Sinkiang? It is well-known that Pakistan seized control of these areas by physical force through aggression. Therefore, Pakistan is a neighbour of China only by virtue of aggression and what the so-called Sino-Pakistan boundary agreement has done is to share between them the fruits of aggression at the expense of India.

3. The note of the Chinese Government says that "both China and Pakistan are sovereign States which have every right to delimit this boundary through negotiations". But it is an admitted fact that Pakistan does not exercise sovereignty over the areas adjoining China. Even the Chinese note admits this when it refers to the "areas the defence of which is under the actual control of Pakistan". Moreover, China and Pakistan, as sovereign States, have no right to delimit the boundary of an area which is under the sovereignty of neither and which is Indian territory. Again, while claiming that it is the sovereign right of China and Pakistan to delimit the boundary, the Chinese note says, almost in the same breath, that "after the settlement of the Kashmir question the Chinese Government will re-open negotiations on the boundary with the sovereign authorities concerned". If anything is obvious from this, it is that neither Pakistan nor China has any right, sovereign or any other, to conclude a boundary agreement concerning territory which is legally and constitutionally a part of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir.

4. The Chinese note has charged India with great-power chauvinism and expansionism and blamed it for not settling its boundary disputes with neighbouring countries. Great-power chauvinism and expansionism is a cap which fits the People's Republic of China more than any other Government in Asia and Africa, and indeed in the whole world to-day. As for settling boundary disputes, it is China who has resorted to force in order to solve the Sino-Indian border problem in her favour and who has rejected all reasonable proposals for negotiations including the proposals made by the six Asian-African countries who met at the Colombo Conference.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Chinese Embassy the assurance of its highest consideration.

\*\*\*

## **II. BORDER ISSUES AND INCIDENTS**

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the  
Embassy of India in China, 18 January, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 4

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to continued Indian intrusions, during the second half of 1964, into Chinese territory and airspace across the Sino-Indian border and Indian intrusive activities on the China-Sikkim and the China-Bhutan borders in the same period, has the honour to state the following:

I. During the second half of 1964, Indian troops made twentyfour intrusions into Chinese territory across the 'line of actual control' on the Sino-Indian border or across the China-Sikkim border (specific cases are listed in Annex 1), of which the following instances are particularly serious:

(1) In the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border, Indian military and administrative personnel again intruded into and entrenched themselves in the Wuje area which China had vacated on its own initiative as one of the areas where there is a dispute about the cease- fire arrangements.

(2) In the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, so far the Indian troops have not yet dismantled the aggressive military structures at the Hsialinkung Terrace, which they built beyond the 'line of actual control' on the Chinese side. Moreover, they frequently carried out reconnaissance and harassment across that line.

(3) Along the China-Sikkim border, the Indian troops built about fifty aggressive military structures either beyond or on the boundary line at Tungchu La, Jelep La and Cho La, and posted guards there.

II. During the second half of 1964, Indian aircraft flew twenty one

sorties across the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border as well as across the China-Sikkim and the China-Bhutan borders, intruding into Chinese airspace over Sinkiang and Tibet (specific cases are listed in Annex II). These Indian aircraft brazenly carried out prolonged reconnaissance and harassment over China's territory, reaching as far as such important cities of Tibet or Sinkiang as Lhasa, Shigatse, Damsune, Pishan and Hotien, with one penetrating as far as the Szechuan Province. The farthest point of such Indian air intrusions was some 350 kilometres behind the 'line of actual control' on the Sino-India border.

III. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against its above-mentioned grave intrusion into China's territory and airspace, and urges the Indian side to put an immediate end to such unlawful intrusions.

IV. It must also be pointed out that in its note dated September 5, 1964, the Indian Government, as usual, flatly denied the well-established facts of Indian intrusions into Chinese territory and airspace during the first half of 1964. What is more, it vilely charged that

China's protest against the Indian intrusions was "solely for the purpose of stepping up more tension on the border". Such an arbitrary and overbearing attitude of the Indian Government of indulging in making intrusions while forbidding others to protest against the same exactly reveals its own "expansionist nature". If the Indian Government has any scruple about just condemnations, it should put an immediate end to all its intrusive activities against China, for no amount of denial or vile charges can cover up the crime of aggression of the Indian side.

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

\*\*\*

## **ANNEXURE I**

## **Intrusions into Chinese Territory by Indian Troops during the Second Half of 1964**

I. Intrusions into China's Sinkiang and Tibet to the east of the 1959 'line of actual control' in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On July 16, 1964, at 1415 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in Chinese Tibet for reconnaissance.

2. On August 2, 1964, at 1924 hours, one Indian jeep carrying three Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the Civilian checkpost at Spanggur in China's Tibet for reconnaissance.

3. On August 11, 1964, at 1010 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian in China's Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

4. On August 12, 1964, at 1300 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Spanggur in China's Tibet for reconnaissance.

5. On August 12, 1964 at 1320 hours three Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian in China's Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

6. On August 15, 1964, at 1900 hours, seven Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs in China's Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

7. On August 21, 1964, at about 1000 hours, one Indian officer and two soldiers intruded into Demchok in China's Tibet for reconnaissance.

8. On August 22, 1964, at 1530 hours, seven Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the Civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in China's Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for about one hour and twenty minutes.

9. On September 14, 1964, at 1100 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in China's Tibet for reconnaissance.

10. On September 15, 1964, at 1130 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentian in China's Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

11. On October 8, 1964, at 1715 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentian in China's Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than two hours.

12. On October 9, 1964, at 1230 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentian in China's Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance there for more than three hours.

13. On October 20, 1964, at 1800 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in China's Tibet for reconnaissance.

14. On November 24, 1964, at 1250 hours, four Indian soldiers intruded into an area in the vicinity of the civilian checkpoint at Tienwentian in China's Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance for more than one hour.

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

In the summer of 1964, Indian military and administrative personnel again intruded into and entrenched themselves in the Wuje area which China had vacated on its own initiative as one of the areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangements.

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

So far the Indian troops have not yet dismantled the aggressive military structures at the Hsialinkung Terrace which they built beyond the 'line of actual control' on the Chinese side and frequently carried out reconnaissance and harassment across that line.

## IV. Intrusions into China's Tibet along the China-Sikkim border:

1. On July 1, 1964, at about 1300 hours, five Indian soldiers crossed the Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance lasting about two hours.

2. On July 11, 1964, at about 1400 hours, three Indian soldiers crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into the area north of the Peilung La for reconnaissance.

3. On August 12, 1964, at about 1400 hours, five Indian soldiers crossed the Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance.

4. On August 14, 1964, at about 1500 hours, four Indian soldiers crossed the Peilung La on the China-Sikkim boundary and intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance.

5. On November 27, 1964, a group of Indian soldiers crossed the Latuo La on the China-Sikkim boundary, intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance and harassment and seized 59 yaks belonging to Tibetan herdsmen.

6. Indian troops crossed the Tungchu La and intruded into China's territory, successively building nearly twenty aggressive military structures (dug-outs, shelters, bulwarks, etc.) either on the Chinese side of the Tungchu La or on the boundary line, and unlawfully entrenched themselves there.

7. Indian troops crossed the Jelep La and intruded into China's territory, building 27 aggressive military structures (dug-outs, bulwarks, etc.) either on the Chinese side of the Jelep La or on the boundary line, and placed guards there.

8. Indian troops intruded into the Cho La on the China-Sikkim boundary and built four aggressive military structures on the boundary line.

9. Indian soldiers continued their unlawful entrenchment on the Chinese side of the Natu La and refused to withdraw.

## **ANNEXURE II**

### **Indian Air Intrusions into China's Airspace during the Second Half of 1964**

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

1. On July 17, 1964, at 14.45 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into

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

2. On August 4, 1964, at 11.30 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the area southwest of Tashigong in Tibet.

3. On September 23, 1964, at about 13.00 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian, Tienhuihai, Howeitan, the Galwan River Valley and other places in Sinkiang and circled over there for about one and half hours for reconnaissance, penetrating as deep as more than 120 kilometres inside China.

4. On October 1, 1964, at 12.43 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at the Kongka Pass, the civilian checkpost at Hot Springs, Linghithang, the Aksai Lake, the Tsoggar Tso, Shanho and other places in Sinkiang and Tibet and circled over there for one hour and twenty minutes for reconnaissance, penetrating nearly 140 kilometres inside China.

5. On October 7, 1964, at 12.45 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Tashigong and other places in Tibet.

6. On October 12, 1964, at 13.48 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the Galwan River Valley, Howeitan and other places in Sinkiang.

7. On October 13, 1964, at 13.53 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the area northeast of the civilian checkpost at Nyagzu in Tibet.

8. On October 16, 1964, at 11.30 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded

into China's airspace over the area south of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

9. On October 20, 1964, at 11.00 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the area south of the Spanggur Lake in Tibet.

10. On December 16, 1964, at about 13.10 hours, an Indian aircraft coming from a point southeast of Pulan, Tibet, intruded into China's airspace and flew northward along the Sinkiang-Tibet Road, passing over Gartok, Gargunsa, Rudok and Shanho in Tibet and Howeitan, Tienwentian, Kangsewar and Saittulla in Sinkiang. It went as far as Pishan at 14.57 hours, then turned east to Hotien and then turned back to Kangsewar, whence it again followed the Sinkiang-Tibet Road, flying over Tienshuihai, Shanho, Gargunsa and other places, and returned to India. The aforesaid aircraft conducted reconnaissance over Chinese territory for as long as about three hours and penetrated as deep as about two hundred and fifty kilometres inside China.

II. Intrusions into the airspace of China's Tibet to the east and to the north of the 1959 'line of actual control' in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. On July 19, 1964, at 13.15 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Demchok, Tashigong, Gargunsa, Toling, the civilian checkpoint at Poling and other places in Tibet and carried out reconnaissance for nearly an hour.

2. On July 22, 1964, at 12.13 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpoint at Silangta and other places in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

3. On August 12, 1964, at 10.10 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace for reconnaissance over the civilian checkpoint at Poling

and other places in Tibet.

4. On September 23, 1964, at 13.10 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Shipki and other places in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

III. Intrusions into the airspace of China's Tibet to the north of the 19:59 'line of actual control' in the eastern sector of the Sino- Indian border:

1. On July 4, 1964, at 19.10 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the civilian checkpost at Migyitun and its vicinity in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

2. On October 13, 1964, at 13.35 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the vicinity of the civilian checkpost at Tsayul in Tibet.

3. On December 17, 1964, at about 13.20 hours, an Indian aircraft coming from a point southwest of Tsona, Tibet, intruded into China's airspace and flew over Linchih and other places. Then it flew eastward, reaching as far as Paiyu, Szechuan Province, whence it turned round, flying over Chiangda, Chamdo, Pienpa and other places in Tibet. It continued to fly over Lhasa and then, in a south- westerly direction, passing over Gyantse, until it left China. The harassing flight of this Indian aircraft inside China lasted more than three hours, penetrating as far as more than three hundred kilometres behind the 'line of actual control' on the Sino-Indian border.

4. On December 20, 1964, at about 1300 hours, an Indian aircraft coming from a point southwest of Rongshar, Tibet, intruded into China's airspace and flew over Shigatse, Gyantse, Lakang, Jiacha and other

places until it intruded into the airspace over Lhasa at 1442 hours. Then it flew northward over Damshune, reaching as far as the vicinity of Nagchuka, and then turned round to fly over Damshune and Lhasa again. Then it flew in a south- westerly direction until it left China at a point southeast of Khamba. The harassing flight of this Indian aircraft over China's territory lasted about three hours, penetrating about three hundred and fifty kilometres behind the 'line of actual control' on the Sino- Indian border.

IV. Intrusion into China's airspace over Tibet across the China- Bhutan and the China-Sikkim borders:

1. On July 10, 1964, at 22.00 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the area southwest of the Pumuchang Lake in Tibet.

2. On December 15, 1964, at 11.03 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over Yatung and its vicinity in Tibet and circled over there for reconnaissance.

3. On December 17, 1964, at about 13.00 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace over the area south of the Lamo Lake in Tibet.

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 2 April, 1965.**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note of January 18, 1965.

2. The Chinese Foreign Office has made a number of allegations of intrusions into Chinese territory by Indian army personnel and of

violations of Chinese air space by Indian aircraft during the second half of 1964. These allegations have been carefully investigated and every one of them has been found to be completely false and baseless. The Government of India, therefore, categorically reject the protest note of the Chinese Government. A detailed refutation of the Chinese allegations is made in the two annexures to this note.

3. The Government of India had stated, on many occasions in the past, that Indian defence personnel and aircraft have strict instructions not to cross the international borders of India, or the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector or the well-recognised Sikkim-Tibet border. There has not been a single instance when these instructions of the Government of India have not been observed by Indian military personnel and aircraft. Even though India does not recognise the so-called 'line of actual control' created by China through military aggression in the Western Sector, Indian defence forces have not crossed this line in the hope that the Government of China will eventually see the error of its ways and agree to negotiations on the basis of the Colombo Proposals and undo the aggression it has committed on the soil of India. It is amazing that, in spite of the self-restraint and desire for peaceful settlement demonstrated by India, the Chinese Government persists in fabricating false charges from time to time about Indian intrusions into Tibet and Sinkiang. Obviously, these baseless allegations are being made and widely disseminated through the high-powered organs of Chinese propaganda in order to step up tension and to worsen the border situation and to cover up the provocative intrusions Chinese troops have been constantly making into Indian territory across the border. This false and strident propaganda against India is the anti-thesis of the concept of Asian-African solidarity which China so glibly talks about.

4. The Chinese Foreign Office has attached to its note of January 18, two annexures which contain a long list of alleged intrusions by India into

Tibet and Sinkiang. These annexure are nothing but a catalogue of falsehoods. In order to make the list of violations long and impressive, a large number of allegations which had been made in the past and which were conclusively refuted and rejected by the Government of India, have been repeated without further argument or evidence.

5. As for the fresh allegations in the list, they are not only false but are alleged to have taken place many months ago. No formal or informal protests were made about these so-called intrusions earlier. It would seem that the Chinese Government has been piling up these fabrications over a period of time and has now put them forward altogether in a note for creating a propaganda effect. But adding zeroes to zero can only result in a zero. This new Chinese technique of the long lie is nothing but an adaptation of the old and discredited Hitlerian propaganda technique of the big lie. The Chinese note betrays this mischievous propaganda motive of the Chinese Government when it talks of the "expansionist nature" of the Indian Government and "the crimes of aggression of the Indian side". Who is expansionist and who is committing crimes of aggression is well-known to the world. Everybody knows that it is China which is expansionist and chauvinistic and is guilty of aggression. It is China, not India, which has the largest army in the world, which has mobilized millions of its people into a vast militia on the belligerent principle that every citizen should be an armed soldier; it is China which has exploded a nuclear bomb contrary to the Bandung Declaration prohibiting nuclear tests and is frantically trying to explode more such bombs; it is China which has laid aggressive claims to large areas of Indian territory and is in illegal occupation of 14,500 sq. miles of Indian territory in Ladakh; and, it is China which is openly preaching world revolution through violence and advocating the sordid doctrine of the inevitability of war.

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

assurances of its highest consideration.

\*\*\*

## **ANNEXURE I**

1. Allegations of intrusions by Indian personnel across the so-called line of actual control in the Western Sector of the India-China border.

In Section I of Annexure I of the Chinese note under reply, a list of 14 allegations have been made of Indian personnel crossing the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. These incidents are stated to have taken place several months ago, some of them as far back as on July 16, August 2, August 11, 1964, etc. In spite of the fact that these so-called violations have been brought to the notice of the Government of India after a very considerable lapse of time, careful enquiries have been made and it has been found that these allegations are absolutely false and baseless.

The places where Indian soldiers are alleged to have intruded, viz., Spanggur, Hot Springs and the place in the Chip Chap region which the Chinese Government refer to as Tienwentian, etc. are all in Indian territory which has been illegally occupied by China. Even though these places are part of the sovereign territory of India, Indian personnel have not visited these places in keeping with the recommendations of the Colombo Proposals, as they are located east of the so-called 'line of actual control'. As for Demchok which is mentioned in item 7 of Section I of Annexure I of the Chinese note, the Chinese Government is aware that it is on the Indian side of the 'line of actual control' and even Chinese maps have shown it accordingly. There is, therefore, no question of Indian troops "intruding" into Demchok.

It should also be mentioned that the Chinese "civilian checkposts" at

Hot Springs, Spanggur and in the Chip Chap region ("Tienwentian") are in the 20 km demilitarized zone, where China has set up posts unilaterally in defiance of the provisions of the Colombo Proposals.

## 2. Allegations of intrusions by Indian personnel in the Middle Sector of the India-China border.

The Chinese allegation that Indian military and administrative personnel "intruded and entrenched" themselves in Barahoti, which the Chinese Government refer to as Wuje, is an old one, which the Chinese have been mechanically repeating since July 30, 1962. These have been thoroughly refuted by the Government of India in their notes dated August 27, 1962, April 9, 1963, and March 26, 1964.

Barahoti, as has been amply proved in various notes of the Government of India and during the Officials' Talks of 1960, is clearly on the Indian side of the international border in 'the Middle Sector.

The Government of India had stated in their note dated April 9, 1963 that in view of the Chinese Government's assurances that they have decided "to vacate" the Wuje (Barahoti) area, the Government of India would reciprocate "by suspending the practice of sending civilian personnel to the Barahoti Plain which has been followed hitherto". The Government of India had in fact, as long ago as 1958, suggested that neither civil nor military personnel of either side should be sent to the Barahoti area, but it was the Chinese Government which turned it down then. However, since the Chinese Government gave assurances in their note dated April 3, 1963 that they will not set up civil posts at Barahoti, the Government of India taking note of this have sent no administrative personnel to this area, much less have they "entrenched themselves" there, as is alleged in the Chinese note under reply.

### 3. Allegations of intrusions across the International border in the Eastern Sector.

The Chinese allegations that Indian troops have not yet dismantled the so-called military structures at Hsialinkung Terrace, supposed to have been built across the international border in this area, is an old and baseless charge. The Chinese Government first mentioned it as early as on July 30, 1963 and have repeated it on numerous occasions. The international border in this region namely, McMahon Line, is clearly known and well-defined. As has been pointed out in the Government of India note dated August 8, 1963, and in subsequent notes on the subject, there has been no instance of Indian personnel having crossed the border in this area, much less erected military structures. There is no question; therefore, of dismantling military structures which do not exist in the first place.

### 4. Allegations of intrusions by Indian personnel across the Sikkim- Tibet border.

As the Chinese Government itself has recognised, the Sikkim-Tibet border is well-known and clearly defined under the Anglo- Chinese Convention of 1890. The Chinese allegations that Indian troops have intruded into Tibet across the Sikkim border and built military structures on the Tibetan side, have already been rejected in various Government of India notes.

Items 3 and 4 of Section IV of Annexure I to the Chinese note have been the subject matter of a Chinese note dated 28 September, 1964 and have been refuted in the Government of India note dated 6th November, 1964. In this note, it was clearly pointed out that the places where Indian soldiers have allegedly intruded like 'Tagi La' and 'Peilung La' do not correspond to the names of any of the passes that the

Government of India are aware of on this well- known Sikkim-Tibet border and the annexure to the Chinese note does not give the location and the co-ordinates of the passes".

Items 1 and 2 also refer to the places mentioned above and refer to incidents, alleged to have taken place on July 1 and July 11, 1964.

The Government of India are absolutely certain that no Indian troops have ever crossed the Sikkim-Tibet border. The Chinese Government's allegations are therefore nothing but pure fabrications.

Items 5-9 of Section IV of Annexure I, once again are repetitions of the false allegations contained in a Chinese Government's note dated 3 January, 1965, which have been dealt with in the Government of India's reply dated 2 February, 1965. In this note, the Government of India had stated: "The Government of India are absolutely certain that their troops and defence works are located beyond any possibility of doubt on the Sikkim side of the border. They have not stationed any troops or built any military structures whatsoever on the Tibetan side of the border, nor have Indian troops crossed the border at any point and seized yaks from Chinese herdsmen as alleged in the Chinese note. The Government of India, therefore, categorically reject the protest lodged by the Chinese Government as entirely baseless and unwarranted".

The Chinese Government's repetitions of these allegations, which have been proved baseless, are only a cover for the Chinese Government's massive military build-up on the Tibetan side of the Sikkim- Tibet border and are projection of China's aggressive designs.

## **ANNEXURE II**

1. Allegations of aerial intrusions by Indian aircraft across the so- called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector of the India- China border.

In Section I of Annexure II to the Chinese note of January 18, 1965, 10 allegations have been made of Indian aircraft crossing the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. In some of the alleged incidents, it has even been stated that Indian aircraft actually overflew places in Sinkiang and Tibet. The Government of India categorically repudiate all these allegations.

Most of the places mentioned in this section of Annexure II of the Chinese note under reply, like Nyagzu, Chip Chap region, Galwan River Valley, Kongka Pass, Hot Springs, Lingzithang, Aksai Lake and the area to the South of Lake Spanggur are located in Indian territory in Ladakh, which is now under the illegal occupation of China. In keeping with their acceptance of the Colombo Proposals, the Government of India have given strict instructions to Indian aircraft not to cross the so-called 'line of actual control'. Therefore, the allegation contained in items 3 and 4- Section I of Annexure II that an Indian aircraft circled over for about one and a half hour and for one hour and twenty minutes respectively across the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector is completely false. Items 6, 7, 8, and 9 in this section also refer to places to the east of the 'line of actual control' in India's Ladakh under China's illegal occupation, and these allegations are equally false. The allegations that Indian aircraft flew over places in Tibet and Sinkiang are even more ridiculous.

## 2. Allegations of aerial intrusions by Indian Aircraft across the Middle Sector of the India-Tibet border.

The statement at 1 of Section II of Annexure II that on July 19, 1964 an Indian aircraft "intruded" into China's airspace over Tashigong, Gargunsa, Toling and Poling is merely the repetition of an old allegation which was made in a Chinese note dated July 27, 1964. The Government of India had denied and rejected this allegation in its note dated 9

September 1964. It must be pointed out, however, that though no Indian aircraft has flown over Demchok on July 19, 1964, as the Chinese note alleges, Demchok is Indian territory which even according to Chinese maps is on the Indian side of the so-called 'line of actual control'.

As for the other fabrications contained in items 2 to 4 Section II of Annexure II to the Chinese note, these refer to incidents which are supposed to have taken place between July 22 September 23, 1964. Government of India are absolutely certain that no Indian aircraft has overflown Tibetan territory across the well-established border in the Middle Sector.

"Allegation" of aerial intrusions by Indian aircraft across the international border in the Eastern Sector of the India-China border.

No Indian aircraft have ever crossed the well-recognised international border of India in the Eastern Sector, namely the MacMahon Line. For the Chinese Government to allege that Indian aircraft made "harassing flights" for three hours penetrating 350 km beyond the international border is both ridiculous and mischievous. The same applies to allegations contained in items 1 and 2 of Section III of Annexure II that Indian aircraft overflew the Chinese post at Migyithun on July 4, 1964 and over the vicinity of the Chinese post at Tsayal in Tibet on October 13, 1964. As for items 3 and 4 of Section III of Annexure II to the Chinese note, the Chinese Government are only repeating allegations already made in a Chinese Government note dated 28 December, 1964 which were repudiated in the Government of India note dated 11 January, 1965.

4. Allegations of aerial intrusions by Indian aircraft into Tibet across the Bhutan-Tibet and Sikkim-Tibet borders.

There is absolutely no substance in any of the three allegations

contained in Section IV of Annexure II to the Chinese Government's note under reply. They are pure fabrications.

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 April, 1965

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

On April 1, 1965, a Chinese military patrol intruded approximately six miles west of the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Chip Chan River Valley region of Ladakh. (Longitude 78°01 E, Latitude 35° 17' N). It is evident that the Chinese patrol had proceeded from the check-post which the Chinese Government has set up in the Chip Chap River Valley region in the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone in defiance of the Colombo Proposals. By this military activity and intrusion, the Chinese Government has-(i) introduced military personnel in the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone, contrary to the provisions of the Colombo Proposals and the unilateral declaration of the Chinese Government itself; (ii) crossed the 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector in defiance of the Colombo Proposals and the Chinese declaration; and (iii) intruded into territory which, even according to the Chinese Government, is indisputably Indian. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this blatant violation of Indian territory by Chinese military personnel and urge the Chinese Government to desist from such activities which are calculated to create tension and conflict between the two countries.

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

\*\*\*

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

## **Embassy of China in India, 14 May, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to say the following :-

At 1200 hours on May 9, 1965, a Chinese military party intruded approximately half a mile into Indian territory from across the Mana Pass in the Middle Sector of the India-Tibet border. On seeing an Indian police patrol at a distance on the Indian side of the border the Chinese intruders fired three shots and withdrew into Tibet through the Mana Pass.

The Government of India hereby lodges a strong protest against this deliberate violation of Indian territory by Chinese military personnel. The international boundary in the Middle Sector of the India- China border is marked by clear natural features and is long- established and well- understood. Even according to the Chinese Government's description of the India-China border for the Middle Sector given by the Chinese officials in 1960 at the Officials' Talks it was clearly admitted that the boundary passes through the Mana Pass. Moreover, the Mana Pass has been specifically mentioned as a border Pass in the 1954 Agreement, between the Governments of India and China, on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet region of China and India. There could be no ambiguity, therefore, about the boundary in the area where the latest Chinese intrusion has taken place. It is, undoubtedly, a deliberate act of violation and provocation which can only serve to increase tension along the India-China border. The Government of India urges the Chinese Government to put a stop to these aggressive activities on the part of Chinese forces.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the  
Embassy of India in China, 31 May, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 366

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 refute the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated April 21, 1965, as follows:-

The Indian note falsely alleged that on April 1, 1965, a Chinese military patrol crossed the line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border and "intruded approximately six miles west of the ... line ... in the Chip Chap River Valley region of Ladakh. (Longitude 18°01' E, Latitude 35°17' N), and lodged a so-called protest. The allegation is an out-and-out fabricated and deliberate attempt to smear China.

It is well-known that the Chinese Frontier Guards long ago completed their 20-kilometre withdrawal behind the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border. Making no positive response to this, the Indians have incessantly crossed the line and made harassments in the past two years or more. Nevertheless, China has all along adhered to its decision and has never sent a single soldier into the 20-kilometre- zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control. The Chinese Government's sincere desire for a peaceful settlement of the Sino- Indian boundary question is evident. The fact that the Indian Government has fabricated a charge, spread groundless rumours and attacked the Chinese Government once again proves that it is none other than the Indian Government which has made the deliberate attempt "to create tension and conflict between the

two countries". The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian side's unwarranted protest.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 7 June, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 409

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated May 14, 1965 which falsely accused Chinese military personnel of transgression in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian boundary:-

In order to maintain the tranquillity on the Sino-Indian border, for a long time China has refrained from sending any military personnel into the 20-kilometre-zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border. It is an out-and-out fabrication for the Indian Government to allege in its note that on May 9, 1965 a Chinese military party intruded into Indian territory from across the Mana Pass and fired three shots at an Indian police control at a distance. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted and mischievous protest of the Indian Government.

It must be pointed out that the middle sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, like its eastern and western sectors, has never been formally delimited, but that there exists a traditional customary line. In pursuance of an expansionist policy, the Indian Government breached this traditional

customary line and has, up to now, occupied about two thousand square kilometres of Chinese territory in the middle sector. China has all along exercised restraint and forbearance on this matter and stood for a settlement by means of negotiations. The Indian Government, however, has always unreasonably rejected negotiations and, in order to feed its anti-China propaganda, has now fabricated the fantastic tale of Chinese military personnel transgressing across the Mana Pass. Recently, the Indian Government has more than once resorted to such false charges. It will certainly not succeed in its attempt to play new tricks by such tactics.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 11 June, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 390

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated December 31, 1964 and January 21 and February 2, 1965 :-

1. Indian troops have built military works beyond or astride of the China-Sikkim border, seized Chinese herdsmen and livestock and carried out other aggressive activities. These are all incontestable facts which the Indian Government can hardly deny. But in its note of February 2, 1965, India alleged that these activities were carried out "on Sikkim side," and continued to deny knowledge of the location of Tungchu La and other passes. Such unreasonable quibblings, instead of absolving the Indian Government of its guilt, have served all the more to reveal the

premeditated nature of its intrusions.

2. In order to mislead the public, the Indian Government has repeatedly spread the rumour that China has concentrated large numbers of troops on the China-Sikkim border. In its notes of December 31, 1964 and January 21, 1965, it went to the length of fabricating four incidents in which Chinese military men "intruded into Sikkim," and alleged that three of the "intrusions" took place in the vicinity of Natu La. However, it is a well-known fact that as early as September 1962 Indian troops invaded and occupied Natu La and its vicinity on the China-Sikkim border, built military works there and barricaded the pass. Then Indian troops built numerous aggressive military works beyond or astride of the border at Jelep La, Cho La and Tung-chu La, which are passes on both sides of Natu La, and have up to now refused to withdraw in disregard of the protests lodged by the Chinese Government. In these circumstances, how could Chinese military personnel cross and recross the border at will in the vicinity of Natu La? It is asserted in the Indian note of December 31, 1964 that at 1710 hours on December 25 two armed Chinese personnel "intruded into Sikkim", and that at 1720 hours on the same day "a larger group of fifteen Chinese military personnel were seen" in the same area. Yet, in replying to a question in Lok Sabha on February 22, 1965, less than two months after the Indian Government delivered the note, Indian Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs Mrs. Lakshmi Menon stated that only "two armed Chinese personnel intruded into Sikkim" on December 25, 1964. Such is the way the Indian Government babbles, telling one story now and a different one another time. Which is the version that counts, in the Indian Government's own opinion? It is ridiculous for the Indian Government to lodge so-called protests with the Chinese Government on the basis of such stories, which cannot stand the slightest refutation.

3. It should be pointed out that, in making frequent intrusions on the

China-Sikkim border on the one hand and inventing lies about so-called Chinese intrusions on the other, the Indian authorities clearly aim at conducting anti-China propaganda, sowing discord between China and Sikkim and creating tension. In order to make the truth known to the world, the Chinese Government has repeatedly suggested that China and India send their personnel to Natchu La for a joint investigation into India's intrusive activities. With a guilty conscience, the Indian Government has never dared accept this suggestion. As the Indian Government is once again reversing right and wrong, the Chinese Government now deems it necessary to renew this demand. Should the Indian Government dare to face the reality, it ought to accept a joint investigation, in order to find out which party has in fact been carrying out aggressive activities on the China-Sikkim border.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 14 June, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 446

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:

The Chinese Government has received reports which have been thoroughly verified to the effect that on the morning of May 29, 1965 three Indian soldiers crossed the China-Sikkim border and carried out reconnaissance and harassment for a long time on Chinese territory at Dai (approximately 28° 09' N, 88° 39' E) and its vicinity in Khamba County. What was particularly serious was that in broad daylight the

intruding Indian soldiers forcibly abducted two young Chinese women named Damque and Jitzongm who were gathering 'dye-stuff at Dai. Up to now these women have not been released and their parents are overwhelmed by grief and anxiety over the loss of their daughters. These brigandish acts of the Indian soldiers who intruded into Chinese territory and kidnapped Chinese women in glaring violation of China's sovereignty have aroused intense resentment among the population of that area. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government and demands that it promptly return the abducted Chinese women, punish the culprits and take effective measures to ensure against the recurrence of such incidents.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 July, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs' note No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 446, dated the 14th June, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have thoroughly investigated the allegations contained in the Chinese note that on 29th May, 1965, three Indian soldiers crossed the Sikkim-Tibet border at a location approximately given as 28° 09' N, 88° 39' E, carried out reconnaissance and harassment, and "forcibly abducted two young Chinese women, named Damque and Jitzongm". The Government of India cannot but express their profound regret that the Government of the People's Republic of China finds it necessary to concoct increasingly absurd and baseless allegations in their

attempt to maintain Sino-Indian border tension and to justify their anti-Indian posture.

The Chinese Government is aware that the boundary between Sikkim and Tibet has been clearly delimited by the Anglo-Chinese Convention of 1890 to which both India and China are parties. The boundary runs along well-defined and clearly distinguishable natural features and is well-known both to India and China. Indian personnel have always scrupulously respected this boundary and have at no time crossed the border at any place. It is, therefore, futile for the Chinese Government to persist in accusing India of border violations.

Investigations by the Government of India into the incident alleged in the Chinese protest note have shown that on May 29, 1965 two Tibetan women, who were fleeing from Tibet, entered Sikkim at approximately 28° 04' N, 88° 38' E. The two women, who gave their names as Thokchoe and Keyzom, stated to the Indian authorities that they had fled from Tibet because of the intolerable economic conditions obtaining in Tibet and because of the repressive measures adopted by the Chinese against the Tibetan people. They pleaded pathetically for refuge in Sikkim and declared that they had no desire to go back to Tibet. Evidently, the allegation that Indian soldiers had forcibly abducted two Tibetan women from Tibetan territory is a story which the Chinese Government has concocted in order to cover up the above incident. The Government of India categorically reject the Chinese protest note as a baseless fabrication. The Indian Government has no wish to interfere in the internal affairs of China, but must point out that manufacturing charges against India is no means of combating the popular discontent arising out of Chinese policies in Tibet.

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

highest consideration.

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the  
Embassy of India in China, 29 July, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 514

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to Indian intrusive activities on the Sino-Indian and China-Sikkim borders during the first half of 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

1. During the first half of 1965 Indian troops made 26 incursions into Chinese territory across the line of actual control on the Sino- Indian border or across the China-Sikkim boundary (specific cases are listed in Annex I). Among them, special mention should be made of the following:

(1) In the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, Indian troops not only failed to dismantle their military structures for aggression which they had built on the Chinese side of the line of actual control at the Hsialinkung Terrace, but had in an even more unscrupulous manner carried out reconnaissance and harassment across the line.

(2) On the China-Sikkim border, apart from maintaining their military structures for aggression around Natu La, Tungchu La and two other passes and continuing their illegal entrenchment there, Indian troops made 10 intrusions in May and June into Chinese territory around Tagi La and other places and on one occasion carried out reconnaissance and harassment lasting as long as two hours. Of special gravity was the fact that on the morning of May 29, three Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory at Dai and its vicinity of Khamba County and in broad

daylight abducted two young Chinese women named Damque and Jitzongm who were gathering dye-stuff at Dai. These two women have not been sent back up to now.

2. During the first half of 1965, Indian aircraft flew 12 sorties across the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border and intruded into Chinese airspace over Sinkiang and Tibet (specific cases are listed in Annex II), penetrating as deep as some 170 kilometres behind the line.

3. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government for the above-mentioned grave intrusions into Chinese territory and airspace in disregard of China's sovereignty.

4. In its note of April 2, 1965, the Indian Government vainly tried to quibble over or deny the Indian intrusions into Chinese territory and airspace during the second half of 1964. However, these stark facts cannot be covered up with lies on paper. The Indian note and its annexures, which are loaded with far-fetched phrases and worn-out arguments, contain malicious and wilful vilifications and slanders against China. These are indeed not worth refuting for they only show that with a guilty conscience the Indian Government has found itself devoid of any presentable argument.

5. It should be pointed out that it is out of its domestic and foreign policy requirements that the Indian Government has kept sending its troops and aircraft to intrude into Chinese territory and airspace with a view to creating tension on the border. Notwithstanding this, the Chinese Government, in order to cut down the exchange of notes between China and India so as to facilitate a gradual ease of relations between them, has since the first half of 1964 taken the step of lodging a comprehensive protest with the Indian Government every half a year against the frequent Indian intrusive activities, except in cases of special gravity against which

prompt protests are needed. An official of the Chinese Foreign Ministry clearly explained to Mr. Damodaran, First Secretary of the Indian Embassy in China, this measure and motivation of the Chinese Government when he handed the latter on July 7, 1964 the Chinese Government's note containing a comprehensive protest against the Indian intrusions during the first half of 1964. The Chinese Government also informed the six Governments participating in the Colombo Conference of this measure taken by China in its note of July 10, 1964. This measure of the Chinese Government, which is open and above-board, is taken entirely out of goodwill. The Indian Government, however, alleged in its note of April 2, 1965 that "no formal or informal protests were made" by China about the Indian intrusions and that the Chinese Government had grouped together all the incidents of Indian intrusion in a single note for the purpose of propaganda. It is indeed astonishing that the Indian Government should have resorted to this petty trick of pretending to be ignorant and standing truth on its head. But the Indian Government certainly will not attain its end of covering up Indian intrusions by vainly attempting to distort China's well-intentioned measure. The Chinese Government wishes to advise the Indian Government once more that if it entertains any fear of its crimes of aggression being exposed, the only way is immediately to stop all its aggressive activities.

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

## **ANNEXURE I**

### **Intrusions into Chinese Territory by Indian Troops During the First Half of 1965**

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

1. On February 10, at about 1000 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded

into an area near the civilian checkpoint at Kongka Pass in Tibet for reconnaissance.

2. On February 24, at about 1400 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area near the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance for about one hour.

3. On February 26, at 1050 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area north of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in Tibet and conducted reconnaissance for more than one hour.

4. On March 14, at 2030 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area north of the civilian check-post at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnaissance.

5. On March 20, at about 1130 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area north of the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnaissance.

6. On March 23, at 1440 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area near the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnaissance.

7. On April 17, at 1000 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area near the civilian checkpoint at Hot Springs in Sinkiang for reconnaissance.

8. On the morning of April 29, two Indian soldiers intruded into areas around Rato in Tibet, conducted harassing activities for a long time and shot in provocation.

9. On May 10, at about 0800 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area near the civilian checkpoint at Spanggur in Tibet for reconnaissance.

10. On the morning of June 19, three Indian soldiers intruded into an area near Rato in Tibet for reconnaissance.

II. Intrusion into China's Tibet to the north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border:

1. The Indian troops have not yet dismantled their military structures for aggression at Hsialinkung Terrace which they built on the Chinese side of the line of actual control and frequently conducted unscrupulous reconnaissance and harassment across the line.

2. On May 30, at about 1200 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into an area near the civilian checkpost at Sama for reconnaissance.

III. Intrusions into China's Tibet along the China-Sikkim border:

1. On May 7, at about 1300 hours, eight Indian soldiers intruded into an area east of Tagi La for reconnaissance.

2. On May 12, at about 1300 hours, one Indian soldier intruded into an area east of Tagi La for reconnaissance.

3. On May 15, at about 1500 hours, four Indian soldiers intruded into an area east of Tagi La for reconnaissance.

4. On May 16, at about 1400 hours, two Indian soldiers with a hound crossed Kailu La and intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance and harassment and seized a sheep from a Chinese herdsman.

5. On May 18, at about 1600 hours, three Indian soldiers intruded into

China's territory near Tagi La for reconnaissance.

6. On the morning of May 29, three Indian soldiers intruded into Dai and its vicinity in Khamba County, conducted reconnaissance and harassment for a long time and abducted two Chinese women, named Damque and Jitzongm, who were gathering dye- stuff at Dai.

7. On May 29, at about 1400 hours, eight Indian soldiers intruded into an area east of Tagi La and conducted reconnaissance for about one hour and a half.

8. On June 6, at about 1400 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into China's territory near Tzelung La and conducted reconnaissance for about one hour and a half.

9. On June 9, at about 1300 hours, two Indian soldiers intruded into China's territory near Tzelung La and conducted reconnaissance for about two hours.

10. On June 14, at about 1200 hours, two Indian soldiers with four hounds crossed Kailu La and intruded into China's territory for reconnaissance.

11. The Indian troops have not yet dismantled their military structures for aggression which they have built since 1962 on China's side of the border at Natu La, where they continue their unlawful entrenchment.

12. The Indian troops have not yet dismantled their military structures for aggression which they have built either on China's side of the border or astride of the boundary at Tungchu La, where they continue their unlawful entrenchment and from where they constantly prowl around.

13. The Indian troops continue to maintain the more than twenty

military structures for aggression which they have built either on China's side of the border or astride of the boundary at Jelep La and constantly carry out illegal activities in Chinese territory.

14. The Indian troops have still not dismantled their military structures for aggression which they have built astride of the boundary at Cho La.

## ANNEXURE II

### Indian Air Intrusions into China's Airspace during the First Half of 1965

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

1. On February 6, at 1150 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass and its vicinity in Tibet.

2. On February 6, at 1155 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian and its vicinity in Sinkiang.

3. On February 9, at 1140 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass and its vicinity in Tibet.

4. On February 27, at 1214 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Spanggur and its vicinity in Tibet.

5. On March 10, at 1100 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the civilian checkpost at Spanggur and its vicinity in Tibet.

6. On June 2, at 1100 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace

over the civilian checkpost at Tienwentian and its vicinity in Sinkiang.

II. Intrusions into the airspace over China's Tibet to the north of the 1959 line of actual control in the eastern sector of the Sino- Indian border:

1. On January 23, at 1200 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over an area to the east of Tsayul, Chikung and other areas and conducted reconnaissance for nearly one and a half hours.

2. On February 24, at 1257 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tsona, Lungtzu and other areas.

3. On February 25, at 1237 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over the vicinity of Tsona and Lungtzu.

4. On March 5, at 1244 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tsona, Lakang, Paiti and other areas for reconnaissance. At 1313 hours, this aircraft flew to the southwest of Lhasa, then turned back to Lakang and other areas and left China through the China-Bhutan border at 1329 hours. It penetrated a depth of about 170 kilometres from the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border.

5. On March 6, at 1145 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into China's airspace across the line of actual control at the vicinity of Sama, flew over Tsayul and Chikung in a northeasterly direction, then turned back to Tsayul, then flew in a northwesterly direction, and then passed over Janwu and other areas and returned to areas south of the line of actual control.

6. On April 14, 1230 hours, an Indian aircraft intruded into the airspace over Tsona, the civilian checkpost at Chuna and other areas.

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 7 August, 1965  
(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 566.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and, in refutation of the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, dated July 13, 1965, has the honour to reply as follows:

In its note of June 14, 1965 the Chinese Government lodged a serious protest with the Indian Government against the intrusion into Chinese territory across the China-Sikkim border by Indian soldiers on May 29 and their kidnapping of two Chinese women named Damque and Jitzongm. In its reply note dated July 13 the Indian Government not only failed to promise to take action against the brigandage of the Indian soldiers and to return the abducted Chinese women, but slanderously asserted that the two Chinese women asked for "refuge" in Sikkim, attempting thereby to detain them indefinitely. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at this unscrupulous course of action taken by the Indian Government.

All the facts are there proving the Indian soldiers' crossing the border and abducting the two Chinese women, and no wilful distortion or denial by the Indian Government will succeed. A Chinese herdsman named Jatso of Jeju (Keyo) village, Khamba County, China, saw with his own eyes the three Indian soldiers crossing the border and intruding into Chinese territory. On the morning of May 29, together with Damque and Jitzongm, who were later abducted by the Indian soldiers, Jatso had set out from Chiehyueh pasture, about 5 kilometres northeast of Dai (approximately 88° 39' E and 28° 09' N), Khamba County. Damque and Jitzongm had gone to Dai to collect dye-stuffs whereas Jatso had gone to nearby places to graze his sheep. At around eleven o'clock in the morning, Jatso

suddenly saw three Indian soldiers, one of them carrying a rifle, trespass into Chinese territory across the China- Sikkim border near Kailu La and advance towards Dai. Thereupon Jatso had driven his sheep to a safe place to hide them. Later, when he hurried back to Dai to look for Damque and Jitzongm, he found that they had been abducted by the invading Indian soldiers, leaving scattered on the ground the two bags they had brought with them containing the dye-stuffs just collected and the barley cake and butter they had taken with them as provisions. Clear traces of the abduction of the two women by the Indian soldiers could be seen on the spot and on the path leading to Sikkim. The Indian Government will never succeed in its sophistry in the face of such conclusive evidence, both personal and material.

The Indian Government alleged that Damque and Jitzongm had "fled" to Sikkim through 88° 38' E, 28° 04' N for "refuge". This is an utterly groundless fabrication. They have grown up from childhood in Jeju Village. Damque has a family of three who depend on one another, and Jitzongm lived a happy and harmonious life with her parents and the younger children of the family. Since the liberation of Tibet, their families have been allotted land or live- stock and their standards of living have been improving from year to year. Their parents and they themselves have always ardently loved their motherland actively supported Government policies and responded to the calls of the Government. Moreover, by actively leading other people in production, Damque has won the deep love of her fellow villagers. On the said occasion, they had gone at the bidding of their parents to Dai and the surrounding areas to gather dye-stuffs for dyeing woollen cloth. Before their departure, they had fixed with their parents the date and time of their return, their itinerary and the place for lodging. They lodged at Chiehueh pasture during their gatherings of dye-stuffs. Their bedding, shawls, several days' rations and other belongings were all left there after they were kidnapped. In view of all these facts who can believe that they would

desert their beloved motherland and happy families "flee" from Tibet and "plead pathetically for refuge" in Sikkim? And how could they, while gathering dye-stuffs, suddenly be in such a haste to "flee" that they did not even have the presence of mind to take their rations with them? The crude lie concocted by the Indian Government can deceive no one. As for the Indian Government's attempt to place into the mouths of these two young women such things as "repressive measures adopted against the Tibetan people" and "intolerable economic conditions obtaining in Tibet", which are phraseology consistently used by the Indian Government to slander China, it is really both stupid and shameless. Bandits are still pandits. The fact that Indian soldiers crossed the boundary line and abducted the women cannot be obliterated by any lies. The Indian Government's attempt to cover up its crimes and conduct anti-China propaganda by fabricating such nonsense as "pleading for refuge" is utterly futile and can only further expose its despicable line of action.

It must be pointed out that this was not the first time that Indian soldiers crossed the China-Sikkim boundary, intruded into Chinese territory and kidnapped Chinese border inhabitants. As early as August 5, 1963, Indian soldiers kidnapped two Chinese shepherds, Zlaba Mgonpo and Tshe Dhang, and seized more than 800 sheep, and they have hitherto not been sent back. These crimes committed by Indian soldiers constitute not only wilful violations of China's sovereignty but also serious threats to the safety of Chinese border inhabitants. They have aroused the great indignation of the families of the victims as well as all the Chinese people. They unanimously strongly condemn the brigandage of the Indian troops and resolutely demand the return of their kinsfolk. The Chinese Government once again lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and sternly demands that the Indian Government immediately return the two abducted Chinese women so that they may reunite with their families back in the motherland. Pending this, the Indian Government must absolutely guarantee their safety. The Indian

Government should also severely punish the culprits and effectively guarantee against similar cases.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 August, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 613.

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

According to verified reports from local Chinese authorities concerned, four serious cases took place in succession during July 1965 in which Indian troops intruded into Chinese territory across the China-Sikkim border and carried out wanton activities. The most striking case took place on the afternoon of July 22, when nine Indian soldiers with rifles and pistols intruded into Chinese territory from a point north of Cho La, a pass on the China-Sikkim boundary. They pitched a tent at the Riwujig pasture and prowled hither and thither for reconnaissance, harassment and the gathering of information, and even intruded into tents of Chinese herdsmen to seize things. On July 23, two of these Indian soldiers came as far as twelve kilometres from the China-Sikkim boundary to the Khunggalhaka pasture near Hsiasima, Yatung, Tibet, and China. The nine intruding Indian soldiers left China at noon on July 24 only after illegally staying in Chinese territory for two days and nights. They left behind them in the places they had come to a great amount of evidence of their intrusion.

The three other cases of intrusion by Indian soldiers are given below:

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

2. On July 3, at about 1900 hours, a group of five Indian soldiers crossed the China-Sikkim border and intruded into Dongnan grassland in Tibet, China. They carried out reconnaissance and harassment for as long as four days within Chinese territory before leaving China near Tungchu La at about 1300 hours on July 7.

3. On July 10, at about 1800 hours, an Indian soldier crossed the border near Tagi La and was discovered by a Chinese shepherd called Trashe Tsewang who was grazing his flock within Chinese territory. The intruding Indian soldier fired two shots at, and narrowly missed, the shepherd.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against these acts of aggression in flagrant disregard of China's sovereignty, disturbing the tranquillity on the China-Sikkim border and menacing the security of Chinese inhabitants there.

Since 1960 the Chinese Government has repeatedly protested against Indian intrusions on the China-Sikkim border. However, India has not only turned a deaf ear to all these protests, it has even more intensely and rabidly stepped up its acts of aggression. It has successively built a great number of aggressive military structures either inside Chinese territory or on the boundary line across Natu La, Tungchu La, Jelep La and Cho La. Indian troops have more than once intruded into Chinese territory to kidnap border inhabitants and grab livestock. In the three months from last May to July, a total of fourteen cases took place in which Indian

troops crossed the China-Sikkim boundary to carry out reconnaissance and harassment. It is particularly serious that the intruding Indian troops had the audacity to pitch tents on Chinese territory and prowl hither and thither some even coming as far as more than ten kilometres from the China-Sikkim boundary to the vicinity of Hsiasima of the important county of Yatung, Tibet. Some Indian soldiers stayed on Chinese territory for as long as four days. All this can by no means be tolerated by any sovereign state. The Chinese Government must warn India that if it does not immediately stop such acts of aggression and provocation, it must bear full responsibility for the consequences that may arise therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the 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, 2 September, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to the Chinese Government's note No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 613 of August 27, 1965.

The Government of India have examined the allegations contained in the Chinese note of August 27, 1965. These allegations relate to what the Note calls the illegal intrusions and activities of Indian soldiers on four occasions in the month of July, 1965, across Tibet-Sikkim border. Having regard to the serious nature of the allegations, the Government of India have had a careful enquiry made into them. They find that there is no truth in these allegations. No Indian soldier has crossed into Chinese territory. As a matter of fact, the Indian troops have strict instructions not to go beyond the boundary of Sikkim with Tibet. The Government of India find it hard to believe that Indian soldiers could cross into Tibet territory

at will and fire shots as alleged in the Chinese Note, in an area which, it is well known, has a strong concentration of Chinese forces.

The Chinese Government's Note of August 27, 1965, also repeats certain baseless allegations made in their earlier notes, namely, the building of so-called aggressive military structures either inside Chinese territory or on the boundary line across Natu La, Jelep La, Tungchu La and Cho La. The Government of India have already effectively replied to these notes and refuted the Chinese allegations. The Government of India have not constructed any military structures in Tibetan territory. They have, of course, every right to construct such structures on the Sikkim side of the Tibet-Sikkim border.

The Government of India cannot understand why the Chinese Government should choose to make such unfounded allegations, at the present time, in an aggressive and threatening manner as is clear from the terms of the Chinese Note of August 27, 1965. The Government of India are constrained to conclude that the Chinese protest is intended to malign India and to cause confusion in the international world and also to prepare a pretext for any illegal actions directed against India which the Chinese Government might be contemplating. Government of India reject the protest note handed by the Chinese Government.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 8 September, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 682.

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

Indian troops crossed the China-Sikkim boundary on 4 successive occasions in July 1965 for unbridled harassment activities and instead of withdrawing continued to entrench themselves on Chinese territory. Against this the Chinese Government has already lodged a protest with the Indian Government and given it warning. Now Indian troops further repeatedly intruded into China's territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border in August and carried out reconnaissance and provocations close to Chinese civil check-posts.

1. On August 1 at about 1630 hours 4 Indian soldiers on horse back and carrying rifles intruded into Tibet China in the vicinity of the Kongka Pass and flanked the Chinese civil check-post at Kongka Pass to its south-east and south for reconnoitring and provocative activities lasting more than 3 hours, penetrating about 18 km. inside Chinese territory.

2. Between August 2 and 25, 4 groups of Indian soldiers successively intruded into vicinity of the civil check-post at Hot Springs in Sinkiang, China, along the Changlung river to conduct provocative activities. The details are as follows:

On August 2 at about 1620 hours 6 Indian soldiers on horse back intruded deep into China's territory to a point within 500 metres of the Chinese civil check-post at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and conducted reconnaissance and map making for about one hour. At 1755 hours they turned south-west to a point about 3 km. to the south of the civilian check-post at Hot Springs and continued their activities there for more than one hour and half.

On August 17 at about 1120 hours 2 Indian soldiers intruded into an area south-east of the Chinese civilian check-post at Hot Springs and conducted reconnaissance there for more than 2 hours.

On August 21 at about 1320 hours and again on August 25 at about 1110 hours 3 Indian soldiers intruded into vicinity of the Chinese civilian check-post at Hot Springs and conducted reconnaissance there each time for nearly an hour.

The Chinese Government hereby lodge a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above described serious cases of Indian troops violating China's territory and sovereignty in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border for 5 successive times within a single month.

It is well known that thanks to the series of efforts made by China the situation on the Sino-Indian border has eased since the large scale armed conflict provoked by India in 1962. However India has never desisted from intrusion into Chinese territory. It has not only carried out frenzied provocative activities in all the sectors of the Sino-Indian border. It has repeatedly crossed the China-Sikkim boundary to penetrate deep into Chinese territory for harassment and even illegally built aggressive military structures beyond or on the China- Sikkim boundary which it refuses to withdraw up to now. All this shows that India has never for a moment abandoned the idea of creating new tension on the Sino-Indian border;

The Indian provocations in August in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border cannot be regarded as isolated cases. They are by no means accidental, occurring as they did at a time when the Indian Government was carrying out armed suppression against the people in Kashmir and unleashing and expanding its armed aggression against Pakistan. Facts have proved once again that India has not the slightest respect for its neighbours but makes incursions, harassment and

encroachments upon them whenever there is a chance.

China cannot but pay serious attention to the Indian Government's expansionist actions against its neighbours and strengthen China's defences and heighten her alertness along her borders. The Chinese Government once again solemnly warns the Indian Government India must dismantle all the aggressive military structures it has illegally built beyond or on the China-Sikkim boundary, withdraw its aggressive armed forces and stop all its acts of aggression and provocation against China in the western, middle and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian border. Otherwise India must bear responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.  
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 12 September, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India, and with reference to the Chinese Government's note of September 8, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

2. It was only two weeks ago on August 27 that the Chinese Government had lodged a protest with India on alleged violations of the Tibet-Sikkim border by Indian troops. These allegations were repudiated by the Government of India in its note of September 2. It is interesting that the Chinese Government has rushed another note on the same subject a few days later, adding some more baseless allegations to the old charges and issuing unwarranted warnings and threats to the Government of India. This has only confirmed what the Government of India had stated in its note of September 2, namely, that the "Chinese

protest is intended to malign India and to cause confusion in the international world and also to prepare a pretext for any illegal actions directed against India which the Chinese Government might be contemplating."

3. On several occasions in the past the Government of India have informed the Government of China that Indian troops have never crossed the Sikkim-Tibet boundary which has been formally delimited and is clearly distinguishable by well-marked natural features. Nor have Indian troops built any structures either on the Tibetan side of the border or on the border itself—there is indeed no need for India to do so. Therefore, the demand of the Chinese Government to dismantle the structures and to withdraw the troops is meaningless. But since the Chinese Government has been making these allegations and demands over and over again the Government of India are willing to allow an independent and neutral observer to go to the border in this sector in order to see for himself the actual state of affairs. Nothing could be fairer than this.

4. Extending the area of false allegations to the western sector the Chinese note alleges that Indian troops intruded into Kongka Pass and Hot Springs on five occasions. The Chinese note asserts that these places are in Tibet and Sinkiang respectively. It is necessary to point out that Kongka Pass and the Hot Springs are neither in Tibet nor in Sinkiang, but in Indian territory illegally occupied by China. Even though India does not recognise this illegal occupation and the so-called 'line of actual control' in the western sector (a phrase which surprisingly has not been used this time in the note under reply), the Government of India, exercising restraint in the interest of peace, has given strict instructions to all its personnel not to cross this line. These instructions have always been scrupulously observed by the Indian troops and personnel. The so-called five intrusions across 'the line of actual control' in August are, therefore, fictitious. The Government of India therefore rejects the protest of the

Chinese Government.

5. The Chinese note under reply has made a reference to events in Kashmir and accused India of 'armed suppression against the people of Kashmir' and 'armed aggression against Pakistan'. This is a complete distortion of facts. The world knows that it is Pakistan which committed aggression against India by sending out armed infiltrators into Kashmir across the cease-fire line and following it up by a massive attack across the international boundary in the Chhamb area of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. The Pakistan attack was supported by heavy artillery, heavy aircraft and other weapons acquired by Pakistan under military pacts of which it is a member. Pakistan has further extended the conflict by air raids on Indian cities and civilian population. These are facts which are well-known to the world. The Chief Military Observer of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan in his report to the U.N. Secretary-General has unequivocally stated that it was Pakistan which violated the cease-fire line in Kashmir by sending thousands of armed infiltrators into Kashmir. In the face of these facts it is extraordinary that Chinese should accuse India of 'suppressing the people of Kashmir' and of 'unleashing aggression' on Pakistan, when India is actually defending the people of Kashmir and the integrity of India against unprovoked Pakistan aggression.

6. The Chinese Government's attempt to connect the events in Kashmir with fictitious intrusions by Indian troops across the 'line of actual control' in the western sector is mischievous. The Kashmir question and India's unfortunate relations with Pakistan are a separate problem and has nothing to do with the Sino-Indian border question. In trying to connect the two, the Chinese Government is doing the opposite of what it had stated in its note to India of 31st May, 1962 viz. that the attitude of the Chinese Government is one of "never getting involved in the dispute over Kashmir" and also in contradiction to the declaration in the joint

statement issued in Peking by the Prime Ministers of China and Poland on April 11, 1957, that the Kashmir issue "should not be allowed to be made use of by external forces to create new tensions". The involvement of external forces in the current unfortunate conflict imposed on India by Pakistan will only impede a peaceful solution at a time when India, the United Nations and the peace-loving countries of the world are urgently striving for the restoration of peace between the two countries.

7. On the Sino-Indian border question, to which the Chinese note makes a reference, any impartial observer would admit that India has striven her utmost to find a peaceful solution. In its ceaseless search for a settlement India has made a number of constructive proposals and also accepted mediatory proposals made by disinterested third parties friendly to both India and China. Notwithstanding China's mounting hostility India still preserves the hope that peaceful settlement of the border question can and will be arrived at between the two countries.

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

Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 September, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 760

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated September 2 and 12, 1965:

(1) In its notes the Indian Government continues to resort to its usual subterfuges in an attempt to deny the intruding activities of Indian troops along the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim boundary. This

attempt cannot possibly succeed. Since cease-fire and troop withdrawal were effected along the Sino-Indian border by China on her own initiative in 1962, Indian troops have never stopped their provocations, and there have been more than 300 intrusions into China either by ground or by air. The Chinese Government has repeatedly lodged protests with the Indian Government and served warnings to it, and has successively notified some friendly countries. The facts are there, and they cannot be denied by the Indian Government by mere quibbling. Moreover, the Chinese Government has four times proposed (the latest occasion in June 1965) Sino-Indian joint investigation into India's illegal construction of military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary, but has each time been refused by the Indian Government. Now, the Indian Government pretentiously says that the matter can be settled if only an independent and neutral observer should go to the border to see for himself. It further shamelessly asserts that Indian troops have never crossed the Sikkim-China boundary which has been formally delimited and that India has not built any military works either on the Chinese side of the border or on the border itself. This is a barefaced lie. How can it hope to deceive anyone?

(2) It must be pointed out that, in each of its notes, the Indian Government has blatantly claimed parts of Sinkiang and Tibet on the Chinese side of the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary to be Indian territory "illegally occupied" by China. But in fact these areas have never belonged to India, and even had never been marked as within Indian territory before India tampered with the maps. On the other hand, it should be pointed out that 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory south of the illegal McMahon Line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border have all along been illegally occupied by India, that eight areas in the middle sector and Parigas in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border are also illegally occupied by India, and that such illegal occupation has never been recognized by the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government for ever retains the right to settle these

questions.

(3) Supported by the U.S. imperialists and their partners, the Indian Government has always pursued a policy of chauvinism and expansionism towards its neighbouring countries. Its logic for aggression is that all places it has seized belong to it and that whatever place it wants to grab but has not yet done so belongs to it too. It was this logic that motivated the large-scale armed attack the Indian Government launched against China in 1962, and it is the same logic that motivates the massive armed attack it is now launching against Pakistan. The Chinese Government has consistently held that the Kashmir question should be settled on the basis of respect for the Kashmiri people's right of self-determination, as pledged to them by India and Pakistan. This is what is meant by China's non-involvement in the dispute between India and Pakistan. But non-involvement absolutely does not mean failure to distinguish between right and wrong; it absolutely does not mean that China can approve of depriving the Kashmiri people of their right of self-determination or that she can approve of Indian aggression against Pakistan on the pretext of the Kashmir issue. Such was China's stand in the past and it remains so at present. Yet some countries have acknowledged Kashmir as belonging to India. In that case, how can one speak of their non-involvement in the dispute? The question now is that India has not only refused to recognise the right of the Kashmiri people to self-determination, but openly launched an all-out armed attack against Pakistan, this cannot but arouse the grave concern of the Chinese Government. Reason and justice must prevail in the world. So long as the Indian Government oppresses the Kashmiri people, China will not cease supporting the Kashmiri people in their struggle for self-determination. So long as the Indian Government persists in its unbridled aggression against Pakistan, China will not cease supporting Pakistan in her just struggle against aggression. This stand of ours will never change, however many helpers you may have, such as the United States, the modern revisionists and the U.S. controlled United

Nations.

(4) As is known to everybody, the Indian Government has long been using the territory of Sikkim to carry out aggressive activities against China. Since September 1962-not to mention earlier times-Indian troops have crossed the China-Sikkim boundary, which was delimited long ago, and have built a large number of military works for aggression either on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself. There are now fifty-six such military works, large and small, which they have built in the past few years all over the important passes along the China- Sikkim boundary, thus wantonly encroaching upon China's territory and violating her sovereignty. In these years, the Chinese Government has made thirteen representations to the Indian Government. But the Indian Government has all along turned a deaf ear to them and does not have the slightest respect for China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Far from stopping its acts of aggression, the Indian Government has intensified them by ordering its troops to intrude into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and provocations. The intruding Indian troops even penetrated deep into Chinese territory, made unbridled harassing raids, kidnapped Chinese border inhabitants and seized their livestock. Is there any international boundary or any principle guiding international relations in the eyes of the Indian Government? This is indeed preposterous and going too far in bullying others!

The Chinese Government now demands that the Indian Government dismantle all its military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself within three days of the delivery of the present note, and immediately stop all its intrusions along the Sino-Indian boundary and the China- Sikkim boundary, return the kidnapped Chinese border inhabitants and the seized livestock and pledge to refrain from any more harassing raids across the boundary. Otherwise, the Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the grave

consequences arising therefrom.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 17 September, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's note No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 760 of September 16, 1965, has the honour to say as follows:-

Ever since the Sino-Indian border problem was raised by the Chinese Government, the Government of India had made strenuous attempts to settle the question peacefully and with honour. Even after the unprovoked Chinese attack across the border in October-November, 1962, the Government of India consistently followed the policy of seeking a peaceful settlement honourable to both the parties concerned. It was in this spirit that India accepted the Colombo Proposals, which China has not accepted hitherto.

2. As has been pointed out in various notes to the Chinese Government in the past, the Government of India has given strict instructions to its armed forces and personnel not to cross the international boundary in the Eastern and Middle Sectors and the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. The Government of India are satisfied, after careful and detailed investigations, that Indian personnel as well as aircraft have fully carried out these instructions and have not transgressed "the international boundary and the 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector at any time at any place. The Government

of India, are, therefore, absolutely convinced that the allegations contained in the Chinese note under reply are completely groundless. The Government of India are constrained to reject these allegations and to reassert emphatically that they do not accept the claims to vast areas of Indian territory in the Western, Middle and Eastern Sectors of the border put forward in the Chinese note under reply. As regards China's stand on Kashmir and on the present unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan, it is nothing but interference on the part of China calculated to prolong and to enlarge the conflict.

3. The Chinese note has once again repeated the allegations of so-called violations of the Sikkim-Tibet border by Indian personnel. These charges have been already answered and refuted by the Government of India. Indian personnel have never crossed the Sikkim border and committed any harassments or raids into Chinese territory. Nor have they seized livestock belonging to Tibetan herdsmen or kidnapped any Chinese inhabitants from Tibetan territory. In the Government of India's note of July 13, 1965, it was clearly stated that the two Tibetan inhabitants alleged by the Chinese Government to have been kidnapped by Indian troops were actually refugees from Tibet who sought asylum in Sikkim. As the Chinese Government is aware a number of Tibetans have come over into India from time to time on their own volition and without our permission. Such persons are detained and questioned, and any of them desiring to go back to Tibet are always permitted to do so. The two Tibetans in question can also go back to Tibet if they wish to do so.

4. The Chinese Government's note has reasserted the old allegations that India has built military structures on the Tibetan side of the border. The Government of India has refuted this allegation on several occasions in the past. In September, 1962, some defence structures were constructed on the Sikkim side of the Sino-Indian frontier. These structures have not been in occupation since the cessation of hostilities in

November, 1962. Since the Chinese Government alleged that some of the structures were on their side of the border India had, in its note of September 12, gone to the extent of suggesting that an independent observer be allowed to go to this border to see for himself the state of affairs. The Chinese Government has not, unfortunately, accepted this reasonable proposal of the Government of India, and has reiterated its proposal for joint inspection. Even though the Government of India are convinced that their troops have not built military structures in Tibetan territory, they have no objection to a joint inspection of those points of the Sikkim-Tibet border where Indian personnel are alleged to have set up military structures in Tibetan territory. The Government of India on their part are prepared to arrange such an inspection as early as possible at an appropriate official level, on a mutually convenient date. If any structures are found on the Tibet side of the border, there can be no objection to their being demolished.

5. The Government of India would like to point out, in conclusion, that the charges made by the Chinese Government in its note are really minor ones and could well be settled through peaceful procedures such as those proposed in this note. These allegations do not, on any reckoning, justify the kind of threatening language and ultimatum held out by the Chinese Government. It is clear that China is fabricating these charges only to find a pretext for further aggression against India. India is a peaceful nation and has no desire for war-like conflicts. If, however, such a conflict is thrust on India by aggression from China the responsibility for the grave consequences that might follow from such action will lie squarely on the shoulders of the Chinese Government.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 19 September, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 763.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply to the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated September 17, 1965 as follows:

The Chinese Government has noted a conspicuous change of tune in the note under reference compared with the previous notes of the Indian Government.

Over the past two years and more, the Chinese Government had on thirteen occasions made representations and lodged protests concerning the construction of military works for aggression by Indian troops crossing the China-Sikkim boundary, and the Indian Government invariably flatly denied its building of any military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself. In the present note, however, the Indian Government suddenly changes its tune by admitting that the possibility of the presence of its military works on the Chinese side is not excluded, stating that if any such works are found, there is no objection to their being demolished.

In all its previous notes, the Indian Government categorically refused to return the Chinese border inhabitants kidnapped by Indian troops. In the present note, however, it suddenly changes its tune by saying that two of the kidnapped Chinese inhabitants will be permitted to come back to China if they wish to do so.

The Indian Government four times rejected the Chinese Government's

demand for a joint investigation as being unnecessary. In its present note, however, the Indian Government suddenly changes its tune by saying that it has no objection to a joint investigation, although the demand was not reiterated in the Chinese Government's note of September 16.

Why does the Indian Government suddenly change its tune while defending its habitual stand of expansionism? Obviously, this is because the stern demand made by the Chinese Government in its note of September 16 has produced effect. But has the Indian Government really altered its aggressive intentions and actions? Far from the case. To put it bluntly, the Indian Government is using this tactic to play for time, evade China's just demand and refuse to dismantle its military, works for aggression within Chinese territory or on the boundary line. But muddling through will never do.

The Chinese side is in possession of ample and abundant evidence which can prove to the world that Indian troops have crossed the China-Sikkim boundary to build military works. The Indian Government is aware of this. There is now no longer any need for investigation. In its present note, the Indian Government admits that the possibility of the existence of Indian military works on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary is not excluded and it does not object to dismantling such military works as may exist. This in effect shows that there are indeed Indian military works for aggression within Chinese territory and on the boundary line. The China-Sikkim boundary is a delimited one. The Chinese frontier guards know the places where Indian troops have built military works across the boundary as they know their own palms. The Chinese Government firmly demands that the Indian Government dismantle these military works for aggression. In order to give the Indian Government the opportunity to do so, the Chinese Government is willing to put off the time-limit set in its note of September 16 to before midnight of

September 22.

Besides dismantling the Indian troops, military works for aggression within Chinese territory and on the boundary line, the Indian Government must hand back the four Chinese border inhabitants who have been kidnapped and the eight hundred sheep and fifty- nine yaks that have been seized by Indian troops on the China- Sikkim border. All these kidnapped persons and seized livestock were explicitly mentioned in previous notes of the Chinese Government. The Indian Government asserts in its note that two of the Chinese inhabitants who were kidnapped by Indian troops went to Sikkim to seek asylum and that they will be permitted to return only if they wish to do so. This is a hoax. All the border inhabitants kidnapped and the livestock seized by Indian troops must be returned unconditionally, not short of a single one. The Indian Government must further guarantee that absolutely no intrusions or harassing raids across the border will recur in future.

In its note, the Indian Government pretends to be peace-loving, alleging that India is a peaceful nation, that it has made consistent attempts to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully, and that the matters raised by the Chinese Government in its note of September 16 are minor ones which do not call for the use of "threatening language" and the form of an "ultimatum". Is all this true? No. We did endeavour to believe that India would be willing to live together in peace with her neighbours. But gradually we came to discover that peace is only a smokescreen used by the Indian Government to cover up its prosecution of an expansionist policy. China and India should have been friendly neighbours co-existing peacefully in accordance with the Five Principles. The Chinese Government has indicated to the Indian Government its desire for friendship on innumerable occasions. But all these demonstrations of friendship have failed to prevent the Indian Government from nibbling away, intruding into and making harassing

raids on Chinese territory, setting up a large number of strong points there, and even launching a massive armed attack on China along the entire Sino-Indian boundary. It was only when the Chinese Government used stern language in talking to the Indian Government and put its words into practice by repulsing India's massive armed attack in self-defence that the Indian Government slightly restrained itself.

It is a tactic of the Indian expansionists to describe all their acts of aggression against India's neighbours as minor matters which do not jeopardize peace; but if you earnestly demand the cessation of their acts of aggression, they will charge you with using "threatening language" and the form of an "ultimatum". But innumerable facts have shown that the Indian Government does not heed good words of advice, and only sobers up a little when faced with categorical just demands and with firm will to see these demands fulfilled. The Indian intrusions and harassing raids across the China- Sikkim boundary are by no means minor matters, nor are those occurring in any sector of the entire Sino-Indian border. The Chinese Government must deal with them seriously.

From their own experience the Chinese people can deeply understand how Pakistan has been bullied by the Indian Government. The Indian Government's expansionism has linked China with all the other neighbouring countries which India has been bullying. The Chinese Government gives all-out support to the people of Kashmir in their struggle for the right of national self- determination. The Chinese Government gives all-out support to Pakistan in her just struggle against Indian aggression. The Chinese Government fully supports the desire of the neighbours of India to safeguard their independence and neutrality and protect their internal affairs from interference. This stand of the Chinese Government is not to be shaken by any tricks on the part of the Indian Government.

In its note the Indian Government flatly denies the fact about its occupation of and intrusions and harassing raids into China's territory, and pretends that the Sino-Indian boundary question has already been settled. This will not succeed. India is now still in occupation of 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory south of the illegal McMahon Line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, eight pieces of Chinese territory in the middle sector and China's Parigas in the western sector. After 1962, Indian troops kept on crossing the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border for harassing raids, and even lately they are still doing so. None of these facts can be denied by the Indian Government. All these issues must be settled, and nothing whatsoever can make the Chinese Government give up its right of settling these issues. The Chinese Government for ever retains the right to settle these issues.

In conclusion, the Chinese Government reiterates that the Indian Government must dismantle all its military works for aggression either on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself before midnight of September 22, 1965, immediately stop all its intrusions along the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim boundary, return the kidnapped Chinese border inhabitants and the seized livestock and pledge to refrain from any more harassing raids across the boundary. Otherwise, the Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the grave consequences arising therefrom.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 September, 1965**

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to a grave incident of Indian troops intruding into Chinese territory and making an armed attack on Chinese civilian personnel, has the honour to state as follows:

At 1450 hours on September 19, 1965, a group of Indian soldiers, who had intruded into Dumchele within Chinese territory in the Western Sector of the Sino-Indian border, penetrated to an area about four kilometres eastward for harassment and brazenly made an attack by opening fire on the Chinese civilian personnel who were on duty there. After serving warnings without avail, the Chinese civilian personnel had to strike back, and thus repulsed the intruding Indian soldiers. This incident is the gravest armed provocation India has made on the Sino-Indian border since her massive armed attack against China in October, 1962, was checked. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government.

Dumchele is Chinese territory. It is on the Chinese side of the 1959 line of actual control between China and India and is under effective Chinese control. It was only after the Chinese frontier guards began to withdraw all along the Sino-Indian border on December 1, 1962 that this place was vacated as part of the demilitarized zone. In its note to China dated July 28, 1964, the Indian Government also recognized Dumchele as being within the Chinese demilitarized zone, yet, Indian troops not only set up an aggressive strongpoint at Dumchele back in June 1965, but have now made an armed attack on Chinese civilian personnel. This is an act of serious encroachment upon Chinese territory and sovereignty and deliberate provocation of an armed conflict.

The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all its intrusions and provocations on the Sino- Indian

border and absolutely guarantee that it will not again invade and occupy Dumchele in China and that similar incidents will not recur. Otherwise, India must bear full responsibility for all the consequences that may arise therefrom.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 21 September, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government Note No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 763 of September 19, has the honour to reply as follows:

2. The Government of India are surprised by the language and contents of the Chinese Note of September 19. We have no desire to compete with the Chinese Government in the use of abusive and undignified language. But it must be pointed out that neither vituperation nor intimidation is conducive to a peaceful settlement.

3. It is regrettable that the Chinese Government has not responded to the peaceful gesture and the reasonable proposal made by the Government of India in its note of September 17.

4. In regard to the defence structures alleged by the Government of China to have been built by the Government of India on the Tibetan side of the Sikkim border, since matters of facts were in dispute the Government of India suggested in their Note of September 12 an inspection by an independent observer but the Chinese Government did not accept this reasonable proposal. The Government of India, therefore, agreed to the suggestion of joint inspection by Indian and Chinese

officials reiterated in paragraph (1) of the Chinese Note of 16th September. It is extraordinary that China now refuses to accept its own proposal for joint inspection into the allegation that Indian troops have built military structures on the Tibetan side of the Sikkim border.

5. The Chinese Government have now demanded that "the Indian Government dismantle all its military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself before midnight of September 22, 1965." It has already been stated in the Government of India's note of September 17 that if after joint inspection any structures are found on the Tibetan side of the border there can be no objection to their being demolished. Surely, if in fact there were in existence any such structures on the Tibetan side of the border, the Chinese Government would not have waited for our consent to demolish them or asked us to do so by sending our personnel across the border.

6. Furthermore, it is not clear what the Chinese Government mean when they speak of military works not only on the Tibet side of the border but also "on the boundary line". The Chinese Government are concerned only with the alleged military works on the Tibet side of the border in respect of which the Government of India have already clearly stated their position in their note of September 17, and which has been reiterated above. As regards military structures on the Indian side of the border whether they exist or not is a matter which concerns only the Government of India within its own sovereign rights, and the Chinese Government is in no way concerned with any matter pertaining to Indian territory.

7. The second demand of the Chinese Government is in respect of handing back 4 Tibetan inhabitants who are wrongly alleged to have been kidnapped and also for the return of 800 sheep and 59 yaks alleged to have been seized by Indian troops. In their note of September 17, the Government of India have already stated that a number of Tibetans-and

there are, as the Chinese Government is aware thousands of such refugees in India-have come over into India from time to time on their own volition and without our permission, and any of them desiring to go back to Tibet are always permitted to do so.

8. The Government of India has told the Chinese Government again and again that our troops have not kidnapped any Tibetans nor have they seized any livestock. The two Tibetan inhabitants mentioned in the Indian note of September 17 and the two Tibetan herdsmen who had come into India in 1963 with their livestock are free to go back to Tibet at any time if they desire to do so. The Chinese Government are aware that there are not four but many thousands of Tibetans who have left their homeland and sought refuge in India. As regards yaks we have already told the Chinese Government in our note of February 2, 1964, that no yaks have been seized by our personnel.

9. It is clear that the Chinese Government are repeating these false and frivolous allegations and accusing India of "acts of aggression" merely to find a pretext for committing aggression.

10. Finally, the Chinese Government have asked for assurance that "no intrusions or harassing raids across the border will occur in future." The Government of India have already, in their note of September 17 and earlier Notes, informed the Chinese Government that the Government of India have given strict instructions to its armed forces and personnel not to cross the international boundary in the Eastern and Middle Sectors and the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector, and these instructions have been observed strictly. Having given the replies to the specific demands made by the Chinese Government, the Government of India cannot but observe that China, taking advantage of the present unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan, is concocting without any valid basis casus belli in order to commit aggression against India. The

Chinese Government accuse the Government of India of expansionism which is totally false as is self-evident to the world, in order to justify its own aggressive intentions and desire to extend their domination over the whole of Asia. The Chinese Government in the Note under reply have enunciated the new doctrine that China must interfere in the inter-se relations of Asian countries. This claim of China to assume the role of guardianship and hegemony over Asian countries is a role which no self-respecting nation in Asia would be prepared to accept or recognise. Large or small, strong or weak, every country in Asia has the fullest right to preserve its independence and sovereignty on terms of equality. The dominance of the Chinese will not be accepted by any of them. The Government of India, therefore, reject the claim of China to advise the Government of India how to resolve its differences with its neighbour Pakistan over Kashmir or any other matter.

11. India's record as a peaceful country and a good neighbour is well-known to the world and it is not necessary for the Government of India to argue this point with the Chinese Government who is blinded with hatred for India. It is also well-known to the world how India since the establishment of the People's Republic of China extended the hand of friendship to China and how, in return, the rulers of China committed aggression against India and occupied by force 14,500 sq. miles of Indian territory in Ladakh. India has neither forgotten nor accepted this illegal occupation of its territory by China. The Chinese note under reply has also repeated their aggressive claims to Indian territory in the Eastern, Middle and Western Sectors, claims which the Government of India categorically reject.

12. China's aggressive intentions are clear from the fact that even while they have in their note extended the time-limit by 72 hours, in actual fact they have started firing at our border posts both in Sikkim and Ladakh having already crossed the Sikkim border at Dongchui La and

Nathu La. In the western sector at Demchok, several hundred Chinese troops have taken position across the Indian checkpoint which is well within the Indian side of the so-called "1959 line of actual control". This action by China is in clear violation of the recommendation of 2(a) of Colombo proposals and China's own so-called "unilateral cease-fire" declaration of 21st November, 1962.

13. The whole attitude of the Chinese Government, its threats and the three-day ultimatum prove that China is not at all interested in a peaceful settlement of the border question or in peaceful co-existence between India and China. India can only urge the Chinese Government to forsake the path of belligerence and intimidation and to return to the path of peace and reason in its relations with India. On her part, India has always been and continues to be willing to settle these differences by peaceful means.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 September, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to state as follows in reply to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 769, dated September 20, 1965.

The Chinese Note under reply has stated that at 1450 hours on September 19, a group of Indian soldiers intruded into Dumchele within "Chinese territory" in the Western Sector and opened fire on Chinese

civilian personnel. The fact of the matter is that it is actually Chinese troops who have crossed into Indian territory and opened heavy fire on an Indian civilian police party near Tsaskur (E 7908 N 3304). Dumchele, as the Chinese Government is aware, is on the Chinese side of "the line of actual control" about 2-1/2 miles north-east of Tsaskur. As a result of this incident, three Indian personnel are still reported missing. Evidently, the Chinese Government has distorted the facts and accused India of intrusion into Dumchele in order to cover up their own intrusion and firing on Indian civilian personnel in undisputed Indian territory near Tsaskur. Even though the Government of India has never recognised the so-called 'line of actual control' unilaterally declared by China, Indian personnel have never crossed that line in the interest of peace and in the hope that China would through peaceful methods vacate its aggression in Ladakh. The Chinese Note has asserted that Dumchele is in Chinese territory, when it is actually in Indian territory illegally occupied by China. It is in vain for the Chinese Government to hope that by such assertions; it can legalise its unlawful presence on Indian soil.

In the context of the ultimatum served by China on India, these concocted allegations of Indian intrusions combined with violent and provocative acts by Chinese military personnel, assume a dangerous significance. The Government of India has noted the statement by the Chinese Government that the so-called incident at Dumchele is "the gravest armed provocation" which India is alleged to have made on the Sino-Indian border. It is well known that in October 1962, the Chinese Government launched a massive attack on India under the pretext of self-defence. Therefore the reference to the events of 1962, at the present juncture is ominous.

The Government of India categorically reject the Chinese protest and urge the Chinese Government to desist from the belligerent course it has set for itself in its relations with India.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 September, 1965**

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

Even while the Chinese Government has in their note of September 19, extended the time-limit by 72 hours for an answer to what was virtually an ultimatum, the Chinese forces have moved up all along India's northern border and started firing at Indian border posts both in Sikkim and Ladakh.

Western Sector

The Chinese troops have, at several points, violated the 20- kilometer demilitarised zone, crossed the so-called 'line of actual control', and entered Indian territory.

(1) On the afternoon of September 19, 1965, a party of fifty mounted Chinese troops intruded into Indian territory near our civil post at Tsaskur (E 7908 N 3304), after crossing the 'line of actual control', and opened heavy fire on an Indian civilian police party patrolling in the area well within Indian territory. As a result of this aggressive action by Chinese troops, three of the Indian personnel are still missing.

(2) On September 19, 1965, Chinese troops intruded upto a depth of

two miles into Indian territory west of the 'line of actual control' near the Indian check-post at the track junction between Daulat Beg Oldi and Murgo and have taken up position approximately at E 7801 N 3517.

(3) Chinese forces after moving from their post at Mabdo La have entrenched themselves in strength at several points opposite our Hot Spring check-post (approximately E 7857 N 3418) on the Indian side of the line of actual control.

(4) In the eastern part of Demchok the Chinese troops after violating the 20 kilometer demilitarised zone, moved forward in strength right up to the Charding Nullah and have assumed a threatening posture at the Indian civilian post on the western side of the Nullah on the Indian side of the 'line of actual control'.

### Middle Sector

16 Chinese soldiers were observed on 19th September, 1965, in the Barahoti area on the Indian side of the international boundary. The entry of Chinese military personnel into Barahoti is in violation of the clear understanding between India and China, and the provisions of the Colombo Proposals according to which, both sides pending a settlement of the border question, are to refrain from sending armed personnel in to Barahoti area.

### Sikkim Sector

(1) At 1100 hours on 20th September 1965, Chinese troops moved up in company strength, backed by a battalion, over the Dongchui La Pass in Sikkim. They resorted to firing and attempted to encircle a position occupied by our observation post. In order not to provoke an incident, our observation post withdrew and the Chinese occupied the area, about 800 yards on our side of the border, and they continue to be in occupation

there.

(2) At 0220 hours on 21st September, Chinese troops fired across the Nathu La Pass towards our post south of the border. Again, in order not to provoke an incident, the Indian post withdrew 300 yards to the rear. Later, our troops when surveying the area discovered that Chinese troops in company strength were entrenched not only in the area from which our post withdrew temporarily, but further inside Sikkim territory. Chinese troops continue to be deployed on the Sikkim side of the border.

The Government of India are gravely concerned by these unprovoked and aggressive activities of Chinese troops across the border. Coming after threats and ultimatum issued by the Chinese Government these cannot be considered anything other than premeditated acts of provocation and aggression. It is now obvious to the whole world that the Chinese Government had deliberately trumped-up allegations of Indian intrusions and Indian structures in Chinese territory for providing an excuse for an attack on India. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government and urge that China stop these military intrusions and provocations.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 22 September, 1965**

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

Government of India have received reports that on the 21st September, 1965, at 1100 hours 60 Chinese soldiers came down Lipu Lekh Pass into Indian territory and carried out reconnaissance for several hours.

As the Chinese Government is aware Lipu Lekh Pass is one of the six passes mentioned as border passes in the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between India and the Tibet Region of China signed in April 1954. Obviously, this latest act of violation of the border is not unconnected with the series of similar incidents which China has created along the India-China border during the last few days.

Government of India would once again urge the Chinese Government to desist from such unwarranted aggressive acts on the Indian border and to return to the path of peace.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 September 1965**

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

The Government of India have now received detailed information regarding the incident created by the Chinese troops near the Indian civil police post at Tsaskur (E 7908 and N 3304). At 1300 hours on September

19, 1965, a party of five Indian civilian policemen was carrying out routine patrol in the vicinity of the Indian check-post at Tsaskur, well inside Indian territory when 20 mounted Chinese soldiers suddenly opened fire at them. Two of the Indian policemen took cover while the three others withdrew towards the Indian post at Tsaskur. Another party of 30 Chinese soldiers who were hiding nearby fired upon the three policemen, overpowered them physically and carried them into Chinese occupied territory. A discarded pair of P. T. shoes and a blood-stained web-belt belonging to the police- men were subsequently found on the Indian side at a distance of half a mile from the 'line of actual control'. Subsequently, twenty Chinese soldiers came up to the Tsaskur civil post, ransacked it and withdrew to the Chinese side at 1700 hours.

According to a Peking radio broadcast of September 23 Chinese personnel were reported to have discovered the bodies of three Indian "soldiers" in the so-called 'battle-field' at Dumchele. The Government of India in its note of September 21 had clearly pointed out that the Chinese allegations contained in their note of September 20 about Indian intrusion into Dumchele was intended to cover up their own intrusion and firing on Indian civilian personnel in undisputed Indian territory near Tsuskur. It now transpires that the Chinese troops not only intruded into Indian territory, fired at our policemen, and ransacked our civil check-post, but abducted three of our policemen and later on killed them. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these wanton and inhuman actions of the Chinese soldiers and ask the Chinese Government to put a stop to such aggressive activities. The Government of India demand the return of the dead bodies of the three Indian policemen and reserve the right to demand full compensation for the damage to Indian life and property inflicted by the intruding Chinese troops.

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

highest consideration.

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the  
Embassy of India in China, 24 September, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 781

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 note of the Indian Government of September 21 in reply to the note of the Chinese Government of September 19, has the honour to state as follows:

In its note the Indian Government feigns peaceableness and innocence and accuses China of "belligerence" and "intimidation". It imagines that by so doing it can cover up its own crimes of aggression against China and elude the Chinese Governments stern condemnation and just demands. Such clumsy tactics can deceive no one.

The fact that Indian troops built military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary is established by conclusive evidence and cannot be overthrown by quibbling. Yet over the past years the Indian Government flatly denied the existence of such military works. Only after the Chinese Government demanded their dismantling within a specified time-limit did the Indian Government admit in its note of September 17 that the possibility of the existence of such military works was not excluded. In its note of September 21, the Indian Government further says: "Surely, if in fact there were in existence any such structures on the Tibetan side of the border, the Chinese Government would not have waited for our consent to demolish them or asked us to do so by sending our personnel across the border." The Indian

Government thinks that it can get away with it by sophistry but in fact this only further exposes itself and is tantamount to admitting that Indian troops did built these works on Chinese territory and that they should be dismantled.

In reality, India has withdrawn the intruding Indian troops within the specified time-limit set by the Chinese Government and demolished some of her aggressive military works. The Chinese frontier guards are now in full control of the sites of the Indian troops' military works for aggression and are in possession of abundant evidence. In these circumstances, if the Indian Government continues to quibble and prevaricate, it will only lose face completely before the people of the whole world.

In its note the Indian Government again refuses to hand back the Chinese border inhabitants kidnapped and the livestock seized by its troops. The note asserts that "there are not four but many thousands of Tibetans who have left their homeland and sought refuge in India," implying that since the thousands are not being returned, what do four persons matter? We hereby serve you notice that while the case of those thousands must be settled, that of the four persons must be settled immediately. These four persons were forcibly kidnapped by Indian troops from Chinese territory in broad day light, and there can be no talk whatsoever of "asylum". The eight hundred sheep and the fifty-nine yaks were likewise carried away from Chinese territory by Indian troops. The Indian side must assume the responsibility of returning all the four persons and all the livestock not short of a single one. As for those several thousand persons, including Dalai Lama, they are no "refugees" either, but were enticed or coerced to go to India after the failure of the rebellion of serf-owners instigated by the Indian Government in the Tibet region of China. Nominally, the Indian Government is giving them "political asylum", but in fact it is using them for continued subversive and disruptive activities against China. Since you have mentioned these

several thousand persons, we deem it necessary to remind you that this debt you owe us must be settled.

In its Note the Indian Government once again asserts that it has given strict instructions to its armed forces and personnel not to make intrusions or harassing raids into China, and that these instructions have been strictly observed. But facts have thoroughly exploded these lies. Even within the past month and more-not to go into earlier history-Indian troops repeatedly intruded into China's Hot Springs, the vicinity of the Kongka Pass, Dumchele and Demchok in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border for harassing raids and armed provocations, and provocatively opened fire at the Natu La and the Jelep La on the China-Sikkim border. These are the proofs. We are all too familiar with the Indian Government's practice of saying one thing while doing another. It must be pointed out that to continue to play such double-faced tricks will never do. The Indian Government must in its deeds truly stop all intrusions and provocations; otherwise, it must face all the grave consequences which may arise therefrom. We mean what we say.

The Indian Government glibly claims that it is a peaceful country and a good neighbour, but in fact it is an arch-hypocrite talking no end of fine words while doing no end of evil deeds. Under the guise of friendship with China, it tried its utmost to obstruct the peaceful liberation of Tibet and seized 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border. It invaded and occupied eight pieces of Chinese territory in the middle sector. After the failure of the rebellion of Tibetan serf-owners which it instigated, it advanced a claim to more than 30,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in Aksai Chin. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian Government's territorial claim, and it forever retains the right to settle these issues of Chinese territory still being occupied by India.

What India calls "peaceful co-existence" in fact is a smokescreen for

covering up its pursuance of an expansionist policy. This is the way India deals with China as well as with her other neighbouring countries. She has perfidiously deprived the people of Kashmir of their right to self-determination, attempting to seize the whole of Kashmir for herself. Recently she has brazenly launched a war of naked aggression against Pakistan. These expansionist crimes of the Indian Government have been severely condemned by countries and peoples upholding justice. In order to cover up its crimes and divert the attention of the people of the world, the Indian Government has in its note turned to slander China as desiring to extend her domination over the whole of Asia, and allege that China wants to assume the role of "hegemony" and "guardianship" over Asian countries. These charges are too preposterous. It may be asked; of the independent Asian countries of today which has stepped into the shoes of imperialism and turned a neighbour into her "protectorate"? Was it not India but China that assumed the role of a guardian of another Asian country in the current incident of the China-Sikkim border? India launched an all-out armed aggression against Pakistan. This is not termed an attempt at "hegemony" over Asian countries, yet China, who together with other countries upholding justice opposed this aggression, is said to want to assume the role of "hegemony" over Asian country. Is there such logic on earth?

China is a country that abides by reason and upholds principles. China will never commit aggression against others, nor will she tolerate unscrupulous aggression by any country. We will certainly oppose aggressors and support victims of aggression. So long as India still commits aggression against Pakistan, so long as she still deprives the people of Kashmir of their right to self-determination, China will not cease to support Pakistan against Indian aggression or support the people of Kashmir in their just struggle for their right to self-determination.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 September, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Yu Tzu No. 782

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China, and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the two notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government of September 21 and its note of September 22, 1965.

In the above-mentioned notes the Indian Government alleges that Chinese troops have made military provocations against India on the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border. The results of check ups by the Chinese Government show that the incidents enumerated in the Indian notes are either out-and-out fabrications or complete distortions. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the unwarranted protest of the Indian Government.

**1. Western Sector of the Sino-Indian Border**

(1) The Indian Government alleges that on September 19, 1965, fifty mounted Chinese troops intruded into Indian territory near the Indian Civil Post at Tsaskur and opened fire on an Indian Civilian Police Party. In fact, it was Indian troops who on that day intruded into an area about four kilometres East of Dumchele within Chinese territory and made an attack by opening fire on the Chinese civilian personnel there. The Chinese Government has given a detailed and factual account of the incident in its note of September 20, and it is in possession of conclusive evidence. In clearing the field the Chinese civilian personnel found the bodies of three Indian soldiers, whom they have swathed with cloth and buried. They also found four rifles used by Indian troops, which are now

kept in their custody.

(2) The Indian Government alleges that on September 19, 1965, Chinese troops intruded into Indian territory in the vicinity of Daulet Beg Oldi and took up position at approximately 78° 01' E, 35° 17' N. This is a sheer fabrication. It may be pointed out that these coordinates were also mentioned in the note of the Indian Government dated April 21, 1965. At that time, however, the Indian Government asserted that these coordinates were six miles west of the 'line of actual control' whereas in its latest note, it asserts that they are two miles west of the 'line of actual control'. This self contradiction on precisely proves that the Indian Government has been concocting lies at will.

The Indian Government alleges that Chinese forces have entrenched themselves opposite India's Hot Springs check-post. As a matter of fact, it was Indian troops who, within the period of one and half months from early August to September 16, 1965, intruded seven miles into the vicinity of the Chinese civilian checkposts at Hot Springs in Sinkiang and at the Kongka Pass in Tibet for reconnaissance and harassment.

(4) The Indian Government alleges that Chinese troops moved forward upto so-called Charding Nullah in the eastern part of Demchok and assumed a threatening posture towards an Indian civilian post. In fact, it was Indian troops who on September 18, intruded into the vicinity of the Demchok village on the Chinese side of the 'line of actual control' after crossing the Demchok River from Parigas (in Tibet, China) which has been illegally occupied by India.

## 2. Middle Sector of the Sino-Indian Border

(1) The Indian Government alleges that Chinese troops have centered the Wuje area. In fact, it is the Indian Government which every year sends its troops for illegal stationing in this area in violation of

the agreement between the two sides.

(2) The Indian Government alleges that 60 Chinese soldiers went into Indian territory through the Lipu Lekh Pass on September 21, 1965. The fact is that at no time have Chinese soldiers crossed this pass into Indian territory.

### 3. China-Sikkim Boundary

The Indian Government alleges that on September 20, 1965, Chinese troops crossed the Tungchu La, fired at Indian troops and occupied an area 800 yards on the Sikkim side of the border; it further alleges that on September 21, Chinese troops fired across the Natu La towards an Indian post South of the border and were entrenched inside Sikkim territory. In fact, it was Indian troops who twice fired from a place near the Natu La at Chinese frontier guards within Chinese territory at 1830 hours and 1900 hours respectively on September 20, and who fired from a place near the Jelep La at Chinese frontier guards at 2000 hours on the same day.

The Indian Government has hastily delivered three notes in succession, in which it made fabrications and confounded black and white. Its intention in so doing is only too obvious. In the face of the stern warning and resolute demands of the Chinese Government, the Indian Government has been compelled to admit the fact about its construction of aggressive military works on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary and has stealthily demolished or abandoned these military works. In groundlessly slandering Chinese troops as making intrusions and provocations on the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border, the Indian Government now tries to cover up its own crimes of aggression and retrieve its lost face. But how can it fool anyone by such a clumsy trick of a thief crying, "stop thief"?

The Indian Government can never succeed in its attempt to pin its own crime on China. The indisputable fact is that India has long been perpetrating intrusions and provocations against China, and has of late grown particularly reckless. The Indian Government must genuinely stop all its intrusions and provocations along the Sino- Indian border and the China-Sikkim border. Any quibbling, lying or counter-charge will only get you into a still worse position. The Chinese Government has every right to strengthen its defences and heighten its alertness along the border or to act in self-defence. If you insist on keeping up your wilful intrusions you must bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 September, 1965**

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

On September 26, 1965 a three-men Indian army patrol, consisting of one NCO and two others were patrolling within forty yards of the Sikkim-Tibet border on the Indian side of Dongchui La, when a group of forty Chinese soldiers descended upon them, surrounded them and forcibly kidnapped them. An Indian patrol party which was sent to investigate the whereabouts of these three men found that the Chinese soldiers who had kidnapped the men, were still entrenched on the Sikkim side of the border. When the Indian patrol was within fifty yards of the Chinese soldiers the latter shouted at them "go back or we will shoot you". The

Indian patrol Commander then asked about the whereabouts of the three men to which the Chinese waved their hands adopting a provocative posture.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against the crossing of the Sikkim border by the Chinese troops and the kidnapping of our personnel, and demand that the three men be returned to the Indian side immediately. The Government of India are gravely concerned by these frequent intrusions and aggressive acts of the Chinese forces across the Sikkim border and urge the Chinese Government to abandon its provocative and war-like course.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 27 September, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 809

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

At 16.30 hours on September 26, 1965 three Indian soldiers armed with ordinary and semi-automatic rifles intruded into Chinese territory by crossing the Tungchu La on the China-Sikkim boundary for reconnaissance and provocation. They were arrested forthwith by Chinese troops.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned intrusion into Chinese territory by Indian soldiers, and demands that India immediately stop all intrusions into and provocations against China and ensure that similar incidents will not recur.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to review 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, 1 October, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's Notes No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 781 dated September 24, 1965, and No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 798 dated September 26, 1965, and has the honour to state as follows:

In the two notes under reply the Chinese Government has again belaboured the trumped-up and farcical allegations which have formed the terms of its impertinent ultimatum to India. The Government of India have already repudiated each and every one of these allegations. As regards the so-called military structures, which the Chinese had made into a casus belli, the Government of India and the entire world are amused by the Chinese Government's statement that these have since been demolished by Indian troops while "withdrawing" within the time-limit set by the Chinese Government. The fact was that there were no Indian troops in Tibetan territory to be withdrawn and that there were no Indian military structures in Tibet to be destroyed. The Chinese Government had, indeed, admitted this indirectly by its refusal to allow an independent observer to go to the border and also by rejecting its own proposal for joint inspection when the Government of India accepted it.

Both the 'construction' and the 'demolition' of military structures by Indian troops were a Chinese myth-a myth which has now exploded in the face of its own authors.

About the four Tibetan inhabitants allegedly kidnapped by Indian troops, an adequate reply has been given in the Indian notes of September 17 and 21. Like other Tibetan refugees these four people had come into India on their own volition and without our permission and taken refuge in India. They are free to go back to Tibet at any time if they desire to do so. Apropos the 800 sheep and 59 yaks the Government of India have already given a reply in the clearest terms possible. We know nothing of the yaks and as regards the sheep it is up to the two herdsmen concerned to take them to Tibet if and when they choose to go back to their homeland.

In its note of September 26, China has protested against the peaceful demonstration which was held near the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi on September 24 when some of the citizens of Delhi took in procession about 800 sheep. The Government of India had nothing to do with this demonstration. It was a spontaneous, peaceful and good-humoured expression of the resentment of the citizens of Delhi against the Chinese ultimatum and the threat of war against India on trumped-up and trivial issues. In India, as the Chinese Government is, no doubt, aware, citizens have the right of peaceful assembly and of peaceful demonstration. There is no reason for the Government of China to protest against this. The demonstration was not only peaceful but the demonstrators kept themselves more than 50 yards away from the gate of the Embassy building. Full security protection was provided to the Chinese Embassy by the Indian authorities. This peaceful demonstration by a number of private citizens of Delhi was entirely in conformity with the laws of India and with the rights and freedoms enjoyed by Indian citizens under the Constitution. The Chinese Government has absolutely no right to interfere in the internal affairs of India. The protest is, therefore, rejected as

completely unwarranted.

The Chinese Government appears to have been embarrassed by the statement in the Indian note that there are not four but thousands of Tibetans who have left their homeland and taken refuge in India. But that is a fact, though not a creditable one for the Chinese regime in Tibet. The Chinese note has stated that these thousands of Tibetan refugees are a debt which India owes to China. On the contrary, it is a debt which China owes to the people of Tibet for making it impossible for them to live in freedom and dignity in their own motherland. It is interesting that a mention has been made in the Chinese note to His Holiness the Dalai Lama. In March, 1959, when the Dalai Lama fled from Lhasa, following the Chinese invasion of Tibet, and took asylum in India, the Chinese Government had stated that His Holiness was "abducted to India by Tibetan rebels" and kept under duress by the Indian authorities. However, on December 17, 1964, the State Council of China, while dismissing the Dalai Lama from his posts as the Chairman and member of the Preparatory Committee for the autonomous region of Tibet, described His Holiness as having "staged a traitorous armed counter revolutionary rebellion against the country in 1959" and to have fled abroad. Now the Chinese Government has changed its tune once again and has alleged that the Dalai Lama and others were "enticed or coerced to go to India." The falsehoods propagated by the Chinese Government do not even possess the virtue of consistency. The Chinese Government ought to be aware that rebellions do not take place under enticement or coercion. Where there is oppression, there is rebellion. It is futile to blame India for the troubles in Tibet and for large number of Tibetans being forced to leave their hearths and homes for refuge in other countries.

The Government of India have told China again and again that Indian personnel and aircraft have strict instructions to respect the international boundary as well as the 'line of actual control' in the western sector. We

are fully satisfied that these instructions have been observed and that there has been not a single instance of intrusion from our side. Yet, the Chinese Government is maliciously repeating the charges of Indian intrusions and harassing raids. This can only be to cover up and justify their own violations and aggressive actions across the border. It is well-known that in the name of self-defence and in order to lend assistance to its ally Pakistan, China has mobilized its forces on the Indian border and had, in certain sectors, actually moved its troops into Indian territory and committed grave acts of provocation. In Sikkim, Chinese troops made serious intrusions across the border, opened fire at Indian posts and kidnapped three Indian soldiers whom they have not yet returned. Chinese troops are at present deployed in considerable strength close to the border of Sikkim where they have been building military structures and installations. In the Western Sector, China has virtually remilitarized the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone in clear contravention of the Colombo proposals, and also made serious intrusions and raids into Indian territory including kidnapping and killing of three Indian civilian police personnel. It is therefore the Chinese Government who should take immediate steps to put a stop to aggressive acts by its troops across the border into Indian territory. There is no use hurling allegations and threats at India when it is actually China which is the law-breaker and the aggressor.

In the present crisis the Chinese Government has made Sikkim a special target of its aggressive attention. It is, therefore, not surprising that China has referred in its note to the relations between India and Sikkim. The special and friendly relationship between India and Sikkim is the natural result of history, geography and culture and is based on a treaty freely entered into by the two parties in 1950 under which India is responsible for the defence and external relations of Sikkim. Mr. Chou En-lai, the Prime Minister of China, had recognised this when in 1960 he stated at a press conference in New Delhi that "China respects India's relations with Sikkim and Bhutan". The stand now taken by the Chinese

Government is, therefore, one of those somersaults in Chinese policy towards India. The Government of India reject the attempt of the Chinese Government to interfere in the relations between India and Sikkim and emphatically affirm their responsibility for the defence and external relations of Sikkim.

The Chinese Government has taken exception to our statement that China wants to assume the role of hegemony and guardianship over Asian countries. India is aware that China's hegemonistic ambitions are not confined to Asia alone. While professing Asian- African solidarity China is, in fact, doing everything possible to split the Asian-African community and to widen and exacerbate the cleavages between Asian and African countries. It is in tune with its policy of divide and rule that the Chinese Government has openly taken sides with Pakistan in the current unfortunate Indo-Pakistan conflict and sought to fan the flames of war and threatened to open a second front against India, when almost every country in the world has been trying to bring about a cessation of hostilities. The Government of India would like to tell China that it is doing the greatest possible dis-service to Asia and to Asian-African solidarity by its doctrine of intervention and its assumption of guardianship over others under the pretext of defence against aggression. This behaviour of the Chinese Government cannot go unnoticed by the peoples of the world and particularly the nations of Africa and Asia.

The Chinese note has expressed annoyance at India's appeal to the Government of the People's Republic of China to forsake the path of belligerence and intimidation and to return to the path of peace and reason. It would appear that the Chinese Government finds the very words 'peace' and 'peaceful co-existence' embarrassing and irritating. In recent Chinese notes and statements, there is not even single reference to peaceful settlement of the differences between India and China. On the contrary, there have been threats and ultimata, peremptory demands and

fantastic claims to vast areas of Indian territory. In the two notes under reply, India is threatened with "grave consequences" and warned that "all accounts will have to be settled". This is the language of aggression and not of peaceful settlement. The Government of India would urge the Chinese Government to realize that such language and threats are of no avail and that there is no alternative to a peaceful and rational solution of the problems between the two countries.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 October, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's notes No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 782 dated 24th September, 1965 and No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 809 dated 27th September, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

In the notes under reference the Chinese Government has tried to evade responsibility for intrusions and acts of aggression by Chinese troops by making concocted counter-charges against India. These counter-charges are, obviously, to camouflage the continuing intrusions and provocations by Chinese forces all along the Sino- Indian border.

**Western Sector**

(1) The Government of India in its note of September 21, 1965, had protested against the wanton incident provoked by China at the Indian

civilian post at Tsaskur on September 19, 1965, when the intruding Chinese troops kidnapped and killed three Indian policemen and ransacked the Indian civilian post. The Chinese Government has tried to cover up this incident by alleging that Indian troops had intruded into Dumchele and that the dead bodies of the three Indian policemen were discovered at the battle-field at Dumchele. The Government of India once again protest against this act of aggression and destruction by Chinese troops and demand that the bodies of the three Indian policemen be returned to the Indian side immediately.

The following further instances of intrusions into Tsaskur area by Chinese troops have come to the notice of the Government of India:-

(a) On September 24, a Chinese patrol intruded one mile beyond the 'line of actual control' towards Tsaskur post and later withdrew.

(b) On September 26, about 20 Chinese soldiers intruded one and a half miles beyond the 'line of actual control' and returned at about 1400 hours. Immediately afterwards, another party of 7 soldiers came to the area and hoisted a small flag at a place about one mile north-east of Tsaskur Lake.

(c) On September 27, at about 1600 hours the Chinese patrol again transgressed the 'line of actual control' and entered into the area adjacent to Tsaskur Lake.

(d) On September 28, a party of four Chinese soldiers again intruded across the 'line of actual control' towards Tsaskur Lake.

(e) On September 29, at 1000 hours a group of 24 Chinese soldiers intruded all the way up to the Indian civilian post at Tsaskur and took up positions around the post. They withdrew after some time.

(2) A party of about 20 Chinese soldiers was observed at Silung Barma Nullah on the morning of September 23, 1965. Although this group withdrew after an hour, considerable Chinese military activity has been observed in this area opposite the Indian civilian post at Hot Springs.

(3) On the morning of September 24, a party of 30 Chinese soldiers took up position across the Indian civilian check-post in the Demchok area. In the afternoon of the same day another group of 100 soldiers reached the area and took up offensive positions for about 3 hours. All these acts are in wilful violation of the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone.

(4) In the last few days the Chinese soldiers have re-established the Rezang Lungpa post south of Spangur Lake and 4-5 miles north of Rezang La which had remained vacant since China's so-called "unilateral withdrawal". This Chinese action is in grave violation not only of China's own so-called "Ceasefire declaration" but also the Colombo Proposals which clearly stipulate that military personnel should not be stationed in the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone in the Ladakh Sector.

In their note of the 24th September, 1965, the Chinese Government have attempted to deny incontrovertible facts of Chinese aggression by referring to the so-called "self-contradictions" in the map references provided by the Indian Government. The Chinese Government will recall that India's protest note dated September 21, 1965 clearly pointed out that Chinese troops entered into Indian territory on September 19, 1965, near the Indian Track Junction civilian post, the approximate map reference of which was mentioned as E 7801 N 3517. The Chinese Government cannot be in any doubt about the place under reference, as Chinese troops subsequently dug trenches and began to establish military positions there. They must know that this place is clearly to the west of the 'line of actual control' in this sector and the Chinese Government are indulging in needless quibbling over the question of its precise location in miles and yards.

#### Sikkim Sector

(1) Chinese troops still remain poised in strength across the Sikkim-

Tibet border. Chinese troops have also been engaged in erecting military structures on the border. On the Jelep La pass the Chinese have erected a low stone wall and are manning it with machine guns and mortars. Intrusions across this pass have also been observed.

The Chinese Government has not yet given a reply to the Government of India's demand contained in its note of September 27 for the return of the three Indian soldiers forcibly kidnapped by Chinese troops from the Sikkim side of Dongchui La. Instead it has been stated in the Chinese note of September 27, 1965, handed over to the Indian Embassy in Peking at 1.00 A.M. (Peking Time) on the morning of 28th September that three Indian soldiers had "intruded" into Tibet and that the Chinese authorities have detained them. This counter-charge is a transparent attempt to cover up the kidnapping of the three Indian personnel by Chinese troops. The Government of India demand the immediate return of the three Indian soldiers.

The Government of India wish to express their grave concern at the continuing Chinese aggressive activities. We would once again urge the Government of China to desist from wilful provocations on the India-China border.

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

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 2 October, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the

Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to state as follows:

At 10.15 A.M. today a group of 25 Chinese soldiers approached Yak La on the Sikkim-Tibet border. About 20 of these soldiers crossed into Sikkim territory and surrounded an Indian Observation post consisting of three men situated well within Sikkim side of the boundary. At 10.35 A.M. the intruding Chinese troops opened fire at the Indian post. According to latest reports received, the Chinese are reinforcing their troops in this area.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this violation of the border, the wanton firing at Indian personnel, and the increasingly aggressive posture of the Chinese forces across the border of Sikkim.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 2 October, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 816.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated September 24, 1965:

In its note of September 20 to the Indian Government, the Chinese Government has set forth the facts and lodged the strongest protest about the Indian troops' intrusion into China east of Dumchele and their armed attack on Chinese civilian personnel on September 19, 1965. But

the Indian Government, in an attempt to cover up its criminal acts of aggression, reversed right and wrong and falsely accused the Chinese soldiers of being the first to open fire on the Indian personnel near an Indian post. This will not do. Facts remain facts, and cannot be changed by any fabrications and distortions. What needs to be pointed out is that, knowing itself to be guilty, the Indian Government at first did not dare play up the incident. On September 20 an Indian official spokesman only vaguely said that Chinese troops "indulged in a few provocative shots" at Dumchele. It was only after the Chinese Government lodged its protest that the Indian Government changed its tune and said in its reply note of September 21 that Chinese troops "opened heavy fire" on the Indian civilian policemen, and described the site of the incident, east of Dumchele which the Indian side itself recognizes to be on the Chinese side of the 'line of actual control', as being so-called Tsaskur in the Indian territory. In the same note, the Indian side also said that three Indians were missing. As a matter of fact the incident took place three days earlier. This shows that the Indian Government knew nothing about what had happened. It was only after the Chinese side announced the discovery of the bodies of three Indian soldiers at the site of the Indian troops' intrusion that the Indian Government suddenly seemed to wake up to a realisation of the fact and concocted the story about Chinese troops "abducting" three Indian policemen, taking them to Chinese territory and then "killing them". One cannot help asking, how came for three days the Indian side was unaware if indeed the incident had occurred near an Indian post, three Indian "policemen" had been abducted and the Indian post had been ransacked, as the Indian side alleged. A mere comparison of the above inconsistent versions given by the Indian side shows that the Indian Government is talking twaddle in complete disregard of the facts.

It is quite clear that the Dumchele conflict was wholly caused by the Indian troops intruding into Chinese territory. It is indeed unreasonable and impudent to the extreme for the Indian side in its note to reserve the

so-called right to demand compensation. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at this and stresses that India has forcibly occupied large tracts of Chinese territory, kidnapped Chinese border inhabitants and seized live- stock, and that there have been more than 300 cases of Indian troop and air intrusions into and provocations against China including the latest Dumchele conflict. The Indian Government must be held responsible for compensating for the losses caused by all these cases. The account will have to be settled eventually.

As for the bodies of the three Indian soldiers, the Chinese Government in the spirit of humanitarianism and out of a desire to safeguard the friendship between the two peoples, is ready to return them together with their rifles, to the Indian side. The Indian Government may, through diplomatic channels and at a time agreed upon by both sides, appoint officials to get into contact with the Chinese civilian checkpost at Spanggur, Tibet, for receiving them.

At the same time, the Chinese Government once again demands that the Indian Government stop all, its intrusions into and provocations against China and guarantee that similar incidents will not recur.

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

\*\*\*

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

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

On October 4 at 1015 hours a platoon of Chinese troops advanced up to Yak La on the Sikkim-Tibet border, crossed the international border and attempted swiftly to close up with the Indian defence personnel in the area well inside Sikkim territory. The Chinese troops fired three long light

machine gun bursts on Indian defence personnel. On being engaged by the Indian defence personnel, the Chinese troops withdrew into Tibetan territory.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this aggressive intrusion across the border and firing on Indian personnel by Chinese forces, and ask the Chinese Government to put a stop to these provocative activities.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 6 October, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 826.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state as follows concerning serious cases in which Indian troops again repeatedly carried out armed provocations against Chinese personnel on the China-Sikkim border:-

(1) At about 1130 hours on the morning of October 2, 1965, a group of Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory through the Ya La (situated about 3.5 Kilometres north-west of the Natu La) on the China-Sikkim boundary and opened heavy fire on a unit of Chinese frontier guards who were carrying out routine duty on Chinese territory, firing more than 200 rounds and wounding a Chinese frontier guard. The unit of Chinese frontier guards were thus compelled to defend themselves. Under the returning fire of the Chinese side, the Indian troops retreated in panic.

(2) Between 1030 hours and 1230 hours on October 4, 1965, in the vicinity of Ya La a group of Indian soldiers again opened fire on two successive occasions with light and heavy machine-guns and mortars upon a unit of Chinese frontier guards who were on duty within Chinese territory.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned serious cases in which Indian troops wantonly intruded into Chinese territory, made provocations and wounded a Chinese frontier guard.

In the circumstances in which the Indian side has repeatedly provoked border conflicts, the Chinese Government cannot but heighten its vigilance and strengthen its defences on the border, and is closely following the development of the situation. The Chinese Government once again warns the Indian Government that the Indian side must immediately stop its intrusions, failing which it must bear full responsibility for all the grave consequences arising therefrom.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 October, 1965**

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

At 0530 hours on October 9 three armed Chinese soldiers intruded into Indian territory across the Lipu Lekh Pass in the middle sector of the

Sino-Indian boundary. On encountering an Indian patrol party well inside Indian territory the Chinese troops opened fire which was returned by the Indian patrol in self-defence.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this intrusion across the border and firing by Chinese troops on Indian personnel on normal patrol duty. The Government of India once again urge the Chinese Government to put a stop to these continuing provocations and aggressive activities by Chinese troops across the Indian border.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration. Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 18 October, 1965

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 873

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated September 27, 1965:

On September 26, 1965 three Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory by crossing the Tungchu La on the China-Sikkim boundary and were arrested on the spot by Chinese defence troops stationed there. Against this intrusion the Chinese Government lodged a strong protest with the Indian Government on September 27. In its note of the same day, the Indian side, instead of admitting its own mistake, falsely accused Chinese troops of crossing the border and kidnapping three Indian soldiers and even lodged a so-called protest with the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this unwarranted and mischievous protest and expresses its surprise and

indignation at the Indian practice of wilfully confounding right and wrong.

In the past few years, Indian troops have carried out repeated intrusions and harassing raids on the China-Sikkim border. The Chinese Government has repeatedly made representations to and protested with the Indian Government, in the hope that the Indian side will rectify these errors. However, the Indian side has turned a deaf ear to the words of the Chinese Government and even taken advantage of China's forbearance to make shameless denials and prevarications, saying that if Indian troops have carried out repeated intrusions and harassments, "how is it that there has not been a single case of an Indian soldier being caught on Tibetan territory?" (Reference remarks made by an Indian official spokesman on September 17, 1965.) The Indian Government should understand that there is a limit to the Chinese Government's forbearance. The fact that Chinese defence troops have now arrested three intruding Indian soldiers on a single occasion has completely belied the denials of the Indian side. The three intruding Indian soldiers who were arrested have personally admitted that they were sent on orders to intrude into Chinese territory for reconnaissance; that they were arrested after intruding into Chinese territory in disregard of the warnings served by the Chinese defence troops on the spot. The culprits and material evidence are all there. The lie painstakingly concocted by the Indian Government that Chinese troops crossed the border and kidnapped Indian soldiers has been exploded. The Indian Government is slapping its own face by lodging a counter protest with China in an attempt to deny the responsibility for its crime and vilify China. Facts are more eloquent than words. The more the Indian Government insists on lie-making, the more will be the loss of face. The Chinese Government once again advises the Indian Government to draw a lesson from its past experience and restrain itself. If it insists on making intrusions and provocations, it will come to no good end.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 October, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs note dated 29th July, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government's note declares that "in order to cut down the exchange of notes" between India and China and "to facilitate a gradual ease of relations between them" the Chinese Government has decided to lodge a comprehensive protest with the Indian Government every year except in cases of "special gravity against which prompt protests are needed". Yet, in practice what the Chinese Government has been doing is to protest frequently about so-called instances of 'special gravity' and then include these again every six months in the comprehensive protest note, which, in addition, contains a mass of mendacious and concocted allegations against India. Far from easing tension this procedure is intended to escalate tension and to mislead world public opinion. The behaviour of the Chinese Government in the past few weeks conclusively proves this. As the whole world knows, the Chinese Government had since the end of August, 1965, sent a series of protest notes falsely accusing Indian personnel of having intruded into Chinese territory, built military structures and kidnapped Tibetan inhabitants and sheep and yaks. The world also knows that on the basis of these fantastic allegations the Chinese Government had served an ultimatum on India and threatened India with "grave consequences". Is any other proof needed for the aggressive intentions and actions of the Chinese Government?

Of the 38 so-called "Indian intrusions" mentioned in the Chinese note some relate to the first six months of 1965. They are, in fact, mere repetitions of old allegations which have already been effectively refuted by the Government of India in the past. In the case of some other allegations (serials 4, 6, 8, 9 and 10 of part III of annexure of the Chinese note) Chinese Government has not given the exact location and the co-ordinates of the places concerned. This only adds to the vagueness of the Chinese charges.

The Government of India have given standing instructions to all Indian personnel and aircraft not to cross the established borders of India and "the line of actual control" in the Western Sector. These instructions also apply to the border of Sikkim. Detailed and thorough investigations of the specific allegations contained in the annexures to the Chinese note have shown conclusively that Indian personnel have scrupulously complied with the instructions of the Government of India. The Chinese allegations are, therefore, completely false and the Government of India categorically reject them.

It is obvious that these allegations were fabricated by the Chinese Government in order to prepare an excuse for the ultimatum which it served on India on September 16 and for the provocative and aggressive actions it has been taking across the Indian border in collusion with Pakistan.

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

\*\*\*

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

## **Embassy of China in India, 30 October, 1965**

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

On October 27, 1965, about 10 to 12 Chinese soldiers intruded 100 yards into Sikkim territory across the Sebu La on the Sikkim-Tibet border. The Chinese soldiers withdrew when they were engaged by Indian troops in the area. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against this violation of the border and the provocative intrusion into Sikkim.

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

\*\*\*

## **Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 30 October, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 918

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 two notes dated October 2, 1965 and the notes dated October 6 and 10, 1965 from the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government, has the honour to state the following:-

1. In one of its notes dated October 2, the Indian Government made a whole series of charges against China concerning alleged military provocations along the China-India border and the China-Sikkim border.

All of them are fabrications or deliberate distortion of the facts, and some are a repetition of lies already refuted by the Chinese Government point by point in its note of September 24, 1965. The Chinese Government will now make a comprehensive refutation of these false charges. Firstly, with regard to the September 19 armed conflict at Dumchele, it is well known that it was entirely provoked by the Indian side. After its occurrence, the Chinese Government for a time ordered its civilian personnel to enhance their alertness in that area. Upon orders, the Chinese civilian personnel also cleaned up the site of the conflict, properly handled the dead bodies of three Indian soldiers found there and returned them to the Indian side at Spanggur on October 10. The activities of the Chinese side in the Dumchele area took place on Chinese territory and were within China's sovereign rights, and the Indian Government has no right to interfere. Secondly, the places mentioned in the charges contained in paragraphs (2), (3) and (4) of the Indian note are all within Chinese territory. The Indian Government has no right to question Chinese activities in those areas. What is more, there were in fact no Chinese troops operating in those areas. Thirdly, Chinese troops never crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and went beyond Chinese territory, whereas the truth about Indian forces crossing the boundary to build aggressive military works and making continuous intrusions and harassments has long been exposed before the whole world. The Chinese side is up to this day in control of the sites where the Indian aggressive military works used to be. And the three Indian soldiers who crossed the boundary at Tungchu La on September 26 were arrested on the spot by the Chinese side (reference the Chinese Government's notes of September 27 and October 18). The Indian Government can never overthrow the multitude of evidence of its crimes.

2. In its second note of October 2 and its note of October 6, the Indian Government slandered the Chinese side as having opened fire on the Indian side Ya La on the Chinese-Sikkim boundary. The truth of the

matter has already been stated in the Chinese Government's note of October 6: It was Indian troops who carried out successive armed provocations at Ya La on October 2 and 4 against units of Chinese frontier guards on duty within Chinese territory and wounded one of the Chinese frontier guards.

3. In its note of October 10, the Indian Government made the slanderous charge that three Chinese soldiers crossed the Lipulekh Pass in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border and opened fire on Indian troops. This is a sheer fabrication. No Chinese troops were present in the vicinity of the Lipulekh Pass, and so it is out of the question that any Chinese soldiers should have intruded into Indian territory and opened fire on Indian troops.

4. It is none other than India that has made continuous intrusions and provocations on the China-India border and the China-Sikkim border. Lately, the Indian side was compelled to demolish part of its aggressive military works within Chinese territory as a result of repeated warnings from the Chinese Government, but it has not reconciled itself to this. In order to meet the needs of its domestic and foreign policies and retrieve lost face, the Indian Government has been seeking every opportunity to continue its intrusions and provocations and create tension. On the other hand, the Indian side is afraid of being exposed and condemned, and so has resorted to the trick of a thief crying "Stop thief!", wilfully trumping up counter-charges against China after having made intrusions and provocations itself. However, in the face of the facts, no resort to trickery will be of any avail. Should the Indian Government continue its senseless haggling by repeating these slanderous allegations, the Chinese Government will pay no attention to it.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 4 November, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to the Chinese note (65) Yi Ya Tzu No. 873 of 18th October, 1965.

In its attempt to cover up the kidnapping of the three Indian soldiers by Chinese troops from Sikkim territory, the Chinese Government has repeated the completely false allegation that it was the Indian personnel who had crossed the border at Donchui La and intruded into Tibet on September 26, 1965. The fact, however, was that the three Indian soldiers were patrolling well within Sikkim territory when a group of Chinese soldiers, who had illegally crossed the border, descended upon them, surrounded them and forcibly kidnapped them. Neither denials nor counter-charges by the Chinese Government can alter this fact. An attempt has also been made in the Chinese note to hold up the three kidnapped Indian soldiers as "proof" of the wild and baseless allegations of Indian intrusions and raids on the Tibet-Sikkim border which the Chinese Government has been making. The reference in the Chinese note to a remark by an Indian spokesman on September 17 that there has not been a single case of an Indian soldier being caught on Tibetan territory and the statement that "Chinese defence troops have now arrested three intruding Indian soldiers on a single occasion" only goes to show that the kidnapping of the three Indian soldiers was a deliberate, calculated and perverse action taken by Chinese troops for the express purpose of producing 'evidence' to bolster up their patently false allegations against India. The claim made in the Chinese note that the kidnapped Indian personnel have "admitted that they were sent on orders to intrude into Chinese territory" only confirms this.

The Government of India have noticed that Chinese newspapers have published a so-called "confession" by the three Indian personnel "admitting" that they had intruded into Tibet. The world is only too well aware of the devices used by the Chinese Government and the deceptions practised by Chinese propaganda to take such "confessions" seriously and as truth. The Government of India regret that the Chinese Government has not only committed intrusions across the Sikkim border and kidnapped our personnel, but has resorted to false propaganda accompanied by threats against India. The Government of India demand that the three kidnapped soldiers be returned to the Indian side immediately. Pending their return the Chinese Government will be held responsible for their safety and welfare.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 November, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 967

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy and has the honour to reply in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated October 30, 1965 as follows:

In its note the Indian side made the slanderous charge that on October 27 Chinese soldiers "intruded 100 yards into Sikkim territory across the Sebu La on the Sikkim-Tibet border," and so on and so forth.

This is an out-and-out fabrication. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this unwarranted protest by the Indian side.

The boundary between China and Sikkim has long been delimited. The Chinese defence troops have never crossed this boundary. Conversely, it is the Indian side that has constantly committed intrusions and provocations against China on the China-Sikkim border. In repeatedly concocting lies to slander China, the Indian Government obviously intends to confuse the public in a vain attempt to cover up its own criminal acts of aggression. But the facts are all there and no fabrications can deceive people.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 November, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 986

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

According to an emergency report received by the Chinese Government from the military authorities concerned at 0730 hours (Peking Time) on November 13, 1965 more than a hundred Indian soldiers at Tungchu La on the China-Sikkim boundary started a fierce attack with light and heavy machine-guns on Chinese frontier guards on duty within Chinese territory. In the meantime, more than ten Indian soldiers crossed the Chinese boundary and outflanked and attacked the

Chinese frontier guards on duty. The Chinese frontier guards were compelled to resort to self-defence. The Indian troops were still firing at the Chinese troops towards that evening. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the strongest protest with the Indian Government against this provocation by Indian troops crossing the boundary and making unwarranted attack on the Chinese frontier guards on duty.

It must be pointed out that recently Indian troops at Ya La on the China-Sikkim boundary continuously opened heavy fire on Chinese frontier guards and wounded one of them. The Chinese Government lodged a strong protest against this on October 6. This time the Indian troops have launched an even fiercer attack on Chinese frontier guards and once again intruded into Chinese territory. This fully shows that the Indian Government is bent on committing armed aggression against China and creating tension on the China-Sikkim border. The Indian troops are even now continuing their attack on the Chinese frontier guards. The situation is extremely grave and the Chinese authorities concerned are following it closely. The Chinese Government seriously warns the Indian Government that it must at once order its troops to stop their intrusion into and provocation against China. Otherwise the Indian Government will have to bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising therefrom.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 November, 1965**

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

At 0700 hours on November 13, 1965 a party of 70 to 100 Chinese troops advanced across Dongchui La on the Tibet-Sikkim border and opened heavy fire upon the two Indian outposts situated well within the Sikkim side of the border. The Indian personnel returned the fire in self-defence, but the Chinese troops continued firing until the evening of November 13. As a result of the firing one Indian soldier and two Chinese soldiers were killed. Before withdrawing from Sikkim territory the Chinese troops dragged with them the dead bodies of the Indian soldier as well as the two Chinese soldiers.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against the unprovoked firing and the wanton aggressive activities of Chinese troops across the Sikkim border. It may be recalled that it was across Dongchi La that the Chinese troops intruded in strength on September 26, 1965 and forcibly kidnapped three Indian defence personnel from within Sikkim territory. The Chinese Government has not, in spite of repeated demands by the Indian Government returned the Indian soldiers kidnapped by their troops on September 26. The Government of India once again urge the Chinese Government to return the kidnapped soldiers to the Indian side. The body of the Indian soldier killed in the firing on November 13, must also be returned. These continuing intrusions and firing on Indian personnel are grave provocations on the part of the Chinese troops who have entrenched themselves in strength in the Chumbi valley across the Sikkim border. The Government of India urge the Government of the People's Republic of China to order its troops to stop their acts of provocation and aggression on the Sikkim-Tibet border.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the  
Embassy of India in China, 18 November, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1009

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the note of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government, dated November 14, 1965:

1. On November 13, 1965 the Chinese Government lodged the strongest protest with the Indian Government regarding the incident on the same day in which Indian troops crossed the China-Sikkim boundary and made an unwarranted provocative attack on Chinese frontier guards. Instead of owning up to its criminal act of aggression, the Indian Government in its note of November 14 invented a false story to counter-charge China and lodged a so-called protest with the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this groundless protest and expresses extreme indignation at the slanderous counter-charge of the Indian side.

2. In its note, the Indian side asserted that 70 to 100 Chinese troops crossed the border and opened fire on Indian troops, and that before withdrawing they dragged away the dead body of an Indian soldier. Furthermore, on November 15 Mr. Chavan, the Indian Defence Minister, came forward in person and alleged sanctimoniously before the Indian Parliament that the trail of dragging the body by the Chinese was still "visible". These allegations of the Indian side are sheer fabrications. The fact was that an Indian detachment of more than a hundred soldiers opened heavy fire on Chinese frontier guards on duty at Tungchu La on

the China- Sikkim boundary. At the same time, more than ten Indian soldiers under the cover of fire crossed the boundary, intruded into Chinese territory and outflanked and attacked the Chinese frontier guards on duty. The Chinese frontier guards were compelled to fight back in self-defence. One of the intruding Indian soldiers, being wounded thereupon, threw away his weapon and tumbled and crawled back to Sikkim territory, where he died. Evidently, the Indian troops, relying on its superior strength, vainly attempted to wipe out the small number of Chinese frontier guards in a surprise attack. The outcome was that when the Chinese frontier guards just began to return fire the Indian troops fled pell-mell. In order to deny their criminal act of aggression and cover up their defeat, the Indian Ministries of Defence and of External Affairs hastily invented a story by turning the facts upside down, and even fabricated the lie that "two Chinese soldiers were killed". How ludicrous and miserable this is!

3. For three days the body of the killed Indian soldier was plainly lying there within Sikkim territory, and yet the Indian side, instead of disposing of it, asked China to return it. Was that not mischievous trouble-making? Only after a responsible officer of the Chinese Defence Ministry refuted the rumour spread by the spokesman of the Indian Defence Ministry and gave a piece of advice, did Indian troops come to the spot and carry away the dead body of the Indian soldier on November 16. This fully shows that the Indian official pronouncements were all fraudulent. Is it not the height of absurdity that the Defence Minister of India should have told bare-faced lie and then on that basis the Indian Ministry of External Affairs should have asked China for the dead body?

4. As for the three Indian soldiers who intruded into Chinese territory at Tungchu La on September 26 and who were captured on the spot, the Chinese Government had already instructed the authorities concerned to make arrangements for their deportation under armed escort, considering

the fact that they had admitted their mistake. However, owing to the occurrence of this extremely grave incident in which Indian troops outflanked and attacked the Chinese frontier guards at Tungchu La, the Chinese Government now has to defer consideration of the disposal of the three intruding Indian soldiers.

5. Recently, the Indian side has stepped up its intrusions into and provocations against China. The Chinese Government has lodged repeated protests with the Indian Government. In the period since August alone, the Chinese Government has nine times solemnly warned the Indian Government that it must bear full responsibility for all the serious consequences arising from its intrusions and provocations. However, turning a deaf ear to these warnings, the Indian side has continued to indulge in making intrusions into and provocations against China and has now gone to the length of outflanking and attacking Chinese frontier guards by armed force. This is absolutely intolerable. The Chinese Government solemnly states that the Chinese frontier guards are duty-bound to defend China's territory. If the Indian troops dare to continue their brazen encroachments upon Chinese territory or again open fire on the Chinese frontier guards, the Chinese frontier defence troops will have to punish them as they deserve.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 20 November, 1965**

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

On November 19, 1965, at 1200 hours a party of fifty Chinese soldiers intruded, for a distance of about one mile, into North Sikkim across the Bomchola Pass on the Sikkim-Tibet border. An Indian patrol party on routine duty in the area saw the Chinese intruders and chased them, whereupon the Chinese withdrew to the Tibetan side of the border at about 1300 hours the same day. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against this unwarranted and aggressive intrusion by Chinese troops into Sikkim territory.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 21 November, 1965**

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

At 1000 hours on November 20, 1965 forty armed Chinese soldiers crossed the Sikkim border through Kongra La and intruded nearly two and a half miles deep into Sikkim territory in the vicinity of Gayum Chhona lake approximately three miles north-east of Dongkung in North Sikkim. An Indian patrol which was sent out to the area of intrusion observed the Chinese intruders from a distance of about 500 yards. On seeing the Indian patrol party the Chinese started withdrawing at 1630 hours and finally crossed back into Tibet at 1800 hours. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against this latest instance of blatant intrusion by Chinese troops into Sikkim territory. The

Government of India had already protested to the Chinese Government against another intrusion into North Sikkim by Chinese troops which took place across Bomchola on November 19, 1965. On November 13 Chinese troops had wantonly intruded in strength into Sikkim across Dongchuila and opened heavy fire on two Indian outposts killing one Indian soldier. On October 27 a party of about 10 to 12 Chinese soldiers intruded 100 yards into Sikkim across Sebula. Earlier on September 26 a party of Chinese troops crossed the Sikkim border at Dongchuila and kidnapped three Indian soldiers on patrol duty well within Sikkim territory.

These continuous and increasingly aggressive activities of Chinese troops on the Sikkim border is a matter of grave concern to the Government of India. Following the Chinese ultimatum to India in September 1965, Chinese troops have remained entrenched in considerable numbers along the Sikkim-Tibet border and seem to be determined to create incidents across the border. The Government of India urge the Chinese Government to order its troops to put a stop to their aggressive and provocative actions across the Sikkim border.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 November, 1965**

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

On November 21st at 1600 hours over 30 armed Chinese soldiers

intruded into north Sikkim to a depth of 1,500 yards in the area north-west of Bom Cho. The Chinese intruders withdrew into Tibetan territory on seeing an Indian patrol on routine duty in the area. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against the continuing intrusions by Chinese troops into Sikkim. As the Chinese Government themselves have recognized the boundary of Sikkim with Tibet has been formally delimited and is well-marked by natural features. The frequent intrusions by Chinese troops across this boundary cannot, therefore, be anything but deliberate acts intended to create tension on the border.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 November, 1965**

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

On the morning of November 19th at 0900 hours about 60 Chinese soldiers in two heavy vehicles intruded into Indian territory near the Track Junction in the Daulat Beg Oldi area well to the west of the 'line of actual control'. They took up positions on the eastern slope of a hill feature at approximately longitude 78° 01' E, latitude 35° 17' N. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against this deliberate and aggressive intrusion by Chinese troops into undisputed Indian territory and demand their withdrawal. This latest violation of Indian territory is in the same area and, in fact, the same point where the

Chinese troops had intruded on the 19th September, 1965 (Indian Government's protest note of 21st September, 1965 refers). This wanton act is not isolated from the increasing instances of intrusions and provocations by Chinese troops in other sectors of the border and underlines the aggressive intentions of the Chinese Government and their determination to create incidents and raise tension on the India-China border. The Government of India urge the Chinese Government to reverse this aggressive course adopted by them and to order their troops to stop violating the 20-k.m. demilitarized zone and the 'line of actual control' to intrude into undisputed Indian territory.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 November, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1036.

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

At 1030 hours on November 24, 1965, a group of three Indian soldiers crossed the Tungmu La Pass on the 1959 Line of Actual Control between the two sides in the Eastern Sector of the Sino-Indian border and intruded into the area of Laigu Bridge in Tibet, China, for armed provocation. On discovering them, Chinese personnel of a civilian checkpost immediately served warning on the Indian soldiers and demanded that they withdraw. Instead of heeding the warning, the Indian soldiers opened fire on the

Chinese personnel of the civilian post. The latter were compelled to return fire in self- defence, and the three intruding Indian soldiers were killed in the exchange of fire. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the above-mentioned provocative intrusion by Indian troops.

It must be pointed out that this provocative intrusion by Indian troops is most serious and in no way accidental. Recently, the Indian side has repeatedly made provocative intrusions on the China-Sikkim border and continuously sent its aircraft to intrude into China's air space for reconnaissance in the Western Sector of the Sino-Indian border. At the same time, India has been amassing large numbers of troops towards the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim boundary and the Indian Government has been constantly spreading lies and wanton slanders against China. What is particularly serious is that this armed provocative intrusion by Indian troops in the Eastern Sector of the Sino-Indian border occurred only eleven days after November 13 when Indian troops brazenly crossed the China-Sikkim boundary at Tungchu La to out- flank and attack the Chinese Frontier Guards on duty. All this clearly shows that the Indian Government is deliberately creating new tensions along the entire Sino-Indian border and the China- Sikkim border.

The Chinese Government has repeatedly warned the Indian Government that if Indian troops should continue their wanton intrusions or open fire on Chinese Frontier Guards or civilian check- post personnel, they will surely be punished as they deserve. The Chinese Government now reiterates this warning. Should Indian troops again make armed provocative intrusions the Chinese side will resolutely fight back without fail?

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 25 November, 1965**

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

At 12.15 P.M. on the 24th November, 1965, 40 armed Chinese soldiers intruded about 1500 yards into north Sikkim territory in the area north-west of Bom Cho. An Indian patrol on routine duty in the area warned the Chinese soldiers and demanded their withdrawal. When the Chinese troops ignored the warning and continued to advance towards our patrol, the Indian personnel opened fire in self-defence. Thereupon the Chinese soldiers withdrew across the Sikkim-Tibet border.

Three days earlier a similar act of intrusion had taken place in this area (Our note of 23rd November 1965 refers). The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these continuing acts of wanton provocation and intrusion across the well-known Sikkim-Tibet border, and once again urge the Chinese Government to order their troops to stop these deliberate and aggressive border violations.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 25 November, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1041

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

1. On November 24, 1965 three Indian soldiers crossed the Tungmu La Pass on the 1959 line of actual control between the two sides in the Eastern Sector of the Sino-Indian border, intruded into the area of Laiguo bridge in Tibet, China and opened fire on the Chinese personnel of the civilian check-post there. The latter were compelled to return fire in self-defence. The three Indian soldiers were killed in the exchange of fire, and their bodies are still in the Laiguo bridge, area. If the Indian side wishes to take back the bodies, the Chinese Government, acting in its consistent spirit of revolutionary humanitarianism, is ready to consent.

2. On September 26, 1965 three Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory by crossing Tungchu La on the China-Sikkim-boundary and were captured on the spot by the Chinese defence troops stationed there. The three intruders truthfully confessed as to how they had crossed the border for reconnaissance upon orders from their superiors. The Chinese Government, taking into consideration the fact that they have admitted their mistake of crossing the boundary and acting in its consistent spirit of revolutionary humanitarianism, has decided to show them clemency as was the case with the intruding Indian soldiers captured on previous occasions. The Chinese Government has instructed the authorities concerned to send them to the border under armed escort. The Indian Government may send personnel to receive them at the time and place specified by the Chinese side.

3. As for the specific time and place and other matters concerning the receiving by the Indian side of the three Indian soldiers captured during

intrusion and the collection of the bodies of the three Indian soldiers killed during intrusion, the Chinese Government will notify the Indian Government of them through diplomatic channels.

4. It must be pointed out that recently Indian troops' provocative intrusions into China along the Sino-Indian and China-Sikkim borders have been most unbridled. Yet the Indian side has repeatedly spread lies slandering China as committing intrusions. What is particularly despicable is that, although there is personal and material evidence testifying to the intrusion and arrest of the three Indian soldiers, yet the Indian side has, in the face of the iron-clad facts, refused to own up to its mistake, and instead has made denials and even false counter charges against China in a number of notes. The Chinese Government solemnly reiterates its warning to the Indian Government that the Indian side should draw a lesson from the failure of its above-mentioned two intrusions and stop all its aggressive activities against China.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 26 November, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to Chinese Government's note No. (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 816 dated 2nd October, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India note with regret that the Chinese Government are still attempting to evade their responsibility for the Tsaskur incident in which three Indian civilian personnel were kidnapped

and killed by Chinese troops. The Chinese Government in its note under reply has expended much effort to sustain their own fabricated version of the incident by distorting facts. Therefore, the Government of India consider it necessary to place on record the following:

1. The Chinese note has claimed that on the 20th September, 1965, an Indian spokesman "vaguely" said that a few provocative shots had been fired near Dumchele. This is cited as proof that India did not "dare play up this incident". The Chinese statement is a ridiculous distortion of the facts because it was in the same statement that the Indian spokesman had added that three policemen were overdue at their bases after a patrol.

2. The Chinese Government have tried to make much of the fact that they were first to lodge their so-called "protest". They have even used their speed in lodging this "protest" as evidence that the Indian Government "knew nothing" about what had happened. This is another distortion. The Government of India, which had already announced on the afternoon of the 20th September that three Indian personnel were missing wanted to check that facts further and to make allowance for a natural mishap before lodging a formal protest. It is futile for the Chinese Government to use the fact that the Indian protest was lodged two days (and not three days as claimed in the Chinese note) after the incident, to detract from the gravity and veracity of the Indian protest.

3. The Chinese note has gone to the extent of claiming that India lodged its protest only after the Chinese Government announced the "discovery" of the dead bodies of the three Indian soldiers. This is a blatant falsehood. India's protest against the wanton act of kidnapping from Indian soil and killing of the three Indian personnel by Chinese soldiers was lodged in a note handed over to the Chinese Charge d'Affaires in Delhi on the 21st September, 1965, at 9 P.M. As far as the

Government of India are aware, Peking Radio's first announcement of the so-called "discovery" of the three dead bodies came only on the night of 23-24th September. How then can it be argued, as the Chinese note has tried, that India's protest came only after the Chinese announcement ?

4. The Chinese note has made some references to the location of Dumchele vis-a-vis the line of actual control. This is irrelevant since the incident took place not at Dumchele but well to the west of the "line of actual control" near the Indian check-post at Tsaskur.

All these facts prove conclusively that in its haste to disguise its inhuman and aggressive activities on Indian territory the Chinese Government have used false and even dishonest arguments to bolster their concocted story of a so-called "Indian intrusion". The Chinese Government should be aware that the strange thing is not that the Government of India waited to verify the facts and make allowance for a natural mishap before lodging a protest on the 21st September. On the contrary, what is curious is the fact that while putting across their concocted story the Chinese Government have overlooked the inherent inconsistency in protesting to India against an Indian intrusion on so-called Chinese territory on the 20th September and then taking three days to "discover" the dead bodies of the Indian personnel who, it is claimed were found on "Chinese territory". It is futile to try and evade facts with such fabrications.

China's responsibility for the death of the three Indian personnel is by no means over with the handing over of their dead bodies. The Government of India reserve the right to demand full compensation for the damage to Indian life and property inflicted by the intruding Chinese troops near Tsaskur on the 19th September, 1965.

The Ministry of External Affairs takes this opportunity to renew to the

Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India the assurances of its highest consideration.

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 27 November, 1965**

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

On the morning of 24th November, 1965, three men of the Assam Rifles were on routine patrol in the area south of Domla Pass, well within Indian territory, in the Eastern sector of the Indian-China border. This small Indian patrol party was ambushed, kidnapped and killed by a group of intruding Chinese soldiers. The Government of India lodge a stern protest against this brutal and inhuman crime committed by Chinese troops.

The Chinese Government have sought to disguise this by putting out a completely fabricated story. In their notes dated the 24th and 25th November, 1965, the Chinese Government have tried to twist facts by claiming that it was the Indian personnel who had "intruded" into Tibet and that Chinese soldiers had killed them in "self-defence". Do the Chinese Government really imagine that the world will be deceived by such a story? In this sector the boundary between India and China is identical with the so-called "line of actual control" and runs along a watershed with clear-cut geographic features. Domla Pass is a well-known and easily recognizable natural feature. Indian personnel have strict instructions to respect the border and they have always scrupulously observed these on all occasions. It is therefore inconceivable that Indian personnel would have, wilfully or accidentally, crossed the border into

Tibet. No amount of concocted counter-charges will absolve the Chinese Government from the responsibility for this cruel deed.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 November 1965**

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

The Government of India have noted with grave concern that during the last two weeks Chinese troops have been concentrating on all the major sectors of the India-China border and indulging in aggressive and provocative intrusions across the border. In the Eastern Sector, which had remained relatively calm since China's massive aggression of 1962, groups of armed Chinese soldiers have crossed the international boundary at several points and intruded into Indian territory. In Ladakh Chinese troops have moved up in strength from their bases in Tibet, and in contemptuous defiance of the Colombo Proposals, entered the 20-k.m. demilitarized zone in several areas. At certain points they have even crossed the 'line of actual control' and intruded into undisputed Indian territory- Chinese troops have yet to vacate the Daulat Beg Oldi area. Across the boundary of Sikkim which the Chinese Government have unambiguously recognized as formally delimited and clearly defined by natural features, intrusions and provocations have been taking place almost daily.

Instead of putting a stop to this aggressive course adopted by their troops the Chinese Government have been levelling unfounded allegations and making naked threats against India. There is once again talk of "serious consequences", "punishment", "coming to no good end", and also the threat of "resolutely fighting back without fail" against imagined "Indian intrusion" into Tibet. These allegations and threats are nothing but a smokescreen for the calculated acts of aggression which the Chinese troops have been committing across the border of India.

#### Eastern Sector

(1) On November 20, 1965 about 200 Chinese troops crossed the international boundary at Zang La and intruded about one mile into Indian territory.

(2) On November 21, 1965 a group of Chinese soldiers came across the boundary to the Sumdorong ridge on the Indian side and on November 23 extended their intrusion to the left bank of the Namjangchu river north of its junction with Sumdorongchu.

(3) On November 23 another party of Chinese troops crossed the international boundary at the Thagla ridge and entered the Namkachu valley in India. (The Thagla Ridge area is one of the "remaining areas" under the Colombo Proposals to which both India and China are to refrain from sending troops. Further, the Chinese Government had undertaken that it would not even establish civil checkposts in this area.)

(4) On November 22 about 300 Chinese troops crossed Siungla Pass and intruded to a depth of 200 yards into the Siang Division of the North East Frontier Agency of India. The Chinese troops further sent forward two of their scouts for reconnaissance to a depth of two miles.

On November 24, the Chinese troops withdrew into Tibet from all the areas of intrusion mentioned above. However, this afternoon at 1400 hours an Indian police party patrolling in Indian territory in the vicinity of Gilling was attacked and fired upon by Chinese soldiers who had intruded into Indian territory across Kepangla on the border of the Siang District of the North East Frontier Agency of India. One of the Indian constables was wounded in the arm.

The Chinese Government are aware that all the areas mentioned above are on the Indian side of the international boundary. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against these serious violations of the border and the territorial integrity of India by Chinese troops. The fact that the Chinese troops have extended and intensified their acts of intrusion along the entire border exposes the belligerent and aggressive intentions of the Chinese Government against India.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 28 November, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1050

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

1. At 1707 hours on November 24, 1965 a group of Indian soldiers at the Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary unwarrantedly fired two shells

at the Chinese frontier guards on patrol duty on the Chinese side of the pass. Following their continuous armed provocations against the Chinese side since mid-November, Indian troops have this time gone to the length of firing shells at Chinese frontier guards. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this rabid provocation.

2. In its note of November 25, 1965, the Indian Government slanderously alleged that on November 24 Chinese soldiers had entered Sikkim territory in the vicinity of the Tagi La (referred to as "The area north-west of Born Cho" in the Indian note) and had then withdrawn after Indian personnel opened fire, and lodged a protest with the Chinese Government on these grounds. It is quite clear that, in concocting this story, what the Indian side tried to do was none other than make a false counter-charge in order to cover up its own criminal act of provocative shelling. The Chinese Government hereby sternly condemns the Indian side's slanderous fabrication and categorically rejects its unwarranted protest. It must be pointed out that it is India and no one else who should stop her "deliberate and aggressive border violations". If the Indian side refuses to heed reason and persists in shooting today and shelling tomorrow on the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border, it will be dealt counter-blows as it deserves.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 29 November, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1045

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the four notes of the Ministry of External Affairs of the Indian Government dated November 20, 21 and 23, 1965.

1. In its notes the Indian Government accused Chinese soldiers of crossing the "Bomchola Pass" and the "Kongrala" on the China- Sikkim boundary to enter Sikkim territory and crossing the boundary in the Western Sector of the Sino-Indian border to enter the Daulat Beg Oldi area, and so on and so forth. This is sheer fabrication. At no time and in no place have Chinese Frontier guards crossed the China-Sikkim boundary or the Sino-Indian boundary. The Chinese Government categorically rejects the Indian Government's protests based on lies entirely of its own concoction.

2. In its notes, the Indian side also rehashed a multitude of other slanderous charges against China. The Chinese Government has already set forth the relevant facts and thoroughly refuted the Indian lies in its notes of September 24, September 27, October 18, November 13 and November 18, 1965. Even though the Indian side repeats those lies a thousand times, it will not succeed in turning them into facts.

3. Why should the Indian Government have recently increased its vilifications against China to such an extent? This is not accidental. It is common knowledge that the Indian Government is now having a hard time. It is eagerly begging the U.S. imperialists and their collaborators for money, food and weapons. Facts over the past years have proved that at such junctures the Indian side invariably intensifies its provocative intrusions into China and creates tension on the border. And the more the Indian side intensifies its intrusions into China, the greater is its need to make false counter- charges against China in order to cover up its own

crimes. But this trick on the part of the Indian Government has long gone bankrupt. Its renewed employment now can have no other effect than reveal the Indian Government's ugly features once again.

4. The Chinese Government advises the Indian Government truly to stop all its acts of aggression and its slanders against China. Otherwise it is bound to meet with even greater failures.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.  
Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 30 November, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to their notes dated the 28th and 29th November 1965 has the honour to state:

The Government of India have noted that the Chinese Government are trying to evade responsibility for their provocative activities in North Sikkim and Ladakh and are seeking refuge in bland denials and fabricated counter-charges. In their note of the 28th November the Chinese Government have talked of "provocative shelling" by Indian troops on Chinese soldiers "on the Chinese side" of "Tagi Pass". On an earlier occasion (in their note dated the 6th November 1964) the Government of India had pointed out that they are not aware of any such place as "Tagi Pass" in this well-known sector of the Sikkim-Tibet border. Since the Chinese note under reply however has equated this "Tagi Pass" with the area north-west of Bom Cho, it is obvious that this false counter-charge has been levelled to confuse the facts regarding China's repeated acts of unwarranted intrusion in the North Sikkim area on the 19th, 20th, 21st and 24th November 1965. (Reference Government of India's notes dated

20th, 21st, 23rd and 25th November, 1965). Similarly, full facts about the wanton intrusion by the Chinese troops in the Daulet Beg Oldi area in Ladakh have been given in another note dated the 23rd November, 1965. No amount of denials can alter these facts.

The Chinese Government may recall that in their note dated the 26th December 1959, they had said of the Sikkim sector of the India-China border: "The boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formally delimited and there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in practice". Notwithstanding this, the Chinese Government have continued with their reckless policy of engineering provocations and injecting tension in an area where there is no territorial conflict. This clearly exposes the expansionist policy being pursued by the Chinese Government.

The Chinese notes under reply have talked of India's "ugly features" and "bankruptcy" and threatened India with "counter- blows" by the Chinese Government. Such language and threats are not used by one independent and sovereign nation to another. We have no desire to compete with the Chinese Government in this field. If the Chinese Government get carried away by their hatred of India and their opposition to India's peaceful policies, and use slander as a substitute for logic and reason, the Government of India cannot but express their regret at this.

The chain of border intrusions and provocative activities staged by the Chinese Government along India's northern frontier are no accidental occurrence. They are an integral part of the Chinese Government's deliberate policy of maintaining tension and conflict in this part of Asia.

The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Chinese 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 December, 1965

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

The Government of India have received information that since the 26th November 1965 armed Chinese troops have once again entered the Thagla ridge area in strength and have taken up positions at several points in this area. On the afternoon of December 1st, about 250 armed Chinese soldiers moved further south towards the Namkachu river and about 100 of them crossed over to the south bank and took up positions there. In carrying out this act of provocation and further extending their intrusive activities southward, the Chinese Government have repeated and enlarged their earlier intrusion in this same area which took place on the 23rd November, 1965 (Reference Government of India's note dated the 27th November 1965).

This latest and serious violation of the established boundary of India by Chinese troops is not only an infringement of India's territorial sovereignty but open defiance of the provisions of the Colombo Proposals and a negation of China's own cease-fire declaration. In sending its troops into the Thagla ridge area, which the Chinese Government call "Che Dong", the Chinese Government has violated the 20-k.m. demilitarized zone it claims to have established all along the India-China border including the Eastern Sector, violated the so-called 'line of actual control' and entered one of the four areas which it had undertaken to leave vacant. In his letter of April 20, 1963, Premier Chou En-lai wrote to the late Prime Minister Nehru that "in response to the Colombo Proposals, it (the Chinese Government) has decided to vacate these areas and refrain from establishing civilian checkpoints there". On February 17, 1963, Marshal Chen Yi, China's Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister, said to a correspondent of the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation: "The Chinese

Government has decided to leave vacant four places which are under dispute in the cease-fire arrangements and not even to set up civilian checkpoints there. These four areas are in the Western Sector where India once set up 43 strong points, Wuje in the Middle Sector and Che Dong area and Longju in Eastern Sector of the Sino-Indian border".

In contravention of the above unequivocal assurances of the Chinese Government and in contemptuous defiance of the provisions of the Colombo Proposals Chinese troops have entered the Thagla ridge area a second time within one week, thereby violating the well-established international boundary of India in the Eastern Sector. This is nothing but a deliberate act of provocation and a calculated attempt to raise tension and create incidents on the India- China border. The Government of India lodge a strong protest against these continuing and increasingly aggressive acts by Chinese troops across the Indian border.

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

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 10 December, 1965

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

The Government of India have received reports that Chinese troops have once again intruded into Indian territory in the Eastern Sector of the India-China border. On the night of 5-6th December, 1965 armed Chinese troops crossed the international boundary at the Thagla ridge and re-entered the Namkachu Valley. On the night of 6-7th December they crossed the Namkachu river, and the next day they moved in strength up to Hatung La Pass which is about three miles south of the international

border. The total strength of the intruding Chinese troops in the Namkachu Valley is now reported to be about 350.

The Government of India vehemently protest against this violation of Indian territory by Chinese troops. In their notes of 27th November and 4th December, 1965 the Government of India had protested against earlier intrusions by Chinese forces into the Thagla ridge area. The Chinese Government have paid no heed to these protests and are, on the contrary, allowing their troops to continue their reckless and aggressive acts against India. The facts of these intrusions are undeniable and there is nothing that even the Chinese Government have been able to invent in order to justify them. As has been pointed out in previous notes of the Government of India, the Chinese Government, by these provocative intrusions, have violated its cease-fire declaration, violated the 20-k.m. demilitarized zone, violated the Colombo Proposals and violated the assurances given to India as well as publicly to the whole world by Chinese leaders that China will not send its troops and not even set up civilian check posts in the Thagla ridge area. Having committed massive aggression against India and occupied a large area of Indian territory in the Western Sector, is the Chinese Government now trying to change by force the status quo on the Eastern Sector of the India- China border ? The Government of India have always held that the border question cannot be settled through application of pressure or the exercise of brute force. Any such attempt is bound to fail and, as in the past, will only further embitter relations between the two countries and endanger the peace of the area.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 11 December, 1965**

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

The following instances of violation of the 'line of actual control' by armed Chinese troops in the Ladakh sector of the India-China border have been noted by the Government of India in the period since 1st December 1965.

(1) On 3rd December at 1800 hours two Chinese vehicles intruded about 2 miles west of the 'line of actual control' opposite the Indian civilian checkpost at Daulet Beg Oldi. They returned to the Chinese side of the line later in the evening.

(2) On the morning of 5th December, two vehicles with Chinese Soldiers intruded about 2 miles west of the 'line of actual control' and came upto a hill feature near the Indian civilian checkpost at Track Junction. They remained in this area till the afternoon.

(3) On 6th December at 1430 hours four Chinese soldiers in a light vehicle intruded to a depth of one mile opposite the Indian civilian checkpost at Daulet Beg Oldi before returning on the same day.

(4) On 8th December between 1045 and 1615 hours about 20 armed Chinese soldiers intruded to a depth of 4 miles opposite the Indian checkpost at the Track Junction.

(5) On the 8th December at 1000 hours two Chinese vehicles intruded about 1 ½ miles west of the "line of actual control" before withdrawing to

the Chinese side of this line.

(6) On the 9th December between 1045 and 1400 hours two Chinese vehicles carrying about 20 soldiers intruded about two miles west of the "line of actual control" and came upto a hill feature near the Indian civilian checkpost at Track Junction.

In addition to these deliberate intrusions, in the period since 1st December 1965, the Government of India have noted the following instances of violation and remilitarization of the 20 km demilitarized zone in Ladakh.

(1) On the morning of December 2, 1965, about 70 Chinese soldiers visited the Silung Burma Nullah opposite the Indian civilian checkpost at Hot Spring and remained there upto 1600 hours.

(2) On December 4, between 0930 and 1630 hours about 50 Chinese soldiers were engaged in construction activity at a point about one mile east of the 'line of actual control' opposite the Indian civilian checkpost at Daulet Beg Oldi. It has been noted that since then Chinese troops have set up a post in this area.

(3) On December 5, about 60 Chinese soldiers visited the Silung Burma Nullah between 0900 and 1700 hours. On 6th December some Chinese troops again visited this point between 0900 and 1600 hours.

(4) On December 6 between 1100 and 1400 hours 30 Chinese soldiers, some of them mounted, visited a hill feature near the Indian checkpost at Tsaskur.

(5) In the past several days about 300 Chinese soldiers have been concentrated in the area near the Indian civilian checkpost at Demchok. They have been observed firing Verey lights and carrying out provocative

exercises in the demilitarized zone.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest against the wilful and unprovoked acts of harassment and intrusions listed above and urge the Chinese Government to order their troops to put an immediate stop to them.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 12 December, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1150.

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:

At 1435 hours on December 12, 1965, a group of more than 30 Indian soldiers intruded into Chinese territory for more than 500 metres through the Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary. These Indian aggressor troops opened heavy fire with rifles and artillery on the Chinese frontier guards who were on patrol duty there, killing one of them, so that the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to fire back in self-defence. The Indian aggressor troops then fled back to Sikkim territory helter-skelter. The Chinese frontier guards caught three Indian soldiers alive (among whom two were wounded), killed five and captured a light machine-gun, five rifles and a tommy gun. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this serious provocation in

which Indian troops wantonly intruded into Chinese territory and launched an armed attack on the Chinese frontier guards.

It is common knowledge that recently Prime Minister Shastri, Defence Minister Chavan and other leaders of the Indian Government have made continual outcries against China; slanderously charging Chinese troops with "intrusions" across the China-Sikkim and the Sino-Indian boundaries and calling for "the necessary steps" "to deal with the Chinese intruders in strength," etc. At the same time, Indian troops have incessantly perpetrated acts of intrusion and provocation against China by firing rifles and artillery on the China-Sikkim border and the Sino-Indian border. Now they have gone to the length of launching an armed attack after invading Chinese territory. All this clearly shows that the Indian Government, in order to meet its present political needs, has frantically resorted to force to create tension on the border and oppose China.

The Chinese Government once again serves a stern warning to the Indian Government; it must immediately stop its intrusions and provocations against China, or else the Chinese side will give it such punishment as it deserves.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 13 December, 1965**

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

On the 10th December 1965 about 400 armed Chinese troops entered the Longju area in Subansiri district of NEFA and intruded to a depth of 1 ½ to 2 miles into Indian territory. Following this unprovoked intrusion, Chinese troops have been digging trenches and setting up military works in this area.

This latest act of calculated intrusion in the eastern sector of the India-China border, has come in the wake of repeated Chinese provocations and intrusions in the other parts of this border. The Chinese troops who had penetrated into Indian territory south of the Thagla ridge (reference our note of 4th December 1965) are still entrenched there and have been strengthening their position at the Hatung La ridge.

These aggressive acts constitute a serious infringement of India's territorial integrity. They are also in gross violation of the Colombo Proposals and China's own statements and assurances.

In their statement of the 1st March 1963, the Chinese Government had stated:

"With regard to the four areas within the 20 km zone on our side of the line of actual control where there is a dispute between China and India about the cease-fire arrangements, namely, the Che Dong area and Longju in the eastern sector, Wu-Je in the middle sector and the area in the western sector ..... our Government in response to the appeal of the Colombo conference, has decided to vacate them and refrain from establishing civilian check- posts there after the withdrawal of our frontier guards."

Confirming this Premier Chou En-lai in his letter to the Prime Minister of India dated the 3rd March 1963 said:

"Moreover, the Chinese Government has further decided to refrain from establishing civilian checkpoints in the four areas where there is a dispute about the cease-fire arrangement."

In blatant disregard of their own statements and public assurances the Chinese Government has now dispatched armed forces to intrude into Longju across the international border of India. This is yet another provocative act in the chain of calculated violations of Indian territory by Chinese troops in recent weeks and is, obviously, designed to further China's scheme of creating tension and conflict in the Indian sub-continent. The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against these reckless and aggressive actions by Chinese troops.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 December, 1965**

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

At 1130 hours on 12th December about 250 to 300 Chinese troops intruded into Sikkim territory, 3 miles north-west of Sese La in north Sikkim. The Chinese soldiers fired at an Indian patrol in this area using mortars and automatic weapons. The fire was returned by the Indian personnel in self-defence. The exchange of fire which started at 1200 hours was continued till dusk. In the firing two Indian soldiers were killed; seven others are missing, while 30 Chinese intruders were also killed. The dead Chinese were carried back under the cover of darkness.

This major incident was preceded by two other acts of provocation. On the 10th December 1965, at 1130 hours, 30 armed Chinese soldiers intruded into Sikkim territory to a depth of about 1500 yards in the area north-west of Born Cho in the north Sikkim. The Chinese intruders retreated into Tibetan territory at 1530 hours when they sighted an Indian patrol which had been sent out to intercept them. On the night of 10th-11th December between 1830 and 0400 hours Chinese troops in the Nathu La area carried out unprovoked firing towards an Indian point south-east of Nathu La, 1000 yards inside Sikkim territory.

The Government of India lodge a strong protest with the Chinese Government against these latest acts of aggression across the Sikkim border by Chinese troops. In order to cover up these criminal acts the Chinese Government has concocted baseless charges against India and handed over with indecent haste a so-called "protest" note to Indian Embassy in Peking at 4 a.m. on the morning of December 13. These are, however, much too serious to be covered up by fabricated allegations. The Chinese Government in its note has admitted that their intruding troops have killed 5 Indian soldiers and captured three others. The Government of India demand the immediate return of these to the Indian side.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 17 December, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1152.

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

On December 12, 1965 Indian troops intruded into Chinese territory through Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary and made an armed attack on the Chinese frontier guards on duty there. Five of them were shot to death on the spot and three captured by the Chinese side. One of the three captured Indian soldiers died of his serious wound on the 13th. Acting in the spirit of revolutionary humanitarianism, the Chinese Government has instructed the authorities concerned to hand over to the Indian side the bodies of the six Indian soldiers mentioned above on the Chinese side of Tagi La at 1400 hours (Peking time), December 20, 1965. The Indian Government can send personnel, who shall carry a green flag as before, to receive the bodies at the place and time specified above. If no Indian personnel appear for receiving the bodies of the six Indian soldiers at the specified time, the Chinese Government will instruct the authorities concerned to bury them.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 20 December, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to their note of the 17th December 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

According to reports just received from the Indian defence personnel on the Sikkim-Tibet border, Chinese troops have today handed over the

dead bodies of six Indian soldiers killed on the 12th December 1965 on Sikkim territory in an encounter between intruding Chinese troops and an Indian patrol. The handing over of the bodies and calling it "revolutionary humanitarianism" does not, of course, absolve the Chinese Government of the responsibility for the crime and for the aggressive intrusion. The Chinese Government has not yet returned the two other Indian personnel whom their troops had seized from Sikkim territory on December 12. The Government of India demand their immediate return to the Indian side.<sup>98</sup>

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 24 December, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's notes of 6th October and 30th October, 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India's notes of the 2nd October and 6th October, 1965 had given details of two incidents of the 2nd and 4th October when the Chinese soldiers carried out provocative intrusions across the Sikkim-Tibet border at Yak La and attempted to over-run Indian positions located well inside Sikkim territory. When the aggressive intrusions of the Chinese troops were foiled by the vigilant Indian personnel, the Chinese Government kept quiet about it and waited for four days after the receipt of India's protest of the 2nd October to come out with their so-called "protest" on the 6th October. But a trumped-up counter-protest cannot cover up facts, especially when the Chinese intrusions in the Sikkim

sector have become more and more frequent and threatening.

The Government of India's note of the 10th October had given details of an incident across Lipu Lekh Pass on the 9th October when the Chinese troops intruded into Indian territory and opened fire on an Indian patrol. The Chinese Government are now denying this with the bland statement that no Chinese troops were present in the area. Such denials are futile because the Chinese troops not only intruded but opened fire on an Indian patrol party in the area.

The Chinese note of the 30th October abounds in falsehoods and self-contradictions. The facts of the Chinese provocations at Tsaskur cannot be evaded by mere denial or sophistry. Unable to deny China's military activities in the 20-k.m. demilitarized zone in Ladakh, the Chinese Government have claimed that these activities took place in "Chinese territory". The whole world knows that 20-k.m. zone as in Ladakh is part of the 14,500 sq. miles of Indian territory forcibly seized and illegally occupied by Chinese troops. By introducing troops in the demilitarized area the Chinese Government have repudiated the Colombo Proposals and also their "unilateral cease-fire" declaration of the 21st November 1962. It is obvious that the Chinese Government has done this to intensify tension and to re-open the border conflict. The further and even graver intrusions which are taking place all along the border demonstrate that the Chinese Government is not interested in peace or peaceful settlement but is pursuing a warped policy of creating trouble, tension and conflict.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the  
Embassy of India in China, 6th January, 1966**

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 040.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to reply as follows in refutation of the Notes of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated November 27 and 30 and December 4, 10, 11 and 13, 1965.

In the six notes under reference, the Indian Government trumped up a great number of slanderous charges about Chinese ""intrusions" into India, alleging that China has been creating tensions and conflicts along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim boundary, and on these bases lodged repeated "protests" with China. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at these unwarranted charges and protests and categorically rejects them.

Whether on the Sino-Indian border or on the China-Sikkim boundary, the Chinese frontier guards and civilian personnel have not crossed either the line of actual control or the boundary between the two sides. The charges made by the Indian Government in its notes about Chinese "intrusions" are all deliberate and complete fabrications.

Regarding the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, the Indian side has accused Chinese personnel of "intrusions" across Zang La, Siungla, Kepangla and Sumdorong ridge. In the first place, the Chinese Government knows nothing about the location of what the Indian side refers to as Zang La and Siungla. The so-called junction of the Nyamjang Chu and the Sumdorong Chu south of Sumdorong ridge is situated north of Shatze and is obviously on the Chinese side of the line of actual control. As for the assertion that Chinese personnel had crossed Kepang

La on the afternoon of November 27, 1965 to "attack" an Indian police party and "wounded" an Indian constable in the arm, it is all the more a sheer fabrication and is not worthy of any refutation.

Particularly absurd is the fact that the Indian side charged Chinese troops with entering Longju and the Che Dong area, alleging that China has "violated the well-established international boundary of India in the eastern sector". It has long been established that Longju is always part of the Migyitun Area of Tibet and is located north of the line of actual control on the Sino-Indian border. Che Dong has always been under the administration of Le Village of Tsona County of Tibet. It is even to the north and on the Chinese side of the illegal MacMahon line according to the original 1914 map of the line. In referring again to Longju and the Che Dong and describing the illegal MacMahon line as the Sino-Indian boundary in the Eastern sector, the Indian Government has merely revealed its expansionist design on Chinese territory. The Chinese Government hereby once again states to the Indian Government that the MacMahon line is illegal and has never been recognised by China. The 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory south of the MacMahon line is now still under India's unlawful occupation. The Chinese Government for ever retains the right to settle this question.

Regarding the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, the many cases of so-called "intrusions" by China enumerated by the Indian side are all charges about Chinese personnel entering the Dauletbeg Oldi area. But the fact is that the Chinese side has never crossed its own boundary, let alone entering the Indian area of Dauletbeg Oldi.

As for the China-Sikkim boundary, the Chinese Government long ago explicitly pointed out in its note of December 26, 1959 that the boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formally delimited and that there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in

practice. China has always respected the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Sikkim and has never crossed the China-Sikkim boundary. On the other hand, ever since 1960 the Indian troops stationed in Sikkim have constantly intruded into China's territory across the China-Sikkim boundary and have built a large number of military works for aggression on Chinese territory. Only when, in September 1965, the Chinese Government set a time limit for the Indian side to dismantle these military works for aggression did the intruding Indian troops hastily withdraw. But since then Indian troops, attempting to stage a come-back, have continued repeatedly to cross the boundary for reconnaissance, and even launched armed attacks against the Chinese frontier guards. It is perfectly clear that India has been using Sikkim's territory to commit ceaseless intrusions and provocations against China and create tension on the China-Sikkim boundary. No matter how many lies the Indian Government may fabricate, it can in no way disguise this iron-clad fact. In its notes under reference, the Indian Government talked nonsense about China's open defiance of the provisions of the Colombo proposals and negation of China's own cease-fire declaration. Here the Indian Government has lifted a rock only to have its own toes squashed. As is well known, back on October 24, 1962, the fourth day after India launched her massive armed attack on China, the Chinese Government issued its statement solemnly proposing that the armed forces of both sides withdraw 20 kilometres from the line of actual control along the Sino-Indian border. Soon afterwards the Chinese side unilaterally withdrew and vacated those areas where there is a dispute between the two sides about the ceasefire arrangement, without so much as setting up any civilian check- posts there. These measures taken by the Chinese side far exceeded the requirements of the Colombo proposals. The Chinese Government repeatedly stated that the sole purpose of China in taking these measures on her own initiative was to ease the situation on the border and facilitate a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. At the same time, the Chinese Government explicitly reserved the right of

self-defence and asked the Indian side to correctly understand China's efforts for peace, to make a positive response and absolutely not to take advantage of China's unilateral steps to commit intrusion or provocation. But in fact what has happened? Far from making any response to the measures taken by China to ease tension, the Indian side has taken advantage of China's self-initiated withdrawal to intensify its intrusions and provocations against China and create tension. In the period of less than three years from November 1962 when China initiated a cease-fire on the Sino-Indian border upto September 1965, there occurred more than three hundred cases of ground or air military intrusions by India. In the face of such rabid intrusions and provocations by India, the Chinese side is fully entitled to take all necessary measures in self-defence. To put it bluntly, it will never do for the Indian Government to permit itself recklessly to intensify its armed intrusion and create border incidents and forbid China to strengthen her defence and alertness and take the necessary defence measures on her own territory. It must be pointed out that the Indian Government's recent frenzied effort to create tension by armed force along the Sino-Indian border and the China-Sikkim border is entirely prompted by the requirements of its current internal and external policies. Facts in the past few years show that whenever the Indian Government needs to beg for aid from the U.S. imperialists and their collaborators, it intensifies its intrusions into China, creates tension and sets in motion its rumour-mongering machinery to smear her in a big way. It is precisely to cope with the increasingly serious food shortage at home and to meet the needs of its arms expansion and war preparations that the Indian Government is intensifying its intrusions into China.

The Chinese Government hereby reiterates its solemn word to the Indian Government; should the Indian side continue its intrusions and provocations against China or even against launch armed attacks on the Chinese frontier guards, the Chinese side will resolutely strike back. Should the Indian side continue to spread rumours and slanders against

China, or even attempt to malign her on the protest of her measures for easing tension, it will not harm her in the least but will only further expose the Indian Government's disgraceful doings.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 2 February, 1966**

No. C/2/66

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

In the past several weeks Chinese troops in the western middle and eastern sectors of the India-China border have continued their provocative activities and the following instances of intrusion and provocation have taken place in the period from 11th December 1965 to the 15th January, 1966.

**Western Sector**

In contemptuous disregard of their own undertakings as well as the Colombo proposals, Chinese troops have continued to violate the "line of actual control" in a series of intrusions in the Dauletbeg Oldi area.

(1) On 12th December, 1965, two vehicles carrying Chinese troops intruded 2 miles across "the line of actual control" and visited a hill feature opposite the Indian checkpoint at Track Junction.

(2) On 14th December, 1965, 60 Chinese soldiers in two vehicles intruded 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" and visited the hill features near the Indian checkpost at Track Junction between 1015 and 1510 hours.

(3) On 15th December, 1965, two vehicles carrying 70 Chinese soldiers intruded 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" across the Indian Track Junction checkpost and visited a hill feature remaining there from the morning till afternoon.

(4) On 16th December, 1965, two Chinese vehicles with 70 soldiers again intruded 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" to visit hill features near the Indian Track Junction checkpost at 1030 hours and returned to their encampment in the afternoon.

(5) On 19th December, 1965, between 1040 and 1330 hours two Chinese vehicles carrying soldiers intruded 2 miles beyond the "line of actual control" and visited a hill feature near the Indian Track Junction checkpost.

(6) On 23rd December, 1965, two vehicles with 50 to 70 Chinese soldiers intruded 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" and visited a hill feature near the Indian Track Junction checkpost.

(7) On 25th December, 1965, from 1045 to 1515 hours two vehicles carrying Chinese soldiers intruded 4 miles beyond the "line of actual control" across the Indian checkpost at Track Junction.

(8) On 2nd January, 1966, two vehicles with 25 Chinese soldiers intruded about 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" and visited two hill features near the Indian checkpost at Track Junction, remaining there

from 0945 hours till afternoon.

(9) On 9th January, 1966, between 1000 to 1150 hours two vehicles carrying Chinese soldiers intruded 2 miles beyond the "line of actual control" and visited a hill feature near the Indian checkpost at Track Junction before returning to their base.

(10) On 15th January, 1966, between 1045 to 1230 hours two vehicles with Chinese soldiers intruded 4 miles west of the "line of actual control" and visited two hill features near the Indian check- post at Track Junction.

In addition, incessant military activity has been carried out by Chinese troops in the 20 km demilitarized zone and Chinese troops have been actively engaged in setting up and enlarging two new military strong points opposite the Indian checkposts at Dauletbeg Oldi and Track Junction. Chinese troops have also been engaged in carrying out troops movements and exercises in the Silung Barma Nullah area and in the Demchok area. Chinese troops have also reestablished their military post in the Rezang Lumpa area in the 20 km demilitarized zone.

#### Middle Sector

On 16th December, 1965, at 1010 hours a Chinese aircraft from Tibet intruded over the Mana area to a depth of 5 miles before returning to Tibet.

#### Eastern Sector

Chinese troops who had intruded south of the so-called "line of actual control" in the Thagla ridge area on the 5th-6th December 1965 (our note of 10th December, 1965, refers) and penetrated upto Hatung La ridge, carried out intensive entrenchment and construction activities in this area, erecting bunkers and observation posts, as well as digging trenches and other military works. The intruding Chinese troops

also carried out provocative exercises including the firing of very lights from Hatung La ridge.

Chinese troops who had intruded into the Longju area in Subansiri district of NEFA on the 10th December 1965 (our note of 13th December, 1965, refers) extended their illegal occupation approximately one mile south of Longju and 21 miles south of the international boundary and the "line of actual control". They carried out various construction activities in this area.

#### Sikkim-Tibet Border

On 19th December 1965, at 2130 hours Chinese troops on the right shoulder of Nathu La opened fire on Sikkim territory, without causing any damage.

These repeated intrusions can only be designed to keep up tension on the borders and to worsen relations between the two countries. The Government of India would once again demand that the Chinese Government refrain from such unprovoked aggressive activities.

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

\*\*\*

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

No. C/3/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's notes of the 31st May, 7th June and 11th June,

1965 has the honour to state as follows:

Events of the last few months have already exposed the hollowness and hypocrisy of Chinese Government's contentions contained in the above-mentioned notes. China's policy of creating border incidents behind a smoke screen of fabricated counter-charges has now become all too clear to the world. Equally self-evident is the Chinese Government's contemptuous rejection of the conciliatory efforts of the Afro-Asian powers, who met at Colombo in December 1962, and formulated the Colombo proposals. Yet, it may be useful to examine these Chinese notes and to place on record some of the facts.

In their note of the 31st May 1965, the Chinese Government have tried to deny that a Chinese intrusion had taken place across the line of actual control" in the Chip-chap River area in Ladakh on the 1st April, 1965 by merely saying that Chinese troops have never been sent to the 20 km demilitarized zone. Since September 1965, the Chinese Government have repeatedly intruded to the west of the "line of actual control" after having re-militarized the 20 km demilitarized zone. These are facts which cannot be denied.

In their note dated 7th June 1965, the Chinese Government have made similar futile efforts to deny facts of a Chinese intrusion into Indian territory across Mana Pass on the 9th May, 1965, by claiming that they have "exercised restraint and forbearance" and "stood for a settlement by means of negotiations. This is a dishonest pretension in the face of the fact that China has not only rejected all reasonable proposals for talks, but has indulged in repeated, unprovoked intrusions into Indian territory and even threatened India with an impudent ultimatum.

In their note dated the 11th June 1965, the Chinese Government have made equally vain attempts to deny facts of Chinese intrusions across the Sikkim-Tibet border. Lacking in any substantial argument in defence of

their intrusions, the Chinese Government have attempted at one point, to distort a brief reply given in Parliament on the 22nd February 1965, by the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, and alleged that the Indian Government have been giving contradictory stories. Such sophistry and hair-splitting will not do. In the same note, the Chinese Government have also made mischievous insinuations about India "sowing discord between China and Sikkim". The Chinese Government are aware that, under the treaty relationship between India and Sikkim, the Indian Government are responsible for the defence and territorial integrity of Sikkim and that the external relations of Sikkim are also the responsibility of the Government of India. Premier Chou En-lai had recognised this special relationship between India and Sikkim in 1960 when, in reply to a question at a Press Conference in New Delhi, he declared that "China respects India's relations with Sikkim and Bhutan". How then can there be any question of India creating discord between China and Sikkim? The very suggestion represents a crude attempt on the part of Chinese Government to spoil the special and cordial relations which exist between India and Sikkim.

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

\*\*\*

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

No. C/4/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and has the honour to refer to their Note No. (66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 040 dated the 6th January, 1966.

The facts that stand out clearly in the Chinese note under reply is the virtual admission by the Government of China that its troops entered the demilitarised zone in Ladakh and the Thagla Ridge area and Longju in the eastern sector of the India- China border. The Chinese Government, who has always been enthusiastic to deny indisputable facts, has not, in this case, cared even to make a pretence of repudiating these facts of grave violations by its troops. On the contrary, it has put forward the hypocritical plea of 'self-defence' to justify these acts of aggression and blatant violations of solemn assurances. It has been alleged that between November 1962 and September 1965 there occurred more than three hundred cases of ground and air military intrusions by India. This is a massive lie manufactured in Peking. In various notes the Government of India have already refuted, once and for all, each and every one of these Chinese allegations.

It is obvious that all these false and malicious charges against India have been made by the Chinese Government with increasing frequency and truculence, especially since September last year, in order to provide a pretext for the discarding of the Colombo proposals and the repudiation of China's own assurances, and to create incidents and tension on the border under the cover of exercising China's 'right of self-defence'. The world is only too painfully aware of what the Chinese Government means when it talks of 'self-defence'. Neither the people of India nor the people of the world have forgotten that it was in the name of 'self-defence' that the Chinese troops launched a massive invasion across the Indian border in the autumn of 1962. The Chinese Government is only deceiving itself and no one else, when it argues that it was in 'self-defence' that its troops carried out unprovoked violations of the demilitarized zone and the Thagla Ridge and Longju areas; according to reports received by the Government of India the Chinese troops who have intruded into Thagla Ridge area and Longju have, with the advance of winter, gone back into

Tibet. Indian troops and personnel have on no occasion transgressed the historically established and well-known international boundary between India and China. As regards 'the line of actual control' in the Western Sector, Indian personnel have never crossed it at any point even though India does not recognise this 'line' which was unilaterally imposed by China as a result of its massive military operations in 1962. In regard to the 'disputed' Thagla Ridge area and Longju, India has scrupulously honoured the provisions of the Colombo proposals; indeed, even the Chinese Government has not suggested that Indian troops have been despatched to these areas. It is, therefore, evident that the Chinese violations and intrusions were not 'measures in self-defence' taken by China but naked and unprovoked "acts of aggression.

The Chinese note under reply says that "the Indian Government talked nonsense about China's open defiance of the provisions of the Colombo proposals and negation of China's own cease- fire declaration". It is well-known that under the Colombo proposals the Chinese Government were to carry out in the Western Sector 20-k.m. withdrawal of their troops and the area vacated by the Chinese military withdrawals was to be a demilitarized zone to be administered by the civilian posts of both sides. In the Eastern Sector, the Chinese troops were to withdraw north of the McMahon Line, and the 'remaining areas' or 'the disputed areas viz., Thagla Ridge area and Longju were to be kept vacant of the troops of both India and China. In a document entitled "The Principles Underlying the Proposals of the Six", which the representatives of the Colombo Conference gave to the Chinese Government in Peking, it was stated: "On the Eastern Sector, (a) it seems to be clear that, whether the McMahon Line is considered to be an illegal imposition or not, it has in fact become a line of actual control, with the Chinese Government exercising exclusive administrative control to the north of it, and the Indian Government exercising exclusive administrative control to the south of it, except in Che Dong and Longju which are disputed ..... ". The Chinese

Government, while maintaining reservations in regard to some of the important provisions of the Colombo proposals, had unequivocally accepted the recommendation to refrain from sending its troops to the Thagla Ridge area and Longju in the Eastern Sector, and also to the 'disputed areas' in the Middle and Eastern Sectors.

On February 17, 1963, speaking to the Sewdish Broadcasting Corporation, Vice-Premier Chen Yi assured the world that the Chinese Government would leave vacant the four places which are under dispute in the ceasefire arrangements and not even set up civilian checkpoints there. Subsequently in an official statement issued by the Chinese Ministry of Defence on 1st March, 1963, it was stated: "With regard to the four areas within the 20 k.m. zone on our side of the line of actual control, where there is a dispute between China and India about ceasefire arrangements, namely, the Chedong area and Longju in the Eastern Sector, Wuje in the middle sector and the area in the Western Sector where India once established 43 military strong points and where China had set up additional frontier posts in order to resist India's invasion, our Government in response to the appeal of the Colombo Conference, has decided to vacate them and refrain from establishing civilian checkpoints there after the withdrawal of our frontier guards".

In a note to India dated March 2, 1963, the Chinese Government repeated this undertaking as follows: "It must be stressed that none of the above-mentioned civilian checkpoints is established in the four areas where there is a dispute between China and India about the ceasefire arrangement—namely, the Chedong area and Longju in the Eastern Sector, Wuje in the middle sector and the area in the Western Sector where India once established 43 military strong points and where China had set up additional frontier posts in order to resist Indian invasion. In response to the peace appeal of the Colombo Conference of six Asian and African countries, the Chinese Government has decided to vacate the four

areas and to refrain from establishing civilian checkpoints there after the withdrawal of Chinese frontier guards".

On March, 3, 1963, Premier Chou En-lai wrote to the late Prime Minister Nehru: "Moreover the Chinese Government has further decided to refrain from establishing civilian checkpoints in the four areas where there is a dispute about the ceasefire arrangement".

Again on 20th April, 1963, Premier Chou En-lai wrote to the late Mr. Nehru "... in response to the Colombo proposals it (the Chinese Government) has decided to vacate those areas and refrain from establishing checkpoints there".

Thus both under the Colombo proposals and China's own declarations and assurances the Chinese Government were committed, amongst other things, (1) not to cross the 'line of actual control', (2) to maintain the 20 k.m. demilitarized zone in the Western Sector under the Colombo proposals, and under the Chinese Declaration, in all the three sectors of the border, and (3) not to send its troops to the 'disputed' areas of Thagla Ridge, Longju, etc.

According to the Chinese note, India is "talking nonsense" when it reminds the Chinese Government of these provisions, assurances and declarations. One can only ask, what is the worth of China's assurances to other countries and its loud slogan of Afro-Asian solidarity if such is its attitude to its own solemn commitments and to the sincere and constructive proposals of the Six Asian-African countries who met at the Colombo Conference for creating conditions for a meeting between India and China?

The Chinese Government, in its note under reference, has also tried to uphold its aggressive actions on the border on the ground that the Thagla

Ridge area, Longju and the junction of Namjangchu and the Sumdorong Chu south of the Sumdorong ridge are situated north of the McMahon Line and of the 'line of actual control' in the Eastern Sector. This is an untenable and fallacious argument, and is nothing but a desperate effort to find a historical loophole for aggression. Regarding the alignment of the McMahon Line, the Government of India have already explained their position fully and clearly in various notes and memoranda to the Chinese Government. The memorandum attached to the late Prime Minister Nehru's letter to Premier Chau En-lai dated November 14, 1962, is relevant in this connection. The memorandum pointed out that "The Agreement of 1914 only formalized what was the traditional and customary boundary in the area which lies along the highest Himalayan watershed ridges. The maps attached to the Agreement were of small scale of 1 inch to 8 miles. They were sketch maps and intended to be only illustrative. All that they made clear was that the boundary ran along the main watershed ridges of the area. The parallels and meridians were shown only approximately in accordance with the progress achieved at that time in the sphere of scientific surveys. This is a common cartographic feature and the Chinese Government have themselves recognised this in Article 48 of their 1960 Treaty with Burma. The principle underlying the McMahon Line agreement was that the boundaries lie along the highest watershed ridges. As regards Longju, it is well-known that it was under Indian administrative control till August 1959, when the Chinese forces attacked the Indian outpost there. Since the withdrawal of the Chinese personnel in 1961, Longju has not been under the administrative control of either side. Regarding the Thagla Ridge area, it has always been under Indian administrative control till the Chinese forces crossed the Thagla Ridge, for the first time on 8th September 1962. In the face of these facts it is absurd for the Chinese Government to claim that these areas are north of the McMahon Line and in Tibetan territory. Furthermore, to induct troops into these areas is an attempt to change the status quo on the border by forcible penetration

and is in gross disregard of China's own categorical assurances to India, the Colombo Powers and the world.

The Chinese note has blandly dismissed as 'fabrication' the incident at Keping La in the Eastern Sector on November 27, 1965, when an Indian police-party was attacked by intruding Chinese soldiers. Regarding the intrusions across Zangla and Siungla it has pleaded ignorance of the location of these places. There is no use denying established facts and pretending ignorance in order to evade responsibility. Zangla and Siungla are known border passes and the intruding Chinese troops could not have been unaware of this fact when they crossed into Indian territory.

As for the border of Sikkim, the Government of India has noted that the Chinese Government has re-affirmed that " .... the boundary between China and Sikkim has long been formally delimited and there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in practice". The question is why has the Chinese Government made repeated aggressive intrusions into Sikkim and created serious incidents involving loss of lives? And why has the Chinese Government concocted such ridiculous allegations of Indian intrusions and the so-called building of 'military works' in Tibetan territory and made them the pretext for its impertinent and theatrical ultimatum to India in the middle of September, 1965? That the ignominious failure of this ultimatum is still rankling in the Chinese mind is evident from the repetition of the false and vainglorious claim that as a result of the ultimatum Indian troops "dismantled" the so-called military works and "hastily withdrew". Indian troops, who are in Sikkim for the defence of Sikkim, have never crossed the well-known border and never intruded into Tibet. The Chinese Government is repeating these baseless allegations ad nauseam in order to create tension and to apply military pressure on Sikkim. These aggressive and divisive tactics of the Chinese are bound to fail.

Regarding the Western Sector, the Chinese note claims that "the Chinese side has never crossed its own boundary, let alone entering the Indian area of Daulatbeg Old". It is significant that the Chinese note has tried to evade the important issue of the re-militarization by China of the de-militarized zone in Ladakh. The induction of Chinese troops into the demilitarized zone is a grave provocative action totally opposed to the spirit and provisions of the Colombo proposals and to the requirements of a peaceful settlement of the border question. The fact that Chinese troops have crossed even their own claim line and the so-called 'line of actual control' and intruded into undisputed Indian territory, makes the matter even more serious. It is futile for the Chinese Government to deny the hard facts of these intrusions which have, as pointed out in the Indian Late of February 2, 1965, continued unabated even in January this year.

The Chinese note has referred to 'the line of actual control' in the Western Sector as the "boundary". The Government of India rejects this expansionist pretension on the part of the Chinese Government. The 'line of actual control' is not the 'boundary' between the two countries but is merely the line up to which Chinese troops advanced in 1962 during their massive military operations against India. It is in vain to pretend that this line of Chinese aggression is the 'boundary' between the two countries and that the 14,500 square miles of Indian territory occupied by China in Ladakh is Chinese territory. It is also in vain to assert, every now and then, that 90,000 square kilometres of sovereign Indian territory south of the McMahon Line belongs to China. To threaten that "the Chinese Government for ever retains the right to settle this question" and "will resolutely strike back" only serves to unmask the expansionist and aggressive designs of China against India. The Government of India rejects these preposterous territorial claims and arrogant threats of the Chinese Government. It also rejects with contempt the mischievous insinuation in the Chinese note that India is intensifying "intrusions" into China on account of food shortages and the requirements of India's

internal and external policy. If there is any Government in the world which is creating tensions and conflicts in order to serve the ends of its internal and external policies, it is none other than the Government of the People's Republic of China.

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

### **III. TERRITORIAL AIR SPACE**

#### **Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 November, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1024

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

At 1310 hours on November 18, 1965 an Indian military aircraft crossed the Sino-Indian boundary, intruded into China's air space over Tibet and circled above the civilian checkpost at Kongka Pass and its vicinity for reconnaissance. At 1050 hours on November 19, another Indian military aircraft flew across the Sino-Indian boundary, intruded into China's air space over Sinkiang and carried out reconnaissance over the Galwan River Valley and Panlung and its vicinity. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the repeated provocative intrusions into China's air space by Indian military aircraft.

It must be pointed out that the above-mentioned Indian air intrusions constitute another proof that recently the Indian Government has

deliberately been creating new tensions along the Sino-Indian border and the Sino-Sikkim border. The Chinese Government once again warns the Indian Government that it must immediately stop all its ground and air intrusions into and provocations against China. Otherwise, the Indian Government will have to bear full responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 23 November, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and in reply to the Chinese Note (65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1024 dated November 20, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India have enquired into the allegations made in the Chinese note that Indian aircraft flew over Kongka Pass and its vicinity on November 18, at 1310 hours, and over Galwan Valley and Panglung on November 19, at 1050 hours. The enquiries have conclusively proved that the Chinese allegations are utterly false and that no Indian aircraft has flown over the areas mentioned in the Chinese note. It may, however, be pointed out that Kongka Pass, the Galwan Valley and Panglung are not in Chinese territory as claimed in the Chinese note, but in Indian territory illegally occupied by Chinese troops as a result of their massive military action in 1962. The Government of India have, nevertheless, given strict instructions to all their personnel not to cross the 'line of actual control' either in the air or on the ground and these instructions have been scrupulously observed by them. The Chinese

protest note is therefore rejected as a mischievous and baseless fabrication.

It is regrettable that the Chinese Government should make such false allegations against the Government of India and threaten India with "serious consequences" etc. It is in fact that Chinese Government which was continuously violated the 'line of actual control' both in the air and on the ground and even intruded into undisputed Indian territory in Ladakh. In view of all this, it is clear that the Chinese accusation about Indian aircraft overflying the areas east of the 'line of actual control' has been made with the sole purpose of increasing tension and providing an excuse for the continuing Chinese violations of 'the demilitarised zone' and the 'line of actual control' and even undisputed Indian territory in the Western Sector.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 16 December, 1965**

(65) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 1153

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

At 1015 hours on December 14, 1965 an Indian military plane intruded into the Shigatse area of Tibet, China across Tagi La on the China-Sikkim boundary, and brazenly circled over the vast areas of Chago La, Tui La,

Phari, Linghsi La and Khala for reconnaissance and harassment; not until 1050 hours did it fly back to Sikkim territory across Kungyangmila Pass on the China-Sikkim boundary. This Indian military plane penetrated into Chinese territory to a depth of more than 60 kilometres. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against the repeated and extended provocative intrusions into China's airspace by Indian aircraft.

The facts are very clear. For obvious political purposes, the Indian Government has recently been making outcries against Chinese "intrusions" and lodging a chain of groundless "protests" with the Chinese Government. The Indian Government is grossly mistaken in thinking that it can, under a smokescreen of lies, expand its aggression against China at will not only on the ground but also in the air. The Chinese Government once again warns the Indian Government that if it persists in its reckless provocations against China, it definitely will not come to any good end.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 18 December, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese note of the 16th December, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

In the past several weeks we have continued to witness a series of Chinese intrusions and provocations along the entire length of the India-China border. When the facts of these aggressive Chinese activities have been exposed, the Chinese Government have either sought refuge in concocted and unconvincing counter-charges or maintained guilty silence.

Now the Chinese Government has gone a step further and escalated their false allegations by claiming that on the 14th December, 1965, an Indian aircraft intruded into Chinese territory upto a depth of "more than 60 kilometres" across the Sikkim- Tibet border. The Government of India have made careful investigations into the allegation and are completely satisfied that neither Indian personnel nor Indian aircraft have crossed into Tibet across the well-known Sikkim-Tibet border. The Chinese protest note is therefore categorically rejected. Instead of fabricating this kind of baseless and meaningless allegations the Chinese Government should stop creating trouble on the border and order their troops to desist from provocations and intrusions.

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

\*\*\*

#### **IV. ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT OF CHINESE REPRESENTATIVES AND NATIONALS IN INDIA**

**Note given by the Embassy of China in India, to the Ministry of  
External Affairs, New Delhi, 25 February, 1965**

No. M/632/65

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

The Embassy has learnt that recently the Indian Government has unjustifiably ordered Mr. Liu Wen Pao, responsible personage of Hsing Hwa Middle School in Calcutta, and Mr. Chen Chi Tu, the publisher of "The China Review", to leave India in a short period. It must be pointed out that

despite the repeated representations and protests by the Chinese Embassy, the Indian Government, for a long time, has not stopped its unwarranted expulsion of the law-abiding Chinese nationals. Now the Indian Government again expels Mr. Liu Wen Pao and Mr. Chen Chi Tu successively. This is a peremptory measure taken by the Indian Government following its recent malicious anti-China slanders, and a vicious plot to strangle the cultural and educational establishments of the Chinese nationals in India. The cultural and educational establishments of the Chinese nationals in India having a history of many years have in recent years been almost completely destroyed by the Indian Government. The Indian Government, however, does not stop at that even now, and once again arbitrarily expels the responsible personages of the Chinese nationals' school and newspaper. Such action of the Indian Government demonstrates that it is bent on further worsening the relations between China and India. But this can only result in further exposing the diabolical countenance of the Indian Government before the people of China and India and of the world. The Chinese Embassy lodges a serious protest against such outrageous practice of the Indian Government and resolutely demand that the Indian Government cancel its expulsion order and allow Mr. Liu Wen Pao and Mr. Chen Chi Tu to continue to reside in India.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 27 March, 1985**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Embassy's note No. M/632/65, dated February 25, 1965, has

the honour to state as follows:

The persons referred to in the Chinese Embassy's note, Messrs Liu Wen Pao and Chen Chi Tu, have been served with orders to leave India on account of their anti-Indian activities. The Chinese Embassy should be aware that it is an accepted code of conduct that foreign nationals should respect local laws and not act in a manner prejudicial to the security of the State wherein they reside. As the two persons under reference conducted activities prejudicial to the security of India, the Government of India have been constrained to serve them with orders to leave India.

The Chinese Embassy note makes the unwarranted allegation that the Government of India are destroying the cultural and educational establishments of Chinese nationals in India. The Chinese Embassy must be aware that in India several thousands of Chinese nationals continue to reside peacefully. This is proof of the fact that there is no impediment in regard to their leading normal lives in this country so long as they respect the laws of the land. The charge that the Government of India are bent on worsening the relations between China and India is absurd. It is, in fact, the Chinese Government who, by its acts of aggression and violent and continuous anti-Indian propaganda, does every thing possible to worsen relations between India and China.

In the light of the above facts the Chinese Embassy note is categorically rejected.

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

\*\*\*

**Memorandum given by the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 4 May, 1965**

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that on March 5, 1965, Mr. Liu Chi-yun, Chinese national in Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, was unjustifiably ordered to leave India within a short period. This is another act of persecution of the peaceable and law-abiding Chinese nationals by the Indian Government in disregard of the repeated representations and protests by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy hereby lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stop all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals in India.

\*\*\*

**Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 1 June, 1965**

Reference Chinese Embassy memorandum dated May 4, 1965.

It has been made abundantly clear to the Chinese Embassy that the Government of India place no impediments in the way of peaceful and law-abiding Chinese nationals in their continued stay in India as long as they respect the laws of the land. The person referred to in the Chinese Embassy's memorandum has been found guilty of indulging in anti-national acts which constitute a threat to the security of India. Hence, in accordance with the laws prevailing in India, the State Government was compelled to serve him with a notice to leave the country.

The externment of the Chinese national referred to in the Chinese Embassy memorandum under reply is a matter which falls purely within the internal jurisdiction of the Government of India and the Chinese

Embassy memorandum is an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of the country. The Embassy's protest, therefore is rejected.

\*\*\*

**Memorandum given by the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi to the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 3 August 1965**

The Chinese Embassy has learnt that on May 1965 Mr. Mao Po-lin, Chinese national in Calcutta, was unjustifiably ordered to leave India within a short period. This is another act of persecution of the peaceable and law- biding Chinese nationals by the Indian Government in disregard of the repeated representations and protests by the Chinese Government and the Chinese Embassy. The Embassy lodges a protest with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs against this and demands that the Indian Government immediately stops all forms of persecution of the Chinese nationals in India.

\*\*\*

**Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi, 24 November, 1965**

Reference Chinese Embassy's memorandum dated August 3, 1965.

It is entirely within the sovereign competence of India to order foreign nationals found indulging in anti-Indian activities to leave the country. It is surprising that the Chinese Embassy in India persists in shielding the activities of persons such as Mr. Mao Po-lin, who was asked to leave India in October 1965. The many thousands of persons of Chinese origin who continue to reside in India amidst peace and tranquility are a living refutation of the Chinese Government's propaganda charges of the so-called "persecution" of Chinese nationals in India. The Government of India categorically reject the Chinese Embassy's protest.

\*\*\*

## **V. TREATMENT OF INDIAN REPRESENTATIVES AND NATIONALS**

Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 14 April, 1965

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, with reference to note No. 17/342 dated the 11th September, 1964, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China regarding Shri M. L. Das has the honour to state as follows:

2. The Chinese Government has stated in the above note that "the way the Chinese side dealt with the case is unimpeachable and in full accord with international practice. However, regardless of the facts described above, the Indian Government in its note deliberately distorted the content of the aforesaid conversations, made unwarranted charges against the Chinese Government and deliberately attempted to interfere in a matter within sovereign jurisdiction of the Chinese Government. This is entirely impermissible".

3. Contrary to the Chinese Government's claim full facts about the case were never given to the Government of India in spite of repeated requests. Shri M. L. Das was arrested on the 29th October, 1963, and the Indian Embassy in Peking asked the Chinese Foreign Office on the 1st November, 1963, for information about his arrest. No information was made available to the Embassy for over a month. It was only after the Embassy sent a note to the Chinese Foreign Office on the 6th December, 1963, that, on the next day, the Chinese Foreign Office informed the First Secretary of the Embassy that Shri Das had been arrested on a charge of rape. Still the circumstances of the alleged offence were not conveyed to the Embassy. On the 4th January, 1964, the Assistant Director of the

Consular Department of the Chinese Foreign Office suddenly gave the First Secretary of the Indian Embassy the extraordinary piece of information that the alleged victim of the offence had given birth to a child which resembled an Indian. The whole story as given by the Chinese Government cannot but arouse serious doubt about the genuineness of the charge levelled against Shri Das.

4. To give another instance of Chinese reluctance to give information, Shri Das's case was decreed on the 25th July, 1964, by the People's Court of Shanghai and both the Chinese Foreign Ministry and the Foreign Affairs Bureau in Shanghai were fully aware of this. During his visit to Shanghai on the 4th August, 1964, the Indian Charge d' Affaires repeatedly urged Mr. Lwo, an Official of the Foreign Affairs Bureau, Shanghai, to expedite the disposal of the case. At that time the Charge d'Affaires was not informed that Shri Das had already been found guilty and sentenced to imprisonment.

5. The Embassy of India in Peking repeatedly asked for certain facilities in conformity with normal consular privileges recognised in international law and practice. The Government of India also requested for these facilities in its note dated the 2nd March, 1964, following the Embassy's notes dated the 6th December, 1963, 4th January, 1964, and 11th January, 1964. The Chinese Government ignored this reasonable request for extending legitimate facilities to the Indian Embassy. On the contrary, the Chinese Government insisted on dealing with the case in complete secrecy in accordance with the so-called "regulation of the Chinese side". As was pointed out in the Government of India's note dated the 2nd March, 1964, it is well recognised in international law and practice that a consular officer has the right to be informed of the arrest of the nationals of his country, to visit them if they are in prison, custody, or detention and to converse and correspond with them and also to arrange for their full and proper legal representation whenever and

wherever found necessary. This well-established right was denied to the Indian Embassy in Peking. Instead the Government of India is being asked to be satisfied with the unsubstantiated assertion of the Chinese Government that "the evidence of his (Shri Das's) guilt was incontrovertibly established". The Government of India cannot but point out that the accused was denied elementary justice in blatant violation of international practice.

6. Furthermore, when officers of the Indian Embassy in Peking asked for permission to see Shri Das in jail, restrictions were placed on the subjects they could discuss with him and no conversation was allowed regarding the case itself. The result was that Shri Das was not allowed to communicate with the Embassy either during or after the trial nor was he allowed to engage a lawyer to defend himself. Moreover, Shri Das's interview in jail with one of the officers of the Embassy was abruptly terminated by the jail authorities before it had lasted even five minutes. Though the jail regulations allow prisoners to receive visitors twice a month, on the first and third Tuesday, his parents were not allowed to see him except on those specific occasions when the Embassy made a request on their behalf to the Chinese Foreign Ministry. It is not known what kind of treatment and food Shri Das is receiving in jail, but when he was seen in jail by an officer of the Embassy and later by his parents, he was looking ill and emaciated. The letters which he wrote to the Embassy were not forwarded to the destination by the jail authorities. All this cannot but raise serious suspicion that Shri Das is being subjected to rave ill-treatment. It is clearly the responsibility of the Chinese Government to issue instructions to jail authorities not to ill-treat him in jail and to provide him adequate diet and medical attendance.

7. The Government of India emphatically lodges a protest to the Chinese Government on the denial of justice to one of their nationals Shri M. L. Das, and urges the Chinese authorities to provide immediately facilities to the accused for appealing to a Higher Court as it has been

established beyond doubt that justice has not been meted out to him by the People's Court of Shanghai.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 15 September, 1965.**

(65) Pu Ling Ech Fa Tzu No. 666.

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

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China has received the note of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India dated April 14, 1965. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China categorically rejects the so-called "strong protest" of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs, which is utterly unwarranted, in connection with the rape of a Chinese girl by Makham Lall Das.

1. Indian national in China M. L. Das forcibly raped a Chinese girl, seriously violating the right of person and damaging the physical and mental health of the victim, disrupting public order and breaking Chinese law. It is proper and unimpeachable that the Chinese local judicial authorities sentenced him to imprisonment according to law.

2. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China had

repeatedly acquainted the Indian Embassy in China with the case long ago, and the Indian Ministry for External Affairs had acknowledged the fact in its reply notes. Yet in its latest note the Indian Ministry for External Affairs haggled unreasonably, asserting that it had not been told the "full facts" and the "circumstances". We would like to state clearly once again that Indian national M. L. Das had committed in China a very serious offence of raping a juvenile girl. Even the official of the Indian Embassy in China Mr. Damodaran admitted in his conversation with Assistant Director Mr. Feng Hsien-pi of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on December 7, 1963 that he considered the offence a "shame". Yet now the Indian Ministry for External Affairs has appealed to so-called international law and practice and asked the Chinese Government to furnish it again with the "full facts" and "circumstances". This is entirely impermissible.

M. L. Das is guilty of the raping of a Chinese girl. Out of regard for the future and the name of the injured girl, the judicial authorities of the Chinese Government decided on a private trial. Hence it was entirely reasonable to deny attendance at the trial to officials from the Indian Embassy in China. This had been made clear by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in its note to the Indian Embassy in China on January 31, 1964. However, in its note under reference, the Indian Ministry for External Affairs still talked drivel, alleging that the Chinese Government had "dealt with the case in complete secrecy". This is not only a vicious slander against the Chinese Government, but also an illegal interference with China's exercise of its sovereign rights.

In order to cast such slanders on China, the Indian Ministry for External Affairs groundlessly stated in its note that "M. L. Das was not allowed to engage a lawyer to defend himself". The fact was that the Chinese authorities concerned offered him a lawyer to defend him, but he refused and decided on defending himself.

The Indian Ministry for External Affairs also said in its note that M.L. Das was not allowed to communicate with the Embassy either during or after the trial. According to the regulations of the Chinese authorities concerned, visits to prisoners are allowed after they have been sentenced. From September 1964 to April 1965, a total of six requests were made by officials of the Indian Embassy in China and relatives of the criminal to meet the latter in prison, each request was met by the Chinese authorities concerned and not one was rejected. Even when the official of the Indian Embassy in China, Mr. Damodaran, failed to go to the prison at the specified time, the Chinese authorities concerned gave him special consideration and let him visit the criminal against the rule. These facts clearly show that the slanders made by the Indian Ministry for External Affairs against the Chinese Government cannot stand refutation.

The assertion in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs that the interview of an official of the Embassy with the criminal "was abruptly terminated by the jail authorities before it had lasted even five minutes" is also a sheer distortion of the fact. The fact was that the visit to M. L. Das had to be stopped because the Press Attache of the Indian Embassy in China Mr. P. V. Srinivasan violated the regulations concerning visits although he had been informed of the regulations in detail beforehand by the jail authorities.

As is well known, the Chinese jail authorities always treat criminals humanely. The assertion of the Indian Ministry for External Affairs about M. L. Das being "ill-treated" is an absurd fabrication pure and simple. Instead of taking shame at the scandal caused by such a bad element as M. L. Das, the Indian Government has kept on haggling about it. Does it really think that this will bring it any honour?

It must be further pointed out that although the Middle People's Court of Shanghai Municipality on January 27, 1964 passed a fair sentence on

the offence committed by M. L. Das, at his request the authorities concerned permitted him to appeal to the Higher People's Court of Shanghai Municipality. After going through another careful examination and full debate in court, the Higher People's Court of Shanghai Municipality confirmed that the evidence of M. L. Das's offence was conclusive, decided to uphold the original sentence and reject his appeal, and concluded that this was the sentence of the final trial and that no further appeal might be made.

3. The Chinese Government has dealt with the offence committed by M. L. Das in accordance with Chinese law. This is in full conformity with international practice, and also reasonable and unimpeachable as a judicial measure which any sovereign state is bound to take in order to safeguard public order and protect personal safety. The Chinese authorities concerned have rendered facilities to meet all the reasonable requests made by the Indian embassy in China concerning the case of M. L. Das, but the Indian Government has repeatedly made baseless and malicious slanders against the Chinese Government and openly interfered in matters which are within China's sovereign rights. This course of action is obviously pursued by the Indian Government with ulterior purposes, and the Chinese Government expresses its deepest regret at it.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 2 November, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to

their note No. (65) Pu Ling Erh Fa Tzu No. 666, dated September 15, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:-

The Government of India reject the untenable arguments put forward by the Chinese Government in defence of the imprisonment and harassment of the Indian national, Shri M. L. Das. Right from the time of his arrest on the 29th October, 1963, until now, the Chinese Government have not shown the slightest regard for well-recognised principles of law and the ordinary canons of humanity in dealing with the case of Shri Das. On the contrary and in spite of protests by the Indian Government, they have persisted in victimising Shri Das through harsh and illegal actions.

The Chinese Government have claimed that they have repeatedly acquainted the Indian Embassy in China with this case. Facts are, however, different. Apart from the bland allegation that Shri M. L. Das "raped" a Chinese girl, that the girl within two months of the arrest of Shri M. L. Das gave birth to a child and that this child is said to "look like an Indian", the Chinese Government have all along refused to give any details of this case to the Indian Government. They merely informed the Indian Embassy in Peking more than ten months after Shri Das's arrest that he was sentenced to five years imprisonment by the higher court of Shanghai. Further, in complete violation of internationally recognised practice, the Chinese Government refused to permit the Indian Embassy in Peking to arrange for legal aid for the defendant or even to attend the trial. It is significant that the Chinese Government themselves have described this so-called legal process as a "private trial".

The Chinese note itself has admitted that Shri M. L. Das was sentenced on the 27th January, 1964. Yet, nothing was done by the Chinese Government to convey this information to Shri M. L. Das's parents or to the Indian Embassy in Peking until 11th September, 1964, although

during the period from the 29th October, 1963, to the 11th September, 1964, the Government of India addressed a total of four notes to the Chinese Government, and the Indian Embassy orally discussed this case and requested permission for a visit to Shri M. L. Das by his parents or Embassy officials on six separate occasions.

It was only on the 11th September, 1964, that the Chinese Government informed the Indian Embassy that Shri M. L. Das had been sentenced to five years imprisonment. Right from the time of the arrest of Shri Das it was repeatedly pointed out by us to the Chinese Government that the 70-year old parents of Shri M.L. Das were in a state of nervous shock on account of their anxiety for their son. The Chinese Government, in callous disregard of all accepted canons of humanity and international law, gave evasive replies for more than ten months and withheld permission for Shri M. L. Das's parents to meet their son in prison.

In its note under reply, the Chinese Government has boasted of its magnanimity towards Shri M. L. Das in permitting officials from the Indian Embassy to visit him after September, 1964. Yet on the 21st September, 1965, barely a week after handing over the note under reply, when an official of the Indian Embassy in Peking visited Shanghai for the purpose of meeting Shri M. L. Das in prison, the Chinese Government, notwithstanding the fact that they had been given prior intimation of this visit, refused to let this official meet Shri M. L. Das. In defence of this they advanced the flimsy excuse that the prisoner had "violated prison regulations".

In its frantic attempt to find justification for the ill-treatment of Shri M. L. Das, the Chinese Government has deliberately misquoted an official of the Indian Embassy in Peking and claimed, in its note dated 15th September, 1965, that this official had expressed "shame" at the offence

allegedly committed by Shri Das. If they have the slightest regard for the truth, the Chinese Government will recall that on being informed of Shri M. L. Das's arrest on 7th December, 1963, the First Secretary of the Indian Embassy in Peking had merely stated that such an incident, if it had taken place, was shameful event. It is regrettable that the Chinese Government should have distorted the context and the meaning of words in this manner.

The allegation of the Chinese Government that Indian officials visiting Shri M. L. Das at the Shanghai jail have "violated regulations concerning the visits" is absurd. As a matter of fact, during each visit Indian Embassy officials counselled Shri M. L. Das to observe the jail "regulations" however distasteful they may be. The truth is that on more than one occasion the Chinese Government have forcibly prevented Shri M. L. Das from communicating with Indian Embassy officials. On one occasion while he was narrating facts regarding his treatment in prison to a visiting Indian official, Shri Das was physically dragged by the prison authorities back into his cell in the middle of the interview. The Government of India condemn these actions of the Chinese authorities and the denial to Shri M. L. Das of the right, under international law, to communicate with the representatives of his country. The Government of India urge that the Chinese Government stop the persecution of Shri M. L. Das and review his case on the basis of universally accepted canons of justice and law, and provide facilities to the Indian Embassy in Peking to extend to Shri M. L. Das full consular protection.

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

\*\*\*

## **VI. MISCELLANEOUS**

**Note given by the Embassy of China in India to the Ministry of**

**External Affairs, New Delhi, 11 June, 1964**

No. M/466/64

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India presents its compliments to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and, with reference to the Ministry's note dated January 8, 1964, has the honour to state as follows: -

With regard to the Indian businessmen's misappropriation of the Chinese Universal Testing Machine and the Brinell Hardness Testor, the Embassy has made things quite clear in its notes to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated August 14, 1962 and September 19, 1963. It is surprising that the Indian Government, being fully aware of the fact that China is the wronged party, should have sent in another note making absurd charges against the Chinese Embassy and arbitrarily asserting that the former Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay had "handed over" the machines to M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd., Bombay. The Indian Government's practice of reversing right and wrong obviously harbours ulterior motives.

As has been clearly pointed out by the Embassy, it is due to the fact that M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd. did not get valid import licence that these two machines were not sold to the firm and are had explicitly assured the Chinese Corporation that "the machines have been kept in M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd. because the former Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay at the time had no appropriate place to keep them and therefore temporarily deposited them in the godown of the firm. This in no way involves the matter of transfer of ownership. In fact M/s. K. T. Steel Industries (P) Ltd. had explicitly assured the Chinese Corporation that "the machines will not be put to use until authorised by you." It is obvious that the machines have not at all been sold to the firm and that

the firm went back on its own words and misappropriated the Chinese machines. The Chinese Corporation and the former Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay time and again demanded the machines from the firm which, however, peremptorily refused to return them. The Indian Ministry of External Affairs, instead of denouncing such despicable behaviour of the Indian businessmen, has sided with these businessmen who have misappropriated the Chinese machines, and has repeatedly and unreasonably haggled with the Chinese Embassy. The Chinese Embassy cannot but express its deep regret at this and clearly states that the Embassy reserves the right to ask for compensation for the losses and will not give further notice to the unreasonable haggling of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in the future.

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

\*\*\*

**Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 13 January, 1965**

1. In the last few years, official mails of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India have repeatedly been held up or confiscated by Indian authorities. On many occasions since 1961, the Chinese side has made representations and protests to the Indian side, urging the Indian authorities to stop such an unwarranted practice. Again, on November 30, 1964, Director Chang Tung of the First Asian Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs made representations regarding this matter to Mr. J. S. Mehta, Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Indian Embassy in China. Mr. Mehta said that he would report that to the Indian Government. Yet the Indian side has up till now failed to make a reply.

2. Not long ago, the Chinese Embassy in India received a letter from

the Assistant Collector of Customs for Postal Appraisalment, G.P.O., Calcutta, India, dated December 23, 1964, saying that copies of a certain issue of the "People's Daily" addressed to the Chinese Embassy which had been held up there for more than four months would be confiscated. In another case, the September 3, 1964 issue of the "People's Daily" was withheld and not delivered to the Chinese Embassy until December 28, 1964. Most of the issues of the "People's Daily" and of other mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy during December 1964 have not reached their destination. The above instances make it clear that the Indian Government has turned a deaf ear to the protests of the Chinese Government and continued to hold up or confiscate mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy.

3. The Indian authorities' detention and confiscation of the official mails of the Chinese Embassy are entirely unwarranted and constitute a serious contravention of international practice. This has caused immense difficulties for the Embassy to perform its normal functions. The Chinese Government hereby again lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government, urging the Indian Government to release immediately the official mails of the Chinese Embassy in India which have been held up or confiscated, and ensure against recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

\*\*\*

**Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 27 March, 1965**

**Reference the Chinese Foreign Office memorandum dated January 13, 1965.**

In a note dated February 9, 1965, the Government of India have

already clearly pointed out that there is no ground for the Chinese Government to lodge a protest with the Government of India that the action of the Postal Customs Authorities in seizing offensive material sent through the normal postal channels which infringe the laws of India, has in any way, created difficulties for the functioning of the Chinese Embassy.

The Chinese Government is aware that, under the existing regulations in India, entry into India of any publication or document which directly or indirectly questions the territorial integrity of India or is of such a nature as would affect India's friendly relations with third countries, is prohibited. The Chinese Government must also be aware of the prevailing international practice that any material transmitted through ordinary postal channels must not violate the laws of the receiving State.

In the light of the above, the memorandum of the Chinese Foreign Office dated January 13, 1965, is categorically rejected.

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 9 April, 1965**

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

The Government of India has learnt that the Chairman of the People's Republic of China, His Excellency Liu Shao-chi has sent a telegram of congratulations directly to His Highness the Chogyal of Sikkim on the occasion of His Highness' Ser-Thri-Nga-Sol. The Government of China is well aware that the external relations of Sikkim

are the responsibility of the Government of India and any communications either formal or informal from the Government of China to the Government of Sikkim or the Chogyal should be channeled through the Indian Government. This is a procedure adopted by all governments and the Chinese Government's action in sending a telegram directly from the Chairman of the People's Republic of China to the Chogyal of Sikkim is totally unacceptable to the Indian Government. This position was explained to the Chinese Government by the Government of India in their note of December 28, 1963. The Government of India take a serious view of the action of the Chinese Government and hereby lodge a strong protest against it.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 19 April, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and, with reference to the latter's note No. M/466/64, dated the 11th June, 1964, has the honour to state as follows:-

This Ministry deeply regrets that the Chinese Embassy is trying to evade a simple, straightforward issue by taking recourse to all manner of sophistry. If, as the Embassy claims, the two machines have not been sold to Messrs. K. T. Steel Industries Private Limited, then it should take necessary and immediate action to bring the machines back to the Embassy premises or re-export them to China failing which the Embassy should pay the customs duty to the Government of India. In its note under reference, the Chinese Embassy claims "that China is the wronged party" and that "the firm (Messrs. K. T. Steel Industries Private Limited)

went back on its own words and misappropriated the Chinese machines". But the fact cannot be denied that it is the Chinese Embassy who transferred the machines in question to a private party in India. This action of the Chinese Embassy was undoubtedly a deliberate abuse of the privileges enjoyed by the Embassy.

The Ministry of External Affairs cannot but express its deep regret at the unreasonable attitude taken by the Chinese Embassy in its refusal to "give further notice" to this Ministry's request for co- operation in setting right an irregular procedure. Import regulations established under the laws of the country have been contravened and the Chinese Embassy must be reminded of its obligation to co-operate fully with this Ministry in setting this matter right.

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

\*\*\*

**Memorandum given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 24 July, 1965**

1. On June 1, 1965 Mr. Chen Chao-yuan , Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy in India, received a letter from the Indian postal authorities concerned, stating that a parcel of Renmin Ribao (People's Daily) addressed to him, which carried articles calling the Indian boundary into question "in violation of" Indian regulations, should be confiscated. On June 15 Mr. Chen further received a notice from the Indian postal authorities concerned, telling him that five copies of Renmin Ribao were confiscated.

In the past few years, mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy in

India have constantly been unwarrantedly held up or confiscated by the Indian authorities. The Chinese Embassy has made repeated representations to the Indian Ministry of External Affairs or lodged protests. However, the Indian authorities have not only failed to stop such action in violation of international practice, but gone further to hold up and confiscate mails addressed to the Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Chinese Embassy personally. The Chinese Government expresses its indignation at this and hereby lodges another serious protest with the Indian Government, demanding that the Indian authorities concerned immediately stop such unreasonable and peremptory action, and speedily return all the mails for the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. and the Chinese Embassy previously held up and confiscated.

2. In its note of February 9, 1965 and its Memorandum of March 27, 1965 to the Chinese Embassy in India, the Indian Ministry of External Affairs alleged that mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy were confiscated by the Indian authorities concerned "under the existing regulations in India" and "according to international practice". This is utterly untenable. The Indian Government should know that newspapers and other mails for foreign embassies and diplomatic officials must not be confiscated or held up, whether they are brought by couriers or sent through postal channels. This is part of the internationally acknowledged diplomatic immunities.

No matter what pretext the Indian Government may fabricate, it has no right to confiscate mails addressed to members of a foreign embassy in India containing newspapers and magazines published in their own country. While diplomatic relations are being maintained between China and India, the Indian authorities' repeated wilful confiscation of journals addressed to the Chinese Embassy and Chinese diplomatic officials, and even of mails addressed to the Chinese Charge d'Affaires a.i. personally, constitutes a serious infringement of diplomatic immunities and a

deliberate violation of international practice. It may be asked: If such arbitrary practice of the Indian side were in order, would there remain any code of international relations to speak of? To what extent are the Indian authorities intending to aggravate China-India relations?

3. As is well known, Indian newspapers have been publishing large numbers of anti-Chinese materials slandering and attacking China year in and year out. Yet consistently and strictly adhering to international practice, the Chinese authorities have never held up or confiscated any Indian journals sent to the Indian Embassy in China from Hongkong or through postal channels. This forms a sharp contrast to the unwarranted action of the Indian side in constantly holding up and confiscating the journals and mails addressed to the Chinese Embassy in India.

4. In its note the Indian Ministry of External Affairs also asserted that the seizure of journals addressed to the Chinese Embassy has in no way created difficulties for personnel of the Chinese Embassy in performing their normal functions. This is sheer nonsense Chinese newspapers report on the situation in China, on China's foreign relations and international affairs, and reflect the domestic and foreign policies of the Chinese Government. Therefore, they are indispensable for the daily functioning of the diplomatic officials of the Chinese Embassy. By arbitrarily holding up and confiscating the Chinese journals addressed to the diplomatic officials of the Chinese Embassy, the Indian authorities are depriving them outright of their right to read journals of their own country and, of course seriously hampering their normal functioning. The Indian authorities will never succeed in their attempt to shirk the responsibility they should take by quibbling.

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the**

## **Embassy of India in China, 14 September, 1965.**

(65) Pu Ling Yi Tzu No. 617

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with regard to the forcible closing and taking over of the Calcutta Branch and Bombay Agency of the Bank of China by the Indian Government, has the honour to state as follows:-.

It is a well-known fact that the Calcutta Branch and Bombay Agency of the Bank of China, during the many years in which they carried on business in India, consistently abided by the local laws and regulations, enjoyed good credit and made useful contribution to the promotion of Sino-Indian Trade. The forcible closing and taking over the establishments and assets of the Bank of China in India in November 1962 was a long-premeditated act of political persecution by the Indian Government. It was one of the grave steps taken by the Indian Government further to worsen the Sino- Indian relations after the Sino-Indian border conflict it provoked in October 1962.

In its note to the Indian Embassy in China dated February 23, 1963, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs thoroughly refuted the sophistry of the Indian Government in justifying its closing and taking over of the establishments of the Bank of China in India, and demanded the immediate return by the Indian Government of all the assets of the Bank of China that had been taken over, frozen and seized. However, the Indian Government has all along refused to consider the reasonable demand of the Chinese side. By long freezing and seizing the assets of the Bank of China in India, the Indian Government has seriously impaired the interests of China and of the large numbers of local depositors. In order to cover up its crimes of persecuting the Bank of China, it has repeatedly resorted to fabrication and vilification, falsely accusing the

Bank of China of being "not quite innocent" and the Bank personnel of carrying on "political propaganda" and "undesirable activities". But, in all these years it has not been able to produce any facts to substantiate its charges. This despicable practice of the Indian Government cannot in the least injure the reputation of the Bank of China, nor can it defraud the public. On the contrary, it can only serve to further reveal the predicament in which it is afraid of being caught out because truth is not on its side, and the more it tries to hide, the more it is exposed.

It is an unlawful act rarely seen in the history of international relations that while diplomatic relations are maintained between China and India, the Indian Government should have unwarrantedly taken over, frozen and seized all the assets of the Bank of China in India and refused to hand them back for two years and ten months. This unreasonable measure has caused China great losses. Take the balance-sheet of the two establishments of the Bank of China alone. It showed a credit of more than nine million rupees when they were taken over by the Indian authorities. The Chinese Government once again lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against this grave unlawful act and reiterates that the Indian Government must be held fully responsible for all the losses suffered by China as a result of the closing and taking over of the establishments of the Bank of China in India and of the freezing and seizure of the assets of the Bank of China in India by the Indian authorities. The Chinese Government demands that the Indian Government compensate for all the losses suffered by China as a result of the taking over, freezing and seizure of the assets of the Bank of China in India by the Indian Government. It demands a speedy and clear-cut reply on this matter from the Indian Government.

\*\*\*

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

**consideration.**

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking to the Embassy of India in China, 26, September, 1965**

(66) Pu Yi Ya Tzu No. 798

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

In the afternoon of September 24, 1965, a mob of Indian hooligans went to the gate of the Chinese Embassy in New Delhi to make provocation led by Indian officials and congress leaders and driving a flock of sheep before them. They made a huge din, yelling that China had "invented absurd pretexts for threatening and intimidating India" that "China wants to start a world war over some sheep and a few yaks", and so on and so forth. This ugly farce was wholly instigated and staged by the Indian Government. The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government.

The Indian Government will definitely not succeed in its attempt, by staging this ugly anti-Chinese farce, to cover up its crimes of aggression against China and the wretched picture of its troops fleeing in panic from the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary. For a number of years you have flatly denied that Indian troops had intruded into Chinese territory across the China-Sikkim boundary and built military works for aggression there. Yet within a few days of our demand for the dismantling of the military works for aggression within a specified time-limit, the Indian troops who had intruded into the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary could not but flee helter skelter under the surveillance of Chinese troops, leaving behind numerous evidence of their crime, thus suddenly exploding the falsehood which you had so painstakingly

concocted over these years. How can you succeed in hiding your shame?

It was clearly because you knew yourselves to be in the wrong that you could not but hastily withdraw all your troops who had intruded to the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary and demolish some of your aggressive military works there. But then you felt it to be too great a loss of face, so you cast aspersions on China alleging that China wanted to start a war merely for some sheep and a few yaks. Actually, you knew full well that this was a deliberate lie. Otherwise, why did you withdraw all your intruding troops before the time-limit set by us was up? You must return every single one of the border inhabitants and livestock you kidnapped and seized from Chinese territory across the China-Sikkim border.

But the issue between China and India is absolutely not limited to a matter of some sheep and yaks. Are your subversive activities in Tibet only a matter of some sheep and yaks? Is your occupation of 92,000 and more square Kilometres of Chinese territory along the three sectors of the Sino-Indian border a matter of some sheep and yaks? No. All Indian intrusions, harassments and armed provocations against China are major questions involving China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and these accounts will have to be settled.

The distinction between aggression and anti-aggression can never be blotted out. The whole world now sees that it was India which launched a war of aggression against Pakistan, thus endangering peace in Asia and the world, and that it was China and other justice-upholding countries which by their firm anti-aggressive stand punctured your aggressive arrogance. It is understandable that you are feeling very much ill at ease. But you will never succeed in your attempt to coerce China into abandoning her just stand by concocting the lie about China wanting to start a world war. The Indian Government should know that it cannot do

what it likes to its neighbouring countries even with the backing of the U.S. imperialists and the modern revisionists. In staging a few forlorn and unseemly anti- Chinese demonstrations you have your undivulgeable motive--to seek reward from the imperialist and modern revisionists. But the Chinese Government must remind the Indian Government that there is a limit to everything, and that the exceeding of such a limit will not be tolerated.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking, to the Embassy of India in China, 20 October, 1965**

(65) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 772

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and has the honour to state the following with regard to the unwarranted order of the Government of West Bengal prohibiting the publishing of "The China Review", an overseas Chinese newspaper in Calcutta:

"The China Review" is a newspaper published by Chinese nationals in India. Since it was launched in 1950, the paper has always abided by Indian laws and regulations and has devoted itself to promoting friendship between the peoples of China and India and Sino-Indian cultural exchanges. However, the Indian Government has been using all methods to persecute the paper since 1960. It has ordered five successive publishers of the paper and its staff members Liao Hui-Lan and others to leave India, among whom former publisher Wu Tao-Lung and former Editor Hou Hsing-Fu were unwarrantedly arrested by Indian authorities and then deported under armed escort. What was still more serious, after

a band of hooligans raided the office of "The China Review" and knifed one of its office workers on January 17, 1962 the Indian Ministry of External Affairs openly absolved them of responsibility for the crime. As the above- mentioned unreasonable measures failed to compel the newspaper to close down, the Indian authorities on September 30, 1965 brazenly ordered the prohibition of its further publication.

The facts have proved that the planned persecution and final banning of "The China Review" is another unwarranted measure taken by the Indian Government to persecute Chinese nationals and aggravate Sino-Indian relations.

In its order, the Indian Government talked the nonsense that "The China Review" was banned because it "weakens defence efforts of India." As is well-known, all the news "The China Review" has printed is well grounded and from proper sources. Is it conceivable that an overseas Chinese newspaper can "weaken" the "defence" of India by reporting events back in the motherland and promoting cultural exchanges between China and India? This absurd allegation exactly serves to expose the Indian authorities as entirely devoid of reason in banning "The China Review".

The Chinese Government also notes that, while diplomatic relations are being maintained between China and India, the Indian Government has encouraged the "Chinese journal of India" run by Chiang Kaishek clique elements in Calcutta to constantly slander China and conduct propaganda for the creation of "Two Chinas", despite its promise that it "will not permit any activities designed to promote the idea of two Chinas". This is clearly an instance of contempt for the principles guiding international relations as well as an act of perfidy. The Chinese Government expresses great indignation at this.

The Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the

Indian Government against its unwarranted measure of ordering the stoppage of "The China Review", a measure which is detrimental to the friendship between the peoples of China and India and to Sino- Indian cultural exchanges. It firmly demands that the Indian Government cancel its unwarranted order banning "The China Review" and ensure the safety of the staff of that newspaper.

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

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, to the Embassy of China in India, 29 October, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to their note No. (65) Pu Ling Yi Tzu No. 617, dated September 14, 1965, has the honour to state as follows:

As early as the 28th December 1962 it was pointed out to the Chinese Government that the liquidation of the Bombay and Calcutta branches of the Bank of China was carried out towards the end of 1962 under the legally established procedure prevailing in India and that there can be no question of "political persecution". In their note dated the 24th January, 1963 the Government of India elucidated for the benefit of the Chinese Government, some features of India's judicial system, stressing the fact that in India the judiciary is independent of the executive branches of Government. It was further pointed out that an official liquidator, such as the one appointed after the liquidation of the Bombay and Calcutta branches of the Bank of China, would be responsible only to the judiciary, in this case the Calcutta High Court, which passed the orders for liquidation of these two branches on the 10th December 1962. Knowing

these facts, the Chinese Government have persisted in their unwarranted haggling over this question. This can only be construed as an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of India.

The Chinese note under reply has made some slanderous references to what it calls "the steps taken by the Indian Government to further worsen Sino-Indian relations after the Sino-Indian border conflict it provoked in October 1962". Anyone familiar with the events in the autumn of 1962 will recall that it was the Chinese Government which launched an unprovoked and massive attack all along India's northern frontier. In the period since, it has been the Chinese Government which has all along rejected a peaceful solution to the India-China dispute. In the last few weeks it has been the Chinese Government, acting in collusion with Pakistan, which issued threats and ultimata and carried out a series of provocations on India's northern frontier. The world is familiar with these facts.

At the present juncture, it is precisely the Chinese Government which is attempting, for its own ulterior purposes, to distort the fact of the liquidation of the Indian branches of the Bank of China through legally established procedure. The Government of India reject the allegations made by the Chinese Government and wish to state that the question of a final settlement of the affairs of the Bank of China can be taken up only at an appropriate time after the completion of the liquidation proceedings.

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

\*\*\*

**Memorandum given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 16 November, 1965**

Reference Chinese Government's memorandum dated 24th July, 1965.

The Government of India are surprised to find that despite the clear-cut explanation contained in their memoranda dated the 9th February, 1965 and 27th March, 1965, the Chinese Government continue to lodge meaningless protests against the action taken by Indian authorities to prevent the circulation in India of publications questioning India's territorial integrity and prejudicing India's friendly relations with other countries. The Chinese Government ought to be aware that material can be transmitted through postal channels only in conformity with the laws of the receiving State. It is entirely within the sovereign competence of India to confiscate any material arriving by postal channels which is found to be in violation of the laws of the land. This is in conformity with the international practice and therefore it is unreasonable for the Chinese Government to characterize this as an "arbitrary practice" or "an infringement of diplomatic immunity". It is futile and unwarranted to link this up with question of diplomatic mail and the functioning of the Chinese Embassy with which Government of India have never interfered. The charges, contained in the Chinese memorandum under reply, are without foundation, and are therefore rejected.

\*\*\*

**Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the Embassy of China in India, 27 December, 1965**

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Chinese Government's Note No. (65) Pu Ling Yi Fa Tzu No. 772 dated the 20th October 1965 has the honour to state as follows:

The Chinese Government's protest against the banning of the "China

Review", a Chinese language newspaper published in Calcutta, is unwarranted and inadmissible. In their notes of 2nd March 1962 and 1st October 1962, the Government of India had pointed out the undesirable activities of the "China Review" and expressed the hope that the Chinese mission in India would not extend its support to such unlawful elements. The Chinese Government's protest note in support of those who violate our laws is a gross interference in the internal affairs of India.

The Chinese note under reply has cited the cases of a few Chinese nationals who were expelled from India on account of their undesirable and anti-Indian activities. The facts relating to the expulsion of these individuals have been explained in several of the Government of India's notes and memoranda including those dated 17th October 1960, 5th May 1962 and 27th March 1965. It is unnecessary to repeat these details once again. In order to bolster up their charges of 'Indian persecution' the Chinese note has even raked up an incident which took place on the 17th January 1962. The Government of India's notes dated 2nd March, 4th July and 1st October 1962 had given full details of the incident of January 17, 1962 and it is surprising that in spite of the clear explanations in the notes mentioned above, the Chinese Government are still repeating these groundless charges. There are many thousand foreign nationals, including those of Chinese origin, residing in India as contented and law-abiding individuals. This bears testimony to the liberal and fair treatment of foreign nationals resident in India.

It is ridiculous for the Chinese Government to suggest that the Government of India has "encouraged" the "Chinese Journal of India". In India there is freedom for any one to run a journal provided the laws of the land are observed. No foreign government, especially one which has committed aggression on India, has the right to protest against and interfere in matters which are strictly within India's internal jurisdiction.

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

\*\*\*

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

No. C/1/66.

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in India and with reference to the Government of India's note, dated the 19th April 1965 has the honour to request the Chinese Embassy to expedite their reply.

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

APPENDICES

**APPENDIX I**

Statement of the Government of the People's Republic of China, 7, September, 1965.

On September 6, 1965, India suddenly launched an armed attack on Pakistan. Indian troops have crossed the International Boundary between India and Pakistan and are pushing towards Lahore, the Capital of West Pakistan. The Indian radio has announced general mobilization. Thus the Indian Government has enlarged the local conflict between India and Pakistan in Kashmir into a general conflict between the two countries. In the face of the massive armed attack by India, the President of Pakistan has called on the entire people of the country to rise in resistance against

the enemy and appealed for sympathy and support from all peace-loving peoples of the world.

The Indian Government's armed attack on Pakistan is an act of naked aggression. It not only is a crude violation of all principles guiding international relations but also constitutes a grave threat to peace in this part of Asia. The Chinese Government sternly condemns India for its criminal aggression, expresses firm support for Pakistan in its just struggle aggression and solemnly warns the Indian Government that it must bear responsibility for all the consequences of its criminal and extended aggression.

The Indian Government has always been perfidious on the Kashmir question. It once pledged solemnly with Pakistan to grant the Kashmiri people the right of self-determination. But far from honouring its pledge it has brazenly declared that Kashmir is an integral part of India and subjected the Kashmiri people to brutal national oppression. Where there is oppression, there will be resistance. It is entirely proper that the people in the Indian occupied area of Kashmir should rise up in resistance. In order to cover up its sanguinary suppression of the Kashmiri people, the Indian Government openly breached the cease-fire line in the disputed territory of Kashmir to intrude into the area under the control of Pakistan and carried out military provocations and armed occupation. This, of course, could not but arouse Pakistan to counter attack in self-defence. All this was in the nature of a local conflict in the disputed territory of Kashmir between India and Pakistan.

India already committed aggression on the Kashmir issue. Now it has openly launched a massive armed attack on Pakistan. This is a still more serious act of aggression.

The United Nations has always had an ill-fame on the Kashmir

question. It solemnly pledged to guarantee national self-determination for Kashmir. However, 18 years have passed during which the United Nations watched on without lifting a finger while India acted lawlessly in Kashmir. The United Nations did not breathe a single word when India violated the cease-fire line. But as soon as Pakistan fought back in self-defence, the United Nations came out to mediate. This is by no means the end of the story. It is unconceivable that the United Nations, which has been unfair for 18 years, should suddenly become fair. The so-called mediation by the United Nations is based on a report of the Secretary General. The report itself is unfair. How can a fair conclusion be drawn from an unfair premise? On the Kashmir question, the United Nations has once again proved a tool of U.S. imperialism and its partners in their attempt to control the whole world. This will be further proved true during the current extended aggression against Pakistan by India.

India's armed aggression against Pakistan is another exposure of the chauvinist and expansionist features of its ruling circles. The Indian Government glibly says that it pursues a policy of so-called peaceful co-existence. But actually it has never ceased for a single day its activities of bullying and encroaching upon its neighbours wherever possible. Almost every neighbour of India has known this from its own experience. The Indian ruling circles are the greatest hypocrites in contemporary international life. The Chinese people have had a deep experience of this. Although the Indian ruling circles did not gain anything from their massive armed attack on China in October, 1962, they have never stopped making intrusions and provocations along the Sino-Indian border. India is still entrenched on Chinese territory on the Sino-Sikkim border and has not withdrawn. It is constantly probing furtively and making intrusions and harassment against Chinese territory in the Western sector of the Sino-Indian border. Indian violations of Chinese territory are far from coming to an end. The Chinese Government has served repeated warnings, and it is now closely following the development of India's acts of aggression and

strengthening its defences and heightening its alertness along its border.

The Indian Government probably believes that since it has the backing of the U.S. imperialists and the modern revisionists it can bully its neighbours, defy public opinion and do whatever it likes. This will not do. Aggression is aggression. India's aggression against any one of its neighbours concerns all of its neighbours. Since the Indian Government has taken the first step in committing aggression against Pakistan, it cannot evade responsibility for the chain of consequences arising therefrom.

The Chinese Government is deeply convinced that, with the sympathy and support of the peace-loving countries and peoples of Asia and the whole world, the hundred million people of Pakistan will rise as one-man to save their country and finally drive back the Indian aggressors.

## **APPENDIX II**

### **Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in Parliament, 17 September, 1965**

I want to inform the House that this morning we received a communication from the Chinese Government demanding that within three days we should dismantle our defence installations which they allege are located on their Side of the border in Tibet across the Sikkim border. I might for the benefit of the House, read out the relevant portions of the communication, although I would be placing the communication and our reply on the Table of the House.

"In its notes the Indian Government continues to resort to its usual subterfuges in an attempt to deny the intruding activities of Indian troops along the Sino-Indian boundary and the China-Sikkim boundary. This

attempt cannot possibly succeed. Since ceasefire and troop withdrawal were effected along the Sino-Indian border by China on her own initiative in 1962, Indian troops have never stopped their provocations, and there have been more than 300 intrusions into China either by ground or by air. The Chinese Government has repeatedly lodged protests with the Indian Government and served warnings to it, and has successively notified some friendly countries. The facts are there, and they cannot be denied by the Indian Government by mere quibbling. Moreover, the Chinese Government has four times proposed (the latest occasion in June 1965) Sino- Indian Joint Investigation into India's illegal construction of military works for aggression on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary, but has each time been refused by the Indian Government. Now the Indian Government pretentiously says that the matter can be settled if only an independent and neutral observer should go to the border to see for himself. It further shamelessly asserts that Indian troops have never crossed the Sikkim-China boundary which has been formally delimited, and that India has not built any military works either on the Chinese side of the border or on the border itself. This is a barefaced lie. How can it hope to deceive anyone?

"As is known to everybody, the Indian Government has long been using the territory of Sikkim against China. Since September 1962, not to mention earlier times, Indian troops have crossed the China-Sikkim boundary, which was delimited long ago, and have built a large number of military works for aggression either on the Chinese side of the China-Sikkim boundary or on the boundary itself. There are now fifty six such military works, large and small which they have built in the past few years all over the important passes along the China-Sikkim boundary, thus wantonly encroaching upon China's territory and violating her sovereignty. In these years the Chinese Government has made thirteen representations to the Indian Government. But the Indian Government has all along turned a deaf ear to them and does not have the slightest

respect for China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Far from stopping its acts of aggression, the Indian Government has intensified them by ordering its troops to intrude into Chinese territory for reconnaissance and provocations."

We are sending a reply to all these points and as I said I shall place the reply on the table of the House. I will read out the relevant portions of our reply.

"Ever since the Sino-Indian border problem was raised by the Chinese Government, the Government of India had made strenuous attempts to settle the question peacefully and with honour. Even after the unprovoked Chinese attack across the border in October- November, 1962, the Government of India consistently followed the policy of seeking a peaceful settlement honourable to both the parties concerned.

As has been pointed out in various notes to the Chinese Government in the past, the Government of India has given strict instructions to its armed forces and personnel not to cross the international boundary in the Eastern and the Middle Sectors and the so-called 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector. The Government of India are satisfied after careful and detailed investigations, that Indian personnel as well as aircraft have fully carried out their instructions and have not transgressed the international boundary and the 'line of actual control' in the Western Sector at any time at any place. The Government of India are, therefore, absolutely convinced that the allegations contained in the Chinese note under reply are completely groundless. The Government of India are constrained to reject these allegations and to reassert emphatically that they do not accept the claims to vast areas of Indian territory in the Western, Middle and Eastern Sectors of the border put forward in the Chinese note under reply. As regards China's stand on Kashmir and on the present unfortunate conflict between India and Pakistan, it is nothing but interference on the part of China calculated to prolong and to enlarge

the conflict."

The background of the matter is that in September 1962 some defence structures were constructed on the Sikkim side of the Sino- Indian frontier. These structures have not been in occupation since the cessation of hostilities in November, 1962. Since the Chinese Government alleged that some of these structures were on their side of the border, India had in its note of September 12, 1965 gone to the extent of suggesting that an independent Observer be allowed to go this border to see for himself the actual state of affairs. The Chinese Government has not, unfortunately, accepted this reasonable proposal and has reiterated its proposal for joint inspection. In our reply which is being sent today, we are informing the Chinese Government that their contention is entirely incorrect. Nevertheless, as an earnest of our desire to give no ground to the Chinese for making this a pretext for aggressive action, we are informing them that we have no objection to a joint inspection of those points of the Sikkim-Tibet border where Indian personnel are alleged to have set up military structures in Tibetan territory. The Government of India on their part are prepared to arrange such an inspection as early as possible, at an appropriate official level, on a mutually convenient date.

We have sent a reply to the Chinese note accordingly and hope that Chinese Government would agree to action being taken as proposed. Copies of the Chinese note and of our reply have been placed on the table of the House.

I know the House would feel concerned about the intentions of the Chinese Government. We do hope that China would not take advantage of the present situation and attack India. The House may rest assured that we are fully vigilant and that if we are attacked, we shall fight for our freedom with grim determination. The might of China will not deter us from defending our territorial integrity. I shall keep the House informed of further developments.

## **APPENDIX III**

### **Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in Parliament, 20 September, 1965**

I place on the Table of the House the text of a further note which was handed over to our Charge d'Affaires in Peking yesterday.

The House will recall that we had taken an attitude calculated to maintain peace when replying to the last note which we had received from the Chinese Government. It is clear from the kind of response which China has sent that what China is looking for is not a redress of grievances, real or imaginary, but some excuse to start its aggressive activities again, this time acting in collusion with its ally, Pakistan. The extension of the time-limit for the ultimatum was, in our view, no more than a device to gain time to watch what comes out of the discussions in the Security Council.

The allegations which China has been making in the series of notes that it has been sending to us, are such that they would hardly justify any civilised Government in having recourse to force, even if the allegations were true. If there are any structures on Chinese territory in areas where the border is delimited and not in dispute even according to the Chinese, surely, there is nothing to prevent the Chinese Government from having them removed, instead of suggesting to us that we should have them removed, which would only be possible by our men going into their territory. Similarly, no one can imagine that any Government would threaten another on the ground that their cattle have been lifted or on the ground that out of the thousands of Tibetans who have sought asylum in this country two or four are being detained here against their wishes.

To justify its aggressive attitude, China is pretending to be a guardian

of Asian countries who, according to China, are being bullied by India. The basic objective of China, therefore, is to claim for itself a position of dominance in Asia which no self-respecting nation in Asia is prepared to recognise. Large or small, strong or weak, every country in Asia has the fullest right to preserve its independence and sovereignty on terms of equality. The dominance of the Chinese cannot be accepted by any of them. We reject China's claim to tell us anything about what we should or should not do about Kashmir which is an integral part of India. Our offer of resolving the differences over these minor matters by peaceful means is still open.

However, China's aggressive intentions are clear from the fact that even while they have in their note extended the time-limit by 72 hours, in actual fact they have started firing at our border posts both in Sikkim and in Ladakh.

If, China persists in aggression, we shall defend ourselves by all means at our disposal.

A formal reply to the Chinese note will be sent later today.

May I say a word that we have just now received the full text of the resolution passed in the Security Council? Naturally, it deserves our very careful consideration, and I might be making a statement on that tomorrow in the House.

## **APPENDIX IV**

### **Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri's Statement in both the Houses of Parliament, 22 September, 1965**

I place on the table of the House a copy of the Security Council resolution, dated the 20th September, 1965, relating to the current conflict between India and Pakistan—a conflict which commenced on the

5th August, 1965, when Pakistan launched a massive attack on India by sending thousands of armed infiltrators across the cease- fire line in our State of Jammu and Kashmir.

As the Hon'ble Members would see, the Security Council had demanded that both Governments should order a cease-fire effective from 12-30 p.m. Indian Standard Time today, the 22nd September, 1965. On the question of cease-fire, the views of the Government of India were stated in detail and without any ambiguity in my letters of September 14 and 15, 1965, addressed to the Secretary- General. As stated in these letters, the Government of India had clearly accepted that they would order a cease-fire without any preconditions on being informed that Pakistan had agreed to do the same. On receiving the Security Council resolution, therefore, we sent a communication to the Secretary-General, in accordance with our earlier stand, informing him that we would be prepared to issue orders for a simple cease-fire effective from the appointed time and date, provided Pakistan agreed to do likewise. A copy of this communication is also placed on the Table of the House.

Throughout yesterday, there was no further message from the Secretary-General, but in the early hours of this morning we received a message from him advising us to order a unilateral cease-fire in compliance with the relevant provisions of the Security Council resolution, with the proviso that our troops could fire back if they were attacked. This, of course, was entirely impossible. In a battle which is continuing, it is just not possible for one side to ask its soldiers to stop firing, leaving the other side free to continue its operations. Our representative at the United Nations was, therefore, instructed to inform the Secretary-General accordingly.

A further report was received a short while ago that at the request of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, an emergent meeting of the Security

Council was convened, at which an announcement was made, on behalf of Pakistan that they also had agreed to issue orders for a cease-fire and cessation of hostilities. From our side, the requisite orders are now being issued to our field commanders to effect a complete cease-fire by 3-30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The Security Council Resolution refers to other matters which will require consideration subsequently. However, the policy of the Government of India in regard to matters which are of vital importance to us and which relate to the present conflict, has been stated by me on more than one occasion on the floor of this House and also in my recent communications to the Secretary-General.

I do not propose to go into any further details at the present stage. Detailed discussions will have to take place and there would have to be a fuller study of the problems to which I have just referred. For this purpose, our representative at the United Nations will keep himself available to the Secretary-General.

There will now be a cessation of hostilities. Peace is good. However, there is still a threat from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, which he held out today, while speaking in the Security Council. We have, therefore, to be very watchful and vigilant.

The nation has recently been going through its greatest trial. The times have been difficult but they have served a great purpose. The whole world knows now that the people of India-Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Parsees and others-constitute a united nation with a determined common will and purpose. On the battle front, the supreme sacrifice has been made by the members of all communities who have shown that they are Indians first and Indians last.

To our armed forces, I would like to pay on behalf of this Parliament and the entire country, our warmest tributes. By their valour and heroism, they have given a new confidence to the people of India. Those who have lost their beloved on the battle front, have made a contribution to the preservation of our independence which will never be forgotten by a grateful nation. Their sorrow and their pride are shared by the whole country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would now seek your permission to express to all the members of this august House, to all the political parties in the country, to the leaders of public opinion, of labour organisations, of business and industry, and of many other voluntary associations, my feelings of the deepest gratitude. In the hour of trial each one of the 470 million people of this country stood up shoulder to shoulder to meet the challenge to our freedom.

I should like to inform the House that on 18th September, 1965, I received a message from Mr. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers. USSR, offering his good offices for bringing about improved relations between India and Pakistan. Mr. Kosygin is impelled by noble intentions. No one can ever contest the view that ultimately India and Pakistan will have to live together as peaceful neighbours. We cannot therefore say no to any efforts, which may help to bring about such a situation, made by those who are sincere and genuine in their feelings of goodwill and friendship. I have therefore, informed Mr. Kosygin today that we would welcome his efforts and good offices.

I would also like to give the House some further details about the tragic incident in which the other day, we suffered a grievous loss. Investigations conducted on the spot show that the aircraft in which Shri Balvantray Mehta was travelling, was shot down by a Pakistani plane. The marks on the fuselage establish that gun fire had been used. Preliminary

investigations by the Air Force authorities who also have visited the scene confirm that the aircraft was shot down at a low height. The ammunition recovered at the site of the crash also proves that the attacking aircraft was a Pakistani plane. That a non-combatant civilian aircraft should have been shot down in this manner is one of the most inhuman acts which we must all deplore and condemn. Shri Balvantrayji, his wife and the others who were travelling with him have laid down their lives at the altar of the freedom of the country. Their names will remain enshrined in our memory.

We are still faced with the Chinese ultimatum. The House is aware that almost at the same time when the Chinese Government announced the extension of the time-limit of the ultimatum to India by 72 hours on September 19, their troops started provocative activities at several points of the border. On the Sikkim border, about which the Chinese have been making baseless and threatening allegations, the Chinese troops crossed the well-known and delimited boundary at Dongchui La and Nathu La on 20th and 21st of September respectively. They fired at our observation posts. They have tried also to intrude into our other territories. Our armed forces have clear instructions to repel the aggressor.

Yesterday we sent a reply to the Chinese note of September 20 in which India was alleged to have intruded into Dum Chale and committed armed provocation. The Chinese charge was rejected as a fabrication and a cover-up for the intrusion and firing at Tsaskur to which I have referred a little while ago.

The House is aware that on September 19, the Chinese Government sent us a note couched in unbecoming language, extending the period of the ultimatum, making demands for destruction of military structures etc. A copy of our reply has been placed on the table of the House together with copies of two other notes we sent yesterday. Regarding the so-called

military structures we have already told the Chinese Government that if after joint inspection any structures are found on the Tibetan side of the border there can be no objection to their being demolished. I have been told that China has announced that some of these so-called structures have been destroyed by our troops while withdrawing. All this is a product of their imagination.

I must tell the House that we view with grave concern the Chinese activities on the border and the armed intrusions into our territory. We have urged the Chinese Government in our note of September 21 replying to the Chinese note of September 19 to foresake the path of belligerence and intimidation and return to the path of peace and reason in its relations with India. I hope that even at this late hour China will respond to this call and prevent a major crisis.

We do not know what the Chinese will do next. We have, however, to remain vigilant all along the frontier.

There are times of the greatest trial for the nation, but the people all over the country are now in that mood which alone ensures the preservation of country's freedom. We may have to face many ups and downs, but I know the people have steeled themselves into a resolve to meet even this bigger challenge. On our Armed Forces, there may be a heavier responsibility. I have no doubt that they are in good spirits. We have no intention of underestimating the gravity of the situation. But we have resolved firmly to meet this challenge to our freedom.

\*\*\*