

November 15, 1962

**Premier Chou En-Lai's [Zhou Enlai's] Letter to the
Leaders of Asian and African Countries on the
Sino-Indian Boundary Question (November 15,
1962)**

Citation:

"Premier Chou En-Lai's [Zhou Enlai's] Letter to the Leaders of Asian and African Countries on the Sino-Indian Boundary Question (November 15, 1962)", November 15, 1962, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1973.
<https://wilson-center-digital-archive.dvincitest.com/document/175946>

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

**PREMIER CHOU EN-LAI'S LETTER
TO THE LEADERS OF
ASIAN AND AFRICAN COUNTRIES
ON THE SINO-INDIAN
BOUNDARY QUESTION
(November 15, 1962)**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

**Premier Chou En-lai's Letter to the Leaders
of Asian and African Countries on the
Sino-Indian Boundary Question**

(November 15, 1962)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1973

DS 480

.85

.C 12

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan
tries which are not the same as issues between Asian-African countries and the imperialist powers; we should be on guard lest we be taken in by the imperialist attempt to sow discord among us.

Inasmuch as the boundary questions are a legacy of history, neither New China nor the other newly independent countries concerned should shoulder the blame. Hence the Chinese Government holds that, in dealing with the boundary questions, both the historical background and the actual situation that has come into being must be taken into account, and that, instead of trying to impose its claims on the other party, each of the parties concerned should seek a settlement that is reasonable and fair to both parties through friendly consultations and in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and the Ten Principles adopted at the Bandung Conference.

In this spirit China and Burma have settled in a friendly way their boundary question, which was in fact much more complicated than that between China and India. Similarly, a friendly settlement of the Sino-Nepalese boundary question was brought about not long ago. In regard to the Sino-Indian boundary question, the Chinese Government has, in the same spirit, striven for a friendly and peaceful settlement with India. Notwithstanding every conceivable effort on the part of China during the past three years or more, the question remains unsettled, and indeed has developed into the sanguinary border conflict of today. Why this is so is a question that deserves serious thought. For this reason

I deem it necessary here to review the background of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

(2) **Historically, the Chinese and Indian peoples have always lived together in peace and amity.** Although the boundary between China and India has never been formally delimited, no border dispute had ever arisen between them before the British colonialists came to the East. This was so because **a traditional customary boundary line had long taken shape on the basis of the extent of each side's administrative jurisdiction in the long course of time during which the two peoples lived together in peace.** This line was respected by the Indian as well as the Chinese people. The eastern sector of this traditional customary boundary runs along the southern foot of the Himalayas, the middle sector along the Himalayas, and the western sector along the Karakoram range (*see attached Map 1*).

In the eastern sector, the area disputed by the Indian Government north of the traditional customary line has always belonged to China. This area comprises Monyul, Loyul and Lower Tsayul, which are all part of the Tibet region. It covers a total area of 90,000 square kilometres and is equivalent in size to three Belguims or nine Lebanons. The inhabitants who have long lived in this area are either Tibetans or peoples closely akin to them. A case in point is the Monba people, who speak the Tibetan language and believe in Lamaism. Most of the geographical names here are in the Tibetan language. For instance, a river is called "chu" here, hence the Nyamjang River is called Nyamjang Chu; a mountain pass is called "la," hence the Se Pass is called "Sela"; a district is called "yul," hence the Mon district is called

Monyul. The administrative set-up here was the same as that in the other parts of Tibet; the basic administrative unit was called "dzong," as in the case of Senge Dzong and Dirang Dzong. Up to the time when the British colonialists and the Indians came to this area, the local authorities of China's Tibet region had always maintained administrative organs, appointed officials, collected taxes and exercised judicial authority here. This administrative jurisdiction was never called in question.

In the middle sector, the places disputed by the Indian Government east of the traditional customary line have always belonged to China. They cover a total area of 2,000 square kilometres. The inhabitants are nearly all Tibetans. The Tibet local government had all along exercised jurisdiction over these places, and its archives to this day contain documents pertaining to this exercise of jurisdiction.

In the western sector, the area disputed by the Indian Government north and east of the traditional customary line has always belonged to China. This area consists mainly of Aksai Chin in China's Sinkiang and a part of the Ari district of Tibet. It covers a total area of 33,000 square kilometres and is equivalent in size to one Belgium or three Lebanons. Though sparsely inhabited, this area has always served as the traffic artery linking Sinkiang with Ari in Tibet. The Kirghiz and Uighur herdsmen of Sinkiang have the custom of grazing their cattle here. The name Aksai Chin is the Uighur term for "China's desert of white stones." To this day, this area remains under Chinese jurisdiction.

The traditional customary boundary was not only respected by both China and India over a long period of

time, but also reflected in early official British maps. Before 1865, the delineation of the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary on official British maps coincided roughly with the traditional customary line (see *Reference Map 1*), and before 1936 their delineation of the eastern sector similarly coincided roughly with the traditional customary line (see *Reference Maps 2A and 2B*).

(3) **The Sino-Indian boundary dispute is a legacy of British imperialist aggression.** After it had completely brought India under its domination, British imperialism, taking advantage of the powerless state of the Indian people, turned its spearhead of aggression and expansion towards China's southwestern and northwestern frontiers, using India as its base. From the second half of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth, British imperialism was actively engaged in conspiratorial activities of aggression against China's Tibet and Sinkiang. Its attempt to force open China's back door was designed to co-ordinate with its aggression along the coast and in the heartland of China. In 1911 there occurred the revolution which overthrew the absolute imperial rule in China. Seizing upon this as an opportune moment to detach Tibet from China, British imperialism sought to negate China's sovereignty in Tibet by recognizing merely China's so-called suzerainty there. It was against this historical background that the Simla Conference was convened in 1914. But even at that Conference the British representative dared not openly demand that China cede large tracts of its territory. It was outside the Conference and behind the back of the representative of the Chinese Central Government that the British representative drew the notorious "McMahon Line" through a secret exchange

of letters with the representative of the Tibet local authorities, attempting thereby to annex 90,000 square kilometres of China's territory to British India. The then Chinese Government refused to recognize this illegal McMahon Line. So have all Chinese Governments since then. That is why even the British Government dared not publicly draw this Line on its maps before 1936.

The illegal McMahon Line was wholly imposed on the Chinese people by British imperialism. Although it contrived this Line, for quite a long time afterwards it dared not intrude into the area lying south of this illegal Line and north of the Sino-Indian traditional customary line. It was not until the last phase of the Second World War that British imperialism, utilizing the opportunity afforded by the then Chinese Government's inability to look after its southwestern frontiers, seized a small part of this area.

In the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, British imperialism, seeking a short-cut for invading the heart of Sinkiang, laid covetous eyes on the relatively flat Aksai Chin in the eighteen sixties and dispatched military intelligence agents to infiltrate into the area for unlawful surveys. In compliance with the will of British imperialism, these agents worked out an assortment of boundary lines for truncating Sinkiang. The British Government did try at one time to alter according to its own wishes the traditional customary line in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, but was promptly rebuffed by the Chinese Government.

Britain's attempt was to obliterate the traditional customary boundary line formed between China and India

over a long period of time, and to attain its imperialist aims of aggression by carving up China's territory and expanding the territory of British India. Yet it dared not completely negate the traditional customary boundary line between China and India or bring out in their entirety the illegal boundary lines it had contrived. From 1865 to 1953 British and Indian maps either did not show any alignment of the boundary in the western sector at all, or showed it in an indistinct fashion and marked it as undefined. It was only from 1936 onwards that the illegal McMahon Line in the eastern sector appeared on British and Indian maps, but up to the end of 1953 it was still designated as undemarcated (*see Reference Map 3*).

(4) India and China attained independence in 1947 and 1949 respectively. Friendly relations were developed by the two countries on a new basis. However, owing to causes from the Indian side, there has been a dark side to the Sino-Indian relations from the very beginning.

Thanks to their mutual efforts, China and India established diplomatic relations quite early, jointly initiated the famous Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, and signed the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse Between the Tibet Region of China and India. This brought about a definite development in the friendly relations between the two countries. China and India ought to have cast away the entire legacy of imperialism and established and developed their relations of mutual friendship on a completely new basis. The Indian Government, however, inherited the British imperialists' covetous desires towards the Tibet region of China and persisted in regarding Tibet as India's sphere of influence, or sought at least to transform it into a buffer zone between China and

India. For this reason, the Indian Government tried its best to obstruct the peaceful liberation of Tibet in 1950. When these attempts proved of no avail, India pressed forward in an all-out advance on the illegal McMahon Line in the eastern sector of the border and completely occupied China's territory south of that illegal Line and north of the traditional customary line. In the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border, apart from long ago inheriting from British imperialism the encroachment on Sang and Tsungsha, India further encroached on Chuva, Chuje, Shipki Pass, Puling-Sumdo, Sangcha, and Lapthal after 1954. After 1954, India also encroached on Parigas in the western sector of the border.

While it was occupying large tracts of Chinese territory, India suddenly made a unilateral alteration of the Sino-Indian traditional customary line on its official map published in 1954. It presented in its entirety the version of the Sino-Indian boundary insidiously contrived by British imperialism and tried to impose this version on China as the delimited boundary between China and India (*see Reference Map 4*).

The Chinese Government did not accept Indian encroachment on large tracts of Chinese territory, nonetheless it took the position that an amicable settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question should be sought through peaceful negotiations, and that, pending a settlement, the status quo of the boundary should be maintained. China does not recognize the so-called McMahon Line, yet in the interest of settling the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations, it refrained from crossing this Line. As for maps of the two parties showing the boundary, they can be brought into conformity only

after the boundary question has been settled through negotiations between the two parties. This was the procedure by which maps of China and Burma and maps of China and Nepal showing the boundary lines between them were brought into conformity. The delineation of the Sino-Indian boundary on maps published by China has its historical and factual basis. But in view of the fact that the Sino-Indian boundary has not been formally delimited, China has never imposed its maps on India; at the same time, China will under no circumstances accept the maps unilaterally altered by India.

From 1950 to 1958, tranquillity generally prevailed along the Sino-Indian border because China adhered to the policy of seeking an amicable settlement of the boundary question through peaceful negotiations, although even in that period India was already sowing seeds for provoking future boundary disputes and border clashes.

(5) **After the rebellion in Tibet, the Indian Government formally laid claim to large tracts of Chinese territory.** In March 1959 a rebellion of serf-owners broke out in the Tibet region of China. The Indian Government not only aided and abetted this rebellion, but gave refuge to the remnant rebels after the rebellion had been put down, and connived at their anti-Chinese political activities in India. Soon after the rebellion broke out in Tibet, Prime Minister Nehru formally presented to the Chinese Government a claim to large tracts of Chinese territory. He asked the Chinese Government not only to recognize as legal Indian occupation of Chinese territory in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, but also to recognize as part of India the Aksai Chin area in the

India's territorial claim to Aksai Chin was conjured up and is devoid of any basis whatever. China has always exercised its jurisdiction in this area. In 1950 it was through this area that units of the Chinese People's Liberation Army advanced from Sinkiang into Ari, Tibet. And it was through this area that between 1956 and 1957 the Chinese side constructed the Sinkiang-Tibet Highway, a gigantic task of engineering. As a matter of fact, up to 1958, India had never disputed the fact of China's exercise of jurisdiction over this area. But now the Indian Government asserted that this area had always belonged to India, and that it was not until 1957 that the Chinese had entered it clandestinely. If India had always exercised jurisdiction over this area, it is beyond comprehension how India could have been unaware of the passing of the Chinese People's Liberation Army units through this area to Tibet and of the construction of the gigantic highway. It was only from a pictorial magazine published in China that the Indian Government came to know that China had built the highway. In September 1958 the Indian side sent patrols to intrude into this area, but they were immediately detained by Chinese frontier guards. How could this have happened if India had really exercised jurisdiction over this area? In point of fact, Prime Minister Nehru himself said in the Indian Rajya Sabha on September 10, 1959 that this area "has not been under any kind of administration." On November 23 of the same year, he further stated in the Indian Rajya Sabha, "During British rule, as far as I know, this area was neither inhabited by any people nor were there

any outposts. Though Prime Minister Nehru was in no position to assess correctly the situation on the Chinese side, his words nevertheless demonstrate authoritatively that India has never exercised jurisdiction over this area.

Having occupied 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the eastern sector and 2,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the middle sector of the Sino-Indian border, India now wants to occupy another 33,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the western sector. In other words, India views both the parts of Chinese territory it has occupied and the other parts of Chinese territory it has not yet occupied as belonging to India. This represents a demand which even the overbearing British imperialists dared not put to semi-colonial, old China. That a newly-independent India should have made such a demand came as a complete shock to China.

The gravity of the situation lies not only in India's extensive claims to Chinese territory, but also in its subsequent use of force to change unilaterally the state of the boundary that had emerged, so as to realize Indian territorial claims. Indian armed forces crossed the illegal McMahon Line in the eastern sector, invaded and occupied Tamaden, Longju and Khinzemane north of the Line; and in August 1959, in the course of invading Longju, provoked the first sanguinary border clash. In October 1959 Indian armed forces crossed the traditional customary boundary line in the western sector and provoked a sanguinary border clash of an even graver nature at Kongka Pass. These two border clashes were omens that India would further aggravate the situation on the Sino-Indian border.

(6) The Chinese Government held that, in order to avert conflict along the border, ways must be found to effect a disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides, and at the same time negotiations must be started quickly to seek a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. The Chinese Government was determined to take every possible measure within its power to prevent a deterioration of the situation.

On November 7, 1959, the Chinese Government proposed to the Indian Government that the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres from the line of actual control along the entire Sino-Indian border and halt patrols. The line of actual control referred to here coincided with the traditional customary line in the western and middle sectors except for the parts of Chinese territory which India had invaded and occupied as referred to in Section (4) above; in the eastern sector, the line of actual control coincided with the illegal McMahon Line except for Khinzemane which was then still under Indian occupation (*see attached Map 3*). The Chinese Government also proposed that the Prime Ministers of the two countries hold talks to discuss the Sino-Indian boundary question. But these proposals were rejected by the Indian Government. On November 16, 1959 the Indian Government put forward a counter-proposal which would require all Chinese personnel in the Aksai Chin area of China's Sinkiang to withdraw to the east of the line which India claimed to be the international boundary, and all Indian personnel in this area to withdraw to the west of the line which China claimed to be the international boundary. Since Indian personnel had never actually come into this area, the Indian proposal was tantamount to

demanding the unilateral withdrawal of Chinese personnel from vast tracts of their own territory. The Chinese Government then put this question to the Indian Government: Since the Indian Government held that each side should withdraw behind the line claimed by the other side in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, did this mean that the Indian Government agreed that in the eastern sector as well, each side should withdraw behind the line claimed by the other side? — in other words, that India should withdraw to the south of the traditional customary line pointed out by China, while China should withdraw to the north of the so-called McMahon Line claimed by India? The Indian Government was at a loss to answer this question and merely kept insisting that its proposal was only applicable to the western sector. Very clearly, the Indian Government had no interest in an amicable settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through peaceful negotiations on a fair and reasonable basis, nor had it any interest in separating the armed forces of the two sides on the basis of the line of actual control with a view to forestalling border clashes. What it was after was only to use armed forces to edge Chinese personnel out of Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border.

Despite this, the Chinese Government still maintained that it was of paramount urgency to avert conflict along the border. Hence, after the Indian Government had rejected the Chinese Government's proposals that each side withdraw its armed forces 20 kilometres from the line of actual control and stop patrols, China unilaterally discontinued patrols on its side of the boundary. The Chinese Government hoped that, by so doing, at least a

disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides could be effected which would be conducive to avoiding border clashes and maintaining tranquillity in the border region.

(7) With a view to seeking a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, the Chinese Premier visited New Delhi in April 1960 and held talks with Prime Minister Nehru. In the course of the talks, I repeatedly explained that the boundary question should be settled peacefully on a fair and reasonable basis; that if there could not be a settlement for the time being, the state of the boundary that had already emerged should be maintained; and that the armed forces of the two sides should be disengaged in order to forestall clashes. At the conclusion of the talks, I summed up the following six points as points of common ground or of close proximity emerging from the talks, namely:

1. There exist disputes with regard to the boundary between the two sides.
2. There exists between the two countries a line of actual control up to which each side exercises administrative jurisdiction.
3. In determining the boundary between the two countries, certain geographical principles, such as watersheds, river valleys and mountain passes, should be equally applicable to all sectors of the boundary.
4. A settlement of the boundary question between the two countries should take into account the national feelings of the two peoples towards the Himalayas and the Karakoram Mountains.

5. Pending a settlement of the boundary question between the two countries through discussions, both sides should keep to the line of actual control and should not put forward territorial claims as pre-conditions, but individual adjustments may be made.
6. In order to ensure tranquillity on the border so as to facilitate the discussion, both sides should continue to refrain from patrolling along all sectors of the boundary.

I suggested that these points of common ground be affirmed so as to facilitate further discussions by the two Governments. These six points are entirely equitable and involve no demands imposed by one side on the other. They include views expressed to me during the talks by Prime Minister Nehru himself. Yet Prime Minister Nehru refused to confirm these six points. His refusal in fact meant that the Indian Government was unwilling to recognize the existence of a line of actual control between the two countries, unwilling to agree to observe this line pending a settlement of the boundary question through negotiations and refrain from putting forward territorial claims as pre-conditions to negotiations, unwilling to disengage the armed forces of the two sides so as to forestall border clashes, and even unwilling to recognize the objective fact that there exist disputes between the two sides with regard to the boundary. In those talks, Prime Minister Nehru took the position that the Chinese Government must unconditionally accede to India's territorial claims and refused to leave any room for negotiation. These were claims which even British imperialism dared not put before the Chinese Government. Prime Minister

Nehru was fully aware that the Chinese Government would in no circumstances agree to these claims. By pressing them he was clearly seeking, out of unrevealed motives, to keep the boundary question unsettled and the border situation tense indefinitely.

Subsequently, during the meetings between officials of the two countries held from June to December in 1960, the Chinese side proved with a large volume of conclusive data that the traditional customary boundary line as pointed out by China had a historical and factual basis. But the Indian side, mainly relying on obviously valueless material from British travellers and adventurers, insisted that the illegal McMahon Line was the traditional customary line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, and that Aksai Chin over which China had always exercised jurisdiction belonged to India. Thus, the meetings between officials of the two countries also failed to yield results.

(8) The sincerity for conciliation demonstrated by the Chinese Government during the talks between the two Prime Ministers was taken by the Indian Government as an indication that China was weak and could be bullied, and China's unilateral halting of border patrols was taken as an opportunity to take advantage of. Therefore, after the meetings between the officials of the two countries had concluded, Indian troops crossed the line of actual control first in the western and then in the eastern sector of the border, occupied more and more Chinese territory and engaged in ever more serious armed provocations.

In the western sector of the border, beginning from 1961, and particularly from last April on, Indian troops

made repeated incursions into Chinese territory, and set up additional military strongpoints. Prior to the recent general outbreak of clashes on the border, India had established a total of 43 strongpoints encroaching on Chinese territory in the western sector of the border (*see attached Map 4*). Some were set up only a few metres away from Chinese posts, others even behind Chinese posts, cutting off their access to the rear. As Prime Minister Nehru put it in addressing the Indian Lok Sabha on June 20, 1962, "India had opened some new patrol posts endangering the Chinese posts and it was largely due to movements on our side that the Chinese had also to make movements. It is well known in knowledgeable circles in the world that the position in this area had been changing to our advantage and the Chinese are concerned about it." The Indian weekly *Blitz* openly boasted at the time that India had occupied 2,500 square miles of territory there, which the weekly described as a "unique triumph for an audacious Napoleonic planning" worked out by Defence Minister Krishna Menon. Invading Indian troops again and again launched armed provocations against Chinese frontier guards. Indian aircraft again and again violated China's air space and recklessly carried out harassing raids. As a result of these increasingly frequent acts of provocation on the part of India, the situation in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border grew sharply in tension and gravity.

Because China exercised great self-restraint and forbearance, India's encroachments in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border were not seriously resisted, whereupon India went further to extend its encroachments to the eastern sector of the border. From last June onwards,

Indian troops crossed the illegal McMahon Line, intruded into the Che Dong area north of the Line, incessantly expanded their scope of occupation (*see attached Map 4*), and launched a series of armed attacks on Chinese frontier guards, inflicting forty-seven casualties on them. Thus, before the recent full-scale border conflict broke out, the Indian side had already created in both the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border a grave situation in which an explosion might be touched off at any moment.

(9) While the Indian encroachments and provocations increased in gravity and the border situation worsened day by day, the Chinese side maintained maximum self-restraint and forbearance throughout. Chinese frontier guards were ordered not to fire the first shot under any circumstances, nor to return fire except as a last resort. **On the one hand, the Chinese Government sent protests and warnings to the Indian Government, declaring that it would never accept the Indian encroachments and firmly demanding that India evacuate Chinese territory. On the other hand, it did not relax in the least its efforts to seek an improvement in Sino-Indian relations and a peaceful settlement of the boundary issue through negotiations.**

The Chinese side held that any steps conducive to improving Sino-Indian relations would without doubt also help promote a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. In view of the fact that the 1954 Agreement Between China and India on Trade and Intercourse Between the Tibet Region of China and India was due to expire in June 1962, the Chinese Government, from December 1961 to May 1962, proposed three times the conclusion of a new agreement to replace the old one.

Although the conclusion of such a new agreement would have nothing to do with the boundary question, it would undoubtedly have helped to improve Sino-Indian relations. In advancing this proposal China had the best of intentions. But the Indian Government demanded China's acceptance of India's territorial claims as the pre-condition for the conclusion of such a new agreement, and unjustifiably rejected the proposal.

It was precisely because the Sino-Indian border situation was growing steadily more acute that the Chinese Government pointed more emphatically than ever to the necessity for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question through negotiations. But the Indian Government persisted in a negative attitude. It was not until July 26 this year that it expressed in vague terms a desire for further discussions on the boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two sides. The Chinese Government responded promptly and positively in its note of August 4, and suggested that such discussions be held as soon as possible.

The Indian Government, however, suddenly adopted a different tone in a note dated August 22 and insisted that China must first evacuate large tracts of its own territory in the western sector of the border before any further boundary discussions on the basis of the officials' report could be held. This was a unilaterally posed pre-condition by which India sought to force its territorial claims on China. In its note of September 13, the Chinese Government pointed out that no pre-conditions should be set for further boundary discussions on the basis of the officials' report. It suggested, moreover, that representatives of the two sides begin discussions on the boundary ques-

tion on October 13, first in Peking and then in Delhi alternately. At the same time, with a view to easing the border tension, the Chinese Government once again proposed that the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres along the entire border.

But the Indian Government, in its note of September 19, rejected China's proposals for separation of the armed forces of the two sides and for holding discussions on the boundary question without pre-conditions. It merely agreed to the date and sites for the discussions proposed by China, while insisting that the discussions should be confined to China's withdrawal from large tracts of China's own territory in the western sector of the border. The Chinese Government, in its note dated October 3, repeated the proposal that the two sides should speedily enter into boundary discussions on the basis of the officials' report, and that in the course of the discussions neither side should refuse to discuss any question that might be raised by the other side concerning the boundary. This proposal was fair to both sides.

Nevertheless, the Indian Government in its reply note dated October 6 not only rejected the above-mentioned fair proposal of the Chinese Government, but added a new pre-condition to the old one, demanding that Chinese troops evacuate the Che Dong area, which is Chinese territory, north of the illegal McMahon Line. Thus, by going back on its own word and putting forward one pre-condition after another, the Indian Government finally blocked the door to negotiations on the boundary question.

(10) Making a series of miscalculations concerning China, India not only turned down China's peaceable

proposals, but finally embarked on the road of military adventure. India thought that China's economic difficulties were so grave that it would not be able to overcome them, and that China's southwestern defences must have been weakened owing to the fact that its national defence forces were tied down by the attempt of the U.S.-supported Chiang Kai-shek clique to invade China's southeastern coastal areas. Therefore India considered the opportunity ripe for launching massive armed attacks along the entire Sino-Indian border. On October 5 the Indian Ministry of Defence announced the establishment of a new corps under the "Eastern Command" for the sole purpose of dealing with China, and the appointment of Lt.-General B. M. Kaul as its commander. On October 12 Prime Minister Nehru declared that he had issued orders to "free" what he termed invaded areas, in reality Chinese territory, of Chinese troops. On October 14 the then Indian Minister of Defence, Krishna Menon, called for fighting China to the last man and the last gun. On October 16, upon returning to New Delhi from abroad, Prime Minister Nehru immediately summoned a meeting of high-ranking military officers to accelerate combat preparations. On October 17 Indian troops in both the eastern and western sectors simultaneously began heavy artillery attacks on the Chinese side. On October 18 officials of the Indian Ministry of Defence declared that the Chinese had been "driven back two miles." Finally, in the early hours of October 20, Indian troops, on Prime Minister Nehru's orders, launched massive attacks all along the line. It was only when they had been repeatedly subjected to frenzied attacks by the Indian troops and had suffered heavy casualties that the Chinese frontier guards, pressed beyond the limits of forbearance and

left with no room for retreat, struck back in resolute self-defence.

(11) **All relevant facts show that the current grave Sino-Indian border conflict was wholly engineered by the Indian Government, deliberately and over a long period of time.** At a mass meeting held in New Delhi on November 11 last, Prime Minister Nehru openly revealed that two years ago India had already drawn up a "plan of operations" against China, which had even worked out such details as the scale of the operations and how advance or falling back was to be made when the battle got under way. But the Indian Government, turning facts upside down, falsely accused Chinese frontier guards of crossing the western end of the illegal McMahon Line on September 8 and thereby touching off the current general border conflict. This accusation is an out-and-out lie. Actually, it was Indian troops that had crossed the western end of the illegal McMahon Line long before September 8. This is a fact that cannot be denied. The Chinese Government is in possession of the original 1914 map of the so-called McMahon Line. According to that map, the western extremity of the Line is clearly at latitude $27^{\circ}44.6'N$ (see *Reference Maps 5 and 6*). The Indian Government, in order to justify its occupation of the Che Dong area north of the Line, insists that the western extremity of the Line is at $27^{\circ}48'N$ and that the boundary between China and India in this area follows the so-called Thagla ridge watershed. But the co-ordinates on the original map of the so-called McMahon Line are there and cannot be altered, and the name Thagla ridge does not even appear on the map. Moreover, the Indian military sketch maps captured by China during the current

border clashes also clearly show the Che Dong area to be north of the illegal McMahon Line. The fact that India intentionally crossed the illegal McMahon Line, occupied the Che Dong area to its north, and publicly declared that India would "free" this area of Chinese frontier guards serves precisely to demonstrate that the current border clashes were solely and deliberately created by India.

The Chinese Government's stand on the illegal McMahon Line is a consistent one. China does not recognize the illegal McMahon Line, yet it refrained from crossing it in the interest of a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The fact was that India first crossed to the north of the illegal McMahon Line and, using places south of the Line as its base, launched massive armed attacks on Chinese frontier guards. Thus, with its own hands the Indian Government finally destroyed the restrictive effect of this Line. In order to prevent the Indian troops from staging a come-back and launching fresh attacks, the Chinese frontier guards, fighting in self-defence, naturally need no longer be restricted by the illegal McMahon Line. China has consistently striven for the settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question by peaceful means. The Chinese frontier guards have crossed the illegal McMahon Line because they had no alternative. But when China is compelled to strike back now in self-defence in the border conflict, it still aims at promoting a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, just as it did in exercising forbearance and self-restraint over the past three years. The Chinese frontier guards have crossed the illegal McMahon Line and advanced to certain points, yet the Chinese side does

not wish to rely on such a move to settle the question of the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. As in the past, the Chinese Government holds that only through peaceful negotiations can a settlement reasonable and fair to both sides be found not only for the eastern sector, but for the Sino-Indian boundary question as a whole.

(12) On October 24, that is, four days after the Sino-Indian border conflict broke out, the Chinese Government issued a statement putting forward the following three proposals with a view to stopping the border conflict, reopening peaceful negotiations and settling the Sino-Indian boundary question:

1. Both parties affirm that the Sino-Indian boundary question must be settled peacefully through negotiations. Pending a peaceful settlement, the Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will agree that both parties respect the line of actual control between the two sides along the entire Sino-Indian border, and the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres from this line and disengage.

2. Provided that the Indian Government agrees to the above proposal, the Chinese Government is willing, through consultation between the two parties, to withdraw its frontier guards in the eastern sector of the border to the north of the line of actual control; at the same time, both China and India undertake not to cross the line of actual control, i.e., the traditional customary line, in the middle and western sectors of the border.

Matters relating to the disengagement of the armed forces of the two parties and the cessation of armed conflict shall be negotiated by officials designated by the Chinese and Indian Governments respectively.

3. The Chinese Government considers that, in order to seek a friendly settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, talks should be held once again by the Prime Ministers of China and India. At a time considered to be appropriate by both parties, the Chinese Government would welcome the Indian Prime Minister to Peking; if this should be inconvenient to the Indian Government, the Chinese Premier would be ready to go to Delhi for talks.

As explained in the statement of the Chinese Government, the line of actual control referred to in the three proposals does not mean the line of actual contact between the armed forces of the two sides in the present border clashes, but means the line of actual control which existed along the entire Sino-Indian border at the time when the Chinese Government mentioned it to the Indian Government on November 7, 1959. This shows that, while it will never accept the Indian encroachments on Chinese territory since 1959 by crossing this line of actual control, the Chinese Government will not impose any unilateral demands on India because of the advances it gained in the recent counter-attacks in self-defence.

The essence of the first of China's three proposals is to restore the state of the Sino-Indian boundary in 1959, that is, before complications arose in the border situation over the past three years, and to have the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres from the 1959 line of actual control. The obligations of both sides under this proposal would be equal. If the Indian Government agrees to this proposal, the Chinese frontier guards would have to withdraw from their present positions south of the

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan
so-called McMahon Line not only to the north of the line, but 20 kilometres further northward. The Indian troops, on the other hand, would only have to withdraw 20 kilometres southward from this line. If measured from Tawang and its vicinity south of the so-called McMahon Line, which Chinese frontier guards have now reached, they would have to withdraw about 40 kilometres, while Indian troops would need to withdraw only one to two kilometres, or need not withdraw at all (*see attached Map 5*).

The reason why China has reiterated and emphasized its proposal for a 20-kilometre withdrawal by the armed forces of each side from the line of actual control is that, through its bitter experiences of the past three years, the Chinese Government has become acutely aware that it is very difficult to avoid clashes in border areas under dispute if the armed forces of the two sides are not disengaged. At the same time, it must be pointed out that the line of actual control is not equivalent to the boundary between the two countries. Acknowledging and respecting the line of actual control would not prejudice each side's adherence to its claims on the boundary, but would create a favourable atmosphere for the reopening of peaceful negotiations to settle the boundary question.

(13) The Chinese Government had hoped that the Indian Government would give careful consideration to China's three proposals before making a response. But on the very day they were put forward by the Chinese Government, the Indian Government hastily rejected them and slanderously termed them deceptive. The Indian Government stated that no negotiations were possible unless the state of the entire boundary as it prevailed

before September 8, 1962 was restored, and declared that the Indian Government was only prepared to hold negotiations "on the basis of decency, dignity and self-respect."

What is the implication of the Indian Government's proposed restoration of the state of the boundary as it prevailed before September 8? In the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, it would mean that Indian troops again invade and occupy Chinese territory north of the illegal McMahon Line; in the western sector it would mean that they again invade and occupy the military strongpoints they set up on Chinese territory after 1959. And what kind of a state of affairs would this be? This would again be the state of affairs on October 20 when Indian troops, utilizing the advantageous military positions they had seized, launched large-scale armed attacks against Chinese frontier guards. It would be a state of affairs pregnant with so grave a danger as to make border clashes inevitable. It would not be fair, nor would it bring peace, to revert either to the state of the boundary as of September 8, or to that of October 20.

The fact that the Indian Government refuses to restore the state of the boundary of November 7, 1959 but wants to restore the state of the boundary of September 8, 1962 proves that since 1959 the Indian Government has seized by force large tracts of Chinese territory. What India proposes to restore is the situation that resulted from the Indian troops' crossing the line of actual control and encroaching on Chinese territory over the past three years; whereas the situation which China proposes to restore is one in which tranquillity was basically maintained along the Sino-Indian border three years ago. According to the Indian proposal, only China would with-

draw, while India would not withdraw, but advance and again invade and occupy Chinese territory. According to the Chinese proposals, both sides would withdraw, and in the eastern sector the distance the Chinese frontier guards would have to withdraw would far exceed the distance the Indian forces would have to withdraw. Looked at from any angle, India's proposal is a one-sided one by which it attempts to impose its will on China and make China submit; while China's proposals are equitable and in the spirit of mutual accommodation and mutual respect. Furthermore, the Chinese side proposed talks between the Prime Ministers of the two countries, expressed welcome for Prime Minister Nehru to come to Peking and stated that should the Indian Government find it inconvenient, the Chinese Premier was prepared to go to New Delhi once again. Clearly, full consideration had been given to India's prestige and sense of decency when China put forward these conciliatory proposals. The Indian Government has stressed that it is prepared to enter into negotiations only "on the basis of decency, dignity and self-respect." However, its proposal shows that it only considers its own decency, dignity and self-respect, but wants to deny decency, dignity and self-respect to the other party.

(14) After my first appeal was rejected by Prime Minister Nehru, I appealed to him a second time, hoping that he would return to the conference table. However, judging by present indications, the Indian Government, far from being ready to conduct peaceful negotiations, is resolved to continue the use of force. The Indian Government has publicly stated that India is in fact in a state of war with China. It presented in the Indian Parlia-

ment a resolution to drive out the Chinese aggressors from the soil of India," and this resolution has been adopted. The President of India has proclaimed a "state of emergency" throughout the country. A wartime cabinet has been set up in India; military mobilization has been set in motion; war bonds have been issued; and India's economy has begun to go on "a war footing." War hysteria enshrouds the whole of India. Setting no store by the friendship of the Chinese and Indian peoples, Prime Minister Nehru has publicly spread seeds of hatred for the Chinese people and used every forum to call on the Indian people to wage a long drawn-out fight against the Chinese people. The Indian Government has stepped up its persecution of Chinese nationals in India, arbitrarily ordered the closure of branch offices of the Bank of China in India, crudely restricted the movement of staff members of the Chinese Embassy and Consulates in India, and is even considering severing diplomatic relations with China. Casting off the cloak of "non-alignment," the Indian Government has openly begged for military aid from the United States of America and is receiving a continuous supply of U.S. arms. Large numbers of Indian troops and huge quantities of U.S. munitions are being rushed to the Sino-Indian border areas. Indian troops in both the western and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian border have not ceased attacking the Chinese frontier guards. The Indian press has been trumpeting that India is about to launch a big counter-offensive. All this indicates that the threat of border conflicts on a bigger scale is growing perilously.

(15) There is no reason whatsoever for China and India to fight on account of the boundary question. In

the past three years the Chinese Government has made every possible effort to prevent the emergence of such an unfortunate situation. From the very beginning the Chinese Government has stood for an amicable settlement of the boundary question through peaceful negotiations. In the past three years, nearly all the proposals for negotiations were initiated by China. For the purpose of negotiation, the Chinese Premier went to New Delhi, and is prepared to go again. However, in the last three years the Indian Government usually refused to negotiate, or, after reluctantly agreeing to negotiate, would not settle a single question capable of being settled. The Chinese Government stood for maintaining the state of the boundary which had taken shape, pending a peaceful settlement; concretely speaking, this means maintaining the line of actual control that existed between China and India in 1959. The Indian side, however, started off by crossing the line of actual control in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, and finally even violated the so-called McMahon Line which it claimed itself to be the boundary in the eastern sector. China sought to disengage the armed forces of the two sides, while India persisted in keeping them in contact. To avoid border clashes, the Chinese Government proposed separating the armed forces of the two sides and halting patrols. After these proposals were rejected by India, China unilaterally stopped patrolling on its side of the border. Taking advantage of China's unilateral cessation of patrols, however, India's armed forces intruded into Chinese territory, set up military strongpoints and pressed steadily forward, thus eventually making border clashes between China and India unavoidable. Had the Indian Government entertained the slightest desire to settle the boundary ques-

tion peacefully, the situation on the Sino-Indian border would never have deteriorated to the unfortunate degree it has. The present unfortunate situation has been brought about solely by the Indian Government. The reasons for these actions of the Indian Government are to be found not so much in the boundary question per se as in its designs of utilizing this situation to whip up an anti-China campaign by which it seeks internally to divert the attention and increase the burden of the people and suppress the progressive forces, and externally to obtain more U.S. aid.

(16) Your Excellency, it is with a heavy heart that I have presented to you the history of the Sino-Indian boundary question in its entirety. But Your Excellency may rest assured that **the Chinese Government is not discouraged, but will look ahead. However complicated the situation may be now, the Chinese Government will never waver in its determination to seek a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. So long as there remains a ray of hope, it will continue to seek a way to conciliation, and take the initiative to create conditions favouring the cessation of border clashes.** There is no conflict of fundamental interests between China and India, and it is utterly unthinkable to the Chinese Government that the present border clashes should develop into a full-scale war between the two countries. The border clashes must and will eventually be settled peacefully.

Ever since the Sino-Indian border issue arose, leaders of many Asian and African countries have exerted great efforts to promote its peaceful settlement. Almost unanimously they hold that the arch enemy of us Asian and

African countries is imperialism and colonialism, that our countries all face urgent tasks of reconstruction to transform the backward state of our economy, and that China and India, the two big Asian countries, should settle their boundary question peacefully, restore Sino-Indian friendship, enhance Asian-African solidarity and together cope with the main enemy before us. They appeal to China and India to halt the armed border clashes and immediately enter into negotiations, and they oppose foreign intervention. Both China and India are big Asian countries. It is only through direct negotiations between China and India that a mutually satisfactory settlement of the boundary question can be secured. The Chinese Government heartily welcomes and sincerely thanks the leaders of friendly Asian and African countries for their fair-minded endeavours to promote direct negotiations between China and India, without themselves getting involved in the dispute. I sincerely hope that Your Excellency will uphold justice and continue to exercise your distinguished influence to promote a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question on a fair and reasonable basis.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) CHOU EN-LAI

Premier of the State Council
of the People's Republic of China