

PEKING REVIEW

50

December 15, 1961

What's Behind the Anti-Chinese Ballyhoo?

- 1) The truth about the Nehru-instigated anti-Chinese campaign (p. 11).
- 2) Chinese Foreign Ministry statement on the Sino-Indian boundary question (p. 14).
- 3) Notes on the boundary question exchanged between China and India (p. 19). With sketch map (p. 16).

Kennedy's Wishful Thinking

An analysis by Observer of U.S. global strategy as revealed in Kennedy's interview given to the Editor of *Izvestia* (p. 5).

Stevenson's Piratical Logic

A commentary on U.S. slanders against China (p. 7).

China at Fifth World Trade Union Congress

Painting, Archaeology and Other Features

北
京
周
報

RADIO PEKING'S English Language Transmissions

(New Schedule Beginning October 30, 1961)

Transmission to:	Peking Time	Local Standard Time	kc/s	metres
Britain and Western Europe	03:00-04:00	19:00-20:00 (London)	6150, 6210, 7035	48.78, 48.31, 42.64
		20:00-21:00 (Stockholm, Paris)	7115, 9457, 9800	42.16, 31.73, 30.61
	04:30-05:30	20:30-21:30 (London)	6150, 6210, 7080	48.78, 48.31, 42.37
		21:30-22:30 (Stockholm, Paris)	7115, 9457, 9800	42.16, 31.73, 30.61
North America (East Coast)	09:00-10:00	20:00-21:00 (Eastern S.T.)	7480, 9480, 9945, 11730, 11945, 11975, 15115	40.11, 31.65, 30.17, 25.58, 25.12, 25.05, 19.85
		21:00-22:00 (Eastern S.T.)	7480, 9480, 9945, 11730, 11945, 11975, 15115	40.11, 31.65, 30.17, 25.58, 25.12, 25.05, 19.85
	11:00-12:00	19:00-20:00 (Pacific S.T.)	7350, 9457, 9785, 11715, 11820, 15060, 15260, 17745	40.82, 31.73, 30.66, 25.61, 25.38, 19.92, 19.66, 16.91
		20:00-21:00 (Pacific S.T.)	7350, 9457, 9785, 11715, 11820, 15060, 15260, 17745	40.82, 31.73, 30.66, 25.61, 25.38, 19.92, 19.66, 16.91
Australia and New Zealand	16:30-17:30	18:30-19:30 (Aust. S.T.)	12055, 15060, 15150	24.88, 19.92, 19.80
		20:30-21:30 (N.Z. S.T.)	17835, 17885	16.82, 16.78
	17:30-18:30	19:30-20:30 (Aust. S.T.)	12055, 15060, 15150	24.88, 19.92, 19.80
		21:30-22:30 (N.Z. S.T.)	17835, 17885	16.82, 16.78
Southeast Asia	20:00-21:00	19:30-20:30 (Djakarta, Singapore)	11650, 11820, 15080, 15095, 17720, 1190	25.75, 25.38, 19.89, 19.87, 16.93, 252
		20:00-21:00 (Manila)		
India, Pakistan and Ceylon	22:00-23:00	19:30-20:30 (Delhi, Colombo)	7060, 7335, 9480, 9660, 11685, 11740, 15140	42.49, 40.90, 31.65, 31.06, 25.67, 25.55, 19.82
		19:00-20:00 (West Pakistan)		
		20:00-21:00 (East Pakistan)		
		21:30-22:30 (Delhi, Colombo)	6150, 6210, 7080, 7350, 9690, 9860, 11650, 12010, 1190	48.78, 48.31, 42.37, 40.82, 30.96, 30.42, 25.75, 24.98, 252
	00:00-01:00	21:00-22:00 (West Pakistan)		
		22:00-23:00 (East Pakistan)		
		18:00-19:00 (East African Time)	7115, 7335, 9690, 9775, 11715, 12055, 15095	42.16, 40.90, 30.96, 30.69, 25.61, 24.88, 19.87
		06:00-07:00 (East African Time)	11740, 12055, 15080, 15500, 17810, 17900	25.55, 24.88, 19.89, 19.38, 16.84, 16.76
Africa	01:00-02:00	19:00-20:00 (Capetown)	7180, 7335, 9595,	41.78, 40.90, 31.27,
		19:00-20:00 (Salisbury)	9775, 11715, 12055,	30.69, 25.61, 24.88,
		20:00-21:00 (East African Time)	15095, 15250, 1190	19.87, 19.67, 252
	02:00-03:00	17:15-18:15 (Monrovia)	6125, 7180, 7335,	48.98, 41.78, 40.90,
		18:00-19:00 (Accra)	9595, 9785, 11715,	31.27, 30.66, 25.61,
		18:00-19:00 (Freetown)	12055	24.88
		19:00-20:00 (Lagos)		
		20:00-21:00 (Cairo)		
	05:30-06:30	20:45-21:45 (Monrovia)	5950, 6080, 7205,	50.42, 49.34, 41.64,
		21:30-22:30 (Freetown)	7480, 9510, 9570	40.11, 31.55, 31.35
		21:30-22:30 (Accra)		
		22:30-23:30 (Lagos)		

Tune in to Radio Peking's Regular Features:

Tuesday:	China in Construction	Saturday:	Opinion in Peking	Sunday:	Listeners' Letter Box
Wednesday:	Culture in China		Music from China		Greeting Africa
Thursday:	In the People's Communes		Quiz		Sunday Concert
Friday:	In the Socialist Countries				

PEKING REVIEW

北京周报

(BEIJING ZHOUBAO)

A WEEKLY MAGAZINE OF CHINESE
NEWS AND VIEWS

December 15, 1961 Vol. IV No. 50

CONTENTS

ROUND THE WEEK	3
Nationwide Support for Government Stand on Sino-Indian Boundary Question	
ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS	
Kennedy's Wishful Thinking — Renmin Ribao Observer	5
Refuting Stevenson — Renmin Ribao Observer	7
The Truth About the Nehru-Instigated Anti-Chinese Campaign in India — Renmin Ribao Editorial	11
The Sino-Indian Boundary Question — Statement of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs	14
— Sketch Map: Sites referred to in the Chinese Foreign Ministry's note of August 12, 1961 and in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs of October 31, 1961	16
— Appendices: Eight notes exchanged between the Chinese and the Indian Governments since August 1961	19
Liu Chang-sheng's Speech at 5th World Trade Union Congress	24
PAINTING, ARCHAEOLOGY	28
Art Tours; 2,000-Year-Old Tomb Opened; Taiwan's Prehistoric Links with Mainland	
CHINA AND THE WORLD	30
Greetings to Tanganyika; Burmese Economic Mission; Sino-Japanese Peoples' Solidarity; Ceylonese Lecturer's Impressions of China; China Publishes Asian, African Literature; Briefs	
WHAT'S ON IN PEKING	31

Published every Friday by PEKING REVIEW
Pei Wan Chuang, Peking (37), China
Cable Address: Peking 6170

Post Office Registration No. 2-922

Printed in the People's Republic of China

ROUND THE WEEK

Nationwide Support for Government Stand on Sino-Indian Boundary Question

The whole of China has been deeply aroused by the publication last week of the Foreign Ministry Statement on the Sino-Indian boundary question and the notes exchanged between the Chinese and Indian Governments. These documents have been widely discussed. Everywhere people expressed intense indignation at the new anti-Chinese campaign whipped up by the Indian Prime Minister Nehru on the basis of fabricated charges against China. The manifest plot of Indian ruling circles to further damage the friendship between the two countries is universally denounced. Full support is expressed for the People's Government's stand on this issue.

On December 7 leaders of the various democratic parties issued statements pledging support for the Chinese government statement and denouncing the anti-Chinese campaign in India.

Nehru's Scheme Condemned

In his statement, Cheng Chien, Vice-Chairman of the Revolutionary Committee of the Kuomintang, expressed firm support for the just stand taken by the Chinese Government.

He said that the Chinese Government and people, treasuring Sino-Indian friendship, had consistently adopted a conciliatory attitude and made persistent efforts to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question left over from history. Far from making a proper response to these efforts, the Indian Government stirred up one anti-Chinese campaign after another.

Cheng Chien pointed out that "these dangerous activities of the Indian ruling circles can only serve to expose their own vicious schemes to undermine the friendship between China and India. They cannot injure the 650 million Chinese people."

As for the Chinese people, Cheng Chien stressed, they had been, were and would continue to stand with the masses of the Indian people in the persistent struggle to safeguard Sino-

Indian friendship, Afro-Asian solidarity and world peace.

Support for Government Statement

Shen Chun-ju, Chairman of the China Democratic League, in his statement said that the new anti-Chinese campaign started by the Indian Government could only please imperialism and those hostile to friendship between China and India.

Shen Chun-ju expressed great indignation at Nehru's outrageous activities in rekindling the anti-Chinese campaign, in slandering China for alleged "renewed incursions and aggressive activities," his open declaration of making preparations "to conduct warfare" in the frontier areas and his statement that India was engaged in military preparations.

On behalf of his party, Shen Chun-ju voiced full support for the statement issued on December 6 by the Chinese Foreign Ministry.

Shen Chun-ju pointed out that the statement of the Chinese Foreign Ministry had proved on the basis of irrefutable facts that it was not China that had invaded and occupied India's territory, but on the contrary, it was India that had occupied a vast area of China's territory over many years.

The Chinese Government and people had always persisted in a foreign policy of peace and adhered to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, Shen Chun-ju said. The satisfactory settlement of the boundary questions between China and Burma and Nepal through friendly consultations had provided a brilliant example.

He said that China always worked for friendly relations with all countries, particularly its Asian neighbours. The present Sino-Indian dispute was only a temporary and local question and should be settled in a just, reasonable way through friendly consultations in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and in the spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation.

Shen Chun-ju said, the China Democratic League still hoped that "the Indian Government would return to the right course, value Sino-Indian

friendship, Asian solidarity and world peace, cease its anti-Chinese activities and, together with the Chinese Government, improve the relations between the two countries and settle the boundary question reasonably."

It would be a gross error on the part of the Indian Government if it took this well-intentioned hope for a sign of weakness, Shen Chun-ju added.

In his statement, Huang Yen-pei, Chairman of the China Democratic National Construction Association, said that only by thoroughly revealing the truth about the anti-Chinese campaign hatched by Nehru could the Sino-Indian boundary question be settled reasonably by the peoples of the two countries.

Huang Yen-pei pledged full support for the statement of the Chinese Foreign Ministry on the Sino-Indian boundary question.

Discussion in Peking

On December 8, leaders of the democratic parties and democrats without party affiliation met in Peking to discuss the new developments in the Sino-Indian boundary question. Without exception they gave their full endorsement to the Chinese government statement and sharply condemned Nehru for restarting the anti-Chinese campaign to undermine Sino-Indian friendship.

Among those who spoke at that meeting were Hsu Teh-heng, Chairman of the Chiu San Society, and Chi Fang, Chairman of the Chinese Peasants' and Workers' Democratic Party.

Hsu Teh-heng pointed out that by launching the anti-Chinese campaign, Nehru had co-ordinated his activities with Kennedy who had started a worldwide anti-Chinese current.

Chi Fang said that Nehru's repeated fanning of the anti-Chinese campaign and his threats of war could only arouse the anger of the entire Chinese people.

Nehru, he recalled, had rejected a number of positive proposals put forward by the Chinese Government to solve the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations; he had adopted an unfriendly attitude towards China and joined in the international anti-Chinese chorus led by U.S. imperialism. "Nehru cannot but bear full responsibility for obstructing settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question and undermining friendship

between the Chinese and Indian peoples." Chi Fang declared that China's proposal to settle the boundary question through consultations was in the fundamental interests of the peoples of China and India and favourable to Afro-Asian solidarity and world peace.

Panchen Erdeni, Acting Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Autonomous Region of Tibet, who also attended the meeting discussed Nehru's and the Indian reactionaries' slander against China, and the fact that they incited the Tibetan rebel fugitives in India to carry out anti-Chinese activities, and create tension on the Sino-Indian border. "All this is part of their long-planned conspiracy," he said.

Panchen Erdeni pointed out that Nehru had whipped up the new anti-Chinese campaign in accordance with the needs of the U.S. imperialists who had always been hostile to China, and to suppress the mounting revolutionary spirit of the Indian people and attack the progressive forces in India.

Ngapo Ngawang Jigme, Vice-Chairman of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, said that the Tibetan people, together with the people of the rest of China, were greatly angered by the slanders hurled at China by Nehru and the Indian reactionaries.

Ngapo Ngawang Jigme stressed that the "McMahon Line" represented a scheme of British imperialism for aggression against China. It had never been recognized by the Chinese Government and people. India should not take over this "heritage" from imperialism, Ngapo Ngawang Jigme said.

Others who spoke at the meeting were Chen Shu-tung, President of the All-China Federation of Industry and Commerce, Huang Yen-pei, Chairman of the China Democratic National Construction Association, Wang Shao-ao, Vice-Chairman of the China Association for Promoting Democracy, Chang Hsi-jo, non-party democrat, Yen Hsi-chun, Deputy Secretary-General of the China Chih Kung Tang, and Hsu Meng-shan, Secretary-General of the Taiwan Democratic Self-Government League.

Overseas Chinese Denounce Persecution

Condemnation of the new anti-Chinese campaign launched by Nehru and resolute support for the Chinese Government's just stand were also voiced by many returned overseas Chi-

nese leaders at a meeting here on December 8. The meeting was sponsored by the All-China Federation of Returned Overseas Chinese.

Many overseas Chinese who were forced to return from India recently also denounced the Indian Government for its persecution of overseas Chinese in India.

Chen Chi-yuan, Vice-Chairman of the federation, in his speech pointed out the fact that this big hue and cry raised against China on the Sino-Indian boundary question was a case of the thief crying "stop thief!" The Indian Government had for years occupied a vast area of Chinese territory and had on many occasions recently sent troops and planes to invade China's territory and air space.

Chen Chi-yuan strongly took the Indian authorities to task for persecuting overseas Chinese in India and driving overseas Chinese out of India.

Chang Hsiu-feng, former headmaster of the Chung Hua School in Kalimpong, who was one of the overseas Chinese unreasonably forced to leave India by the Indian Government, said: "In early December last year, I received an Indian government order which, without giving any reason, demanded that I leave the country within 48 hours.

"We have five children. The eldest was 11 years old at that time and the youngest less than a year old. And it was nearing examination time in the school.

"The Indian authorities ignored our difficulties and our appeal for postponement. At the end of the time limit, we, my wife and I, were arrested, jailed and forcibly torn from our children."

Chang Hsiu-feng was kept in custody for over a month before he was sentenced to four months imprisonment. He said: "I asked the judge what I was charged with. The judge forbade me to ask and told me that it was a government order. The criminal's card I saw was left blank as to what crime I was charged with. This is typical of the Indian Government which infringes on the personal freedom of the overseas Chinese."

Chang Ching, Liang Tzu-chih and Hsieh Ying-jui, who were deported from India with no reason given, also denounced the Indian Government for such activities detrimental to Sino-Indian friendship.

Kennedy's Wishful Thinking

by OBSERVER

Following is a translation of an article by "Renmin Ribao's" Observer published in the newspaper on December 8, analysing the interview which Kennedy gave to Aleksei Adzhubei, Editor of "Izvestia." The full text of the interview was carried in "Renmin Ribao" on the same day. Subheads are ours.—Ed.

U.S. PRESIDENT Kennedy on November 25 gave an interview to Aleksei Adzhubei, Editor of the Soviet newspaper *Izvestia*. This interview warrants attention because it has completely laid bare the global strategic plan of U.S. imperialism. Anyone who is not befuddled by Kennedy's fine phraseology and makes a serious analysis of the content of this interview, will have no difficulty in detecting the unbridled aggressive ambitions of U.S. imperialism.

In his talk, Kennedy put forward, under the pretext of seeking improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations, a series of demands:

On the German question, he refused to recognize the German Democratic Republic as a sovereign state and insisted on the "unification" of Germany on his own terms;

On the West Berlin question, he insisted on the West's occupation of West Berlin and demanded the so-called right of "free access in and out" of that city so as to continue to maintain West Berlin as a bridgehead for subversion against the German Democratic Republic and for aggression against the socialist camp;

On the question of disarmament and cessation of nuclear tests, he insisted on so-called "effective inspection" before the question of disarmament could be considered;

On the Cuban question, he obstinately opposed the Revolutionary Government headed by Premier Castro and insisted on the continued pursuance of the policy of intervention and aggression against Cuba;

On the Laotian question, he sought to turn Laos into a U.S. protectorate in the name of "assuring" its independence and neutrality.

It can be seen that on all these above-mentioned pressing international questions of today, Kennedy clung obstinately to the consistently reactionary stand of U.S. imperialism and refused to budge an inch. He made it clear that only when these demands were satisfied would the United States begin to consider the question of improving U.S.-Soviet relations.

Terms for "Peace for 20 Years"

And this is not all. Kennedy went further and set forth the terms for what he called "peace for 20 years." They are:

First, the people of the countries in the capitalist world should not be allowed to carry out revolutions. In Kennedy's own words, the Soviet Union should abandon its plan "to communise the entire world";

Second, the capitalist system must be restored in the socialist countries, first of all, in the socialist countries

in Eastern Europe. In Kennedy's own words, the people in Eastern Europe must be given a "free choice."

According to Kennedy, only when these terms were accepted would he agree to grant that "peace for 20 years." (Attention: not yet a lasting peace.)

But, if these two major terms were to be realized in accordance with Kennedy's wishful thinking, all countries and areas on earth would be placed under the barbarous rule and counter-revolutionary military terror of imperialism and colonialism, and world peace would dissolve into thin air.

These two major terms put forward by Kennedy completely unmask the rabid ambitions of U.S. imperialism for world conquest. It is necessary for all peace-loving peoples to take a serious view of this.

Now, we will proceed to analyse these two terms.

Kennedy Allows No Revolution

First, let us deal with the first term.

Anyone with common sense knows the simple truth that it is primarily U.S. imperialism's policies of aggression and war that threaten world peace. But Kennedy, turning things upside down, alleged: "Where we feel the difficulty comes is the effort by the Soviet Union to communise, in a sense, the entire world." He added: "It is this effort to push outward the communist system, on to country after country that represents, I think, the great threat to peace." There is nothing new in this rigmarole of Kennedy's; it is just another repetition of the shopworn themes of imperialism and the reactionaries in various countries. What is the meaning of Kennedy's humbug when translated into plain talk? It means, first of all, that if you want peace, you must not carry out a revolution, and the peoples of the countries in the capitalist world must not be allowed to wage revolutionary struggles to achieve their liberation. Secondly, it means that if you want peace, you must not support any revolution, and the Soviet Union must not be allowed to support the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the capitalist countries. Kennedy described these revolutionary struggles as the result of the Soviet Union's effort to communize the entire world. Obviously, all this is utterly preposterous.

In the capitalist world, the people of the various countries wage revolutionary struggles every day to achieve their liberation. These struggles have deep social causes. In the capitalist world, there exist oppression and exploitation, imperialism and colonialism. Precisely because of this, there are struggles against oppression and exploitation, against imperialism and colonialism. These struggles existed long before the Soviet Union emerged as a socialist country in the world, and the Soviet Union was also born of such struggle. After World War II, the peoples in an increasing number of countries

have won liberation. Those who have not yet been liberated are waging struggles for their liberation. At present, these struggles are going on over the vast expanse of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They are going on in Western Europe, North America and Australasia. They are being waged also in the United States where the Kennedy Administration rules. Obviously, so long as the system of oppression and exploitation, the system of imperialism and colonialism exists, these struggles will continue and will develop day by day. Only when the system of oppression and exploitation, the system of imperialism and colonialism is wiped out completely from the face of the earth, will these struggles fade away.

Marxist-Leninists have always maintained that revolutions are the affairs of the peoples of the various countries themselves. Revolutions can neither be "exported" nor "imported." The struggle for liberation of all oppressed nations and peoples can neither be instigated nor stopped by any foreigners or foreign countries. All these struggles, far from being a threat to peace, are extremely important factors for the consolidation and defence of world peace. The Soviet Union, China and all other socialist countries and all Communist and Workers' Parties throughout the world have always given their fullest sympathy and active support to these struggles. Just as the Statement and the Appeal to the Peoples of All the World issued by the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties held in 1960 point out: "The successes of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle promote peaceful co-existence." "The struggle of the peoples for their freedom and independence weakens the forces striving for war and multiplies the forces of peace." The Statement stresses: "All the socialist countries and the international working-class and communist movement see it as their duty to render the fullest moral and material assistance to the peoples fighting to free themselves from imperialist and colonial tyranny."

Victory Through Struggle

The revolutionary struggles in many countries in the capitalist world at the present time have not as yet reached the stage of socialist revolution. But there is no doubt whatsoever that all the countries throughout the world, including the United States of America now under the rule of the Kennedy Administration, will eventually advance to communism. The existence of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp naturally exerts a profound influence on the liberation struggles of the peoples of these countries. However, in the last analysis, the liberation of the peoples of the various countries and the victory of the socialist revolution have to be won by the peoples through their own struggle in their own countries. The existence of the socialist camp and its sympathy and support for the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the various countries are merely a favourable international condition for the struggle of the peoples for liberation.

Kennedy described the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of these countries as the socialist countries "attempting to impose the communist system." This is sheer nonsense. He demanded that the socialist countries loyal to the principles of proletarian internationalism stop supporting the revolutionary struggles of all oppressed nations and peoples. This is even more an idiot's daydream. And his demand that the Soviet Union abandon its "effort

to communise the entire world," etc., to put it plainly, means that he wants to subject the peoples of the various countries in the capitalist world comprising two-thirds of the world's population to permanent enslavement and domination by imperialism and colonialism. This is absolutely out of the question.

Now, let us turn to the second term for Kennedy's so-called "peace for 20 years."

Freedom — Kennedy Style

In his talk, Kennedy launched a vicious attack alleging that the peoples of the socialist countries in Eastern Europe had no right of "free choice" and demanded freedom to change the socialist system of these countries. To use the current catchwords of the Western bourgeoisie, this means demanding the "liberalization," "destalinization," and "Europeanization" of these countries. In a word, it means that the dictatorship of the proletariat should be abandoned, so that imperialism may have a free hand to repeat the 1956 Hungarian counter-revolutionary rebellion in these countries, subvert the people's state power, restore the capitalist system and drag the socialist countries in Eastern Europe back to their old days of reactionary rule.

It is clear to all what "freedom" on Kennedy's lips means. It means that only the capitalist class, only the monopoly capitalist groups, only the imperialists and colonialists are to enjoy freedom, while the proletariat, the working people and all oppressed nations and peoples shall have no freedom at all. "Freedom" of the Kennedy-style means enslavement, exploitation, darkness and counter-revolutionary terror for all the oppressed nations and peoples. In fact, the peoples of the various countries are only too familiar with the so-called "freedom" of U.S. imperialism. Subversion of the legal Congolese Government headed by Lumumba, the murder of Lumumba, and armed invasion of Cuba—such is "freedom" of the U.S. brand. Recently, the Kennedy Administration, in order to deprive the Communist Party of the United States of its legal status, went so far as to indict the Party and even summon its General Secretary Gus Hall to appear before the court. This is also "freedom" of the U.S. brand. It is precisely this "freedom" of the U.S. brand that Kennedy wants to impose on Eastern Europe.

An Inviolable Law of Mutual Relations

In this talk Kennedy did not mention the socialist countries in Asia; China, for instance. But judging from the speech delivered by Adlai Stevenson, representative of the Kennedy Administration at the United Nations, at the U.N. General Assembly on December 1, U.S. imperialism has the bitterest hatred for New China, and shows the utmost hostility towards it. Stevenson unleashed a venomous attack on People's China, accusing it of being "warlike," "aggressive by nature," "predatory," "callous," "arrogant," in "defiance of the principles of the United Nations" and "a massive and brutal threat to man's very survival," in a word, wicked to the last degree. He raved about bringing the so-called "law and spirit" of the United Nations "back into the whole territory of China." So in the eyes of the Kennedy Administration, it goes without saying that People's China should not be allowed to exist.

The socialist countries in both Eastern Europe and Asia were liberated by the peoples of these countries after protracted, arduous revolutionary struggles and with the support and assistance of the Soviet Union and the progressive forces throughout the world. The people have

become the masters in these countries. It is they themselves, and nobody else, who have chosen the road of socialism. Each socialist country has joined the socialist camp as an independent and equal member. Just as the Moscow Statement of 1960 said: "It is an inviolable law of the mutual relations between socialist countries strictly to adhere to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism." This new type of relationship between the socialist countries is completely different from the relationship between the imperialist powers, in which one plots against the other and the weak are devoured by the strong. Kennedy is so used to that kind of master-servant relationship between the United States and its allies that he even regards the relations between the socialist countries in the same light and puts forward the fantastic demand that the Soviet Union let the socialist countries in Eastern Europe have the so-called right of "free choice." This is a monstrous insult to the peoples of these countries, to the Soviet Union and to all socialist countries.

U.S. Domination of the World

In Kennedy's view, all the socialist countries in Eastern Europe must change their social system, not to mention the socialist countries in Asia. In other words, he demands the complete collapse of the socialist camp. It seems that Kennedy is dreaming that as a first step, things should get back to what they were before World War II, when the Soviet Union stood completely alone in an imperialist encirclement. In that case, is it conceivable that this insatiably greedy U.S. imperialism would stop there, and, as Kennedy put it, coexist in peace with the Soviet Union? If, according to Kennedy's wishful thinking, he could turn back the wheel of history, change the balance of forces between socialism and imperialism and place the Soviet Union in an isolated and helpless position, then would he not go further and one day put the sign "occupied" on the map of the Soviet Union and send bayonet-carrying U.S. gendarmes to "protect" this piece of land under the double banners of the United Nations and the United States just as the American magazine *Colliers* dreamt of doing ten years ago? All this, of course, is the wildest dream. But we must not forget that in the United States there really are just such rabid and ambitious imperialists as the boss of *Colliers*.

Such then are the terms that Kennedy has put forward for his "peace for 20 years"!

China's Legitimate Rights in U.N.

Refuting Stevenson

by OBSERVER

Following is a commentary by Observer published in "Renmin Ribao" on December 10 denouncing Adlai Stevenson's scurrilous attack on China at the United Nations. The full text of Stevenson's speech at the U.N. General Assembly on December 1 was published in "Renmin Ribao" on December 11. Subheads are ours.—Ed.

SINCE December 1 the United Nations General Assembly has been debating the question of restoring

Dear readers, please try to think over what terms are these which Kennedy has prated about "keeping the peace for 20 years"! These terms, in essence, constitute a demand for the surrender of the people of the whole world to U.S. imperialism, for the subjection of the capitalist world accounting for two-thirds of the world's population to the complete domination of U.S. imperialism, and the complete liquidation of all countries of the socialist camp which account for one-third of the world's population. In a word, what U.S. imperialism demands is world domination. According to Kennedy's wishful thinking, only when this is realized will he agree to grant "peace" to the world.

Kennedy's "peace" is nothing but the subjection of the people of the whole world to perpetual enslavement by U.S. imperialism.

No Turning Back the Wheel of History

But Kennedy is painting too rosy a picture for himself. The wheel of history will never roll backward as imperialism would have it; nobody can subjugate the liberation struggle of the oppressed nations and peoples forming two-thirds of the world's population; nobody can split, let alone smash, the socialist camp embracing one-third of the world's population.

At the present time, the national and democratic movement continues to mount in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In Western Europe, North America and Australasia, the workers' movement rises wave after wave. All the countries of the socialist camp, from Berlin to Pyongyang, from Tirana to Hanoi, are flourishing. The torrents of the revolutionary struggles of the people throughout the world are battering with increasing fury against the foundations of imperialism and colonialism. The days when the imperialist powers ruled supreme in the world are gone, gone for ever.

Kennedy in his talk has confused right and wrong and stood things on their heads in such a manner and voiced his ambitions so candidly that he is truly an excellent teacher by negative example for the people of the whole world. That is why this paper has published the full text of his talk. The only conclusion that can be drawn from his talk is that the people of the world must thoroughly expose the peace mask of U.S. imperialism, further close their ranks, resolutely oppose U.S. imperialism's policies of aggression and war and fight to the end for victory in the struggle for world peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism.

China's legitimate rights in the United Nations. On the very first day of the discussion, Adlai Stevenson, chief U.S. delegate at the United Nations, rushed forward to unleash an utterly virulent, shameless campaign of slander and abuse against China. He almost exhausted the world's vocabulary of name-calling in vilifying China, calling it a "warrior state," "modern imperialists," "a massive and brutal threat to man's very survival," "ruthless," "aggressive by nature," "predatory," "far from being

reformed," "arrogant," "rapacious," "callous," etc., etc. In short, Stevenson did his utmost to paint China in U.S. imperialism's own ugly image, as a fiendish monster, an unpardonably wicked arch-criminal.

To the Chinese people, slander or attack by U.S. imperialism is nothing new. In the twelve years since the birth of New China, we have grown up amidst the gnashing of teeth and the bitter curses of the U.S. panjandrums. The more bitterly U.S. imperialism curses us, the more clearly does it prove that we have not done the wrong thing, nor done anything terribly foolish which is to the liking of U.S. imperialism. On the other hand, U.S. imperialism which persists in a policy of hostility towards China is finding itself in an ever worsening plight. The virulent outburst of the foul-mouthed Stevenson at the U.N. General Assembly has furnished fresh evidence of all this.

Washington's New Trick

Everyone knows that the truculent line followed by the United States in depriving China of its legitimate rights in the United Nations has become so increasingly unpopular that even the United States itself is now aware that at the current session of the General Assembly it would be difficult to rely on the simple majority under its control to obstruct the restoration of China's legitimate rights. So this time the Kennedy Administration has been forced to play a new trick; it has ganged up with Japan, Australia, Colombia and Italy to submit a proposal that the question of restoring China's legitimate rights be treated as a "question of importance" requiring a two-thirds majority in the Assembly for adoption. In this way, the United States hopes to continue depriving the 650 million Chinese people of their legitimate rights in the United Nations by controlling merely a bit over one-third of the votes. This new U.S. scheme, like the "moratorium" it resorted to previously, is utterly illegal and unjustifiable. The Soviet Union and other countries which uphold the principles of the U.N. Charter and justice and which are friendly to China, have all justly pointed out that China's seat in the United Nations must be restored immediately and the Chiang Kai-shek elements illegally occupying China's seat must be kicked out of the United Nations. The Chinese people are sincerely grateful to these countries for their support.

The present situation is so unfavourable to the United States and its new scheme is so unpopular that Stevenson was left with no alternative but to resort to slinging mud on China and heaping slanders, calumnies and curses on her.

Stevenson's speech cannot harm the Chinese people one bit. On the contrary, the people of the whole world can learn many useful lessons from it. This speech is valuable because in it Stevenson, this fanatical imperialist, tells us most openly why the U.S. imperialists are so hostile towards the Chinese people, what the U.S. imperialists bitterly hate, what they are afraid of and what they like and need.

U.S. Imperialism — The Biggest Aggressor

According to Stevenson, China is "aggressive by nature," she is a "modern imperialist" and has committed "aggression" against Korea, Taiwan and Southeast Asia.

What monstrous crimes indeed! But who are the real perpetrators of all these crimes? U.S. imperialism, the biggest aggressor in the world, is now trying to pass its own title onto others, but how can this be done?

Is it conceivable that U.S. imperialism which started the war of aggression against Korea and spread the flames of war from the 38th Parallel to the Yalu River and is still in military occupation of south Korea is not guilty of aggression, while the Chinese people, who fought shoulder to shoulder with the Korean people to defeat U.S. imperialist attacks and after that withdrew their volunteers from Korea, are guilty of "aggression"?

Is it conceivable that U.S. imperialism which occupies China's territory of Taiwan and conducts military provocations against China is not guilty of aggression, while the Chinese people are guilty of "aggression" in asserting their own sacred right to liberate their own territory of Taiwan?

Isn't it U.S. imperialism itself which is committing aggression in all parts of Indo-China and Southeast Asia? Whereas China is not stationing a single soldier, keeping not a single flotilla and maintaining not a single base in these places, the United States, which is clearly an eastern Pacific country, has paid no attention to the distance of thousands of miles and sent vast numbers of its own troops, war vessels, aircraft and guns to the western Pacific, occupied south Korea, China's territory of Taiwan and Japan's Okinawa, controls south Viet Nam, Japan, Thailand and the Philippines and interferes in Laos, Cambodia and Indonesia.

Not only this. U.S. imperialism is also seizing other countries' territories and encroaching on other countries' sovereignty in various other parts of the world so that the call "Yankees go home!" is resounding throughout the five continents and the four oceans. Isn't it rather out of keeping for this U.S. imperialism, which is aggressive by nature and which everybody wants to give a thorough beating, to appoint itself grand judge and pronounce verdicts as to who is aggressive by nature and who is modern imperialism?

Stevenson's Piratical Logic

Obviously, according to Stevenson's piratical logic, only U.S. imperialism is to be allowed to commit aggression on and intimidate others, while the victims of aggression are not to be allowed to put up resistance in self-defence. And one would be perpetrating a monstrous crime if one should dare to resist U.S. imperialist aggression and give the U.S. imperialist aggressors a good dressing-down, as the Chinese and Korean peoples did in their resistance to the U.S. war of aggression against Korea, and as the Cuban people are now doing in heroically struggling for the defence of their motherland. And only those who fall on their knees before aggression and intimidation by U.S. imperialism and allow it to do as it pleases, and who, when U.S. imperialism wants to grab their territories, offer them to it with both hands, only those persons could be considered to possess "tolerance" and "humility."

According to the logic of the U.S. gangsters, the Chinese people could be considered "reformed" only if they should allow U.S. imperialism to come back to the Chi-

nese mainland, willingly subject themselves to its outrageous oppression and massacres, and let it ride roughshod once again over China. But Stevenson and his ilk are overestimating their own strength. The Chinese people who have risen to their feet will never practise "tolerance" and "humility" in relation to imperialist aggression. The Chinese people are proud of their victory in their struggle against imperialism. Through the victory of their revolution, the Chinese people have proved the truth that all peoples who refuse to be slaves have no alternative than to wage a resolute struggle against imperialism if they are to win and safeguard their independence, freedom and liberation. And this is precisely what U.S. imperialism hates most and fears most.

Another charge which Stevenson levelled against China is that China is "warlike" and takes a "singular" view of nuclear war. It is singular because the Chinese people hold that if imperialism dares to unleash an all-out nuclear war, the result can only be the destruction of imperialism while the victorious peoples will build a beautiful future for themselves on the debris of dead imperialism. This view indeed constitutes the biggest slight on U.S. imperialism's policy of nuclear blackmail.

U.S. imperialism, while making frantic preparations for a nuclear war, is doing all it can to spread the terror of such a war. It hopes that the people of all countries will tremble from head to foot before the nuclear weapon which it brandishes as a "magic wand" and will kowtow to it, begging for mercy.

China's Attitude Towards U.S. Nuclear Blackmail

The Chinese people's consistent attitude towards the nuclear blackmail of U.S. imperialism has always been this: first, we are against it and second, we are not afraid of it.

We hold that the nuclear bomb has great destructive power and is a weapon of mass slaughter. Should a nuclear war break out, it would be a serious calamity for mankind. That is why we firmly oppose U.S. imperialism's policy of preparing for a nuclear war and advocate a complete ban on all nuclear weapons. But the Chinese people absolutely refuse to be intimidated by the nuclear blackmail of U.S. imperialism. What is the use of being afraid of a nuclear war? If a nuclear war could be avoided and prevented by being afraid of it, we would of course approve of this wholeheartedly. But, is it conceivable that the enemy will turn benevolent because we quake for fear? The very opposite would be the case. If we take fright, we shall disarm ourselves spiritually, the enemy will become more rabid and the danger of nuclear war will become more serious. And should the imperialist war-maniacs unleash a nuclear war, the people of the world would suffer greater losses for lack of mental preparedness. We must, therefore, absolutely refuse to be scared by the nuclear blackmail of imperialism but must resolutely expose and oppose its frantic schemes. If imperialism is bent on imposing nuclear war on us, we shall put up a resolute resistance and bury imperialism in the end. Only in this way can the nuclear blackmail of U.S. imperialism be crushed and U.S. imperialism be forced to think twice before embarking on any adventure. And only this will help the defence of world peace.

What objections can there be to this attitude of ours? Is it conceivable that to refuse to be scared by nuclear blackmail is to be "warlike" while to be scared out of one's wits by nuclear war and to throw up both hands and surrender before the nuclear weapons of the United States is to be "peace-loving"? It is crystal clear that the very aim of Stevenson in doing his utmost to pour vituperation on this attitude of ours and slander China as being "warlike" is to make the people of the whole world submit to the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail and allow themselves to be slaughtered like a lamb.

"All Political Power Grows Out of the Barrel of a Gun"

Stevenson also believed that he had seized the "theoretic ground" to prove that China was "warlike." He attacked Chairman Mao Tse-tung's thesis that "all political power grows out of the barrel of a gun," asserting that it was "an obsolete maxim" and that the sooner China abandoned this "maxim," "the better for the world." But here, Stevenson's attack boomeranged.

True, the Chinese people in the course of their protracted revolutionary struggles have learnt this truth that "all political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." But this truth was taught us first of all by the imperialists and the Chinese reactionaries, not anybody else.

In the very beginning, the Chinese people had no weapons whatsoever. During the First Revolutionary Civil War, it was precisely because the Chinese people had no guns that they were caught unawares and fell victim to a bloodbath when Chiang Kai-shek, supported by the imperialists, betrayed the revolution by launching a counter-revolutionary coup. This has made the Chinese people realize that everybody has two hands: the people have a pair of hands and so do the reactionaries. The only difference is that while the people are barehanded, the reactionaries hold guns in both hands, and guns can kill. This is a simple truth but it was driven home to the Chinese people only after many of them had been killed by the guns of the reactionaries. Once this truth was grasped, the Chinese people were determined to wrest the guns from the hands of the reactionaries in order to arm themselves and fight against imperialism and reaction. Wasn't it a fact that after the conclusion of the War of Resistance Against Japan, U.S. special envoy Marshall tried his utmost to induce the Chinese people to lay down their arms? But the Chinese people were not taken in. The guns with which the Chinese people overthrew Chiang Kai-shek's reactionary rule were exactly those "sent" continuously by U.S. imperialism through Chiang Kai-shek, that captain of the transport corps. If the Chinese people had not dared to wrest guns from their enemies to arm themselves, the revolutionary Chinese people would have been knocked down long ago and U.S. imperialism would have long ago realized its ambition of enslaving the whole of China.

Put Up or Shut Up

Stevenson tried to frighten the people of various countries, clamouring that the principle that "all political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" must be "abandoned." But we would like to ask Mr. Stevenson: What do you and your ilk after all depend on for ruling the American people at home, dotting the globe with your

military bases, committing aggression everywhere, proping up reactionaries in various countries, and suppressing and slaughtering all oppressed nations and peoples who demand independence and democracy? Is it not the guns which you possess in far greater numbers than China does? Our goodhearted Mr. Stevenson, for the sake of realizing what you said will be "better for the world," isn't it you yourselves who should first of all lay down your guns? Mr. Stevenson, in order to put your lofty wishes to the test, we are ready to challenge your United States of America: let both of us throw away our guns; do you dare? If you dare not, then let us advise you, Mr. Stevenson: keep your mouth shut, the sooner the better.

Obviously, in the eyes of the U.S. imperialists, only imperialism and reaction are to be allowed to be armed to the teeth and to massacre at will the revolutionary people, whereas all oppressed peoples are to be forbidden to have their own guns and to rise in self-defence and resist. But has it ever occurred to Stevenson and his like that wherever there is oppression there inevitably will be resistance and that wherever the counter-revolutionaries have guns the revolutionaries will inevitably have theirs too? This is something that cannot be prohibited by anyone. As long as imperialism and reaction exist and hold in their hands weapons to kill, no revolutionary people can ever abandon the truth that "all political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." The more oppressed peoples realize this truth, "the better," in Stevenson's own words, will it be "for the world," and the worse for U.S. imperialism.

Evidently, what is most alarming to imperialist elements like Stevenson and his ilk is that ours is an epoch of revolutions. The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, after suffering long years of imperialist and colonialist enslavement, plunder and oppression, can no longer be "tolerant" in conformity with the deceptive philosophy of the imperialists. More and more people have embarked on the road of revolution.

Great Influence of Chinese Revolution

The revolution of the Chinese people and its victory have exerted a tremendous influence on the people of all countries, particularly those of Asia, Africa and Latin America. U.S. President Kennedy has recently admitted again that the victory of the Chinese revolution "effected a very strong imbalance of power in the world." To U.S. imperialism, what is even more alarming is that the revolutionary theories, strategy and tactics which the Chinese people have summed up from their revolutionary practice and which are expressed in a nutshell in Comrade Mao Tse-tung's writings, are attracting ever greater attention among the people of various countries who long to find in them something which will benefit their own struggles for liberation.

In Stevenson's speech, such terms as the "protracted revolutionary war," the "people's war," the "theory and practice of guerrilla warfare," the "Party," the "united front," the thesis that "the imperialists are only paper tigers" and so on all became targets of attack. He regarded these as "the principal exports" from China to the whole world. It appears that Stevenson and his ilk re-

garded all these as a "plague." But, in this case, blockades and embargoes are utterly unavailing. To put it frankly, all oppressed nations and peoples will sooner or later rise in revolution and this is precisely why revolutionary experiences and theories will naturally gain currency among these nations and peoples and go deep into their hearts. This is why such pamphlets as those expounding guerrilla warfare in China have had such a wide circulation in Africa, Latin America and Asia and are looked upon as precious things even after they are worn and have come apart and the print has become illegible through much use. The influence of ideas indeed knows no state boundaries. No one can prevent the dissemination among the people of what they need.

What warrants further mention is that the United States has suffered a big defeat in "peaceful competition" in the dissemination of ideas. Is it not true that the U.S. Administration has appropriated several hundred million dollars yearly for counter-revolutionary propaganda? But its tragedy lies in the fact that even if it multiplies this expenditure each year several times, or tens of times or even hundreds of times, its counter-revolutionary propaganda can still find no market among the revolutionary peoples. For this, it has no one else but itself to blame.

The "charges" against China mentioned above are Stevenson's "grounds" for opposing the restoration of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations. So preposterous are these "grounds" that any person with a little sense will see through them at a glance.

U.S. Seeks Permanent Occupation of Taiwan

In the final analysis, Stevenson's endless twaddle was designed to achieve the ulterior aims of U.S. imperialism. According to Stevenson, if China's legitimate rights in the United Nations were restored, it would be tantamount to "approval in advance" of the Chinese people's right to liberate Taiwan, and the United States "will never stultify itself in such a way." It is crystal clear that Stevenson, after a lengthy speech, finally came out with the confession that the reason why the United States opposes the restoration of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations is because of its desire to perpetuate its occupation of China's territory, Taiwan.

And this is not all. Stevenson openly blustered about getting the "de jure authority" of the Chiang Kai-shek clique extended "throughout the territory of China" and to "bring the United Nations—its law and its spirit—back into the whole territory of China." In fact, this is to say that the United States is prepared to use Taiwan as a base for subverting New China some day and restoring its colonial rule over the whole of China.

Stevenson's vilification and clamour against New China show once again that U.S. imperialism is the most ferocious enemy of the Chinese people and of the people the world over. Let the U.S. imperialists carry on with their curses. No matter how scurrilous they may be, they cannot roll the wheel of history backwards. On the contrary, they can only enable the people of China and the world to increase their knowledge, draw a sharp line between friend and foe and find out the truth, so that they can gain still greater victories in their common struggle against imperialism.

The Truth About the Nehru-Instigated Anti-Chinese Campaign in India

Following is a translation of an editorial published in "Renmin Ribao" on December 7. Subheads are ours. —Ed.

A NEW anti-Chinese campaign was recently launched in India. It got underway when the Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru returned to New Delhi from the United States on November 20, and immediately made public in parliament a note sent by the Indian Government to the Chinese Government, in which it declared that China had added "aggression to aggression" against India. In the past half month and more, the anti-Chinese clamour raised by the Indian bourgeois politicians and press has mounted to a frenzy. They banded together to pour out a stream of slander, abuse and threats against China; they even managed to get together a gang of thugs to create provocative disturbances in front of the Chinese Consulates-General in Calcutta and Bombay.

The Indian Government's Evil Intentions

Nehru's current hysterical charges of so-called Chinese "occupation" of and "aggression" on Indian territory, like those in the past, are completely false and fabricated. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in its note of November 30 to the Indian Embassy in China and in its statement of December 6, proved with incontrovertible facts that it is not China that has encroached upon any Indian territory, or harbours any "evil intentions" against India, but it is the Indian side that has for many years now occupied large tracts of Chinese territory. It has recently encroached upon the territory and territorial air of China more frequently, and even sent troops and other personnel on numerous occasions across the line of actual control to intrude into Chinese territory, establish additional posts and extend its illegal occupation. Nehru himself admitted publicly in his statement on November 28 that "we have set up more than half a dozen new posts, important posts in various parts of the Ladakh border" unilaterally claimed by India. On the same day, the *Times of India* reported that "it may now be difficult to avoid an armed clash or two with the Chinese" as the Indian troops were ordered to continue to carry out the plan for the extension of the checkpoints. Nehru himself declared in parliament on December 5 that "one cannot rule out war and we do not rule out war." So it is clear that it is precisely the Indian Government itself, not the Chinese side, that has deliberately broken the status quo along the border, aggravated tension in the border areas and harbours evil intentions.

As is generally known, the Sino-Indian boundary question is a complex outstanding issue left over by history; it was caused, in particular, by the expansionist policy of British imperialism towards China. After the founding of New China, the Chinese Government, treasuring Sino-Indian friendship, has always maintained that it would not be difficult to settle this question if

the Chinese and Indian sides took into account the historical background and current actual conditions and conducted friendly consultations. Even though for the time being an overall settlement cannot be achieved and the two sides maintain the status quo, the friendly relations between China and India will not be affected. As a matter of fact, tranquillity generally prevailed along the borders between China and India over a considerable period of time, and the two countries lived in friendship although some minor disputes took place in individual localities on the borders. But ever since the end of 1958, particularly after the outbreak of the rebellion in China's Tibet region, the Indian side has acted differently from what it did in the past, provoking one border incident after another in a deliberate attempt to aggravate the boundary dispute. In spite of the fact that China has never occupied an inch of Indian territory while India has occupied vast tracts of Chinese territory and repeatedly provoked border incidents, China still patiently explores avenues for a fair and reasonable settlement of the boundary question. It may be recalled that in order to bring about a reasonable settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, Premier Chou En-lai in April 1960 made a personal visit to India and held talks with Prime Minister Nehru. The Indian Government, however, did not want to pay any attention whatsoever to our friendly, reasonable and conciliatory attitude on the Sino-Indian boundary question.

Letting the Question Drag On Indefinitely

Nehru remarked in February 1961: "The question of sitting down with the Chinese to define it [the boundary] and consider the whole matter afresh does not arise, so far as we are concerned" and "the question will only be settled when they leave this territory." In other words, unless China bows to India's unreasonable demands, the Indian Government will refuse to negotiate with the Chinese Government on the boundary question and even if negotiations are held, no agreement can be reached. It is clear that Nehru is not at all interested in solving the Sino-Indian boundary question; on the contrary, he prefers to leave the question open indefinitely.

Anyone with a bit of common sense can see that there is no threat whatsoever to the security of India's northern border. This is not only because the precipitous Himalayas, snow-bound most of the year, lie along this border but, what is more important, because China is a socialist country, which absolutely does not need to, absolutely must not and cannot commit aggression on a single inch of another country's territory. It is impossible that Nehru and other responsible personages among the Indian bourgeoisie are not aware of this. Even as they kick up a fuss about "Chinese aggression," they know that they are not speaking the truth. In their view, the Indian ruling circles have nothing to lose but much to gain by leaving the Sino-Indian boundary question open for a long time. This is because by so doing they can at any time fan

up anti-Chinese feelings and raise a hue and cry against China to meet the needs of the domestic and foreign policies of the Indian Government. It is out of such considerations that the Indian Government, over the past two or three years, has consistently refused to reach any agreement on the Sino-Indian boundary question, or to maintain the status quo pending an agreement on the question. Moreover, it has constantly created tension along the border and stirred up one anti-Chinese campaign after another.

Hence, it is obvious that the truth about the anti-Chinese campaign in India and the background of the successive campaigns launched by the Indian ruling circles against China, should not be sought in the Sino-Indian boundary question itself but in the needs of the domestic and foreign policies of India's ruling circles.

With an Eye to the General Elections

It is no accident that India's ruling circles have whipped up the current anti-Chinese campaign on the eve of the general elections in India. These are the third general elections since the Congress Party came to power after India won independence. The leaders of the Congress Party are not optimistic about their prospects in these coming elections. The reason is that during its ten years' rule, despite certain reformist measures it has taken, the Congress Party has done nothing to abolish the feudal system of land holdings while foreign capital still controls many important branches of the Indian economy. Nehru himself has said: "Capital is of paramount importance for a country struggling to bring about industrial revolutions. India could produce the necessary capital by tightening the belt of her people and foreign aid." This is exactly what the Indian Government has been doing. But in spite of the constant rise in taxation and commodity prices and a considerable amount of foreign aid, the main targets in India's Second Five-Year Plan (1956-60) have not been fulfilled. Discontent among the broad masses of the people is mounting daily, the struggles of the workers, peasants, intellectuals and other sections of the people to win the right to live and democratic rights are developing day by day, while the prestige of the Congress Party continues to decline. Nehru said last year that the Congress Party had lost prestige, and if its weaknesses were to continue, it might be better for the party to be disbanded.

It is precisely under such circumstances that India's ruling classes are seeking to play up this fake bugaboo of Chinese "aggression" to divert the attention of the people and whip up narrow-minded nationalist sentiments as a means of dealing blows against India's progressive forces. On this point, an article published in the U.S. newspaper *Christian Science Monitor* on July 31 this year disclosed that "after Chinese aggression in the Himalayas in 1959," the Congress Party "had the Communist Party of India on the run" and that the Congress Party, "if firm on this single issue, or if allowed to be firm, would be assured of a sweeping victory in 1962." People can fully understand without further explanation that the current anti-Chinese campaign is precisely a means of deceiving the people and catching votes at the forthcoming general elections and thus keeping the Congress Party in power.

Who Pays the Piper Calls the Tune

The current anti-Chinese campaign in India was launched following Nehru's visit to the United States.

This is no accident, either. One needs only to review the history of the past three years to see that the anti-Chinese campaign in India is inseparably bound up with U.S. "aid" to India. Incomplete statistics show that during the 12 years from 1947 to 1959, the "aid" granted to India by the United States and U.S.-controlled international organizations amounted to some \$1,900 million. But, since Nehru made use of the "Tibet question" and the Sino-Indian boundary question to whip up repeated large-scale anti-Chinese campaigns, that is, during the three years from 1959 up to the present, the total amount of "aid" which the United States and U.S.-controlled international organizations have granted or have promised to grant to India exceeded \$4,100 million. What warrants attention is that U.S. "aid" to India increased still more sharply after Premier Chou En-lai visited India in April 1960 to seek a settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question and Nehru refused without any justification to come to any agreement. During the period from May 1960 to November 1961 the "aid" the United States and international organizations under its control granted or promised to grant to India amounted to more than \$4,000 million.

Thus it appears that the anti-Chinese campaign in India grows in direct proportion to the amount of U.S. "aid." According to Indian press reports, of the \$5,000 million needed to finance India's Third Five-Year Plan, \$3,800 million are expected to come from the West, and over half of this sum is expected to be obtained from the United States. Almost all the food grain which India must import during its Third Five-Year Plan period will depend on U.S. credits and grants. It was precisely against this background that Nehru visited the United States. The Indian newspaper, *Loka Sevak*, in its editorial on November 13 wrote quite frankly that "Nehru has gone to the United States with a beggar's bowl." "There will be great danger," the paper added, "if the United States becomes dissatisfied. The Indian Prime Minister is satisfying the politicians there as far as possible."

"A Top Favourite of the Kennedy Administration"

In fact, the foreign policy pursued by the Indian ruling clique in recent years has received increasingly open approval and praise from Washington. Apart from its all-out anti-Chinese campaign, the Indian Government has sent 6,000 troops to the Congo to serve the United States' policy of swallowing up that country. Nehru himself did his best to oppose any condemnation of imperialism and colonialism at the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. On the other hand, he attacked the just stand of the Soviet Union on the German and West Berlin questions and on the resumption of nuclear tests. Nehru has always adopted an attitude of indifference towards the anti-imperialist struggles of the Cuban, Algerian and Japanese peoples. That is why during Nehru's visit to the United States Kennedy declared jointly with him: the United States and India "share in the fullest measure their common objective." The U.S. Secretary of State Rusk also said at a dinner in Nehru's honour that the "bond" between the United States and India was the "interlocking of common interest and aspiration which cannot but keep us friends and partners in this present world scene."

As to how Nehru stands in the eyes of the U.S. monopoly capitalist group, this can be seen from *U.S. News and*

World Report, a journal which usually reflects the views of that group. An article entitled "A Close Look at the Man U.S. Is Betting on in Asia" carried in the May 29 issue of the magazine said: "Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, is turning out to be a top favourite of the Kennedy Administration among statesmen of the world." The article further revealed that it was the feeling of Kennedy and his top advisers that India "is the key to chances of stemming the communists in Asia and Africa" and "that Nehru can become a firm friend of the West . . . would bring large dividends to the U.S. in India and in other underdeveloped parts of the world."

International Background

It may also be noted that recently an anti-Chinese counter-current has appeared on the international scene. "China does not want peaceful coexistence," "China commits aggression" and "China is warlike"—these and other anti-Chinese cries have been much in the air for a time. U.S. delegate Stevenson's speech at the U.N. General Assembly debate on December 1 concerning the restoration of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations can be said to have struck the shrillest note in the anti-Chinese chorus. It is certainly no mere coincidence that Nehru should have staged a new anti-Chinese campaign in India at this very juncture.

The above-mentioned facts show that the anti-Chinese campaign in India stems primarily from the needs of the domestic and foreign policies of the Indian ruling clique. At the same time, this campaign has an international background that goes beyond India. It is a component part of the international anti-Chinese campaign, which is mainly designed to meet the needs of U.S. imperialism. Events over the past few years have shown that the Indian ruling class whips up an anti-Chinese campaign whenever it is required by its domestic and foreign policies. It has been so in the past, and it will continue to be so in the future.

China's Consistent Stand for Peace

The anti-Chinese outbursts by imperialists and reactionaries, however, can in no way cover up the facts or conceal the truth. The consistent efforts made by China to safeguard world peace and what China has actually done in adhering to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence are there for all to see. Take the boundary question for instance. China has satisfactorily settled the boundary questions with Burma and Nepal in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and in the spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation and through friendly consultation. As for the Sino-Indian boundary question left over by history, which is of a similar nature, it is necessary and also entirely possible to achieve a fair and reasonable settlement in accordance with the same principles. With a view to ensuring tranquillity along the border and creating an atmosphere favourable to an amicable settlement of the boundary question, the Chinese Government has proposed that the armed personnel of the Chinese and Indian sides on the border withdraw 20 kilometres respectively. It has also proposed that each side refrain from sending any patrol to places within 20 kilometres of the line of actual control on its own side. After these proposals were turned down by the Indian Government, the Chinese Government, on its own initiative and unilaterally, stopped sending patrols to places within 20 kilometres on the

Chinese side of the line of actual control. The Chinese Government has more than once affirmed its stand that both sides should refrain from breaking the status quo along the border and affecting friendly relations between the two countries even if the boundary question cannot be settled for the time being. Incontrovertible facts show that the responsibility for the current deadlock over the Sino-Indian boundary question rests entirely with the Indian side and not with the Chinese side.

It must be mentioned here that on the day after Nehru accused China on November 20 of so-called "incursions" into India, Ajoy Ghosh, General Secretary of the Indian Communist Party, trailed behind Nehru and hurriedly issued a statement in condemnation of China without bothering to find out the truth or look into the rights and wrongs of the case. This really fills one with "surprise and regret."

Where the Responsibility Lies

Events in the past few years have proved that the Indian Government has no intention whatsoever of solving the Sino-Indian boundary question in accordance with the Five Principles and on the basis of fairness and reasonableness, mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. On the contrary, the Indian Government, while unleashing successive anti-Chinese campaigns, has continually sent armed personnel and aircraft across the Sino-Indian boundary line and carried out intensive preparations for war in the border area. This shows that the Indian Government has switched from refusal to solve the boundary question through negotiation to the use of force to realize its territorial claims on China. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has pointed out in its statement of December 6 that "should the Indian Government, obstinately persisting in its course, continue to push forward into Chinese territory and extend its unlawful occupation, it must bear full responsibility for the resulting new tension."

As to the anti-Chinese campaign, it will eventually boomerang against those who stage it, be they U.S. imperialism, Nehru or anybody else. In the world as a whole, only the imperialist elements, and reactionaries and their followers, who altogether make up only a very small number, take their stand against China; while the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals, the anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist national bourgeoisie and all other people with a sense of justice who form the overwhelming majority of mankind, are not anti-Chinese but stand for friendship with China. As far as the handful of imperialists and reactionaries are concerned, they will attack and curse China anyway, irrespective of what China does or does not do, or what China says or does not say. But the overwhelming majority of mankind will always regard the Chinese people as their friends although imperialism and the reactionaries may curse China a thousand or ten thousand times. Even though some people, falling under the influence of the rumour-mongering and slanders spread by imperialism and the reactionaries, may have some misunderstandings and suspicions about China, these too are only transient. More and more people are coming to understand the Chinese people's just cause of building socialism and their peaceful foreign policy. China's international prestige is rising with each passing day. The fact that imperialism and the reactionaries in various countries should launch attacks against China only proves

that we are doing the right thing. Should imperialism and the reactionaries in various countries lavish praise on us, wouldn't that signify that we have been foolish enough to play their game? No anti-Chinese counter-current can

harm the 650 million Chinese people whose feet are firmly planted on this earth. It will only serve to expose the reactionary nature of these anti-Chinese "warriors." They have lifted a rock only to crush their own feet.

The Sino-Indian Boundary Question

Statement of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs

December 6, 1961

THE Indian Government on November 20, 1961, made public excerpts of the note delivered by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India on October 31, 1961, in which it energetically denied the facts of Indian intrusions into Chinese territory and air space set forth in the Chinese Government's note of August 12, 1961, and, at the same time, groundlessly accused China of "renewed incursions and aggressive activities" and spoke of "aggression being added to aggression" against India. On the same day of November 20, Prime Minister Nehru, who had just returned from a visit to the United States of America, made the same charge in the Indian Lok Sabha. On November 28, he made another statement in the Lok Sabha further attacking China, and the Indian Government issued its fifth White Paper on diplomatic correspondence between the Chinese and Indian Governments. In the meantime, the Indian propaganda machine was set in motion to cast wanton slanders against China. Right-wing Indian political parties rushed in to raise a hue and cry against China. In Calcutta and Bombay, a number of ruffians brazenly created provocative disturbances in front of the Chinese Consulates-General. Individual Indian personages, ignorant of the true state of affairs, hastened to follow up with unfair criticisms directed against China. These are signs that the Indian side is whipping up a new anti-Chinese campaign by exploiting the Sino-Indian boundary question. In order to safeguard the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples, clarify the facts and distinguish between right and wrong, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, besides delivering a note to the Indian Embassy in China on November 30, 1961, in refutation of the Indian note of October 31, now issues the following statement:

What grounds has the Indian Ministry of External Affairs produced in its note for its wild charge that China allegedly has carried out "renewed incursions and aggressive activities" and that "aggression is being added to aggression"? One of the Indian grounds is that there have allegedly occurred eleven instances of "Chinese intrusions into Indian territory." The other ground is that Chinese forces have allegedly established three new posts in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border and gone beyond the so-called "1956 Chinese claim line in Ladakh." But, as clearly shown by the refutation in the Chinese Government's note of November 30, 1961, these grounds of the Indian side are wholly untenable.

The Chinese Government has in its note of November 30 replied to each of the eleven cases of alleged Chinese intrusions into Indian territory listed by the Indian side, proving that the results of careful investigations by the Chinese Government show that there is no basis for any of these cases. Among the eleven so-called cases, four were refuted and rejected by the Chinese Government long ago. As to the other seven cases, even the simple matter of dates is not clear in some cases, not to speak of any factual basis. It can thus be seen that the bringing up of these charges by the Indian side was most frivolous and irresponsible. As pointed out in the Chinese Government's note of November 30, the allegation that Chinese forces have established "new posts" and gone beyond the "1956 Chinese claim line in Ladakh" is also wholly inconsistent with facts. The fact is that Chinese forces have never gone beyond the Sino-Indian traditional customary line in the western sector, let alone set up any new posts there. The Sino-Indian traditional customary boundary in the western sector is most clear and definite. It is the boundary marked on the 1956 Chinese map which was mentioned in Premier Chou En-lai's letter of December 17, 1959; it is also the boundary marked on the map handed over to the Indian side by the Chinese officials during the meeting of Chinese and Indian officials in 1960. The three places where China is alleged by the Indian side to have established new posts are all within Chinese territory east of this sector of the boundary line and have always been under China's effective control. Among the three places, at Nyagzu and at the point 35°19' N, 78°12' E the Chinese posts have long been in existence and are not at all newly established, and at the third place, Dambuguru, no post has ever been established. The Indian charges are not only sheer fabrications, but open interference in the internal affairs of China.

IN his statements in the Lok Sabha on November 20 and 28, Prime Minister Nehru particularly dwelt on and exploited the question of the alleged establishment of new posts by Chinese forces. But the more he spoke on this question, the more flaws were revealed, further proving that the Indian charges are purely fictitious.

It can be said that Prime Minister Nehru's statement in the Lok Sabha on November 28 about the time of the establishment and the geographical location of the three so-called new posts was a thorough muddle. Regarding the time of their establishment, he first said that it was

in the course of the last two years, and then that it was during last summer. Regarding the location of the three posts, his version was different from that given in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs. Prime Minister Nehru said, "Two of them . . . are practically on the international frontier between Tibet and Ladakh," and again, "We are not quite certain whether they are a mile or two on this side or on that side." When an Indian member of parliament groundlessly alleged, "Then, they must be on this side. If there is doubt, then they are obviously on this side," Prime Minister Nehru actually agreed by saying, "Let us presume that. We have presumed that." Prime Minister Nehru further said that he more strongly objected to the third post. However, he lacked courage to admit openly that the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs of October 31 had wrongly given the coordinates of this post as 33°19' N, 78°12' E. It was only after the reactionary Indian papers, basing themselves on these wrong coordinates, loudly cried about Chinese occupation of a vast tract of Indian territory that the Indian Government quietly sent another note to the Chinese Government to amend the coordinates to 35°19' N, 78°12' E. All this shows that Prime Minister Nehru and the Indian Government have made charges against the Chinese Government on the basis of stories which they themselves could not confirm and even of wilful presumption and wrong data. One cannot but be greatly surprised that the government of a country and the leader of that government could be so unscrupulous in choosing their means to achieve their ulterior purposes.

CHINA has never committed aggression against India, let alone any new aggression or "aggression being added to aggression." This is a fact which no slander or calumny can alter. For many years, it is precisely India which has invaded and occupied many parts of Chinese territory, for instance, Parigas in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, Chuva, Chuje, Shipki Pass, Sang, Tsungsha, Puling-Sumdo, Sangcha and Laphal in the middle sector, Khinzemane and the extensive territory south of the illegal McMahon Line and right up to the foot of the Himalayas in the eastern sector. In spite of this, the Chinese Government has all along striven to settle the boundary dispute between China and India through negotiations. The Indian Government, however, has mistaken this reasonable attitude of the Chinese Government for a sign of weakness, and has, in the past two years, intruded more frequently into Chinese territory and air space.

Counting the cases which the Chinese Government has brought up with the Indian Government, since 1960 there have been 17 cases of intrusions into Chinese territory by Indian troops and personnel, numbering more than 200 persons, and there have been 45 cases of intrusions into Chinese air space by Indian aircraft, flying in 53 sorties. On account of these, the Chinese Government has sent many notes of protest to the Indian Government, pointed out the gravity of these unlawful activities and asked the Indian Government to take effective measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents. Because of the continuous increase in such illegal Indian activities in recent months, the Chinese Government successively delivered four notes of protest to the Indian Government on August 12, October 7 and November 2, 1961. The Indian Government, besides replying to the two notes of the Chinese Government dated August 12 and October 7,


1961, and making every effort to deny the facts, has hitherto given no reply to the other two notes of the Chinese Government dated November 2, 1961. It has even failed to include the Chinese Government's note of October 7 and the other two notes of November 2 into its fifth White Paper on diplomatic correspondence between the Chinese and Indian Governments, which it issued recently. However, the facts of Indian intrusions into Chinese territory and air space cannot be covered up in this way. The fact is that in the period from the middle of May to October this year Indian troops and personnel overstepped the line of actual control by the Indian side and intruded into Chinese territory at Spanggur and Demchok in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary and at Salan and Wuje in the middle sector. In the Demchok area, in particular, armed Indian personnel, using as their base Parigas which India had unlawfully occupied, pushed steadily into Chinese territory, established illegal posts and even overstepped the boundary line unilaterally claimed by India near Charding La. In the Wuje area, the Indian Government, in violation of the Sino-Indian agreement that both parties should refrain from sending armed personnel there, openly dispatched Indian troops to station and construct forts in the area. During this period of five and a half months, there were 30 cases of intrusions into Chinese air space by Indian aircraft, flying in 33 sorties.

These new encroachments and intrusions into Chinese territory and air space by the Indian side are not only facts verified by the Chinese Government through careful investigations, but are also directly or indirectly confirmed by the Indian Government's note of October 31 and Prime Minister Nehru's statement of November 28.

In its note of October 31, the Indian Government, while trying hard to deny the facts brought up by the Chinese side, cannot but admit that Indian troops and personnel have carried out activities in the Demchok and Wuje areas. The Indian Government further openly asserted that all the places mentioned by the Chinese Government except one are on the Indian side of the boundary line unilaterally claimed by it, and that therefore whatever actions the Indian side may take there do not constitute intrusions into Chinese territory. That is tantamount to admitting openly that the Indian side intends unilaterally to change the status quo of the boundary and is preparing to further invade and occupy Chinese territory, because the boundary line unilaterally claimed by India not only greatly exceeds the Sino-Indian traditional customary line in cutting deep into Chinese territory, but also greatly exceeds the present extent of Indian occupation.

PRIME Minister Nehru's statement on November 28 clearly shows that India has long been continuously strengthening its military dispositions on the frontier, establishing a large number of posts and building roads. He said, "We have been engaged to the best of our ability to strengthen our position all along the borders." He said that not only had "many posts been established" along the illegal McMahon Line in the eastern sector but "more than half a dozen new posts, important posts, have been set up in various parts of the Ladakh border." He said that India "is now building up a system of roads right up to the border" in the eastern sector, and also "has been building these roads and building bases at suitable places

SKETCH MAP: SITES REFERRED TO IN THE CHINESE IN THE NOTE OF THE INDIAN MINISTRY



Locations of the cases which were brought up in the Chinese Foreign Ministry's note of August 12, 1961 in protest against Indian encroachments on Chinese territory and territorial air are (the serial numbers of the cases are as those in the Chinese note):

- (I) Points at approximately $33^{\circ}36'N$, $78^{\circ}46'E$ and $33^{\circ}35'N$, $78^{\circ}47'E$.
- (II) Around Cuje sheepfold, Rato, Oga, Kargo and Charding La.
- (III) Near Salan.
- (IV) Wuje area.

(V1) Chiakang.

(V2) Digra.


(V3) Area approximately at $35^{\circ}19'N$, $78^{\circ}12'E$.

(V4) Around Migyitun and Yalep.

Alleged locations of the cases of Chinese "intrusions" into Indian territory of which the Indian Ministry of External Affairs unreasonably accused China in its note of October 31, 1961 are (the serial numbers of the cases are as those in the Indian note):

(1), (2) A point at $33^{\circ}47'N$, $78^{\circ}52'E$.

FOREIGN MINISTRY'S NOTE OF AUGUST 12, 1961 AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF OCTOBER 31, 1961



(3) A point approximately 1.25 miles east of Hot Springs.

(4) A point at 34°17'N, 79°01'E.

(5) A point at 33°31'N, 78°48'E.

(6) Near Dauletbeg Oldi.

(7), (8), (9) Near Jeleppla.

(10) Taksang Gompa.

(The point near Chemokarpola referred to in Case 11 of Indian charges is not indicated on the map as the Indian side in its note failed to give the specific co-ordinates.)

Alleged locations at which the Indian Ministry of External Affairs in its note of October 31, 1961, charged China with having established new posts are:

(A1) At 33°19'N, 78°12'E.

(B) Nyagzu.

(C) Danbuguru.

The alleged location of (A1) in the Indian note of October 31 was corrected in the note of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs dated November 23, 1961 as follows:

(A2) At 35°19'N, 78°12'E.

for our armed forces" in the western sector, out of which bases "forward posts" had been dispatched.

Prime Minister Nehru did not stop there; without seeking to disguise it he further disclosed India's aim in doing so. He said, "It is not an easy matter to conduct warfare in these regions, but it has to be done, and therefore we have to prepare for it." He also said, "The situation has been changing, from the military point of view and from other points of view, in our favour, and we shall continue to take steps to build up these things, so that ultimately we may be in a position to take action to recover such territory as is in their (China's) possession." That is to say, from refusing to settle the boundary question through negotiations the Indian Government has turned to realizing its territorial claims on China by armed force. The Chinese Government cannot but seriously point out that this policy of the Indian Government is extremely dangerous. The Chinese Government has never made any territorial claims on India. It has always held that, pending the settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, both sides should maintain the status quo of the boundary. In order to ensure the tranquillity of the border and create a favourable atmosphere for a friendly settlement of the boundary question, the Chinese Government has decided, on its own initiative, that the Chinese frontier guards stop patrolling within twenty kilometres on the Chinese side of the line of actual control along the entire Sino-Indian border. All this fully proves the sincerity of the Chinese Government to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations. But under no circumstances will the Chinese Government be cowed by clamour about war and military threats. Should the Indian Government, obstinately persisting in its course, continue to push forward into Chinese territory and extend its unlawful occupation, it must bear full responsibility for the resulting new tension.

ACTUALLY, the Indian side has not only used the boundary question for noisy propaganda purposes, but also used other questions to aggravate the tension between China and India. Going back on its pledge, the Indian Government has increasingly incited the Tibetan rebel fugitives in India to carry out anti-Chinese activities. Last October, the Indian Government brazenly allowed the Tibetan rebels to issue in the name of the Dalai Lama a report slandering China and a declaration on the so-called "Draft Outline of the Constitution" of Tibet, thus enabling them to operate in India in the virtual capacity of an "exile government." The Indian Government, in disregard of repeated and reasonable representations by the Chinese side, has persecuted and expelled one group of Chinese residents in India after another. In repeated breach and violation of the 1954 Sino-Indian Agreement on Trade and Intercourse Between the Tibet Region of China and India, the Indian Government has blocked and restricted trade between the Tibet region of China and India, but falsely tried to put the blame on China. The Indian Government has placed unreasonable restrictions on the normal activities of the Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong, bringing its operations to a standstill, while groundlessly charging that the Chinese side has placed restrictions on Indian missions in China. All these actions of the Indian Government have further artificially worsened relations between China and India.

The fact that the Indian Government is so zealous in pursuing an unfriendly policy towards China obviously cannot be ascribed to any reason which concerns the Chinese side, but can only be due to certain needs of the internal and external politics of the Indian Government. However, this line of action of the Indian Government absolutely does not represent the desire of the broad masses of the Indian people, it can only gladden imperialism and those who are hostile to Sino-Indian friendship. It absolutely will not harm China one bit. Rather, the Indian Government will reveal its true intentions more and more and land itself in an increasingly awkward position before the people of India and the whole world.

THE Chinese Government has consistently adhered to a foreign policy of peace, faithfully abided by the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and striven to live amicably with all countries, and particularly its Asian neighbours. China and India, as two big powers in Asia as well as two world powers, need all the more to live amicably with each other and make valuable contributions to the cause of Asian-African solidarity and world peace. Proceeding precisely from the vital interests of the Chinese and Indian peoples and the interest of world peace, the Chinese Government has always held that the present boundary dispute between China and India is only a question of a temporary and partial nature, and should be settled fairly and reasonably in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and the spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation, and through friendly consultations. The boundary questions between China and Burma and between China and Nepal have already been settled satisfactorily in accordance with these principles. Hence, it is entirely possible likewise to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question. Even if the question cannot be settled for the time being, both sides should respect the status quo of the boundary, ensure the tranquillity of the border and refrain from using the boundary question to impair Sino-Indian friendship. Basing itself on this stand, the Chinese Government has made unremitting efforts, advanced many reasonable proposals over the past two years, and taken a series of important measures to ease the situation and promote the peaceful settlement of the boundary question. Unfortunately, these efforts have not evoked a due response from the Indian side. Nevertheless, the faith of the Chinese Government in Sino-Indian friendship is unshakable, and China's stand of safeguarding that friendship will not change under any circumstances. For this reason, the Chinese Government has throughout the past two years exercised self-restraint in the face of the anti-Chinese clamour coming from the Indian side. The purpose of the Chinese Government in issuing the present statement is still not to seek a quarrel, but to make known to the general public the true facts concerning the Sino-Indian boundary. The Chinese Government sincerely hopes that the Indian Government will change its course and, attaching importance to the interests of Sino-Indian friendship, Asian-African solidarity and world peace, will work jointly with the Chinese Government to improve relations between the two countries and settle the boundary question in a reasonable way.

Appendices: Eight notes exchanged between the Chinese and the Indian Governments since August 1961 on the question of the boundary between the two countries.

Appendices

Note from Ministry of Foreign Affairs of People's Republic of China Dated August 12, 1961 to Indian Embassy in China

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 recent period, Indian troops, personnel and aircraft repeatedly encroached on Chinese territory and territorial air in China's border areas and even openly made armed provocations. The Chinese Government now points out the following serious cases:

(1) About 12:00 hours on July 9, 1961, thirty odd armed Indian military men approached the traditional customary boundary line to the west of Spanggur in China's Tibet region. Nine of the Indian military men intruded into Chinese territory at different times and reached a point approximately 33°36' N, 78°46' E, and jointly with other Indian military men staying outside of Chinese territory, they, unprovoked, fired thirteen shots towards Chinese territory. About 16:30 hours on the same day, two more armed Indian military men intruded into Chinese territory and reached a point approximately 33°35' N, 78°47' E. It was not until about 17:00 hours on that day that all the Indian military men who had illegally crossed the border withdrew.

(2) Since last April, Indian troops, starting from their illegally occupied Parigas which is situated in China's Demchok area, continually pushed further into Chinese territory, and expanded the area of their unlawful patrol to include Cuje sheepfold (approximately 32°41' N, 79°26' E) and Rato (approximately 32°42' N, 79°29' E). In May, Indian troops went so far as to illegally set up a checkpoint at Oga (approximately 32°50' N, 79°26' E). More recently, on July 5, thirty odd Indian military men carrying light and heavy machine-guns and other weapons came on unlawful patrol to Kargo (approximately 32°40' N, 79°28' E), and on July 22 they penetrated still deeper to Charding La (approximately 32°32' N, 79°24' E) for unlawful patrol.

(3) Between July 21 and 22, 1961, six Indian military men carrying weapons, starting from Indian illegally occupied Tsungsha area of China, crossed Thaga Pass and penetrated deeply into a place about one kilometre southeast of China's Salan (approximately 31°31' N, 79°09' E) and carried out reconnaissance.

(4) Last June, some fifteen Indian official personnel, carrying a receiver-transmitter set, intruded again into China's Wuje area and stationed there to carry out unlawful activities.

(5) Indian aircraft repeatedly encroached on Chinese territorial air. The instances of encroachment are as follows:

(a) On May 19 and about 10:00 hours on May 20 respectively, an Indian airplane intruded into the air space over Chiakang (approximately 32°54' N, 79°37' E) of China's Tibet region for the purpose of reconnaissance.

(b) About 11:00 hours on June 3 and at 10:48 hours on July 15 respectively, an Indian airplane, flying from the direction of the Tinruzhe airfield on the Indian border, intruded into the air space over Digra (approximately 33°33' N, 78°53' E) of China's Tibet region for the purpose of reconnaissance. Afterwards, it flew back in the direction of the Tinruzhe airfield.

(c) At 12:45 hours on June 9, an Indian airplane, flying from the direction of Murgg of India, intruded into the air space over an area of China's Sinkiang approximately at 35°19' N, 78°12' E for the purpose of reconnaissance. Afterwards,

it flew back along the Chipechap River in Chinese territory.

(d) About 09:00 hours on June 8 and at 12:11 hours on July 17 respectively, an Indian airplane, flying along the Subansiri River, overflow Migyitun (approximately 28°40' N, 93°37' E) in China's Tibet region and further intruded into the air space over Yalop (approximately 28°44' N, 93°19' E) for the purpose of reconnaissance; thence it flew back by the same route.

The above-mentioned activities of the Indian side have gravely encroached on the territory, territorial air and sovereignty of China, and once again caused the tension in the border areas. The Chinese Government is consistently devoting itself to maintaining the status quo of the boundary and keeping tranquillity along the border so as to facilitate the peaceful settlement of the boundary dispute between the two countries, and all the Chinese frontier outposts, for this purpose, are continuing to desist from sending out patrol parties. The Indian side, on the contrary, taking the good-will of China for a sign of weakness, has wilfully carried out armed provocations and expanded its illegally occupied areas in the Chinese border region. The Chinese Government cannot but lodge a serious protest against this and point out that such practice may lead to serious consequences. The Chinese Government asks the Indian Government to order the immediate withdrawal of all the Indian troops and other official personnel who have crossed the border and adopt effective measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents.

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

August 12, 1961.

Chinese Foreign Ministry's Note to Indian Embassy in China Dated October 7, 1961

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 continued intrusions into China's air space by Indian aircraft, has the honour to state as follows:

1. About 11:25 hours on the morning of August 8, 1961, an Indian airplane intruded into China's air space over Spanggur (approximately 33°36' N, 78°49' E) in Tibet, China.

2. About 9:40 hours on the morning of August 9 and about 9:50 hours on the morning of August 14, 1961, each time one Indian airplane intruded into China's air space over Height 6,181 metres (approximately 35°07' N, 78°11' E) and Height 5,651 metres (approximately 35°20' N, 78°04' E) in Sinkiang, China. The one which flew in on August 9 circled over the said places as long as 30 minutes.

3. About 10:00 and 10:40 hours on the morning of August 14, 1961, each time one Indian airplane intruded into China's air space over a place (approximately 34°19' N, 79°07' E) east of the Kongka Pass in Tibet, China. The former circled at a low altitude for about 5 minutes and the latter for about 10 minutes.

4. About 9:00 hours on the morning of August 26, 1961, an Indian airplane penetrated deep into China's air space over a place east of Lake Spanggur in China's Tibet region and then flew at a low altitude along the same Lake back to India.

5. From September 11 to 25, 1961, Indian airplanes intruded into China's air space over the above-mentioned Height 5,651 metres in Sinkiang, China, for 10 sorties as follows: 12:18 hours at noon on September 11, one airplane; about 10:00 hours on the morning of September 12, two airplanes;

about 11:20 hours on the morning of September 13, three airplanes; 10:12 hours on the morning of September 14, one airplane; about 10:00 and 11:10 hours on the morning of September 22, one airplane each time; and about 10:25 hours on the morning of September 25, one airplane. Each of these aircraft circled at least 20 minutes over the said place. The two airplanes which flew in on September 12 circled over there as long as 40 minutes.

6. From September 23 to 25, 1961, Indian airplanes intruded into China's air space over the area around 35°18' N, 78°09' E in Sinkiang, China, for four sorties, one each, as follows: about 10:20 hours on the morning of September 23; about 10:05 and 10:30 hours on the morning of September 24; and about 10:00 hours on the morning of September 25. Each of these aircraft circled about 20 minutes over the said place.

Since recently, Indian aircraft have time and again violated China's air space, thus creating new tension in the China-India border areas. Although the Chinese Government has made repeated representations, such Indian intrusions, instead of coming to an end or decreasing, have obviously been on the increase. In the period of one month and more since August 8, Indian airplanes have intruded into China's air space for at least 20 sorties. What is particularly most disturbing is that these Indian aircraft time and again circled for a long time at a low altitude over the Chinese border areas where Chinese frontier guards were stationed. The Chinese Government lodges a serious protest with the Indian Government against these deliberate provocations by the Indian side and demands once again that the Indian Government should take effective measures at an early date against the recurrence of such intrusions into China's air space by Indian aircraft.

The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy the assurances of its high consideration.

Peking, October 7, 1961

Note from Indian Ministry of External Affairs Dated October 31, 1961 to Chinese Embassy in India

THE Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and with reference to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note (No. 61) PU Yi Ya tzu No. 648 dated August 12, 1961, handed over in Peking to the Charge d'Affaires of the Indian Embassy have the honour to state as follows:

2. Despite a searching enquiry into the allegations about encroachments into Chinese territory and violations of Chinese air space by Indian armed personnel and aircraft including an on-the-spot survey, Government of India have not discovered a single instance where Indian forces or aircraft transgressed into Chinese territory. The existing border establishments of the Government of India are well within Indian territory unlike a number of border posts of the Chinese Government unlawfully established on Indian territory in Ladakh. Indeed, according to recent reports, Chinese troops have made further inroads into Indian territory.

3. The specific allegations of intrusion mentioned in the Chinese note are dealt with below:—

Allegation I: At about 1200 hours on July 9, 1961, thirty-odd armed Indian personnel allegedly approached the traditional customary boundary line to the west of Spanggur in China's Tibet region etc.

Comments: The customary boundary line, as the Chinese should be well aware, does not run to the west of Spanggur but cuts across the eastern part of the Spanggur lake. It

follows that had nine Indian Army men reached a point approximately 3336 N, 7846 E, which is not a fact, they would have been 10 miles west of the Indian boundary. It has been further alleged that about 1630 hours on the same day two armed Indian personnel reached a point approximately 3335 N, 7847 E, and while this too is factually incorrect, had it been so, the two men would have been still well within the customary boundary line. All the locations mentioned in paragraph 1 of the Chinese protest note are on the Indian side of the international border and demarcated so in Indian maps. The allegation that Indian troops are intruding when they go to a part of the Indian territory is manifestly absurd. As to firing by Indian armed personnel on Indian territory, on careful examination, it has been established that no shots were fired from or near the locations in Indian territory mentioned in the note.

Allegation II: The Chinese note alleges that Indian troops have recently "pushed further into Chinese territory" in the Demchok area and patrolled up to the Guje sheepfold and Rato etc.

Comments: Both Demchok and the other locations mentioned in the Chinese note are well within India's international border in this sector. The Chinese note refers to the setting up of a checkpoint at Oga. The Ministry do not see why the Government of China should have any concern with measures India adopts inside her territory for the defence of Indian territories. As regards patrolling up to Kargo and Charding La, while Kargo is well within Indian territory, Charding La is on the border, and has been under Indian control for several years. The Chinese Government would appreciate that it is illogical to expect the Government of India to leave their territories unprotected to facilitate Chinese incursions, and indeed unlawful occupation by the Chinese has already occurred in wide areas of India's Ladakh.

Allegation III: Six Indian armed personnel crossed Thagala and penetrated up to 1 kilometer deep south-east of Salan for reconnaissance etc.

Comments: Nilang which is called Tsungsha in the Chinese note has been a part of India for many years. It is several miles south of the border pass of Thagala. Detailed enquiries have revealed that no Indian patrol crossed the Indian border pass of Thagala or any other part of the international frontier in this sector.

Allegation IV: Last June, some fifteen Indian personnel intruded into the Wuje area etc.

Comments: It would be recalled that, in the discussions held on August 19, 1958, on Barahoti—which the Chinese call Wuje—between the Chinese and Indian delegations, it was mutually agreed that the two sides would refrain from sending armed personnel to Barahoti, while the area remained in dispute. The Indian side had further proposed that the civil authorities of either country should not extend their jurisdiction over Barahoti until the dispute had been finally settled. This suggestion was not found acceptable to the Chinese side. The Government of India have therefore been continuing to send their civil officials to Barahoti just as they used to do before in exercise of their traditional jurisdiction.

Allegation V: Violations of Chinese territorial air by Indian aircraft.

Comments: The Government of India, after a very thorough investigation, are in a position to assert positively that no Indian aircraft was involved in the flights mentioned in the Chinese note. However, the Government of India must enter a caveat to the unfounded Chinese claim that the air space over Digra and the point 35.19 N and 78.12 E [(b) and (c) of paragraph 5 of the Chinese Note] are Chinese. These locations are in Indian territory, so is the Chipchap river.

If, as it seems from the Note, the Chinese are establishing posts on this river, the Government of India must denounce this further incursion into Indian territory.

4. It is surprising that the Chinese Government should draw up a list of groundless allegations against the Government of India based on false assumptions and imaginary provocations and conclude therefrom that the activities of the Indian side have "once again caused tension in the border areas". The facts are clear and they clearly establish that the tension in the border areas is caused by acts of transgression committed by the Chinese.

5. As late as December 17, 1959, H.E. Premier Chou En-lai writing to the Indian Prime Minister had, inter alia said that "as a matter of fact, the Chinese map published in 1956 to which Your Excellency referred *correctly* shows the traditional boundary between the two countries in this sector (Ladakh-Tibet/Sinkiang)". The Chinese forces consolidated their hold on that line in 1959-60. Since then, however, aggression is being added to aggression and instances of China's misbehaviour against a neighbour bound to her by the Five Principles of co-existence are increasing.

6. It is not true that the Chinese 'are continuing to desist from sending out patrol parties'. Nor is there any factual basis for the assertion that the 'Chinese are devoting themselves to maintenance of the status quo'. There are reports of intensive Chinese patrolling on the frontier, of numerous incursions into Indian territory, of new military roads close to the frontier in the middle and eastern sectors and deep inside Indian territory under unlawful Chinese occupation in the western sector and new army posts closer to the border than those of 1959. Of instances of recent Chinese intrusions into Indian territory, some are cited below:—

Western sector

1. In April 1960 Chinese military personnel posted at Khurnak Fort patrolled the Suriah (E. 7852, N. 3347) area inside Indian territory.

2. A Chinese survey party visited Suriah on June 25, 1960, and returned towards Khurnak Fort the same day.

3. On October 13, 1960 two mounted Chinese soldiers were seen about 1¼ miles east of Hot Springs (E 7857, N 3419).

4. Four Chinese soldiers were seen at MR. E. 7901, N. 3417, about five miles from Hot Springs in the second week of October 1960.

5. Sometime in May 1961, the Chinese intruded into Indian territory near Chushul at MR E. 7848, N. 3331. A section of Chinese troops was also seen on May 22, 1961 towards the east of this location.

6. A Chinese patrol intruded into Indian territory at MR E. 7758, N. 3523 near Dauletbeg Oldi sometime in the autumn of 1960.

Middle sector

7. On September 22, 1960, a Chinese armed patrol party consisting of one officer and ten soldiers crossed the Sikkim-Tibet border near Jelepala and came 200 yards inside Indian territory.

8. On April 20, 1961, an Indian army patrol at Jelepala noticed three Chinese wearing khaki uniforms, approximately 80 yards within Indian territory.

9. On September 12, 1961, 12 Chinese armed personnel in blue uniforms came 100 yards inside Indian territory from Jelepala.

Eastern sector

10. On June 3, 1960, a Chinese patrol party consisting of

25 soldiers intruded four miles within Indian territory and came to Taksang Gompa (E. 9150, N. 2745).

11. In the first week of July 1961, a Chinese patrol entered a point about one mile west of Chemokarpola in Kameng Frontier Division.

As against these, there is not one instance of Indian intrusion into Chinese territory.

7. This is not all. Reports received in August-September 1961 show that the Chinese forces have spread even beyond the 1956 Chinese claim line in Ladakh to establish the following new posts, and that they have constructed roads to link these posts with rear bases:—

Post at E 78.12, N. 33.19

Post at Nyagzu

Post at Dambuguru

These fresh instances of violation of Indian territory by the Chinese establish conclusively that the Chinese are guilty of further aggression against India and their protestations to the contrary are only a cloak to cover up these renewed incursions and aggressive activities.

8. The Government of India reject the Chinese note of protest dated August 12, 1961, and urge on the Government of China to stop further incursions into Indian territory and withdraw from areas of Indian territory illegally occupied by Chinese forces.

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

To

The Embassy of the

People's Republic of China in India,

NEW DELHI.

Chinese Foreign Ministry's Note to Indian Embassy in China Dated November 2, 1961

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 repeated violations of China's territory and territorial air by India, has the honour to state as follows:

1. In recent months, Indian troops have continuously expanded their illegal occupation and patrol range in China's Demchok area. On July 6, 1961, Indian troops intruded into the Rato area east of Demchok and set up a checkpoint there. They openly carried out military exercises with solid shots there and time and again illegally sent their patrols to and around Goro (approximately 32°38' N, 79°34' E) to the east of Rato. On August 9, three Indian soldiers penetrated deep into the Deboche area (approximately 32°27' N, 79°25' E), 20 odd kilometres south of Demchok. On July 22, Indian troops went so far as to detain illegally in the Demchok area, which is China's territory, a Chinese citizen named Dopeje, who was held as long as five days and interrogated nine times before being released.

2. In June 1961, fifty odd Indian military men intruded into China's Wuje area, stationed themselves around 30°49' N, 79°58' E, and built fortifications and other works there. On July 2, 3, 5 and 15, each day an Indian aircraft intruded into the air space over that area and air-dropped supplies to these intrusive Indian troops. The intrusive Indian troops did not withdraw till early September.

The Chinese Government points out with regret that, despite its repeated protests to India against the latter's illegal activities in the two areas mentioned above, Indian troops have still been further expanding their area of occupation,

setting up strongpoints and carrying out all kinds of illegal activities in China's territory. Moreover, the intrusion into and stationing at the Wuje area by Indian troops are in serious violation of the Sino-Indian agreement to refrain from sending armed personnel into the area. The Chinese Government hereby once again lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government against all these activities on the part of the Indian side.

The Chinese Government has been following with great anxiety the Indian troops' steady pressing forward on China's borders and cannot but regard such action of the Indian side as an attempt to create new troubles and to carry out its expansion by force in the Sino-Indian border areas. It is not difficult to conceive that, had not the Chinese side restrained strictly its own border guards to avoid by all means any conflict with India in line with China's consistent stand of maintaining peace and tranquillity along the border, such gross violations of China's territory and sovereignty by the Indian troops would have led to very serious consequences. The Chinese Government deems it necessary to point out that it would be very erroneous and dangerous should the Indian Government take China's attitude of restraint and tolerance as an expression of weakness. The Chinese Government hereby demands that the Indian Government speedily change its present practice and order all the intruding Indian troops to put an end immediately to their violations of China's territory and territorial air and withdraw from Chinese territory and take effective measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.

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

Peking, November 2, 1961

Chinese Foreign Ministry's Note to Indian Embassy in China Dated November 2, 1961

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 incidents of Indian aircraft encroaching on China's territorial air, has the honour to state as follows:

1. On October 4, 1961, about 12:00 hours at noon, an Indian airplane intruded into the air space over the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China, and circled around the area of Lanak La (approximately 34°23' N, 79°32' E), Howeitan (approximately 34°58' N, 78°36' E) and Chipchap La (approximately 35°19' N, 78°25' E) for as long as one and half hours.

2. About 5:50 hours in the afternoon of the same day, an Indian airplane intruded into the air space over the area of Nischu (approximately 34°37' N, 79°06' E) in the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region, China, and then circled as long as about 35 minutes over the area between Nischu and Howeitan.

The Chinese Government has noted that the Indian side, in disregard of the Chinese Government's repeated protests against Indian aircraft encroaching on China's territorial air, has again sent its aircraft to penetrate deep into China's territorial air and circle for an unusually long time over several thousand square kilometres of Chinese territory. Against these acts of deliberate provocation and tension-creating by Indian aircraft, the Chinese Government hereby lodges a strong protest with the Indian Government and demands that it immediately adopt effective measures to prevent the recurrence of incidents of Indian aircraft encroaching on China's territorial air.

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

Peking, November 2, 1961

Note from Indian Ministry of External Affairs Dated November 23, 1961 to Chinese Embassy in India

THE Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to request the Embassy to correct the coordinates given in paragraph 7 of this Ministry's note dated October 31, 1961, to read as East. 78. 12, North. 35. 19.

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

The Embassy of the People's Republic of China,
Jind House,
Lytton Road,
New Delhi.

Chinese Foreign Ministry's Note to Indian Embassy in China Dated November 30, 1961

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 Ministry of External Affairs to the Chinese Embassy in India, dated October 31, 1961, has the honour to state as follows:

The Indian Government has in its note denied and quibbled about the facts of Indian intrusions into Chinese territory and air space as pointed out in the Chinese Government's note of August 12, 1961 and, at the same time, made groundless charges against the Chinese Government concerning alleged intrusions into Indian territory by Chinese forces. Of late, the Indian Government has further made use of these groundless charges to whip up another anti-Chinese campaign in India. The Chinese Government expresses its extreme regret at such action of the Indian Government, which seriously impairs the friendship between the Chinese and the Indian peoples.

All the places listed in the Chinese Government's note of August 12, which were invaded by the Indian side, lie indisputably within Chinese territory and have all along been under the actual jurisdiction of the Chinese Government. In disregard of the jurisdiction in these places, the Indian Government has dispatched armed personnel to push into these places and even cross the boundary line claimed by the Indian side itself. This is obviously an attempt to realize its territorial claims unilaterally and by force. Although trying hard to deny the fact that the Indian side has further invaded Chinese territory in Spanggur, Demchok, Salan, Wuje, etc., and that Indian aircraft have continually intruded into China's air space, the Indian Government in its note nevertheless cannot but admit its unlawful activities such as the setting up of checkpost, extended patrolling and dispatch of personnel in the Demchok and the Wuje areas. The Chinese Government has long since proved with large quantities of authentic documents and facts that both Demchok and Wuje are within Chinese territory. As the Chinese Government has pointed out in its note of August 12, armed Indian provocations within Chinese territory and the extended illegal occupation there by the Indian side cannot but once again cause tension in the border areas.

It is especially surprising that the Indian Government in its note of October 31 arbitrarily and unreasonably asserted that the above-mentioned places invaded by the Indian side, except Salan, are within the boundary line unilaterally claimed by India, and that therefore whatever actions the Indian side may take there do not constitute intrusions into Chinese territory. Such logic of the Indian Government is untenable and also most dangerous. The Indian Government must be aware that the Chinese and the Indian Governments do not hold identical views concerning the boundary between the two countries. Take the case of the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, the Chinese Government has always held that this sector of the boundary lies along the southern foot of the Himalayas and that the so-called "McMahon Line" is totally illegal. If the Indian Government's above logic should be followed, the Chinese Government would have every reason to send troops to cross the so-called "McMahon Line" and enter the vast area between the crest of the Himalayas and their southern foot. But the Chinese Government has never done so, and all Chinese military and administrative personnel, acting upon orders, have not crossed the so-called "McMahon Line." The Chinese Government has always held that, pending the final settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, both sides should maintain the status quo of the boundary. The Chinese Government has proved by deeds that it is true to this stand. The Indian Government, however, has ceaselessly tried to change unilaterally the status quo of the boundary, and this can only harm the peaceful settlement of the boundary question and the maintenance of the tranquillity of the border areas. The Chinese Government once again asks the Indian Government to stop its unlawful actions in the Chinese border areas, otherwise the Indian Government must be held fully responsible for the new tension caused by such unlawful actions.

For some time the Indian Government has continually stepped up its military activities in the border areas and established many new checkpoints. This was not denied even by responsible officials of the Indian Government, including Prime Minister Nehru, in their public statements. But the Indian Government has now groundlessly charged Chinese troops with establishing new posts in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border, going beyond the so-called "1956 Chinese claim line in Ladakh," etc. It should be pointed out that the Sino-Indian traditional boundary in the western sector has always been most clear and definite. It is the line marked on the Chinese map published in 1956 which was mentioned in Premier Chou En-lai's letter to Prime Minister Nehru dated December 17, 1959, it is also the line marked on the map handed over to the Indian side by the Chinese officials during the meeting of Chinese and Indian officials in 1960. The vast territory east of this sector of the boundary, except the Parigas area in the Demchok region, which has been occupied by India in recent years, has all along been under the effective administrative jurisdiction of the Chinese Government. Out of considerations for Sino-Indian friendship and border tranquillity, the Chinese Government has ordered its frontier guards to strictly observe this sector of the boundary and has kept Chinese troops from sending patrols within 20 kilometres on the Chinese side of the boundary. Hence, the question of Chinese troops crossing the so-called "1956 Chinese claim line in Ladakh" cannot possibly arise. The three places where Chinese troops were alleged by the Indian Government in its note to have established new posts are within Chinese territory east of this sector of the boundary line. The Chinese checkpoints at Nyagzu and at 35°19'N, 78°12'E have long been in existence, and no checkpoint has ever been established at Dambuguru. The Indian Government's fallacious charge that China has established new posts at these three places not only is an open interference with China's internal affairs but also shows the Indian Government's irresponsible attitude

of trumping up falsehoods. This cannot but greatly pain the Chinese people and Government, who have consistently upheld traditional Sino-Indian friendship.

In its note the Indian Government further listed eleven cases charging the Chinese side with intrusions into Indian territory. These eleven cases can be divided in two categories:

Category I. Four of the cases are repetition of old stories. Case (3) alleges that Chinese soldiers were seen near Hot Springs in Indian territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. Cases (7) and (8) allege that eleven armed Chinese personnel and three Chinese respectively crossed into the territory of Sikkim south of Jelepala. Case (10) alleges that 25 Chinese soldiers went to Taksang Gompa in the area controlled by India in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian boundary. Concerning these four cases the Indian Government long ago sent notes to the Chinese Government, and the Chinese Government already pointed out in its respective replies that the result of the investigations showed that there was no case of armed Chinese personnel entering the above areas referred to by the Indian side. In replying to allegation (7), the Chinese Government on its own initiative explained that at the said time eight Chinese border inhabitants, who were gathering medical herbs in the vicinity of Jelepala according to their usual practice, had reached a spot not far to the south of Jelepala, but returned from there soon afterwards. In replying to allegation (10), too, the Chinese Government explained that nine local working personnel of the Tibet region of China, while out to fell bamboos, had lost their way because of the low cloud and thick fog and stepped over the so-called "McMahon Line" by mistake, but that as soon as they perceived it they had turned back. The above replies fully prove that the attitude of the Chinese Government is one of seeking truth from facts and is open and above-board.

Category II. The other seven so-called new cases are mostly dated over a year ago; in some cases no specific dates have been supplied at all. In spite of this, the Chinese Government has conducted serious and thorough investigations. The replies are given severally as follows:

A. Four of the cases pertain to the western sector. Cases (1) and (2) allege that Chinese military personnel and a Chinese survey party went to the Suriah area. Case (4) alleges that four Chinese soldiers were seen at 34°17'N, 79°01'E. Case (5) alleges that Chinese and Chinese troops were seen near 33°31' N, 78°48' E. The Chinese Government deems it necessary to point out that all the above places are within Chinese territory and have all along been under the effective administrative jurisdiction of the Chinese Government, and so the Indian Government has no right to intervene. Moreover, as mentioned above, the Chinese Government, in order to maintain the tranquillity of the border areas, has instructed the Chinese frontier guards not to send patrols within 20 kilometres on the Chinese side of the boundary. The results of the recent investigations show that the Chinese frontier guards have always observed this instruction faithfully, and have not trespassed into Indian territory at all. On the contrary, as pointed out by the Chinese Government in its note of August 12, 1961, it is the Indian frontier guards who have not only occupied long ago Demchok and other places within Chinese territory in the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary, but have pushed forward and expanded continually the extent of its illegal occupation.

B. Case (6) also pertains to the western sector. It is alleged that a Chinese patrol was seen near Dauletbeg Oldi. Of all the seven new cases brought up in the note, this is the only case which concerns Indian territory. But the time given in the Indian note is extremely vague, using only the loose expression of "sometime in the autumn of 1960." According to the result of investigation, the Chinese Government

can reply definitely that throughout the autumn of 1960 no Chinese patrols ever went into the area within twenty kilometres on the Chinese side of the western sector of the Sino-Indian traditional boundary, to say nothing, of course, of trespassing into Indian territory.

C. Case (9) concerns the China-Sikkim border. It is alleged that twelve armed Chinese personnel went 100 yards inside Sikkim territory from Jeleppla. As is well-known, the China-Sikkim boundary has long been formally delimited and its location is very clear. The result of investigation once again shows that this boundary has always been respected by the Chinese side, and that no armed Chinese personnel trespassed into the territory of Sikkim at the time mentioned in the Indian note.

D. Case (11) says that in the first week of July 1961 a Chinese patrol was seen near Chemokarpola, south of the "McMahon Line" in the eastern sector. The note fails to give the specific coordinates of the scene of the so-called incident, or the exact date. In spite of this, the Chinese Government has conducted an extensive investigation, but no Chinese forces are found to have gone beyond the so-called "McMahon Line" in early July.

It can be seen from the above that the Indian Government, in order to make the fabricated charge of "aggression" against the Chinese Government has not hesitated to repeat allegations, which were refuted by the facts, and make new allegations in which even the simple matter of dates cannot be clearly stated and only one of the places involved is really within Indian territory. Thus, it is very difficult to make people believe that the Indian Government was taking a serious and responsible attitude. The Indian Government, in its note, asserted that it was not true that the Chinese side had desisted from sending out patrol parties and that there was no factual basis for China's maintenance of the status quo of the boundary, and so on. This can only be regarded as an attempt to create pretexts for unlawful activities by the Indian side in the Chinese border areas.

The Chinese Government has never spared any effort to maintain the status quo of the boundary and the tranquillity of the border areas, in the hope of creating favourable conditions for the settlement through negotiation of the boundary question by the Chinese and Indian sides in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. The Indian Government, however, has acted in a diametrically opposite way, it has made incessant provocations in the border areas in an attempt to realize its territorial claims by force, and

turned back to falsely accuse China of committing so-called new aggression. Such practice of the Indian Government, whatever needs it may be designed to meet, will only result in the daily aggravating of the tension in the Sino-Indian border areas, the putting off of a settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, and the lack of improvement in Sino-Indian relations, and these run counter to the common desire of the Chinese and Indian peoples. The Chinese Government earnestly hopes that the Indian Government will change its line, treasure Sino-Indian friendship and the interests of the Chinese and Indian peoples, adopt a friendly and cooperative attitude, agree to settle reasonably the boundary question and improve the relations between the two countries.

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

Peking, November 30, 1961

Text of Note from Indian Ministry of External Affairs Dated December 4, 1961 to Chinese Embassy in India

... with reference to note dated October 7, 1961, handed over by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Indian Embassy in Peking, have the honour to state that the Government of India after due verification is in a position to state that there has been no violation of Chinese air space by Indian aircraft as alleged in the note.

2. It has been noted that of the places mentioned in the Chinese note all but one are in Indian territory now under unlawful Chinese occupation.

3. The Government of India does not accept the Chinese Government's right to be present in these places which lawfully belong to and form part of the territories of the Indian Union.

4. In the interests of peace and international amity the Chinese Government may wish to consider the immediate withdrawal of its forces from Indian territory to Chinese territory.

...

5th World Trade Union Congress

Liu Chang-sheng's Speech

Following is the text of a speech delivered on December 8, 1961, by Liu Chang-sheng, Head of the Chinese Trade Union Delegation and Vice-President of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions, dealing with the first item on the agenda at the Fifth World Congress of Trade Unions. — Ed.

Dear Comrade Delegates, Friends,

Allow me, on behalf of the workers and trade unions of China, to extend our warm congratulations to the Fifth World Trade Union Congress now in session and to

present our fraternal greetings to its delegates representing the workers of many lands. (Applause.)

We thank the working people of the Soviet Union and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions for the warm reception they have accorded us and the fine conditions they have provided for the successful work of our congress. (Applause.) It is of great significance that the Fifth World Trade Union Congress is meeting in Moscow, capital of the Soviet Union—the world's first socialist country. Forty-four years ago, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party and the great Lenin,

the Soviet people carried out the greatest revolution in human history, overthrew the regime of the landlords and the bourgeoisie and established a society free from the exploitation of man by man on Russian soil—one-sixth of the world. The Great October Socialist Revolution broke the chain of world imperialism and proclaimed the new era of man's transition from capitalism to socialism. The Soviet people have overcome all kinds of difficulties and built a strong and prosperous socialist state. Today they are engaged in the extensive building of communism. Let us pay our deep respects to the fraternal Soviet people, builders of communism. (*Warm applause.*)

COMRADES, the Chinese Trade Union Delegation approves Comrade Saillant's report. We thank the World Federation of Trade Unions for the good preparatory work it has done for this important meeting. Several months ago, the W.F.T.U. published the "Draft Programme of Trade Union Action at the Present Stage for the Defence of the Workers' Interests and Rights" prepared for this congress. In general terms this draft programme sums up the experience of the common struggles waged by the workers of the various countries; it points out the direction and tasks of the world trade union movement in the struggle for peace, national liberation, democracy, social progress, improvement of the workers' living standards and the strengthening of unity. Its publication has evoked a warm response in the world trade union movement and it has played a positive, stimulating role in the workers' struggles in the various countries. In his report to our congress, Comrade Saillant explained with a wealth of facts the great significance of this draft programme. We hope that our congress will adopt this programme.

Comrades, since the Fourth World Trade Union Congress the international situation has undergone tremendous changes in favour of the workers and people of the world. An excellent situation confronts us.

There is a rapid increase in the strength and international influence of the world socialist system. The countries in the socialist camp have made great achievements in their socialist construction. The Soviet Union has accomplished stirring, brilliant feats in the conquest of the cosmos. There is a steady improvement in the material and cultural life of the workers and people in the socialist countries. All this demonstrates the incomparable superiority of the socialist system. The people of the countries in the socialist camp are advancing shoulder to shoulder in their common struggle of revolution and construction, giving assistance, support and encouragement to each other. Their untiring efforts to preserve world peace are playing an ever greater role in the world.

In the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, there have been great developments in the struggle of the working class and people against imperialism and colonialism. Revolutionary storms are rising one after another. The Laotian people have achieved a great victory in their struggle against U.S. imperialist intervention and aggression. The Japanese workers and people are waging an unrelenting struggle against the U.S. and Japanese reactionaries. In Africa, the Algerian people persist

heroically in their war of national liberation; the peoples of the Congo, Kamerun, Angola, South Africa and other African countries are continuing their struggle against both old colonialism and neo-colonialism and ever fresh forces step forward to take the place of those who fall. In Latin America, the great Cuban revolution is striding forward, triumphantly repulsing U.S. aggression and schemes for intervention. The patriotic struggle of the peoples of Brazil, Ecuador and the Dominican Republic against U.S. imperialist intervention has made great progress in recent times. All this shows that the powerful upsurge of the national-democratic movement is striking heavy blows of tremendous force at the imperialist forces headed by the United States, thus making brilliant contributions to the cause of world peace and human progress. (*Applause.*)

In the capitalist countries, the class struggle is sharpening daily. The past few years have witnessed mass political and economic struggles in many countries on a scale seldom seen before in the history of the international workers' movement. Important progress has been made in working class unity and united action. Significant successes have been scored in the struggle to improve the workers' lot, defend trade union rights and oppose the attacks launched by monopoly capital. Furthermore, this struggle has been increasingly integrated with the nationwide struggle against the fascist menace and the imperialist forces of war and for the defence of world peace. In the course of sharp class struggles, as the draft programme has pointed out, "a growing number of workers realize that only socialism can bring a decisive and lasting improvement to their economic and social situation and free them from economic and political oppression."

THE struggle against the imperialist policies of aggression and war and in defence of world peace has become the mightiest, the most widespread mass struggle in the world today. The imperialist forces of war headed by the United States have suffered a series of defeats under the blows of the joint struggles of the working class and people of all lands. Things are getting more and more difficult for them; they are approaching nearer and nearer to their doom.

Imperialism, however, will never become reconciled to its defeat. The Kennedy Administration, under cover of its mask of peace, is playing deceitful tricks like the so-called "peace corps," the "alliance for progress," the "food for peace programme," and so on and so forth, and at the same time is expanding its armaments and preparing for war on an even bigger scale and at greater speed; it is imposing the burden of the biggest peacetime military budget in the United States on the American workers and people. It is preparing to wage both full-scale nuclear war and all kinds of "limited wars" both big and small. It continues to strengthen its various aggressive military blocs and nearly 1,000 overseas military bases of all sizes. It occupies China's territory of Taiwan and constantly violates China's territorial waters and air space. It is plotting to rekindle the flames of war in Laos and rabidly interfering against the just struggle of the people in the southern part of Viet Nam. It is constantly instigating military coups

in Latin America and preparing a new armed aggression against Cuba. It supports the colonial war waged by the French colonialists against Algeria and, under the United Nations' flag, is massacring the Congolese people. It is energetically arming the militarist forces of West Germany and Japan and using West Berlin as a base for provocations and subversive activities against the socialist countries. The Kennedy Administration is everywhere engaged in expansionist and aggressive activities; everywhere it utters threats of war. Recently, the anti-Soviet, anti-Chinese and anti-Communist clamour and war threats uttered by Kennedy himself and other central figures in his administration have become even more frenzied. Kennedy has openly raved that in the last analysis "the only way to maintain peace is to be prepared in the final extreme to fight for our country—and to mean it." These facts completely prove the correctness of the following conclusions contained in the draft programme: "U.S. imperialism is the ringleader of world reaction," "the source of international tension and war danger arises precisely from the aggressive policy pursued by the United States and other Western powers which is directed fundamentally against the socialist camp" and "so long as imperialism remains, the danger of war will continue."

U.S. imperialism clearly demonstrates by its deeds that it is the common enemy of the people of all countries. Therefore, opposition to imperialism, and particularly opposition to the aggressive policy and war threats of U.S. imperialism, so as to defend world peace, remains an urgent militant task facing the people of all lands and the international workers' movement.

IN the struggle against imperialist aggressive adventures and colonial wars, against the expansion of armaments and war preparations, against the remilitarization of West Germany and Japan, for universal disarmament, for the dismantling of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of troops stationed on foreign soil and the dissolution of aggressive military blocs, the workers and people of all countries have increasingly strengthened their unity and formed a broad international united front with the forces of socialism and the working class of all countries as the core and including the forces of national liberation, democracy and peace. By relying on the joint struggle of these powerful forces in defence of peace, a new world war can be prevented.

The Chinese people have worked consistently for the safeguarding of world peace, the relaxation of international tension, universal disarmament and the realization of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems on the basis of the Five Principles. They have always supported the workers and people of other lands in their struggle against imperialism and for liberation. We are confident that provided the people of the world strengthen their unity and persist in the struggle, they will surely be able to defeat the policies of aggression and war pursued by imperialism headed by the United States and safeguard world peace.

The working class, as mankind's most progressive class, shoulders the historic mission of opposing imperialism and colonialism and abolishing oppression and exploitation. The working class of all countries is waging heroic and arduous struggles in fulfilment of this glorious

mission. It is an important task of the international working class to support the struggle of the oppressed nations and people.

LIKE the workers and people of other socialist countries, the workers and people of China consistently show their sympathy and support for the just struggles of the working class and people of other countries. Over the past few years, we have given all possible support to the struggles of the workers and people of various countries in the capitalist world. We have shown particular concern and given firm support to the heroic struggles of the people of Cuba, Algeria, Laos, south Viet Nam, south Korea, Japan, Angola, Kamerun, South Africa, Brazil, Ecuador and the Dominican Republic—who are in the forefront of the struggle against imperialism, to win and safeguard national independence—(Applause.) and the struggles of the people of other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America against imperialism and new and old colonialism, because in the past we ourselves suffered a plight similar to theirs and because today our country is still subject to aggression from U.S. imperialism, we are all confronted with the task of a common struggle against imperialism. We agree with the proposal put forward by Comrade Saillant in his report for the thorough uprooting of the colonial system; the workers and people of China have been and will for ever be the true friends of the workers and people of all countries in their fight against imperialism, colonialism and monopoly capital. We believe that support for the struggles of the workers and people of other countries is an internationalist duty which we must shoulder, and that their struggles are at the same time a valuable support to us.

The workers in the capitalist countries are faced with frenzied attacks from both domestic and foreign reactionaries; these attacks are both political and directed against their living standards. It is a constant task of the trade union movement to struggle in defence of the vital interests and rights of the mass of workers. It is through such daily struggles that the workers learn to see more clearly the crimes of the capitalist system; they constantly steel themselves and raise their level of understanding in these struggles, their unity develops and grows, and they inspire the whole people in a common advance. Their struggles have likewise gained the profound sympathy and support of the Chinese workers and the trade unions of China.

In order to oppose the common enemy, it is of great importance to strengthen unity in the ranks of the working class both within the country and throughout the world. Only by strengthening unity can the working class constantly achieve victory in the struggle. The strengthening of unity is our lofty task and constitutes our basic guarantee of victory.

The imperialists and reactionaries are mortally afraid of this unity, and they always do all they can to disrupt it. Reactionary trade union leaders like Meany and his ilk, who are always doing the bidding of their imperialist masters, engage in such shameless schemes. Many comrades present here today can remember that the split in the trade union movements of many countries and in the world trade union movement in 1947-49 was the result precisely of their criminal activities. Today, the imperialists and their agents are still engaged in activities

aimed at splitting and sabotaging the international trade union movement and the trade union movements in various countries, preaching anti-communism, attacking the socialist countries and the progressive forces of various countries, undermining the national-independence movement, glorifying capitalism, betraying the interests of the working class, serving imperialism and monopoly capital. In order to safeguard the interests of the working class and preserve working-class unity, it is therefore necessary constantly to raise the level of consciousness of the working class, thoroughly expose the true face of the enemy and wage an uncompromising struggle against the forces of reaction.

TODAY, the imperialists and reactionaries are using every trick and device to spread rumours and slanders; they are resorting to provocative and disruptive tactics in their intensified attempt to undermine the unity among the countries of the socialist camp — the core of the great unity of the world working class. However, this vile plot is doomed to fail. The unity of our socialist camp is built on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. We have a common cause and common ideals, and we are engaged in a common struggle. No force on earth can undermine this great unity. (*Warm applause.*)

The trade unions of China have always held it to be their sacred international obligation to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp, to strengthen the unity of the international working class and of the world trade union movement, to strengthen unity with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations. Since the Fourth World Trade Union Congress, the trade unions of China have had various friendly contacts with the trade unions of many countries, supporting each other and strengthening their militant friendship. We hold in high esteem the W.F.T.U.'s glorious tradition of steadfastness in struggle and unity. It is precisely because of this that its influence on and its role in the international trade union movement is steadily growing greater. The Constitution which the W.F.T.U. adopted at its inaugural meeting in 1945 in Paris and the resolutions of its successive congresses and General Council meetings are all important indications of the development of this tradition. The present draft programme is also a continuation and development of this invaluable tradition.

The Chinese workers regard their achievements in socialist construction as a contribution towards strengthening the world working class in its opposition to imperialism. In our construction, we have constantly received encouragement and support from the working class and the people of all the countries in the world. At the same time we have inevitably incurred the hatred and curses of the imperialists and reactionaries. We know that ours is a righteous cause and that we have friends all over the world. The imperialists and reactionaries are vainly trying by every possible means to isolate us, but eventually it will be the imperialists and reactionaries, and not we, who will be isolated. (*Applause.*)

Twelve years ago, when the workers and people of China overthrew the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism and seized state power, the imperialists and reactionaries declared that New China, lacking raw materials and technical forces, would not be

able to industrialize and rid itself of poverty and backwardness. They also imposed an embargo and blockade and even launched a war of aggression against Korea to intimidate us. But Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the great leader of the workers and people of China (*Warm applause.*) gave them a resounding reply: "We are not only good at destroying the old world, we are also good at building the new. (*Applause.*) Not only can the Chinese people live without begging alms from the imperialists, they will live a better life than that in the imperialist countries."

Real life has dealt imperialism a telling counter-blow. Under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, the Chinese working class and the Chinese people have scored tremendous successes in socialist revolution and socialist construction, and have enabled China's national economy to develop at a speed unmatched by the capitalist countries.

In the past three years the Chinese people, under the guidance of the three red banners of the general line for building socialism, the big leap forward and the people's commune, overfulfilled three years ahead of schedule the main targets of industrial production for the Second Five-Year Plan. We have completely eliminated unemployment left over by the old China, and the number of workers and staff has increased many times; with the growth of production, there has been a steady corresponding rise in their standard of living. Sponsored by the trade unions, a spare-time educational network for workers and staff, from primary schools to universities, has been formed; about 10 million workers are attending classes, and the ranks of intellectuals of the working class are growing at an unprecedented rate in New China.

CHINA'S trade unions are playing a positive role in building socialism. They not only organize the productive work of the masses and show concern for their livelihood and welfare, but have always attached extremely great importance to political and ideological education among the broad masses of workers and staff. The constant heightening of the workers' level of socialist consciousness and the strengthening of their organizations play a positive and constant role in the building of socialism.

Full of confidence, the Chinese working class and people are striving today to build China into a strong, socialist country with a modern industry, a modern agriculture and a modern science and culture. The realization of this goal is the historic task of China's working class and its glorious internationalist duty to the cause of the world working class.

Comrades, the convening of the Fifth World Trade Union Congress is a great event in the international trade union movement today. We hope and believe that, through our concerted efforts, this congress will be a congress for strengthening the great unity of the world working class, a congress for mobilizing the working class of the whole world to carry on its victorious struggle against imperialism, colonialism and monopoly capital. (*Applause.*)

Long live the great unity of the working class of the whole world! (*Warm applause.*)

Long live the great cause of peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism! (*Warm applause.*)

PAINTING

Art Tours

A considerable number of art tours were arranged for its members this year by the Union of Chinese Artists and its branches. Moving in convenient stages, sometimes in twos and threes, sometimes in larger numbers, groups of artists travelled extensively in many parts of the country, sketching, drawing and painting on the way. The many exhibitions of work done on or resulting from these tours have already shown how rewarding they are; this was also eloquently affirmed again at a recent discussion sponsored by the Artists' Union and attended by many well-known painters who had come to Peking on the conclusion of their tours.

Speakers were enthusiastic about the way their travels had helped to enrich their knowledge, broaden their creative outlook and mature their understanding of such problems of art as choice of creative method and techniques.

Speaking of her experience, the painter Yu Feng said: "I used to have a special love for southern landscapes. This might be because I was born and brought up there; furthermore, I have more than once visited the south in recent years. So whenever my thoughts turned to the beauty of our land, in my mind's eye I visualized views typical of my home province—whitewashed houses under roofs of black tile against a background of green mountains and clear waters.... As to our northeast, I didn't know it. I never had a chance to go there. Then recently I joined other artists on a tour there. It was only for two short months, nevertheless that experience opened for me a new world of landscape beauty. Things which I never liked in the past, I now look upon with delight. Now I'm eagerly trying my hand on subjects and themes which I never before painted or even thought of."

One question that constantly cropped up was the relation between content and form. Many speakers referred to the fact that during their tours they had visited steel mills and coalmines and seen much else that was completely new to them. They were delighted by the tremendous achievements of socialist construction

and felt a strong urge to paint or draw what they had seen. But then there arose the question of how this was to be done. These were entirely new themes in art to many of them, especially to artists of the Chinese traditional school, the majority of whom are still mainly accustomed only to such traditional themes as "birds and flowers," thatched cottages, wooden bridges, murmuring streams. It is not so long ago that big, modern blocks of houses, steel bridges, spillways, automobiles, steel mills and coalmines were regarded as too alien to be fit subjects for scrolls painted in the classical mediums of Chinese ink and water colours. Not only this: the old traditional school had no adequate means of representing these things. It was only in the 1930s that progressive, go-ahead painters of the traditional school even began to search for a pictorial language able to depict the materials, objects and dynamics and thoughts of a modern industrial civilization.

Few artists today any longer have doubts about whether or not modern objects like mills or factories are fit subjects for painting but the problem of finding suitable forms of expression for the new subject matter and content of modern socialist life remains one of the most challenging to traditional-style artists. Most speakers at the discussion expressed the opinion that once painters have a really strong feeling for a subject and are really moved by the beauty they see in it, they will sooner or later find a suitable form of expression for it. Some artists, recalling the former controversies over whether a certain subject was fit or unfit for painting, noted how this was linked with the degree of skill of the artists. In certain paintings in the traditional style it has happened that a train, for instance, looks "like a loaf of bread." Then the artist is all too apt to blame the train as being "unfit for painting" while really the trouble is that the artist himself didn't have

the knowledge, feeling or technique adequate to a truthful depiction of his subject.

The traditional style painter Kuan Shan-yueh of Canton said that his art tour had given him a new understanding of the question of what it means to impart a "national flavour" to one's work. Many have considered this question, he said, mainly from the viewpoint of form and the technical method of painting; he criticized this approach and described it as one which "forsakes the essential in preference for the non-essentials."

Kuan cited with approval the example of the oil painter Yu Pen with whom he had travelled. Yu Pen had made many sketches on their tour. They were very simply done with just a few essential strokes and colour areas. But after reworking, these sketches were swiftly turned into finished works of art. Kuan said Yu Pen's method of making such rapid sketches as the foundation for his pictures is one which has long been followed in the Chinese traditional school, but what was more important was the knowledge, experience and skill the artist had accumulated over the years. Only by drawing on these assets, Kuan said, was Yu Pen able to



A Camel Transport Team in Ningsia

Painting in traditional style by Wu Tso-jen who has hitherto been best known for his oil paintings



Park in Spring Time

Painting in traditional style by Ho Ching-han

give expression to his new feelings; these new feelings and new experiences in turn added to the wealth of his knowledge and experience.

On the organizational side of the tours, most speakers were in favour of keeping the groups small and made up of artists whose interests were not too diversified. The interests of a landscape painter differ somewhat from those of a flower-and-bird painter or the artist specializing in figure painting. The latter always has more interest in enquiring about local customs and habits, traditions and legends. Some suggested that if they are to tour again next year, they would like to revisit the places they went to this year, and take the opportunity to make fuller use of the material they had already collected. Others suggested that ample allowance be made in planning itineraries so that enough time could be given to painting during the journey. Chairman of the Artists' Union Tsai Jo-hung, who presided at the discussion, promised that all these suggestions would be considered in organizing art tours in the coming year.

—CHENG MING

ARCHAEOLOGY

2,000-Year-Old Tomb Opened

A coffin of wood beautifully painted with pictures in lacquer has been found in a large tomb of the Western

Han Dynasty (206 B.C.-24 A.D.) at Shatzutang in the southern suburbs of Changsha, the provincial capital of Hunan in central China. The coffin was found together with many wooden cases inscribed with Han characters. All are now on display in the Hunan Provincial Museum. These new finds provide valuable material for research into ancient Chinese painting and the evolution of writing in the Han language.

Although quite a number of such coffins have been found before, few have come down to us in a good state of preservation. A similar coffin brought to light in 1933, at Chuchiachi in Anhwei, had been damaged by grave-robbers. In 1957, lacquered designs were found on the boards of a decayed wooden coffin discovered in a tomb of the Warring States Period (475-221 B.C.), in Hsinyang, Honan, but these too were damaged. The Changsha find, made of high quality wood, retains its freshness of colour and is the only one of its kind to be found in such perfect condition.

The 73 wooden cases found are of the kind used to hold sealing clay; 43 of them bear inscriptions in ink with a total of more than 130 characters. These are mainly in the *li shu*, or the square, plain style of Han writing. But they retain certain features of an earlier type of writing, the *chuan*, or seal style, which became known to us through earlier discoveries of inscribed bamboo slips of the Warring States Period. The writing of the characters

is not as good as in the inscriptions on the Han Dynasty wooden and bamboo slips unearthed in Edsen Gol, Inner Mongolia, in 1930, and more recently in Wuwei, Kansu Province. Archaeologists believe they belong to an earlier period than these latter finds.

Taiwan's Prehistoric Links With Mainland

Large quantities of prehistoric relics including more than 400 stone artifacts and over 6,600 potsherds have been discovered during excavations near Taipei.

Remains of Neolithic times unearthed recently at Taanliao Village in Tucheng District, Taipei County, reports the *United Daily News* of Taipei, include stone hoes, chisels and knives, and broken pieces of earthenware bearing cord or trellis impressions, stripe or other designs. The same paper quotes the "Antiquities Association of Taipei County" as saying that "potsherds bearing cord or trellis impressions like those recently unearthed have been extensively discovered on the mainland" and that "stepped stone chisels like those discovered (in Taipei) have been found in Fukien Province and in Hangchow (Chekiang). The shouldered adzes are very similar to those discovered in eastern Liaoning (north-east China) and north China." The paper quotes the belief of experts that this prehistoric culture of the Taipei area stemmed from the same source as the culture found in the Yellow River Basin on the mainland.

CHINA AND THE WORLD

Greetings to Tanganyika

Another newly independent country has raised its flag in East Africa. Tanganyika's proclamation of independence on December 9, after years of brutal colonial rule, was warmly greeted by the Chinese people; together with the people of Tanganyika, they are now also joyfully hailing the happy news of the establishment of diplomatic relations. The Governments of the two countries have already exchanged letters on this question. Premier Chou En-lai and Foreign Minister Chen Yi on December 11 each sent messages to Prime Minister Julius Nyerere extending warm congratulations on the establishment of diplomatic relations.

The fact that Tanganyika, on the day that its independence was proclaimed, also announced its decision to establish diplomatic relations with China, notes *Renmin Ribao* in its December 12 editorial, reflects the common desire of the two peoples for the development of friendly relations between them. The people of China and Tanganyika, both having suffered under imperialism and colonialism, have always sympathized with and supported each other. Now following the establishment of diplomatic relations, there are broad prospects of strengthening their friendship and co-operation. The editorial declares that the Tanganyikan people will certainly have the sympathetic support of the 650 million Chinese people in their continued struggle against imperialism, in upholding national independence and building their homeland. At the same time, the editorial continues, the Chinese people are very grateful for the independent Tanganyikan Government's friendly and just stand on the question of the restoration of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations. Prime Minister Nyerere declared that "there is only one China in the world which we recognize and that is the People's Republic of China which truly represents the Chinese people." The Chinese people greet these words of the Tanganyikan people as an ex-

pression of active support for their cause.

Burmese Economic Mission

The Burmese Government Economic Delegation led by Thakin Tin and U Thwin which is at present visiting China had talks with Yeh Chi-chuang, Minister of Foreign Trade and leader of the Chinese Economic Delegation, in Peking on December 8.

Speaking at the banquet to welcome the Burmese guests, Yeh Chi-chuang and Thakin Tin expressed their hope for the continual growth of the *pauk-phaw* (kinsmenlike) friendship between the Chinese and Burmese peoples and the constant development of economic and trade relations between the two countries.

Yeh Chi-chuang said that the satisfactory demarcation of the Sino-Burmese boundary of peace and friendship enabled the friendly relations between China and Burma, and the traditional close friendship between the two peoples to rise from peak to peak. Thakin Tin said that the settlement through sincere negotiations of the Sino-Burmese boundary question was of incomparable significance to all peace-loving people of the world. Sino-Burmese friendship had never before reached such heights. "We want to extend our achievements and will never allow them to be undermined by others," he declared.

Sino-Japanese Peoples' Solidarity

At a mass rally in Tokyo on December 9 to welcome the delegation of the Chinese People's Relief Administration which is at present on a visit to Japan, the Chinese delegation and the Japanese National Relief Association issued a joint statement.

The two parties strongly condemned U.S. imperialism for its war provocations in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe which are designed to increase international tension, said the statement. They pointed out that U.S. imperialism is the root cause of misery in the world, and expressed their determination to struggle to the end to strengthen unity and co-operation between the Chinese and Japanese peoples, to wipe out this root cause of the world's misery and to defend peace in Asia and throughout the world.

The Japanese National Relief Association expressed firm support for the Chinese people's struggle for the

liberation of Taiwan and the restoration of China's legitimate rights in the U.N. It also spoke of their sincere admiration for the Chinese people's great leap forward in socialist construction and China's contribution to the fight against U.S. policy of aggression and in support for the struggles of the peoples for independence and democracy, and in defence of world peace.

The Chinese delegation expressed its determination to continue to support the Japanese people's just, patriotic struggles and their various relief activities.

Ceylonese Lecturer's Impressions of China

The Chinese people are working with great enthusiasm for socialist construction, said Dr. M.B. Ariyapala, lecturer on Sinhalese at the University of Ceylon, in an article on his impressions of China which appeared on December 3 in *Rivindina* (Sunday). He cited the building of the bridge over the Yangtse River in three years as a good example of the efficiency of the Chinese people. He refuted stories of slave labour in China as slanderous. "Wherever we went in China we saw the Chinese people's great love for their motherland," he wrote. "We saw that they are prepared to do anything for their country and her progress. It was clear that there had been a change in the mentality of all her people, which is the source of China's progress," the article said.

China Publishes Asian, African Literature

Literature representing the works of some 200 writers from more than 20 Asian and African countries has been translated and published in China in the past three years. These include a new four-volume selection of works by the Japanese author Tokunaga Sunao, including *Sunless Street* and *Quiet Hills* and 14 stories about the present-day life of Japanese workers. A ten-volume collection of the works of the Indian writer Tagore was published this year, the 100th anniversary of his birth. Indonesian writing is represented by a well-received novel by Abdoel Moeis based on the heroic struggles of the national hero Surapati against foreign invaders during the 17th and 18th centuries.

An anthology of Asian and African literature includes such popular old

translations as *Taedong River* by Han Sul Yak of Korea, and 53 poems written during the past 20 years by the Vietnamese poet To Huu.

Works by contemporary writers of Burma, Iran, Jordan, Iraq, Algeria and other African countries have been translated during this period. Among them are *La Grande Maison* and *L'incendie*, two parts of a trilogy, by the young Algerian writer Mohammed Dib, on the Algerian people's sufferings under colonial rule; the novel *O Pays, Mon Beau Peuple* by the Senegalese writer Sembene Ousmane; and works by the Kamerun author Ferdinand Oyono and Peter Abrahams of South Africa.

BRIEFS

Chairman Mao Tse-tung received and had a cordial talk with a visiting delegation from the Municipal Council of Caracas, capital of Venezuela, on December 5 in Hangchow. The delegation is headed by Eduardo Gallegos Mancera, Vice-President of the Council.

Premier Chou En-lai on December 3 sent a message to the Premier of the Somali Republic Abdi Rashid Ali Shermarke extending profound sympathy to the Somali Government and people, and the victims of the flood disaster in Somali Republic.

As a token of sympathy and expression of its help to the Somali people, the Chinese Government has presented to the Somali Republic 150,000 yuan in cash and Chinese medicines valued at a further 150,000 yuan.

Members of a visiting delegation of the Democratic Youth League of Japan headed by Yukio Morishita were given a warm welcome by young Chinese workers, students and government functionaries at a gathering in Peking on December 2. It was a gay occasion with the young people of both countries singing, dancing and chatting together animatedly throughout the evening.

WHAT'S ON IN PEKING

The following programme scheduled for the coming week is subject to change.

PEKING OPERA

Special performances to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the stage career of Chou Hsin-fang, well-known Peking opera actor.

▲ **UPBRAIDING WANG KWEI** An episode from the traditional opera *The Faithless Lover*. Faithless Wang Kwei's good old servant upbraids him for his ingratitude to his wife who once saves his life when he suffers misfortune and poverty. Chou Hsin-fang in the role of the old servant.

Dec. 15, Peking Workers' Club

▲ **FOUR SCHOLARS** A Ming Dynasty story. In this opera Chou Hsin-fang plays his best-known role as Sung Shih-chieh, an old discharged court adviser, a man of integrity and chivalry, who fights the corrupt officials of his time to help the poor and oppressed.

Dec. 17, Renmin Theatre

▲ **HAI JUI REBUKES THE EMPEROR** The people suffer greatly under the Ming Dynasty Emperor Chia Ching. Hai Jui, an upright official, despite the danger, rebukes the tyrant. The angry emperor imprisons and sentences him to death. At the request of the people the emperor's successor sets him free. Chou Hsin-fang as Hai Jui.

Dec. 19, Renmin Theatre

▲ **BEATING THE GOLDEN BOUGH** A traditional comedy. Kuo Ai, son of Kuo Tzu-yl, a minister of the Tang court, slaps his wife, the emperor's daughter, to prove her haughtiness. The princess complains to her emperor father. But apprehensive that a family quarrel may affect his relations with his minister, he doesn't punish Kuo Ai, but apologizes to him for his daughter's impertinence. Peking Opera Company of Peking.

▲ **THE BUTTERFLY CUP** A prefect's son, Tien Yu-chuan, accidentally kills the son of a viceroy when restraining him from beating an old fisherman to death. The fisherman's daughter helps Tien escape. They fall in love and he gives her a butterfly cup to seal their betrothal. They are parted. But all ends happily. Mei Lan-fang Peking Opera Troupe.

PINGJU OPERA

▲ **OLD MAN CHUNG-LI'S SWORD** A historical opera of the Warring States Period. Kou Chien, Emperor of Yueh, after three years' captivity in the State of Wu, returns home, and together with his people rebuilds the ruined state. This production of the China Pingju Opera Theatre centres on how a patriotic sword maker, old man Chungli, makes a great contribution to his

country's victory by making the fine swords used to defeat the aggressive State of Wu.

KUNQU OPERA

▲ **AN IMPERIAL CONCUBINE BANISHED** Story about Wang Chao-chun, the imperial concubine of the Emperor Yuan Ti of the Han Dynasty, who is presented to the king of the invading Hsiung Nu in an attempt to appease him. Also on the programme: **THE YOUNG COWHERD** The love of a village girl and a young cowherd. **HUCHIA VILLAGE**, an episode from *Water Margin*.

QUYI OPERA

▲ **YANG NAI-WU AND HSIAO PAI-TSAI** A drama based on a notorious murder case in the Ching Dynasty. Peking Quyí Opera Troupe.

MODERN OPERA

▲ **MADAME BUTTERFLY** Puccini's famous opera. In Chinese. Central Opera and Dance Drama Theatre.

DANCE DRAMA

▲ **LEIFENG PAGODA** Adapted from the *Tale of the White Snake*. The White Snake fairy falls in love with and marries a mortal. But her happy life is shattered by a misanthropic recluse who imprisons her in the Leifeng Pagoda. Many years later her son destroys the pagoda and sets her free. Central Opera and Dance Drama Theatre.

SONG AND DANCE

The Central Nationalities Song and Dance Ensemble presents:

- Folk dances of the Tibetans, Koreans, Lis, Uighurs and other nationalities.
- Chorus and vocal solos.

MODERN DRAMA

▲ **A FISHERMAN'S FAMILY** A play by Albanian playwright Suleiman Pitarka. It tells how the Party of Labour leads the heroic Albanian people to victory in their fight against the fascists. Produced by the Art Ensemble of the Air Force of the People's Liberation Army.

▲ **THE PEACH BLOSSOM FAN** The story of the tragic love of a courtesan for a scholar who betrays his love and his allegiance to the Ming Dynasty for wealth and position in the service of the Ching. The Experimental Modern Drama Theatre of the Central Drama Institute.

FILMS

▲ **SONG OF YOUTH** based on the popular novel by Yang Mo. A story of the heroic revolutionary movement in Peking in the early 1930s. Peking Studio.

HIGHLIGHTS OF CURRENT ENTERTAINMENT, EXHIBITIONS, ETC.

▲ **NIEH ERH** A feature film based on the young life of China's first great proletarian composer. In colour. Shanghai Haiyen Studio.

▲ **THE HIGHEST PRINCIPLE** A Czechoslovak film. The story is set during the fascist occupation of Czechoslovakia. A middle-school teacher vainly endeavours to rescue three students from the fascists' killers and learns a bitter lesson from reality.

▲ **A PEARL** A Mexican film. A poor diver gets a large pearl and dreams of fortune and happiness. But tragic events smash his beautiful dreams. Finally, he throws the pearl back into the sea.

▲ **THE TEUTONIC KNIGHTS** A Polish colour film directed by Alexander Ford. It exposes the brutality and aggressive nature of the Teutonic crusaders and how the people of Eastern Europe rise against them.

▲ **LE ROUGE ET LE NOIR** An adaption of Stendhal's famous novel. A joint French-Italian production.

EXHIBITIONS

▲ **CHINESE WOODCUT EXHIBITION** More than 300 works made between 1931 and 1949. Daily, 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. till Dec. 24. At Artists' Union Gallery.

▲ **HUNGARIAN FOLK ART EXHIBITION** Daily, 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. till Dec. 27. At Zhongshan Park.

▲ **EXHIBITION OF WATER COLOUR PAINTINGS IN PEKING** Daily, 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. till January 4, 1962. At Beihai Park.

▲ **KWANGTUNG'S INDUSTRIAL ARTS EXHIBITION** Daily, 9:00 a.m.-4:30 p.m. till January 3, 1962. At the main entrance of Beihai Park.

(Above exhibitions closed on Mondays)


ACROBATICS

Thrills and laughs for your weekend! The China Acrobatic Troupe's circus is performing in the Peking Workers' Gymnasium on Saturdays and Sundays. New Acrobatic features. Aerial equilibrists and gymnasts. Superbly trained animals: bears, dogs, monkeys, goats, etc.



You will find **no bothersome gadgets or costly frills**

on a **BUTTERFLY**
sewing machine



But you will find that all **BUTTERFLY** sewing machines are built for
a lifetime of dependable service

BUTTERFLY sewing machines of simple,
robust construction, are made in many
models — treadle, hand or electrically
operated models are available.

Write to us for further particulars.



CHINA NATIONAL LIGHT INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS IMPORT AND EXPORT CORP.

SHANGHAI BRANCH

128 Huchiu Road, Shanghai

Cable Address: "INDUSTRY" Shanghai