

India-China Official's Negotiations -1960

The Indian team at the talks comprised:

Mr. J. S. Mehta, Director, China Division in the Ministry of External Affairs

Dr. S. Gopal, Director, Historical Division in the Ministry of External Affairs

Among the advisors who attended all meetings were:

Mr. V. V. Paranjpe, Mr. T. S. Murthy and Mr. G. Narayana Rao.

Mr. K. Gopalachari attended only those meetings as were held in New Delhi.

The Chinese team at the talks included :

Mr. Chang Wen-chin, Director, First Asian Department in the Chinese Foreign Office

Mr. Yang Kung-su, Director, Tibet Bureau of Foreign Affairs, in the Chinese Foreign Office

Among the advisors were-Messrs Chen Chia-tung, Liao Teh-yun, Tu Kuo-wie, Chu Chen-chi, Chi Chao-chu, Kao Chen-chi and Ho Ta-chi.

Three to four from among them attended the meetings.

The first two meetings were held in Peking, in late June and late July; the next two in New Delhi, in late August and late September and the last in Rangoon, early in December, all in 1960.

PEKING

(Fourth Week of June)

Mr. Chang-Would Mr. Mehta like to say something first, or I should begin first?

Mr. Mehta- I Would like Director Chang to begin first.

Mr. Chang -We have made a study of your views on the question of the agenda, as well as some of the specific suggestions which were made by you regarding the agenda. Our general views on the agenda are identical; we both want to work out a common agenda and to give both sides an opportunity of submitting, for examination and study, all the material in the possession of the two Governments on the boundary question. In submitting the material, neither side will be restricted in making comments so as to use the material to prove the respective governmental stands. The agenda which we are to draw up will be a framework and for convenience' sake we can on specific topics divide it into sectors and items, and under any particular subject each side may, according to necessity, relate the material to the whole length of the

boundary or to other items. That is, our agenda should be a flexible one. Does Mr. Mehta have any different views with regard to this point?

(Mr. Gopal wanted to have the term 'specific topics' clarified further. Director Chang explained that on specific topics the material could be related to the whole line or to some other items of the agenda.)

Mr. Mehta – I do not exactly disagree with that. We have agreed on flexibility of definitions and freedom to explain the significance of documents furnished. Naturally, if we adopt some kind of an agenda pattern, we must more or less bear that in mind. I do not want to go over this point again because the record is there. That is there are two things-firstly, the broad agenda pattern which we have to bear in mind. Secondly, we have to concentrate on and start off our comments with facts or documents.

Mr. Gopal-May I add a word and seek one clarification? Does Director Chang have in mind that the comments will be free and range on the whole boundary i. e. will the comments on the documents be flexible or the presentation of the documents be flexible?

Mr. Chang-I think these two questions are connected with one another, because when we want to explain the significance of a document, we may, on specific questions, relate it to other sectors or to other documents, i. e. we can leave it to the discretion of either side to make their explanations without any restrictions.

Mr. Mehta-We have to keep in mind that when we are presenting documents say on item 'X' pertaining to Sector (a) then we must start with the documents which pertain to item 'X' under sector (a); and you can, in explaining the document say that the significance of this document is the same as for some other document. That would not be objectionable.

Mr. Chang-Yes; we will not, if we are discussing the first item start with documents on the fourth item.

Mr. Mehta-This is only a question of keeping to the broad framework-to some kind of an agreed rough order.

Mr. Chang-I agree very much with Mr. Mehta that our agenda is a rough framework. So, based on this general understanding, I do not want to go more into discussion on the agenda.

We agree to the compromise agenda which Mr. Mehta submitted last time and to let our work proceed according to such a pattern. In order to confirm this, I will repeat it-

Item 1 – Location and natural features along the entire length.

Item 2 – Treaties and agreements; tradition and custom along the entire length.

Item 3 – Administration and jurisdiction – Sector-wise.

As for items 3 & 4, according to the need they may be combined, i. e. we are not against either side according to its discretion, linking items 3 & 4.

Mr. Mehta-There is just one small question of semantics about the head called ' Others'. I am not an authority on the meaning of words in English! We had suggested "Miscellaneous" because, according to my understanding, "Others", may mean other persons, while "Miscellaneous" suggests other facts. Going over these notes, I find that when we first mentioned this thing Director Chang also agreed that let us say "Miscellaneous" instead of "Others", because the word "Miscellaneous" is fully comprehensive. I think "Others" means other persons;" Miscellaneous" means "Other facts", and "Other items".

Mr. Chang-According to the Chinese, the word "Others" is very clear, that means it does not include the above three items, but "all other items". Our English is also not as good as yours. According to Chinese, interpreted in English it will be "Others", but so long as there is such an understanding that this last item "Others" will be comprehensive and will include "Other questions", the wording does not matter. In Chinese the word "Miscellaneous" is not very good; it means small bits of things. So if you mean it will include "all other facts and questions", then it will be all right.

Mr. Yang-We think that so long as either side wants to raise the question on what we have already made clear. You agree it is other factual material which may illustrate whatever you think it illustrates. That would be covered if you call it "Miscellaneous".

(Mr. Chang wanted to know whether this will include comments. Mr. Mehta clarified that of course it will include comments starting with facts.)

Mr. Mehta-What said earlier was that "other facts" may be brought up to illustrate whatever you want to illustrate with those facts.

I am very glad that after these five meetings in which we both have explained our understandings of the joint communiqué, we are agreed that we must work together and, in order to work together there should

be a broad framework of a common agenda. We have now finalised such a definition of the agenda which we will follow. We have also clarified the order in which we will proceed with all these four items. We agree that this is a broad framework and each side while adhering to it, will have freedom to bring up such facts and documents as they choose and the further freedom of commenting on them and of explaining their significance. I think if we adhere to this pattern, it should not be necessary to have further discussions on procedure and we should be able to proceed from now on until the completion of our assignment in a purposeful and systematic manner. I am happy to note that as a result of the mutual exchanges and the spirit of adjustment, we have reached this solution. I agree that we may now proceed to take up the first item on the agenda which is "Location and natural features" of the entire length of the Sino-Indian boundary as claimed by the respective sides.

Before we proceed with the first item, I think at this stage, we might also go back to the original suggestion, which was agreed to in principle by both sides, of keeping some sort of a brief record of the facts and documents brought forward. This we suggested could be done and I think Director Chang agreed by each side nominating a rapporteur to meet. But from now onwards, we will be recording each other's facts which will eventually be compiled into the report. To enable the teams to spend as much of their time on the actual business of the officials, I suggested that the rapporteur should meet briefly in between our meetings and draw up some kind of a brief record, listing the documents and summarising briefly the significance explained; and this record, jointly drawn up by the rapporteur, could be confirmed at the beginning of our next meeting. If that is agreed, we might nominate one member each from our teams to function as rapporteur and fix when they would normally meet between our meetings.

Mr. Chang – I have said before that we agree in principle that each side nominate a rapporteur and that they meet to summarise the proceedings of the meetings. It is also agreed that the task of the rapporteur will be technical and a mechanical one. It concerns the summarising of what documents have been submitted, the significance explained and the comments made. As to how many times they will meet, that has not yet been decided upon, but we all agree in principle that they can meet according to circumstances and that the interval between their meetings should not be too long. I suggest that we first designate our rapporteur; as to how they will work and how are they to meet and how many times to summarise the proceedings, let them decide between themselves. We can give them a part of our task so that we can have a lighter task.

Mr. Mehta- From our side, I will ask Mr. Murty to be our rapporteur.

Mr. Chang – Our rapporteur will be the gentleman opposite Mr. Murty-
Mr. Chien Chia-tung.

Before we go on to the first item of the agenda, I would like to say a few words. It will be recalled that at our first meeting when talking about news release, we agreed that we would not reveal the contents of our meetings. But we have seen some recent Indian news reports saying that no agreement whatever has been reached in the officials' meetings and, more recently, we have even seen reports of Indian official circles revealing the contents of our meetings, saying that we are still engaged in procedural questions. Such a situation does not conform to what we have decided upon at our first meeting. So, I would like to bring this to your notice.

Mr. Mehta – I note what Director Chang has just said. I am not aware of anything of substance pertaining to our meetings having been disclosed. But we agree that matters of substance pertaining to our discussions must be kept confidential and only the fact that meetings are taking place would be disclosed by either team to the press.

Mr. Chang – All right.

Now to the first item of the agenda. We formally agreed that on the first item we will exchange maps and descriptions of the boundary. You asked us about the scale of maps and I think we told you it was 1 to 5 million. We would like to know what is your scale.

Mr. Mehta-We had always agreed that we would be willing to exchange maps on a roughly corresponding scale. Since the map which the Chinese side wish to exchange is on 1 to 5 million, we would provide a map which is on the scale of 1 inch to 70 miles. Our maps for that scale at least, are in inches and miles. This scale translated into the metric lineal scale corresponds to 1 to about 4. 4 million; in other words, it is of a slightly larger scale, giving greater detail than 1 inch to 5 million scale maps.

I would, however, like to confess to a sense of disappointment that we officials, engaged in trying to exchange facts and precise definitions, cannot exchange maps of a larger scale. We have always placed emphasis on this question of having a precise indication of the right border claimed by the other side, because it is obviously important to have details. Our Prime Minister underlined this fact to Premier Chou En-al and we hoped that we could vouchsafe to each other maps which would be more detailed, more precise. for our purposes, to avoid

ambiguities, we think that maps on roughly the scale of 1 to 2 million is the least that would serve as a proper working document. It would have been better if it were one to 1 to 1 million, which is the internationally recognised scale. I make these observations in the hope that it may be possible to exchange maps with greater details, with greater precision. I wonder whether it would be possible for the Chinese side to do so. We consider this point important, but I understand that I cannot insist that you do so. It is only for the facility of our work, for being helpful to our Governments that we think we should exchange maps on scales which are larger than ordinary atlas scale. However, if the Chinese side can provide only a map on slightly larger scale, i. e, 1 inch to 70 miles, which comes to about 1 to 4. 4 million.

Mr. Chang- About the scale of maps and the views which have been expressed by Mr. Mehta, I would like to say, something. In Delhi, the Indian side had mentioned that it hoped that in the meeting of officials, the two sides would exchange maps on a scale more precise than those which we ordinarily find in the market. But as to what the scale should be, no views were expressed. We have seen the latest map published by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs which is also what was shown by Prime Minister Nehru to Premier Chou En-lai. At that time, and later on also, Prime Minister Nehru emphasised that India had a very precise map to show clearly the position of her boundary, and what we saw on this map was that it was of scale 1 to 7 million with some smaller insets of 1 to 4. 5 million. For our side, according to our possibilities, we have this map of 1 to 5 million scale and we have no other map of a great scale available, for the purpose of exchange. Since Mr. Mehta also mentioned that he could agree to our scale, I do not want to comment any more on this matter.

Mr. Mehta – Our Prime Minister was having an overcall general discussion with Premier Chou En-lai and showed him what might be considered a simple map prepared for the illustration of the problem to the general public. But at the official level meetings or for more detailed and precise study of this problem, we believe that larger scale maps should, if possible, be exchanged. 1 to 5 million is an atlas scale and there might be dangers of it not being sufficient for the purpose of avoiding ambiguities. We were, therefore, hoping that when we meet in pursuance of the directive of the communiqué, we could get down to more precise cartographic indication. We are told that the United Nations Cartographic Organisation of which Soviet Union, India, Great Britain and other countries are members, have considered 1 to 1 million as a sort of standard scale for small scale maps. We are dealing with a definite problem and we should have exchanged maps at least on that scale. However, I note that the Chinese Government is not in a position

to provide a map on a larger scale than 1 to 5 million, in which case we will provide a map roughly on the scale of 1 to 4. 4 million.

Mr. Chang-So, Mr. Mehta agrees that on our side we exchange a map on scale 1 to 5 million with Indian side's map roughly on scale 4. 4 million. We believe that such a scale is sufficient to clarify matters because we will also give description. So, for the purpose of explaining the stands of the two sides, we believe that such a scale is sufficient. In future, if there are certain places which either side may feel are not sufficiently clear, we can either clarify it through statements or either side may provide further material to clarify it.

We also proposed investigations on the spot, but the Indian side did not agree to this. This can be considered later.

In order to understand the facts about the boundary and to explain the stands of the two Governments, we feel that there will be no difficulty with the maps exchanged and the exchange of description. But we have taken note of Mr. Mehta's wish that in future if there is opportunity, we can exchange more detailed maps. What we want to make clear now is that at present we have not prepared a map on 1 to 1 million scale and, from our point of view, at present there is no need for such an exchange.

Mr. Mehta-The idea of on the spot (investigations) was rejected in Delhi and falls outside the scope of our present functions. We still believe that the scales do not provide sufficient details, but in the circumstances, we may proceed to exchange maps on these scales. We will, of course, follow the exchange with a definition of the border. Perhaps we can agree that pending any more detailed maps being exchanged, clarifications on any specific points on the alignment can be mutually sought and given.

Mr. Chang-Suppose, we go into the work of the first item, without further discussions on procedure.....

Mr. Mehta- I think this is a part of the work and part of the exchange, because we must try to have as full an idea of the factual basis as possible.

Mr. Chang- So we now exchanged maps and the descriptions. (On Mr. Mehta's suggestion, the Chinese map was signed by Mr. Chang Wen-chin and Mr. Yang Kungsu, and the Indian map was signed by Mr. Mehta and Mr. Gopal).

Maps were exchanged at 4-25 P. M.

Mr. Chang-Shall we have a break for study of the maps now, or after description?

Mr. Mehta- Reading the full description will take a little time. If we can agree, we can provide a description, say of the Western Sector, then you also provide a description of the Western Sector, and so on. That will be convenient for inter-linking the two descriptions.

Mr. Chang- Since we have exchanged maps comprising the entire boundary, suppose we give the descriptions along the entire boundary and then after the descriptions are made, if we want to ask questions or make studies, we may do so by sectors, or along the entire length of the boundary, i. e. we may have certain freedom in doing so.

Mr. Mehta-Would you like to have an adjournment now or after the descriptions?

Mr. Gopal – Our description will take a little time.

Mr. Chang-Suppose we have a break now; after that we will both read out our description of the Indian boundary. Mr. Gopal also said at this stage that at the beginning of the next meeting, he would furnish an extra typescript copy of the description to the Chinese side.).

(Statement read by Mr. Gopal)

INDIA-CHINA BOUNDARY

The India-China boundary starts from the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, China and Afghanistan at approximately Longitude 74° and $34'$ East and Latitude $37^{\circ} 3'$ North and runs eastward through the Kilik Pass (Long. $74^{\circ} 41'$ E and Lat $37^{\circ} 5'$ N), Mintaka Pass (Long. $74^{\circ} 51'$ E and Lat $36^{\circ} 59'$ N), Kharchanai Pass (Long. $75^{\circ} 1'$ E and Lat $36^{\circ} 57'$ N), and the Khunjerab Pass (Long. $75^{\circ} 28'$ E and Lat $36^{\circ} 51'$ N). These passes lie on the watershed between the Hunza river flowing into the Indus system in India and the Qara Chukar river flowing into the Yarkand system in Sinkiang. From the Khunjerab pass the boundary lies along a spur down to the north western bend of the Shaksgam or Muztagh river which it crosses at that point and ascends the crest line of the Aghil mountains. It then runs along the crest of the Aghil watershed through the Aghil Pass

(Long. $76^{\circ} 37'$ E and Lat $36^{\circ} 11'$ N), the Marpo Pass (Long. $77^{\circ} 14'$ E and Lat $35^{\circ} 43'$ N), and the Shaksgam Pass (Long $77^{\circ} 28'$ E and Lat. $35^{\circ} 34'$ N) to the Karakoram Pass (Long $77^{\circ} 50'$ E and Lat. $35^{\circ} 31'$ N)

From the Karakoram Pass the boundary lies along the watershed the Shyok (belonging to the Indus system) and the Yarkand and runs through the Qara tagh pass (Long $78^{\circ} 20'E$ and Lat. $35^{\circ} 43'N$) to cross the eastern bend of the Qara Qash river (north west of Haji Langar) and to ascend the main Kuen Lun Mountains. Thereafter the boundary runs through the Yangi Pass (Long $79^{\circ} 25'E$ and Lat. $35^{\circ} 55' N$) along the crest of the mountains separating the Yurungkash basin from those of the lakes in Aksai Chin. It leaves the main crest of the Kuen Lun mountains at a point approximately Long $80^{\circ} 21'E$ and descends in a south westerly direction, separating the basins of the Amtogor and Sarigh Jilganang lakes in India from those of Lighten and Tsoggar lakes in Tibet, down to Lanak Pass (Long $79^{\circ} 34'E$ and Lat. $34^{\circ} 24'N$)

South of Lanak Pass the boundary passes through the Kone Pass (Long $79^{\circ} 29'E$ and Lat. $34^{\circ} 8' N$) and the Kepsang Pass (Long $79^{\circ} 30'E$ and Lat. $34^{\circ} 8' N$) which lie along the watershed between the Chang Chenmo and Chumesang in India and the streams flowing into the Dyap Tso in Tibet. Thereafter the boundary lies along the southern bank of the Chumesang and the eastern bank of Chang-lung Lungpa, skirts the western extremity of the eastern half of Pangong lake, lies along the watershed between the Ang stream flowing into the western Pangong lake and other streams flowing eastward, cut across the eastern part of Spanggur lake and follows the northern and eastern watershed of the Indus through the Chang Pass (Long $79^{\circ} 33' E$ and Lat. $32^{\circ} 47' N$). A little south of Jara Pass it turns south westward, crosses the Indus about five miles south-east of Demchok, and following the watershed between the Hanle river and the tributaries of the Sutlej river it passes through the Charding Pass (Long $79^{\circ} 24'E$ and Lat. $32^{\circ} 32' N$), The Imis Pass (Long $79^{\circ} 2'E$ and Lat. $32^{\circ} 23'N$), and Kyungzing Pass (Long $78^{\circ} 46'E$ and Lat $32^{\circ} 38'N$). Thereafter it turns westward and crosses the Pare river about five miles south of Chumar to reach Gya Peak (Long $78^{\circ} 24'E$ and Lat. $32^{\circ} 32'N$).

From the Gya Peak the boundary follows the watershed between the Spiti and Pare rivers and crosses the Pare river a mile south of the village of Kaurik. South of the Pare river the boundary ascends one of the spurs leading to the highest peak of Leo Pargial (Long $78^{\circ} 45'E$ and Lat. $31^{\circ} 54'N$), crosses the Sutlej at its bend, and following the Zaskar range it lies through the Shipki Pass (Long $78^{\circ} 44'E$ and Lat. $31^{\circ} 51'N$) the Raniso Pass (Long $78^{\circ} 44'E$ and Lat. $31^{\circ} 29'N$) and the Shimdang Pass (Long $78^{\circ} 44'E$ and Lat. $31^{\circ} 29'N$). Thereafter it follows the main watershed between the Sutlej and the Ganges basins and lies through the Thaga Pass (Long $79^{\circ} 7'E$ and Lat. $31^{\circ} 26'N$), Tsang Chok Pass (Long $79^{\circ} 13'E$ and Lat. $31^{\circ} 20'N$), Muling pass (Long $79^{\circ} 18'E$ and Lat. $31^{\circ} 14'N$), Mana Pass (Long $79^{\circ} 1'E$ and Lat $31^{\circ} 4'N$), Niti Pass (Long

790 52'E and Lat 300 58'N), Tun Jun Pass (Long 790 58'E and Lat. 300 53'N), Kungri Bingri Pass (Long 800 13'E and Lat 300 38'N), Darma Pass and the Lipu Lekh Pass (Long 810 2'E and Lat. 30014'N) to join the tri-junction of the India, Nepal and Tibet boundaries.

East of Nepal the boundary follows the watershed between the Tista river system, and the Yaru Chu and the sources of the Amo Chu in Tibet and crosses the Natu and Jelep Passes. Thereafter it crosses the Amo Chu and, following the watershed between the Amo Chu and Para Chu joins the great Himalayan range at Chomo Lhari and runs east along the crest of that range upto the Mela Pass.

It then crosses the Luhit river a few miles south of Rima and joins the tri-junction of the India, Burma and China boundaries near the Diphu Pass.

M. Chang – Before Director Yang gives our description I would like to say something.

First Point-As we have said before that we are now discussing the Sino-Indian boundary and that is to say as shown in the correspondence and then in the talks between the two Prime Ministers, discussion is round three sectors-Western sector, middle sector and eastern sector. For the Western sector in our discussion in the past we always begun eastward from Karakoram Pass, and the area of dispute which we are discussing also pertains to that part which starts eastward from the Karakoram Pass.

Second Point – Both the joint communiqué and Premier Chou En-lai's statements in Delhi have clearly shown that the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan are not within the scope of our discussions and in the past meetings I have also made it clear that the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan are not within the scope of our discussions. I would like to reiterate this here. Now I would like to ask Mr. Yang to give our description.

Mr. Mehta-Since Mr. Chang has made these two points, I might comment briefly on them straightaway (i) We are providing here a description of the border where we consider India touches India. In our description we must provide an exact and accurate description as seen by us. The description is over the entire length of this border not just a point where there is or where we think there might be a dispute. This is essentially a matter of what India considers to be her own border with China we must have full discretion to explain our alignment. We must avoid touching here important and serious political problems which are

unrelated to the question which we are here considering. We have provided a description of what we considers to be her own border between India and China. The Chinese side will now provide the description of the common border as seen by them. Any points of doubt can be clarified subsequently. (ii) Regarding Sikkim and Bhutan I have also on behalf of the Government of India made our position repeatedly clear in the earlier meetings. We consider their border with the Tibet region of China is a matter for India to represent about and have therefore provided the appropriate description. We would now like to hear the description of the Sino-Indian border as seen by China.

Mr. Chang- I would like to say a few words. Ours is a matter of fact attitude of making a study and check of the various documents. Our work proceeds from the points agreed by our two Prime Ministers as shown in the communiqué. I do not know whether according to what Mr. Mehta has just said that Mr. Mehta plans in the future in discussing the materials still according to his stand bringing forward the question of the border west of the Karakoram pass and the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan. As for the border west of the Karakoram Pass in the past correspondence, in the note of the Indian Government itself of November 4th and also in Dr. Gopal's account of the western sector in Delhi, I remember clearly that he began his account beginning from the part east from the Karakoram Pass. So here it is necessary for both sides to adopt a matter of fact attitude and avoid serious political questions unrelated to our work. About Bhutan and Sikkim it is clear that our task as defined in the joint communiqué agreed upon by our two Prime Ministers they are not within the scope of our discussions. As for the question of the stand of the Indian Government Mr. Mehta has already mentioned it. Before Mr. Mehta also said that we should not get involved with political questions unretrary to what Mr. Mehta himself agreed to before. If we take such an attitude it would be very difficult to proceed with our work. Because the result would be involving various political questions which are not concerned with our work. Of course we can respect each other's stand but we must adopt a matter of fact attitude otherwise many difficulties will be created in our work and this Mr. Mehta can also see clearly.

On these points I hope Mr. Mehta will give some clarifications because otherwise it will be difficult to go on with our work whereas Mr. Mehta intends to bring up continuously these two questions in future.

I would like to repeat on this point what Mr. Mehta said himself that is this is a question of stand of the two sides. Both of us know what the stand of the other side is. Here at the official level neither side would want to influence the stand of the other. We are only engaging in a matter of fact discussion of questions.

Mr. Mehta- As I said a moment ago we have provided a description of the border of India consistent with our stand. It is purely a matter of fact description of what we consider to be India's border with China. As has explained by the Prime Minister and repeated by me we have a certain stand, certain understanding in respect of the position of Bhutan and Sikkim. Indeed the state of Bhutan has asked us to draw attention to certain discrepancies. The border description which we have provided is consistent with our stand. As I have explained once before the joint communiqué in its first paragraph the two Prime Ministers met to discuss "certain differences relating to the border areas which have arise between the Government of India and the Government of the People's Republic of China". I explained that this does not conform with their understanding that if there are any points of dispute with regard to problems relating to Bhutan and Sikkim they are to be excluded. The description given is consistent with India's stand.

Both these points which have been raised by Mr. Chang touch political questions. Our view point is known and has been stated. The description given in Delhi or in the notes was referring to the dispute in the Ladakh area but here when we are covering the entire border we have to give a complete description. But we agree we must proceed in a matter of fact way and as I myself just said we are anxious to do so.

Mr. Chang- I would like to say some more words.

First Point – About division into sectors-I recall in the past two meetings Mr. Mehta particularly emphasised that there is no agreement which is more clear between the two countries than the question of dividing of our boundary into these three sectors. Just I have said before, in its November 4th note of the Indian Government and Dr. Gopal's account this division into three sectors was agreed to according to this manner and also in the fifth meeting of Prime Minister Nehru and Premier Chou En-lai the western sector was described as proceeding eastward from the Karakoram Pass so the conception by both sides of the western sector is very precise. If now you want to change such a definition we will only be going back to procedural questions and is not in conformity with the exchanges by the two sides in the past

Second point – About borders of Bhutan and Sikkim. I entirely agree with Mr. Mehta that we must proceed from what was agreed upon by the two Prime Ministers and strictly confine ourselves to the scope defined by the two Prime Ministers for the two official teams. At the 7th meeting of the two Prime Ministers on April 25th i. e., the meeting in which the joint communiqué was drafted Premier Chou En- lai mentioned that the borders of Bhutan and Sikkim with China is not in

the scope of our discussions. So it is very clear regardless of the stand of the Indian side, this question has not agreed to by the two Prime Ministers and therefore is not in the scope of our discussions. Mr. Mehta said that he adopts a matter of fact attitude and proceeds from the stand of his own government. Now then I cannot but ask the question whether he intends to, in our future examination of materials also, to proceed from such a stand point and raise again these two questions. If so then it would be very difficult for us to proceed with our work. I repeat we do not wish to impair or to disregard the Indian stand. Both of us have stated that we would respect the stand of the other but we must proceed from what has been agreed to by the two Prime Minister and of course we can each maintain our own stand; we will not try to influence the stand of the other side. If we proceed in such a way then our work can proceed in an easy way.

I have specific suggestions to make concerning this matter. In order to bring about a smooth progress of our work I suggest that Mr. Yang will first give our description and then we adjourn our meeting today and as for these two questions we can have some informal exchanges to see how we can find a matter of fact attitude dealing with it.

Mr. Mehta-Yes, we have both explained our positions on these two points. I agree that we proceed by Mr. Yang giving description of the Sino-Indian border as seen by China. If there is anything further to be stated on these points-we may do so either informally or subsequent meeting.

(Mr. Yang then read out the following statement)

DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCATION AND TERRAIN FEATURES OF THE TRADITIONAL CUSTOMARY SINO-INDIAN BOUNDARY LINE

The Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited and there is only a traditional customary boundary line between the two countries. The location and terrain features of this boundary line in its various sectors are as follows:

The western sector –This sector of the boundary is divided into two portions, with Kongka Pass as the dividing point. The portion north of Kongka Pass is the boundary between Sinkiang and Ladakh, and the portion south of it is that between Tibet and Ladakh.

The Portion between Sinkiang and Ladakh is a part of the entire boundary between Sinkiang and Kashmir and bears the general natural features of the latter which for its entire length runs along the

Karakoram Mountain range, following broadly the watershed between two big river systems-that of the Tarim River of Sinkiang and the Indus River which flows to Kashmir. The location of the portion between Sinkiang and Ladakh is as follows-From the Karakoram pass it runs eastward along the mountain ridge to a point east of 78 degrees East Longitude, turns south-eastward along the high ridge of the Karakoram Mountains on the east bank of the Shyok River and northern bank of the Kugrang Tsangpo River down to Kongka Pass.

The terrain features of the portion between Tibet and Ladakh are complicated. They include mountain passes, river valleys, lakes and watersheds. Its location is as follows-South of Kongka Pass, it runs along the ridge passing through Ane Pass, cuts across the western half of Pangong Tso, skirts the western side of the Spanggur Tso upto Mount Sajum, crosses the Shangatsangpu (Indus) River at 33 degrees north Latitude, runs along the watershed east of the Koyul Lungpa River and South of the hanle River up to Mount Shinowu and then runs westward to reach the tri-junction of China's Ari district and India's Punjab and Ladakh.

The middle sector-This sector of the boundary also has the natural features of watersheds, mountain passes and river valleys. Its location is as follows-Starting from the terminal point of the western sector, it runs southward along the watershed west of the Pare river and the Spiti River, crosses the Siangchuan (Sutlej) River west of Shipki Pass, continues southward along the watershed and crosses the Jadhganga River west of Tsungsha. It then turns east, passes through Mana Pass, Mount kamet, skirts along the south side of Wuje, Sangcha and Lapthal, again runs along the watershed passing through Darma Pass and reaches the tri-junction of China, India and Nepal.

The eastern sector- The terrain features of this sector are comparatively simple. The greatest part of it-the portion from the south-eastern tip of Bhutan eastward to a point west of 94 degrees East Longitude and then north-eastward to Nizamghat-follows all along the line northern bank of the Brahmaputra River. This portion of the line crosses the Subansiri River south of Bini and the Tsangpo (Brahmaputra) River in the vicinity of Pasighat. From Nizamghat onwards, the line turns south-eastward and enters mountainous terrain passing through Painlon Pass, following the valley of the lower reaches of the Tsayul River and reaching the tri-junction of China, India and Burma.

The present line of actual control between the two sides is to a certain extent different from the above described traditional customary line. In the western sector, the Parigas district which is on the Chinese side of the traditional customary line has been occupied by India in recent

years. In the middle sector, eight places-Chuva, Chuje, Shipki Pass, Sang, Tsungsha, Puling-Sumdo, Sangcha and Lapthal, which are on the Chinese

Side of the traditional customary line are also at present under Indian occupation. In the eastern sector, the entire area north of the traditional customary line up to the so called McMahon line is now under Indian occupation.

Mr. Chang- I suggest for the sake of convenience and study and Dr. Gopal has also made a very good suggestion of exchanging the written texts so that we can study better –I suggest that in order that we have full time to study we may exchange texts of these statements-may be tonight it is late-early tomorrow morning-Two copies-you will give us English version, we will give both-Chinese and English translation.

PEKING

(Third week of July)

Mr. Mehta- May I offer a brief comment on Director Chang's statement made at the conclusion of the last meeting and, if there are no further points, round off consideration of Item One. The questions and replies exchanged have been useful and clarified to a certain extent our obscurities. Earlier, based on the description we had thought that, according to the Chinese alignment, Wuje, Lapthal and Sangchmala were separate pockets of divergence of our two alignments, but it was only after the last meeting that we realised that they formed one composite unit.

I regret the length of my last statement but it was necessary to explain what I wished to convey. The organic coherence of the line of argument and its relevance to the geographical aspects of the alignments which were the subject of this item would become apparent from its perusal. while I have tried to explain the basic importance of the geographical aspect in determining traditional boundaries, I did not imply or suggest that the historical evidence was unimportant. The historical aspects, as Director Chang has said, will come up for discussions under subsequent items. In fact we feel, and will later try to demonstrate, how the historical evidence confirms the geographical principles evidence in our alignment rather than negate it. The purpose of my statement was to seek elucidation on some important segments of the Chinese alignment where it departed from the Indian alignment as well as the watershed.

Generally speaking, boundary agreements are only a feature of the history of nations since the 17th century when countries started coming in closer contacts. Traditional boundaries, we are agreed, hark back to a

much earlier period. The validity and legitimacy of the watershed principle in determining boundaries is not a feature only of British viewpoint but can be recognised in frontiers all over the world. India does not seek to make any convenient or free interpretation of the watershed principle and at least in the middle sector both sides have referred to and seemed to be clear where the watershed lies. Moreover, we have not suggested that since some rivers arising in the Tibetan plateau which break through the watershed into the Indian subcontinent, therefore the watershed lies halfway across in Tibet. It may be true that geographical features in the alignment of eastern sector as claimed by China bear similarity to the southern boundaries of Bhutan and Nepal, but the point of reference was that these features are significantly different from the relevant features of China's boundaries with other sectors common to India and other States astride the Himalayan mountain barrier. I repeat we had legitimately sought elucidation on some topographical aspects of the Chinese alignment and, in fact, this was in accordance with an earlier Chinese promise. While regretting the lack of further elucidation than could be provided, we have noted the Chinese reply.

Mr. Chang-Mr. Mehta's statement is basically the same in content as that of the last meeting. I have already made a brief clarification of our stand at the last meeting and I particularly mentioned that the reference to various principles for determining a boundary is irrelevant to Item One. But since both of us are agreed to go on to Item Two, I will not, besides reiterating what I had said last time, make further statement today. I believe that there will be due opportunity in the future for me to make a statement because, I believe, the items will have co-relation with one another. So, I will make the statement at a future date.

Mr. Mehta – We have no rigidity about statements. We were, according to our understanding, concentrating on what would be comprehended under Item One. Naturally, we are only in the middle of our work and we have to discuss other items. If there is nothing further to discuss on Item One, we may proceed to Item Two. As far as we are concerned, the relevance of geographical principles to Item One has been explained at the last meeting in our statements.

Mr. Mehta- I would now request Dr. Gopal to start on Item Two.

Mr. Gopal- I would like to start Item Two of the agenda with a short statement regarding the area west of the Karakoram Pass where the Indian and Chinese alignments diverge. The Indian alignment in this segment is in accordance with geographical principles, tradition and custom and the area has always been under Indian jurisdiction. Both the upper valley of the Khunjerab river and the upper valley of Shaksgam

river lying south of the Aghil mountains have always been a part of Hunza in India. The people of Hunza have exercised various rights including agricultural cultivation and pasture and grazing rights in this area. The Shimshalis in particular used the entire area up to the Shaksgam for grazing and extracted salt at various places in the valley. On the other hand, no one from China ever used this area. The Mirs of Hunza exercised authority in this region, maintained posts and collected revenue. The official maps of the Government of India, including the one attached to the 1907 edition of the Imperial Gazetteer of India and the political maps published by the Survey of India showed this area in Indian territory. Official Chinese maps published in 1917, 1919 and 1923 also showed this area as a part of India.

I will now go on the western sector east of the Karakoram Pass. The first document I am presenting this afternoon is an extract from an old Ladakhi chronicle as proof that the Indian alignment in the western sector is a traditional one. We have already dealt with the location and natural features of the Sino-Indian boundary and shown, among other things, that it has come to coincide with a geographical principle. This natural boundary of India in western sector as in other sectors, is also in traditional and customary boundary which has been well recognised for centuries by both sides. According to international usage and practice, a traditional and customary boundary which follows well known and unchanging natural features requires no further or formal definition. But in fact this traditional and customary boundary has secured the additional confirmation of treaties and agreements. I will now deal with the historical evidence showing that throughout the ages the boundary of Ladakh with Sinkiang and Tibet has been where we are now showing it and is therefore a traditional one.

At first Ladakh was an independent state comprising a large part of western Tibet, but later, towards the end of the tenth century A. D. it was divested of most of its Tibetan possessions by a family partition. Even then in the tenth century, the traditional boundary of Ladakh with Tibet was well known and recognised by tradition. There is manifold proof of this. A Chronicle of Ladakh compiled in the 17th century and called –I will spell this LA-DVAGS-RGYAL-RABS, meaning the Royal Chronicle of the Kings of Ladakh, records that this boundary was traditional and well known. The first part of the chronicle was written in the years 1610-1640; and the second half towards the end of the 17th century. I would like to table extracts from this chronicle. References to page I am giving are from the English translation by A. H. Francke and published as a part of volume 2 of "ANTIQUITIES OF INDIAN TIBET", published in Calcutta in 1926. The Ladakh chronicle describes the partition by King Skyid-Ida-ngeema-gon of his kingdom between his three sons, and then the chronicle describes the extent of territory

secured by that son who was given Ladakh. I am quoting from page 94 of this book. The following is the quotation:

"He gave to each of these three sons a separate kingdom viz., to the eldest, Dpal-gyi-ngon, Maryul of Mnah-ris, the inhabitants using black bows, Ru-thogs of the east and the gold Mine of the Hgog; nearer this way Lde-mchog-dkar-po at the frontier Ra-ba-dmar-po; Wam-le to the top of the pass of the Yi-mig rock..... "

(Mr. Gopal again read out the full extract). Now, Maryul, meaning lowlands, was the name given to Ladakh. Even at that time i. e. in the 10th century, the boundary of Ladakh was therefore known to lie –apart from Rudok which at that time belonged to Ladakh-at Lde-mchog-dkar-po, i. e. Demchok; and at the top of the pass of the Yimig rock, i. e. at the limis pass; and Wamle, i. e. Hanle, was known to be within Ladakh. The present Indian alignment runs past Demchok and through the Imis pass to include Hanle in India. So even in the tenth century the boundary alignment of Ladakh was, in this sector, where it is now.

In the later part, i. e., the second half of this same Ladakh Chronicle, there is a reference to the war that took place at the time (1681 to 1683) when this part of the chronicle was being written, when a mixed force of Mongols and Tibetans invaded Ladakh. This force was driven out by the Ladakhis with the assistance of the Mogul Governor of Kashmir, Ladakh in 1664 having become a part of the Mogul empire. The Ladakhi Chronicle states- I am quoting from page 116-that after the war Ladakh Tibet again decided that "the boundary shall be fixed at the Lha-ri stream at Bdemchog". Bde-mchog is clearly Demchok and this quotation shows that in the 17th century, as in the tenth century 700 years earlier, the traditional boundary of Ladakh continued to lie east of Demchok.

Mr. Mehta- I just wanted to know whether it is proposed that documents or photostat copies of documents are to be exchanged or are they to be shown in original and not be given for study.

Mr. Chang-They must just be shown.

Mr. Gopal- Now we are coming to rarer documents. If the Chinese side prefers the system of exchange of photostats.

Mr. Chang-Suppose we do like this. If the quotations are short, we can quote them orally. If they are longer then we may exchange typed copies to start with. But we will discuss what method we will adopt in varying situations because to prepare photostats may require some time.

Mr. Gopal-Extracts are quite convenient for documents; but what about maps?

Mr. Chang-For maps we have either photostats or originals.

Mr. Gopal- Let it be decided now.

Mr. Mehta-I take it that it is agreed that wherever possible, considering the nature of the documents, photostats will be exchanged; that would provide us time to study them, which of course cannot be done immediately. We do not want to complicate this business any more than is necessary. I think perhaps we might leave it now by saying that if the receiving side which is to study the document desires to have a Photostat copy, then the furnishing side should be agreeable to provide it.

Mr. Chang-In principle we have no objection to this, but in some specific cases, as Mr. Gopal has mentioned some books, if we want Photostat of the entire book, it may be difficult. In such cases, only the relevant portions may be given.

Mr. Mehta-of course, in the case of published material, this may not always be necessary, but even where photostats are considered necessary obviously we must limit it to the relevant portions.

Mr. Gopal-What about maps?

Mr. Mehta-In the case of maps, it will be necessary to exchange photostats. (The Chinese side agreed)

Mr. Gopal – Shall I continue?

Mr. Chang – Yes

Mr. Gopal – Further evidence of the traditional Indian alignment in this sector is provided by the travellers who visited this area and recorded their experience. Ippolito Desideri, a Jesuit priest, travelled from Leh to Lhasa in the years 1715-16. In his diary (translated into English as "An Account of Tibet") Desideri wrote-I am quoting from Page 81 of this book-

"On the seventh of September we arrived at Trescij-Khang, or "Abode of Mirth", a town on the frontier between Second and Third Tibet, defended by strong walls and a deep ditch with drawbridges".

Second Tibet is Ladakh and Third Tibet is Tibet proper and the town on the frontier is Trescij-Khang, i. e. Tashigong. If therefore the frontier lay at Tashigong, that means that the traditional boundary between Ladakh

and Tibet in 1715 when Desideri went there, was in accordance with the present Indian alignment and Demchok was a part of Ladakh.

Another traveller who visited this area in the early 19th century, James Baillie Fraser, published his account in 1820. His book is called Journal of a Tour through part of the snowy range of the Himala Mountains and to the sources of the rivers Jamna and Ganges. Describing his route from Leh, Fraser states that on the 11th day after setting out from Oopshée, a town of Ladakh, he arrived at "Donzog, thus far in Ladakh"; then he states that on the 12th day he reached "Tuzheegong (A Chinese fort)". In other words according to Fraser, Donzog, i. e. Demchok, was on the frontier of Ladakh, while Tashigong was in China. These references are on page 309 of the book.

About thirty years later, in 1846, Alexander Cunningham, an official of the East India Company, visited the area, in 1854 and published a book on Ladakh. This book called Ladakh, I might add, has been referred to with approval by Premier Chou En-lai himself in his letter of 8th September 1959. Cunningham wrote of the boundary between Ladakh and Tibet-I am quoting from page 261-

"With Rudok on the east there has been a long peace. The boundary is well defined by piles of stones which were set up after the last expulsion of the Sokpo, or Mongol hordes in A. D. 1687, when the Ladakhis received considerable assistance from Kashmir".

Cunningham also specially mentions the Demchok region and states-this is a quotation from pages 328-329, the first two lines are from page 328 and the last two lines from page 329-

"A large stone was then (after the expulsion of the Mongols) set up as a permanent boundary between the two countries, the line of demarcation being drawn from the village of Dechhog to the hill of Karbonas".

Dechhog is Demchok.

That this boundary between Ladakh and Tibet was a traditional boundary, well known for centuries, is proved not only by evidence from the Indian side, but also by Chinese evidence. For instance, when in 1846 the British authorities in their correspondence with the Chinese Government referred to the boundary between Ladakh and Tibet, the Chinese Imperial Commissioner at Canton replied on 20th January 1847- I am quoting from the Imperial Commissioner's reply-

"In regard to your question whether this matter has been reported to the Emperor, I beg to remark that you the Honourable Envoy in your

former correspondence referred to the distinct settlement of the boundaries and the wish of English merchants to trade with Tibet. Since however that territory had its ancient frontier, it was needless to establish any other".

In other words, even the Chinese Government agreed that the frontier between Ladakh and Tibet was an "ancient frontier", well-known for centuries, that it was a traditional frontier beyond dispute ; and this traditional frontier, as I have already brought forward further evidence, was in accordance with the present Indian alignment.

In other words, even the Chinese Government agreed that the frontier between Ladakh and Tibet was an "ancient frontier", well-known for centuries, that it was a traditional frontier beyond dispute; and this traditional frontier, as I have already brought forward further evidence, was in accordance with the present Indian alignment.

Some other travellers, apart from the ones I have already mentioned, also crossed the boundary between Ladakh and Tibet and their accounts and evidence substantiate the present Indian alignment. Nain Singh, an Indian traveller, went on a journey from Leh to Lhasa in 1873. His account was published in the journal of the Royal Geographical Society in 1877 – and I am quoting from page 89-

"At Niagzu Rawang is the boundary between Tibet and Ladakh; the right bank of the stream belongs to the latter and the left bank to the former.
"

This description by Nain Singh corroborates the Indian alignment in the Chumesang-Changlung area. Niagzu is a camping ground which is within the Indian frontier-coordinates $78^{\circ} 56' E$ $34^{\circ} N$ -and when Nain Singh in 1873 says the boundary lies along Niagzu stream, he is giving a description in accordance with the Indian alignment. This statement of Nain Singh that Niagzu lay on the boundary is confirmed by Wellby, another traveller, who visited the area towards the end of the 19th century and published in 1898 a record of this journey. This book is called Through Unknown Tibet and confirmation about the alignment at Niagzu is on page 57 of the book. Though Wellby's book is a well known published one, I have a Photostat here of a diagram in the book showing that Niagzu is located on the border, which the Chinese side may like to see.

(Mr. Gopal handed over a photostat copy of the diagram to the Chinese side who returned it after perusal.)

There is also such evidence of the traditional alignment further north. That the boundary lay along the Lanak Pass at the top of the Chang

Chenmo valley is testified to by several travellers, Carey who travelled through this region during the year 1885-87 and published an account in the Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society for 1887, has stated-I am quoting from page 732 of the Proceedings –that he engaged yaks from the pahgong villages to carry his baggage “as far as the frontier between Ladakh and Rudokh, at the head of the Chang Chenmo Valley”. Later, in another detailed account – a day to day account-published by him in the supplementary Papers of the Royal Geographical Society for 1890 he refers to the crossing by him of the Lanak Pass – I am quoting from page 18 of the supplementary Papers-

August 21 1885. Gentle ascent to head of Lanak-la pass. From top to pass slight descent into valley with wood, water and a little grass. At 5th mile a grassy swamp crossed. Good camping lies in independent Tibet”.

That is detailed evidence that the frontier lay at Lanak Pass - at the top of Lanak Pass.

My statement this afternoon, I am afraid, will be a long one. We from our side, therefore, suggest an adjournment at this stage.

(The Chinese side agreed to have an adjournment.)
(Adjourned from 4. 45 p. m to 5. 15 p. m.)

Bower, who also travelled through the Chang Chenmo area in 1891, has stated in his account published in the Geographical Journal of May 1893 (Page 386) that he “crossed the frontier” at Lanak La. Wellby, whose book Through Unknown Tibet I have already referred to describing his travels in the Chang Chenmo region, refers on page 73 to “the frontier pass called Lanak La”. Later, Deasy, who travelled extensively in the Aksai Chin area, in his account of his Journeys in Central Asia published in the Journal of the Geographical Society issue of July to December, 1900 refers to Lanak Pass and says on page 142-“It was decided to halt for a day at Lanak Pass before entering to us the unknown land of Tibet”. He repeats the statement that the frontier was crossed at Lanak La in this book published in 1901 and called, In Tibet and Chinese Turkestan -Being the Record of Three Years Exploration.

This massive and varied evidence shows that the traditional boundary between Ladakh and Tibet lay at least for over a thousand years where the Indian alignment is now showing it. Even in the tenth century, this boundary was recognised and for the next 900 years, there is, as I have shown, considerable proof that the boundary lay along Lanak La along the Niagzu stream, between Demchok and Tashigong and through the Imis Pass.

Evidence for the traditional basis of the Indian alignment in the Western Sector is also provided by unofficial maps; I say official maps because I am not at this stage dealing with official Chinese and Indian maps-that will come later under the item "Administration and jurisdiction"- I am here dealing with maps published by private agencies. These unofficial maps published in China, in India and in other countries show the boundaries of Ladakh with Sinkiang and Tibet in accordance with the present Indian alignment.

The first map I would like to submit and I have here a photostat copy for the use of the Chinese side-is the oldest Chinese map available of this region. This map which was drawn towards the end of the sixth century A. D., shows clearly that the Kuen Lun mountains are marked as well as Khotan and Kashgar.

(Photostat handed over by Mr. Gopal to Mr. Chang)

Mr. Chang-(intervening) Allow me to interrupt for a moment. All the maps referred to by Mr. Gopal-attached in books-can we have also the name of the books and the pages on which the maps appear; they may be furnished to us now or later.

Mr. Gopal-These maps are not from books. They are photostats taken from original collections which are in various libraries in the world. The first two maps submitted are photostats from a library in Berlin.

Mr. Chang-But from this photostat it appears it came from a book, cut from it. It is very clear that it is from a book. May be the library may not have the book.

Mr. Gopal-The library has original Chinese maps of which these are photostats. I can assure Mr. Chang that this is not a photostat from a second-hand authority.

Mr. Chang-Allow me to add a word here. The Chinese old books according to custom, have both maps and descriptions, that came from it would help us to make a further check and study and also look up relevant material. It is also important to know the edition, because there may be many editions put out in various years. And so it would help us if we can also know the edition of book and thereby the true author of the book.

Mr. Gopal-Certainly. When maps are from books Chinese or non-Chinese, I shall certainly give the references. These two maps, I may add, are not from books; they are photostats of the originals which are

in the Herrmann collection in the Berlin Library. That may help in identification.

The third map is from the Chinese work, Chin-ting huang-yu- hasi-yu tu-chih, which I believe in translation in Annals and Maps of the Western Territories of the Empire. This was published in 1762 and has a number of maps of this area all of which show that Sinkiang did not extend even up to where the Indian alignment is now being shown, that is, along the Kuen Lun mountains. I will quote and submit one photostat out of the various maps in this book on page number. This photostat is a copy of the map in this book on page 42(b). This map states clearly where the boundary of what it calls Hindustan is. The boundary of Hindustan, according to this map of 1762, lay at Sanjutagh. Sanju Pass is nearly sixty miles north of the Qara Tagh Pass and the Kuen Lun mountains.

The next map is from the Chin-ting hsin-chiang chih-lueh an account of Sinkiang published by a commission set up by the scholars and officials of Peking in 1821. Book of this work contains number of maps of Sinkiang. I will for our purpose quote only one map, that on page 4(b). The photostat I am submitting is that of the map on page 4(b) of book 3 of this Chinese work of 1821. This map shows clearly that by the Tsung-ling mountains, which form the boundary of Sinkiang, are meant the Kuen Lun mountain system. It is written twice on the map showing that all along the south, the boundary lay along the Kuen Lun ranges, on the map. The Yurung Kash and the Qara Qash rivers are shown as cutting through the Kuen Lun mountains. In fact, as you know, the Yurung Kash rises in the Kuen Lun mountains. But at the time (1821) even the source of the Yurung Kash was not in Sinkiang. So the boundary presumably lay north of the present Indian alignment which lies along the main Kuen Lun range south of the source of the Yurung Kash river.

(Photostat of the map handed over by Dr. Gopal to Director Chang)

The next map is from the His-yu- shui- tao-chi which I am told is translated as Remarks on the rivers of the Western Countries. Now this book was written by Hsu Hsing-po, a geographical of ill, and this book was published in 1824. In this book, there is a map in eight sheets of this area. I am referring to and supplying a Photostat of only sheet 7 which shows the southern limits of the Yarkand- Khotan region. This limit is said to be the "southern mountains", Nanshan. These "southern mountains" seem, in fact to be one of the northern ranges of the Kuen Lun mountains, for both the Yurung Kash and the Qara Qash rivers are shown as cutting through the mountains.

(Photostat of the map handed over by Dr. Gopal to Director Chang)

The next unofficial Chinese map I would like to bring forward is the map published by the Peking University in November 1925 and showing the maximum extent of China under the Ch'ing dynasty, that is before 1911. It will be seen from this map that even in the days of its maximum expansion before 1911, China did not include the Aksai Chin area. The map I am supplying is one that has already been published in the Atlas brought out by the Government of India and the reference at the top right hand corner is to that Atlas.

(Photostat handed over by Dr. Gopal to Director Chang)

I would now like to submit three maps published by well informed private agencies in China in the twentieth century:
The first map is the map of the Tibet in the Atlas of the Chinese Empire published in 1908. It shows the Indian boundary in the Western Sector more or less in consonance with the traditional Indian alignment.

(Photostat handed over to Director Chang by Dr. Gopal)

The next map is from the Chinese Atlas, Ta Chiang Ti Kuo Chuan Tu-the Atlas of the Chinese Empire published on 15 June 1908 by the Commercial Press Limited, Shanghai. Map 25 in this Atlas shows the Sino-Indian boundary. The alignment is shown by a thick line, but even so it is sufficiently precise to show, for example, that like present Indian alignment it cuts the Pangong Lake at the western extremity of the eastern half and also that the Chang Chenmo Valley is included in India.

(Photostat handed over to Director Chang by Dr. Gopal)

The next map is that of Western Tibet in the New Atlas and Commercial Gazetteer of China published in Shanghai some time after authoritative official surveys. The introduction to the Atlas states that it was produced by the Far Eastern Geographical Establishment with the purpose of giving "maps as nearly perfect as is admitted " by the data available. This Atlas therefore, cannot be brushed aside as the publication of a British owned paper and representing the British view rather than the Chinese view. The Atlas is based on generally accepted views which had been carefully ascertained and reflects the traditional nature of the boundary alignment. This is further proved by the fact that though the Atlas was nominally an unofficial one, it was generally utilised for over forty years as the standard atlas of China and was a scientific and objective as was possible in 1917. In this Atlas in the map of Tibet, the northern and eastern boundaries of Ladakh are shown more or less similar to the present Indian alignment.

(Photostat handed over to Director Yang by Dr. Gopal)

Apart from Chinese maps there is evidence also in maps published in other countries that the traditional boundary in the western sector lay where the Indian maps at present showing it. In 1876, John Arrowsmith drew a map of Central Asia which he said he had constructed from the latest information with additions and corrections to 1876. In other words, he had taken the trouble to study the problem carefully to incorporate up-to-date information with information as well as the historic position. In this map of Arrowsmith, the boundary from the Muztagh Pass in the north west right down to the Hanle region in the south east is shown more or less in accordance with the present Indian alignment.

(Photostat handed over to Director Chang by Dr. Gopal.)

The next map is a German map, a map of Central Asia (that is Central Asia) compiled from the latest sources by Dr. Joseph Chavanne and published in Leipzig in 1880. This

Map shows an alignment which approximates very closely to the traditional boundary in this sector. For easier identification, I have put black arrows on the photostat pointing out the alignment.

(Photostat of the map handed over to Director Chang by Dr. Gopal)

The next is a map published in the March 1912 issue of the Geographical Journal which is the official publication of the Royal Geographical Society. This map was designated to show what are called the "Chinese Frontiers of India". It shows a boundary which approximates closely to the traditional alignment. This is a map published by a leading scientific society with an established reputation for cartographic accuracy and it is a map meant specially to show the Northern Frontiers of India.

(Photostat handed over to Director Chang by Dr. Gopal)

The same Society, four year later, in September 1916 published another map showing the traditional northern boundary of India. As this is on a small scale, we have, for easier identification of the boundary alignment, enlarged it in the photostat.

(Photostat of the map handed over to Director Chang by Dr. Gopal)

The varied evidence that has been led this afternoon-contemporary chronicles, Chinese references, reports of men who visited the area, unofficial maps published in China as well as in other countries-all go to show that the Indian alignment in the Western Sector is a traditional, boundary well-known and recognised for thousands of years.

This is one group of documents dealing with the Western Sector. Before opening on the next group, I suggest that we might adjourn.

Mr. Mehta-Today since we have the evening's engagement, and having completed one group of evidence, it will not be worthwhile starting work on another subject.

Mr. Chang-Is it Mr. Mehta's view that we adjourn now today and when will Dr. Gopal raise the other group of documents?

Mr. Mehta-Next time, if the Chinese side find it possible, they may bring their positive evidence. I was wondering whether you would like to allow some time to consider the rapporteurs' report.

Mr. Chang- Of course we are agreeable to raising our evidences at the next meeting but we are first thinking that if Dr. Gopal could raise his other groups of evidence also in Peking, then it might facilitate our work speedily in Delhi because in that way we both could present the basic material of the two sides. We can use the time between the two meetings to make some separate studies.

Mr. Mehta-The other evidence (under item 2) along with the necessary explanation etc., would be far too much to be completed, I am afraid, before Monday. Will the Chinese side be able to complete their evidence on the Western Sector in one day?

Mr. Chang-That is what we are saying, and we have been thinking we may also raise some evidence on other sector also.

Well our Director Yang is preparing the way of submitting evidences, so I am not sure of the method. But generally speaking, our method is probably somewhat different in presentation of the evidences, but we are thinking of presenting the main evidences. We are concentrating more on the main evidences. As for the details of the specific evidences, we will supplement them may be later on in Delhi. We are very grateful to Dr. Gopal for putting forward so many evidences. We will surely study them. We think some of them are rather but some others we think could have been submitted later on. But, anyway we have no intention to object to the way the Indian side is presenting the documents. Our method of presentation may be a little different.

We are thinking that we will make the general presentation of main evidences, all the three sectors, in Peking. Of course, we will not be able to Prime Ministers directives, to examine and study these things, these evidences in Peking, but we can make use of the interval between the two meetings in Peking and Delhi to do this work, and then when we go

to Delhi, we may make supplements to these main evidences which he will submit. Of course, this is only our point of view. But we hope that it would be good if we can also exchange some evidences on the other sectors, it is for the side presenting the evidence to decide. But we might also consider that in order to save time may be we can hand over in writing some of those evidence to decide. But we might also consider that in order to save time may be we can hand over in writing some of those evidences so that we can save time in reading and translating it later. This is only a suggestion.

Mr. Mehta-Well we would certainly like to do as much as possible before we leave Peking and if there is any time left over, we will try to submit further group of evidence. But I understand there is quite considerable more evidence on the Western Sector. We have tried to group it according to tradition, custom, agreements etc. and it would be difficult for us as you can imagine, to switch from one sector to another sector, but we could bring up the next subject on which we have been thinking of furnishing further evidence. We will also of course study your evidence once you have produced it in between Friday and Monday. I dare say you may wish to comment on some of our documents at the beginning of the next meeting. I would also like if possible, to have the rapporteurs bring their work up-to-date or at least finish Item one-now that we have finished Item one –and there may be other small points before we wind up in Peking.

So we are in principle agreeable to push across as much documentary evidences as possible, but it will not be possible by any means to cover the rest of the evidence even on the Western Sector.

As for the Chinese side wanting to present their evidence in a different pattern, well that is up to the Chinese side. We have tried to sift the material and group it under convenient headings which we think, makes it easier for presentation, and I think might be easier also for your study. We have today presented about thirty documents under this head of tradition and this forms a convenient group of evidence.

It is rather difficult for me to discuss what would be the appropriate procedure. While I have some idea how we have grouped our documents, we have no idea of the pattern which the Chinese side has in mind and intends to follow, I suggest, as agreed last time, that at the next meeting the Chinese side first of all comment if they so wish, on our evidence and then present evidence in whatever way they may have planned. I might add that we have certainly planned to present the evidence sector-wise, one sector and then the next sector and then the third sector and so on, leaving any overall presentation till the end.

Mr. Chang-We agree to such an understanding, each side will present their documents according to their own pattern because we think each of us have so many documents to present and we have all thought of an order in which to present them and if you want to break up this already planned order and make a new one, it will present difficulties for both sides; so we think this way it would be better. But of course in the process of our work, if in considering the documents presented by the other side or the requirements of its own side that side may make some changes in the order of its presentation according to its own desire. So we still agree to what we have agreed to last time, that is we will submit our documents and if necessary will make comments.

Mr. Mehta-I had the impression that when we were discussing Item two and the order (of presentation of documents) we stated that we must complete this and Item one for the entire boundary by proceeding sector-wise. Also we are anxious that in the process of our official exchanges, we should produce documents and information to supplement what is already in the official exchanges-in the Notes which have been exchanged by the Governments. We have grouped our documents for convenience and to enable systematic presentation. However, we agree that at next meeting the Chinese side may comment on the evidence produced by us and present their evidence under Item two in the way they have planned it. I cannot comment on their pattern until I know what it is

Mr. Chang-We basically agree that each side may present their documents in the way they have prepared and also that when we make supplements to the documents, it will not only be simply a repetition of the documents referred to, but also will be making specific the contents of the documents which have only been named in the (referred to) governmental exchange.

NEW DELHI

(Fourth Week of August)

Mr. Mehta-This morning was received the statement from the Chinese side on the traditional and customary basis of the alignment claimed by them in the Western Sector. As Director Chang stated Dr. Gopal had been studying the statement but since it was only received this morning I am afraid it may not be possible for him to comment on it this afternoon but he will be able to do so at our next meeting. Perhaps, the Chinese side may wish to offer comments, if any, on the statement which we furnished at the last meeting which endeavour (sic) to complete the positive evidence in support of the Indian alignment in the western sector.

Mr. Chang-We have noted Mr. Mehta's statement. Now, Director Yang would first like to make some comments on the documents handed over by the Indian side. So far as I know, his comments would be about the treaties and agreements.

Mr. Yang-At the last meeting the Indian side handed over two documents-one concerned basis in tradition and custom for the western sector and the other concerned basis in treaty for the western sector. And now, I would like to make some comments on these documents handed over by the Indian side concerning the Indian alignment in the western sector.

First, in the written statement of the Indian side concerning treaty basis of the Indian boundary alignment in the western sector, it made some distortions and presumptions which did not conform to the original meaning of the Chinese side's statements and I would first like to make a simple clarification of this. For example, the Indian side stated that we had at the 17th meeting in Peking actually accepted the assertion that Ladakh was an independent country in the tenth century and it was not a part of Tibet. Such an assertion is not correct. On the contrary, I pointed out clearly at that time that we have sufficient material to prove that Britain ruled Ladakh, Ladakh was a part of Chinese Tibet and I had cited some material to prove this point. This is the first point I would like to clarify.

The Indian side stated that the Chinese Government did not question the authenticity of this treaty in its note of December 26 and other correspondence did not mention this treaty, precisely shows that the Chinese Government expresses its doubts about the existence of such a treaty and was waiting for the Indian side to submit factual material showing the existence of such a treaty and the original text of this treaty. The Indian side has also made some quotations of the talks between Premier Chou En-lai and Prime Minister Nehru concerning the question of Minsar and these quotations do not conform to the original meaning of Premier Chou En lai's statement. These are the points which I would like to make as clarification.

Second, in the treaty basis cited by the Indian side for their alignment in the western sector, their main point of contention is that when Nyeemagon gave Maryul to his eldest son in the tenth century, the boundary has already been delimited in the way as claimed by the India and that the treaties thereafter of 1684, 1842 and other correspondence between the two sides only reiterated the maintenance of this boundary line. We hold that such a contention does not conform to the actual historical facts and is untenable.

First of all, with regard to the question of Nyeemagon giving lands to his three sons, although some books on history have recorded this, the specific facts are recorded in different ways, in different books, such as, who is the eldest son, where are the feudal estates given to the three sons, and so on? The different books of history says it differently. I have also mentioned some authoritative historical works which, although mentioning that the three sons were given lands but they did not mention the boundaries of so-called Maryul and even if this matter of giving feudal estates were a fact, it only reflects change in the manorial estates of the lords of Tibet itself at that time and cannot show that the so-called clear state boundaries were already formally delimited at that time.

At the 16th meeting in Peking, Dr. Gopal mentioned, cited some material, showing the boundaries of Maryul, but the Indian side did not cite the source of this material. After making a checking we have found that it may be one of the five manuscripts of the "Ladakhi Chronicles", but in that manuscript, it only mentioned the names of the places and the name of Maryul and with regard to the names of the various places in this area, the Tibetan experts also have different interpretations as to the names and not as the Indian side interpreted it, and so we can see that the Tibetan experts even do not have an identical view-point with regard to the names of the places in this area, such as, Maryul. So, to assert that boundary had already been delimited at that time is untenable.

3. Concerning the so-called 1684 treaty, after having studied the written statement handed over by the Indian side, we still have reason to doubt the existence of such a treaty. The Indian side mentioned a book by Francke but in Francke's book 'Antiquities of Indian Tibet', he did the account which was put together on the basis of unreliable B manuscript and C manuscript and termed that as treaty. I would add here that in the five manuscripts upon which he based himself, the other three mentioned at all the war of 1684. The English translation of the so-called treaty which the Indian side handed over this time further different from that of Francke's. So this gives us the impression that the India (sic) side also does not seem to consider that the text of Francke's is authentic. We would like to know what are the sources of this treaty handed over by the Indian side.

The Indian side also cited as basis the biography of Polonai but this biography has no account whatever about the conclusion of this so-called treaty. The biography records that the Tibetan side gave as gifts seven forts to Ladakh. This can only be interpreted as after Tibet conquered Ladakh, Tibet gave Ladakh seven towns and thereby determining the rough confines of Ladakh, but if one were to draw from

this that the two sides certainly reached an agreement on a delimitation of the boundary, it can only be said that this is a very forced argument. (Director Yang handed over two copies to Mr. Mehta). It is the original of the biography of Polonai that is going to be read. I would now like to quote a part from the original text of this biography for the Indian side's reference. This is from Page 21 of this biography. The original is in Tibetan. The general meaning of it is as follows:

"At that time owing to the personal request of living Buddha Tan-Ji-Chien-Pa who is the incarnation of Na-lau-ta-pa, Ga-tan-tsai-wang-he is the Mongol General –allowed the King of Ladakh Tsang-ge-lang-chieh, The-tan-lang-chieh and his sons and grandsons to kneel before him. Since a man of wisdom at the Tibetan court, his heart and soul for religion and the people, he also had feelings of compassion and pity, for these enemy chieftains and therefore he gave Leh, Piti, Chesha etc. all together seven border towns of Tibet with estates attached to them- "Those foolish men of the world, all are of one heart to seek happiness but actually they only create the factor of their own sufferings. You too have done wrong in looking for happiness and your hearts are not rectified. You made vain attempts to oppose the yellow sect and thereby you have landed yourself in such a bitter and dangerous situation. In the future, you must not depart your heart from Buddhism as a whole, particularly from the yellow sect". And so he gave them a lecture in this respect and after this lecture to them he completed, the King of Ladakh and his sons etc. promised that they will act accordingly and having knelt down, they went away.

As a matter of fact, after that war in the middle of the 17th century, politically or religiously, Ladakh continued to be in a subservient position of Tibet.

The Locha and some customs of mission of Minsar-ula mention (sic), had occurred only under the situation of Ladakh being subservient to Tibet. I would like to explain the Lo-cha in Tibetan means "yearly tribute"; La meaning 'year' and cha meaning 'tribute'. This cannot form the basis that the so-called 1684 treaty exists. In summary in the circumstances obtaining at that time, the question of specifically delimiting the so-called boundary by means of treaty does not exist regardless of what arrangements may have been made by the two sides after a religious war for adjusting their relations. Even according to the documents submitted by the Indian side, these documents did not clearly specify the location and what is more, Tibetan authoritative historical works have no accounts about the conclusion of such a treaty.

4. Concerning the 1842 treaty, our side has repeatedly pointed out that this treaty is only of the nature of a treaty of mutual non-aggression.

Judging from the written statement of the Indian side, it seems that the Indian side is no longer opposed to such a view but the Indian side still persists in saying that this treaty affirmed the specific location of the boundary, the reason for this being that if the two sides did not clearly know the extent of their territories, they could not each abide by their respective confines. But I must point out two points here. The first point, this treaty did not specify the specific location of any boundary. I have already in the past submitted exchanged by the two sides as evidence, and I will not repeat here. Second point, the term “each abide by their confines” means without a shadow of doubt that each side will administer the territory under its jurisdiction and neither side carry out aggression against the other. It is very clear that this is no treaty(defining) determining the boundary but only an assurance that the two sides will respect each other’s territory. This shows that the Chinese-Tibetan side is clear about the territory under its jurisdiction and the customary line even under the condition of gradual changes in the relations between Ladakh and Tibet.

5. The Indian side mentioned the correspondence of 1847 saying that the Chinese Viceroy of Kwangtung and Kwangsi Provinces expressed recognition of the traditional customary line between Ladakh and Tibet and it need not be affirmed again. We have already said at the seventeenth meeting that the old boundaries of the Tibet region mentioned by the Viceroy of Kwangtung and Kwangsi Provinces can only mean the traditional customary line of the Chinese side. The Indian side mentioned the Agreement of 1852 between Rudok Dzong of the Tibet region and Ladakh, but the Indian side did not supply the original of this agreement and so we cannot comment. And the assertion of the Indian side concerning the statement that Ladakh and Tibet will each adhere to the old boundaries, it did not specify any boundary. The Indian side mentioned the correspondence of 1921. We have long ago said that between 1919 and 1927, the British Indian Government asked to delimit a stretch of the boundary between Ladakh and Tibet but no results came of these negotiations. All this proves that at that time, although the British Indian Government tried hard to formally delimit the boundary between Ladakh and Tibet through negotiations, or may be because the Chinese Government felt that its traditional customary line is clear and needed no delimitation or because the understanding of the two sides concerning the boundary is not the same, the talks were fruitless. From the above mentioned documents, we can see that China considers this as traditional customary line between Ladakh and Tibet and that China has always considered this tradition customary line as clear, but the Indian side at present and says that this alignment has been determined through treaty and correspondence. Such assertions of the Indian side obviously do not conform to the facts and are misunderstandings of the repeated statements of the Chinese authorities.

6. We have noted that the Indian side still do not submit any treaty or agreement basis in support of the Indian assertions for the boundary between Ladakh and Chinese Sinkiang. In the Indian written statement, it openly mentioned the correspondence of 1899. I would like to point out that Britain at that time, not as the Indian side asserted, did not just give a description of the northern boundary of Kashmir to China but submitted a specific proposal for delimiting the boundary. In its note, the Indian side clearly stated that if these proposal is accepted for delimiting the boundary, that part of the territory on this side of the line will henceforward be considered as Chinese territory and the British side had asked for the consideration and answer of China to this note. It can thus be seen that this is but a proposal to delimit the boundary. Incidentally, I could also mention that proposal of Britain at that time also admitted that the entire basin of the Qara Qash river should remain within Chinese territory. This is very different from the boundary line as shown in Indian maps at present, but this attempt to change the traditional customary line and encroach on Chinese territory was not accepted by the Chinese Government and thanks to the vigilance of China, this attempt of Britain did not succeed.

7. I would like to cite further some authoritative British documents and accounts to show that the boundary has never been formally delimited. I mentioned some orally in the last meeting and now I would like to mention some more. First, in a letter of the British Viceroy in India, Hardinge, to the Chinese Amban in Tibet in 1846, it mentioned determining the eastern boundaries of the land to be given to Maharaja Gulab Singh and asked the Chinese side to send a delegate to point out the exact boundary of China so as to avoid interference and encroachment occurring, but owing to the suspicious and vigilance of China at that time to the expansionist activities of Britain, no specific result came out of this. Second, Fredrick Drew, who served as Governor of Ladakh, in his book Jammoo and Kashmir Territories made some one-sided and incorrect accounts of the Sino-Indian boundary and was quoted by the Indian side. He nevertheless admitted on page 496 of this book that the boundary between Ladakh and China east of Karakoram as "not defined" and as "equally doubtful". He can only give his personal views towards the boundary and so his views naturally cannot become the basis for delimiting the boundary. I will not repeat the Indian official documents, maps and other authoritative material but only wish to point out that the Indian Government too, on many occasions could not but by different means admit that the Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally determined. We consider that these official statements and maps are very important evidence showing whether the boundary has been delimited or not and the location of the traditional customary line. But the Indian side states that maps explain administrative jurisdiction

and so it will not comment (on them) under the present items of discussion. This we find incomprehensible nor can we agree to it. According to what has been said above, the documents, maps and material submitted by our side have proved indisputably that the western sector of the boundary, just as the other sectors, has never been formally delimited or determined by the two Governments and that the alignment claimed by India, besides having no basis in tradition and custom, has even less basis in treaty and law.

Mr. Gopal-I thank Director Yang for his statement this afternoon. He has raised a number of points, asked for certain documents and cited others. I should like to comment on this statement along with the two statements given to us this morning, at the next meeting.

Mr. Mehta-Unless Director Chang would like to add anything more to what has been started on behalf of the Chinese side regarding the western sector, we might consider adjourning now, at least for tea. After a short break, we will have to consider whether we can today proceed further or use the time which is still at our disposal to dwell on the middle sector. As I mentioned to Director Chang that while we are trying to complete and exchange the documents and evidence pertaining to the western sector, we might look ahead and prepare for exchange on the middle sector. I am afraid, the full statement on the middle sector on our side is not yet ready, but we could perhaps agree to exchange statements before our next meeting so that we could then utilise part of the time on Wednesday to exchange comments on the statements which we will furnish to each other.

Mr. Chang Wen-chin-I agree that we may have a break now for tea and during the break, I would like to exchange some views with Director Yang about how to proceed after the break because some of the material handed over by the Indian side has not yet been commented upon by us and may be we would like to comment on them. As for the middle sector, I am afraid, we are not prepared to go into it today, but if the Indian side will like to go ahead first on the middle sector, we agree to it so as to utilise our alone to start on the middle sector then we can exchange the statements after the meeting, but for us, we are afraid, we may not have prepared our statement by tomorrow but only by the day after. We will try to have it completed before the meeting.

Mr. Mehta-As I said, we have tried to begin study in advance on the middle sector, but it is not yet complete. Perhaps we can agree in view of what has been stated by Director Chang, perhaps we can agree to exchange statements regarding the middle sector on Wednesday morning and then if possible utilise the meeting, to complete the

comments on the Western sector and initiate comments on the Middle sector.

(Break for tea 4-45 P. M)

Mr. Chang Wen-chin-I would now like to make some supplementary comments on the other evidence presented by the Indian side for the Western Sector.

First of all concerning the basis in customs, the Indian side mentioned various facts of salt mining, pasturing, hunting and trade as evidence.

In particular region if people of a certain country move and live about there, exclusive of other peoples or almost exclusive of other peoples, then this of course would be a traditional basis for the fact that this territory belongs to that nation. But in border areas it is frequently the case where border people of one country go into the territory of another country, particularly in the case of nomads there are sometimes cases when they may go across the border for salt mining or pasturing. So salt mining and pasturing by themselves cannot serve as a solid proof. But only in the case where these people live and move about in the area exclusive of other peoples or almost exclusive of other peoples can it be taken as evidence.

In our written statement we have already cited much evidence showing that the Aksai Chin and Linzhitang areas are places where Chinese people of the Uighur and particularly of the Kirghiz nationalities live and move about exclusive of other peoples or almost exclusive of other peoples and only in exceptional cases do occasionally Ladakhis come to these areas close to Ladakh. But these are only occasional cases which cannot prove that this area belongs to Ladakh and we have made investigations in this matter. Concerning the coming and goings of border people across the boundaries, it is according to the situation of the two countries concerned-allowed or not allowed. At times when this was not allowed, the Chinese forbade Ladakhis to enter into Chinese territory and sometimes even detained them or held them for questioning. As for the material in this respect, we will cite the under the third item on jurisdiction.

It can also be noted that in the material submitted by the Indian side, it only mentioned Ladakhis pasturing in the Chang Chenmo valley and south of the Chang Chenmo valley but not to the north i. e., in Aksai Chin and Lingzhitang areas. It can thus be seen, that Ladakhis very seldom frequent those places.

Ladakhi pasture in the Chnag Chenmo valley and it is indeed true that the major part of the Chang Chenmo valley belongs to Ladakh and only a small part of Chang Chenmo valley –east and north of Kongka Pass, which form the sources of the river, belongs to China. Therefore, the fact that Ladakhi people pasture in the Chang Chenmo valley cannot serve as proof that this part of the valley to the north and east of Kongka Pass also belongs to Ladakh.

Concerning the Spanggur lake area i. e., further south down the Chinese customary line, it does not conform to the facts to assert that the pastures there are always being used by inhabitants of Chushul and Hamle. We have cited material showing that traditionally and customarily Tibet has always considered this part as belonging to China and indeed Chinese border people have been constantly using these pastures.

Secondly, the Indian material dwelt at considerable length on hunting. I would like to make the following points on this matter.

First point –Those who went hunting were mainly in the Cheng Chenmo valley i. e., most of it took place within Ladakh. Naturally not all of the hunting was in Ladakh, some of the hunting expeditions crossed into Chinese territories in Tibet or Sinkiang and these people did not try to hide this fact either. In the names of the books and articles mentioned in this Indian material, we can see evidence of this, such as the names of "Two Tibets", "Chinese Turkestan", "Tibet" and so on. At the time of this hunting expeditions, the Imperialists paid no respect to Chinese sovereignty and territorial integrity and without obtaining Chinese permission intruded into Chinese territory to engage in activities. These activities cannot be considered lawful and China has again and again announced that without permission the foreigners cannot intrude into Chinese territory and when such intrusions were discovered, they were stopped.

And so accounts of these hunting expeditions cannot serve to prove the Indian claim for the traditional customary line and the views expressed by these persons concerning the traditional customary line can only represent their personal views and cannot constitute a formal basis. And what is more, the numerous evidences, the numerous official Chinese and Indian evidence cited by the Chinese side are different from the accounts of these persons.

Next concerning the Ladakhi traders who went along customary trade routes to Sinkiang to carry on trade. Such trading in the past did indeed take place and similarly Sinkiang traders also went along these trade routes to Ladakh to carry on trade. So it is clear, that a part of these

routes to Ladakh while another part lies in Sinkiang. What I want to point out here is that that part of these routes east of the Chinese traditional customary line are in China and they cannot be considered as belonging to Ladakh just because some Ladakhi traders went along them, just as that part of Ladakh where these trade routes pass cannot be considered as belonging to China just because some Chinese traders went along them.

The Indian [sic] side states that these routes are on the Indian side of the Indian traditional customary line and that the Kashmir authorities protected these routes and built rest houses and store houses along these routes and also constructed these routes. But according to our investigation in that past east of the Chinese traditional line where these routes extend, Kashmir authorities have not constructed any routes or rest houses or store houses.

There are only preliminary comments. We will still make a further study of the material evidence cited and also will make a study of the other evidence which the Indian side says, they will submit under the third item.

Now, I would like to make some comments on the maps presented by Dr. Gopal at the 16th meeting. Director Yang has already made comments on the questions of the history of Ladakh and travellers accounts and I would not repeat these points here.

Generally speaking, concerning these maps, Dr. Gopal, first of all, stated that these are unofficial maps of various countries. Although they are still worth studying, nevertheless, they are unofficial and, as for some of them, we have pointed out in the past and will still point out that their sources are suspect and so the majority of these maps cited with the exception of some Chinese maps of an official nature are of not much authority. Director Yang has already stated that in quoting maps we should lay our emphasis on authoritative official maps can best indicate whether or not the boundary has been delimited and where is the location of the boundary. The maps cited by Dr. Gopal can generally be divided into the following categories :

The first category-These maps are in name Chinese maps but actually they were drawn up by westerners and cannot represent the Chinese view-point. The Chinese people have never attached importance to the but looked upon them with distance. Among these maps, the first one cited by Dr. Gopal is said to be one of the oldest maps drawn towards the end of the sixth century. Actually, this map only tried to indicate the boundary at the sixth century and not drawn up in the 6th century. According to the findings of Chinese geographers, this map was drawn

up at the earliest towards the end of the Ch'ing dynasty i. e., in the 19th century and drawn up by missionaries outside China. This fact is very easy to ascertain because firstly the form of this map is not in the form of Chinese maps and secondly the characters on this map are written in very awkward and crooked manner, not written by Chinese but can be seen to be written by foreigners trying to learn Chinese.

Dr. Gopal cited a map produced by the Inland Mission in 1908 and printed in London and another map published in Shanghai by the North China Daily News and Herald in 1917. In the past Chinese notes, we have already made it clear that these maps were drawn up by foreign imperialist elements with their ulterior motives and Chinese people never attached any importance to them. And the Sino-Indian boundary as drawn by these people has never been accepted by China. Dr. Gopal stated at the 18th meeting that for 40 years China has been always using these maps. I cannot agree to such an assertion. Not to say that the Chinese authorities after Liberation never accepted such maps, even before Liberation the Chinese Government authorities have never accepted these maps nor used them.

The second category of maps are those said to be private maps of private agencies in China. He cited a maps are those said to be private maps of 1952 published by the Peking University (actually published by the Peking University's Publishing House). And also, the map "His Yu Shin Tao Chi" can also be considered as in this category.

And what is more, what is indicated by these maps does not tally with the conclusion drawn by Dr. Gopal. The map of the Peking University belongs to an Atlas, Ladakh is entirely shown to be a part of China and for its part on the map after the 1911 Revolution, it shows the disputed areas as belonging to China. In the map of the Commercial Press, it is generally consistent with the Chinese maps at present, i. e., showing the boundaries to run along the Karakoram. "His Yu Shui Tao Chi" is a map drawn in its own style and rather crude and it is mainly intended to show the river basin of the Lop-nor and that map is not show the boundary of Sinkiang.

The third category is those of official maps drawn in the traditional way and whether or not these traditional maps are official are not, there is one general point which I would like to make and that is the Indian assertion that Tsungling is precisely KuenLun and absolutely not Karakoram. This assertion does not conform to the facts. Nor is it difficult to prove this point. For example, the well-known Chinese traveller Fa-Hien, who passed through Tsungling recorded in his accounts which are generally accepted, and that is, the he passed over the karakoram mountains in the vicinity of the Karakoram Pass.

In the ancient days, we know that the word Karakoram could not have been used as it is now; that this word only came into usage in the beginning of the 19th century on the initiative of the westerners and in those ancient days, they could not have a very clear conception of the beginning and ending points of the karakoram mountains or its relations with the Kuen-luen mountains. But generally speaking Tsungling mainly refers to the Pamirs and the karakoram mountains.

In the maps cited by the Indian side called the Sin Kiang Chih Lueh, the Indian side stated that on the map it shows that Qarakash river and Yurkung Kash river as cutting across the Tsungling mountains and therefore proving that Tsungling is Kuen Lun but the situation is exactly to the reverse of this Indian contention because that map is precisely shows these rivers having their sources in the north of Tsungling. The Indian side says that it cuts across Tsungling. The map shows that these rivers do not cut across the Tsungling but have their sources north of Tsungling. I think that this misunderstanding of the Indian side of this map is probably due to a lack of familiarity with the way our maps are drawn.

As for the His Yu Tu Chih, I would only say it is but a very simple sketch map with only the names of some major places and it would show the Sino-Indian boundary by the means of the names of a few places.

Another category are maps by private agencies of the West. Some of the maps are very simple and it is very difficult to ascertain the specific location of the boundary line from them. I would only like to point out here that there are many such maps by private foreign agencies and selecting two or three of them cannot prove a point. I believe, that the Indian side can find many more such maps and similarly we can also find such maps in support of our alignment but such maps cannot prove any point. What we should depend on are official authoritative maps, particularly official authoritative maps of China and India from which we can draw clear conclusions. Such maps would play a much greater role than those above-mentioned maps cited by the Indian side. We know that the Indian side plans to provide official maps and make comments on them later, but we hopw very much that Dr. Gopal in his statement next time would be able to comment on the official maps because we consider their importance not only under the third item but above all great importance under the second item.

Mr. Mehta-Thank you Director Chang. We will study the two statements which have been been made today one by Director Yang and subsequently by Director Chang regarding the western sector. We might adjourn for the day and also agree to exchange of statements on the western sector on Wednesday morning.

NEW DELHI

(Fourth Week of September)

Mr. Yang-Before I begin my statement, I have some supplementary comments to make on Dr. Gopal's statement on the maps. Now I would just like to hand over these comments.

(At this stage the comments were handed over to the Indian side)

Mr. Gopal-Thank you.

These are about our maps or Chinese maps?

Mr. Yang-All maps.

Concerning the basis in administration and jurisdiction for the Western sector, for the traditional alignment in the Western sector, advocated by China, we have carefully studied the Indian side's written comments on our positive statement. The Indian side in its comments made different interpretations of the various authoritative facts and evidences our side cited, and mentioned some material, used some contentions which the Indian side has consistently persisted and developed some new contentions in an attempt to deny our arguments. For this we feel it necessary to make the following answers and clarifications.

(1) Under the Second Item we have shown by means of a large amount of material that the Chinese traditional customary line in the Western Sector is of long standing, that is, that part from the Karakoram Pass and passing from the Kongka Pass. The Indian side preposterously persist in saying that the southern part of China's Sinkiang has never extended south of the Kuen Lun mountains so far as its boundary is concerned. Proceeding from such an untenable contention the Indian side says that the evidence, we have cited, of China in the past setting up administrative organs in Sinkiang or Hotien or of strengthening the border defences and carrying administration and jurisdiction and all such specific facts, are not relevant. We cannot at all agree to such an assertion. It may be pointed out that we have cited such material precisely to prove our stand by means of describing the process of carrying out administration and jurisdiction in Sinkiang and in the southern frontier regions of Sinkiang. If it is to be considered that because such materials do not conform to the Indian standpoint can be examined? If this is to be case, it cannot be considered as in conformity with the spirit of our meetings.

(2) The fact that the Chinese Government in 1928 set up in the southern part of Hotien Sinkiang, in Shahidulla a Bureau of Administration can be

looked up in the records, in the archives, and is well known; but the Indian side made a wrong interpretation of such evidence cited by us as the petition of the Governor of Sinkiang and other clear documents, and arbitrarily asserted that in the document it did not deal with the scope of administration of the Office of Administration and that it cannot prove that the Aksai Chin and Lingzithang area belongs to Sinkiang. The Indian side again said that our argument that the areas of the administration of the Administrative Bureau extends up to the vicinity of the Kongka pass is a "far-fetched conclusion" etc. Such commentary of the Indian side can only show that they have not studied very well the documents we have cited. It can be pointed out that in the petition of the Sinkiang Governor in 1927 he clearly described the four corners of the area under the administration of the Administrative bureau, which he proposed to be set up at Shahidulla. China has always described the extent of jurisdiction of a local administration unit by mentioning the four limits. This is also entirely in conformity with the general practice. For example people often say that India stretches southwards upto the Cape Comorin and this in a brief way describes the southern-most extent of India without citing one by one all those places to the north of this Cape. It can thus be seen that our documents in mentioning the four limits, described the extent of administration and jurisdiction of the Bureau of Administration set up at Shahidullah, including the frontier region from the Karakoram Pass, up to the vicinity of the Kongka Pass, that is Chang-Chi-li-man-ta-ban. This, therefore, shows that the Aksai Chin and Lingzi-thang area is within the Chinese territory. It can also be pointed out that Chang-chi-li-man-ta-ban although is to the south-east of Shahidullah, yet so far as the frontier areas under the administration of this Bureau of Administration are concerned, it is an important border defence point in the east and that is why in stipulating the scope of administration of this Bureau of Administration, this place was particularly mentioned. As for the Chang-Chi-li-man-ta-ban mentioned to be in this place, it is a mountain pass on the edge of the Chang Chenmo. This can be seen from the report of survey of Li-Yuan-ping.

The Indian side further said that this document "states clearly that south of Shahidulla there is an important Indian road" thus making it clear that the area was Indian. I find it quite odd that the Indian side should arrive at such an interpretation from this document. The part of this original document concerning the four limits of Shahidulla is as follows: "To the south it reaches upto K'e-la-hu-lu-mu-ta-pan bordering Tibet and it is an important route to India for the traders and peoples of China in India". That is to say, the southern part of the Shahidulla area reaches Karakoram Pass (that is K'a-la-hu-mu-ta-pan), and there it borders Ladakh, (that is T'iao Pai Tai) and that this mountain Pass is an important communication route for the traders and the people of the two

countries going to India and coming from India. No matter how you look at it, you cannot get from this documents such an impression that "it is an unimportant Indian route" or the impression that "this area belong to India".

Mr. Gopal-Excuse me. May I interrupt for a minute?I would be grateful if Director Yang could identify these places for us. For example, what according to the Chinese reading is K'e-la-hu-lu-mu-ta-pan?Is it Karakoram Pass? Then Chang-li-man-ta-pan, Pa-cha-ta-la-ka, and k'an-chu-t'I and the two places after that and P'u-li.

Thank you Director Yang.

Mr. Yang-K'e-la-hu-lu-mu-ta-pan is as Dr. Gopal said the Karakoram Pass and the second one, Chang Chi-li-man-ta-pan is near Chang Chenmo. The Pa-cha-ta-la-ka is to the west and it is called P'la. I do not know the English name.

Mr. Kuo-Chang Lung Barma.

Mr. Yang-In your evidence produced, you also mentioned K'an ju t-i

Mr. Chien-It is called Hunza.

Mr. Yang-P'u-li-I do not know the English name, but you can find it in the Chinese maps.

Mr. Gopal-It would help us if we know the approximate location of these places.

Mr. Yang-In the region of Ta saku erh k'an

Mr. Gopal-Thank you Director Yang.

Mr. Yang-It can thus be seen that our evidence concerning the Bureau of Administration of Shahidulla proves that the Aksai Chin and Lingzithang areas have been under the administration and jurisdiction of China, and through our clarifications the doubts expressed by the Indian side for evidence, we feel, should no longer be there.

3. In its comments the Indian side also said that in 1856 the Chinese authorities "lost control of Sinkiang" and only "re-conquered it" in 1878 and also asserted that Chinese authority (extended), reached up to the Karakoram Pass only by 1892, and that the Chinese authorities in 1889 "disowned responsibility for the administration" of Shahidulla etc. These assertions cannot but make us feel that the Indian side is terming the Southern Sinkiang area as an area outside China. Regardless of what internal disorders and rebellions and external interferences occurred in Sinkiang for a time in the latter part of the 19th century, they cannot change the fact that the area north and east of the traditional customary line in Western Sector has always belonged to Chinese Sinkiang, nor can it deny the fact that in the beginning of the 20th century, China set up

administrative bureaux in Shahidulla to strengthen border defences and administrative jurisdiction.

In 1865 rebellion mentioned by the Indian side is a rebellion headed by Yakub with the support of foreign forces that is Britain-in an attempt to grasp the local authority of Sinkiang. But this rebellion was equally clearly put down by the Chinese Government and the schemes of neither Yakub nor Britain succeeded.

In commenting on the evidence cited by the Indian side in administration and jurisdiction for the Western Sector, we have cited a large amount of facts to show how at that time Britain schemed to carry out aggression under Chinese Sinkiang, and I will not repeat that here. Under the condition of suffering from aggression and of internal rebellion, even though for a certain period China found it difficult to effectively control certain parts of its territory, China speedily restored its control later on. And it naturally, cannot be asserted that during this period such Chinese territory is not Chinese territory or that the administration and jurisdiction before and after this has become invalid. Just as Hyderabad for a time declared independence and before the Central government of India took police measures, it cannot be considered that at that time Hyderabad is not Indian territory.

In order to attempt to support its contention, the Indian side further cited some so-called statements of private persons (their contents) do not conform to the facts and they are subject to doubt, because such private persons, statements cannot be considered as authoritative. Secondly, they also cannot prove that at that time China had given up its responsibilities-'disowned' its responsibilities-for administering Shahidulla. In the statements of Haji Mohammed and Usman and Bower we can see that they precisely show that the Chinese authorities were willing and agreed to provide protection. How can this be asserted that the Chinese authorities 'disowned' administration. Thirdly, such so-called statements precisely prove the aggressive intentions towards southern Sinkiang. In the so-called statement of Usman it is said that in 1889 there were troops of Kashmir stationed in Shahidulla and that they constructed a fort. In the so-called statement of Haji Mohammed, it is mentioned that a British official in his letter to the Amban in Yarkand even went to the length of saying that the British Government shall undertake responsibility for protection. All this nakedly shows the fact of British aggression. Then the people admit that Shahidulla is in Chinese territory even though for a time China was not able to administer up to these places. But does this mean that the troops of Kashmir are, therefore, justified to enter into this Chinese territory and be stationed there? It may be possible that for a time China was not able to maintain public security even within its territory and give protection to certain

persons, but this by no means can justify the interference and the entrance of troops into Chinese territory by the British Government. Therefore such statements cannot support the contentions of the Indian side nor affect the fact that the vast territory of Shahidulla is a part of Chinese territory.

4. Concerning the area of Pangong lake and the Demchok area, we have cited firm and unshakable facts and evidence to prove that they belong to Tibet and at the last meeting I further explained the Shika system of Tibet in the past under the system of feudal lords and pointed out that according to this system and feudal lords not only enjoyed the right of ownership of land and revenue but also enjoyed the right of administrative jurisdiction as in the competence of the State authority towards the Shika. This is known to all those who are familiar with the situation of Tibet. The fact that the Tibet local government in Demchok directly administered the Shika, proves that the Tibet local Government has carried out directive administrative jurisdiction in this area.

The Indian side states that it has cited a large amount of representative evidence to show that Demchok area and the Pangong Tso area are Indian territory. In our written comments of September 21, we have pointed out a number of contradictions and vague and unclear places in these evidences. Although Dr. Gopal made a number of explanations at the last meeting, he still cannot explain himself and so we cannot but still consider that the evidence of the Indian side is inconclusive.

We consider that the most convincing are still the official maps of India. We can cite the following maps of India. We can cite the following maps of which we would like to hand over photostats-the maps of Survey of India of 1881, 1889 and 1900, the map of the Imperial Gazetteer of 1908 and the map of the Survey of India of 1945.

(Five maps quoted above were handed over by the Chinese side to the Indian side).

As the boundaries in the maps of 1900 and 1945 were in colour wash we could not take it in colour, i. e., it does not show the boundary in colour. We did not have the colour photographs. So we marked it on the Photographs. These maps which are of a continuous nature, although they have some major mistakes in delineation of the Western Sector, but yet we can see that delineation of the boundary in the Demchok area is basically correct and it can be clearly seen that Demchok is within Chinese territory.

There are also maps, besides which we have cited, between 1945 and 1954 which have neither boundary line nor making with colour. We

cannot have from them where lies the boundary line. It can also be seen from these maps that in the great majority of them the boundary is shown as Niagzu within Chinese territory and cutting across the western part of the Pangong lake which is basically in conformity with the traditional customary line advocated by China. If it is to be said that the Indian territory proves that these areas have always been Indian territory then why is it that these official maps, particularly official maps as late as 1945, still did not show these areas as within the Indian territory but as within the Chinese territory?

5. In their statement of September 21st the Indian side arbitrarily asserted that China has never administered south of the Kuen Lun mountains and even said that there is even no evidence of Chinese in the area under dispute. We cannot but be very surprised that such assertions of the Indian side are in total disregard of the facts. We do not want to repeat that we have already cited but only mention the evidence cited by the Indian side itself, that is the report of Johnson. This report mentioned again and again that on the route from the Chang Chenmo valley to Hotien and Yarkand there is a section which is occupied by what he called shepherds of Rudok and this part of the road was sometimes closed by them. The shepherds of Rudok mentioned by Johnson cannot by any means be considered as Indians or Ladakhis but can only be Chinese, that is people of Sinkiang and Tibet. So this evidence of the Indian side itself, not to say the Chinese evidence, shows that the assertion that there is no evidence of Chinese people in this area is not correct.

As for the evidence of so-called administration and jurisdiction cited by the Indian side in respect of trade roads and rest houses etc., we have pointed out that such evidence only involved the Chang Chenmo area west of the Chinese traditional customary line and is not concerned with the area disputed by India. The Indian side cannot cite any new evidence to refute the facts which we have already proved. As for the assertion of the Indian side that in 1865 there were checkposts in Yangi Dawan, not only, as we have pointed out this is not in conformity with the Imperial Gazetteer of India's account but also, according to the accounts of the same year of Johnson cited by the Indian side, this pass was very recently used by the so-called emissary of Hotien to Britain who discovered and used it for the first time. Please refer to the photostat provided by the Indian side. The pass mentioned here is the Yangi Dawan pass and from the notes of 19th day of the record of the travels of Johnson, this can be proved. Therefore the contention that at the time Indian side has already a checkpost in this place is difficult to be comprehended. The Indian said that only by saying that there is a road from Pulu Shah to Ladakh it cannot be proved that the Aksai Chin through which the road passes, is within Chinese territory. Such an

assertion is all right. But the evidence forwarded by China is not so simple as discovered by the Indian side. We have already shown in photostat 4 that this road is from Pulu Shan and passes through Aksai Chin which is disputed by the Indian side is within Chinese territory, just as Rudok is in Chinese territory.

This document also mentioned that shortly after 1883 China closed this route and according to the material in our possession the situation of British personnel openly going into Aksai Chin from Chang Chenmo: that, all or most British personnel are no longer going there; that such situation has almost vanished. This further proves that this area has been under the effective control of China.

On the other hand the Indian side said that because there is a road from Chang Chenmo which goes to Hotien and Yarkand therefore it arbitrarily asserts that this proves that Aksai Chin belongs to India. Such an assertion is indeed difficult to be comprehended.

The Indian side arbitrarily divides Aksai Chin into two portions-showing that one portion is within the Chinese territory and the other within Ladakh. Such an assertion is totally not in conformity with the facts because the whole Aksai Chin is in Chinese territory and the assertion that the Chinese authorities refusal to allow Deasy to go to Aksai Chin is only referred to that area east of the alignment claimed by India is obviously unconvincing. As a matter of fact, China has never considered that there was any other so-called Aksai Chin so-called Aksai Chin outside of Chinese territory and China has at the time had effective control over the entire Aksai Chin.

The Indian side asserts that Wellby before arriving at the small river between two Pangong lakes, that is along the alignment claimed by India was stopped by the guards of Rudok. But this is not a fact. Wellby made it very clear. The persons he sent tried the cross river at the place which the alignment claimed by India. He had been stopped somewhere before reaching the water. The above "he had been stopped somewhere before reaching the water" is from Wellby's book called Unknown Tibet on Page 48. This proves that Rudok has always guarded over the Chinese boundary line and not the alignment claimed by the Indian side. As for Niagzu we have already answered it before.

Shall we have a break?

(Adjournment for tea from 4. 25 p. m to 5 p. m)

Mr. Yang-Shall I begin?

As for the arrest of the 11 Ladakhis for trespassing by Chinese Border Guards in 1941, the position is to the west of the alignment claimed by the Indian side and not to the east. For this, the then Chinese authorities had lodged a note of protest with the British at Kashgar stating clearly that these people were arrested at the Aksai Chin lake and every one knows that the Aksai Chin lake is the most famous of salt lakes in the area to which India has put forward claims.

This is the original copy which was kept by our side of a protest note to the Consul General of the British in Kashgar.

(A Photostat copy was handed over to the Indian side)

The Indian side considers that the Chinese statement that taxes in kind and of sending animals and persons there is in area east of China's alignment is untenable. The only reason which was cited by the Indian side was that this area is "Sparsely populated and shepherds only go to these areas for grazing and salt collecting during certain seasons" and making it out that this would show that the Chinese side cannot collect taxes or obtain work from the people there.

I think that this is very clear. This is just as the Indian side stated that taxes can be collected from Demchok even though there is no permanent habitation there.

6. We cannot agree to the comments of the Indian side concerning our evidence of photostats 9 and 10, concerning the surveys conducted in the frontier regions of southern Sinkiang in the years 1891 and 1892.

Our evidence (Photostat 9) clearly stated that Hai Ying and Li Yuan-ping (in their surveys) at the time they conducted these surveys in the various frontier regions south-west and north-west Sinkiang, and at the same time, made check-up surveys in groups of Sa-lei-kuo-le and the borders of China and Afghanistan. But the Indian side said that they only surveyed borders of China and Russia and China and Afghanistan and of the Hindu-Kush. But the report specifically mentioned the situation in Aksai Chin upto Chang Chi-li-man-ta-pan, the situation along this area and that is in our photostat 10.

The Indian side quoted from the report of a so-called "well-informed traveller" and even fundamentally denied the facts of this survey saying that the southern limits of Sinkiang only reached the Karakoram Pass in 1892 and, therefore, "it is conceivable that the same, any official expedition could have ventured south in what was well-known Indian territory".

But the facts are exactly to the reverse. We in our evidence, have precisely assertion of Indian side is in actuality doubting the authenticity of the evidence we have cited and for this we would like to call the attention of the Indian side.

At the same time, it also must be pointed out that the Indian assertion that "the whole of Sinkiang was void of communications and in form of regular administration right down almost to our own times" is untenable. Similarly, we consider that such an assertion does not conform to the facts.

China not only cited evidence showing the establishment of the Bureau Administration and Shahidulla but also cited the facts concerning various administration activities of the Chinese Government which prove this point.

The Indian side asserts that the surveys carried out by China in 1940-41 were only in the areas of the Sino-Russian Boundary and the vicinity of Gilgit. we would like to call the attention of the Indian side once again that we said there were surveys conducted in the areas of Aksai chin, Lingzithang and the upper reaches of Qara Qash river, i. e., within the area disputed by India. These surveys are another matter from the Gilgit route mentioned by the Indian side.

The fact that China at the time surveyed the Aksai Chin region and drew up detailed maps is fully grounded in both human and material evidences.

The fact that a map has not been published or not submitted at the officials, meetings cannot be equivalent to the non-existence of such a map. We can also assume that the Indian side also has a number of unpublished maps or maps not brought forward at these meetings. But we definitely will not thereby arbitrarily assert that the Indian side does not have such maps.

As for the assertion that since China has surveyed this area, then why did the Chinese side say under the first item that it lacks a detailed understanding of this area? This is not what we had said at that time. Because under the first item the Chinese side has made it clear that it is only in those places "right up to or very close to the Chinese alignment" that surveys were not carried out in order to avoid misunderstandings. But as for the places of Aksai Chin, Lingzithang and the upper reaches of the Qara Qash river we were fully clear and on the basis of this knowledge the Chinese side has pointed out that in a number of places while giving the description of the features of this area, the Indian side did not conform to the actual situation.

The Indian side although it repeatedly says that in the period 1911 to 1949, it had carried out continuous surveys and patrols in this area, did not cite specifically the facts and evidence to support this assertion.

As for the period after 1950 when China continued to exercise effective administration and jurisdiction, the Indian side has no means to deny. But it termed the legitimate exercise of sovereignty of China as "illegal incursions". We categorically reject such charges.

It can thus be seen from the above that the attempts of the Indian side to deny the Chinese traditional customary line and the fact of Chinese administration and jurisdiction is untenable.

Finally, China's alignment west of the Karakoram Pass. We have already cited our stand on this matter and it is not within the scope of the discussions of the officials and I do not want to go into it.

Thank you.

Mr. Gopal-Thank you very much Director Yang for your comments this afternoon.

Firstly, about photostat 2 of our evidence. At the last meeting I promised to provide further photostat evidence from this published volume showing that Aksai chin, Lingzithang and the Chang Chenmo valleys were parts of the Tankste Ilaqa. This settlement reports are of great bulk and the information regarding the extent of this Ilaqa is scattered throughout the volume. It seems to me, therefore, that it would be most practical and convenient to give a photostat copy of the map in this volume showing the extent of this Ilaqa in Ladakh Tehsil. This map shows clearly that Aksai Chin, Lingzithang and the whole of the Chang Chenmo valley were parts of Ladakh Tehsil. But I would like to make clear one point, and that is that this map shows the boundaries of Ladakh Tehsil in Ladakh and not the international boundary of Kashmir or Ladakh. The Qara Qash valley which belongs to another Tehsil is, therefore, shown outside the Tehsil. That makes it clear, I think, that it is a map of Ladakh Tehsil and not of Ladakh State.

(A photostat copy was handed over to the Chinese side by the Indian side).

Mr. Yang-Thank you

Mr. Gopal-I would now like to make a few comments on Director Yang's statement this afternoon. We have produced a large amount of evidence

under both Items 2 and 3 to substantiate our conclusion that Sinkiang never extended south of the Kuen Lun mountains. Far from this being what Director Yang described as "groundless persistence", we feel that it is well substantiated conclusion. It is not a question, on our part, of accepting only such evidence that suits us. That has never been the Indian position. Our viewpoint is that we should consider only such evidence as is relevant and draw only such conclusions as follow logically from the evidence. It is for these reasons that we feel that it has been proven that Sinkiang never extended south of the Kuen Lun and it has not been established that the southern frontier regions of Sinkiang lay south of these mountains.

Regarding the first photostat produced by the Chinese side, I would like to elaborate a little more as to why we feel that this document cannot prove that the Chinese alignment, where it has now been shown, marks the limits of China's administrative control. In their statement the Chinese side have stated that the description which this document is said to give of Shahidulla has been borne out by the Chinese work Hsin Chang chin Lueh. However in that work chapter IV, page 14, it is made clear that the southern boundary of Sinkiang lay along the Kuen Lun ranges if not, indeed, to the north. Further, the identification of Chang Chin Li Man with the Kongka Pass does not seem to us at all clear. The Kongka Pass is not to the east of Shahidulla. It lies to the south-east and in fact more south than south east. It is much more probable, to say the least, that Chang Chin Li, Man to the east is a reference to the Khangili mountains which lie to the east of Shahidulla. But even if we accept the identifications which Director Yang was kind enough to give us this afternoon, all that photostat 1 would prove is that this new district stretched up to the Chang Lung Barma Pass. Even that would not substantiate the alignment now being claimed by China. For Chang Lung Barma Pass is much to the north of the Kongka Pass. And even this document does not say that the division extended up to this pass but only that it should extend-a statement of intention rather than a proof of fact. So in 1928 certainly whether this intention was carried out or not at the time of the document just over 30 years ago, the new district of Shahidulla did not extent up to this point.

Then regarding Chinese interest and the Chinese position in Sinkiang in the 19th century, Director Yang stated that he saw no reason why this should be discussed at these meetings. I can assure Director Yang that we are not discussing for its own sake the internal history of Sinkiang or the de jure sovereignty of China over this region. What I was concerned to point out was that as we are discussing under this item "Administrative Control", it was relevant to show that there was no "Administrative Control" over these areas exercised by China in the later half of the 19th Century.

There seems to be no differences of opinion about this because Director Yang stated this afternoon that it was only in the early years of the 20th century that China set up bureaus for border defence etc. in this area. This confirms my point that if it is only in the 20th century that China was efficiently administering the southern areas of Sinkiang, she could not possibly have had check-posts for the last 200 years in areas south of the Kuen Lun mountains.

Director Yang then mentioned Hyderabad. This has no bearing at all on the problem we are considering. Hyderabad has always been a part of Indian territory and its administration has always been in Indian hands.

Regarding the evidence we brought forward about the lack of Chinese control of Shahidulla in 1889, Director Yang stated that statements by private individuals are no proof of administration. We only brought these forward because it is private individuals who provide the truest and the best indication of the state of affairs prevalent at the time of their writing. But I do not wish to go into this further because Director Yang himself stated that the fact that the Chinese were unable to administer this area does not mean that they were unwilling to do so. We are only concerned, however, to say that if the Chinese authorities at that time were unable, however willing to administer the Shahidulla area, they could not possibly have administered the areas lying even further south. lack of Chinese administration of Shahidulla is only being quoted to highlight the lack of it in the regions lying south of it.

Director Yang once more referred to British Imperialism in Sinkiang and stated that Britain wanted to annex Shahidulla. We are not claiming that Shahidulla is a part of Ladakh or Kashmir. We recognise Shahidulla to be a part of Sinkiang and China. All that we are concerned with is to show that China could not have administered that area, or as Director Yang himself put it, it could not maintain security and give protection in that area. If China could not maintain law and order in her own territory how could she have administered Indian territory lying south of this alignment?

I would like, however, at this stage to say a little more about the 'Imperialism' of this period. It is not sufficient for our purpose to state even to prove that Britain was following a policy of imperialism within Sinkiang. It must be established that those particular individuals who have been cited by us were firstly British agents and secondly, that they were changing the traditional boundary alignment. It does not follow-if I may say so-that all Englishmen were "Imperialists". The Chinese side themselves have quoted evidence drawn from English sources –such men as Deasy and Wellby. It is also necessary for our purpose to

produce evidence of Chinese administration in these areas before these men who are alleged to be imperialists came in and altered the alignment. May I add that the Chinese side has stated that this imperialist policy of Britain in this area was during the years 1866 to 1878. Even if that were so, it could not affect the evidence brought forward by us, both for the period before and for the period after these years.

At the last meeting Director Yang stated that I had made against China the wanton charge of 'Imperialist'. May I say that I was only drawing from orthodox Chinese sources rather than making any wild allegations. When I had the privilege of being in Peking this Summer, I purchased at the Foreign Languages Publishing House a standard one-volume History of China published very recently. In that volume it is stated-I quote-"Under the brutal rule of the Manchu Government, the people of all nationalities were bound by the same destiny to make a common stand against the oppressors". Director Yang pointed out that Prime Minister Nehru had always condemned imperialism. That, of course, is a well known fact. May I add that another great hero, the late Sun-yat-sen(sic), also condemned all forms of imperialism. He condemned -I am quoting from Sun-yat-sen: "the employing of generations of China by Manchu imperialism to subdue other races"; and then Sun-yat-sen goes on in his condemnation of past imperialism describing the features and events of those times, I was only adopting the viewpoint and conclusion of the great Chinese patriot who is respected throughout the world, and the accepted standard interpretation by Chinese historians. It is to make my position clear that I have now gone into details.

But I would like to stress once again what I stated already at the outset that it is not necessary to discuss the nature of imperialism -British or Chinese-for our purpose when examining the location of the basis of the boundary alignment.

Then Director Yang referred to the Shika system. Shika merely refers to home- a dwelling place-and the Shikhal is a separate estate. So while the owner of a Shika owns the land on which it is situated and has the right of managing and administering that property, it cannot prove sovereignty or administrative control of the whole area in which it is located. In other words Shika is private property as distinct from State sovereignty.

Director Yang stated that our evidence on certain points was vague and unclear. We have shown in great detail that our evidence is not inconsistent but is in fact conclusive of administration.

On the last occasion Director Yang referred to photostats 25 and 31 as showing, shall I say, confused administration of Demchok. In fact these documents, as we have stated, refer not to Demchok but to Minsar, and may I say that the seeming inconsistency disappears when one recalls that photostat 25 concerned 1900-1901, whereas photostat 31 dealt only with the calendar year 1901. Further the first photostat shows gross revenue, total revenue under one head, whereas the second photostat shows revenue under different headings.

Regarding Demchok itself we have produced a large amount of evidence showing Indian administrative control over these areas. In fact it was pointed out by the Chinese side that the bulk of our evidence drawn from administrative records seemed to concern only area. Nowhere therefore, does our case seem to be more clearly proven.

Director Yang was good enough to give us some maps today and we shall study these along with the written statement given by the Chinese side this afternoon dealing with maps in general. But may I recall that it is on Demchok that the two sides seem to agree, because the Chinese side have themselves stated that the alignment lies at Lhari Karpo.

I would like at this stage to deal with certain statements of our Prime Minister which had been cited by Director Yang at the 17th meeting at Peking and which we have had no occasion so far to mention. All these statements when read in the context in which they were made, make clear that all that the Prime Minister had in mind were two points.

- a. that the area was sparsely inhabited; and
- b. that the alignment had never been marked on the ground.

Director Yang then cited Johnson's report in two connections-one to suggest that there were Chinese shepherds in what is the Aksai Chin area of India and two to disprove that police checkposts were located near Yangi Dawan. In fact Johnson's evidence, based on first-hand knowledge, is clear and explicit. The Shepherds mentioned in Paragraph 41 of this report were blocking the road from Rudok to Polu i. e. well in the territory of China, and can have no bearing on the Indian alignment. Secondly, Johnson states clearly that the Qara Qash valley was in India and that the northern alignment of Ladakh lay along the Kuen Lun Range. We have already quoted these two passages in our statement and I will not repeat them. In fact Johnson states that guards had been stationed all along the route right up to the Kuen Lun and further that the pass across the Kuen Lun had been very recently discovered by the Khotan Ambassador to the British Government. This shows both the safeguarding of this area by the Ladakh Government as well as the fact that the Sinkiang authorities did not even know at all till a short time

before that there was a pass across the Kuen Lun, let alone their controlling the area south of it.

Director Yang stated again that all the trade routes we had mentioned lie west of the alignment now claimed by China. I would like once again to draw attention to the list of places on these routes-particularly the eastern Chang Chenmo route which we specified both when dealing with this under Item 2 and in our statement and photostats under Item 3. I mentioned them again at the last meeting.

Regarding the Pulushan-Ladakh road, the Chinese side themselves have mentioned that it ran from Polu to Rudok. Such a road obviously lay east of the traditional Indian alignment. That would be the most direct route between Polu and Rudok. This is borne out by the map of Deasy, of which we have given a photostat. Deasy's article has been cited by the Chinese side in a manner that does not tally with this map, which showed that the areas both west and east of the traditional Indian alignment in this sector were called Aksai Chin because of the nature of the soil, the term Aksai Chin being the description of it. This is borne out both by Deasy's maps as well as many other maps. The route that the Chinese Government are later stated to have closed, is clearly the Polu-Rudok route running throughout in Chinese territory and east of the traditional alignment. Governments control the areas through which their roads run and the closing of the Polu-Rudok route is substantial proof that west Aksai Chin, Lingzitan and the whole of the Chang Chenmo valley belonged to Kashmir.

Mr. Chang-May I ask a question ?You just mentioned that in Johnson's report, it says that the route upto the boundary is guarded. Can you give us the page.

Mr. Gopal-Page 6 paragraphs 40 states:

"There was also a wish that the several routes beyond the Karakoram should be made safe, by the Maharaja detaching guards of adequate strength to occupy the ground within his boundary in the vicinity of the plain called "Kher giz jungle"on the Kugiar route and at Shadula and Illnagar on the Sanju route. The guard of 25 men which the Maharajah had at Shadula last season proved insufficient for the protection of the Kafilas, as some of them were plundered by robbers. The object of having these guards stationed along the route is to enable them to escort caravans when passing over dangerous ground".

Director Yang referred to Wellby and his statement that his men had been stopped not at the Pangong but west of it. Wellby went right upto the frontier area and he does not state how far west of the alignment

the guards stopped him. This might be any distance and cannot be said to substantiate the Chinese position. Other positive statements of Wellby made clear the precise alignment of our boundary. Director Yang stated that the Chinese side has already dealt with Wellby's evidence regarding the boundary at Niagzu. I am afraid I seem to have missed that and would be grateful if the Chinese side would repeat their explanation about Wellby at Niagzu.

Yang-In the map which we just handed over it shows clearly Niagzu.

Mr. Gopal-Oh, I see. Thank you. But we cannot regard that as an explanation.

Then regarding the arrest of eleven Ladakhis in 1941, there are lakes on both sides of the traditional alignment and the mere fact that these men were arrested at a lake cannot by itself prove that it was west of the traditional Indian alignment. Regarding the collection of taxes from shepherds in this area what we stated was that it was not what would seem normal practice in this difficult areas and we would appreciate positive evidence of this effect that the taxes were collected.

Now regarding photostats 9 and 10 provided by the Chinese side, photostat 9 authorised surveys of the south western and north western boundaries of Sinkinag. This does not prove that the boundary between Sinkiang and Ladakh lay where the Chinese side are now showing it. In fact they would not seem to concern Ladakh at all because Ladakh is not to the southwest of Sinkiang-Russian border and the Sinkiang-Afghan border is made clear in the itself for its says:

"The Russians cast their greedy eyes at Pamir". This obviously is an area southwest of Sinkiang. Then again the documents says: "regarding areas adjoining the border of Afghanistan ". So this document merely concerns not the Sinkiang-Ladakh border but the areas much to the west of the Karakoram Pass.

Then regarding photostat 10, the account of Li Yuan, I would like to assure Director Yang straightaway that I do not for one moment doubt the authenticity of this report of Li Yuan. All I am saying is that if Li Yuan went into Ladakh, he was going to Ladakh without any orders. Photostat 9 only authorised him to go into the south-western and north-western boundary areas of Sinkiang. In fact Li Yuan intruded into India and that his survey could not have been a scientific one, let alone an official one, is proved by the fact that it was only nearly 30 years after, as shown by photostat 1, that the Sinkiang authorities were planning the establishment of an administrative centre at Shahidulla. The proper administration of the southern frontier areas of Sinkiang was only

considered in 1928. It does not seem possible that a scientific survey or an official survey was carried out in 1892. I have no doubt that Li Yuan submitted this report which the Chinese side have cited but it is clear that it was an unauthorised intrusion by Li Yuan across the border into Ladakh. It will be noticed that nowhere in this document does Li Yuan say that he is in Sinkiang or Chinese territory.

Then regarding the Chinese survey of 1940, photostat 11 gives a list of places which are to be surveyed and there is no mention of any place in the area now claimed by China. In fact, if this survey had been anywhere near the frontier of Ladakh, there is no doubt, relations being what they then were between the Indian Government and the Chinese Government, that the Indian Government would have been informed. It is stated in the document that the border sentries of the friendly neighbouring country, the Soviet Union, should be informed in advance. If this survey had covered the areas near the Ladakh frontier, is it not reasonable to accept that the Indian Government would have also have been informed in advance? The explanation would seem to be what is borne out by the list of areas of work, that the survey was not only in the area now claimed by China but nowhere near the traditional Kashmir-Sinkiang border.

Director Yang stated that the fact that the Chinese side had not given detailed information under Item 1 did not mean that the Chinese side did not have any information. The co-operation between the two sides at these meetings has been so cordial and unqualified that we cannot believe any information has been deliberately withheld. The information we have sought had covered not just the areas near the alignment claimed by the Chinese side but well up in the north. For instance, at what point did the Chinese alignment turn south-east after the Karakoram pass and along what particular ridge did it lie. It has been said that as a result of this survey of 1940 that Chinese side have maps of the scale of 1 to 200000 of the whole area claimed by them. That would seem physically impracticable when one looks at the strength of the team composing the 1940 survey. For example, could one man with seven soliders survey this vast area of over 30, 000 square Kilometres on such a detailed scale in one year?

I would like to conclude by pointing out once again that we have brought forward a large amount of evidence covering the various aspects of administration for the whole area showing the administrative control of the Governments of Ladakh, Kashmir and India. It is a continuous record through the centuries right upto our own times. For the years 1911 to 1949, there was unbroken administration throughout the region and at no time was there evidence of Chinese presence in this area. Nor have the Chinese side in these meetings brought forward

any substantial evidence that can bear out their claim to have administered these areas. Even as late as 1950, the nature of the administration and the comprehensiveness of the administration was shown by a photostat given by us last time. Nothing is more telling in proving administration than evidence of a trifle such as a sample of official salt collection. After 1950 we gave a detailed account of Indian patrols that had regularly gone right upto the borders in the north and in the east. And it was only in 1958-1959 that for the first time they came across evidence of Chinese presence. As late as June 1959 the Indian patrols found no evidence of Chinese presence or activity in the eastern Chang Chenmo area.

Thank you.

Mr. Yang-Thank you Dr. Gopal for your statement. If I were to answer one by one all the points mentioned in Dr. Gopal's statement and comment on them as Dr. Gopal has done, I would have to spend a long time. A number of questions raised by Dr. Gopal have already been clarified as stated in our past written statement and today's statement. So on this portion of the points raised by Dr. Gopal I would not make any more clarification as they have already been stated in our stand and position.

Just to cite an example of such questions like the boundary of Demchok Karpo, we have on this point again made clarifications from the Indian side as to what it considered the relations between Lhari Karpo and Lhari stream. But we did not obtain clarifications as yet. But I do not want to go into these questions now.

Mr. Gopal-I beg your pardon. We have given the co-ordinates of Lhari stream where it joins the Indus and showed that Lhari stream and Lhari Karpo are the same.

Mr. Yang-Also I want to make clarification that is, we have said twice where Lhari Karpo is where the boundary alignment is at the Lhari Karpo area both in our written statement and oral.

Mr. Gopal-I beg Director Yang's pardon for interrupting so often. But we had asked for the co-ordinates of Lhari Karpo and the Chinese side said that they were not in a position to give that.

Mr. Yang-We said then as it was under the Indian occupation, we cannot give it and we have said that it crossed the Indus in the vicinity of 33⁰. we have given a written statement. And again for example Pulu route, we just said that it not only includes Rudok but passes through Aksai Chin, Rudok and Tiao Pai Ti of India.

And again when I said "not those cited at the meetings" I meant "maps" and not "material". Our 1:200, 000 map was cited in the meeting at Peking. So, Dr. Gopal asked "why did we not cite such information". It is not an "information", it is a "map".

Mr. Gopal-What I said was that information derived from this map was not given.

Mr. Chang-I would like to supplement one point and that is under the first item; we gave information concerning the alignment and not the areas within the Chinese alignment. Similarly the Indian side provided information for the Indian alignment. But when in our discussions we included those places within our alignment, we gave such information.

Mr. Yang-Clarifications like this are numerous; so I will not give them one by one now. We will study the statement when we get back and if necessary give written comments.

Second Point-On some questions which I would like to clarify-In his statement today, Dr. Gopal again mentioned the so-called "Chinese Imperialism". We have made a statement on this question at the last meeting and Dr. Gopal also said that it is outside the scope of our discussions but again raised it. And I cannot but express my regret at this.

Dr. Gopal mentioned Imperialism. I agree this question is outside the scope of our meetings but as he mentioned so-called "Chinese Imperialism", I cannot but say a few words.

Our understanding of "Imperialism" is "an aggression carried out by one country against another".

Dr. Gopal in his statement said that he bought in Peking a volume on the history of China and he quoted a passage from it which stated:

"Under the brutal rule of Manchu government the people of all nations were bound by the same destiny to make a common stand against the aggressors. "

This passage is most clear. It concerns internal aggression by the Manchu rulers on the other minority nationalities and the Han which is rather a large nationality. It did not mention "Chinese Imperialism".

Dr. Gopal then quoted some passages from Dr. Sun Yat-sen. I would not repeat those quotations. I believe, Dr. Gopal also recognises the fact that Dr. Sun Yat-sen opposed Imperialism. But in addition to opposing Imperialism, Dr. Sun Yat-sen also opposed the National oppression of the Manchus. So we know in that, Dr. Sun Yat-sen concluded:

Firstly, it was a revolution against the Manchu national oppression. So internally it is against national oppression at that time by the Manchus who were externally opposed to the Imperialist aggression.

We do not have Dr. Sun's Sun Min Chu Yi ' in our hands right now. So we cannot say in what context this quotation was taken from. We know that his first principle was nationalism and we know it is a fact that externally he was opposed to Imperialism but internally he was opposed to national oppression. I understand only this context.

If it were to be asserted that opposition to internal national oppression is imperialism that we cannot agree. I believe, in many countries of the world with a number of nationalities in it, in their past history there has always been the case of the ruling class of a certain nationality oppressing other nationalities. But this can only be considered the internal history of that country and not imperialism. And I venture to say that in India's history there also may have been cases where the ruling class of one nationality oppressed other nationalities. I do not know very much about Indian history but if this were to be so that cannot be considered as Imperialism.

As for China, particularly during the recent 200 years since the Opium War of 1848 (sic), the fact that China has suffered from foreign aggression is known by all. And that is why during the recent 100 years the Chinese people have persisted in their struggle against Imperialism, of continuing the struggle over the bodies of those who fell before them for liberation. And today after the Chinese people have been liberated, they are supporting all the peoples of the world who are opposing Imperialism. But the Chinese people themselves are also rigidly opposed to Imperialism.

As for the history of the Manchu or other former Chinese Governments during the past 100 years or so, it is not a matter of providing the rule of these rulers because their activities are irrelevant to our meetings and it is only a question of history. And as for these historical questions of more than 100 years only, just as Dr. Gopal said, they are not within the scope of our discussions and I agree for not discussing these. I know that Dr. Gopal is an expert of history and I do not know how much about history; but I believe if we were to try to evaluate the activities of

historical personalities or dynasties or ruling classes, it cannot be done very simply.

I have taken much time. What I want to bring out is that there is difference between internal national question and the Imperialism in which one country carries out an aggression against the other. I venture to say that if Dr. Gopal did not make a distinction between these two questions in his statement just then that is understandable. As for our statements last time and today, we were discussing those points concerning British Imperialism relevant to our discussions. Of course, we agree to this statement of Dr. Gopal that not every Englishman is an imperialist and we have not said that. We were referring to those people at that time who are British officials or even British military officers carrying out policies of British Imperialism at the directions of British Imperialism.

Then the second question which I would like to make clarification. That is the assertion that China's Sinkiang administration never extended south of the Kuen Lun mountains. Dr. Gopal said just then that since India was only having administration and jurisdiction over Shahidulla in 1928, that is the beginning of the 20th Century, then that shows that in the 19th century, China could not have administered south of Shahidulla i. e. south of the Kuen Lun mountains.

What we want to state is, first of all, that in the Western Sector, in the eastern and northern portions, it always has been under the administration of Hotien. What we said was merely that in 1928 for the purpose of strengthening defences, a special administrative organ i. e. the Administrative Bureau, was set up in Shahidulla but still under the administration of Hotien.

So, it is clear that it is not that Shahidulla was a new piece of territory brought under Chinese administration but that it was long in China under the administration and jurisdiction before the setting up of the Administrative Bureau.

And then about administrative control in Shahidulla, as mentioned by the Indian side, I will not say much because it involves much details and will take quite some time but just say that whatever shortcomings or insufficiencies there may have been in the administrative control there, they cannot influence the fact that it belongs to China.

Finally, there are some points I wish to clarify on the question of surveys. We mentioned Hai Ying and Li Yuan-ping in the south-western and north-western parts of Sinkiang. It is generally understood in China that when we mentioned the south-western and north-western borders

of Sinkiang that refers to the borders of the then Russia, Afghanistan and Ladakh i. e. at that time under British control.

Now, the understanding of the Indian side of south-western and north-western Sinkiang is different from ours. But the document itself makes this clear at the very beginning and as this passage in the document at the very beginning was not provided, I will read it out.

At the beginning of this document, the first few words are not necessary. Then it says "The boundaries of Sinkiang run for several thousand of lis; the north-western of it borders on Russia; for the south-western part it borders on those external lands under Britain". We can supplement such a document latter.

Mr. Gopal-That is not necessary. We accept Director Yang's statement.

Mr. Yang-As for Li Yuan, we will not go into it because in our documents it is already stated there.

As I said before, owing to the time factor I will not deal with them now. If necessary, I will give a written statement later.

And then there are some points of clarification we would like to ask from the Indian side.

The Indian side said that this map shows that Aksai Chin and Lingzithang as under the Tankse Ilaga. It says Tankse here, but it does not indicate how it administers over the whole area.

And then Dr. Gopal said that the Qara Qash valley is not shown as it belongs to another administrative unit. If it is convenient, could he tell us the name of "another administrative Unit".

As for a number of other questions, as I said before, if necessary, we will raise or ask for clarification in writing.

Mr. Gopal-Thank you Director Yang. I will also not take very long.

First about Demchok and the location of Lhari, we have cited various kinds of evidence, to show that Lhari is near Demchok. The Chinese side state that Lhari Karpo is near 33°. We would be grateful for evidence to that effect. When they say Lhari Karpo, they say they meant Lhari stream at 33° and they have given us the latitude of the point. We would also be grateful for the point of longitude. As the Chinese side have been good enough to tell us that it is near 33° we would like to have precise coordinates. We would also request the Chinese side to describe

the alignment shown by the Chinese side between 33° and the place from where it follows the watershed east of the Koyul stream.

Then about Aksai zhin, we have already explained and given a map to show that Aksai Chin refers to the area both east and west of the traditional Indian alignment, for Deasy's map and also the various maps of Walker which the Chinese side have themselves quoted show that Aksai Chin lay on both sides of the alignment.

Then the Chinese side stated that they had not given us the information derived from their map on the scale 1 to 200, 000 because it concerned territory which was not near the alignment claimed by them. But as I mentioned earlier even information regarding the alignment near the Karakoram pass was not vouch-safed to us.

Then regarding imperialism, Director Yang stated it is irrelevant, and may I say that I fully agree with him. We were not the first mention this concept of imperialism and as Director Yang has himself acknowledged, in our written statement on administrative control in the Western Sector, there was no mention of imperialism. We hold, as we have again repeatedly stated, no brief for imperialism. But our point was that in considering the boundary alignment it is not necessary to consider or analyse the motive of the past unless of course there is definite evidence to prove that it has a bearing on the alignment under consideration. At no stage did we indulge in historical criticism or judgements but have always tried to concentrate on the facts and to deal with them objectively even when they concern the period of British imperialism in India. Our comments on imperialism arose from the Chinese comments and my comments earlier this afternoon were only to establish my innocence and to show that what I said about Chinese imperialism was only a repetition of what had been said by the best and noblest of Chinese authorities.

I am glad that Director Yang agrees with me that not every Englishman is an imperialist. The only proves my point that it is not sufficient to state or to prove a general motivation of British imperialism. What is necessary for our purpose is to show that every particular individual who has been cited has been describing the alignment in a particular manner because he is motivated by imperialist intentions. It means it is necessary to prove what the Chinese side said that every Englishman who confirmed the traditional Indian alignment was therefore an imperialist. To rebut our evidence it would be necessary to prove in every individual case that the person concerned was inspired by imperialist ideas.

We have proved at these meetings that the Indian administration extended upto the Kuen Lun and Sinkiang administration never extended southward. From the Chinese side no positive proof has been brought forward of regular administration and continuous administration or jurisdiction in these areas. In one of the letters in the correspondence between had maintained checkpoints in these areas for the last 200 years. No evidence to that effect has been brought forward in these meetings. The photostat that the Chinese side have given us deal with the setting up about 30 years ago, of a Special Border Defence Bureau at Shahidulla, proof that Deasy was turned away at some point east of the traditional alignment, proofs of a road from Polu to Rudok and evidence of surveys in areas outside India. There has been no direct evidence of the maintenance of law and order, of the collection of revenue or any other form of normal, regular administration.

Director Yang stated that inefficient administration cannot change the fact that these areas belong to China; but under this item of administrative control it is necessary to prove the existence of such administration and the evidence brought forward by the Chinese side shows not just errors in administration but rather a complete lack of it. And may I add that when Director Yang stated that inefficient administration cannot prove the lack of administration he was corroborating what I had stated at such length at the last meeting.

Regarding photostat 9, Director Yang stated that when they said southwestern they really had the areas with which we are concerned in mind; and to confirm this he read out an extract from this photostat. But when it said that the boundaries of Sinkiang run southwest and along with the borders of British territory, clearly this refers to the territory much to the west of Ladakh and to the territory which is now occupied by Pakistan. That would be the southwestern territory belonging to Britain.

Finally the two clarifications sought for by the Chinese side it is true that it is not specifically made clear in the map we have given that Aksai Chin, Lingzithang and Chang Chenmo belong to Tankze Ilaga. But it certainly does show that these territories were part of Ladakh Tehsil and that is adequate from our particular point of view.
Thank you.

Secondly as to what administrative unit did Qara Qash valley belong at the time, the answer is it was for administrative purposes linked with Baltistan.

Mr. Yang-Thank you Dr. Gopal for your statement.

RANGOON

(Second Week of December)

Mr. Chang-We are entering the concluding stage of our meetings. And it is our opinion that at this stage both sides need to exercise a certain degree of restraint to avoid new disputes and it is in this spirit in which the Chinese side drew up their report and summing-up statement. We have received and studied the Indian side's summing up statement and annexures. As for general appraisal of these documents, it can be expected that we feel that much of what the Indian side said about the proceedings of the meetings was not fair to the Chinese side. But of course this is the Indian report and we could expect this from the stand expressed by the Indian side in the past. The question is that in the concluding chapter finally submitted by the Indian side, many new arguments were added to the former Indian summing-up statement and made new distortions of the Chinese side's statements and evidence, and brought forward new allegations against the Chinese Government. I do not say that the Indian side has no right procedurally to do this. The question is we were not able to answer these questions before they were brought forward and we saw these statements only at the last minute. Naturally, we cannot agree to this, to the substance of some we have strong objection and a number of them, we feel it is difficult for us not to answer. I do not want to go into details on these matters but only mention one point as an example. For instance, the Indian side brought forward by each side. The Indian side considered that this later list of its evidence was drawn up according to the Chinese standard which is naturally not the case. Further, it asserted that according to the Chinese standard the number of the later list has greatly increased over that of the former list. Such a practice of the Indian side implied a criticism of the Chinese side's argument and in our view is not fair and is a distortion. The comparison made by the Indian side concerning official maps and the method of its drawing up statistics we feel, is also not fair. In a number of other places, the Indian side also made distortions of the Chinese side's statements and evidence. For instance, the Indian side said in summing-up statement that only by means of Chinese evidence alone, it would be sufficient to prove the Indian side's claimed alignment. We feel that the Indian side made interpretations not conforming to the original meaning of the evidence and also alleged that the Chinese side have quoted certain certain material as evidence which the Chinese side did not quote as such. The Chinese side of course, can also adopt a similar practice. It is not that we could not do it but we feel if we did this it would not be proper and fair and if we did, we believe the Indian side could also point out that it is not a fair or objective attitude towards the evidence.

In the summing-up statement of the Indian side, the Indian side alleged that the Chinese side has made baseless and unbecoming allegations against the integrity and bona fides on the Indian side. We consider this to be a groundless allegation. We have already made clear that our side has always adopted an objective and fair attitude towards the evidence and statements on the Indian side and always used moderate language. But we need to point out that a number of allegations made by the Indian side against the Chinese side are what we consider as baseless and unbecoming allegations against the bona fides and integrity of the Chinese side. For instance, in the Indian side's report, the Indian side alleged that the Chinese side cast aspersions on the Indian side and even involved the Chinese Government in its allegations. For instance, in implying that the Chinese Government deceived the Indian Government. Such allegations cannot but be considered as rather serious. We particularly regret such allegations.

I cited these few examples only to show that the Chinese side could not be considered as if it considered as if it cannot make a written answer to such newly brought forward allegations in the Indian's side concluding chapter and put these answers in the report because in doing this we have the entire right as well as full reasons. Because the Indian side raised these few points in the concluding chapter, therefore, compelling the Chinese side to answer them. However, after considering the matter we felt that if we were to give a written answer at this concluding stage, the Indian side as it expressed, would also make an answer and it further indicated that it may revise its report. In this way even though our side would not expand the scope of the dispute, it is difficult to assure that the Indian side would not expand the scope of dispute and thereby letting the dispute continue. Therefore, proceeding from our common responsibility to concluding our meetings as speedily as possible, we decided not to give answer in writing to the new points raised by the Indian side and thereby having the risk of going into endless dispute, but we would rather adopt an attitude of restraint and not make a written comment and even in our oral comments, we did not go into details but briefly set forth our stand.

Both sides have a clear understanding towards the report that neither side is responsible for the contents of the report of the other side i. e. the Chinese side is not responsible for the contents of the Indian side's report and although we are going to sign this report it does not indicate that one side is responsible for the contents of the other side's report, even less would indicate agreement to such contents. The contents of the Indian side's report, wherever it involves Chinese side's statements, can only represent the understanding of the Indian side itself, and for all the Chinese side's statements and comments only the Chinese side's report can be taken as correct.

As our side has already made clear for the Chinese side's report, only the Chinese text can be taken as correct; the English version is only an official translation provided for the convenience and reference to the Indian side. There has been no strict checking of the contents of the English translation. This we have made clear both inside and outside the meetings.

Another point is also clear and that is-after our meetings conclude, the Chinese side is not restricted from the right of speaking either on the questions of the report or on questions which Indian side may raise involving our meetings in order for the Chinese side to uphold its stand. Because in the first place of our meetings were restricted to a certain extent in the scope of our task and in time and the other conditions; it of course cannot be said that we have exhausted what we wanted to say or brought forward everything and every bit of evidence and that there is nothing more to add. The Chinese Government, similarly of course the Indian government, naturally have the right whether or not the officials have said it or not or whether or not the piece of evidence was brought forward by the officials, the two Governments would have the right at any time if it considers necessary to bring forward such further arguments and items of evidence. Of course, I want to make clear that it is not that we want to continue the dispute even less that we are preparing to continue the dispute. So far as the Chinese Government is concerned, it has always considered that the newly independent Asian-African countries should co-operate in friendship with one another and there is no fundamental conflict of interests between our countries and that differences between us can and should be settled through friendly consultations in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation.

As regards the great Indian people and our Indian neighbour with whom we have mentioned deep friendship for thousands of years, we have all the more adopted such an attitude. We are aware that some times it is difficult to avoid disputes over certain questions, but disputes alone without adopting a spirit of understanding and accommodation and of seeking practical and fair methods cannot be settled. We realise that whatever disputes there may be between China and India-for two great countries, such as China and India-neither side can force its will on the other.

Actual experience in life tell us that difference cannot be solved by arguing alone but only through friendly consultations and in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. There are not a few precedents in this respect. It is difficult to avoid disputes in the officials meetings will be of help to the two Governments in further considering how to settle the boundary question and to seek a fair and reasonable

method towards the settlement to these differences. Just as in the past, the Chinese side has no desire to give rise to disputes but on the contrary makes every effort so that the disputes would become a thing of the past and differences and disputes over the boundaries between the two countries would be further strengthened and developed. Of course, however, if unfair allegations are made against the Chinese side, the Chinese side cannot but give the necessary answers in order to clear up the rights and wrongs. Of course, we hope that such a situation will not be necessary. We consider that the two countries proceeding from the interest of their respective construction and interest of the people need more to strengthen their friendship and not to continue the dispute.

Mr. Mehta-Thank you Director Chang. I would like to say very little because I fully endorse what Director Chang said at the beginning about the necessity of exercising restraint at this stage, in the larger interest and particularly in the interest of the common responsibilities with which we have to conclude our work. The two teams have worked together now for nearly six months and even though we may not agree with each other's view points of the other side are. For much of what Director Chang said at the beginning of his statement I am almost tempted to say that he can guess my answer.

At all events as far as our viewpoint is concerned, it is contained clearly in verbatim record and now our report and our concluding chapter. What is contained in our concluding chapter also provides the answer to some of the points-to most of the points made by Director Chang this morning. I will merely say that we have tried earnestly and scrupulously not to be unfair to the Chinese side much less to the Chinese Government. In every essential and important aspect, both of arguments as well as evidence, in our concluding chapter we have only made mention of what we have stated before. We have also in the past explained the reasons for concluding chapter we have only made mention of what we have stated before. We have also in the past explained the reasons for including a mention of certain comparative statements and tables. Director Chang mentioned that there were certain items of new material or quotations on our part attributing statements to the Chinese side which were not made by the Chinese side. I cannot recall any such new materials or statements but I may say that we have tried very carefully to avoid making such mentions and we have also tried according to our understanding to maintain an objective attitude to the material which we exchanged in support of our respective stands. We have not suggested deception and certainly not made any aspersions against the Chinese side.

Beyond this I would merely invite reference to a brief statement which I made at the meeting on the 29th of November. I hinted then that there were a number of points in the concluding chapter of the Chinese side on which under normal circumstances we would have sought elucidation or provided our explanation. I refer to new material, new arguments and what we consider new allegations. But at this stage we thought, and we maintain, we must accept a certain finality. I will, therefore, now not list or give examples of the points of which we would like to comment either verbally or on writing. Of course, the temptation to do so is there apart and distinct from the verbatim record. But I endorse the views expressed by Director Chang just now that we must avoid the possibility of starting on a further round of written comments. This I had even stated before. This restraint, if I may so, on the part of both sides is in the interest of our common responsibilities. It is, of course, understood that the viewpoints of the two sides are contained in the reports prepared by the respective sides. The Chinese side have suggested that for any reference to the evidence of Chinese statement the true meaning should be sought in the Chinese part of the report and as far as the understanding of the evidence or viewpoints of the Indian side is concerned, reference should be made to the appropriate explanation in the Indian side's report. As I said earlier, whenever making reference to the Chinese side evidence or statements we have tried according to our light to do it objectively and correctly.

Director Chang said that the evidence contained in the report or even in the verbatim record is not exhaustive. Once again may I say that such a reservation also applies to the Indian evidence and the Indian statements. But we certainly hope that after six months, labours, our report will enhance the understandings of the full facts relating to the points. I also endorse the view that while the official teams in accordance with our joint directive, will submit the report to the two Governments; we cannot restrict the Government from such comments which they may wish to make subsequent to the submission of the report.

Finally, in consideration of the limited aspect of the responsibilities given to us in this assignment, I cannot say more but I would like to recall that friendship and understanding with China has been a corner stone of the policy of independent India. With Director Chang I share the hope that the results of our labours would be helpful to the two Governments to whom our teams owe allegiance.

(Mr. Mehta asked Director Chang whether he wanted to add anything. Director Chang said he had nothing to add).