

The Revolution in Tibet and Nehru's Philosophy

The People's Daily

6 May 1959

The war of rebellion unleashed by the handful of traitors in Tibet has in the main been quelled. With the ignominious defeat of the rebels, the sanguinary conflict they created has ended over the overwhelming portion of Tibet. Now Tibet faces a peaceful revolution, that is, the democratic reforms in Tibet referred to in the resolution of the National People's Congress and which the broad masses of people in Tibet have long expected and urgently demanded. This is a revolution — the continuation in Tibet of the great people's revolution which swept the Chinese mainland around 1949. Because of obstruction by the former Tibet Local Government this revolution has been delayed in Tibet during the past eight years since the peaceful liberation of Tibet. The revolution to be carried out immediately after the putting down of the rebellion will be a peaceful one, that is to say, a revolution without bloodshed. The Tibetan people will pursue a policy of redemption toward those of the upper classes in Tibet who have not taken part in the rebellion—almost the same policy adopted in the Han areas towards the national bourgeoisie. Ample conditions exist for the Tibetan people to do so, because they are backed up by China's hundreds of millions of people, who have already completed democratic reforms and the socialist transformation.

An Excellent Thing

At present, public opinion in many countries of the world is talking quite a lot about the question of Tibet. This is an excellent thing. The more than one million people living on the roof of the world, to whom no serious attention has ever been paid before, have every right to enjoy the honour of holding the attention of the whole world, and to be enlightened and steered in the course

of worldwide discussions. Some foreigners say that the rebellion of the handful of reactionaries in Tibet is a "revolution", a "nationalist", "anti-aggressive", "anti-colonialist" and "anti-imperialist" "revolution" and that these reactionaries are entitled to "full" and "inviolable" autonomy or "independence". On the other hand, they describe the putting down of the rebellion by the People's Liberation Army with the active support of the Tibetan people as "armed intervention", "aggression", "colonialism" and "imperialism", an action of "Hitler". Talking like this are the western imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries, like Nobusuke Kishi, Syngman Rhee, Sarit Thanarat, Ngo Dinh Diem and Chiang Kai-shek in Asia (nevertheless Chiang Kai-shek does not favour independence for Tibet, but demands that Tibet belong to Taiwan). There are certain sections of the bourgeoisie in some capitalist countries, whose political attitude in general is different from that of the above-mentioned people, but who line up with imperialism on this question. Certain bourgeois elements in India are such an example. All these people are a minority in the world as well as in their own countries. But they control considerable propaganda machines and appear to be kicking up quite a big fuss for the time being. A greater number of people in the world say that the rebellion in Tibet is reactionary and that putting down the rebellion is a just action. The people of the socialist countries unanimously support the Chinese people's struggle against the rebels. Even in the capitalist world, the majority are on the side of the Chinese people. They include the working people of all lands, people who stand for justice and progress, and those national bourgeois who are fighting foreign aggression and foreign intervention. These national bourgeois understand that approving foreign interference in Tibet would mean approving foreign interference in the internal affairs of Indonesia, Ceylon, Cambodia, Nepal, Iraq, Cuba and many other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, or approving encroachment on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of these countries.

However, in some capitalist countries, this voice of righteousness for the time being does not sound so loud as the noisy clamour of the anti-Chinese propaganda machines. Some people feel sorry: here we have the fine People's Republic of China; here we have the fine Sino-Indian friendship; would it not be better if there had been no rebellion in Tibet! These people are well-intentioned, but they fail to see that as the rebellion in Tibet broke out and was rapidly stamped out, a bad thing has been turned to good account. The revolution in Tibet has been accelerated by this rebellion and with the democratisation of Tibet the history of foreign intervention in Tibet will finally come to an end. This is absolutely necessary for the true consolidation of Sino-Indian friendship. In short, not only the people of Tibet and of China as a whole should carefully examine and draw lessons from these different opinions but the people of many capitalist countries, particularly those capitalist countries where there has been much ballyhoo on the Tibet question will also examine them and draw the lessons they need.

Mr. Nehru's Speech Quoted

Here we would like to talk about the statement made by Mr. Nehru in the Indian Lok Sabha on April 27. (The Editorial Department's note: Since writing this commentary, we have read Prime Minister Nehru's May 4 speech in the Indian House of the States. The principal points contained in that speech did not go beyond the scope of his April 27 speech. Therefore, we have made no revisions or additions.)

This was the seventh time since March 17 up to the end of April that Mr. Nehru had spoken on the question of Tibet in the Parliament. Mr. Nehru has on many occasions expressed his sympathy with the so-called "aspirations of the Tibetans for autonomy" and his opposition to what he called "armed intervention" by China. His statement of April 27 is somewhat more systemic; And its full text appeared in our paper on April 30. For the convenience of our

readers, we here again quote certain passages from this statement which, to a very large extent, can be taken as a summing up of his views on the rebellion in Tibet and on India's role:

"The circumstances were undoubtedly difficult. On the one side there was a dynamic rapidly moving society; on the other, a static unchanging society fearful of what might be done to it in the name of reform. The distance between the two was great and there appeared to be hardly any meeting point. Meanwhile change in some forms inevitably came to Tibet.

Communications developed rapidly and the long isolation of Tibet was partly broken through. Though physical barriers were progressively removed, mental and emotional barriers increased. Apparently, the attempt to cross these mental and emotional barriers was either not made or did not succeed.

To say that a number of "upper strata reactionaries" in Tibet were solely responsible for this appears to be an extraordinary simplification of a complicated situation. Even according to the accounts received through Chinese sources, the revolt in Tibet was of considerable magnitude and the basis of it must have been a strong feeling of nationalism which affects not only the upper class people but others also. No doubt, vested interests joined it and sought to profit by it. The attempt to explain a situation by the use of rather worn-out words, phrases and slogans, is seldom helpful.

When the news of these unhappy developments came to India, there was immediately a strong and widespread reaction. The Government did not bring about this reaction. Nor was this reaction essentially political. It was largely one of sympathy based on sentiment and humanitarian reasons. Also on a certain feeling of kinship with the Tibetan people derived from long established religious and cultural contacts. It was an instinctive reaction. It is true that some people in India sought to profit by it by turning it in an undesirable direction. But the fact of that reaction of the Indian people was there. If that was the reaction here, one may well imagine the reaction among the Tibetans

themselves. Probably this reaction is shared in other Buddhist countries of Asia. When there are such strong feelings, which are essentially not political, they cannot be dealt with by political methods alone, much less by military methods. We have no desire whatever to interfere in Tibet; we have every desire to maintain the friendship between India and China; but at the same time they have every sympathy for the people of Tibet, and we are greatly distressed at their hapless plight. We hope still that the authorities of China, in their wisdom, will not use their great strength against the Tibetans but will win them to friendly cooperation in accordance with the assurances they have themselves given about the autonomy of the Tibet region. Above all, we hope that the present fighting and killing will cease."

The Beginning of our Discussion

Nehru did not explain what kind of society in Tibet he referred to as a "static, unchanging society fearful of what might be done to it in the name of reform". But this is precisely the starting point of the whole question. Our discussion must and can only begin here.

Tibetan society is a serf society based on manorial estates. In Tibet, the main means of production—all the land and most of the cattle belong to three kinds of feudal estate holders or serf-owners, namely the officialdom (the feudal government), the monasteries and the nobles. These three kinds of serf-owners only account for approximately five per cent of the population, that is, about 60,000 of the 1,200,000 population of Tibet. All the peasants and most of the herdsmen have no land or cattle of their own, and can only toil for the serf-owners. Together with their children, they have for generation after generation belonged to different serf-owners. A part of the estate of the serf-owners is especially for service to the feudal government. The serfs that are assigned to cultivate such land have to do various kinds of corvée without pay for the feudal government. Military service is also borne by some of the serfs

on such land. The rest of the estates are the so-called "self-managed land" of the serf-owner. On this kind of manorial land, the serfs have to cultivate all the land for the estate owners with their own draught-animals and farm implements (sometimes also having to bring their own food), while the lords only allot a small piece of inferior land (about three-tenths of the land of the lords) to the serfs as payment. The serfs spend the great bulk of their time every year working on the land of the serf-owners, and also have to do all kinds of unpaid corvee for them. On the above-said two kinds of estates, more than 70 per cent of the income obtained from toil of the serfs goes into the pockets of the serf-owners through exploitation. It is generally difficult for the serfs to live on their incomes and, therefore, they are forced to borrow on usurious terms from the serf-owners. A great many serfs are unable to repay the debts they have incurred, and there are even some debts hundreds of years old. The serfs not only have no political rights, they do not even have ordinary freedom of movement. They must get permission from the lord of the manor for even a short term of absence. The nobility in Tibet is hereditary. At present there are two or three hundred noble families in Tibet. Their positions vary according to the amount of their property. The big nobility make up around one-tenth of this number, or some twenty-odd families; they each own dozens of manorial estates and thousands of serfs. In the feudal government of Tibet, the power has always been in the hands of these big nobles. The distinctions of rank between serf-owners and serfs are extremely rigorous. On seeing nobles, the serfs have to avoid them or bow down and put out their tongues as an expression of awe. They have to follow a definite pattern of conversation with no slips. The nobles can use torture at will on serfs who run away and are recaptured or who are considered to have otherwise violated the law. Besides the commonest form, flogging, there are even such frightfully cruel tortures as gouging out the eyes, cutting out the nose and the hands, hamstringing and chopping off the knee caps.

Reactionary Social System in Tibet

Monasteries occupy an important place in Tibet's social life. The proper religious activities of the monasteries and the people's freedom of religious belief must at all times be protected and respected. But up to the present all rulers of the monasteries in Tibet are at the same time serf-owners. The exploitation of the serfs by the monasteries through usury and trade is even harsher than that, by the officialdom or the nobles. The monasteries have an additional kind of exploitation of the serfs carried out under the name of religion. Distinctions of rank in the monasteries are also strict.

The poor lamas that come from serf families and the small lamas are also exploited in the monasteries. The monasteries also have various instruments of torture and prisons. They can punish the serfs and the lower ranking lamas at will. The cruelty of such the punishment is not different from that imposed by other serf-owners.

Roughly speaking, the nobles and the monasteries each hold around 30 per cent of all the land in Tibet. The other approximately 40 per cent belongs to the feudal government.

It is natural that based on such a reactionary, dark, cruel and barbarous serf system, the political and religions hub in Tibet was a tiny collection of the biggest self-owners. All kinds of shocking corruption and, internal strife inevitably arise among these serf-owners. Countless cases of murder and poisoning have occurred among part of the high-ranking power-wielding officials surrounding the Dalai Lama, in their fight for power and gain. The Dalai Lama is by no means highly respected unconditionally by these people, as Nehru says. Quite to the contrary, they often make the Dalai Lama their puppet, impose their opinions on him and even do him to death when they deem it necessary.

For example, it is well known that the 11th Dalai Lama met with sudden death in the Potala Palace in 1855 when he was only 18 year old. After that, in 1875, the 12th Dalai Lama also died a death in the Potala Palace at the age of 20. After the British imperialists' invasion of Tibet, the upper strata reactionary rulers resorted to even baser and crueller methods of squeezing out those not in their own gang. In 1923, the 9th Panchen was forced to flee Tibet to the interior of the country for the rest of his life. In 1947, the Rabchen Hutuktu, regent for the Dalai Lama for eight years, was arrested and strangled to death in prison. In the same year, the father of the present 14th Dalai Lama now in Mussorie, because of his patriotic ideas, was poisoned by reactionaries who had connections with foreign countries in order to facilitate their control over the Dalai Lama. In 1950, Living Buddha Geda who worked for the peaceful liberation of Tibet was poisoned in Chamdo and his body was burned in order to destroy the evidence. All these notorious crimes were committed by stooges of foreign intervention within the Tibetan ruling clique.

This society has indeed been static in the past. Not only was the economy depressed and the culture backward but even the population was unable to increase. However, the 'system of this society was not in the least "moderate" or "humane". It is a thoroughly backward, reactionary, cruel and barbarous system.

For Whom is your Sympathy?

May we ask all those vociferous self-styled sympathizers of the Tibetan people, just who are the "Tibetan people" you sympathize with? Whose autonomy or independence is the autonomy or "independence" of Tibet you propagandise? Whose defeat is the defeat of the rebellion in Tibet which you weep and mourn over? It seems that many of the so-called "sympathisers" are only usurping the name of the Tibetan people, the name of Tibetan autonomy and the name of humanitarianism. It is not the Tibetan people" they sympathize with, but

those who for generations oppressed, exploited and slaughtered the Tibetan people, those chiefs of the cannibalistic system in Tibet. When the big serf-owners in Tibet gouge out the eyes and hearts of the serfs, these specialists in sympathy did not feel it a tragedy and did not demand of these serf-owners moderation and humanitarianism. When these big serf-owners launched armed attacks on the People's Liberation Army stationed on the soil of their own country, when they used savage methods to slaughter captured PLA fighters and People's Government personnel, these sympathisers only cried "bravo", and blustered: that these serf-owners could carry on a one-hundred-year guerrilla war; they did not demand of them moderation and humanitarianism. Only when the People's Liberation Army went over from the defensive to the offensive against those wolves who persisted in; rebellion, that is to say, only when this cruelest and most savage serfdom in the world finally met with crisis as a result of the defeat of the rebellion of the armed bandits, only then did all the cries of tragedy, sympathy, humanitarianism, autonomy and independence: flood forth like a torrent bursting through sluice gates. From this it can be seen that except for some who have misunderstood, those who uttered such cries are precisely the defenders of the most reactionary serfdom and the most barbarous big serf-owners precisely the enemies of the freedom and liberation of the Tibetan people. And it is precisely for this reason that this counter-revolutionary "holy alliance" of the Metternich type has bound together the US State Department, British colonialists, Syngman Rhee of , South Korea, Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam, Chiang Kai-shek of China and India's reactionary parties-the Praja Socialist Party and the Jan Sangh Party. There is nothing strange about all this.

Nehru, a Friend of China

What surprises us is that the Indian Prime Minister Mr. Nehru, on the one hand, obviously has major contradictions with many disreputable characters in

that alliance and understands that their plots and tricks are detrimental to India, to Sino-Indian friendship, and to Nehru himself; on the other hand, he has involuntarily , been pushed by that alliance into an important role in their so-called sympathy — with Tibet movement, enabling them to look on with glee like someone watching tigers fight from a hill-top. We feel much distressed at being forced now to argue with Mr. Nehru in our comment. Mr. Nehru, the respected Prime Minister of our friendly neighbour-India, is one of the statesmen who enjoy prestige in the world. In particular, we cannot forget that he is a friend to China and an opponent to the imperialist policy of war and aggression.

Furthermore, he has also made a number of enlightened statements on social progress. For instance, in his "autobiography" written in prison between 1934 and 1935, although he showed many misconceptions and prejudices towards communism (he admits himself to be "a typical bourgeois", "with all the prejudices" fostered in bourgeois surroundings) he admitted, nevertheless, that owing to the application of scientific methods to past history and current events, 'the most revealing and keen analysis of the changes that are taking place in the world today come from Marxist writers". He also wrote: "Economic interests shape the political views of groups and classes. Neither reason nor moral considerations override these interests. Individuals may be converted, they may surrender their special privileges, although this is rare enough, but classes and groups do not do so. The attempt to convert a governing and privileged class into forsaking power and giving up its unjust privileges has therefore always so far failed, and there seems to be no reason whatever to hold that it will succeed in the future." Nehru put it quite right here. But what a different tune he was piping in his statement on April 27, 1959! Either he has completely cast away the views he once expressed, or else he really did not understand the scientific Marxist methods which he had thought he understood.

Now he blames us for not having been able to convert the privileged ruling class in Tibet into forsaking power and giving up its privileges, and tries to write off at one stroke the class analysis of Tibetan society as "worn-out words, phrases and slogans". Moreover, he described the two extremely antagonistic classes of serfs and serf-owners as a single society "fearful of what might be done to it in the name of reform". Of course, we find it impossible to agree with this attempt of Nehru's. The class antagonism in Tibetan society is a living fact. It is by no means a matter of words, phrases or slogans, to say nothing of being worn-out. Reforms naturally call for action, and they should naturally be in the interests of the overwhelming majority who demand reforms and detrimental only to the tiny minority who stubbornly oppose reforms. As the situation stands in Tibet, reforms should benefit first of all the 1,140,000 people who account for 95 per cent of the population. As for the 60,000 who make up the other five per cent of the population, the situation with them also varies. Only a tiny minority of them resolutely oppose reform, to the extent of launching a rebellion and refusing to the last to repent. As we have said the majority of the 20,000 or so rebels are coerced or hoodwinked members of the labouring people, as is the case with all counter-revolutionary armies. If the, Khampas who account for about one-third of the rebels are subtracted, the Tibetans who took part in the rebellion were only a little over one per cent of the 1,200,000 population of Tibet. To think that the entire upper class in Tibet rebelled is not correct. Furthermore, among these 60,000 there is quite a section of enlightened persons who approve of reforms. Therefore, it is necessary to differentiate among the members of the upper class too, and to give them appropriate treatment accordingly; we have always adhered to this policy. To say that all those in the varying circumstances we mentioned above have the same fear of reform and the same mental and emotional barriers to reform does not accord with the facts. As for the

overwhelming majority who demand reforms" why should they be fearful of reforms and have mental and emotional barriers!

Nehru's Deplorable Error

In discussing Tibetan society, although Nehru does not oppose reforms and does not deny the part vested interest played in the rebellion, still on the whole he not only fails to touch on its externally cruel system of exploitation, but virtually lumps together the vast majority of the exploited with the tiny minority of the exploiters. On this basis, he denies that a handful of upper strata reactionaries are responsible for the rebellion in Tibet, describes the just action of the Chinese people in putting down the rebellion as a "tragedy" and expresses sympathy for the rebellion. Thus, he commits a most deplorable error. As friends of India and as the people whose affairs Nehru is discussing, we deem it necessary to point out this error. If one agrees with Nehru's logic, not only the revolution in Tibet, but the whole Chinese revolution would be impermissible. It will be recalled that before liberation the area of China inhabited by the Han nationality had basically not emerged from the orbit of feudal society, although it was not serfdom. It, too, had always been called a static, unchanging isolated society. Some people also sneered at us for proceeding from a worn-out, outdated, and extremely simplified imported ideology-Marxism-Leninism, which was said to be entirely unsuited to specific Chinese conditions.

They asserted that our reform movement would meet with resistance from the entire society, the "hole nation. They even declared that we split the nation, betrayed the motherland, and that we were agents of so-called "red imperialism" acting on orders from Moscow, and so on and so forth. Now, history has rendered its verdict: it is we who are right, not they. All the attacks and slanders against the Communists have gone completely bankrupt. Under the leadership of the proletariat, China, once static and unchanging, has all of

a sudden become a China full of vitality and moving swiftly forward—a proof that Marxist-Leninist analysis is applicable anywhere on earth. The static state of the past was merely due to the fact that the development of the forces of production was shackled by the backward relations of production. Marxists-Leninists and Communists truly represent the interests of the nation and the motherland, while the handful of anti-Communist elements who claimed to represent the interests of the whole nation proved indeed to be agents of imperialism, although they temporarily hoodwinked a section of the III: 1sses. We believe that Prime Minister Nehru is not likely to oppose this conclusion from Chinese history. But according to Nehru's logic on the Tibet question, if his sympathy is not simply confined to the "Tibetan people" but is extended to the whole of the "Chinese people", then the whole Chinese revolution would become a many limes more distressing and unprecedentedly great "tragedy", During the period of the Chinese people's liberation war, Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang and the Kuomintang troops greatly outnumbered the 20,000 Tibetan rebel bandits, there were many more "reasons" 10 say 111ey were not merely "upper strata reactionaries", and the war was on a much bigger scale. In a word, it should have warranted much stronger "sympathy". Yet, so far .as we know, When Prime Minister Nehru sympathised with the whole of China he did not sympathise with the "big serf-owners" of the Han people; nevertheless, when he sympathises with Tibet which is a part of China, his sympathy goes to the "little Chiang Kai-shek" in Tibet. How is this most glaring contradiction to be accounted for?

The Tibetans and the Hans

Perhaps Mr. Nehru will say that we are not doing him justice, because what he said was limited to Tibet and the Tibetans are different from the Hans. This is to say, the Han people, in leading the revolution among the Tibetan people, would inevitably meet with national barriers. The Tibetans are different from

the Hans. That's perfectly true. And that is not all: the Mongolians, the Uighurs, the Chuangs, the Huis, the Miaos, the Koreans and many other minority nationalities of China are all different from the Hans. The Chinese Communists and the Chinese Government, face the question of minority nationalities in the country. We have approached this question with extreme caution. For over ten years we have trained up indigenous cadres among the various national minorities, and have seriously carried out education against Han chauvinism among the Han people, especially among the Han cadres, the Han members of the Communist Party and the Han officers and men of the People's Liberation Army. We adopted a method unprecedented in the capitalist world: we persuaded the Han people in multi-national areas where they were in the majority to establish minority nationality autonomous regions. The Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region, the Kwangsi Chuang National Autonomous Region, the Ningsia Hui National Autonomous Region and the autonomous chou and autonomous counties were established in this way. In Tibet, we displayed especially great patience in order to win the cooperation of Tibetan upper strata elements. For eight long years since the peaceful liberation of Tibet, we maintained intact the former Tibet Local Government, its complete system, its army and even its currency and persuaded the people of Tibet not to carry out for the time being the reforms they urgently demand. If the Central People's Government had not given the former Tibet Local Government any right of autonomy as alleged in the so-called statement of the Dalai Lama, then those reactionaries, whose treason had been established, would have been arrested and punished long ago and the democratic reforms in Tibet would not have been put off up to the present. The Central People's Government adopted an attitude of extreme magnanimity towards the reactionaries. Even after the outbreak of the rebellion in Lhasa, and after learning that the Dalai Lama had been abducted from Lhasa, the troops of the Tibet Military Area Command of the People's Liberation Army' did

not start the counter-attack until seven hours after the rebel bandits had, launched a direct armed attack on the Military Area Command Headquarter. Quite clearly, by then the reactionaries had blocked all roads to peaceful settlement, and, the only possible recourse left open was resolutely to launch a punitive expedition and put down the rebellion. Since the People's Liberation Army had the strength quickly to put down 'the rebellion in the Lhasa area, if it had chosen to make the first move, it could certainly have surrounded the Norbulingka in good time and prevented the rebel bandits from abducting the Dalai Lama. Any sensible person need only think for a moment and he will understand this, and will pay no attention to the fairy tales about two or three mortar shells fired in the direction of the palace and falling in a nearby pond. The policy adhered to by the Central People's Government and the People's Liberation Army from beginning to end not to fire the first shot in the face of such a serious situation precisely shows that the Communists have always 'dealt very' carefully with the question of nationalities, and in particular have exerted the maximum efforts to win over the upper strata elements in Tibet. Such a policy can only be carried out in earnest by the revolutionary proletariat. The bourgeoisie or other exploiting classes could never carry it out even if they wanted to.

The Meaning of National, Regional Autonomy

Here, in the relations between nationalities, the fundamental key point is still the method of class analysis. Mr. Nehru hopes that we "will win them to friendly cooperation". No doubt this is- a good idea, though it was meant by Mr. Nehru as an indirect charge that we have not done so and are not doing so. In point of fact, only the revolutionary proletariat can find a thorough and correct solution to historical national problems. Disputes and barriers between nationalities are in the main created by the exploiting classes and can never be eliminated by them. But under the correct leadership of the revolutionary

proletariat, it is entirely possible for the working people of different nationalities to eliminate, through certain efforts, all the disputes and barriers left over from history and enter into a cordial, fraternal friendship. Chinese history has witnessed long-standing national oppression and national strife. Mongolian and Manchurian rulers once 'oppressed the Hans, Uighurs and Tibetans; Han rulers, too, have oppressed the Mongols, Manchus, Uighurs and Tibetans. This state of affairs has been radically changed since the founding of the Chinese People's Republic led by the proletariat. The Hans, who form the overwhelming majority of the population and the main revolutionary force, now still have to send personnel to Inner Mongolia, to Sinkiang and to Tibet they no longer go there to oppress and exploit the national minorities there but rather, together with the revolutionary cadres of the local nationalities, to help the working people there to win freedom and liberation from the oppressors and exploiters of their own nationalities and to achieve democracy and socialism: that is, to lay the foundation for the flourishing economy and culture of the national minorities. The Communist personnel of the Han nationality who work in those areas, including the Han officers and men of the People's Liberation Army, do not ride on the backs, of the people of the national minorities there and lord it over them; "on the contrary, they go there to work, together with the revolutionary cadres of the local nationalities, as the servants of the people of the national minorities. They share the weals and woes of the labouring people of the national minorities and fight for their rights and happiness in disregard of difficulties and perils.

Thus, the working people of the national minorities and those upper and middle strata elements of the national minorities who are patriotic and favour reforms, have united with the working people of the Han nationality and overthrown, as the Han people did, the reactionary rule of the upper strata reactionaries of their own nationalities. Thus, the sources of national disputes and barriers disappeared and friendly cooperation among different nationalities

was placed on a really solid foundation. This is the process which has been carried out in Inner Mongolia, in Sinkiang, in Ninghsia, Kansu and Chinghai of the Northwest and in Szechwan, Kweichow, Yunnan and Kwangsi of the Southwest. In the course of this process, the personnel who lead the reforms make every effort to unite with people of various strata among the national minorities who approve of reforms and maintain close cooperation with them before during and after the reforms. True, it would be impossible not to have struggles and armed rebellion occurred in the Tibetan-inhabited areas in Szechwan, Kansu and Chinghai. But, as we have pointed out elsewhere, the rebellions in these Tibetan-inhabited areas were directed and instigated precisely by the reactionaries in Tibet taking advantage of their special position.

Why the Rebellion Could be Launched

In Tibet, where the rule of the big serf-owners had not been changed in the course of the peaceful liberation, it was still possible for them to utilise their legal position to direct the old Tibetan army and the Khampa rebels and other reactionary political organs which defended the system of serfdom and continue to collude with foreign interventionists. It is for this reason that reforms have not been carried out there and it was even possible to launch this rebellion. But in spite of all this the Tibetan people have time and again eagerly demanded reforms since the entry of the People's Liberation Army troops into Tibet. The long-suffering Tibetan people were not afraid of reforms; they were fearfulest the Central People's Government delay reforms year after year by being too accommodating to the big serf-owners of Tibet. Messrs. humanitarians of the world should know that the serfs in Tibet are also human beings. It is impossible to make them believe that the monsters who brutally exploit them, flog them and gouge out their eyes are their protectors. Nor is it possible to make them believe that the People's Liberation Army men who

warm-heartedly and amiably help them in their labours and treat their diseases who do not take from them so much as a needle or a piece of thread are their enemies. There lies the fundamental reason why the 'rebellion was entirely without support from the Tibetan people and was utterly routed in the twinkling of an eye, in spite of the national and religious sign-boards held up by the rebels the difficult terrain with high mountains and precipitous valleys and the many different kinds of foreign aid they got. In putting down the rebellion the People's Liberation Army confiscated the official seals of the feudal government, the arms of the rebel bandits and the court whips-serf-owners' instruments of torture. The Tibetan people everywhere greeted this with the joy of hailing rain after a long drought. How they have suffered under the oppression of these three things! They volunteered to serve as guides for the People's Liberation Army troops, and of their own accord supplied them with information about the bandits, and helped them to round up remnant rebels and arms. The People's Court in Lhasa alone has received hundreds of rifles taken up by the people. In many villages of the Loka area, the people gathered together as soon as they learned that the People's Liberation Army men were coming, to present them with hata (ceremonial scarves), to bring them crimson poach blossoms and fresh willow wands and at the same time pouring out to them bitter tales of rape, plunder, murder and arsons by the rebel bandits and enjoining the People's Liberation Army to avenge them. At Kung Ke-Tsong, the rebels had dug four ditches across the highway in an attempt to prevent the advance of the People's Liberation Army. But as soon as the rebels were gone; the local inhabitants filled the ditches up. When the PLA troops arrived at Lintze, the local inhabitants immediately organised a pack animal caravan of their own accord to help them carry ammunition and rations and move on with them as they mopped up the remnant bandits. Such moving stories are inexhaustible.

When the rebellion was put down, the broad masses of people very quickly assisted the People's Government to restore order and with the assistance of the People's Government, quickly went back to production. Spring ploughing in the Loka area, though delayed for half a month by the harassment of the rebel bandits, was finished with the assistance of the PLA troops without delaying the sowing. Large numbers of people there are now taking manure to the fields, sowing and repairing irrigation canals and ditches. They are singing long-forgoing songs of joy. The peasants are everywhere asking when the land will be distributed. After it was announced that whoever so could reap the crop this year on the land formerly belonging to the chief rebels, the serfs of the big serf-owner Surkong Wongching Galei, one of the chief culprits in abducting the Dalai Lama, at Kaishuhsika immediately of their own accord organised the labour power into labour mutual-aid teams to cultivate all the land jointly to strive for a bumper harvest. It is very clear that the Tibetan peasants are confident that the day is fast approaching when they will stand on their feet and be their own masters on Tibetan soil. Excuse us for being 50 lengthy her... However, let all well-intentioned people who care about Tibet see for themselves; how different all this is from the picture that met the old type Chinese armies that entered Tibet from the Ching dynasties on! What a sharp contrast it presents to the picture met with by the British aggressive forces storming Lhasa from India! Therefore, how can one depict the just action of the People's Liberation Army, together with the Tibetan people, in suppression of the rebel bandits who committed murder, arson and all other manner of civil as national oppression and national aggression?

Mr. Nehru asserts that there appeared to be hardly any meeting point between the Han and Tibetan societies and that the attempt to break down the mutual mental and emotional barriers was either not made or did not succeed. So far as the Tibetan working people are concerned, this question has been answered by the facts and will be answered in greater quantity and more vividly in the

future. Even for the upper strata people in Tibet, the mental and emotional barriers have undergone varying degrees of change for many of them. The three letters to General Tan Kuan-san written by the Dalai Lama secretly and entirely on his own volition when he was held under duress and the speeches of Panchen Erdeni, Ngapo Ngawang Jigme, Shirob Jahso, Ngawang Jaltso and Lozong Tsewang at the National People's Congress furnished a part of the obvious evidence in this respect. Standing on the side of the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region are many patriotic members of the upper and middle social strata in Tibet.

It can thus be seen that there is no ground to call the rebellion a national "revolution" and to describe the putting down of the rebellion as a national "tragedy". Lhasa middle and primary school pupils, a large number of whom are children of upper class families went back to class as soon as the rebellion was quelled, and their number now is much greater than before the rebellion.

Facts Speak Louder Than Eloquence

It is possible that some Indian friends who bear China no ill-will misunderstood, for a time, China's position and policy, owing to the long-time influence of biased propaganda, and to the fact that they have not seen the true conditions of life in Tibetan society and the activities of the People's Liberation Army first-hand, while their newspapers rarely publish full Chinese data. However, facts speak louder than eloquence and the truth will prevail in the end. We are fully confident that those Indian friends who labour under misapprehensions for the time being and who still hesitate to believe us will ultimately arrive at an objective conclusion. We hope that Mr. Nehru will be among them. Of course, Mr. Nehru has great confidence in himself, and he has his own set of independent views on the question of Tibet. He is inclined to assume that the powerful group in the former Local Government of Tibet are a flock of milk white lambs. So even after they had attacked us, he still held that

we were to blame. We cannot demand that our foreign friends see the scene the way we do, much less can we demand that Mr. Nehru change his philosophical, historical and political viewpoints. Obviously, there exist contradictions in Mr. Nehru's thinking. But we do not propose to discuss how these contradictions are to be resolved. On such matters, we could engage in a friendly debate, or we need not debate at all. Both our households have plenty to do. We are busy enough minding our own business, and why should either of us poke his nose into the other's business? When Mr. Nehru was in Peking, he said with good reason: "Any attempt to impose the will of one nation on another or the ways of life of one people on another must necessarily produce conflict and endanger peace." However, the point now is that a group of Indians, unfortunately including Mr. Nehru, insist that we do things according to their opinions. We are very good friends and neighbours and can easily live in peace with each going his own way.

If your way of doing things yields good results in India, there would still be time for us to learn from you. Where, indeed, is the need, for this urgency, not even scrupling to take certain acts of interference which impair friendship? We have thought it over and over and still fail to understand.

Prime Minister Nehru denies that India has interfered in Tibet. He recalls the course of events before and after India's independence and partition to show that India has never had political or ulterior ambitions in Tibet. We acknowledge that Nehru's remarks conform with reality in the sense that the Indian Government has no desire to annex Tibet or send its armed forces to intervene in Tibetan affairs. India has all along recognised Tibet as a part of China and that the Chinese Government enjoys sovereignty over Tibet. India concluded with China in April, 1954, the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse between the Tibet Region of China and India based on the Five Principles, and later withdrew its troops from Tibet and handed over its post and telegraphic installations. The Chinese people view all this with satisfaction. However,

interference by one country in the internal affairs of another may take diverse forms. To say that the Indian Government in the past and at present has not interfered in China's Tibet in any way does not sound convincing.

India's Intervention in Tibet

It may be recalled, as this newspaper reported, that the Indian Government intervened through diplomatic channels in October, 1950, when the Chinese Government ordered its troops to enter Tibet. At that time, the Chinese Government, while ordering its troops to enter Tibet, asked the Local Government of Tibet to send its representatives to Peking for negotiations. This was exclusively an internal affair under Chinese sovereignty. The Indian Government, however, delivered three notes to the Chinese Government, on October 21, October 28 and November 1, 1950, declaring that the invasion of Chinese troops of Tibet cannot but be regarded as deplorable" and with "no justification whatever" and that the Indian Government deemed it "most surprising and regrettable". It was further alleged in these notes that Chinese troops' entry into their own territory of Tibet "will give those countries in the world which are unfriendly to China a handle for anti-Chinese propaganda at a crucial and delicate juncture in international affairs", and, on the question of restoring Chinese representation . in the United Nations, "will have serious consequences, and will give powerful support to those who are opposed to the admission of the People's Government to the United Nations and the Security Council", "may prejudice the position of China in the eyes of the world", while the "peaceful negotiations [between the Central People's Government and the Local Government of Tibet] can hardly be synchronized with it', will not be in the interests of China or of peace, "have greatly added to the tensions of the world and to a drift toward general war", and "have affected these friendly relations between India and China] and the interests of peace all over the world". In this regard, the Chinese Government in its reply notes to the Indian

Government pointed out that in entering Tibet, the People's Liberation Army was exercising the nation's sovereign rights. that the Tibet question was China's internal affair and that no foreign interference is to be tolerated. This had nothing to do with the Chinese People's Republic's right of representation in the United Nations. If those countries which were unfriendly to China went 50 far as to exploit the question of representation in the United Nations for the purpose of threatening China against exercising its sovereign rights on its own territory, that would only confirm once again their hostility towards China. Only after the Chinese Government had repeatedly made known this solemn attitude in resolute terms, and especially after the People's Liberation Army had scored an important victory in the Chamdo area, wiping out the main forces of the Tibetan army which attempted to bar its advance into Tibet, only then did the delegation of the Local Government of Tibet which remained in India arrive in Peking for negotiations in the latter part of April, 1951. After negotiations, the 17-article agreement on the peaceful liberation of Tibet was finally concluded in May of the same year.

If may not be pleasant to recall this episode. However, facts are facts. How can it be said that the Indian Government has never interfered in Tibet?

Interference Still Continues

Unfortunately, such interference still continues in certain forms. Such interference is ail the more regrettable since it has taken place after the Chinese and Indian Governments jointly declared that the relations between their two countries should be guided by the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. Take Prime Minister Nehru himself for example. In his statements and remarks made since the rebellion in Tibet there are not a few friendly indications, but there are some utterances which, we feel, cannot be said to be conformable to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. For instance, he said: "The agreement between Tibet and China on the autonomous status of

Tibet and the assurances given to India had not been kept by Peking. Armed intervention was taking place there (April 13); "I do earnestly hope that the Tibetan people will be able to maintain and be able to enjoy their autonomy' and not be oppressed and suppressed by others" (April 14). It may be asked, to describe China's putting down a rebellion in its own territory as "armed intervention" as "oppressing and suppressing" their "autonomy" and to say that "the assurances given to India" have not been kept-how can it be said that all this is not interference? The Indian Government insists that the Dalai Lama is not held under duress by the rebels but is the head of the rebels. If this is so, did not the impressive welcome extended to the Dalai Lama by the Indian Government and the visit to Mussoorie by Prime Minister Nehru himself mean giving a welcome to and holding a meeting with the leader of a rebellion in a friendly country? Because the head of the Indian Government has never pursued a clear-cut hands-off policy, it is quite understandable why both Madame Indira Gandhi, President of the ruling National Congress Party, and Madame Sucheta Kripalani, General-Secretary of the Party, have declared that Tibet was a "country" or an "autonomous country" and why the "People's Committee in Support of Tibet which was formed by most of the political parties in India including the National Congress Party openly demanded that the Tibet question be submitted to the United Nations, and why Indian papers openly slandered the Chinese Government as "practicing banditry and imperialism, insulted China's head of state as an "abominable snowman" and demanded the convening of a so-called tripartite conference of India, Tibet and China on the pattern of the Simla conference to settle the Tibet question, which is purely China's internal affair. After the outbreak of the rebellion in Tibet and e\`en before, certain political figures and papers in India launched a smear campaign against China of a scope reminiscent of intervention by US political and press circles in the execution of counterrevolutionary criminals in

Cuba. We must ask, applying political pressure to the internal affairs of a friendly country — can this be considered conformable to the Five Principles?

India's Feeling of Kinship for Tibet

Prime Minister Nehru says that the Indian reaction on the question of Tibet is essentially not political but instinctive, largely one of sympathy based on sentiment and humanitarian reasons, also on a feeling of kinship derived from long-established religious and cultural contacts with the Tibetan people. We understand that the Indian people have a feeling of kinship for the people of China's Tibet. Not only that the Indian people have a feeling of kinship for the whole of the Chinese people. When Premier Chou En-lai visited India, the ardent slogan "Indians and Chinese are brothers" was heard everywhere, and these scenes and sentiments seem like a matter of only yesterday. But how can feelings towards the people in Tibet be used as a pretext for impairing feelings towards the Chinese people and for interference in China's internal affairs?

This kind of logic is fraught with obvious danger, because if such logic can stand, then when Tibet has taken the road of democracy and socialism, the road of strength and prosperity, could not a "people's committee to support Assam" and a committee for Uttar Pradesh affairs" be set up to interfere in the affairs of India's State of Assam or Uttar Pradesh under the pretext of ancient religious and cultural links? Could not the Government of the Autonomous Region of Tibet or the Government of China as a whole declare deep sympathy with the people of Assam or Uttar Pradesh as a basic policy and in pursuance of such a policy find fault with this and that in the affairs of these States? If the Indian Government can demand certain assurances from the Chinese Government on the grounds of deep sympathy and ancient links with the Tibetan people, could it not on the grounds of deep sympathy and ancient links with all the people of China make the outright demand for certain assurances

from the Chinese Government as regards all its internal affairs? Similarly, could not the Chinese Government, also on the grounds of deep sympathy and ancient links with the Indian people, demand certain assurances from the Indian Government as regards its internal affairs? Where would peaceful coexistence and the Five Principles be? Would not the world sink into the chaos of mutual interference? We believe that our friends in India would no more welcome or tolerate such an international order than we do.

Indians Follow British Policy

When India's interference in China's Tibet on these two occasions is taken into account, it is not difficult to see that although the Indian Government has no desire to occupy Tibet or make Tibet formally independent, it really strives to prevent China from exercising full sovereignty over its own territory of Tibet. In this respect certain political figures in India have followed the tradition of the British Government of the past—they only recognise China's "suzerainty" over Tibet, like India's "suzerainty" over Bhutan and Sikkim. What they call "autonomy" for Tibet is different from national regional autonomy as laid down in clear terms in the Constitution of China, different from the national regional autonomy practised in Inner Mongolia, Sinkiang, Kwangsi and Ninghsia; rather it is a kind of semi-independent status. True, Tibet is not a province but an autonomous region of the 'People's Republic of China, with greater powers and functions than a province as laid down in the Constitution and by law; but it is definitely no protectorate neither a Chinese protectorate, nor an Indian protectorate nor a joint Chinese-Indian protectorate, nor a so-called buffer state between China and India. The People's Republic of China enjoys full sovereignty over the Tibet region just as it does over the regions of Inner Mongolia, Sinkiang, Kwangsi and Ninghsia; there can be no doubt whatever about this, and no interference by any foreign country or by the United Nations under whatever pretext or in whatever form will be tolerated.

Consequently any question concerning Tibet can only be settled by China and in China, and not in any foreign country. Any status of semi-independence for Tibet would be detrimental to the Tibetan people, to the Chinese people, to the Indian people, to Sino-Indian friendship and to Asian peace. It would only serve the interest of the traitorous, reactionary big serf-owners of Tibet and their foreign interventionist backers, as well as of the expansionists and imperialist schemers who seek to sow discord between China and India. China and India are two peace-loving countries whose friendship is of long standing. Our two countries have every reason to live together in harmony, and refrain from aggression and interference, and have not a single reason for mutual conflict, or for wanting to set up any buffer zone; and if establishment of such a buffer zone were pressed for, it would indeed create a truly deplorable conflict where none existed before. In view of the attitude of the Indian Government on this question, in view of the statements by certain Indian figures who are by no means irresponsible, we think it vital for the consolidation of Sino-Indian friendship to make this point absolutely clear. In his April 27 statement, when Prime Minister Nehru referred to the Five Principles he mentioned only "mutual respect (which is undoubtedly necessary), but did not mention "mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty" (those are the original words from the Five Principles, and moreover are preconditions for any sort of mutual respect). We hope that this was only an oversight.

India 's. Links with Imperialism

Interference in China's internal affairs by certain political figures in India is not fortuitous. It bears the sign of the time. India is a country that has gained independence after shaking off the colonial rule of British imperialism. It desires to develop its national economy in a peaceful international environment and has profound contradictions with the imperialist and

colonialist forces. This is one aspect of the picture. Another aspect is that the Indian big bourgeoisie maintains innumerable links with imperialism and is, to a certain extent, dependent on foreign capital. Moreover, by its class nature, the big bourgeoisie has a certain urge for outward expansion. This is why, while it opposes the imperialists' policy, of intervention, it more or less reflects consciously or unconsciously, certain influences of imperialist policy of intervention. In international affairs, the Indian Government, headed by Prime Minister Nehru, has been reflecting generally the will of the Indian people and playing an important and praiseworthy role in opposing war and colonialism and safeguarding peace, in carrying out a foreign policy of friendship with China, with the Soviet Union and with other Socialist countries, of not joining in the military blocs of United States imperialism. But for historical reasons India's big bourgeoisie has inherited and is attempting to maintain, a certain legacy from the British colonialist rulers. Of course, the great Indian people are not in the least responsible for this dual character of the Indian bourgeoisie. We also believe that not only the Indian people, but all far-sighted and wise members in the Indian Government, acknowledge that the way for India lies in progress, in looking forward not back ward. We, as they do, hold that for the authorities of a country which gained independence not long ago and is not still subjected to threats from imperialist interventionists to interfere in the internal affairs of its neighbour is a deplorable phenomenon in contemporary international politics.

China has nor Interfere with India

We and Mr. Nehru may differ on this point or that, but there is not likely to be any difference of opinion on this: China has not interfered in India's internal affairs. It was only after a large volume of slanderous utterances had appeared in India that the Chinese people began to hit back. Prime Minister Nehru in his April 27 statement rightly censured certain Indians' statements and actions

intended to undermine the friendly relations between China and India. Unfortunately, he followed this up with a concentrated attack on the Chinese declaration against interference. Nehru' says that "the comments and the charges made against India by responsible people in China" are "regardless of truth and propriety" and "used the language of cold war". But China's charge of Indian interference, as already stated is ill-founded. The suspicions voiced by Chinese public opinion about the authenticity of the so-called statement of the Dalai Lama are also based on facts.

The numerous loopholes and signs of forgery in that statement are still there objectively. It is very obvious that those Tibetan reactionaries who abducted the Dalai Lama to India, together with those Tibetan reactionaries who have assembled in Kalimpong for a long period of time carrying on traitorous activities, are sparing no effort to make use of the so-called statement of the Dalai Lama to bar the way to the Dalai Lama's return to his motherland, and this does not conform with the desire repeatedly expressed by Prime Minister Nehru.

As to attaching importance to truth and propriety, we regret that much that was said by some political figures and publications in India in the past month and more can by no means be considered as showing regard for truth and propriety. The people of our country took note of the fact that Prime Minister Nehru more than once exerted a restraining influence in this respect. This is undoubtedly beneficial to Sino-Indian friendship. But when he accused the Central People's Government of China of violating the 17-article agreement and spoke about China's so-called "assurances" to India and so forth, we, after all, cannot say that his remarks showed regard for truth and propriety.

Speaking of the language of cold war, some Indian political figures and publications have slandered China as "a new and sinister form of imperialism" and "expansionist imperialism" and attacked China's putting down and the rebellion in Tibet as "military intervention", "colonisation" and "banditry". Is

not all this precisely the "language of cold war"? Towards such "language of cold war", we, for quite a long time, exercised forbearance time and again, exercising the maximum self-restraint. Our papers maintained almost complete silence. It will be recalled that as late as April 18, Premier Chou En-lai issued an earnest appeal for upholding Sino-Indian friendship at the Second National People's Congress. But, sad to say, all it got in return was a great clamour about the so-called statement of the Dalai Lama and even more unbridled attacks on our Government and people. When it was impossible to retreat further, we had to rise and hit back. Some people try to use "freedom of speech" to justify India's slander campaign against China. But why do they not think for a moment: cannot the Chinese people have freedom of speech too? Tibet is our territory. The question of Tibet is our internal affair. If even foreigners can have so-called instinctive responses on this question, how could the people of our country, on the contrary, have no instinctive responses? At present; it seems that the slander campaign against us in certain foreign lands is already ebbing, and reason is getting the upper hand but there are still a tiny number of people trying to continue fanning the flames. We can tell these people plainly: "So long as you do not end your anti-Chinese slander campaign, we will not cease hitting back. We are prepared to expend as much time on this as you want to. We are prepared, too, if you should incite other countries to beleaguer us. We are also prepared to find all the imperialists in the world backing you up in clamour. But the attempt to interfere in China's internal affairs and to salvage the odious rule of the big serf-owners in Tibet by any pressure is utterly hopeless. The more violently all the anti-Communist, anti-Chinese elements in the world vilify us, the more clearly will they reveal their true colours" and the better lesson will they provide for the people of the whole world."

Prime Minister Nehru is Different

As we said before, a great many people in the world today talking about the Tibet question, from a great many different standpoints. Prime Minister Nehru is different from many persons who obviously bear ill will towards China. He disagrees somewhat with us on the Tibet question. But in general he advocates Sino, Indian friendship. Of this we have no doubts whatsoever. We have made such a detailed reply to Prime Minister Nehru's reproaches (touching, of course, in not a few parts of the article also on those people who obviously bear us ill will precisely because we are fully confident that differences can be reduced and the argument can be settled. The argument may have been a bit sharp, because the vital interests of our motherland and the Tibetan people are involved. But we still hope that in substance, our argument will benefit the mutual understanding between our two peoples and the friendship between our two peoples and two Governments and that, in the language used, there has been no failure to pay regard to friendship and propriety. We are in full agreement with those friendly words to the Chinese people spoken so sincerely and seriously by Prime Minister. Nehru: He said, "We have every desire to maintain friendship between India and China" and it would be a tragedy if two great countries of Asia, India and China, which have been peaceful neighbours for ages past should develop feelings of hostility against each other." Sino-Indian friendship is of long duration and stands on a solid foundation. Our basic interests are the same and our main enemy is also the same; we will certainly not forget our common interests and fall into the trap of our common enemy. Although it is regrettable for this argument to have taken place, we firmly believe that it will not result in feelings of hostility, nor will it shake the friendship between our two countries. Prime Minister Nehru has announced that India has no desire whatever to interfere in Tibet. We warmly welcome this friendly statement. Once the Indian side stops its words and deeds of interference in Tibet, the present argument will end. China never has interfered and never will interfere in India.

We would like solemnly to assure all Indian patriots who are concerned for the security of India that a democratic and prosperous Tibetan autonomous region as a member of the big family of the people of various nationalities of China is bound to be a factor for consolidating and strengthening friendship between China and India: it certainly will not be, nor can it possibly be, any sort of "menace" to the Republic of India. The peaceful, good-neighbour policy of Socialist China is for ever unshakable and the friendship of the nearly one thousand one hundred million people of our two countries is forever unshakable, just as the Himalayas are unshakable. All the drivel poured out by those slanderers is without any basis. When Prime Minister Nehru visited China in October 1954, he said: "China and India are great countries facing similar problems who have set out resolutely on the road to progress.

To the extent that they will understand each other shall depend the well-being not only of Asia but of the whole world. The tensions in the world today demand that we should jointly work for peace.

It is our desire that the peoples of our two countries forever remember the truth pointed out here by Prime Minister Nehru. Like the Chinese people, the great Indian people have always treasured Sino-Indian friendship. We are firmly convinced that the slanders poisoning Sino-Indian relations will be recognized as such and repudiated by the broad mass of the Indian people as the true facts become known and common efforts are made by all personages concerned in both countries. China and India, and the peoples of the two countries, will continue their friendly cooperation in the cause of peaceful construction and will continue to join hands in their struggle for peace in Asia and the whole world.