

Report of the Officials
of the
Governments of India
and the
Peoples' Republic of China
on the
Boundary Question

(Introduction & Item I till page 40)

Ministry of External, Government of India

1. The Prime Minister of India and the Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China met in Delhi from the 19th of April to the 25th of April 1960 to discuss certain differences relating to the border areas which had arisen between the Government of India and the Government of the People's Republic of China. The two Prime Ministers explained fully the respective stands of the two Governments and as a result, there was a better appreciation of the points of view of the two Governments. The talks, however, did not resolve the differences that had arisen and the two Prime Ministers decided that officials of the two Governments should examine the factual materials in the possession of the two Governments in support of their stands.

2. The Joint Communiqué issued on the 25th of April 1960 at the conclusion of the talks of the Prime Ministers in Delhi embodied their decisions and served as a broad directive for the official teams who were to undertake the examination envisaged by the Prime Ministers. The Joint Communiqué *inter alia* stated as follows:

The two Prime Ministers, therefore, agreed that officials of the two Governments should meet and examine, check and study all historical documents, records, accounts, maps and other material relevant to the boundary question, on which each side relied in support of its stand, and draw up a report for submission to the two Governments. This report would list the points on which there was agreement and the points on which there was disagreement or which should be examined more fully and clarified.

This report should prove helpful towards further consideration of these problems by the two Governments.

It was further agreed that the officials should meet from June to September, 1960, alternately in the capitals of the two countries. The first meeting should take place in Peking and the officials would report to the

two Governments by the end of September, 1960. During the period of further examination of the factual material, every effort should be made by the parties to avoid friction and clashes in the border areas."

3. The two Governments accordingly designated the following teams of officials to meet and study the documentary materials in accordance with the decisions of the two Governments:

INDIA

1. Shri J. S. Mehta, Director, China Division, Ministry of External Affairs (Leader)
2. Dr. S. Gopal, Director, Historical Division, Ministry of External Affairs.
3. Shri V. V. Paranjpe, Adviser.
4. Shri T. S. Murty, Adviser.
5. Shri G. N. Rao, Adviser.

CHINA

- 1, Mr. Chang Wen-chin, Director, First Asian Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Leader).
2. Mr. Yang Kung-su, Director, Tibet Bureau of Foreign Affairs.
3. Mr. Chien Chia-tung, Adviser.
4. Mr. Liao Teh-yun, Adviser.

In addition, the Indian team was assisted by Dr. K. Gopalachari as an Adviser during the Delhi Session. Similarly, the Chinese team was assisted as Advisers by Mr. Tu Kuo-wei and Mr. Chu Chen-chi during the Peking session and by Mr. Ho Ta-chi during the Delhi and the Rangoon sessions.

4. The officials of the two teams have held three sessions in fulfillment of the assignment given to them. In accordance with the communique, the first session of the meeting of officials took place in Peking from the 15th June to the 25th July during which 18 formal meetings were held. At this session the agenda pattern was discussed and determined, and the first item of the agenda (Location and Natural Features of the boundary) was completed.

The second session was held in Delhi from the 19th August to the 5th October during which 19 formal meetings were held. At this session discussions on the second item of the agenda (Treaties and Agreements; Tradition and Custom) and the third item (Administration and Jurisdiction) were completed, thereby concluding the entire substantive work of examining the factual material in the possession of the two sides.

5. The Joint Communique envisaged that the officials should complete their assignment by the end of September, but the two teams realised that despite their determined efforts, the assignment given to them, because of its size and scope, could not be completed within the stipulated period. Therefore, on the 24th of September the leaders of the two official teams dressed a joint message to the Prime Ministers of the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India requesting them to extend the prescribed time-limit to the minimum extent necessary. The two teams agreed to continue in session to complete the substantive work in Delhi and suggested that after a short break a third session might be held for the purpose of completing the work and finalising the report for submission to the two Governments.

6. The Prime Ministers of the two countries were pleased to agree to this extension and, after mutual consultations between the two Governments, it

was decided that the third session be held in Rangoon. The Burmese Government were good enough to agree to the request of the two Governments and made the necessary arrangements for holding the meeting in their capital.

7. The third and final session of the talks started at Rangoon on the 7th of November and after 10 formal meetings concluded today with signing of this report.

8. The task assigned to the officials, though limited to the study of the evidence and the documentary material in support of the stands of the two Governments, was nevertheless voluminous and difficult. Moreover, the Sino-Indian Boundary question has an obvious bearing on the friendly relations between the two neighbouring countries. The two teams were fully conscious of the complexity as well as the importance of the assignment which had been entrusted to them. The following report embodies the earnest and sustained labours of the Chinese and the Indian official teams spread over a period of nearly six months. During the discussions, each side not only furnished factual material to substantiate and elaborate the stand of their own Government but endeavoured to explore the viewpoint and evidence of the other Government. It is hoped that the report will enhance the understanding of the facts relating to the Sino-Indian boundary and prove helpful to the further consideration of the boundary question by the two Governments.

9. The report is formulated in accordance with the framework which was agreed upon after consultations between the two teams. The first part of the report is an introduction summarising the discussions which led to the adoption of the agreed Agenda and the commencement of the substantive

examination of the evidence. The second and third parts contain the summary of the factual material and comments brought forward by the Indian and the Chinese sides respectively in support of the stands of the two Governments. It will be observed that the statements and comments of each side in the report were drafted by the side concerned and faithfully explain each side's understanding of the factual material furnished and the discussions held during the meetings. The actual pattern within the substantive part of the report corresponds to the framework of the agreed Agenda.

10. The two teams would like to record that notwithstanding the difficulties of the assignment and the differences in the understanding of the facts relating to the question, they worked in harmony and in a spirit of cordiality and co-operation throughout these meetings.

Sd. Chang Wen-chin, Director, First Asian Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China.

Sd. Yang Kung-su, Director, Tibet Bureau of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China

Sd. J. S. Mehta Director, China Division, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India.

Sd. S. Gopal, Director, Historical Division, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India.

RANGOON

12 December 1960, Saka 21 Agrahayana 1882

STATEMENTS LEADING TO THE ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA
(As summarised by the Indian side)

At the first meeting of the officials of the Chinese and the Indian Governments, the Indian side stated that the Joint Communiqué issued by the two Prime Ministers at the conclusion of their discussions in Delhi should, obviously, serve as the broad terms of reference for these meetings and an Agenda should be drawn up which would enable both sides to bring forward the documentary evidence in their possession to support the stands of the respective governments. In the view of the Indian side, this could best be done by commencing with the exchange of official maps on a roughly corresponding scale showing the delineation of the Sino- Indian boundary as conceived by the two Governments, supporting it with a precise description of the common boundary as shown in the map furnished to the other side. Thereafter, factual material could be put forward by both sides in respect of the areas where the two boundary alignments diverged. The factual material could be conveniently considered by dividing the Indian boundary into the following sectors, which were no different from the divisions which have been utilised, in practice in the correspondence of the two Governments:

- (i) Western Sector (the boundary between Jammu and Kashmir of India and Sinkiang and the Tibet region of China) ;
- (ii) Middle Sector (the boundary between the States of Punjab, Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh of India and the Ari district of the Tibet region of China);
- (iii) Eastern Sector (the boundary between the North East Frontier Agency of India and the Tibet region of China):

(iv) Northern boundaries of Bhutan and Sikkim on the one hand and the Tibet region of China on the other.

2. Further, for facilitating systematic work, the documentary material in respect of all the sectors could be grouped under such heads as historical agreements, maps, surveys, evidence of jurisdiction and administration, travellers' accounts, etc.

3. The Chinese side in commenting on the Indian suggestion showed that they had a radically different conception of the procedure to be adopted for the meetings of the officials. For one thing, the Chinese side did not consider it necessary to exchange maps and descriptions for the fulfillment of the assignment given to the officials.

Further, the Chinese side stated that the question of the boundaries of Bhutan and Sikkim fell outside the purview of these meetings. According to them, the task envisaged in the Joint Communique could best be taken up by both sides making preliminary general statements of their viewpoints on the Sino-Indian boundary question and from the text of these statements a list of questions could, be drawn up and such a list could serve as the Agenda for the meetings.

4. The Indian side pointed out that the Joint Communique clearly presumed that the general stands of the two Governments had already been clarified in the correspondence exchanged and that the officials were required merely to bring documentary material in support of their stands.

5. At the second meeting, the Chinese side while agreeing in principle that no general statement need be made, in fact, gave an overall explanation of the Chinese Government's viewpoint on the boundary question. For

example, they asserted that the Six Points formulated by Premier Chou En-lai in Delhi could be subscribed to by both sides as providing a basis of proximity or agreement.

6. The Chinese side proceeded to suggest that the main differences, which could form the basis of the Agenda, were the following three points (which were similar to the points listed by Premier Chou En-lai in his conversation with the Indian Prime Minister ' and .subsequently at the Press Conference):

- (i) Whether the Sino-Indian boundary had been formally delimited;
- (ii) The Location and Terrain Features of the traditional boundary and its basis;
- (iii) Ascertaining the line of present actual control between the two countries.

7. The Chinese side also stated that at present India, like Britain, had invaded and occupied various portions of Chinese territory along the Sino-Indian boundary.

8. The Indian side pointed out that the Six Points, far from providing a basis of agreement, had been firmly rejected by the Prime Minister of India, and they could scarcely be accepted as providing a starting point for the discussions of the officials. The Six Points listed expressly referred to the methods of resolving the dispute which were matters obviously within the realm of the discretion of the Governments while in fact the task of officials was, as had 'been stated by Premier Chou En-lai himself, the limited one of trying to "find out what is the historical and factual material relevant to the dispute". The scope of the work of the officials also became dear from the nature of the discussions which took place in formulating the joint

communique in which suggestions of the Chinese officials to incorporate these very "Points of Agreement" and proposals for an on-the-spot investigation were clearly excluded from the purview of the work assigned to the officials.

9. The Indian side also stated that it could not but object to the suggestions of India having 'invaded and occupied Chinese territory since these areas were correctly parts of India. In fact, the task of the officials was to help to establish, through a factual examination, whether these territories legitimately belonged to India or China; but to suggest that India had illegally occupied them was to beg the question by unilateral assertion. The Indian side could similarly commence by bringing forward a charge that China had invaded and occupied' Indian territory in the Western Sector.

10. The Indian side also pointed out that since the terms of reference for the meetings of the officials were to examine factual material on the differences which had arisen between the Indian and the Chinese Governments regarding the border areas, it was not justified to exclude from consideration the boundaries of Bhutan and Sikkim.

Indeed, references to these boundaries had already been made in the correspondence between the two Governments. For example, the Chinese Government's note of the 26th December, 1959, in reply to the Indian Prime Minister's letter of the 26th September, had dealt with the question of Bhutan and Sikkim. By the terms of the Treaties between these States and India, the latter clearly had responsibility for the external relations of Bhutan and Sikkim and at Bhutan's request the Government of India had already represented to the Chinese Government on matters pertaining to her interests in Tibet. The question was important because there existed a discrepancy between the correct delineation of the boundaries of Bhutan

and that shown on Chinese maps. Moreover, the relevance of these questions to the present dispute had been clearly affirmed by the Prime Minister of India in his talks with Premier Chou En-lai.

11. Subsequently, in response to these comments of the Indian side on the question of the agenda, the Chinese side came forward with a new proposal on the method of work to be followed by the officials.

They suggested that each side should choose their own Agenda and present material in support of their Government's stand in a manner considered convenient to the furnishing side, leaving the other side to comment on the evidence produced.

12. The Indian side, however, pointed out that they could not agree to such a procedure as it would amount to there being no discipline of a common agenda. The communique approved by the Prime Ministers clearly envisaged a joint examination and a comparative appraisal of the factual material of both sides and not that each side would merely file unilaterally their documents in accordance with a pattern of their own choosing.

13. The Chinese side continued to assert that the question of the nature of the boundary and whether it was formally delimited as also the lines of present control were not merely relevant but crucial to the entire boundary problem and as such must be discussed by the officials. The Indian side felt that while these questions might constitute important elements in the Chinese Government's stand, they could not be accepted as essential and, in the case of determining the lines of control, even relevant to the assignment of the officials. The Chinese Government considered that the boundary was not delimited, while the Indian Government considered that the boundary stood defined. But the core of the problem for the officials

was to ascertain the location of the alignments claimed by the two Governments and then for both sides to bring forward evidence to sustain the claim where it overlapped with the alignment of the other, and thus to vindicate that it was Indian or Chinese territory-as the case may be. The question of actual control was unconnected with the task of deciding as to which country had legitimate title to the area claimed by the other. The method of work proposed by the Indian side provided extraneous and irrelevant questions or the pitfalls of having an agenda loaded to suit one or the other Government's point of view. Instead, it envisaged a neutral and non-controversial framework which would enable both sides to furnish the positive evidence in support of their claim.

14. The Indian side pointed out that even while proceeding according to an agreed agenda both sides would retain initiative in the choice of the documents and the opportunity to provide explanations in elaborating the significance of the item of evidence which was being furnished. At the same time the other side would have the right and the opportunity to comment on the validity and relevance of the evidence received. Neither the initiative in the choice of a document by the furnishing side nor the discretion of the other side to comment or to seek relevant clarifications of it, would be, in any way, restricted or inhibited. But consistent with the spirit of the directives from the Prime Ministers, the starting point must be the facts and documents and not general propositions which lay within the discretion of the Governments.

15. These general discussions on the scope of the task given to the officials and the method of determining an agreed agenda and order of work to enable joint working and comparative appraisal of the evidence of both sides continued from the 2nd to the 5th meetings.

As a result of the discussions at the second and the third meetings, the following tentative pattern for the agenda had already become the basis for the discussion:

- Location and Natural Features of the Sino-Indian boundary. Basis in Treaties and Agreements.
- Basis in Tradition and Custom.
- Basis in Administration and Jurisdiction.
- Miscellaneous.

16. The Chinese side, while agreeing in principle to the discussions being conducted sector-wise, insisted that the consideration of the evidence relating to Treaties and Agreements should be completed for the entire length of the boundary before considering evidence under the other headings. The Indian side felt that there was greater logic and obvious convenience in all evidence under all heads, e.g., Treaties and Agreements, Tradition and Custom, Administration and Jurisdiction, being completed for one sector before proceeding to the consideration of the relevant Treaties and Agreements for another sector. The problem before the officials, whether looked at from the point of view of the Chinese or the Indian stand, pertained to certain geographical areas and all evidence on any particular area should be studied together before taking up evidence relating to another area. Both the Prime Ministers, during their discussions, recognised the coherence of such a method of work and themselves adopted the basis of sector-wise consideration of the stands of the respective Governments. Besides, sector-wise discussion under all headings provided the necessary neutral basis for both sides to furnish all their factual material without, in any way, being prejudicial to the stand or the presentation of the evidence of either side.

17. In view, however, of Chinese insistence on the separate consideration of the legal aspects of the basis of the boundary, the Indian side suggested as a compromise, that the historical basis of the boundary which comprised legal as well as traditional and customary support of the boundary may be taken up and completed for all the sectors before the other aspects of the basis of the boundary such as administration and jurisdiction were discussed. This could be done by the consideration of the evidence under Treaties and Agreements together with that of Tradition and Custom for the whole boundary. This compromise proposal was found acceptable to the Chinese side.

STATEMENTS LEADING TO THE ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA
(As summarised by the Chinese side)

The Chinese side indicated at the outset of the meetings between the Chinese and Indian officials that the agenda pattern should be determined in accordance with the terms of reference laid down by the Prime Ministers of the two countries for the officials' meeting. The Joint Communiqué of the Prime Ministers of the two countries specified that the duty of the officials' meeting was to "examine, check and study all historical documents, records, accounts, maps and other material relevant to the boundary question, on which each side relied in support of its stand." Therefore, the Chinese side deemed it necessary, first of all, to make clear the stands of the two sides and ascertain the common points and points of difference between the two sides so as to facilitate the carrying out of the examination of material.

The Chinese side pointed out that the successive correspondence and talks between the two governments had made it clear that there exist between the two sides certain common points or points of proximity. They are the six points put forward by Premier Chou En-lai during his talks with Prime Minister Nehru in Delhi, namely:

(1) There exist disputes with regard to the boundary between the two sides. (2) There exists between the two countries a line of actual control up to which each side exercises administrative jurisdiction. (3) In determining the boundary between the two countries, certain geographical principles, such as watersheds, river valleys and mountain passes, should be equally applicable to all the sector of the boundary. (4) A settlement of the boundary question between the two countries should take into account the national feelings of the two peoples towards the Himalayas and the Karakoram Mountains. (5) Pending a settlement of the boundary question

between the two countries through discussions, both sides should keep to the line of actual control and should not put forward territorial claims as pre-conditions, but individual adjustments may be made. (6) In order to ensure tranquility on the border so as to facilitate the discussions, both sides should continue to refrain from patrolling along all the sectors of the boundary. At the same time, the Chinese side pointed out that at present there exist three main points of difference between the two sides with regard to the facts of the boundary:

(1) Has the Sino-Indian boundary been formally delimited (2) Where is the traditional customary Sino-Indian boundary line (3) Where is the line up to which each side at present exercises actual control. These three main points of difference are the questions which need to be cleared up through an examination of factual material.

The Chinese side, therefore, proposed that these three questions should be taken as the three major items of the agenda for the officials' meeting. Under each item, the discussion could be conducted in the order of the western, middle and eastern sectors of the boundary.

The Indian side disagreed to the proposal of the Chinese side, holding that the only duty of the officials of the two sides was to examine factual material, and should not involve the question of stand.

The Indian side was of the opinion that the six points put forth by Premier Chou En-lai were rejected as a whole by the Indian Government. The Indian side also did not agree to examine material relevant to the questions of whether the Sino-Indian boundary has been formally delimited and of the line up to which each side now exercises actual control. It advocated the discussion of only one question, namely, where does the Sino-Indian boundary lie. The Chinese side pointed out that this view of the Indian side was neither justified nor in accord with the provisions of the Joint Communique of the Prime Ministers of the two countries because it was

explicitly stipulated in the Communiqué that all factual material relevant to the Sino-Indian boundary involving the stand of each side should be examined. At the same time, the three questions included in the agenda pattern put forward by the Chinese side were precisely the questions which had all along been disputed in the past correspondence between the governments and the Prime Ministers of the two countries, which should be made clear through an examination of factual material. The Chinese side also pointed out that its proposed agenda pattern was a neutral one, according to which both sides would have an equal opportunity to bring forward material to prove the governmental stand of each side.

Later on, through discussions, the Indian side also accepted that there should be opportunity for bringing forward for discussion without any exclusion all relevant evidences involving the stand of each side, and both sides agreed generally to include the following items in the agenda pattern: (1) Location and terrain features of the Sino-Indian boundary; (2) Treaties and agreements; (3) Tradition and Custom; (4) Administration and jurisdiction; (5) Miscellaneous.

Concerning the location and terrain features of the boundary, the Chinese side indicated 'at the very outset that written descriptions and maps could be exchanged, but it pointed out that this exchange was only for the purpose of making clear the location of the traditional customary Sino-Indian boundary line as understood by each side and should not imply the laying of territorial claims on the other side; because as Premier Chou En-lai had repeatedly stated, pending a settlement of the boundary question between the two countries through discussions, both sides should keep to the line of actual control and should not put forward territorial claims as pre-conditions.

In further discussing the itemization of the agenda, the Chinese side pointed out that treaties and agreements should be listed separately as one

item, while basis in tradition, custom and administrative jurisdiction should be put together under another item. This was because treaties and agreements pertain to legal aspects, whose examination was mainly to ascertain whether the boundary had been formally delimited; while examination of the basis in tradition, custom and administrative jurisdiction, put together, was for the purpose of clarifying which after all of the traditional customary boundary lines set forth respectively by the two sides was the correct one. The Chinese side at the same time also indicated that it would not object to a sector-wise examination of materials concerning tradition, custom and administrative jurisdiction. However, the Indian side insisted on putting tradition and custom together with treaties and agreements in one item, and listing administration and jurisdiction under another item. While the Chinese side deemed such a separation as not quite appropriate, it finally agreed with reluctance to the Indian side's proposal on the itemization of the agenda in order to commence the substantive work as quickly as possible.

Regarding the extent of the boundary to be considered at the meeting of officials of the two countries, the Indian side also suggested that the boundaries between China and Sikkim, between China and Bhutan, and between China's Sinkiang and Kashmir west of the Karakoram Pass, must be included. The Chinese side expressed its disagreement to this assertion. The Chinese side pointed out that, according to the talks and the Joint Communique of the Prime Ministers of the two countries, the work of the officials of the two countries should be confined to the Sino-Indian boundary, namely, the western, middle and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary as mutually understood by the two governments in their past correspondence.

Regarding the boundaries between China and Bhutan and between China and Sikkim, the Chinese Government has always declared that they do not

fall within the scope of the Sino-Indian boundary question. For instance, in his letter to Prime Minister Nehru dated September 8, 1959, Premier Chou En-lai had explicitly made clear this point. In the note of the Chinese Government to the Indian Government dated December 26, 1959, it was only when referring to the general relations between China and Southeast Asian countries that the conditions of the boundaries of China with Bhutan and Sikkim were explained along with them. During his talks with Prime Minister Nehru in Delhi, Premier Chou En-lai once again made it clear that this question was not included in the Sino-Indian boundary question. As for the boundary west of the Karakoram Pass, there was no discussion about it between the two governments in their past correspondence and talks, and the western sector of the Sino-Indian boundary as mutually understood by the two sides starts from the Karakoram Pass eastwards. At the same time, in view of the present actual situation in Kashmir, it was also inappropriate for the two sides-China and India-to discuss the boundary west of the Karakoram Pass between China's Sinkiang and Kashmir.

In the ensuing discussions, the Chinese side persisted in and repeatedly reiterated the above-mentioned stand regarding the extent of the boundary to be considered at the meeting of the officials of the two countries.

Contents

Introduction

1. Location and Natural Features of the boundary

- Description of the India-China boundary provided by the Indian side
- The Chinese description of the Location and Terrain Features of the Traditional, Customary Sino-Indian Boundary line
- Comments under Item One
- Clarifications sought by the Chinese side
 - (i) Western Sector
 - (ii) Middle Sector
 - (iii) Eastern Sector

Clarifications sought by the Indian side

- (i) Western Sector
- (ii) Middle Sector
- (iii) Eastern Sector

Further comments under Item One

II. Basis in Tradition and Custom; Treaties and Agreements

(A) Western Sector:

Traditional and Customary basis of the Indian boundary in the Western Sector:

- Part One: Tradition
- Part two: Custom

Treaty basis of the Indian boundary in the Western Sector

Comments on the Western Sector

(B) Middle Sector:

Traditional and Customary basis of the Indian boundary in the Middle Sector

Treaty basis of the Indian boundary in the Middle Sector.

Comments on the Middle Sector

(C) Sikkim and Bhutan:

Traditional, Customary and Treaty basis of the boundaries between Sikkim and Bhutan and Tibet

(D) Eastern Sector:

Traditional and Customary basis of the Indian boundary in the Eastern Sector

Treaty basis of the Indian boundary in the Eastern Sector

Comments on the Eastern Sector

III. Basis in Administration and Jurisdiction

(A) Western Sector:

Evidence regarding Indian administration and jurisdiction of the areas right upto the traditional boundary in the Western Sector

Comments on the Western Sector

(B) Middle Sector:

Evidence of Indian administration and jurisdiction of the areas in the Middle Sector claimed by China

Comments on the Middle Sector

(C) Sikkim and Bhutan:

Exercise of administration by Bhutan and Sikkim upto the traditional boundary

(D) Eastern Sector:

Evidence of Indian administration upto the traditional boundary in the Eastern Sector
Comments on the Eastern Sector

IV. Conclusion.

INTRODUCTION

In the following chapters, the Indian side after giving the descriptions of the alignments provided by the two sides and an account of the clarifications sought by them have traced the course of the discussions on the other two items of the Agenda-Treaties and Agreements, Tradition and Custom, and Administration and Jurisdiction. For each sector, the statement of evidence of the Indian side, as made at the discussions, has been reproduced; and this is followed by a summary account of the discussions on the Indian statement and the corresponding Chinese statement. Finally, in a concluding chapter, there is a general assessment of the discussions as a whole.

Item 1
Description of the India-China Boundary provided
by the Indian Side

The India-China boundary starts from the tri-junction of the boundaries of India, China and Afghanistan at approximately Longitude $74^{\circ} 34'$ 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. $74^{\circ} 1'$ E and Lat. $36^{\circ} 59'$ N), Parpik Pass (Long. $75^{\circ} 26'$ 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 between 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 Leighten and Tsoggar lakes in Tibet, down to Lanak Pass (Long. 79° 34' E and Lat. 34° 24' N).

South of Lanak Pass the boundary passes through the Kone pass (Long. 79° 29' E and Lat. 34° 9' N) and the Kepsang Pass (Long. 79° 30' E and Lat. 34° 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 the 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 Pan gong lake and other streams flowing eastward, cuts across the eastern part of, Spanggur lake and follows the northern and eastern watershed of the Indus through the Chang Pass (Long. 79° 22' E and Lat. 33° 1' N) upto the Jar Pass (Long. 79° 33' E and Lat. 32° 47' N). A little south of Jara Pass it turns south-westward, crosses the Indus about five mile 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° 24' E and Lat. 32° 32' N) the Imis Pass (Long. 79° 2' E and Lat. 32° 23' N), and the Kyungzing Pass (Long. 78° 46' E and Lat. 32° 38' N). Thereafter it turns westward and crosses the Pare river about five miles south of Chumar to reach Qya Peak (Long. 78° 24' E and Lat. 32° 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 ranges leading to the high peak of Leo Pargial (Long. 78° 45' E and Lat. 31° 54' N), crosses the Sutlej at its bend, and following the Zaskar range lies through the Shipki Pass (Long. 78° 44' E and Lat. 31° 51' N), the Raniso Pass (Long. 78° 49' E and Lat. 31° 38' N), and the Shimdang Pass (Long. 78° 44'

E and Lat. 31° 29' N). Thereafter it follows the main watershed between the Sutlej and the Ganges basins and lies through the Thaga Pass (Long. 79° 7' E and Lat. 31° 26' N), Tsang Chok Pass (Long. 79° 13' E and Lat. 31° 20' N), Muling Pass (Long. 79° 18' E and Lat. 31° 13' N), Mana Pass (Long. 79° 24' E and Lat. 31° 4' N), Niti Pass (Long. 79° 52' E and Lat. 30° 58' N), Tun Jun Pass (Long. 79° 58' E and Lat. 30° 53' N), Kungri Bingri Pass (Long. 80° 13' E and Lat. 30° 38' N), Darma Pass and the Lipu Lekh Pass (Long. 81° 2' E and Lat. 30° 14' 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 Arno Chu, and, following the watershed between the Arno Chu and Paro Chu, joins the Great Himalayan Range at Chomo Lhari and runs east along the crest of that range upto the Mela pass (Long. 91° 40' E and Lat. 27° 57' N). There it turns south and about 13 miles from the Mela Pass, turns east, crosses the Namjang river, and following the crest of the Great Himalayan Range which is also the watershed between the Chayul Chu in Tibet and the Kameng, Kamla and Khru rivers in India, proceeds east and northeast. Thereafter it crosses the Subansiri river and then the Tsari river just south of Migyitun and taking a north-easterly direction crosses the Tunga Pass (approximately Long. 94° 10' E and Lat. 28° 59' N). It then runs east, crosses the Dihang and ascends the watershed between Chimdru Chu and Rongta Chu in Tibet and the Dibang and its tributaries in India. The boundary crosses the Yonggyap Pass (Long. 95° 36' E and Lat. 29° 13' N) and the Kangri Karpo Pass (Long. 96° 5' E and Lat. 29° 28' N) in this sector. It then crosses the Lohit river a few miles south of Rima and joins the tri-junction of the India, Burma and China boundaries near the Diphu Pass.

The Chinese 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 up to Mount

Sajum, crosses the Shangatsangpu (Indus) River at 33 degrees North Latitude, runs along the watershed east of the Keyul 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 Chuva River, passes by the converging point 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 southeastern tip of Bhutan eastward to a point west of 94 degrees East Longitude, and then northeastward to Nizamghat follows all along the line where southern foot of the Himalayas touches the plains on the 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 southeastward 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.

COMMENTS UNDER ITEM ONE

The two delegations exchanged formally maps showing the boundary alignments claimed by them. The Indian side suggested that as it was necessary to have a precise indication of the alignments claimed by the two sides, it was important to have maps of a sufficiently large scale. They, therefore, proposed that the maps exchanged should be of the scale of at least 1:1 million which was the standard scale for maps of this nature laid down by the United Nations Cartographical Organisation of which India, the Soviet Union and other countries were members. The Chinese side replied that they had no map of a greater scale than 1:5 million available for this purpose of exchange. In the circumstances, the Indian side agreed to an exchange of maps of that scale. The Indian side provided the Political Map of India, scale 1: 4' 4 million (Survey of India 1958), and a Physical Relief Map of the Northern Frontier of India, scale 1:7 million (Survey of India 1960). The Chinese side provided a map of the South-western Frontier region of China, scale 1: 5 million (Peking 1960). Along with the maps the two sides also provided written statements.

The Chinese side stated that the written description given by the Indian side was in some respects beyond the scope of the conference. The area of dispute between India and China, according to them, lay east of the Karakoram Pass, and discussion of the alignments west of it would involve the Chinese side in the problem of the legal status of Kashmir, that State having been claimed by both India and Pakistan. The northern boundaries of Sikkim and Bhutan were also stated to be beyond the scope of the meetings of officials.

The Indian side were unable to agree with this. They pointed out that an exact and accurate description covering the entire length of the border, and not just those sectors where there was or where they, was thought to be a

dispute, should be given by both sides. The note exchanged between the Governments till then and the description provided by the Indian officials at the meeting in New Delhi on 2 April 1960 had referred to some specific areas of dispute; but now the question under discussion was what India and China considered to be their boundary alignments, and India had a right' to describe th whole alignment of her boundary with China. In fact, on this basis alone would it be possible to define the scope of the areas about which evidence was needed to be furnished subsequently. It was only at the 6th meeting held on 27 June 1960 that for the first time an authoritative map showing the whole alignment claimed by the People Government of China had been made available.

The Indian side also pointed out that the Chinese side were doubt less aware that the State of Jammu and Kashmir was an integral part of India. Legally and constitutionally that State had acceded to the Indian Union and the Indian side could not compromise this position or surrender it by implication. The Indian side could not accept the equation of India and Pakistan in respect of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Nor did India recognise the illegal occupation by Pakistan of any part of that State. It was also stated by the Indian side that their Government's position with regard to the boundaries of Bhutan and Sikkim was well-known. As had been fully explained in the earlier correspondence and at the meetings of the two Prime Ministers, India had the sole responsibility of representing these two States in matters concerning.

foreign governments. Indeed, the Government of Bhutan themselves had recently asked the Government of India to draw the attention of the Chinese Government to certain errors in their understanding of Bhutan's external boundaries. The Joint Communique of the two. Prime Ministers referred to the "differences relating to the border areas which have arisen between the Government of India and the Government of the People's

Republic of China." As such, all problems relating to the location of the boundary, including those of Bhutan and Sikkim, should be dealt with. Consistent with this correct position, the Indian side had included a description of the boundaries of these two States in their statement.

CLARIFICATIONS SOUGHT BY THE CHINESE SIDE

Chinese Questions

Q. 3.-It was said that the alignment, after crossing the Qara Qash river, ascended the Kuen Lun mountains. At what point did it do so? What were the peaks on this stretch and what were their co-ordinates? At what point did it reach the crest of the Kuen Lun mountains?

A.-As soon as it crossed the river, the line ascended the spur. Then it ran in a northerly and north-easterly direction until it reached a peak 23,100 feet (7040 metres). It then ran along the watershed, along Peaks 21960 feet (6693 metres) and 23300 feet (7102 metres).

Q. 4.-What were the co-ordinates of peak 7040 M (23100 feet)?

A.- The co-ordinates of Peak 23100 feet were Long. 79° 24' E, Lat. 35° 59' North.

Q. 5.-In the Indian description, the alignment was described as leaving the Kuen Lun mountains at a point approximately Long 80°21' E. What was the latitude of this point?

A.-The point at which the alignment left the main crest of the Kuen Lun mountains was approximately Long. 80° 21' E, Lat. 35° 28' N.

Q. 6.-Was the watershed from the point where the alignment left the Kuen Lun mountains down to Lanak Pass a continuous one, or was it broken at various points, i.e., were the two basins on the two sides of the watershed

entirely separated from ,each other or were they connected in some parts? Also, what were the rivers which formed this watershed, and what were the co-ordinates and the important turning points in this portion?

A. - The watershed was that between the rivers flowing into the Amtogor and Sarig Jilganang lakes in India on the one hand and the streams flowing into the Leighten and the Tsoggar lakes in Tibet, on the other. The Indian alignment in this sector did not cut across the waters flowing into the lakes mentioned. It, however, cut the western extremity of Nopte Tso. The watershed in this sector which the alignment followed, was, very high one, with an average height of about 20,000 feet.

Q. 7.-What was the height of this watershed, in contrast to the basins ,on the two sides ?

A. -On the Indian side the height of the basin was about 16,000 feet. On the Tibetan side, it was also roughly that much. The height of the watershed, as already stated, was about 20,000 feet.

Q. 8.-Was this watershed a continuous one or was it broken at some places?

A. -As already stated, it was a continuous one upto the point where it crossed the Nopte Tso lake.

Q. 9. Why then on the relief map provided by the Indian side was the alignment shown as cutting across a river flowing into the Amtogor lake?

A. - The river shown on the map as cut by the alignment was in fact a dry bed and not a river or a stream. The Chinese side would notice that it was not shown in the larger scale inset map on the same sheet.

Q. 10.-Was this not a discrepancy between the larger scale inset map and the small scale map?

A. - There was no discrepancy, Small scale maps do not differentiate between dry river beds and perennial streams. The smaller the scale of the map, the more slurred are the Details. Larger scale maps naturally show more details, and differentiate between dry beds and perennial streams. Further, the large scale map was a topical map emphasizing the Indian alignment in this sector, as in other sectors, was a watershed boundary and therefore it only showed perennial streams.

Q. 11.-In the Indian description it was stated that the Indian alignment after the Karakoram Pass lay along the watershed and crossed the Qara Qash river. Were there any particular mountain ranges along the crest of which the Indian alignment ran, between the Karakoram Pass and the place where it cut across the Qara Qash river? Did it belong to the Karakoram ranges or the Kuen Lun Mountain ranges?

A. - The alignment lay along the crest of one of the ranges, running east to west, of the Karakoram system.

Q.12.-In the Indian description of the alignment it was stated that after 'the line left the: Kuen Lun mountains it descended in a south-westerly direction separating the basins of the Amto gor and Sarig Jilganang lakes in India from those of Leighten and Tsoggar lakes in Tibet, down to Lanak Pass.

What were the coordinates of the mountain peaks and passes along this continuous watershed and of the point where it cut across the Nopte Tso lakes?

A. -The peaks were 21250 feet (6477 metres) and 21240 feet (6474 metres). The co-ordinates of peak 21250 feet were 80° 19' E and 35° 35'N; and the co-ordinates of peak 21240 feet were 80° 21' E and 35°28' N.

Q.13.-Were these two peaks after the alignment left the crest of the Kuen Lun mountains or before?

A. -They were both in the Kuen Lun mountains, more or less where the line began to move south.

Q. 14.-What were the peaks and passes from the point where the line left the Kuen Lun mountains till it reached the Lanak Pass?

A. -After it left the two peaks' the alignment lay along a continuous watershed with no prominent peaks. This watershed lay roughly at a height of about 20,000 feet. Just before the Lanak Pass, there was a peak 20610 feet (6282 metres).

Q. 15.-What were the co-ordinates of this peak?

A. -79° 32; East, 34°28' North.

Q. 16.-Was the Nopte Tso lake a separate basin in itself or was it incorporated with the basins of Leighten and Tsoggar lakes?

A. - The alignment ran along the main watershed of the region. There were tributaries and waters flowing into the Nopte Tso lake, as distinct from the waters flowing into the other lakes already mentioned in the description.

Q. 17.-The Indian description stated that the boundary lay along the southern bank of the Chumesang and the eastern bank of the Changlung Lumpa. What was meant by the statement that the line lay along the southern bank and the eastern bank? Did it lie on the banks itself?

A. -Yes, on the banks of the rivers.

Q. 18. -The description stated that the Indian boundary skirted the western extremity of the eastern half-of the Pangong lake, and lay along the watershed between the Ang stream flowing into the western Pangong lake and other streams flowing east ward. What specifically were the other streams flowing east ward?

A. - The Indian side felt they were not obliged to answer this question. To say that it was the watershed dividing the waters of the Ang river from other waters was precise enough to locate the watershed, and the Indian side should not be asked to describe the natural features of Tibet. However, as the Indian side believed that all questions seeking clarification: should be answered wherever possible, they provided the answer to this question. The streams flowing into Tibet at this point were steep mountain torrents. The three major torrents were Numkum, Aghlung Trong Trong and Aghrong.

Q. 19.-What were the co-ordinates of the point where the Line touched the northern bank of Spanggur lake?

A. - The co-ordinates of the point where the Indian boundary crossed the northern bank of the Spanggur lake were approximately 78° 56' R and 33° 33' N.

Q. 20.-What was the specific point where the Indian alignment cut across the Spanggur lake at the southern part of this lake?

A. -78° 56' E, 33° 32' N

Q.21.-The Indian description stated that its alignment crossed the Indus about five miles south-east of Demchok. What were the co-ordinates where the line crossed the Indus and also, what were the terrain features which the line followed from this point to the watershed between the Hanle and the tributaries of the Sutlej river.

A.-Crossing the Indus river at point Long. 79° 32'E., Lat. 32°40' N, the alignment ascended the spur on the opposite bank and ran along, the crest of the Ladakh range. Then it proceeded along the watershed in a north-westerly direction upto peak 21,000 feet and then moved along a spur in a south-westerly direction

Q. 22.- The Indian description of A.-From the Kyungzing Pass the southern portion of the alignment line ran north upto peak 21°3° feet in the Western Sector stated that the-: (6410 metres) and then turned south-line passed through Kyungzing Pass, west thereafter turned westward and crossed the Pare river about five miles south of Chumar. Did this mean that the line ran straight westward or did it run in some other direction, not entirely directly westward?

Middle Sector

Q. 1.-Was the watershed between the Spiti and the Pare rivers referred to by the Indian side a continuous mountain ridge or did it again move on to spurs? Before the India alignment crossed the Pare river what ridge did it follow?

A. - The watershed between Spiti and Pare rivers lay along high and continuous mountains and not along spurs. Before crossing the Pare river the Indian alignment lay along the ridge lying to the north-west Kaurik.

Q. 2.-What was the location of Kaurik village? From inset 'A' on the map handed over by the Indian side, it appeared that it was situated north-west of the junction of the Pare and the Spiti rivers. Did the Indian alignment also pass in the vicinity the junction of the Pare and the Spiti rivers as indicated on the Indian map?

A- Kaurik was situated at approximately Long. $78^{\circ} 39'$ E. and Lat. $32^{\circ} 06'$ N, which was about five miles north-east of the junction of the Pare and Spiti rivers. The Indian alignment lay immediately to the north and east of Kaurik and cut the Pare river about a mile south of Kaurik.

Q. 3.- The Indian side stated that south of the Pare river their alignment ascended a spur. To what their mountain range did this spur belong?

A- The spur south of the Pare river, along which the Indian alignment belonged to the Zaskar Wange.

Q. 4.- The Indian side stated that their alignment crossed the Siang-chuan (Sutlej) river at its bend. What were the co-ordinates of the crossing? What were the geographical features followed by the Indian alignment from Peak Leo Pargial to Shipki Pass?

A.-The Indian alignment crossed the Sutlej at approximately Long $8^{\circ} 44' E$ and $32^{\circ} 52' N$. From Peak Leo Pargial the alignment descended along a spur, crossed the Sutlej and again mounted the spur on the opposite bank of the river to the Shipki Pass.

Q. 5.-Were there other passes along the Indian alignment from Shipki Pass to Thaga Pass besides Raniso and Shimdang Passes mentioned by the Indian side?

A.-Between Shipki Pass and Thaga Pass, apart from the Ramso and the Shimdang Passes mentioned earlier, the Khimokul (Gumrang) Pass (Long. $78^{\circ} 49' E$ and Lat. $31^{\circ} 26' N$) also lay on the boundary.

Q. 6.-After passing through Shimdang Pass, from what point did the Indian alignment turn north east to reach the Thaga Pass?

A- After passing across the Shimdang Pass and the Khimokul Pass, the Indian alignment first ran in a south-easterly direction and then turned north-eastward at a point approximately Long. $78^{\circ} 56' E$ and Lat. $31^{\circ} 15' N$.

Q. 7.-On Inset 'B' of the Indian map, there were marked Shalshal Pass, Balcha Dhura Pass and Kiogad Pass, but they had not been mentioned in

the Indian description. Did the Indian alignment pass through these passes? What were their co-ordinates?

A.-The Indian alignment lay across the Shalshal Pass (Long. $80^{\circ} 04'E$. and Lat. $30^{\circ} 50'N$), the Balcha Dhura Pass (Long. $80^{\circ} 11'E$. and Lat. $30^{\circ} 48'N$) and the Kiogad Pass (Long. $80^{\circ} 13' E$ and Lat. $30^{\circ} 41' N$).

Q. 8.-It appeared from the Indian map that the Indian alignment, after passing through Kungri Bingri Pass, crossed a point from which it turned east. What point was this? Was it a pass or a peak?

A.-From Kungri Bingri Pass the alignment lay south up to a point Long. $89^{\circ} 13' E$ and Lat. $30^{\circ} 35'N$ along the crest of hills which also formed the watershed and then turned slightly south-east and then eastward.

Q. 9.- The co-ordinates of all the places named in the Indian description had been given with the exception of those for Darma Pass. What were the co-ordinates of Darma Pass?

A.-The co-ordinates of Darma Pass were Long. $80^{\circ} 32' East$ and Lat. $30^{\circ} 27' North$.

Q. 10.-According to the Indian side's understanding, what was the distance between the Lipu Lekh Pass and the tri-junction of China, India and Nepal?

A.-From Lipu Lekh Pass to the trijunction of the boundaries of China, India and Nepal, the distance was about three miles.

EASTERN SECTOR

Q. 1.-What were the co-ordinates of the point south of the Mela Pass where the Indian alignment turned east, as stated in the Indian side's description?

A.-The point south of the Mela Pass from where the Indian alignment by lay east was approximately $91^{\circ} 40' E$ and Lat. $27^{\circ} 48' N$.

Q. 2.-How far south was Khinzemane from the Indian alignment, and what were its coordinates?

A.-Khinzemane was situated at Long. $91^{\circ} 46' E$ and Lat. $27^{\circ} 36' N$ and lay immediately south of the boundary, which ran along the Tang La (Thagla) ridge.

Q. 3.-At what point did the Indian alignment cross the Namjang river?

A.-The boundary crossed the Nyamjang river east of Khinzemane.

Q.4.-What were the terrain features followed by the Indian alignment from the point south of the Mela Pass where it turned east to reach 92° East Longitude?

A.-The boundary started at Teygala on the Mela ridge and ran along the Tang La (Thagla) ridge, crossed the Nyamjang east of Khinzemane and ran along the Zanglung ridge to Bumla. From Bumla the line ran along Nakchutpa range to Tona Chu.

Q. 5.-From $91^{\circ} 40' E$ Long., $27^{\circ} 48' N$ Lat., how did the Indian alignment run along Tangla? Where were the turning points? What were the co-ordinates of the peaks and passes on this ridge?

A.-From 91° 40' E Long., 27° 48' N. Lat., the Indian alignment ran along the crest of Thagla (Tang La) ridge. It lay across the Thagla pass at approximately 91° 44' E Long., 27° 46' N Lat.

Q.6.-What were the specific locations of Teygala, Zanglung ridge and Nakehutpa range?

A.-Teyga La was located at point 91° 40' E Long., 27° 48' N. Lat. Zanglung was the name given to the Great Himalayas east of Nyamjang Chu. Nakchutpa was the name given to the Great Himalayas east of Bumla.

Q.7.-What was the direction in which the Tangla mountain ran?

A.-The ridge ran in a west-north range west to east-south-east direction.

Q.8.-What were the co-ordinates of the Indian alignment where it crossed the Namjang?

A.-The Indian alignment crossed the Nyamjang at approximately 91° 46' E Long., 27° 46' N Lat.

Q.9.-What were the co-ordinates of the Indian alignment where it crossed the Tsona Chu?

A.- The Indian alignment crossed Tsona Chu at approximately 92° 0' E Long., 27° 44' N Lat.

Q. 10.-On what terrain features were the three northward protrusions of the Indian alignment between 92° East and 92° 30' East Longitude based? What were the co-ordinates of the respective turning points?

A. - The northward protrusions of the boundary between 92° East and 92° 30' East were based on the actual alignment of the crest of the Great Himalayan Range in this region. The Peaks and the coordinates were 18982 (92° 16' E-27° 49' N) 18525 (92° 16' E-27° 52' N) 19359 (92° 20' E-27° 47' N) 21271 (92° 23' E-27° 51' N) 21450 (92° 24' E-27° 48' N) 21420 (92° 26' E-27° 52' N) 20769 (92° 27' E-27° 49' N)

Q. 11.-At what point did the Indian alignment cross the Subansiri River and what were its co-ordinates?

A. - The alignment crossed the Subansiri River at approximately Long. 93° 13' E and Lat. 28° 22' N.

Q. 12.-How far south of Migyitun did the Indian alignment Cross the Tsari river, and what were the co-ordinates of the crossing? What was the shortest distance between Tso Karpo and the Indian alignment? What were the terrain features followed by the Indian alignment in this portion?

A. - The alignment crossed the Tsari River immediately south of Migyitun, at approximately Long. 93° 33' E, and 28° 39' N. The shortest distance between Tso Karpo and the alignment was roughly about a mile and a half. The natural features followed in this region was the ridge separating the tributaries of the. Tsari Chu south of Longju on the one hand and the Oro Chu flowing into the Tsari Chu north of Migyitun, and the Lilung Chu basin on the other.

Q. 13.-What was the distance between Longju and Migyitun?

A. - The distance between Longju and the alignment south of Migyitun was about two miles. Migyitun itself was in Tibet.

Q. 14.-What were the terrain features followed by the Indian alignment from the point where it crossed the Subansiri River to the point where it crossed the Tsari River? The Co-ordinates and geographical features of some of the points along this portion of the Indian alignment might also be supplied.

A.-After crossing the Subansiri River, the alignment lay northward along the ridge west of the Pindigo river (flowing into the Subansiri); and then at about a point approximately Long. 9318' E and Lat., 28° 37' N, the alignment turned north-eastward along the ridge lying to the north-west of the Hariak river flowing into the Tsari Chu) upto Peak 18056 feet (Long. 93° 32' E., and Lat. 28° 41' N) whereafter it turned south-east and east to cross the Tsari Chu south of Migyitun.

Q.15.-What were the co-ordinates of the heights on the bridge separating the tributaries of Tsari Chu south of Longju on the one hand and the Tri the Oto Chu flowing into the Tsari Chu north of Migyitun and the Lilung Chu basin on the other? What were the co-ordinates of the on the point nearest to Tso Karpo

A.-Height 17,500 feet (coordinates 93° 42' E Long., 28° 40' N. Lat) was located on the ridge separating the tributaries of Chu on the one hand and the Oto Chu flowing into the Tsari Chu north of Migyitun and the Lilung Chu

basin on the other. The co-ordinates of point nearest to the south of Tso were the point nearest to Tso Karpo were 93° 4' E Long., 28° 4' N Lat.

Q. 16.-At what place did the Pindigo river flow into the Subansiri river? At what place did Hariak river flow into the Tsari Chu? The Indian side might furnish the heights of peaks on the ridge west of the Pindigo river and their coordinates and the heights of peak" on the ridge north-west of the Hariak river and their coordinates.

A.-The Pindigo river flowed for its whole course well within Indian territory and joined the Subansiri at 93° 16' E Long., 28° 22' N Lat. The Hariak river also flowed for its whole course in Indian territory and joined the Tsari Chu at 93° 31' E Long., 28° 37' N Lat. The heights of the ridges west of the Pindigo river and north-west of the Hariak river were about 16,000 feet.

.

Q. 17.-Was there a ridge between Longju and Migyitun? If so, what was its height in comparison with .that of Longju?

A.-Longju and Migyitun lay in the Tsari valley. The height of the intervening ridge was about 10,000 feet. The height of Longju was slightly over 9,000 feet.

Q. 18.-Did the watershed pass ;between Longju and Migyitun, Or was the watershed here cut by the valley?

A.- The fact that a river cut through did not invalidate the principle of the watershed. The alignment ran along the watershed and at the point where the Tsari river broke through, the line ran between Migyitun and Long ju. The average height of the watershed in this area was about 15,000 feet.

Q. 19.-How far was the Indian alignment east and south of Tsari Sarpa? What were the co-ordinates .of the point where the Indian alignment which had been going eastward "turned northward?

A. - The alignment was about four miles to the south and four miles to the east of Tsari Sarpa. The alignment turned northward at approximately Long. $93^{\circ} 57' E$, and Lat. $28^{\circ} 4' N$.

Q. 20.-What were the terrain features followed by the Indian alignment south of Tsari Sarpa? If there were ridges, the Indian side might furnish the heights of peaks and the .co-ordinates.

A. -South of Tsari Sarpa, the boundary followed the southern watershed of the Lilung Chu. This watershed was about 16,000 feet high.

Q. 21.-What were the geographical features of the Indian alignment between $93^{\circ} 3'$ East Longitude and Tunga Pass.?

A. -Between $93^{\circ} 3' E$ Longitude and the Tunga Pass the alignment lay along the ridges lying to the south of Tso Karpo and Tsari Sarpa and separating the basins of the Oro Chu and Lilung Chu in Tibet from the tributaries of the Subansiri in the south. From peak 16,454 feet (Long. $93^{\circ} 59' 5'' E$, and Lat. $8^{\circ} 48' N$) the alignment lay through peak 16,894 (Long. $94^{\circ} 2' E$, and Lat. $28^{\circ} 51' N$) along the crest of the Great Himalayan Range upto Tunga Pass.

CLARIFICATIONS SOUGHT BY THE INDIAN SIDE

Q. 1-The Chinese description stated that the boundary between Sinkiang and Ladakh "for its entire length runs along the Karakoram mountain range following broadly the watershed between the two big-river systems." The word "broadly" suggested that the alignment did not throughout follow the watershed between the two big river systems. In which parts of the sector did the Chinese alignment not follow the watershed?

A. -Except for the sources of certain tributaries of the Shyok river, it broadly-not strictly-followed the watershed between the two big river systems. The line turned south-eastward along the high ridge of the Karakoram mountains on the east bank of the Shyok river and the northern bank of the Khugrang Tsangpo river. The entire portion of this line lay along the high ridge. This was a watershed.

Q. 2.-The Chinese side might give the names of those tributaries as marked on the map and which the alignment crossed.

A- Between the Karakoram Pass and the Kongka Pass, the rivers which the alignment crossed were

- (1) Chip Chap river,*
- (2) 3 small rivers called western gulleys*
- (3) Chilowan,*
- (4) the tributaries of the Chang Chenmo.*

Q. 3.-The Chinese side might give the exact co-ordinates of the points where the Chinese alignment crossed these rivers.

Q. 4.- The Chinese description stated : "From the Karakoram Pass, the boundary runs eastward to a point east of 78° East Longitude. " What was the exact point east of 78° East longitude where it turned south-eastwards? The Chinese side might give the degrees and minutes longitude as well as degrees and minutes latitude.

A.-Longitude $78^{\circ} 5'$ East, Latitude $35^{\circ} 33'$ North.

Q. 5.-The Chinese alignment proceeded east from the Karakoram Pass to a point $78^{\circ} 5'$ E., $35^{\circ} 33'$ N. This segment east of the Karakoram pass was shown on the map as a straight line. The Indian side would like to have more details.

A.-The map given by the Chinese si de showed this alignment very clearly. It followed the watershed between the tributaries of the Yarkand river and the Shyok.

Q. 6.-The Indian side would like to have the co-ordinates of prominent peaks on this range from Karakoram Pass to the point $78^{\circ} 5'$ East and $35^{\circ} 33'$ North.

Q. 7.- What were the heights of prominent peaks on this range?

Q. 8.- The Chinese description stated : "From the Karakoram Pass it runs eastward along the mountain ridge." Was that the highest range? And was it a continuous range?

A.-It ran along the ridge of that particular mountain range which lay east of the Shyok river and north of the Khugrang Tsangpo river. It might not be the highest range.

Q. 9.-The Indian side would like to have some heights of peaks and location of passes on this particular ridge.

A.-From 78° 5' East, the line turned south-west to a point Long. 78° 1' E. and Lat. 35° 21' N., where it crossed the Chip Chap river. After this, it turned south east along' the mountain ridge and passed through two peaks Peak 6845 metres and Peak 6598 metres. The co-ordinates of Peak 6845 M were Long. 78° 12' E, Lat. 34° 57' N. The co-ordinates of Peak 6598 M were Long. 68° 13' E., Lat. 34° 54' N. After the alignment passed over the two peaks, it went south along the mountain ridge, where it crossed the Galwan river at Long. 78° 13' E, Lat. 34. 46' N. It then passed over Peak 6556 M and followed the watershed between the Khugrang Tsangpo river and its tributary the Changlung river, crossed the Changlung river at Long. 78° 53' E, Lat. 34° 22' N, and reached the Kongka Pass.

Q. 10.-Was the boundary line .along one long continuous ridge except where the rivers broke through, or was it a series of broken hills?

Q. 11-From the crossing of the Chang Lung river to the Kongka Pass, did the alignment run along a ridge?

A.-It ran along the mountain ridge in a south-easterly direction upto the Kongka Pass.

Q-. 12.-The Chinese alignment turned south-west from the point 78° 5' E, 35° 33' N. to a point 78° 1' E, 35° 21' N, where it crossed the Chip Chap river. The Indian side would like to have more details about this stretch of the alignment. Did it follow a ridge or a stream ?

A.-It ran in a south-westerly direction along a gulley upto the Chip Chap river for the entire length. .

Q. 13.-The Indian side would like to have a confirmation of what was clear from the information and map given by the Chinese side, that their alignment did not run along the highest range of the Karakoram mountains, but along lower ridges to the east.

A.- The ranges west of the Shyok river were higher, and in Indian territory.

Q. 14.-After crossing the Chip Chap river, and before it reached Peak 6845 metres, did the Chinese alignment cross any other tributaries flowing into the Chip Chap?

Q. 15.- The Chinese description stated: "The boundary alignment runs along the east bank of the Shyok river and the northern bank of the Khugrang Tsangpo river." At what exact point-either the coordinates or distances correlated with some natural features-did the alignment move from the east bank of the Shyok river to the northern bank of the Khugrang Tsangpo river?

A.- The line passed over Peak 6556 meters. It then moved to the watershed on the northern bank of the Khugrang Tsangpo river.

Q. 16.-South-of the Kongka Pass, the alignment ran along the ridge passing through Ane Pass. The Indian side would like to have details of this ridge, heights of peaks location of passes, etc.

Q. 17.-South of the Kongka Pass, the alignment cut the Chang Chenmo river. What were the exact points at which it cut this river valley?

A.-After passing the Kongka Pass, it turned south-west, crossed the junction of the Chang Chenmo river and the Silung Barma river, and went upto Peak Tamate, the coordinates of which were Long. 780 55' E, Lat. 34° 10' N. Then the line ran in a south-westerly direction,. along the Chang Chenmo mountains, and over Peak 61°7 M to the Ane Pass.

Q. 18.-From the Kongka Pass "to the junction of the Chang Chenmo and the Silung Barma rivers, did the alignment run south-west immediately after it passed the Kongka La? Did it run along a ridge or along streams?

A.-After passing through the Kongka Pass, it turned south-west along mountain ridges.

Q. 19. The Chinese side stated that the alignment, running along the Chang Chenmo mountains, reached the Ane Pass. This meant presumably that at some point it left the Chang Chenmo mountains and turned south to reach the Ane Pass. At what point did it leave the Chang Chenmo mountains ? Did it run due south from there and along a ridge upto the Ane Pass?

A.-After leaving Peak 16°7 metres it went in a south-easterly direction along the mountain ridge upto the Ane Pass

Q. 20.- The Chinese alignment ran along the Chang Chenmo range and then crossed the river valley to the Ane Pass. At what point did it -Cross the valley?

It crossed the river at the junction of the Chang Chenmo river and the Silung Barma river

Q. 21.-Did it cross any rivers between Peak 6107 and the Ane Pass? Where did it cross Kiu river?

A. - To the Chinese knowledge there was a river called the Chee Yu river which might be the Kiu river. This Chee Yu river lay within Chinese territory, and the line did not cut across it.

Q. 22.-Passing through Ane Pass, the alignment cut across the western half of Pangong Lake. What were the details of the alignment, such as terrain features, from the Ane Pass to the Pangong Lake?

A. -It followed the mountain ridge to Height 6127 M, turned in a southwesterly direction, and reached the northern bank of the Pangong Lake.

Q. 23.-What was the exact point where the alignment cut the western half of Pangong Lake? And what was the exact point where it left the Pangong Lake?

A. - The co-ordinates of the point where it reached the Pangong Lake were- Long. 78° 49' E, Lat. 33° 44' N. It crossed to the southern bank of the lake at a point Long. 78° 43' E, Lat. 33° 40' N. Then it went in a south-easterly

direction along the watershed dividing the Tongta river and the other rivers flowing into the Spanggur Lake, till it reached Mount Sajum.

Q. 24.- The Indian side would like to have the names of passes through which the Chinese L alignment ran ?

A.-The Chinese side have already mentioned the main passes - the Karakoram Pass, the Kongka Pass and the Ane Pass.

Q. 25.-The Chinese description stated that the alignment skirted the western side of the Spanggur Lake. Did this mean that it touched the western side of the Spanggur Lake?

A.-It did not touch, but went along the ridge, i.e., it ran along the watershed composed of the streams flowing into the Spanggur Lake on the Chinese side and the river on the Indian side, which the Chinese called Tongta river.

Q. 26.-According to the Indian map, the watershed ridge was cut by the western tip of Spanggur Lake. It would, therefore, help understanding to have the names of the rivers flowing into the Spanggur Lake. The Indian side would also like to have the distance of the Chinese line from the western tip of the Spanggur Lake as well as the co-ordinates of this point. According to the map given by the Chinese side, the alignment touched the western tip of the Spanggur Lake.

A.- The alignment marked on the map given by the Chinese side did not seem to touch the lake.

Q. 27.-If according to the Chinese side, the alignment on their map did not touch the lake, would they give the distance from the lake and the co-ordinates of this point?

Q. 28.- The boundary in this area, according to the Chinese, lay in a south-easterly direction along the watershed. The Indian side would like to have the heights of peaks on this watershed and their co-ordinates.

Q. 29.- The Chinese side mentioned three peaks-6556 metres, 6106 metres and 6127 metres. The Indian side would like to have the co-ordinates of these peaks.

A. -6556 metres :-Long. 78° 26' East Lat. 34° 32' N.

6107 metres :-Long. 78° 39' E. Lat. 34° °4' N.

6127 metres :-Long. 78° 46' E, Lat. 33° 50' N.

Q. 30.- The Chinese alignment was stated to run from the Spanggur Lake upto Mount Sajum. What were the terrain features of this stretch?

Q. 31.-From Mount Sajum the alignment was said to run to the crossing of the Indus. What were the natural features of this stretch: heights of peaks, passes, etc?

Q. 32.- The Chinese description stated that the alignment crossed the Indus at 33° North latitude. The Indian side wished to have the exact co-ordinates of this crossing.

A. -It crossed the Indus river at point Long. 79° 10' E, Lat. 33° (approximately).

Q. 33.-In the Chinese statement, it was alleged that in the Western sector, India was in "occupation" of Parigas district. This district was not marked on the map supplied by the Chinese side. Nor was Parigas known to the Indian side. The Chinese side might give details of the location and area of this district.

A. - Parigas was part of the Demchok area. West of Demchok, after crossing the Chopu river, one arrived at Parigas.

Q. 34.- The Chinese side stated that Parigas lay west of Demchok after crossing the Chopu river. As the Indian side were not aware of these names Parigas and Chopu, they wished to have the co-ordinates of Parigas.

A. -Chopu river was located one kilometre to the west of village Demchok. West of this river, there was a frontier post of the Indian troops and that was Parigas.

Q. 35.- The Chinese alignment ran along the watershed east of the Koyul Lungpa river and south of the Hanle river. The Indian side would like to have details of heights of peaks, names of passes, etc., on these two watersheds, and also the exact point where the alignment turned from the watershed east of the Koyul Lungpa to that south of the Hanle river.

Q. 36.-The Indian side would like to have the height and co-ordinates of the of Mount Shinowu, mentioned in the Chinese description.

A. - The height of this peak was approximately 6410 metres. Its coordinates were approximately Long..78° 5' E., Lat. 32° 43' N.

Q. 37.-From that point, according to the Chinese statement, the alignment ran westward. At what point did it cross the Pare river?

Q. 38.-From the map given to the Indian side, it appeared that the Chinese alignment cut the Pare river as its junction with a stream at a point Long. $78^{\circ} 37' E.$, Lat. $32^{\circ} 37' N.$ The Indian side would be glad to have a confirmation of this.

A. - The location of the point where the line crossed the Pare river was approximately as stated by the Indian side.,

Q. 39.-What were the co-ordinates of what was called the tri-junction of the Ari district in China and the Punjab and Ladakh in India?

A. - The co-ordinates of this junction were approximately Long. $78^{\circ} 24' E.$, Lat. $32^{\circ} 31' N.$

MIDDLE SECTOR

Q. 1.- The description given by the Chinese side stated that their alignment ran southward along the watershed west of the Pare river and the Chuva river. Would the Chinese side point out the Chuva river on their map?

Q. 2.-What was meant by the watershed west of the Pare river and the Chuva river? Was it the watershed between the Pare and Chuva rivers? Otherwise, between which rivers did this watershed lie?

A.-In the portion north of the junction of the Pare and the Spiti rivers, the alignment followed the watershed between the Pare and the Chuva rivers (the Chuva river was situated between the boundary and the Pare river, and flowed into the Spiti river) on the one hand, and the other tributaries of the Spiti river on the other.

Q.3.-Would the Chinese side give details of heights of peaks and names of passes on this watershed? The co-ordinates of these points might also be given.

A.-It passed through Peak 6526 metres (approximately 78° 3' E. Long. and 32° 21' N. Lat).

Q. 4.-Did the alignment run along the watershed right up to the converging point of the Pare river and the Spiti river? Would the Chinese side give exact co-ordinates of the point where the Pare river and the Spiti river converged? Did the alignment pass through this point?

Q.5.-The Chinese side stated that the alignment passed through Peak 6526 metres. The Chinese description stated that the boundary ran along the watershed and passed by the converging-point of the Pare and the Spiti rivers. Did this mean that Peak 6526 was on the watershed?

A.-Height 6526 was on the watershed separating the Pare and the Chuva rivers on the one hand and the other tributaries of the Spiti river on the other

Q. 6.- The Chinese side have stated that Height 6526 is on the watershed separating the Pare and the Chuva rivers on the one hand and the other

tributaries of the Spiti on the other. The Indian side would like to know how many miles west of Chuva river the height was located.

Q. 7.- The Chinese side gave the height of one peak on the watershed north of the junction of the Pare and the Spiti rivers. The Indian side would like to have heights of some other peaks on this watershed and the names of passes, if any.

Q. 8.- The Chinese side stated that the Chuva river was situated between the boundary and the Pare river. Was this river shown on the Chinese map and, if it were, would they point it out? The Chinese answer also stated that the Chuva river flowed into the Spiti river. The co-ordinates of this junction might be given. .

Q. 9.- The Chinese description stated that their alignment passed by the converging-point of the Pare and the Spiti rivers. Did the alignment pass east or west of the junction, and at how many miles distance from it? The Indian side would also like to have the co-ordinates of the point at which it passed this junction.

Q. 10.-Before the alignment reached the junction of the Pare and the Spiti rivers, did it cross what the Chinese side called the Chuva river? If it did, the Indian side would like to have the co-ordinates of this crossing.

Q. 11-The Chinese side stated that their alignment met Spiti river a few kilometres west of the converging-point of the Chuva and Spiti and that it then ran along the Spiti upto its junction with Pare. In the Chinese map however, the alignment was shown not along the Spiti but descending directly from the north and cutting the Pare river just east of its junction

with the Spiti. The Indian side would like to have a clarification of this discrepancy.

A.-With regard to the position of the Chinese line in the vicinity of the junction of the Pare and the Spiti rivers, the Chinese side's earlier answer was a more detailed explanation of the map provided by the Chinese side. This explanation therefore, should not be considered as being different from the map.

Q. 12.-Chuva and Chuje were alleged to be places" under Indian occupation". These places were not marked on the map. The Indian side would like to have details of their location and area.

A.- Chuva and Chuje were to the east of the boundary and west of place called Chulupu. Chuje was to the east of Chuva.

Q. 13.-The Chinese side mentioned that Chuva and Chuje were to the east of the Chinese alignment and west of Chulupu. The Indian side would like to have the coordinates of Chuva and Chuje. Were these villages or camping-grounds?

A.-Chuva and Chuje were two villages. Chtiva river was a small river west of Sumdo. The Chinese line met the Spiti river a few kilometres west of the converging-point of the Chuva and the Spiti rivers. Then it ran along the Spiti river upto the junction where it met the Pare river (approximate 1y 78' 36' E. Long. 32° 02' N. Lat.)

Q. 14.-Chuva and Chuje were stated to be two villages. The Indian side would like to know how far and in what direction from Sumdo they were located.

A.-Chuva was to the north of Sumdo. Chuje was to the east of Sumdo.

Q. 15.-Did the alignment from the junction of the Spiti and the Pare rivers to H 6791, cut across streams, or did it lie along a ridge?

Q. 16.-Would the Chinese side give details of the alignment from the converging-point of the Pare and Spiti rivers to the crossing of the Sutlej river? If it ran along the watershed, the Indian side would like to have detail of heights of peaks and names of passes on this watershed, and the co-ordinates of these points.

Q. 17.-Would the Chinese side give the co-ordinates of the point at which the alignment crossed the Sutlej river? It was said to be west of Shipki.Pass. How far west of Shipki Pass?

A.-At a place (there was a small river called the Hupsand Khud there) about 6 to 7 kilometres west of Shipki Pass, the boundary crossed the Siangchuan River. North-east of this point the boundary passed through Peak 6791 (approximate) 78° 45'E. Long, 31° 54'N. Lat.)

Q. 18.- The Chinese side stated that the alignment crossed the Sutlej at a place 6 to 7 kilometers west of Shipki Pass. The Indian side would like to have the co-ordinates of this point.

Q. 19.- The Chinese side stated that west of Shipki there was a small river called the Hupsang Khud. Did the alignment cross the Sutlej west or east of the junction of the Sutlej with the Hupsang Khud?

20.- The Chinese side stated that north-east of the crossing of the Sutlej the alignment passed through Peak 6791. The Indian side would like to have the heights of other peaks and a description of the natural features followed by the alignment in this segment.

Q. 21.- The description given by the Chinese side stated that after the crossing of the Sutlej river the alignment continued southward along the watershed. The Indian side would like to have details of heights of peaks and names of passes on this watershed, as well as the co-ordinates of these points.

A. -South of this point, the boundary passed through Peak 5642 (approximately 78°50'E. Long. 31°37 N. Lat.).

Q. 22.- The Chinese side stated that south of the Sutlej, crossing the alignment passed through peak 5642. The Indian side would like to have the heights of other peaks and a description of the natural features in this segment.

A. -From Height 6791, the alignment ran along a spur in a southerly direction, and crossed the junction of the Siangchuan river and the Hupsang Khud river. It then ran along the ridge passing through Height 5642 and Gumrang Pass (approximately 78° 49'E. Long., 31°25' N. Lat).

Q. 23.-South of the Sutlej crossing the Chinese alignment was stated to run directly from Height 5642 to the Gumrang Pass. The Indian side would like to have the names of any other heights and passes on this ridge.

A.-Between Height 5642 and Gumrang Pass, the boundary also passed through Tapulung Pass (approximately 78° 5' E. Long 31° 35' N. Lat.)

Q. 24.- The Indian side would like to have the co-ordinates of Shipki and Puling Sumdo which were marked on the map

A.-Shipki was a village in China Puling Sumdo was located at approximately 79° 08' E. Long. 31° 18' N. Lat.)

Q. 25.-The Indian side would like to have details of the alignment from Gumrang Pass to the crossing of the Jadhganga.

Q. 26.-As the Chinese alignment crossed the Jadhganga river, obviously it had left the watershed at some point before. At what exact point did it do so, and on the basis of what geographical principles? The Chinese alignment in the Middle Sector was stated in the description to have the natural features of watersheds, mountain passes and river valleys. What natural features did it follow from the point where it left the watershed upto the crossing of the Jadhganga river?

A.-In the Sang and Tsungha area, the boundary crossed the Jadhganga river west of Tsungsha. With regard to the location of the traditional boundary in this area, the Tibet local authorities and the British side had entered into many negotiations in the past. The Chinese side were willing to make clarifications on this later.

Q. 27.- The Chinese side promised clarifications at a later stage on negotiations about this sector. But Item 1 dealt with only natural features. What were the natural features followed by the Chinese alignment in this sector?

Q. 28.- The alignment was said to cross the Jadhganga river west of Tsungsha. How far west of Tsungsha?

Q. 29.- The Indian side would like to have the co-ordinates of the point where the Chinese line crossed the Jadhganga river.

Q. 30 - The alignment was stated to turn east after crossing the Jadhganga river. At what exact point did it turn east, and on the basis of what natural features ?

Q.31.-From the Jadhganga crossing to the M3na Pass, did the alignment lie along the Mana Gad river?

Q. 32.-What were the natural features followed by the Chinese alignment after the crossing of Jadhganga river till it reached the Mana Pass?

Q.33.-What was the name of the river shown near Sang on the Chinese map?

A. - Jadhganga river.

Q. 34.-Would the Chinese side give details of the alignment from Mana Pass to Mount Kamet ?

A. - The Chinese alignment ran along the ridge from Mana Pass to Mt. Kamet and after crossing Mt. Kamet.

Q. 35.-Would the Chinese side give details of the alignment from Mount Kumat onwards? Did it lie along Niti Pass?

A. - After passing through Mt. Kamet, the boundary did not pass through Niti Pass but passed through Ma Dzo La which was south of Niti Pass.

Q. 36. -Was Ma Dzo La a pass or a village?

A. -Ma Dzo La was a mountain pass.

Q. 37.-It was stated that the alignment "skirts along the south side of Wuje, Sangcha and Lapthal". These three places were not marked on the map, and the Chinese side might, therefore, give details of their area and location. What was meant by skirting along the south side? How far south of these three places did the Chinese alignment run? The Indian side would like to have details of the alignment in this segment and the natural features which it followed.

A. -In the area of Wuje, Sangcha and Lapthal, the boundary followed a mountain ridge south of these three places. This ridge was higher than the ridge north of these three places. The approximate co-ordinates of these three places were as follows:

Wuje 79° 58' E. Long. 30°50' N. Lat

Sangcha 80° 9' E. Long. 30° 46' N. Lat.

Lapthal 80° 8' E. Long. 30° 44' N. Lat.

Q. 38.-In the Wuje, Sangcha and Lapthal area, the boundary was said to follow a mountain ridge south of these three places. How far south of these three places did the alignment lie?

Q. 39.-The Chinese side stated that in the area of Wuje, Sangcha and Lapthal the boundary followed the mountain ridge south of these three places. Were there any rivers crossing this mountain ridge ? If so, the Indian side would like to have the co-ordinates of these crossings, and the heights of any peaks on this ridge.

Q. 40.-What were the co-ordinates of the point at which the alignment cut the Dhauli river?

Q. 41.-It was stated that after Wuje, Sangcha and Lapthal the alignment "again runs along the watershed". At what point did the alignment leave the watershed, at what exact point did it return to her watershed, and on the basis of what geographical principles and natural features did the alignment first leave the watershed and then return to it?

A. - In the area of Wuje, Sangcha and Lapthal, the alignment ran along a ridge south of these three places passed through Mt Dzo La (approximately 79° 55' E. Long. 30° 5' N. Lat.) and then skirted the southern side of U-Dra La river upto U-Dra La. From there the alignment followed the watershed separating the tributaries of the Siang chuan and the Map Chu rivers on the one hand and the Dhauli, Ganga and the Kali rivers on the other upto the tri-junction of China, India and Nepal.

Q. 42. The Indian side wished to know the co-ordinates of the point from which the Chinese alignment, after running along the south side of Wuje, Sangcha and Laphal, again runs along the watershed."

Q. 43.- The Indian side would like to have details of the alignment from the point where it returned to the watershed upto Darma Pass.

Q. 44.-Were all the areas lying between Wuje, Sangcha and Laphal Chinese territory or were the three places separated by wedges of Indian territory? Did all the three places form one composite area or did they form three different pockets?

A. - These three places were all within Chinese territory and there were no Indian territories in between.

Q. 45.-The Indian side would like to have the co-ordinates of U-Dra La.

A. -U-Dra La was s not far south west of Kungri Bingri Pass

Q. 46.-How far were Sangeha and Laphal from the U-Dra La river?

Q. 47.- The Indian side would like to have details of the alignment from the Darma Pass to the trijunction of China, India and Nepal.

Q. 48.-Would the Chinese side give the heights of some peaks on the watershed upto the tri-junction of China, India and Nepal?

Q. 49.-What were the coordinates of the tri-junction of China, India and Nepal?

A. - The tri-junction of China India and Nepal was in the vicinity of Lipulekh Pass. As this tri-junction concerned three countries it could only be determined by the three sides checking together.

Q. 50.-What were the co-ordinates of the tri-junction of India, China and Nepal on the Chinese map?

Q. 51-The Indian side wished to have the co-ordinates of Lipulekh Pass.

EASTERN SECTOR

Q.1.-What were the geographical principles and natural features followed by the Chinese alignment in this sector?

A. - The main feature of the eastern sector of the boundary was that it roughly followed the line where the southern foot of the Himalayas touched the plains. Its specific location and terrain features were basically the same as drawn on many Indian maps in the past (for example, India of 1901, the District Map of India of 1905, and Tibet and Adjacent Countries of 1917, etc., published by the Survey of India.)

Q. 2.- The Indian side would like to have a more detailed description of the south-eastern tip of Bhutan. What were the exact coordinates of the point from which the eastern sector started?

A. - The eastern sector of the boundary started at the tri-junction of China, India and Bhutan (approximately $91^{\circ} 3' E$ long. $26^{\circ} 53' N$ Lat.) and proceeded eastward to approximately $93^{\circ} 47' E$ Long., $27^{\circ} 1' N$ Lat. where it turns north-east and reached Nizamghat.

Q. 3.-It was stated that the alignment followed all along the line where the southern foot of the Himalayas touched the plains. Did this mean where the hills ended and the plains started? Along what particular ranges of foothills did the alignment run?

Q. 4.- The Chinese description stated that their alignment in this sector followed "all along the line" where the southern foot of the Himalayas touched the Plains. The Chinese answer given subsequently, however, stated that their alignment followed 'roughly" the line. Did this mean that it did not follow "all along the line"? The Indian side would like to know the segments where it did not follow this line.

A. - The Traditional customary line in the eastern sector from its starting point to Nizamghat followed all along the line where the foot of the mountains touched the Plains. The use of the word "roughly" meant there were individual exceptions. This situation had been clearly shown on the map provided.

Q. 5.- The Chinese side stated that there were individual exceptions to the alignment lying along the line where the foot of the mountains touched the plains. The Indian side would like to know which were these individual exceptions.

Q. 6.-It was stated that these, plains were on the northern bank of the Brahmaputra river. The Chinese side might explain the reference to the river

Q. 7.-What were the co-ordinates of the point west of 94° East Longitude upto which the alignment ran?

Q. 8.- The Indian side would like to have a more detailed description of the alignment from Bhutan upto This point west of 94° East Long - heights of peaks, names of passes, coordinates of points where it crossed rivers, etc.

Q. 9.-The Indian side would like to have the names of the rivers which were shown on the Chinese map, and the exact point at which the alignment crossed them.

A. -Between the starting point of the eastern sector and Nizamghat, the line crossed the Bhoroli river at approximately $92^{\circ} 51'$ E Long., $26^{\circ} 55'$ N. Lat., the Subansiri river at approximately $94^{\circ} 15'$ E. Long., $27^{\circ} 34'$ N. Lat., the Tsangpo river northeast of Paighat et approximately $95^{\circ} 19'$ E. Long. $28^{\circ} 05'$ N. Lat. and the Dibang river at $95^{\circ} 4'$ E. Long, $28^{\circ} 15'$ N. Lat.

Q. 10.- The alignment was shown as crossing the second river at the bend, which was a long way from the foot-hills. How did this conform with the description that the alignment ran along the line where the foot of the Himalayas touched the plains.

Q. 11.-How many miles south of Bini did the alignment cross the Subansiri river? By "South" did the Chinese side mean due south?

Q. 12;- The Indian side would like to have details of the alignment from the point west of 94° 'East Longitude upto Nizamghat. At what point did it turn north-eastward and what natural features did it follow ? According to the Chinese map it seemed to run well in the Himalayas.

Q. 13.-What were the names of the first and the third rivers crossed by the Chinese alignment on their map in this sector? The Indian side would also like to have the co-ordinates of the points at which the Chinese alignment crossed them.

A.- The first river crossed by the alignment in the eastern sector was the Chungli river. The crossing point was approximately 92° 07' E. Long., 26° 52' N. Lat. The third river was the Ranga river, the crossing point was approximately 93° 58' E. Long., 27° 20' N. Lat.

Q. 14.- The Chinese side stated that their alignment turned northeast at point 93° 47' E. Long., and 27° 01' N. Lat. Did it lie along a mountain ridge from This point?

Q. 15 -Did the Chinese alignment run through Nizamghat? If not, how many miles near it and in which direction?

A.-Nizamghat was situated immediately on the northern side of the Chinese alignment.

Q. 16.- The description stated that from Nizamghat the line turned south-eastward. At what exact point did it turn south-eastward?

Q. 17.-At what exact point did the alignment enter mountainous terrain?

Q. 18.-Could the Indian side have details of the alignment from Nizamghat to Painlon Pass-heights and co-ordinates of peaks, river crossings, passes, etc.?

Q. 19.-The Chinese description stated that after Nizamghat the alignment entered mountainous terrain. Did this mean that the alignment ran along a ridge? If so, along what points and peak"?

Q. 20.-Between Painlon Pass and point $96^{\circ} 31' E$, $28^{\circ} 04' N$. where the Chinese alignment met the lower reaches of the Tsayul river, what natural features did the Chinese alignment follow? If it were a ridge, the Indian side would like to have the heights and co-ordinates of any peaks.

A. - After Nizamghat the alignment entered mountainous terrain upto the meeting point with the lower reaches of the Tsayul river. The alignment ran along a ridge. The main heights were 3295 (approximately $96^{\circ} 06' E$. Long., $28^{\circ} 12' N$. Lat.); and 3575 (approximately $96^{\circ} 17' E$. Long., $28^{\circ} 08' N$. Lat.)

Q. 21.- The description given by the Chinese side stated that the alignment crossed the Brahmaputra river in the vicinity of Pasighat. The map, however, showed the boundary as running through Pasighat. The Indian side would like to have a clarification of this discrepancy.

A.-The line crossed the Tsangpo river north-east of Pasighat at approximately $95^{\circ} 19' E$., $28^{\circ} 05' N$.

Q. 22.-At what exact point did the alignment join the valley of the lower reaches of the Tsayul river?

A.-The boundary met the lower reaches of the Tsayul river at approximately $96^{\circ} 31' E$. Long., $28^{\circ} 04' N$. Lat., and left it at approximately $96^{\circ} 54' E$. Long., $27^{\circ} 53' N$. Lat.

Q. 23.-Between points $96^{\circ} 31' E$. $28^{\circ} 04' N$. and $96^{\circ} 54' E$, $27^{\circ}53'$; did the alignment lie along any particular bank of the Tsayul river?

A. -After the alignment met the Tsayul river at its lower reaches, it followed the river course.

Q. 24.-Could the Indian side have details of the alignment from the Tsayul valley to the tri-junction of India, China and Burma?

Q. 25.- The Indian side would like to know how far south of Walong the Chinese alignment lay.

Q. 26.-After leaving Point $96^{\circ} 54' E$., $27^{\circ}53' N$., did the Chinese alignment run along any natural features.

Q.27.-Could the Indian side have the co-ordinates of the tri-junction of India, China and Burma?

A. - The tri-junction of China, India and Burma concerned three countries, and could only be determined by the three sides checking together.

Q. 28.-The Indian side would like to have the co-ordinates of the tri-junction of China, India and Burma, as shown on the Chinese map.

It will be noticed that whereas the Chinese side provided answers to only 59 of the 118 questions put by the Indian side-and these too were in most cases incomplete or partial answers-the Indian side answered fully all the 57 questions put by the Chinese side.

There was only one question-whether the Indian alignment differed from the so-called McMahon Line that the Indian side declined to answer, on the ground that it was irrelevant to Item One, which concerned the location of the Indian alignment as furnished to the Chinese side. Spherical coordinates, names of places and, where necessary, the distances were all given to make the information as complete as possible. When the Chinese side said some of the co-ordinates might be different on their maps, the Indian side replied that the information given by them was accurate and based on scientific surveys and triangulations; and the Chinese side could not show that any of the information supplied by the Indian side was wrong. The Indian side were, therefore, astonished to read, in the final statement of the Chinese side, that the Indian description was imprecise. This suggestion, never substantiated or even made during the discussions, was wholly unacceptable to the Indian side.

The Chinese side stated that though the Indian side claimed that their maps were detailed and precise, they had never been checked by China, and the various Indian maps showed the Sino-Indian boundary differently. The Indian side replied that they were quite willing to explain old Indian maps, the boundaries shown on them and the surveys on which Indian maps were based, but such discussions would not be within the scope of Item One. Under that Item, the two sides were discussing only the location of the two alignments, and the Indian side had given a very precise and detailed description of the Indian alignment.

The Chinese side sought to explain why they had been unable to answer many of the Indian questions. According to them, though areas upto the

Chinese line had always been under Chinese administrative jurisdiction, a specific and precise boundary line only existed where there were important routes or regular contacts. The degree of precision sought by the Indian side could be obtained only by "delimitation" and joint surveys; and as many parts of the boundary claimed by China were under Indian occupation, China had had no opportunity to survey these areas or to check her maps. The Indian method of asking detailed questions on the location of the line claimed by China was equivalent to determining and delimiting the boundary.

The Indian side pointed out that they had provided an accurate description of the traditional boundary between China and India, which had been formed over the course of centuries. This boundary was delimited and well-known, and the Indian side had unhesitatingly given all clarifications that had been sought. The Chinese side had given a precise description in several places but, on the other hand, had argued that the alignment claimed by them was only a broad line. If a precise alignment existed in one sector it followed that it could exist with equal validity in other sectors. For example, the Chinese side had given a precise description of the alignment near the Chip Chap area; but immediately north and south of it, the boundary was said to be only a broad alignment. It was difficult to understand how a precise alignment could exist in installments. A boundary alignment by definition was a precise line with length and no breadth. It was possible that precise coordinates might not be available for a particular point on the Chinese alignment, but certainly a precise line had been claimed by China. In fact, they said it was a historical boundary which had been accurately marked on the map given by them.

The Chinese side had also themselves asserted that their information was detailed and surveys had been conducted at least in those places under Chinese control where there were important communication routes or

where the contacts between people were frequent. It was, therefore, particularly disappointing to the Indian side that the questions regarding the Pare and the Spanggur areas had not been answered. There were important routes in these areas, and contacts between the people; and the Chinese side had even stated that the alignment in the Spanggur area was along the watershed. Indeed, in a note sent to the Government of India on 2 July 1960, the Chinese Government had given the co-ordinates of a place in the Spanggur area not just in degrees and minutes but even in seconds. These are as were, obviously, therefore, known to them; and yet no information had been provided at these meetings.

While seeking further clarifications about the Chinese alignment, the Indian side wanted to know at what point the Chinese line left the highest range of the Karakoram mountains and how it ran from there upto the Kongka Pass.

The Chinese side replied that their alignment lay along one of the lower Karakoram ranges, which was not the main watershed in the region.

The Indian side replied that it was obvious from this answer that at some point the Chinese line left the highest range, and the Indian side desired to know the co-ordinates and exact location of that point. That the boundary claimed by China zig-zagged from range to range was clear, for the heights of various peaks given by the Chinese side as located on their alignment were on different ranges. The claim of the Chinese side, that the different ranges along which their alignment ran, were linked by spurs, was unsubstantiated. The Indian side also noted the acceptance by the Chinese side that there were at least four rivers cutting across their boundary alignment.

The Indian side were gratified that the Chinese side agreed that the range dividing the main water systems, which was the major watershed in this region, lay east of the Chinese alignment. In fact that was the range along which the traditional and customary boundary lay, and it was along that

range that the Indian alignment was shown. It was the major watershed; and the fact that the Qara Qash river pierced it did not make it any less of a watershed. It was not necessary for a watershed that no river should cut across it. The main watershed in any region was that range which divided the greater part of the volume of the waters of two river systems; and it was the Kuen Lun range which divided the greater part of the volume of waters of the two big river systems in this area. There might be a number of minor watersheds in a region, but there could be only one main watershed, and it was this main watershed that the Indian alignment followed. It did not jump from range to range at any place, and the Chinese had not given any examples of such jumping. It was a continuous watershed and ran along the Qara Tagh range of the Karakoram system till that range met a range of the Kuen Lun system; and thereafter it lay along the latter. These ranges had a geological and geographical unit *y*; and the traditional and customary boundary had in the course of centuries conformed to this watershed.

The Indian side sought a general clarification as to the geographical principles to which the Chinese line conformed. The Chinese side had themselves earlier emphasized the importance of this; and the Indian side requested the Chinese side to let them know if the alignment claimed by them conformed to any geographical principles. The Indian alignment had a basic unit *y*' and overwhelming consistency provided by the watershed principle, and these watersheds had been listed. The Chinese alignment, on the other hand, appeared to be a collection of natural feature only. In the Ladakh sector for instance, the Chinese statement said that 'the salient features of the portion between Tibet and Ladakh are complicated. They include mountain passes, river valleys, lakes and watersheds'. Were there any geographical principles underlying this traditional and customary alignment?

The Chinese side replied that their alignment adopted different principles in different situations. A boundary was naturally formed through thousands of years of history and not by abstract geographical principles. For specific portions the Chinese side would put forward specific principles, and according to actual conditions there might be several of these. They also thought the Indian question would be relevant only if a delimitation or a demarcation of the boundary were being attempted.

The Indian side replied that they were not claiming that the watershed concept was a preconceived principle, much less the sole principle, for delimiting a boundary. Determining a boundary or demarcating it was not, in fact, the work of the officials. The Chinese alignment, as was apparent from Chinese statements, was inexplicable on the basis of any geographical principle, while geographical facts and principles had determined the Indian alignment, and tradition and custom, developed over hundreds of years, had confirmed it.

That the watershed principle was a valid and legitimate one in determining boundaries had been recognised in all parts of the world, and it was incorrect to state as the Chinese side had done that it was a British concept. Various international authorities of different countries had testified to the logic of watershed boundaries; and examples of such boundaries were numerous. The boundaries between France and Spain along the Pyrenees, between Chile and Argentina along the Andes and between the Sudan and Congo were examples of direct and indirect recognition of the watershed principle as the basis of a boundary alignment. A recognition of this watershed principle could be seen in the boundaries of China also. The Anglo-Chinese Convention of 1890 had accepted that the boundaries between Sikkim and Tibet would be the crest separating the waters flowing into the Teesta on the one hand and the Mochu on the other. The Agreements between China and Great Britain of 1894 and 1897 had laid

down that the watershed between the Mekong and the Salween would determine the boundaries between Burma and China in the respective sectors. The two agreements concluded by China in 1960 with Nepal and Burma had also recognised the validity of the watershed principle in determining customary boundary alignments. So the Indian side were making no convenient or free interpretation of the watershed principle. In the Middle Sector both sides had referred to the watershed boundary and were clear as to where the watershed lay. In fact, the two alignments coincided for the most part along the main watershed. The Chinese alignment departed from it only at Gyund Kaurik, Shipki, Nilang-Jadhang, Barahoti, Laphthal and Cangchamalla. All these departures from the watershed were also the points of divergence from the Indian alignment, and were, curiously enough, to the south and west, so as to include Indian territory in Tibet, and in no case the other way round. These isolated and small departures always in one direction were difficult to comprehend and emphasized that the correct traditional boundary lay along the watershed itself.

In the Eastern Sector, the divergence between the Chinese claim and the traditional, customary boundary along the watershed was very great. The area in dispute appeared to be over 30,000 square miles, the Chinese side claiming that the traditional and customary line ran roughly along the southern foothills of the Himalayas. This again was curious, for the southern boundary of China lay along the watershed formed by the Himalayas, not just in the Middle Sector of India but also with Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan; and the same continuing watershed of the Himalayas formed the northern boundary between Burma and China. Only in the Eastern Sector of the Sino-Indian boundary did the alignment claimed by China swoop down to the southern foothills of the Himalayas, while both east and west of this sector, it lay along the main watershed range.

The Chinese side sought to answer this by stating that their alignment in the Eastern Sector corresponded to the southern boundaries of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. But this could not answer why the boundaries of China should in this sector alone depart from the Himalayan watershed, when they followed it elsewhere not only with India but with other countries as well.

At one stage the Chinese side questioned the relevance of the attempts to obtain a detailed understanding of the boundary line claimed by them, and proposed that the Indian side restrict themselves to some specific and important points on the boundary so that all discussion on Item 1 could be completed by the 12th session of the conference. The Indian side pointed out that Item I was of basic Importance, because only when the two sides had a precise and clear understanding of the location of the alignments would they know the exact areas of dispute and be able to bring forward documents in support of the stands of the two Governments. The Chinese side themselves had asked many detailed questions, and the Indian side had always replied to them.

The Chinese side then withdrew their proposal, but wished to know whether the insistence of the Indian side on knowing the precise location of the Chinese alignment meant that if they knew it Indian personnel would not cross this line. They alleged that in the past India had persisted in despatching armed forces into Chinese territory, and accused the Indian Government of creating tension in the border areas. They mentioned in this connection the recent visits of the Prime Minister, the Defence Minister, and senior Indian officers to these areas. The Indian side replied that this was beyond the purview of Item 1 and indeed beyond that of the meeting of the officials. It was sufficient to say that Indian personnel had never crossed the well-recognized boundary alignment, and all Indian activities in the

border areas, including the visit of the Prime Minister, were normal, public and legitimate.

This subject having been raised by the Chinese side, the Indian side pointed out that there had been apprehension in India at Chinese military constructions and the recent enhancement of the strength of Chinese troops on their side of the border. As far as the Government of India were concerned, they respected and would continue to respect the agreement, mentioned in the Joint Communique issued at the conclusion of the meetings of the two Prime Ministers, to avoid friction and clashes in the border area during this period of examination of factual material.