China Puts Forward 3 Proposals
To End Border Conflicts and Settle Sino-Indian Boundary Question by Reopening Negotiations

Chinese Foreign Ministry's Protest Against Massive Indian Attacks on the Border
National Defence Ministry Statements

Nehru Rejects Talks and Gives The Order to Fight
Commentary by Renmin Ribao's Observer (p. 8).

China Respects Bhutan's Sovereignty And Territorial Integrity
Chinese Foreign Ministry statement on the Indian Government's decision to ask Bhutan to allow Indian forces to enter that country (p. 7).

New U.S. Venture Against Cuba Must Stop!
SHEELED AND TEMPERED

by Ai Wu

A novel of China's steelworkers. Chin Teh-kuel, a young Communist Party member, is sent by the Party after the liberation to a job in the steel industry. Working there with the same revolutionary enthusiasm and selflessness as in the days when he was a guerrilla fighter, he quickly becomes a skilled steel-maker and model worker. In the van of the movement to introduce high-speed methods to steel-making, his drive comes into conflict with the individualistic and conservative ideas of the backward elements in the plant, among them the factory manager, bogged down in bureaucracy. The struggle between these two lines—a struggle which becomes inextricably mixed up with the course of his love for a girl colleague—the attempt of counter-revolutionaries to take advantage of the situation, and the victory for revolutionary ideas under the able leadership of the plant's new Party secretary, makes for a taut and exciting climax.

RED SUN

by Wu Chiang

This stirring novel describes how the Chinese People's Liberation Army fought the enemy on the East China front during the War of Liberation.

The story begins with the second attack on the city of Lienshui by the Kuomintang army's crack unit, the Reorganized 74th Division, late in the autumn of 1946, and ends with this unit's total annihilation at Mengliangku by the People's Liberation Army in the summer of 1947.

With the two famous campaigns of Laiwu and Mengliangku as its central theme, the book vividly depicts scenes of battle and moving feats of bravery. Through realistic descriptions of the fighting and the daily life of the P.L.A. troops it portrays the heroism of its commanders and fighters, and shows the great collective strength of the People's Liberation Army in defeating a stubborn enemy. At the same time it gives a revealing picture of the brutality and degeneration of the enemy command.
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Elections in Tibet

Holding flowers and hata ceremonial scarfs and gaily beating gongs and cymbals, Tibetans in Lhasa, Shigatse, Loka, Chamdo, Gyantse and Ari went to the polls for the first time in their life. They elected the first group of deputies to local people's congresses and the local people's government at the township level.

More than 80 per cent of the people's deputies elected to the township people's congresses in these places are former slaves and serfs. In these elections slave-owners and their agents who did not take part in the 1959 rebellion of reactionaries of the upper strata also enjoyed the right to elect and be elected. Those who took part in the rebellion but who have turned over a new leaf and become law-abiding after their surrender were also given the right to vote.

The election, the first of its kind ever held in Tibet, signifies that the newly freed Tibetan people have taken another step forward in exercising their democratic rights, following the democratic reform which abolished the age-old serfdom in that part of China.

Railway News

Tough Sleepers. More than 75 per cent of the railway sleepers in this country are now corrosion-proof, says a recent report from the Ministry of Railways.

The introduction of corrosion-proof sleepers means great economies in the use of timber and corresponding reductions in maintenance costs. Sleepers treated with creosote, for instance, will last ten to thirteen years whereas ordinary sleepers usually wear out in two to five years.

Corrosion-proof sleepers have been introduced on a steadily expanding scale since 1955. In that year the Railway Ministry ordered that all sleepers on new railways should be corrosion-proof. Such sleepers are also being laid on lines undergoing reconstruction.

China now has seven plants making corrosion-proof sleepers. They are turning out millions of such sleepers each year for the nation's trunk lines as well as local lines in big coalmines, metallurgical plants and oilfields.

Better Sleepers. Besides creosote-treated sleepers, reinforced concrete sleepers are also being used on a large scale. Four trunk lines now have sections laid on such sleepers. This has not affected the speed of trains and it is found that reinforced concrete sleepers give longer service and lower maintenance costs than ordinary sleepers.

“Unjoined” Rails. Travellers on the Shanghai-Nanking Railway find riding especially smooth on the 5-kilometre section near Soochow, Jiangsu Province. Railway engineers have laid new “unjoined rails” on this section of the track. Ordinary rails, each about 10 metres long, usually leave a gap at the joints for expansion in hot weather. The new rails are 500 to 600 metres long. They are laid under a temperature of 19 to 29 degrees Centigrade, so expansion is reduced to a minimum. Such rails not only make for smoother and more comfortable riding but cut maintenance costs, since it is at the joints, which are the weakest parts of the track, that 40 per cent of the damage done to rails is found.

Super-Light Train. A new prototype train, about half the weight of the ordinary passenger train, is now in service between Peking and Tientsin.

Designed by Chinese technicians, the new train has a low centre of gravity and a light body. Its ten silver coaches are drawn by diesel locomotive at a designed speed of up to 140 kilometres per hour. Built by the Szefang Locomotive and Rolling Stock Plant in Tsingtao, the new train will make trial runs on the Peking-Tientsin run for a year. After this test any necessary alterations will be made and more of this type will be built for other lines.

Big Increases in Livestock

On the vast grasslands in Inner Mongolia and the lush pastures up on the Pamirs, the Tien shan and Altai Mountains in Sinkiang, and on the
pasturelands of the Tibetan Plateau, millions of lambs, calves and colts are grazing. These are welcome additions to the flourishing flocks and herds of these stock-breeding areas in China. Herdsmen here have had notable successes raising more animals this year.

Sinkiang in the northwest can boast of over six million new lambs, calves, colts and camels this year. This is a 12 per cent increase over last year. An average of over 90 per cent of all ewes produced young on many ranches in Ili and other important stock-breeding areas at the foot of the Tianshan Mountains. Not a few ranches reported a lambing rate of 100 per cent or even higher, as a result of multiple births. A large proportion of the new-born lambs are of improved breeds, obtained through crossing local strains with the famous fine-fleeced Sinkiang sheep.

The favourable weather last winter and this spring had much to do with these successes. No serious blizzards occurred, and losses of animals were kept down to a minimum. But the major reasons for the high survival rate were improved breeding methods and the fine veterinary services now obtainable in Sinkiang. Breeding and veterinary stations have been set up in all the farming and ranching areas of the region. These are linked with special research centres which offer technical guidance whenever needed. The vigorous measures taken to control animal diseases have greatly reduced the mortality rate. With such technical help, one people's commune near Urumchi has succeeded in completely preventing mares from aborting. It has also found successful treatments for glanders and other diseases.

Inner Mongolia, China's leading stock-breeding area, reports an increase of 9 million young animals this year. This exceeds the total number the region had in 1945 when it was liberated. In the old days, the number of livestock here was declining steadily as a result of animal diseases, backward grazing methods and ruthless exploitation of the people and their flocks by the ruling classes and Kuomintang officials. Scientific methods of breeding were introduced after liberation, and steps were taken to improve the pastures by irrigation and methods of looking after livestock. These measures have helped the region register an average increase of some 10 per cent in its livestock each year.

The Hulunbuir League, which possesses some of the best pastures in Inner Mongolia, has 450,000 more head of sheep, cattle and horses this year — an increase of nearly 15 per cent over last year. The Mongolian, Han, Tahir and Ovorkhe herdsmen here have made good use of the advantages afforded by the people's commune system to make capital investments in the pastoral areas. Besides putting up large numbers of permanent cattle sheds, they have built four reservoirs and sunk two thousand wells. These have greatly facilitated the watering of the animals and the irrigation of the pastures. The herdsmen have made great progress too in improving the strains of their livestock. This year, they have half a million animals of improved breed, or eight times as many as in 1957 — the year before the people's communes were set up.

The number of livestock in Tibet is growing too. Damshung County, one of the main pastoral areas on the Tibetan Plateau, for instance, now has over half a million head of yak and sheep. This is a 25 per cent increase over 1959.

Only a few years back, under feudal serfdom, the Tibetan herdsmen were ruthlessly exploited. About 80 per cent of their annual income was seized by the manorial lords who owned the grazing grounds. In the new Tibet the herdsmen have been given yaks and sheep. Collective effort in the mutual-aid teams which they have organized and the use of scientific methods such as artificial insemination introduced by the People's Government have helped to bring prosperity to the pasturelands.

Training Specialists

More than 800 young scholars have recently been enrolled for post-graduate studies in China's universities.

All of them are outstanding students who have graduated from colleges in various parts of China. They were selected from among 4,000 recommended applicants.

Most of these post-graduate students have only recently finished their college education. Others are teachers in higher educational institutions, technicians in various enterprises, or members of the research staffs of scientific organizations. Some of them will do part-time study while carrying on their original work.

Many of China's leading scientists are among the professors who will be giving personal guidance to these students in their studies and research work. Philologist Chen Wang-tao, mathematician Su Pu-ching, physicist Wang Chu-hsi, physiochemist Tang Ao-ching and bridge engineer Li Kuohao are among those who will coach post-graduate students.

The progress of China's socialist construction calls for an ever increasing number of specialists. Post-graduate work is regarded by educators as one of the effective ways to train such personnel.
China Puts Forward Three Proposals
To End Border Conflict, Reopen Negotiations and
Settle Sino-Indian Boundary Question Peacefully

The following is a translation of the full text of the Chinese government statement issued on October 24.
—Ed.

Serious armed clashes have recently taken place on the Sino-Indian border. This occurrence is most unfortunate. The Chinese and Indian peoples have always been friendly to each other and should remain so from generation to generation. That China and India should cross swords on account of the boundary question is something the Chinese Government and people are unwilling to see, it is also what the peace-loving countries and people of the whole world are unwilling to see.

The Sino-Indian boundary question is a question left over by history. There is a traditional customary boundary between the two countries, but the boundary between the two countries has never been formally delimitated. The so-called McMahon Line in the eastern sector is a line which the British imperialists attempted to force upon China by taking advantage of the powerlessness of the Chinese and the Indian peoples. It is illegal and has never been recognized by the Chinese Government. After the independence of India, and especially around the time of the peaceful liberation of the Tibet region of China, the Indian side gradually extended its scope of actual control in the eastern sector northward from the traditional customary line to the vicinity of the so-called McMahon Line. In the middle and western sectors, up to 1959 the extent of actual control by China and India in the main conformed to the traditional customary line, except at individual places. Although India occupied more than 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the eastern sector, provoked two border clashes in 1959 and made claim to large tracts of Chinese territory, the Chinese Government has always stood for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations and held that, pending a peaceful settlement, the extent of actual control by each side should be respected and neither side should alter the state of the boundary by unilateral action.

Seeking a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, Premier Chou En-lai went to New Delhi in April 1960 to hold talks with Prime Minister Nehru, and tried hard to reach a preliminary agreement conducive to a settlement of the boundary question. Regrettably, the sincere effort of the Chinese side did not evoke a response from the Indian side. Following that, the meeting of the officials of China and India likewise failed to yield results as it should.

The Chinese Government has always held that, even though China and India cannot for a time reach agreed opinions on the boundary question, this should not lead to border clashes. As early as 1959, the Chinese Government repeatedly proposed that the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres all along the border and stop frontier patrols so as to disengage the armed forces of the two sides and avoid conflict. After the Indian side rejected these proposals, China unilaterally stopped patrols on its side of the boundary in the hope that this might help ease the border situation. Contrary to our expectations, the Indian side, taking advantage of this circumstance, pressed forward steadily and penetrated deep into Chinese territory, first in the middle and western, and then in the eastern, sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary, set up scores of military strongpoints and continually caused armed clashes, thus making the border situation increasingly tense.

In the past year and more, the Chinese Government has again and again asked India to stop changing the status quo of the boundary by force and return to the table of negotiations. In the last three months, the Chinese Government three times proposed negotiating the Sino-Indian boundary question without any pre-conditions, but all three times met with the refusal of the Indian Government. The Indian Government insisted that negotiations cannot start until China has withdrawn from vast tracts of China's own territory.

Especially shocking to China is the fact that the Indian Government, after rejecting China's peaceful proposal, on October 12 ordered the Indian forces to "free" Chinese frontiers of Chinese troops. Then, on October 20, Indian forces started a massive general offensive in both the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border. In these serious circumstances, the Chinese frontier guards had no choice but to strike back in self-defence.

Fierce fighting is now going on. The occurrence of this grave situation pains the Chinese Government and people and disturbs the Asian and African countries and people. After all, what issue is there between China and India that cannot be settled peacefully? What reason is there for bloody clashes to occur between China and India? China does not want a single inch of India's territory. In no circumstances is it conceivable for the Sino-Indian boundary question to be settled by force. China and India are both big countries of Asia having a major responsibility for peace in Asia and the world. They are initiators of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and participants of the Bandung Conference. Although the relations between China and India are presently very tense, there is no reason to abandon the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and the spirit of the Bandung Conference. The Chinese Government holds that both the Chinese and Indian Governments should take to heart the fundamental interests of the 1,100 million people of
China and India, the common interests of the people of the two countries in their struggle against imperialism and the interests of Asian peace and Asian-African solidarity, and try their best to seek a way to stop the border conflict, reopen peaceful negotiations and settle the Sino-Indian boundary question.

In line with its consistent stand for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, the Chinese Government now solemnly puts forward the following three proposals:

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

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

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

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

The Chinese Government appeals to the Indian Government for a positive response to the above three proposals. The Chinese Government appeals to the governments of Asian and African countries for an effort to bring about the materialization of these three proposals. The Chinese Government appeals to all the peace-loving countries and people to do their part in promoting Sino-Indian friendship, Asian-African solidarity and world peace.

Protest Against Massive Indian Attacks

Chinese Foreign Ministry’s Note to Indian Embassy

October 20, 1962

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China presents its compliments to the Embassy of India in China and has the honour to state the following:

The Chinese Government received successive urgent reports from the Chinese frontier guards on October 20 to the effect that Indian troops had launched massive general attacks against the Chinese frontier guards in both the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border simultaneously. The Chinese Government hereby lodges the most urgent, the most serious and the strongest protest with the Indian Government.

In the eastern sector, the Indian forces of aggression had, in the three days since October 17, repeatedly directed vehement artillery bombardments against the Chinese frontier guards in the area between Kalung and the Sechang Lake in the upper reaches of the Kechilang River, and in the Che-jao bridge area in the middle reaches of the river in the Che Dong area in China’s Tibet region. At the same time, great numbers of Indian troops had moved continuously to concentrate at Pangkangting south of the Che-jao bridge. At seven o’clock (Peking Time) in the morning of October 20, the aggressive Indian forces, under the cover of fierce artillery fire, launched massive attacks against the Chinese frontier guards all along the Kechilang River and in the Khinzheman area.

In the western sector, the Indian forces of aggression entrenched in the Chip Chap valley and the Galwan valley in Sinkiang also launched general attacks early in the morning of the 20th against the Chinese frontier guards under the cover of fierce gun fire. Two days before, that is, on October 18, the Indian forces occupying the Chip Chap valley had already begun closing in on the Chinese frontier posts in preparation for these attacks.

The above-mentioned frenzied attacks by the aggressive Indian forces on Chinese territory in both the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary have caused heavy casualties to the Chinese frontier guards. Pressed beyond the limits of forbearance and forced to where no further retreat was possible, the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to strike back in self-defence.

It must be seriously pointed out that the present massive general attacks by the Indian forces were prepared over a long time by India. On October 6, the Indian Government for the third time flatly rejected China’s proposal for holding discussions on the boundary question as soon as possible on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries. On October 12, Indian Prime Minister Nehru declared that he had issued instructions to “free” China’s territory of Chinese troops. On October 14, Indian Defence Minister Menon stated that they would fight China to the last man and the last gun. On October 16, immediately after his return to New Delhi from abroad, Prime Minister Nehru summoned a
meeting of high-ranking military officers to step up war dispositions. And on October 20, the Indian forces brazenly unleashed their massive general attacks on Chinese territory in the Sino-Indian border.

The Chinese Government has always stood for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Indian Government, after flatly refusing to negotiate, has launched massive general attacks against the Chinese frontier guards on Chinese territory. China has no choice but to rebuff these frenzied attacks resolutely. The fighting is still going on. The Indian Government must bear full responsibility for all the serious consequences arising therefrom.

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

Statement by the Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman

On the Indian Government’s Decision to Ask Bhutan to Allow Indian Forces to Enter That Country

(October 21, 1962)

According to foreign press reports on October 20, the Indian Government has decided to ask the Kingdom of Bhutan to allow Indian forces to enter the country to strengthen “defence against Communist China.” In this connection, the spokesman for the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs points out that the current military clashes on the Sino-Indian border are caused solely by the Indian side which has occupied Chinese territory, rejected peaceful negotiations and launched massive general attacks on the Chinese frontier guards. It is an out-and-out lie to describe China’s legitimate self-defence as a threat by China to its friendly neighbour Bhutan. The military clashes between China and India are confined to the Sino-Indian border areas. Between China and Bhutan there is a long-standing friendship. The Sino-Bhutanese boundary is a boundary of peace and friendship. In its relations with Bhutan, China has strictly adhered to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and scrupulously respected the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bhutan. China will never threaten, let alone invade, Bhutan. The lie about alleged Chinese threat or ambition towards Bhutan will only serve to expose the ulterior motives of the lie-teller.

Statement of Chinese Ministry of National Defence

A spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of National Defence issued a statement on October 20 concerning the all-out attacks launched by the invading Indian troops against Chinese frontier guards on the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian boundary. The statement reads as follows:

On the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, Indian troops, from October 17 onward have launched continued attacks in the areas of Khinzemane. Che Dong and Changto in China's Tibet region from their strongpoints along the Kechilang River. At 07:00 hours (Peking Time) this morning (October 20th), the Indian troops even started a large-scale attack on the Chinese frontier guards along the entire Kechilang River. The Chinese frontier guards suffered heavy casualties under the fierce shelling of the Indian troops and were compelled to return fire resolutely in self-defence. As a result of one day's intense fighting, the Chinese frontier guards repulsed the many attacks by the Indian troops and recovered Khinzemane, Che Dong and Kalung. According to reports from the front, fierce fighting is still going on.

On the western sector, in the small hours of this morning (October 20th), Indian troops which had intruded into the Aksai Chin area of China’s Sinkiang region, under cover of heavy fire, launched all-out attacks on the Chinese frontier guards, first in the Chip Chap Valley and then in the Galwan River Valley. The sudden attacks of the Indian troops on the western sector of the boundary are obviously co-ordinated with their large-scale offensive on the eastern sector. In self-defence, the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to strike back resolutely and cleared away some aggressive strongpoints set up by the Indian troops in China’s territory. Up to the time when this report was sent from the front, fighting was still in progress.

The above-mentioned facts about the large-scale, all-out attacks launched by Indian troops have laid bare the slanderous lies which the Indian Defence Minister V.K. Krishna Menon uttered to the press in New Delhi this afternoon, saying that the Chinese frontier guards have initiated the attacks.

The Chinese Government has repeatedly proposed that the Sino-Indian boundary question be settled peace-
fully through negotiations. But the Chinese Government’s proposals were time and again rejected by the Indian Government. Now the Chinese frontier guards have been subjected to an all-out attack, which the Indian aggressive troops launched after long-term preparations. The Chinese side had no choice other than to fight back resolutely and recover the territory occupied by the Indian troops. The Indian Government must be held fully responsible for all the serious consequences arising therefrom.

The following is another statement made by a spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of National Defence on October 22.

In the eastern sector of the border, aggressive Indian troops entrenched around the Kechilang River and Chusum area launched repeated attacks against Chinese frontier guards on October 21 and 22. After our Chinese frontier guards resolutely hit back, some Indian troops continued to fight in their original positions while others moved towards Tawang. In co-ordination with the attack by the Indian troops around the Kechilang River and Chusum area, Indian troops south of the Taehang Pass and the Pang Pass on October 22 also launched attacks on Chinese frontier guards, who hit back resolutely. Fighting is going on there.

In order to prevent the aggressive Indian troops from renewing their attacks and expanding the border clashes, Chinese frontier guards advanced from the area of the Kechilang River to the Lungpu area on October 22.

In the western sector of the border, after three days’ fighting following the attacks launched by the Indian troops, Chinese frontier guards have removed some of the aggressive strongpoints set up by the Indian troops in the Chinese territory of Sinkiang and Tibet; Indian troops have withdrawn from some strongpoints. But there are still some aggressive strongpoints in which Indian troops remain entrenched.

Since the aggressive Indian troops intruded further into Chinese territory this spring first in the middle and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border and then in the eastern sector and set up aggressive strongpoints there, the Chinese Government has, on the one hand, put forward strong demands for the withdrawal of Indian troops from Chinese territory while repeatedly proposing, on the other, the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through immediate negotiations. All the repeated demands and proposals of the Chinese Government, however, were rejected by the Indian Government.

On October 6 the Indian Government bluntly closed the door to negotiations. Using the aggressive strongpoints they had set up on China’s territory, the Indian troops constantly conducted armed provocations against the Chinese frontier guards and, finally on the morning of October 20, launched massive general attacks on the Chinese frontier guards in both the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border. This left the Chinese frontier guards with no other choice but to strike back in resolute self-defence to repel the attacks by the Indian troops, recover the territory occupied by them and remove all the aggressive strongpoints set up by the Indian troops on Chinese territory.

In its efforts to seek a friendly settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through peaceful negotiations, the Chinese Government has repeatedly declared that “we absolutely do not recognize the illegal McMahon Line in the eastern sector, but we will not cross this line.” However, taking the great restraint of the Chinese Government as a sign of weakness, the Indian Government pushed farther and farther ahead and its troops crossed the so-called McMahon Line, invaded and occupied larger tracts of Chinese territory and launched large-scale attacks on China’s frontier guards. Thus, the Indian Government has finally broken the limits indicated by this line. The Chinese side now formally declares that in order to prevent the Indian troops from staging a comeback and launching fresh attacks, the Chinese frontier guards, fighting in self-defence, need no longer restrict themselves to the limits of the illegal McMahon Line.

It is a long-cherished desire of the Chinese people to maintain lasting friendship with the Indian people. The consistent stand of the Chinese Government is to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully. Even under present circumstances, the Chinese side will definitely not rule out the possibility of seeking an end to the border conflict and reopening peaceful negotiations to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question.

It’s Nehru Who Refuses to Negotiate And Who Orders Fighting

by “RENMIN RIBAO” OBSERVER

Following is a translation of a commentary in “Renmin Ribao” on October 20, 1962. Its original title was “It Is Nehru Who Refuses to Negotiate; It Is Also Nehru Who Gives the Order to Fight.” Subheads are ours.—Ed.

India’s Prime Minister Nehru, speaking at a press conference in Colombo on October 15, talked at considerable length about the Sino-Indian boundary question. In plain words, however, his entire talk boils down to a refusal to negotiate and a preparation for large-scale fighting.

Distorting History of the Boundary Question

Several days ago Nehru gave an order to “free” China’s territory of Chinese troops. The difference between that order and his Colombo talk is that in the latter he distorted the history of the Sino-Indian boundary
question and pretentiously declared that he was not interested in fighting but it had become very difficult not to try to stop the Chinese troops from advancing.

But truth is truth and lies are lies. Nehru’s talk cannot alter by one jot the fact of who is right and who is wrong in connection with the Sino-Indian boundary question.

It is unnecessary to refute Nehru’s talk point by point. However, it must be pointed out that Nehru lied when he said that ever since the founding of the People’s Republic of China, India had been making clear to China what its frontiers were. Since the boundary line unilaterally claimed by India did not appear on India’s own official maps until 1954 how could that line have been made clear to China before?

Nehru lied again when he hinted that the signing by China and India in 1954 of the Agreement on Trade and Intercourse Between China’s Tibet Region and India signified China’s recognition of the boundary unilaterally claimed by India. The fact is that that 1954 agreement only covered the question of trade and intercourse between China’s Tibet region and India and made no reference at all to the Sino-Indian boundary question.

Referring to China’s quelling of the rebellion in Tibet in 1959, Nehru said: “We have recognized their [China’s] special position in Tibet.” He spoke as if India had not interfered in China’s internal affairs. But the question lies precisely in the fact that Nehru, just like the British imperialists, has only recognized China’s “special position” in Tibet, but not its full sovereignty over Tibet. Hence the instigation and support which the Indian reactionaries have given to the rebellion in Tibet.

The areas on the western sector of the Sino-Indian border have always been under Chinese jurisdiction. It is precisely through these areas that in 1950, the Chinese People’s Liberation Army units stationed in Sinkiang entered into the Ari area of Tibet and afterwards built the great Sinkiang-Tibet Highway through these areas. Nehru again told a complete lie when he said that China seemed to have entered these areas only after putting down the rebellion in Tibet.

China’s Efforts for Peaceful Settlement

It is an indisputable fact that after China quelled the rebellion in Tibet, the Indian authorities deliberately wrecked the status quo of the boundary at that time and provoked one border conflict after another. Nevertheless, the Chinese side has made a series of efforts to seek a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations. In order to ease tension on the border, China proposed in 1959 that the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres along the entire Sino-Indian border and stop patrolling. After these proposals were rejected by India, China unilaterally stopped patrolling. Seeking a way to the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, China’s Premier Chou En-lai himself paid a visit to New Delhi in April 1960. These Chinese efforts have not met with a corresponding response from the Indian side. On the contrary, with the conclusion of the meetings of officials of the two countries, the Indian side, beginning in 1961, took advantage of the opportunity offered by China’s unilateral cessation of patrolling to make further incursions, set up more strongpoints and increase its provocations on the western sector of the Sino-Indian border. With the situation on the border daily becoming more tense, the Chinese Government has, on the one hand, lodged protests against the Indian intrusions, but, on the other, not in the least relaxed its efforts to seek a peaceful settlement of the boundary question through negotiations.

The Indian Government, however, has all along taken a negative attitude towards a peaceful settlement of the boundary question through negotiations. It was only on July 26 this year that for a time it expressed a desire for further discussions on the boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials. In its note dated August 4, the Chinese Government responded promptly and positively to this desire and proposed that the discussions be held as soon as possible.

But in its August 22 note, the Indian Government stated that the status quo of the boundary in the western sector as conceived by India must first be restored before the proposed discussions could take place. This means, in actual fact, that China must evacuate large tracts of its own territory. The Chinese Government pointed out in its note dated September 13 that there should be no pre-conditions for discussions on the boundary question and further proposed that representatives of the two sides start discussions on the boundary question from October 15 first in Peking and then in Delhi, alternately. With a view to easing tension on the border, the Chinese Government once again proposed that the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres along the entire border.

However, in its September 19 note, the Indian Government, apart from hypocritically agreeing to the proposed date and places for the discussions, rejected all the substantive proposals put forward by the Chinese side. Nevertheless, the Chinese Government, in its note dated October 3, reiterated the proposal that both sides should speedily enter into discussions on the boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials, and that in the course of the discussions, neither side should refuse to discuss any question concerning the boundary that might be raised by the other side. This represents a major effort on the part of the Chinese side. The proposal is fair to both sides.

India Shut Door to Negotiations

But the Indian Government in its October 6 reply rejected this fair proposal and, what is more, added new pre-conditions to its old ones. It demanded that China evacuate Chinese territories north of the so-called Mahon Line, which India has occupied or plans to occupy. This shut the door to negotiations.

These facts provide the best evidence on the situation. From these seven notes alone which were exchanged between the two sides in the past two months and more, it is not difficult to see that it is China which truly desires a peaceful settlement of the boundary question through negotiations and that it is India which has actually seized Chinese territories by force, while talking, as a smokescreen, about negotiations; that it is China which has time and again put forward reasonable proposals and sought to bring the positions of the two sides nearer to each other and that it is India which has changed its
mind time after time, put up one obstacle after another and refused to come to a peaceful settlement of the boundary question.

Nehru slandered China by saying that its idea was "to seize territory and then to talk about it." But the hard facts show precisely that it is not China but Nehru himself who has this idea.

The obvious facts are that India after gaining independence occupied 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory south of the so-called McMahon Line and has now crossed that line and occupied Chinese territory north of it. Yet Nehru had the effrontery to accuse the Chinese side falsely of crossing the so-called McMahon Line and occupying Indian territory south of the line; he also attempted to use this as a pretext to "free" Chinese territory of Chinese frontier guards. To put an end to this endless trouble-making of the Indian side and expose the true colours of the Indian expansionists, we are prepared here to clarify this matter thoroughly to see who has actually occupied large tracts of territory of the other party and crossed the so-called McMahon Line.

The "McMahon Line" is illegal and has never been recognized by any Chinese government. It was concocted in the secret exchange of letters in Delhi on March 24, 1914, by the British delegate to the 1913-14 Simla Conference, McMahon, and Lyon Chen Shatsha, delegate of the local Tibetan authorities of China, outside the Simla Conference and without the knowledge of the delegate of the then Central Government of China, whereas the traditional customary boundary line is located far to the south of the so-called McMahon Line, that is, it is precisely the eastern sector of the boundary as traditionally marked on Chinese maps. Leaving aside, for the moment, the illegality of the so-called McMahon Line, the only document to support the concrete location of this line is the map attached to the letters exchanged illegally and secretly by the above-mentioned British delegate and the delegate of the local Tibetan authorities of China.

After the peaceful liberation of Tibet in 1951, the local Tibetan government of China submitted this signed map to the Central Government. This newspaper today publishes and makes known to the world the relevant part of this map. [The section of map in question here-with reproduced on pp. 12-13 was published on p. 3 of Renmin Ribao of the same date as this commentary.]

**Location of Illegal "McMahon Line"**

The scale of the original map is large: one inch on the map is equivalent to eight miles in actual distance, that is, 1 to 500,000. Longitude and latitude are clearly marked on the map. According to this original map, the western end of the so-called McMahon Line is located at 27°44.6' N and 91°39.7' E. The line extends eastward from there and then turns slightly southward.

What is of decisive significance is latitude 27°44.6' N, whose location can be measured by us, by India and by all in the world who are interested in this matter. On the one hand, the Indian Government has claimed that the Che Dong area (called Dhola by India), which it had occupied, is located south of the so-called McMahon Line, but on the other hand, it admitted that Che Dong is located at 27°46.5' N. Comparing the latitude of Che Dong and that of the western end of the so-called McMahon Line, everybody can readily see that Che Dong is definitely located north of the so-called McMahon Line, not south of it.

According to the latitude of the western end of the so-called McMahon Line, Khinzheman which the Indian Government occupied in 1959, and such places as Che Dong, Jungputiu, Chekuopu, Kalung, Changto, Keningnai, Jihtingpu, Tang and Niangpa which it has occupied recently, are all indisputably located north of the so-called McMahon Line.

By what magic has the Indian Government shifted Che Dong and the above-mentioned places along the Kechilang River which are located north of the so-called McMahon Line, to south of that line? It turns out that the Indian Government claims that the so-called McMahon Line in this sector starts from 27°48' N and 91°40' E. In this way, it has thrust the western part of the so-called McMahon Line 3.4 minutes of latitude into China in the north. Computing one minute of latitude to be equal approximately to 1.8 kilometres in actual length, this northward thrust of 3.4 minutes means a thrust of six or seven kilometres.

We would like to question the Indian Government:

On what grounds can you support your claim that the so-called McMahon Line starts from 27°48' N, instead of 27°44.6' N? Do you consider the 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory south of the so-called McMahon Line which you have occupied since independence still too little? Do you still want to shift arbitrarily northward the so-called McMahon Line which has not been surveyed and can only be measured by longitude and latitude, so that you can occupy more Chinese territory? This is indeed the best evidence of your stepping into the shoes of the British imperialist aggressor.

All along to defend your expansionism you have also talked glibly about the Thangla ridge and the watershed. This can only deceive those who do not know the true situation. Everybody knows that the so-called McMahon Line has never been surveyed, let alone any watershed. The original map is printed in today's issue of our paper. Anybody can see that not even the name of the Thangla ridge is on it.

The location of the so-called McMahon Line in terms of longitude and latitude is perfectly clear. However hard it prevaricats, India cannot possibly prove that Khinzheman, Che Dong, Jungputiu, Chekuopu, Kalung, Changto, Keningnai, Jihtingpu, Tang and Niangpa are to the south of this so-called McMahon Line, nor can it divest itself of the guilt of further encroachments upon Chinese territory.

**Bellicose Nehru**

Whatever Nehru feigns to be, he is in fact bellicose to the bone. It is Nehru who has refused to negotiate and it is also Nehru who has issued the order to fight. He wants China to acknowledge that India's occupation of large tracts of Chinese territory is legitimate. What is more, he wants China to hand over submissively still more of its territory. Nehru has issued instructions to "free" Chinese territory of Chinese troops. The Indian Defence Minister, V.K. Krishna Menon, has declared blatantly that his government has come to make the decision to
throw back the Chinese and will fight to the last man, to the last gun. Upon his return to New Delhi from Ceylon on October 16, Nehru immediately conferred with Menon and others and Menon in turn called an urgent meeting of senior Indian officials. Menon then flew to Tezpur to make the necessary arrangements. In the past few days, Indian troops have continued to cross the "McMahon Line" in large numbers to reinforce their positions north of the line. Since October 17, Indian troops have opened fire at the Chinese troops all along the Kechilang River north of the line. This obviously is the prelude to a massive Indian offensive.

China is unswerving in its stand for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question through negotiations. On the other hand, the Chinese people will on no account let themselves be bullied. If they continue their attacks, the Indian troops will reap the evil fruit which they themselves have sown.

World Opinion Survey

Indian Expansionists Under Fire

by MAO SUN

In their grab for yet more Chinese territory the Indian rulers have finally provoked a large-scale military conflict on the Sino-Indian border. By rejecting all Chinese offers for negotiations and by launching massive attacks against China's frontier guards, the Nehru government has left China with no choice but to fight back in self-defence.

Progressive opinion in Asia and throughout the world understands this. All just-minded people condemn Indian aggression and support China's defensive action. They support China's stand that negotiation, and only negotiation, must be the method used in settling the boundary dispute. They know that in unleashing an all-out border attack, the Indian ruling circles are acting against the interests of the Indian people, against Asian peace and in the service of U.S. imperialism.

Nehru Resorts to Force

The first thing that comes under fire is the Nehru government's rejection of negotiations and its use of military force to accomplish its aggressive aims against China. Fair-minded observers stress how inexcusable this is especially when the Chinese Government has been doing all it could to achieve a peaceful settlement of the boundary dispute through negotiations. India, not China, is responsible for the unfortunate military clashes.

On behalf of the Korean people, Rodong Shinmun condemns Indian aggression on the Sino-Indian border and backs China's consistent efforts for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question. It declares: The reactionary Indian ruling group has looked upon China's sincerity and regard for Sino-Indian friendship and the consolidation of peace as a golden opportunity for its expansionist adventure. This is a challenge to the Chinese people; it has aggravated tension and threatens Asian peace and security. It runs counter to the fundamental interests of the Indian people.

The Vietnamese paper Nhandan supports China's stand that the Sino-Indian boundary question should be settled through negotiations. It describes as "correct and reasonable" China's proposal for negotiation with no pre-conditions.

The Indonesian paper Harian Rakjat writes: "We are really disappointed with India's attitude. Through its Prime Minister, India even openly expressed its unwillingness to negotiate with the Chinese People's Re-

public. The Indian Prime Minister has declared with a prejudiced mind that it is useless to hold negotiations at present. This, in effect, is diametrically opposed to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and the Bandung spirit." The Indonesian people, it declares, hope that China and India will hold talks for the settlement of the boundary issue.

Vanguard, a Burmese paper, also dwells on the need for talks. Since the boundary issue is a complicated problem inherited from British imperialism, it says, a correct solution "can only be accomplished through patient negotiations based on historical facts." The paper characterizes China's stand on the boundary issue as "flexible, patient and free from hostility" and India's stand in rejecting talks as "hard, short-tempered and hostile."

Commenting on the armed clashes along the Sino-Indian border, K.M.P. Rajaratna, Ceylonese M.P. and leader of the Ceylon National Liberation Front, declared: "I have always believed that India is an aggressor and China is legitimately defending her own frontiers. And yet, China is ready to negotiate, not Nehru.

"Nehru's 'Panch Shila' has now been exposed as mere hypocrisy. Nehru's Panch Shila or everything else is for other people. When it comes to his own affairs, aggression is the policy. It does call into question India's 'holier than thou' attitude. Why does India, which spends so much time preaching to others the value of peaceful negotiations, not practise what she preaches?" (Ceylon Observer)

The Japanese Socialist M.P. Toyojiro Fujiiwara told the press: "India rejects negotiations and launches attacks against China. She is invading Chinese territory. Such an attitude is very wrong; it will not have the sympathy of the people of the world."

He also said that the attitude of the Chinese Government in handling the Sino-Indian boundary issue was "correct."

The Pakistan paper Imroze refutes Nehru's claim that he has tried "with patience" to settle the dispute with China through negotiations. "Up to now," it states, "it has been India's desire to attempt to make China give up the disputed territory [meaning China's territory which India claims] on its own. In other words, India has indeed left the door of submission open to China but never let the stage of reconciliation come."

Sa'ut El Ahrar of Iraq points out that violent and massive attacks were first launched by India with aircraft
CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE THAT INDIAN TROOPS

These two photos reproduce parts of the original map of the so-called McMahon Line drawn on March 24, 1913, by the British delegate and the delegate of the local Tibetan authorities without the knowledge of the delegate of the then Central Government of China. The photo at right is that part of the original map with the signatures and seals. The photo at left shows the westernmost part of the so-called McMahon Line as drawn on the original map. The original map, as can be seen, shows lines of longitude and latitude; the scale is one inch to eight miles, or 1:500,000.

The left hand photo clearly shows that the western end of the so-called McMahon Line is located at 27°44.6' N. and...
HAVE CROSSED THE ILLEGAL MCMAHON LINE

91°39.7' E. From here this section of the so-called McMahon Line extends eastward and then slightly southward and, near the point 92° E., it goes east-by-north. Che Dong, situated at 27°46.5' N. and such places adjacent to it as Jungputiu, Chekuopu, Kalung, Changto, Keningnai, Jihitingpu, Tang and Niangpa along the Kechilang River are all clearly north of the so-called McMahon Line.

The Nyimjang Chu River and Le Village on its west bank are marked on the map. The second tributary south of Le Village is the Kechilang River.

October 26, 1962
Viet Nam Backs China's Stand on Sino-Indian Boundary Question

The Vietnamese Foreign Minister Ung Van Khiem declared that the Vietnamese people and the Government of the Viet Nam Democratic Republic supported the correct stand of the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Sino-Indian boundary question. He expressed the hope that the two countries could settle this question through negotiations. He made this statement in his report on Viet Nam's foreign policy to the Fifth Session of the Second National Assembly of the Viet Nam Democratic Republic.

and heavy weapons and China fought back in self-defence. The paper says that what is incomprehensible is why Nehru and Menon should take such an obstinate stand towards "China which only wants negotiations and not aggression." The Indian ruling circles "know quite well that socialist China opposes aggression and colonialism wherever it may be," it notes, adding that "there is still time for India to change her stand before forthcoming developments force her to do so."

What Neighbours Say

The Indian rulers, in an attempt to defame China and justify their own ambitions, are trying to raise the bogey of so-called "Chinese aggressive ambitions" against neighbouring countries. In many of the Southeast Asian countries, particularly in those neighbouring China and India, their first-hand experience has been exactly the opposite of the Indian claim.

The Nepalese Naya Samaj, for example, asks: Since the Nepal-China and China-Burma boundary problems can be resolved, why has the China-India border dispute become tense instead of being settled? And it answers: The only reason is the chauvinistic feeling and expansionist attitude of the Indian leaders.

There are many other Nepalese papers which condemn Indian expansionist policy against its neighbours. Upholding the right of the Chinese frontier guards to self-defence, the Matibumi Weekly warns: "If India continues its firing on the Sino-Indian border, its skirmishes in Kashmir with Pakistan and its harassment of the Nepalese people in Tarai, it will surely harm its own interests."

The same conclusions are being drawn in Pakistan. Jang, a leading paper in that country, justifiably remarks: If, as the Indian rulers have asserted, China harbours aggressive intentions against India, why haven't these aggressive intentions shown up on its border with Pakistan, but only on the Indian border? The fact shows that it is India, not China, which has the habit of bullying its neighbours. In the opinion of the Indian leaders, its neighbours should follow India's dictates. China is a peaceful neighbour, a dependable friend of weak Asian nations. She has always been avoiding intervention in other people's internal affairs.

Not only Asians think this way. Progressive opinion in other parts of the world shares these sentiments.

The Canadian Tribune notes that China has made many moves towards negotiations but they had all been aborted by the Indian Government, which "insisted on Chinese withdrawals from some of the areas under dispute before even agreeing to preliminary talks." It stresses that the Chinese Government has "continued to press for peaceful negotiations without laying down any prior conditions."

"A host of reliable news reports confirm that Indian troops crossed the 'McMahon Line' to start the fighting and that Nehru does not want to negotiate," states the Swedish Ny Dag. The paper also points out that India has forsaken its earlier proclaimed stand and has extended its demands. "At present Indian troops have intruded north of the McMahon Line and occupied territory never disputed before and hitherto confirmed by both sides as China's."

Ugly Hand of U.S. Imperialism

Of course, the reasons for the anti-Chinese campaign which the Indian rulers are hell-bent on whipping up lie much deeper than the immediately visible aspects of the Sino-Indian boundary issue. To understand it, one needs to analyse the class motives of the Indian reactionaries and the international forces which are supporting them in this adventure. Many progressive newspapers have done this.

Writing in the London Daily Worker, the British political commentator Ivor Montagu points to what he calls the "third party deeply implicated in" the Sino-Indian boundary dispute — this is the U.S. State Department, whose openly declared policy is to make "Asians fight Asians." We quote: "India desperately needs credits. The U.S. Congress and the World Bank have alike shown clearly that they have scant tenderness for any friend of China. The businessmen's Bible in the U.S. How to Win Friends and Influence People is well studied by those who control and direct the dollar flow. Chinese liberation had an enormous effect in India. The Congress-led government, corrupt in many provinces and dominated by the local businessmen and landlords was failing and even oppressing the people. The example of the Chinese agrarian reform became a shining beacon to the Indian peasant and the voter in India began to turn towards communism."

The writer concludes with the wish: "May the Indian people not allow their natural and worthy love of their country to be distorted and exploited to make a triumph for those whose professed desire is to set Asians at each other's throats."

The fact is: the connection between the Indian rulers' anti-Chinese campaign and U.S. "aid" is so clear that several Asian papers including the Burmese Luddu, the Pakistan Observer, and the Korean Minjoo Chosun have commented on it.

In this respect, it is worth pointing out that India's intensified offensive against China takes place precisely at a time when U.S. imperialism is carrying out all-round provocation against China. As the Albanian paper Zeri I Popullit has stressed, it is "not fortuitous that the U.S. imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries and Nehru's friends have whipped up and backed this anti-Chinese campaign by every conceivable means." In the analysis of this paper: They are aiming at aggravating relations between the two largest Asian countries, libelling and slandering People's China as an aggressor and setting
to naught the peaceful policy of the Communist Party of China and the Government of the Chinese People's Republic.

However, the U.S. imperialists and the Indian reactionaries have overplayed their hand. Zeri I Popullit has put it well when it declares: “The sincere efforts of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the outstanding contributions it has made to defending and consolidating peace in Asia and the world and to the peaceful settlement of the boundary question with India clearly testify to its peace-loving policy. This cannot be blotted out by slander, intrigue, or provocation.”

**Factual Background**

**U.S. “Aid” and India’s Anti-Chinese Campaign**

The more frenzied the attacks which India makes on China, the more “aid” will India receive from the United States. There is abundant evidence to prove this. It is futile for the Indian reactionaries and their followers to deny any connection between U.S. “aid” and India's stand on the Sino-Indian boundary question.

**Bigger “Aid” Since 1959**

From 1949 to the end of July 1962, the United States granted or promised to grant India a total of U.S. $4.754 million in “aid,” according to the “foreign aid” reports issued by the U.S. International Co-operation Administration in October 1961 and in April 1962, and other official U.S. data. When to this is added the $1.844 million of “aid” granted to India during the same period by the U.S.-controlled international monetary agencies, the total amounts to $6,598 million (equivalent to 31,420 million rupees). Of this, approximately $2,500 million was given in the period 1949-59. About $4,100 million was given after India started its anti-Chinese campaign in 1959. This is almost twice as much as was given in the preceding decade.

Since Kennedy took office, the United States and the international monetary agencies under its control have granted or promised to grant more than 14,800 million rupees in “aid” to be used by India during its third five-year plan period from April 1961 to March 1966. (Of this amount, most of the 6,000 million rupees connected with U.S. “surplus” farm produce was promised by the Eisenhower Administration, but actually allotted by the Kennedy Administration.) This is equivalent to about 46 per cent of the total foreign aid needed by India in its third five-year plan.

The Kennedy Administration has become all the more generous with its “aid” to India since the spring this year when India started its military provocations against China and nibbled away at Chinese territory on an ever larger scale. The *Times of India* and *Janasakti* report that in March this year, the United States extended to India a loan of 2,568 million rupees in accordance with the Indian-U.S. agreement on the sale of “surplus” U.S. farm produce as “aid” to India.

It may be recalled that Indian Prime Minister Nehru launched a new anti-Chinese campaign immediately after his return from his visit to the United States in November 1961. He visited the United States at a time when India was in urgent need of U.S. “aid.” “Nehru,” the Indian press itself commented, “has gone to the United States of America with a beggar's bowl.” In September this year Indian Finance Minister M. Desai once again went to the United States to beg for “aid.” He was quite outspoken about the fact that India needed help because it needed money to deal with the so-called “Chinese intrusion on the frontier.” It was during Desai’s stay in the United States that Indian troops were making unbridled provocations and launching armed aggressions on the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border.

**U.S. Pledges Support for India**

Top-ranking U.S. officials have time and again instigated India to intensify its anti-Chinese campaign and openly pledged their support. Some of them have even talked of U.S. “aid” in the same breath with India's anti-Chinese campaign.

U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk declared at his press conference on December 8, 1961: “We, of course, support the Indian view with respect to their northern borders.” Sino-Indian borders “have been well established in law” and “the McMahon Line generally is something that the rest of the world has accepted,” he said.

U.S. Ambassador to India Galbraith, in testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in June, spoke of “the importance of the aid programme in India and the very great return the United States is getting” from it.

Acting Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Sparkman, in a television interview in Washington on June 9, 1962, said that continued U.S. aid to India was justified. “We know right now,” he said, “that India is pressing very hard against Communist China upon her northern boundary and her northeastern frontier. . . . I feel that we ought not to be discouraging India [meaning by a reduction of U.S. “aid”] at the very time that she is moving in the direction that we have been wanting her to move for a long time.”

Answering a question in a television interview on July 8, 1962, Rusk said that it would be “calamitous” if President Kennedy's hands were so tied that the United States could not give “aid” to India. Earlier, on June 7 this year he said in testimony to the House Appropriations Subcommittee: India is “situated in a most strategic part of the world” and the United States has “enormous stakes” in the development of India. Kennedy himself said on August 22 this year: “It is in our interest to support” India.

In face of all this, it is not surprising that public opinion in many countries should generally hold that India's anti-Chinese campaign is designed to get more U.S. dollars.

October 26, 1962
Halt U.S. Imperialism's New Adventure!

The following is a translation of the “Renmin Ribao” editorial of October 24. Subheads are ours. — Ed.

U.S. IMPERIALISM has sent up the danger signal — it is about to launch a fresh aggression against Cuba! Peace in the Caribbean is most gravely threatened.

On October 22, Kennedy bluntly announced a “strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment” being shipped to Cuba and declared that “if needed,” this quarantine will be extended to “other types of cargo and carriers” and will force ships carrying such equipment to “turn back.”

U.S. Military Moves

The United States has also taken a series of other military measures: the order has been given to alert U.S. troops stationed all over the world; warships have left Key West naval base in Florida which is just over the sea from Cuba; 2,000 men of the U.S. Marine Corps are on their way to the Guantanamo base as reinforcements; 40 U.S. warships and 20,000 troops are massed at Vieques Island, east of Puerto Rico to carry out “exercises.”

These signs show that the Kennedy Administration is prepared to embark on new military adventures in the Caribbean Sea, and is seeking an opportunity to launch a surprise attack on the Cuban people. All peace-loving countries and people of the world must maintain the keenest vigilance against U.S. imperialism; they must halt the aggressive schemes of the Kennedy Administration!

Kennedy’s so-called reason for taking all these grave aggressive measures is that Cuba has obtained “offensive military equipment,” but as everybody knows, this is U.S. imperialism’s most shameless pretext for its intervention in Cuba. Cuba is an independent, sovereign state with every right to build up and increase its national defence strength. What right has the U.S. Government to interfere? Can it be that only U.S. imperialism is allowed to invade and intervene in Cuba while Cuba is not allowed to reinforce its power of self-defence, thus leaving the U.S. robbers free to engage in acts of violence?

Kennedy has ordered U.S. naval and air forces to intercept ships on the high seas bound for Cuba, and declared his intention to put Cuba under “close surveillance.” This is an open act of piracy! The U.S. Government has thus trampled on the fundamental principles of international relations. Kennedy in his statement also admitted that the United States has never suspended its own shipments of various types of military equipment to many countries. It may be asked: what if other people also impose a military blockade on countries and regions accepting U.S. munitions as the U.S. does in such a barbarous and unreasonable manner? Then indeed the whole world would be thrown into utter chaos. These adventurist acts of U.S. imperialism violate the safety of navigation on the high seas and making provocations against world peace cannot but be strongly denounced by all peace-loving countries and peoples in the world.

Who Threatens Whom?

No matter what excuses he may make up, Kennedy cannot cover up U.S. imperialist crimes of intervention and aggression against Cuba. Ever since its military incursion at Giron Beach was defeated, the United States has never ceased to cherish its wild ambition to “wipe out” revolutionary Cuba. U.S. imperialist mercenaries are being trained now in double quick time in the southern parts of the United States and in Panama; it attempts to make use of such bodies as the Organization of American States, and the “Alliance for Progress,” etc. to push ahead its plan in Latin America to isolate Cuba while trying its utmost to make some Latin American countries to act as its pawns in its invasion of Cuba. In August this year, U.S. gunboats openly intruded into Cuba’s territorial waters and bombarded Havana. The facts are there for all to see: it is not Cuba that has “threatened” U.S. “security” but the other way round: the U.S. aggressors are threatening the security of Cuba.

U.S. imperialism is anxious to stamp out the Cuban revolution and subvert the Cuban Revolutionary Government. U.S. military deployments in the Caribbean show that the Kennedy Administration, after prolonged and full preparations, and after it has failed to get an embargo going against Cuba jointly with other Western countries, does not hesitate to throw away its mask and openly go it alone in blockading Cuba — it is also prepared to go a step further and launch a direct military intervention against Cuba.

World Support for Cuba

The people of Cuba are people who will not bend the knee. Premier Castro has already ordered Cuba’s revolutionary armed forces to be combat ready, ready to strike at the aggressors. Several million heroes who are determined to defend the Cuban revolution and their motherland have taken up arms and gone to their fighting posts. The cry of “Defend the motherland to the death! Victory will be ours!” rings through Cuba.

There is no shadow of doubt that, like their struggles in the past, this latest struggle of the Cuban people against U.S. imperialist aggression will have the firm support of the entire socialist camp and of all peace-loving countries and peoples in the world. China’s 650 million people have stood consistently and firmly at the side of the Cuban people. We are fully convinced that the Cuban people, under their great leader Premier Castro, will, with the support of all peace-loving countries and peoples in the world, smash all U.S. imperialist acts of aggression and intervention.

Peking Review
An Important Supplement to Industry

China's Handicrafts Flourish
by PI PING-FEI

NEW China's modern industrial plants turn out tools by mass production methods. Kitchen utensils and plastic household articles pour from machines. Textiles roll off weaving looms in millions of yards and modern mills churn out paper by the mile. Yet handicrafts lovingly made by hand still make a significant contribution to the national economy.

There is no machine that equals the skills of a Canton ivory carver, a Soochow embroiderer, a Peking cloisonne maker or a lacquerware moulder of Foochow, makers of wares admired around the world. But more than that, there are a host of useful things: handy farm tools, carpenter's planes and saws, kitchen cleavers, seamstresses' scissors, ceramic wares, sun hats of straw or fans of palm fronds, and much else which are produced by the nation's handicraftsmen and used by a people long grown accustomed to their homely forms.

The old crafts have by no means been killed off by the growth of modern industry; on the contrary, they are flourishing as never before. Handicraft production has played a big role in Chinese economic life for millennia. Naturally and increasingly in the last decade it has been giving way to modern industry, but its products are still indispensable to the people. There are millions of full-time handicraftsmen in China today and the figure will be several times larger if all those who do part-time, or seasonal work are included. The present trend is that though the growth of state-run modern industry will continue to reduce the relative share of the market taken by handicrafts, the output of handicrafts in absolute terms will continue to rise.

Brilliant Renaissance

The crafts today serve as an important supplement and aid to China's modern industry. In fact the state guides this development by the set of policies known as "walking on two legs," that is: "the simultaneous development of large, medium-sized and small enterprises, of national and local enterprises and of modern and indigenous methods of production."

In the sense of being the sole supplier on the market, the great days of Chinese handicrafts have ended. In the sense of level of skill and output they are now in a period of brilliant renaissance.

In the period just before liberation handicrafts suffered because of economic stagnation and decline, Kuomintang maladministration and especially the dumping of foreign goods on the Chinese market and ruthless exploitation of the craftsmen by middlemen. Millions of craftsmen were driven into poverty and bankruptcy. At one time for instance nearly every family in Tingshu, the famous pottery town in Ihing County, Kiangsu Province, was engaged in the flourishing trade. In the decade preceding liberation the town was ruined. Kilns had been turned into blockhouses first by the Japanese invaders and then by the Kuomintang reactionaries, workshops were wrecked. Its skilled craftsmen were reduced to the direst straits; many left the trade.

Liberation brought vast and rapid changes. The Communist Party and People's Government took immediate steps to foster handicraft production. They helped the craftsmen to get raw materials and market their goods, and later organize co-operatives along socialist lines. The remarkable recovery and growth of the national economy as a whole vastly improved the situation of the handicraftsmen.

Socialist transformation was an essential step. In old China the craftsmen worked individually, each on his own. This was their weakness. They had little capital and faced constant difficulties in getting a steady supply of raw material and in disposing of their products. With small reserves, slack seasons found them especially hard up. Capitalist merchants took advantage of their difficulties and ruthlessly exploited them. It was not unusual for a handicraftsman and his family to be forced to toil twelve or more hours a day for a pittance. Techniques were backward, slow and laborious.

Two Steps in Co-operation

The handicraftsmen's supply and marketing group or co-op was their first form of co-operative organization. Their members still worked individually, but the state supplied these groups or co-ops with raw materials, loaned them capital and bought their products at fair prices for marketing through the state-led marketing network. Some groups or co-ops worked on orders placed by state commercial establishments. In some cases they would work up the raw materials supplied them by the state establishments and receive payment for processing.

This elementary co-operative organization, the first step in the socialist transformation of the individual craftsmen, freed them from middleman exploitation, introduced them to and trained them in collective action and fostered their collective spirit. This laid the groundwork for the next step—the advance to producers' co-operatives.

In the producers' co-op, members pool their resources and work collectively. Each draws a regular wage and is entitled to an annual dividend or bonus from the profits of the co-op, both calculated on the basis of the work done. In addition to a welfare fund, part of the proceeds of the co-op is set aside for the reserve fund from which investments in new equipment can be made. The co-op can organize a rational division of labour among its members. This and investment in new, improved equipment have
greatly increased labour productivity and the quality of production. The collective workshops of the co-ops have also been fertile sources of technical innovations and inventions in the various handicrafts.

1956 was the year of the great upsurge in the socialist transformation of China's economy. The peasants had poured into socialist co-operative farms and the capitalist enterprises switched by whole trades to joint state-private operation. The handicraftsmen too in their overwhelming majority joined producers' co-ops.

The co-ops are today the main form of economic organization of the craftsmen but a limited number of the best developed of them have voluntarily transformed themselves into state enterprises to meet the needs of the state better; in such cases the members receive a refund of what they have invested as shares; become wage employees of the state and enjoy the benefits stipulated by the state labour regulations.

Great flexibility is evident in the organization of handicraft production. Members of a co-op may work together in their workshop or individually in their homes. To serve the customers better, the co-ops, in addition to producing goods for the state trading establishments, maintain their own shops or stalls to market their products. Many of them make things to order; many make up customers' own materials, clothing, knitted wear or metalware, etc. Such itinerant or fixed workshops are found in all China's great cities, towns and villages. This is well suited to Chinese conditions where the itinerant craftsman has always played a big and popular role.

**Great Handicraft Centres**

In addition to the local craftsmen who so well and closely serve the people in town and countryside, there are the great and famous centres of handicrafts. Some of these have been renowned for centuries past. There is Chingtchehchen, the famous "porcelain town" in Kiangsi Province. It boasts of a trade in porcelain that goes back 1,400 years. In one way or another 70 per cent of its population is engaged in the trade. Their wares are known far and wide in China and abroad for being "as white as jade, mirror bright, thin as paper and sounding like the finest chimes." This craft is based on the fine Kaolin clay that is found in the area and its unrivalled cadres of craftsmen with age-old craft traditions that are among the finest in the world.

Another famous centre is Jungyang County in Honan Province. Here they produce fine objects made of plaited straw in such quantities that there is a saying: "The Yellow River flows on eternally and the supply of Jungyang plaiting never dries up." Hangchow and Wenchow in Chekiang Province are two other famous handicraft centres. The scissors made by Changshiaochuan in Hangchow are nationally famous, well designed and finished. sharp and long lasting. Wenchow, along with Changsha (Hunan) and Fochow (Fukien), produce the lion's share of the oiled paper and bamboo umbrellas and mats sold in China.

Soochow is well known for silk embroidery, sandalwood fans and redwood furniture, and Icing for pottery, both in Kiangsu Province. The number of other famous centres of handicrafts are too numerous to mention: Yangchuan and Chincheng in Shanshi Province; Yentai (Chefoo) and Weifang in Shantung Province; Chengtu in Szechuan Province. These are just a few.

The state naturally gives priority in the allocation of raw materials and production quotas to these well-known centres. Since they already have a good foundation laid, unrivalled knowledge of the production techniques involved and well-established market outlets, this keeps costs to a minimum, ensures a big output of high-quality goods and stimulates a general rise in the technical level of the trades.

**Crafts Aid Farming**

The vast majority of the Chinese people live in the villages. The handicrafts therefore naturally have the closest ties with this great rural population and its needs. Two-thirds of the craftsmen live in the rural areas. Most of their raw materials—bamboo, timber, reeds, mulberry, willow and rattan wicker, and so on—come from the countryside and the lion's share of their products are sold on the rural markets. A great deal of these products are household goods and mass consumption articles like cooking utensils, buckets and wicker baskets, hand tools and furniture, wearing apparel, ceramics and musical instruments, and the many objects of household or personal adornment that the peasants love, like purses and festival clothes. But the handicraftsman is still one of the farmers' main suppliers of farm tools.

Farm mechanization has gone ahead in recent years but the hand-operated or animal-drawn implements like shovels, hoes, sickles, ploughs, water-wheels, boats and carts are still most widely used and most of these are handicraft products. The handicraft co-ops therefore give top priority to making farm tools and they make them in huge quantities. Incomplete figures for the first seven months of this year show that nearly 400 million pieces of small and medium-sized farm tools of all kinds were made and sent to the farms.

In addition, of course, the handicraftsmen also play an enormously important role in repairing farm tools. During the spring ploughing or autumn harvesting seasons the handicraft co-ops see to it that the farm tool repair network functions properly. They also send out teams to help the farms with their repair work and to train their own repairmen.

**Better Techniques**

The socialist organization of China's handicrafts has led to a steady improvement in their techniques. In most of the handicraft trades the tools used were extremely simple. The metal worker, for example, had a small furnace, hand-worked bellows, anvils and hammers, that is all. Such was the nature of his work that "Wielding a blacksmith's hammer," said the old saying, "needs a hero of a man and he'll be too old for it at forty!"

The handicraft workshops were some of the worst centres of sweated labour in old China, with long hours and poor working conditions. Liberation ended the long hours. The progress of the mass-based movement to introduce technical innovations to these old trades has already brought about a vast change in the conditions of work. Bit by bit power is being introduced into the
workshops. Spring, steam and belt-driven hammers have largely replaced the heavy sledge hammer, greatly lightening the work of the smith. Circular saws have eased the labour of the carpenter. The making of bamboo or rattan ware is a toilsome and tedious job when done by hand. The co-ops in Loho County, Honan Province, which specialize in such work, have made 32 special devices that replace most of the manual work by semi-mechanized processes. This has not only eased the work but increased production fivefold. This is only one of many such examples.

While machine processes are introduced wherever possible, care is taken that these innovations do not lower the high standards of manual craftsmanship. The fine traditional skills and distinctive features of the crafts are meticulously preserved and further developed. This is admirably demonstrated at displays in the Great Hall of the People in Peking. Here the conference rooms and lounges for the delegates of the various provinces are equipped with sofas, tables, curtains and draperies, tablecloths, screens and other furnishings that are characteristic of these various provinces and regarded as the best examples of their crafts. The workmanship displayed here testifies to the high level of development of China’s handicrafts today.

**Master Craftsmen Honoured**

The production of many traditional wares depends on rare skills that are often handed down generation after generation within the family. Chang Kwei-lu of Peking, nicknamed “Grape Chang” makes clusters of grapes in glass that at a glance cannot be distinguished from the real thing. She represents the fifth generation in a single family of craftsmen with a mastery of this craft. Virtually every handicraft has such exceptional masters. Their skills are cherished as part of the nation’s cultural heritage. They are carefully looked after and everything possible is done to help them pass on their knowledge and skill to the younger generation. Some 800 of them bear the title of “Master Craftsman”; 169 have been elected deputies to the people’s congresses at various levels or invited to become members of the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference or its local branches, while 130 have been accepted as members of the Union of Chinese Artists. The honour and respect in which they are held stands in startling contrast to the way they were economically exploited and socially despised by the ruling classes before liberation.

In this new atmosphere it is not surprising that these veteran craftsmen willingly, in fact eagerly, part with their old professional secrets. In the old days the Chang family jealously guarded their skills and never passed them on to anyone but members of their family. No daughter engaged in the trade was allowed to marry. Today that has all ended: the Changs are passing on their craft to a number of talented youngsters.

**Master-Apprentice Relationship**

In training the younger generation personal coaching is combined with classroom study. Many co-ops have opened regular vocational courses and schools, but the main form of teaching, particularly in the art crafts, is still based on the time-tried master-apprentice relationship. But that relationship is naturally quite different from what it was before. Then the apprentice was expected for part of his indentured time to be a sort of servant to his master. He did any house jobs required from fetching firewood to looking after the baby, just as in feudal times. Apprentices were cruelly abused and actually prevented from learning the masters’ trade as long as possible. Today contracts are signed in which both sides undertake to do their best, in teaching and in learning respectively. The apprentices are now free to devote his full time to study; they receive a reasonable wage for their work and plenty of opportunities for independent practical work.

In its new form and under these new conditions the apprenticeship system has proved to be most effective in the handicraft trades. In Soochow, famous among other things for its embroideries, 920 apprentices have been trained in the art crafts since 1958. One of them, Ku Wen-hsia who studied directly under the famous 70-year-old needlewoman Chin Ching-fen, an expert in 90 traditional embroidery stitches and inventor of many new ones and author of a basic textbook on the art, has twice been selected to demonstrate her art at international fairs held abroad.

The life of China’s handicraftsmen today is running forward on socialist lines. Large numbers of them are entitled to the name of “Outstanding Workers.” That means they are finely skilled craftsmen and socialist activists in their trades, men and women known for their patriotism and public spirit, and good co-operators with an exemplary sense of responsibility to the customer. It is such men and women who are carrying China’s age-old handicrafts to new heights under socialism.
SONG & DANCE

Vietnamese Ensemble in Peking

Peking will long remember the melodies of the songs, the rhythm of the dances, and the warmth of the sentiments of friendship brought by the Youth Song and Dance Ensemble from the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. In three — all too few — performances in the capital, these gifted artists spoke eloquently of the joyful life the Vietnamese people are building, they voiced their passionate desire for the unification of their country, they expressed too their deep, fraternal regard for the Chinese people.

In 1961, a young Vietnamese student bid farewell to a place he loved well — Peking. Before he left, he expressed his sentiments in a song about Vietnamese-Chinese friendship which he composed called The Kapok Flower, a red flower that grows on the borders between China and Viet Nam. The notes of this soft, beautiful song, sung in the rich tenor of the well-known singer Mai Khanh at the ensemble’s first performance in Peking, had hardly ended before they were caught up by thunderous applause from the audience. Mai Khanh went on to delight his audience with his Vietnamese songs and with Chinese folk songs such as The Luingan Mountain and Singing a Folk Song Into the Blue Skies. These he sang with a natural grasp of the sentiments expressed and a crystal clear and accurate enunciation of the Chinese.

Sopranos Ngoc Dau and Tan Yen sang a number of Vietnamese songs including The Butterfly Loves Fragrant Flowers, The Lullaby and Morning on the Farm. The former, with her full, ringing voice, combines Western techniques with characteristic Vietnamese national features in singing; the latter is soft and lyrical. Her rendering of Reunite My Land!, in particular, moved her audiences with its depth of feeling. The day the ensemble arrived in Peking, Tan Yen expressed the wish to learn a Chinese song describing the Chinese people’s march to socialism. She told her Chinese friends: “We Vietnamese regard as our own the achievements won by the Chinese people under the three red banners.” The very next night in her first appearance she sang The Three Red Banners in Chinese to an audience that showed its keen appreciation in no uncertain terms.

In his performance, flutist Dinh Than, gold-medal winner of the Folk Song Contest in the northern part of Viet Nam, displayed an excellent technique on an instrument very similar to the traditional Chinese flute. In Thinking of the South, he evoked a spirit of youthful, lyrical optimism that touched chords particularly close to the hearts of his Chinese audience.

Peking again listened entranced to the single-stringed lute playing of Manh Thang. As it was during his previous visit to China last year, his was among the most enthusiastically applauded items on the programme. This gold-medal winner of both the 6th World Youth Festival and the last Folk Song Contest in the northern part of Viet Nam made his instrument talk in human tones. His playing can best be described by the Chinese saying: “The lingering notes of the music weaved in and out of the beams in the ceiling for three days without ending.”

The folk dances of Viet Nam made a colourful pageant. The repertoire of the ensemble included four gold-medal-winning items from the recent 8th World Youth Festival in Helsinki: the tinkling ball dance, the Rong Chien Dance and the Cham Rong Dance, joyous folk dances of the various nationalities in Viet Nam, the classical dance-pantomime Night Patrol, and the bronze-medal-winning Blossoms of Early Spring. These, together with the comic Sa-aim, the heroic Breaking Off the Fetters, the lively Butterflies in Spring, and the poetic Girls by the Lakeside give a variegated picture of the life of the Vietnamese people today.

Night Patrol, an episode from the traditional classical Vietnamese dance, depicts an enemy spy stealing into a city at night. The night patrol discovers him, fights with him in the dark, and captures him. It has a strong national flavour but it also has many points of similarity with Chinese opera that doubly endeared it to Chinese audiences. Sa-aim is a comedy dance of four youthful male dancers beating “Elephant Leg Long Drums,” and moving with exaggerated movements, necks outstretched like turkeys and doing a spasmodic sort of peacock strut. This exuberantly youthful dance brought gusts of delighted laughter.

The Cham Rong and the Rong Chien show merry-making at harvest festivals. The latter with its colourful costumes and synchronized musical accompaniment is particularly attractive. To the throbbing beat of drums and gongs six youths in fiery red costumes and with peacock feather headdresses danced with six lovely girls in black and white with vivid splashes of scarlet at the back and flowing sashes of many colours. They wove back and forth in graceful, lively dance patterns. When the number ended, as the audience applauded, they warmly shook each other’s hands — and the word quickly spread that the young male dancers were members of China’s Tung Fang (The East) Art Ensemble. The Vietnamese ensemble had prevailed upon their Chinese colleagues to appear with them in a joint performance.

The Vietnamese Youth Song and Dance Ensemble has shown the astonishing progress made by Vietnamese artists in developing a people’s art since the victory of their struggle for liberation. Their performances in Peking have added further lustre to the friendship between the Chinese and Vietnamese peoples.
The Korean People's Brilliant Victory

Greeting the achievements of the First Session of the Third Supreme People's Assembly of the Korean Democratic People's Republic and the formation of a new government headed by Comrade Kim Il Sung, a Rennmin Ribao editorial (October 24) says that this reflects the Korean people's confidence in the Korean Workers' Party and Comrade Kim Il Sung.

The Central Committee of the Korean Workers' Party and Comrade Kim Il Sung, adds the editorial, have led the Korean people from victory to victory in their socialist construction. The brilliant victory of the recent general elections is also the great victory of the general line of the Party.

The outstanding achievements of the First Session of the Third Supreme People's Assembly are a powerful inspiration to the Korean people in their struggle against U.S. imperialist schemes to keep their country divided. The Korean people will certainly win final victory in their struggle for the peaceful reunification of their fatherland, concludes the editorial.

It's No Use Denying It, Mr. Menon!

Following the large-scale attacks launched on October 20 by the Indian troops on the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border against the Chinese frontier guards, the Indian Defence Minister Krishna Menon went so far as to deny the very fact of India's long-prepared attack on China. This, says Rennmin Ribao's Commentator (October 23), was designed to try to absolve India of responsibility for refusing to negotiate and for provoking the serious military conflicts on the Sino-Indian border.

Apart from his shopworn nonsense about so-called Chinese "aggression," which is unworthy of refutation, Menon in his several speeches brazenly asserted that China has "forced India into war" and that "we [the Indians] did not prepare for this."

But these lies of Menon can never alter the facts known to the whole world, Commentator declares.

Is it really true, as Menon tries to make out, that India "did not prepare" for the current serious military conflicts on the Sino-Indian border? The answer is No! The fact is that the massive armed aggression launched by the Indian authorities against China was being fully prepared over a long period of time. Nehru himself said on July 27 that India's defence position on the India-China border had considerably improved and that the Indian troops were in a position to give a good fight to the Chinese. In regard to the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border, the Indian Government not long ago set up a new army corps under its "Eastern Command." And the commander of this army corps Kaul was authorized to "fight a limited offensive operation" on the Chinese border. An article published in the Indian Express has revealed that "our [Indian] troops have been recently reinforced" in the northeast Frontier Agency, and "there appeared to be at least a corps which would put our military strength there at around 50,000 if not more."

Can Mr. Menon's memory really be so bad as all that? On the eve of the current large-scale offensives launched by the Indian troops, Nehru, having heard your report on your "on the spot study," indicated that "all steps would be taken to evict the Chinese from the area." And you yourself, Mr. Menon, told the press that "we [India] are resolved that the Chinese shall be thrown back" and that military action to expel the Chinese will continue "until the desired results are achieved." On October 18, Indian Defence Ministry sources announced that the Chinese had been "pushed back" two miles. How elated you were then!

"All these words," says Commentator, "were spoken and all these actions were taken by the Indian authorities. Are these facts not sufficient to show that the massive offensives launched by the Indian troops were long planned and prepared?"

"It appears," adds Commentator, "that the Indian Government has not yet learnt the lessons it should have learnt from the armed conflicts on the Sino-Indian border." On October 21, Nehru cried that Indian troops would "take action to repulse the Chinese and regain the lost positions."

Menon, too, said that India would continue to fight. Going all out to incite anti-Chinese feeling, he added that for every man that the Chinese kill "we [India] will kill more of them."

"The Chinese Government, in its series of notes and protests, has solemnly pointed out that the Indian side must be held fully responsible for all the consequences arising from its repeated provocations and armed attacks and that responsibility for casualties suffered by the Indian troops rests wholly with the Indian Government. Do you, gentlemen intoxicated with expansionism and mistaking China's sincere desire to seek a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question for a sign of weakness, still hope to gain something out of your adventure?" asks Commentator in conclusion.

Juggling With Time

According to an AFP report, Krishna Menon, the Indian Defence Minister, said that the Chinese news agency had put out its report accusing the Indian forces of launching their attack on the Sino-Indian border at 07:00 hours Peking Time on the morning of October 20, but that the "Chinese attacks" had actually begun at 07:30 hours Peking Time. This meant, said Menon, that the Chinese news agency had put out its report of the attacks "half an hour before the attacks had actually begun." On the basis of these "facts," the Indian Defence Minister asserted that therefore it was the Chinese who had begun the attacks.

Here, Menon had the time of the "Chinese attack" which he had invented, the time of the actual Indian attack on the eastern sector of the border, and the time at which the Hsinhua News Agency released the news of the Indian troops' attack deftly mixed up, and sidestepped completely the question of the Indian attack.

The fact is that the Indian forces launched their attack on the Chinese frontier guards at 07:00 hours Peking Time on October 20 and the report of this attack was first released by Hsinhua (the Chinese news agency) at 09:10 hours Peking Time on the same day, that is, two hours and ten minutes after the Indian troops began their attack. So there is no question whatsoever of the Indian attacks being reported by China before they began.
Sino-Albanian Militant Friendship

Bringing with them the Albanian people’s profound friendship, the delegation of the China-Albania Friendship Association led by Hu Yao-pang left Tirana on October 18 after a three-week visit to Albania. The delegation was invited to attend the celebrations for the 13th anniversary of the National Day of the Albanian People’s Republic and pay a friendly visit to the country.

During their stay, in addition to touring the capital, the delegation visited factories, state farms, universities and cultural centres in different parts of the country. Everywhere they went they received a rousing and cordial welcome. In Shkoder, Peshkopia, Durres and Valona, people held meetings to express their friendly feelings for the envoys of the Chinese people.

In Tirana, the Chinese delegation had friendly talks with the Albanian Party and state leaders, Enver Hoxha, Mehmet Shehu, Abdyl Kellezi, Todi Lubonja, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Albanian Union of Working Youth, and others.

China and Albania are far apart geographically, but they are fast friends whose hearts beat in unison and who are fighting shoulder to shoulder in opposing imperialism, colonialism and modern revisionism. This feeling of solidarity was especially demonstrated at a big banquet given by the Albania-China Friendship Society on October 16 to bid farewell to the Chinese delegation.

Kellezi, Chairman of the Albanian-China Friendship Society and Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Albania, in his speech at the banquet condemned the recent hostile activities of the Indian reactionaries in violation of Chinese territorial integrity. He said that the Albanian people and all members of the Party of Labour were following the events with burning indignation, scorn and hate. Supported by the U.S. imperialists and their running-dogs, the Indian reactionaries were bent on making large-scale attacks on the Chinese frontier guards. He also condemned the Indian reactionary circles headed by Nehru for carrying out adventurist activities in answer to the Chinese Government’s sincere efforts to uphold the friendship between China and India, and expressed the Albanian people’s support for the Chinese people.

Speaking about their impressions of Albania, Hu Yao-pang, head of the Chinese delegation, said at the banquet that they had rejoiced to see that relying on their own efforts and with the help of other fraternal countries abiding by Marxist-Leninist principles, the Albanian people were engaged in capital construction works for their new socialist industry and agriculture. All this had convinced the Chinese delegation that all the sabotage activities of imperialism and modern revisionism had met and will meet with ignominious failure.

What deeply impressed them was the fact that the Albanian people are filled with the spirit of proletarian internationalism. The Albanian people show great courage and determination in the struggle against the imperialist policies of war and aggression, and in giving support to the struggle of all the oppressed nations for independence. They have also made outstanding contributions to the struggle against the imperialists and their lackeys—the modern revisionists—and in defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the preservation of the great unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

Addressing the banquet, Chen Yi said that the delegation’s visit to China had made important contributions to strengthening and enhancing the great militant friendship between the Chinese and Korean peoples. The Vice-Premier thanked the Korean Workers’ Party and the Korean people for their constant support for the struggles of the Chinese people. He praised the immense achievements and rich experience of the Korean Workers’ Party and the Korean people in socialist construction. The Chinese people can learn a great deal from this valuable experience, Chen Yi said.

In his reply, Choi Chang Suk praised the Chinese Communist Party for the three red banners—the general line for socialist construction, the big leap forward and the people’s commune—which were a creative application of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism to China’s reality. They were leading the Chinese people from victory to victory, he said.

He acclaimed the Chinese people, under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, for their infinite loyalty to proletarian internationalism and their resolute struggle to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

At the banquet, both hosts and guests proposed and drank toasts to the eternal friendship between the two peoples, and to the Parties and leaders of the two countries.

The Korea-China Friendship Association delegation came to China to attend China’s National Day celebrations. After touring Peking, Shanghai, Hangchow and Canton, and making a short stay in Shenyang, they left China for home on October 19.

Establishment of Sino-Uganda Diplomatic Relations

China and Uganda have agreed to establish formal diplomatic relations and to exchange diplomatic representatives at ambassadorial level. An official joint communique to this effect was signed by representatives of the Governments of China and Uganda in Kampala on October 18.

Premier Chou En-lai and Foreign Minister Chen Yi sent congratulatory
messages on the occasion to the Prime Minister Apollo Milton Obote of Uganda.

Greeting the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and Uganda, Renmin Ribao's editorial of October 20 described it as a great event for friendly relations between the two countries. The establishment of diplomatic relations shortly after the independence of Uganda showed that no imperialist intrigues could succeed in undermining the friendship between the Chinese and African peoples, said the editorial. In recent years, in the course of the upsurge of the national-independence movement in Africa, increasing numbers of countries had attained independence on that continent, and the friendship and co-operation between China and the African countries had grown stronger. To date, China had established diplomatic relations with ten African countries.

The editorial declared that the Chinese people had resolutely supported, and would continue to support the Uganda people in their struggle against colonialism, both new and old, and in their efforts to uphold their national independence and build their country.

Building of Kathmandu-Lhasa Highway to Begin

A preliminary survey of the Kathmandu-Lhasa Highway has been completed and the Chinese experts, with local assistance, are now making a detailed survey. Simultaneously with the survey work, arrangements are being made to bring in necessary equipment to build the highway. Actual construction will be started shortly.

Sino-Ghanian Co-operation Protocol

China and Ghana signed on October 18 in Accra a protocol of the Sino-Ghanian agreement on economic and technical co-operation which was concluded in Peking last year during President Nkrumah's state visit to China.

Under the protocol, China will supply Ghana with complete sets of equipment and certain quantities of building material, and render it technical assistance in building a number of industrial projects and to develop paddy rice cultivation, freshwater fisheries and some handicraft industries.
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