

**THE TRUTH ABOUT
HOW THE LEADERS OF THE CPSU
HAVE ALLIED THEMSELVES
WITH INDIA AGAINST CHINA**



FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

**THE TRUTH ABOUT
HOW THE LEADERS OF THE CPSU
HAVE ALLIED THEMSELVES
WITH INDIA AGAINST CHINA**

by the
Editorial Department of *Renmin Ribao*
(*People's Daily*)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1963

CONTENTS

THE TRUTH ABOUT HOW THE LEADERS OF THE CPSU
HAVE ALLIED THEMSELVES WITH INDIA AGAINST
CHINA by the Editorial Department of *Renmin Ribao*
(*People's Daily*)

November 2, 1963

1

APPENDIX: A SERIOUS HOTBED OF TENSION IN ASIA
(Article published by *Pravda*, September 19,
1963)

37

**THE TRUTH ABOUT
HOW THE LEADERS OF THE CPSU
HAVE ALLIED THEMSELVES
WITH INDIA AGAINST CHINA**

by the
Editorial Department of *Renmin Ribao*
(*People's Daily*)

November 2, 1963

On September 19 the Editorial Board of *Pravda* published an article on the Sino-Indian boundary question, entitled "A Serious Hotbed of Tension in Asia", the full text of which we printed on September 25. Disregarding the facts and confounding right and wrong, the article makes the slanderous charge that China wants to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question by force of arms and does not sincerely desire a peaceful settlement. It strives to sow dissension between China and Asian-African countries and makes the accusation that, unlike India, China has not "reacted favourably to the proposals of the Colombo Conference" and "accepted them fully without any reservations". In its anxiety to stir up trouble, it makes the inflammatory statement that the Sino-Indian border conflict "may again be aggravated".

The *Pravda* article gained the immediate applause of the Indian reactionaries and the U.S. imperialists.

Nehru said on September 21 that it indicated "a significant development in the Soviet appreciation of India's case".

The Indian Information Service, rejoicing over this windfall, asked all its receiving posts to give "maximum publicity" to the full text of the *Pravda* article.

The reactionary Indian press crowed over "all-out Soviet support to India against China" and declared that, "shedding its 'brotherly' reserve, the Soviet Union today came out openly on the side of India on the Sino-Indian border dispute".

The U.S. *Christian Science Monitor* said that the Soviet Union "is now taking an active role" in restraining China and that "the West has reason for deep and greatly needed relief". It also reported that many Indians see the *Pravda* article "as a deterrent comparable in its own way to the forthcoming Western-oriented air exercises".

The *Pravda* article is assuredly an important document. The Soviet leaders have long allied themselves with the Indian reactionaries to oppose socialist China. This article marks their advance from their previous attitude of feigning neutrality while actually favouring the Indian reactionaries to alignment with U.S. imperialism in openly supporting them.

I

One of the important differences of principle between the Soviet leaders and ourselves turns on the Sino-Indian boundary question. We would have preferred to be reticent about the origin and development of the differences between China and the Soviet Union on this question. But the Soviet leaders have now brought them

into the open and have moreover asserted in the Soviet Government statement of September 21 that their stand on the Sino-Indian boundary question has been consistently correct since 1959 while China's stand has been wrong; it has, therefore, become necessary to show how our differences with the Soviet leaders on this question have developed over the last few years so as to distinguish between truth and falsehood.

1. The Indian reactionaries provoked the first armed conflict on the Sino-Indian border on August 25, 1959, after their failure in the armed rebellion of the reactionary clique of the Tibetan upper strata, which they instigated and abetted. On September 6, 1959, a Chinese leader told the Soviet Charge d'Affaires the facts about the conflict and the Chinese policy of striving to avoid hostilities. He also pointed out that the Indian Government's purpose in provoking the border conflict was to oppose communism and China; that, as was to be logically expected, the Indian bourgeoisie had become increasingly reactionary with the sharpening of the internal class struggle; and that it was necessary not to be taken in by Nehru who was striving to put pressure on China by utilizing the Soviet Union.

2. On the morning of September 9, 1959, the Soviet Charge d'Affaires notified the Chinese Government that the Soviet Government would issue a TASS statement concerning the Sino-Indian boundary question on September 10 and delivered a copy of this statement. The Chinese Government immediately intimated in principle that it would be better for the Soviet Government to refrain from making a public statement on this question.

On the afternoon of the same day, the Chinese Government gave the Soviet Charge d'Affaires a copy of

Premier Chou En-lai's letter to Prime Minister Nehru of September 8, in which the Chinese Government made proposals to the Indian Government for a friendly settlement of the boundary question through negotiations and for the maintenance of the border *status quo* pending such settlement.

That evening, the Chinese Government informed the Soviet Charge d'Affaires that China had already published Premier Chou En-lai's letter to Nehru, and asked the Soviet Government to take into consideration the Chinese Government's attitude and position in this letter and not to issue the TASS statement.

3. Ignoring China's advice, the Soviet Government issued the TASS statement ahead of time on the night of September 9, 1959, thus revealing the differences between China and the Soviet Union. In that statement, without distinguishing between right and wrong, the Soviet Government expressed general "regret" over the Sino-Indian border conflict and, although assuming a facade of neutrality, actually favoured India and condemned China.

4. On September 30, 1959, Comrade Khrushchov publicly blamed China for wanting to "test by force the stability of the capitalist system". The whole world recognized this as an insinuation that China was being "bellicose" regarding Taiwan and the Sino-Indian boundary.

5. On October 2, 1959, the Chinese leaders personally gave Comrade Khrushchov an explanation of the true situation and background concerning the Sino-Indian border hostilities, pointing out that it was India that had provoked conflict across the border and that it would not do to yield to the Indian reactionaries all the time. But Khrushchov did not wish to know the true situation and

the identity of the party committing the provocation, but insisted that anyway it was wrong to shoot people dead.

6. The Indian reactionaries provoked the second armed conflict on the Sino-Indian border on October 21, 1959. On October 26, the Chinese Government informed the Soviet Charge d'Affaires of the facts of the incident.

7. At a session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on October 31, 1959, Khrushchov again expressed "regret" and "distress" over the Sino-Indian border conflict and brushed aside India's responsibility for the provocation.

8. Receiving a correspondent of the Indian weekly, *New Age*, on November 7, 1959, Khrushchov said that the Sino-Indian border incident was "sad" and "stupid". He cited the case of the settlement of the Soviet-Iranian boundary question and said, "What are a few kilometres for a country like the Soviet Union?", insinuating that China should cede her own territory to satisfy India's claims.

9. Between December 10, 1959 and January 30, 1960, the Chinese leaders had six talks with the Soviet Ambassador. They pointed out that the Soviet leaders were wrong to "maintain strict neutrality" on the Sino-Indian boundary question and that, far from being neutral, their statements actually censured China and were in favour of India.

10. In a verbal notification to the Central Committee of the CPC on February 6, 1960, the Central Committee of the CPSU stated that "one cannot possibly seriously think that a state such as India, which is militarily and economically immeasurably weaker than China, would really launch a military attack on China and commit aggression against it", that China's handling of the question was "an expression of a narrow nationalist attitude"

and that "when shooting was heard on the Sino-Indian border on the eve of N. S. Khrushchov's trip to the United States, the whole world considered this to be an event that could hamper the peace-loving activity of the Soviet Union".

11. On June 22, 1960, Khrushchov said to the head of the delegation of the Chinese Communist Party during the Bucharest meeting, "I know what war is. Since Indians were killed, this meant that China attacked India." He also said, "We are Communists, for us it is not important where the frontier line runs."

12. On October 8, 1962, a Chinese leader told the Soviet Ambassador that China had information that India was about to launch a massive attack along the Sino-Indian border and that should India attack we would resolutely defend ourselves. He also pointed out that the fact that the Soviet-made helicopters and transport planes were being used by India for air-dropping and transporting military supplies in the Sino-Indian border areas was making a bad impression on our frontier guards and that we deemed it our internationalist duty to inform the Soviet side of the situation.

13. On October 13 and 14, 1962, Khrushchov told the Chinese Ambassador the following: Their information on Indian preparations to attack China was similar to China's. If they were in China's position, they would have taken the same measures. A neutral attitude on the Sino-Indian boundary question was impossible. If anyone attacked China and they said they were neutral, it would be an act of betrayal.

14. On October 20, 1962, the Indian reactionaries launched a massive attack on China. On October 25, *Pravda* carried an editorial pointing out that the notorious

McMahon Line was imposed on the Chinese and Indian peoples and had never been recognized by China. It said that the three proposals put forward by the Chinese Government in its statement of October 24 were constructive and constituted an acceptable basis for opening negotiations and settling the dispute between China and India peacefully.

15. On December 12, 1962, forgetting everything he had said less than two months earlier, Khrushchov reverted to his original tune and made the following insinuations at a session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR: The areas disputed by China and India were sparsely populated and of little value to human life. The Soviet Union could not possibly entertain the thought that India wanted to start a war with China. The Soviet Union adhered to Lenin's views on boundary disputes. Her experience over forty-five years proved that there was no boundary dispute which could not be solved without resorting to arms. Of course, it was good that China had unilaterally ordered a cease-fire and withdrawn her troops; but would it not have been better if the Chinese troops had not advanced from their original positions?

16. By publishing the article of the *Pravda* Editorial Board on September 19, 1963, the Soviet leaders discarded all camouflage and openly sided with the U.S. imperialists in supporting the Indian reactionaries against socialist China.

It is clear from the above facts that China has done her utmost to eliminate the Sino-Soviet differences on the Sino-Indian boundary question. But the leaders of the CPSU have persisted in their attitude of great-power chauvinism, acted arrogantly and turned a deaf ear to China's opinions. They brought the Sino-Soviet dif-

ferences into the open in order to create the so-called Camp David spirit and make a ceremonial gift to the U.S. imperialists. During the Caribbean crisis, they spoke a few seemingly fair words out of considerations of expediency. But when the crisis was over, they went back on their words. They have sided with the Indian reactionaries against China all the time. As facts show, the stand taken by the Soviet leaders on the Sino-Indian boundary question is a complete betrayal of proletarian internationalism.

II

Our differences with the Soviet leaders on the Sino-Indian boundary issue over the past four years can be summarized under the following four main questions:

1. Is the Sino-Indian boundary issue a major one of principle or an insignificant one?
2. Who has firmly maintained the border *status quo* and who has provoked armed border conflicts?
3. What attitude should a socialist country take in the face of armed attacks by bourgeois reactionaries?
4. Who lacks a sincere desire for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, India or China?

Let us see how the Soviet leaders, inspired by ulterior motives, have disregarded the facts and confounded right and wrong in supporting India and betraying China on these four questions.

(1) IS THE SINO-INDIAN BOUNDARY ISSUE A MAJOR ONE OF PRINCIPLE OR AN INSIGNIFICANT ONE?

It is well known that the Sino-Indian boundary question involves 125,000 square kilometres of Chinese ter-

ritory. This is therefore a major issue, not a minor one. We consistently maintain that even an issue of such major importance can be settled, so long as both sides treat each other as equals and in the spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. However, the Indian Government has not only occupied 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory south of the illegal McMahon Line in the eastern sector of the Sino-Indian border and 2,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the middle sector, it is also insatiable and wants to occupy another 33,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the western sector, which has always been under Chinese administration. This is the reason why no solution of the Sino-Indian boundary question has been found for so long.

The Soviet leaders assert that it is an insignificant issue. Khrushchov says, "What are a few kilometres?"

We cannot agree. It is not a matter of a few odd square kilometres but of 125,000 square kilometres. How much is 125,000 square kilometres? It is larger than the total area of the Azerbaijan and Armenian Republics. Supposing that a capitalist country were bent on occupying these two Union Republics of the Soviet Union, would the Soviet leaders regard that, too, as an insignificant matter beneath its notice?

Khrushchov also asserts that the disputed areas along the Sino-Indian border are sparsely populated and of no great value to human life, and therefore need not be taken seriously.

We cannot agree with this either. Who says that a socialist country may only defend its densely populated areas but not its sparsely populated ones? Actually, the population density of the area in the eastern sector of

the Sino-Indian border is roughly the same as that of the Turkmen Republic of the Soviet Union. And the area in the western sector of the Sino-Indian border is not more deserted than the vast frozen northeastern part of the Soviet Union, facing the United States of America's Alaska across the sea. Supposing that a capitalist country wanted to occupy these areas in the Soviet Union, would the Soviet leaders agree that there was no need to worry about them and that they could be surrendered?

The Soviet leaders also assert that Communists need not bother about where the frontier line runs.

Of course, this is clever talk. Unfortunately, they have forgotten that we are living in a world of classes and states, a world which still has imperialists and bourgeois reactionaries. If these words were applicable, would not the socialist countries forego all right to defend their own frontiers? And what would be left of the unanimous determination of the socialist countries to uphold the inviolability of the Oder-Neisse boundary between Germany and Poland? Obviously, this absurd statement cannot be tolerated by the people of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries.

**(2) WHO HAS FIRMLY MAINTAINED THE BORDER
STATUS QUO AND WHO HAS PROVOKED ARMED
BORDER CONFLICTS?**

The answer is clear.

Although India has already occupied over 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory, China has consistently stood for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question through negotiations and for the maintenance of the border *status quo* and the avoidance of conflict pending such settlement.

On the other hand, the Indian reactionaries desire neither a peaceful settlement of the border question through negotiations nor the maintenance of the objectively existing *status quo* on the border. Pursuing their ambition to occupy another 30,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory, they have not scrupled to resort to force, have repeatedly violated the border *status quo* and even provoked armed clashes.

The two diametrically opposite positions of China and India on the boundary question are perfectly clear to all unprejudiced people who respect facts.

China has made unremitting efforts to maintain the border *status quo*, ensure tranquillity on the border and strive for a negotiated settlement of the boundary question.

China does not recognize the illegal McMahon Line. Yet in the past ten years and more it had never crossed it.

After India provoked two successive border clashes, it was China that proposed on November 7, 1959 that the armed forces of each side should withdraw twenty kilometres from the line of actual control and stop patrolling. India rejected these proposals. Nevertheless, China unilaterally stopped her own patrolling.

Disregarding the anti-China wave stirred up by the Indian reactionaries, the Chinese Premier visited New Delhi in April 1960 and held talks with the Indian Prime Minister. But India desires neither the peaceful settlement of the boundary question nor the maintenance of the border *status quo*.

In 1961, and particularly in 1962, India took advantage of China's unilateral cessation of her patrolling to press forward, occupy more and more Chinese territory and

perpetrate increasingly serious armed provocations. Exercising the greatest forbearance and self-restraint, China thrice proposed negotiations on the boundary question between August and October 1962, and thrice did India reject them.

On October 12, 1962, Nehru issued the order to "free" Chinese territory of Chinese troops. On October 20, 1962 the Indian troops launched a massive general attack. China struck back in self-defence only when the situation was unendurable and there was no room for further retreat. However, in order to reverse the trend, on October 24 she opportunely put forward three proposals for the cessation of conflict, the reopening of negotiations and the peaceful settlement of the boundary question. After India rejected them, China on her own initiative again took major conciliatory measures — the cease-fire, the withdrawal, etc.

The events of the past years prove that it is China which has firmly maintained the border *status quo*, and that it is India which has tried to alter it by force. It is China that has put forward every peace proposal, and it is India that has provoked every armed clash.

Yet the Soviet leaders shut their eyes to all these plain facts. They never publicly uttered a single word of censure against India over the years during which the Indian reactionaries made repeated armed provocations, nibbled away at Chinese territory and finally launched their massive attack. When China was compelled to strike back, they raised a hue and cry, wildly slandering China and insisting that she "wanted to settle the border dispute with India by means of arms". What grounds do they have for making this assertion?

Khrushchov says, "I know what war is. Since Indians were killed, it meant that China attacked India."

This is most illogical. It amounts to saying that, in the face of an aggressor's attack, you must take a beating and not strike back, because if you do, you may kill some of the enemy and so become the aggressor yourself. How can anyone with a clear conscience talk this way?

Khrushchov says, "Nor can we possibly entertain the thought that India wanted to start a war with China." The Soviet leaders also say, "One cannot possibly seriously think that a state such as India, which is militarily and economically immeasurably weaker than China, would really launch a military attack on China and commit aggression against it." In other words, in their opinion, in view of China's greater strength, there was only one possibility — China might launch military attacks and commit aggression against India, but not vice versa.

Again, their argument is preposterous. Anyone with an elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism knows that all reactionaries are subjectivist and usually miscalculate the balance of forces and the trend of development. The Indian reactionaries are no exception to this law. They mistook China's long forbearance as a sign that China was weak and could be bullied. They thought that with the backing of the imperialists and the support of the Soviet leaders they had nothing to fear, and that as soon as they took action China would be forced to retreat and their territorial claims would be realized. It was on the basis of this wrong analysis and miscalculation that they launched their massive attack on China. Instead of having the courage to face these facts, the

Soviet leaders unreasonably take the strength of a country as the criterion of whether it is the aggressor or the victim. Is there an iota of Marxism-Leninism in their attitude?

The cease-fire and withdrawal initiated by China have won the acclaim and warm praise of peace-loving countries and people throughout the world. But for some ulterior motive, Khrushchov obliquely attacked China by saying that of course it was good that China had unilaterally ordered a cease-fire and withdrawal, but would it not have been better still if the Chinese troops had not advanced from their original positions?

This question seems very clever. But we would like to ask the Soviet leader, "Why did you not ask Nehru whether it would not have been better still if he had not ordered the attack?" How could there have been any counter-attack without any attack? Is this not something even a school child can understand?

We would like to tell the Soviet leader: In striking back in self-defence, the Chinese frontier guards advanced to Chinese territory south of the illegal McMahon Line in order thoroughly to rout the Indian reactionaries' assault and to shatter their plan of altering the border *status quo* by armed force. We then initiated the cease-fire and withdrawal in order to maintain our consistent stand of not altering the border *status quo* by armed force and to create conditions for a negotiated settlement of the boundary question. There is nothing incomprehensible about our measures. As the facts show, it is because we struck back at the Indian reactionaries that they have begun to have a little more sense and the Sino-Indian border tension has basically eased.

(3) WHAT ATTITUDE SHOULD A SOCIALIST COUNTRY TAKE IN THE FACE OF ARMED ATTACKS BY BOURGEOIS REACTIONARIES?

In the face of an armed attack by bourgeois reactionaries, a socialist country has only two alternatives, either self-defence or capitulation. According to the logic of the Soviet leaders' statements, it is only capitulation which is permissible and that anything else would be a violation of the principle of peaceful coexistence. Their viewpoint, they continue, is Leninist, while China's action in defending herself and repulsing the military attack of the Indian reactionaries is non-Leninist and an expression of a narrow nationalist attitude.

Is there a Leninist principle forbidding counter-attack as a means of defending oneself against a military attack launched by reactionaries? No, there never has been. To assert the contrary is an outrage against the memory of the great Lenin.

Is there a principle of peaceful coexistence put forward by Lenin that one must take a beating and not strike back? No, there never has been. To assert the contrary is an insult to the memory of the great Lenin.

It is common knowledge that peaceful coexistence is a principle both parties should abide by. Only when both parties desire and practise peaceful coexistence can conflict be avoided and a state of peaceful coexistence be maintained. If one party is bent on fighting, hostilities are inevitable, however much forbearance the other party exercises. This is common sense. China did everything possible to avoid a conflict over the Sino-Indian boundary question. The armed conflict was deliberately forced on China by the Indian reactionaries. China's speedy cease-fire and withdrawal after counter-

attacking was precisely an effort on behalf of a negotiated solution of the boundary question and on behalf of the maintenance of peaceful coexistence. What the Soviet leaders call "peaceful coexistence" is really capitulationism. And capitulationism has no place in our policy.

In defence of his wrong views, Khrushchov says that the experience of the Soviet Union over the past forty-five years has proved that there is no boundary question which cannot be settled without resorting to arms.

This is a flagrant distortion of Soviet history.

The following incident in Soviet-Turkish relations, which occurred in 1921, may be recalled. Although the Soviet state had vigorously supported the Turkish revolution and a Soviet-Turkish treaty of friendship was being negotiated, the Kemal government, which dreamed of resurrecting the plan for a Greater Turkey, forcibly occupied Soviet territories and even seized Batum, an important city in Georgia, after the signing of the treaty. In these circumstances, the Soviet Government ordered the Red Army to strike back in self-defence. After three days' fighting it recovered Batum. It was only thus that the Kemal government's expansionist ambitions were checked, the frontiers of the Soviet state protected and friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Turkey preserved.

We would like to ask the Soviet leaders: Can you say that this action taken by the Red Army in self-defence was non-Leninist? Can you say that Lenin's decision was an expression of a narrow nationalist attitude?

Certainly not. On the contrary, Khrushchov's views on the Sino-Indian boundary question are an outstanding

example of his adulteration of Lenin's principles on peaceful coexistence.

(4) WHO LACKS A SINCERE DESIRE FOR A PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF THE SINO-INDIAN BOUNDARY QUESTION, INDIA OR CHINA?

Since repulsing the massive attack of the Indian reactionaries, China has continued, as in the past, to adhere unswervingly to her policy of a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. Seeking a negotiated settlement, the Chinese Government has taken active steps to stabilize the cease-fire, to disengage the armed forces of the two sides and to ease the border tension. On the contrary, the Indian Government has done its best to make the cease-fire unstable and keep the armed forces of the two sides engaged, continued to create tension and stubbornly refused to negotiate. These two attitudes stand in sharp contrast for the world to see.

Yet, on no ground whatsoever, the Soviet leaders accuse China of lacking a sincere desire for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question and of "not heeding the voice of reason which expressed the will of the Afro-Asian people", and they assert that "while the Indian Government reacted favourably to the proposals of the Colombo Conference, accepted them fully without any reservations and expressed its readiness to start talks with the PRC on the basis of these proposals, the Chinese Government has not yet accepted the proposals of the friendly neutral countries and has not shown its readiness to start talks on the proposed basis. . . . No constructive steps have been taken by the Chinese Government".

Facts speak louder than words. Let us review what the Chinese side has done.

1. The Chinese frontier guards ceased fire and withdrew on their own initiative. They not only evacuated the Chinese territory into which they had advanced during the counter-attack of October 1962 but also withdrew twenty kilometres behind the line of actual Chinese control of November 7, 1959.

2. On its own initiative, the Chinese Government released and repatriated all the captured Indian officers and soldiers and returned most of the captured Indian weapons and war *matériel* in order to create a favourable atmosphere for renewing negotiations.

3. The Chinese Government has repeatedly proposed talks between the Prime Ministers of the two countries and has declared that if the Indian Prime Minister should find it inconvenient to come to Peking, our Premier is ready to go to New Delhi once again in order to find a way to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully. We have recently repeated this proposal.

4. The serious efforts made by China laid the foundation for mediation by the Colombo Conference nations, which is a fact they have unanimously acknowledged. The Chinese Government has responded positively to the appeal and proposals of the Colombo Conference and has unilaterally given effect to the great majority of the Colombo proposals and even gone beyond them in certain respects. For example, the Colombo proposals ask China to withdraw twenty kilometres from the border on the western sector only, but China withdrew twenty kilometres on the middle and eastern sectors as well.

5. In response to the mediatory efforts of the Colombo Conference nations, China has moreover vacated those

areas on the Chinese side of the line of actual control which had been invaded by India and also those areas where there were disputes about the cease-fire arrangements and has even refrained from setting up civilian posts in any of these areas.

6. China's attitude to the Colombo proposals is sincere and consistent. She accepts the Colombo proposals in principle as the basis for the opening of negotiations between China and India and does not make her own interpretation of their individual stipulations a precondition for such negotiations.

These important and constructive steps taken by China have provided adequate conditions for the reopening of Sino-Indian negotiations and have won high appreciation and praise from the Colombo Conference nations. Not a single Colombo nation denies that China's attitude towards the Colombo Conference is positive and cooperative and that China sincerely desires a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, a settlement to which she has already made significant contributions. Is it not a plain lie when *Pravda* says that "no constructive steps have been taken by the Chinese Government"?

Now let us see what the Indian Government has done.

While China ceased fire on her own initiative, India has continued her provocations along the border.

While China withdrew on her own initiative, India has pushed forward anew.

While China released and repatriated all the captured Indian troops, India has imprisoned and persecuted Chinese residents in India.

While China has done her best to improve the relations between the two countries, India has continued to stir up hysteria against China.

While China advocates the unconditional holding of negotiations, India insists upon her pre-conditions and refuses to negotiate.

In the words of the Soviet leaders, all this adds up to India's "reacting favourably" to the Colombo proposals while China has done nothing. When they talk such drivel, what kind of conference do they take the Colombo Conference to be? A conference for promoting direct negotiations between China and India, or a conference favouring India and opposing China?

In its attempt to cover up its arrogant attitude in refusing to negotiate, the Indian Government has produced an excuse, which is, "acceptance of the Colombo proposals *in toto*". What is behind India's "acceptance of the Colombo proposals *in toto*"? In the beginning India, too, considered that the Colombo proposals were not altogether clear and said that it accepted the proposals only in principle. It was only after the production of a document described as the New Delhi clarification of the Colombo proposals that India began to talk about "acceptance of the Colombo proposals *in toto*". China knew nothing about this so-called New Delhi clarification. We found out later that it was actually a document drafted by the Indian Government as its own interpretation of the Colombo proposals. Therefore, by insisting on "acceptance of the Colombo proposals *in toto*", the Indian Government was actually making acceptance of its own interpretation of the proposals a pre-condition for Sino-Indian negotiations. The Indian Government was well aware that China would never accept such an unreason-

able pre-condition. It has insisted on this pre-condition in order to prevent negotiations. This is a plot to distort the good mediatory intentions of the Colombo Conference nations. And *Pravda's* warm praise of this plot merely proves that the Soviet leaders desire neither a solution of the Sino-Indian boundary question nor success for the mediatory efforts of the Colombo Conference nations.

More ludicrous still, in trying to shield the Indian reactionaries *Pravda* has described China's negotiated conclusion of boundary agreements with Burma, Nepal and other neighbours as proving that she lacks a sincere desire for a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. *Pravda's* logic amounts to this: Since China has been able to settle her boundary questions with Burma, Nepal and other countries peacefully, why can't she also settle her boundary question with India peacefully? This shows that China lacks a sincere desire for the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. What a brilliant inference! Anyone capable of logical thinking will surely draw the following conclusion from the fact that China has concluded boundary agreements with Burma, Nepal and other neighbouring countries: If the Indian Government, too, were sincere, the Sino-Indian boundary question, like the Sino-Burmese and Sino-Nepalese boundary questions, could be settled peacefully as well. China cannot be blamed for the fact that the Sino-Indian boundary question remains unsettled. Yet the Soviet leaders have drawn an entirely different conclusion. Obviously, in order to collaborate with the United States in supporting India and opposing China they have degenerated so far as to flout elementary logic.

III

The position of the Soviet leaders on the Sino-Indian boundary question is a betrayal of proletarian internationalism and cannot be said to be even neutral. Together with the U.S. imperialists, they are helping the Indian reactionaries against socialist China and against the Indian people too. They have betrayed the Indian people as well as the socialist camp.

Their position is also quite different from that of the Asian-African countries which maintain strict neutrality.

The Asian-African countries respect facts and patiently listen to both China's and India's views. But the Soviet leaders ignore the facts and give ear only to the Indian reactionaries.

The Asian-African countries seriously study the rights and wrongs of the dispute and avoid rash judgements. But the Soviet leaders wilfully assert that China has committed an error.

The six Asian-African countries which took part in the Colombo Conference have repeatedly stated that their task is mediation and not arbitration, that their purpose is to bring about direct Sino-Indian negotiations and that China and India are not required to accept the Colombo proposals *in toto* before sitting down at the conference table. However, like the Indian reactionaries, the Soviet leaders demand that China should "accept the Colombo proposals *in toto*", thus attempting to place the Colombo Conference nations in a pro-Indian position.

The Asian-African countries sincerely hope that the Sino-Indian boundary question can be peacefully settled by negotiation and that the Sino-Indian border situation will remain relaxed. The joint communique issued re-

cently by Gamal Abdel Nasser, the President of the UAR, and Mme. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, the Prime Minister of Ceylon, expressed the desire that the "Colombo powers should continue in their efforts to remove the strained relation between these two great countries [China and India] to whom the UAR and Ceylon are tied in bonds of friendship". But the Soviet leaders spare no efforts to sow discord and declare that the Sino-Indian border conflict "may again be aggravated", disregarding the fact that, thanks to China's unilateral efforts, the situation on the Sino-Indian border has long been relaxed.

The truth is so clear that even the renegade Tito clique, the bosom friends of the Soviet leaders, have had to admit that "in its analysis of the Himalayan conflict the Soviet Government has gone further than the Colombo countries, first of all censuring China for this conflict". ("New Action of the Colombo Countries", *Politika*, Yugoslavia, October 4, 1963.)

What is more, the Soviet leaders have recently worked even harder than the U.S. imperialists in supporting the Indian reactionaries. The U.S. imperialists are well aware that it is for the purpose of getting money from the United States that the Indian reactionaries have manufactured fantastic rumours about a planned Chinese "invasion" of India. They therefore often take a wait-and-see attitude, having reservations about these rumours. However, the Soviet leaders have been most active in supporting and chiming in with the Nehru government in its concoction of rumours.

With respect to the Sino-Indian boundary question, we have always welcomed the just efforts of friendly Asian-African countries to promote direct Sino-Indian negotiations without becoming involved in the dispute,

and we have attentively listened to their views which stand for fair play. On the other hand, like the Tito clique of renegades, the Soviet leaders wholly side with the Indian reactionaries and hence have lost any right to speak on the Sino-Indian boundary question.

The Soviet leaders not only give Indian reaction vigorous political support but, following in the wake of the U.S. imperialists, they also give it active economic and military aid to oppose China.

From 1955 to April 1963, the Soviet Government gave or promised economic aid to India totalling five billion rupees, the larger part being offered since the Indian reactionaries began their campaign against China.

It was in 1960, that is, after the Indian reactionaries had started their armed provocations against China, that the Soviet leaders began to supply India with military aid.

After the Indian reactionaries unleashed a large-scale assault on China in October 1962, the Soviet leaders stepped up their aid to India. On December 19 of last year, C. Subramaniam, Indian Minister of Steel and Heavy Industries, told correspondents that, after India's proclamation of "emergency", the Soviet Union accelerated the construction work on projects she was helping India on.

Following the Sino-Soviet talks in July of this year, the Soviet leaders promised to increase their military aid to the Indian reactionaries.

The *Pravda* article says, "... the nature of Soviet assistance to India is exactly the same as that it is giving to many other newly developing states."

The sole purpose of a socialist country in aiding newly independent countries is to help them develop indepen-

dent national economies, eliminate colonial influence and free themselves from imperialist control — it is definitely not to help them oppose another socialist country. But the Soviet Government's motives in giving aid to the newly independent countries are open to suspicion. As for its aid to the Indian reactionaries, it overtly supports their subservience to U.S. imperialism and their opposition to China, communism and the people. This is a plain fact.

The September 21 statement of the Soviet Government says:

Now the Chinese leaders make accusations, stating that India is waging war against China and using Soviet armaments. This, first of all, is essentially not according to fact. Secondly, if one was to follow this kind of logic, the Indian Government has much more reason to declare that the Chinese troops are waging war against India and are using Soviet armaments, because everyone knows about the tremendous military aid which the Soviet Union renders China.

Denial and sophistry are of no avail. First, in the course of their counter-attack undertaken in self-defence, the Chinese frontier guards captured Soviet-made weapons used by Indian troops. Secondly, we wish to ask the Soviet leaders: What are you? Munition merchants? If so, what you say is quite right. This is called cash on delivery, and you can do business with anybody. But if you still consider yourselves Communists and leaders of a socialist country to boot, then your words are silly as well as quite wrong. How can a Communist mention socialist China in the same breath with an India ruled by big bourgeoisie and landlords? How can he put aid

to his own class brothers on a par with aid to reactionaries?

The Soviet leaders assert that by giving aid to India the Soviet Union can help her to maintain a neutral position and prevent her from moving closer to U.S. imperialism and other Western countries.

This is a hypocritical lie. The facts are the exact opposite. The greater the Soviet aid, the farther the Indian reactionaries depart from a neutral stand and the closer they move to U.S. imperialism.

Let us look at the events of the past year. The Indian Government has concluded agreements for military aid and "air defence" with U.S. imperialism, both of which are in the nature of military treaties. Large numbers of U.S. military personnel and large quantities of U.S. weapons and military equipment have poured into India. The Indian Government has undertaken to provide the United States with more military intelligence and has agreed to the holding of air exercises by the U.S. and British imperialists in India. Radhakrishnan, the President of India, issued a joint communique with U.S. President Kennedy on June 4, 1963, openly declaring that the United States and India agreed that "their two countries share a mutual defensive concern to thwart the designs of Chinese aggression against the sub-continent". Thus, it is clear to any unbiased person that the Nehru government has virtually formed a military alliance with the United States, that India's "non-alignment" policy has very little practical significance left and that India has long ceased to be one of the countries "taking an anti-imperialist stand and forming, together with the socialist countries, a broad peace zone", as described by the 1957 Moscow Declaration. It is only

because of the Soviet leaders' support and assistance that the Nehru government can still make demagogic use of its tattered flag of "non-alignment" before the world. Such support and assistance make it possible for the Nehru government brazenly to become a retainer of U.S. imperialism in disregard of the Indian people's opposition.

In fact, in supporting the Indian reaction, the Soviet leaders are not only competing with the U.S. imperialists but also running a joint-stock company with them. After the *Pravda* Editorial Board published its article of September 19, the *Indian Express* exulted that "in addition to the U.S.A., this brings to India another powerful ally vis-à-vis China" and that "the noose is already round Peking's neck. Along with our two powerful allies, we have only to pull it". Although this is utterly reactionary drivel, it does bring to light the corporate aims of the U.S.-Soviet Company in aiding India and opposing China.

With the increase in Soviet aid, the Indian reactionaries have become more and more frantic in their exploitation and suppression of the Indian people. The Nehru government has striven to stir up war hysteria and stepped up its arms expansion and war preparations. It has openly deprived the Indian people of their basic rights, throwing thousands of Indian Communists and other progressives into prison. By extorting taxes and levies under all sorts of names, it has plunged the Indian people into an abyss of misery. The Indian weekly *Blitz* of June 22, 1963 admitted that the overwhelming majority of the teeming millions of the Indian people have remained on the verge of the starvation level, that anger rises in their temples, and that "a slow, burning class hatred is accumulating today". It cried out in alarm, "There is thunder in the air, as clouds of crisis and

demoralisation darken our land." The Nehru government has completely discarded its counterfeit democratic and progressive signboards. It is pursuing an out-and-out anti-Communist and anti-popular policy, which has aroused stronger and stronger opposition on the part of the Indian people. By supporting and aiding the Nehru government, the Soviet leaders have covered up its reactionary nature, strengthened its hand in suppressing the people and enabled it to push ahead more actively with its counter-revolutionary policy.

The 1960 Moscow Statement says that the national bourgeoisie in the newly independent countries has a dual character and that, as social contradictions grow, it inclines more and more to compromise with domestic reaction and imperialism. Communists in newly independent countries should expose the attempts of the reactionary section of the bourgeoisie to represent its selfish, narrow class interests as those of the entire nation. But so far from exposing the Nehru government's reactionary policy, the renegade Dange clique of the Indian Communist Party has completely betrayed the proletariat and the people of India and has degenerated into a shameful tool of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords. Instead of exposing the Dange clique of renegades, the Soviet leaders encourage them to help the Indian reactionaries persecute the true Communists and progressives in an attempt to strangle the revolutionary movement of the Indian people.

The Nehru government is hiring itself out to imperialism abroad and suppressing the Indian people at home. And the Soviet leaders are actively supporting the Nehru government and defending and whitewashing its reac-

tionary policies in every possible way. The Soviet leaders have betrayed the revolutionary cause of the Indian people; this account will be settled sooner or later.

IV

Today when tension on the Sino-Indian border has been eased as a result of the initiatives taken by China, what is *Pravda's* real aim in suddenly conjuring up tension and publishing an article under the sensational heading, "A Serious Hotbed of Tension in Asia"?

Does the article show the Soviet leaders' concern over the preservation of peace in Asia? Obviously not. There is certainly tension in Asia. The peace of Asia is being threatened and undermined. But it is the imperialists, headed by the United States, who are threatening and undermining the peace of Asia. The hotbeds of tension in Asia are places like South Korea, Taiwan, Japan, South Viet Nam and Laos, which are being subjected to U.S. aggression and are under its occupation, and particularly South Viet Nam where the U.S. imperialists are waging inhuman special warfare. Why do the Soviet leaders shut their eyes to these hotbeds of tension? Why don't they have the courage to step forward and speak out firmly with a few words against the U.S. imperialists' intervention and aggression in these areas, and particularly in South Viet Nam and Laos? Why do they deliberately single out the relaxed situation on the Sino-Indian border to make such a fuss about?

To be blunt, the Soviet leaders are doing so because they want to exploit the Sino-Indian boundary question to sow dissension between China and other Asian-African

countries, divert the people in Asia and Africa from the struggle against imperialism and cover up the U.S. imperialists' aggressive and warlike activities. This is a betrayal of the anti-imperialist revolutionary cause of the people of Asia and indeed of the whole world.

Trying hard to sow dissension, *Pravda* slanderously accuses China of refusing the mediation of the Colombo Conference nations, ignoring their efforts and even "questioning the competence of the Colombo Conference". These words suffice to show that the Soviet leaders are wholly on the Indian reactionaries' side in the latter's opposition to socialist China, and are trying, by their demagogic language and activities behind the scenes, to incite the Colombo Conference nations to abandon the lofty mission of peace mediation and follow them in their cold war against China over the Sino-Indian border question. The October 5 issue of the Indian weekly *Blitz* blurted out the truth when it said that *Pravda* openly "condemned China and blamed her for tension on the Sino-Indian border", and that "Russia has also taken it upon herself to do the explaining in Afro-Asian countries which, China claims, are critical of India's stand on the border issue". What does "the explaining", to which this Indian weekly refers, mean? It means the sowing of dissension.

Besides supporting the Indian reactionaries in rejecting a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, the Soviet leaders are opposed to China's establishing and developing friendly relations with other Asian-African countries, and particularly her settling disputes left over from history with other Asian countries. The *Pravda* article and the Soviet Government statement of

September 21 repeatedly express dissatisfaction with China for settling her boundary question and developing good-neighbourly relations with Pakistan and maliciously accuse China of "making overtures to the obviously reactionary regimes in Asia and Africa". To the Soviet leaders, their submission and surrender to the arch-imperialists is a great contribution to world peace, while China's peaceful settlement of her boundary question with a neighbour is a crime. We would like to ask the Soviet leaders: Is it not enough that you are supporting the Indian reactionaries in creating tension on the Sino-Indian border? Do you want to create tension on the Sino-Pakistan border as well?

In international mass organizations, the Soviet leaders forbid activities against imperialism while instigating activities against China, and try to break up the anti-imperialist united front by exploiting the Sino-Indian boundary question. China has repeatedly and earnestly pointed out that, for the sake of upholding unity in the common struggle against imperialism, disputes between Asian-African countries should not be brought up in these organizations. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union has time and again instigated and abetted the Indian delegates in stirring up trouble by utilizing the Sino-Indian border question. For example, at the World Congress of Women in Moscow, the Soviet Union, the host country, encouraged the Indian delegation to raise the Sino-Indian boundary question which had nothing to do with the main theme of the Congress, and by its manipulation of the Congress tried to deprive the Chinese delegation of its right of reply. It is no secret that this anti-China farce was carefully planned and stage-managed by the

Soviet Union. Again, at the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Conference in Moshi, the Indian delegates, with the Soviet delegates' support, insisted on placing the Sino-Indian border issue on the agenda. In his letter to the *Indian Express*, the head of the Indian delegation to that conference gave away some inside information about these underhand activities. He said, "We obtained the full support and cooperation of the Soviet delegation." Matters could not be clearer. And yet the *Pravda* in its article of September 19 has the audacity to accuse China of using the Sino-Indian border issue to "poison" the atmosphere at various international forums. Don't its authors have any sense of shame?

The present Sino-Indian border situation has been eased as a result of the initiatives taken by China and of the active mediation of the Colombo Conference nations. Unless India makes further provocations, this relaxed situation can undoubtedly be maintained. But to meet the needs of their domestic and foreign policies, the Indian reactionaries are working hard to create new tension. The U.S. imperialists are, of course, anxious to stir up trouble. The coming Anglo-U.S. air exercises in India prove that they do not wish to see a further relaxation of the Sino-Indian border situation. Likewise, the fact that the Soviet leaders are sowing dissension among Asian-African countries and fanning the flames proves that they are endeavouring to aggravate it. While the U.S. imperialists are attempting to exploit it for the purpose of controlling India, the Soviet leaders are trying to do so for the purpose of discrediting China. These are different roads to the same goal. Therefore, the possibility of the Indian reactionaries' provoking a new con-

flict on the Sino-Indian border with the support of the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet leaders cannot be excluded.

But, after all, 1963 is not 1962. The six nations of the Colombo Conference have undertaken the responsibility of mediation for peace, the people in Asia, Africa and throughout the world see the rights and wrongs of the Sino-Indian boundary question more and more clearly, the reactionary features of the Nehru government are being increasingly revealed and the joint anti-China plot of the U.S. imperialists, the Soviet leaders and the Indian reactionaries is no longer a secret. Under these circumstances, if the Indian reactionaries dare to provoke new clashes, we are confident that they and their supporters will surely be strongly condemned by the people of Asia and Africa and the rest of the world.

We hope the situation on the border will remain relaxed and we will do all we can to this end. We have told the Colombo Conference nations that we would keep them regularly informed on Indian provocations, and we have already begun to do so. If India carries out not only harassing provocations but also armed invasions like those before October 20, 1962 and if she refuses to withdraw from Chinese territory, we will ask the Colombo Conference nations to persuade India to withdraw. We will consider striking back in self-defence only if the Indian side turns down such persuasion and is determined to occupy China's territory.

We will not change our policy of seeking a peaceful and negotiated settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question, whatever action the Indian reactionaries may take and however much the Soviet leaders support them.

We are fully convinced that our policy will finally triumph, no matter what happens in the world or however long the settlement is delayed. It is impossible to undermine the great friendship between the peoples of China and India.

The stand and policy of the Soviet leaders on the Sino-Indian boundary question amply prove that they have betrayed the Chinese people, the Soviet people, the people of all the countries in the socialist camp, the Indian people and all the oppressed peoples and nations. It is becoming clearer and clearer that the Soviet leaders no longer consider the imperialists, headed by the United States, and the reactionaries of all countries to be their enemy. It is the Marxist-Leninists, the revolutionary people and China in particular who are their enemy.

In order to oppose China, which firmly upholds Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, the Soviet leaders have allied themselves with U.S. imperialism and the renegade Tito clique, and now, with the September 19 article of the *Pravda* Editorial Board and the Soviet Government statement of September 21, they have openly declared their alliance with the Indian reactionaries. They probably think that by joining with all the scoundrels in the world in shrieking abuse, they can discredit and isolate China.

We would like to advise the Soviet leaders not to rejoice too soon. Revolutionary China can never be isolated. The more brazenly you collaborate with all imperialists and reactionaries, the more you isolate yourselves. China cannot be discredited. For truth is on China's side. Your Achilles' heel is your lack of respect

for truth. More than ninety per cent of the people of the world heed the truth. As the Chinese saying goes, "With truth on your side you can travel all over the world, without it you can't move an inch." Those who have no respect for truth will fail in the end.

APPENDIX :

A SERIOUS HOTBED OF TENSION IN ASIA

(Article published by *Pravda*, September 19, 1963)

The conclusion of a nuclear test ban Treaty and the adherence to it by most of the countries of the world were vital steps in creating a healthier international atmosphere. Such is a fact universally-recognised, such is the world public appraisal of the Moscow Treaty. New hopes for the peaceful settlement of outstanding international issues through negotiation, and for the elimination of the hotbeds of tension still existing in the world have arisen.

Unfortunately, there still is inflammable material on our planet which threatens to flare up at any moment and becomes a source of grave danger to peace. One such hotbed of tension is the now chronic Sino-Indian border conflict in the area of the Himalayas which is still just as acute.

The Chinese press has lately come out with a whole series of declarations — “A Statement by a Spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China”, leading and editorial articles — dedicated to the Sino-Indian boundary conflict. The common feature of these declarations is their desire to justify in every way possible every action of the Chinese

Government in the border conflict and to smear the policy of other states. These statements are full of slanderous concoctions about the Soviet Government's position in the Sino-Indian controversy.

The Chinese leaders have gone to the absurd lengths of reproaching the Soviet Union for "cooperating with US imperialism" and "collaborating with India in the fight against China". They accuse the Soviet Government of regarding India as part of an "important sector in a zone of peace". They thereby completely ignore the proposition of the 1957 Declaration, which stressed that the peace-loving states of Asia and Africa constitute a vital factor in the struggle to prevent war and, together with the socialist countries, "form an extensive zone of peace". The actions of the Chinese Government in the Sino-Indian conflict contradict the general, agreed line of the Marxist-Leninist Parties on peaceful coexistence and on supporting the national-liberation movement.

At the recent Executive Committee meeting of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation, the Chinese representatives distorting the nature of Soviet aid to India, went so far as to make the monstrous allegations that the Soviet Union is "inciting India to clash with China". This absurd statement, naturally, is not confirmed by facts. This is quite understandable, because such facts do not exist. The Chinese Government is well aware that the nature of Soviet assistance to India is exactly the same as that it is giving to many other newly-developing states.

The USSR stand on the Sino-Indian conflict, no matter how the Chinese leaders try to distort it, has been and is in essence directed to helping settle this conflict as soon as possible. It would only be natural to expect that this stand would find understanding and support among

the Chinese leaders. However, strange to say, Peking did everything it could to distort it. With regard to the latest pronouncements of the Chinese leaders on the question of the Soviet Union's position in the Sino-Indian border dispute, it is difficult to understand what predominates here — hostility toward the first socialist country, or the desire to discredit the policy of peaceful coexistence which the Soviet Government is consistently conducting, or disguised attempts to hide their withdrawal from the agreed line of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the world on questions of the socialist countries' policy toward the new independent states.

It is well known that the neighbouring peoples of India and China lived in peace and friendship for many centuries. There were no wars between them, no disputes on territorial problems.

After the Indian people won their independence in 1947 and the revolution triumphed in China in 1949 friendly, good-neighbourly relations were established between India and China. The borders between them remained the same as before, and no border conflicts sprang up. In 1954 the Governments of the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India affixed their signatures to the well-known five principles of peaceful coexistence — "Panchsheel".

Together with other peaceloving states of Asia and Africa they solemnly reaffirmed their loyalty to these great ideas at the Bandung conference.

The first armed clashes on the Indian-Chinese border began in the middle of 1959. The situation became particularly acute last autumn. Battles involving large army units flared up between China and India, with thou-

sands of men being wounded and killed and taken prisoner.

The clashes in the Himalayas evoked feelings of great anxiety among the peace-loving public. The Soviet people and the peoples of other socialist countries were especially concerned over the reports about these clashes. The well-known TASS statement of September 10, 1959, expressing the Soviet Government's point of view, pointed to the dangerous consequences that this conflict might have for the destinies of peace in Asia and all over the world. "In Soviet leading circles," the statement said, "confidence is expressed that the Government of the Chinese People's Republic and the Government of India will not permit the forces, seeking not to relax international situation but to aggravate it, and to prevent the easing of tension which is taking shape in the relations between states, to use this incident for their own ends."

This actually was and remains the only correct attitude to the solution of this problem, an attitude supported by all peace-loving states. In the subsequent period the Soviet Government had on a number of occasions called for an end to be put to the tension existing in the area of the Himalayas and for the conflict to be settled on a mutually acceptable basis. The Soviet Union has proceeded from the fact that this conflict was only beneficial to the forces of imperialism and reaction, which are interested in preserving the hotbeds of international tension.

However, the Chinese leaders are not satisfied with the USSR's peaceful stand. Perhaps they wanted to settle the border dispute with India by means of arms and hoped to receive the Soviet Union's support in this matter? If this is what the Peking leaders wanted, then, naturally, they have reason to be "indignant" with the

USSR's stand. However, no matter what they say in Peking, the Soviet Government, loyal to the Leninist policy of peace, has always done and will continue to do everything to extinguish, instead of warming up, the hotbeds of international tension, and to firmly promote the preservation and consolidation of peace. We have always considered and still consider that there were no reasons for starting a border conflict between India and China, and especially for bringing this conflict to an armed clash.

The border conflict in the Himalayas has given rise to serious concern in the young Afro-Asian states, which know from their own experience that the weakening of unity of the young independent states and that friction and dissent between them play into the hands of none other but the imperialists and colonialists. In autumn 1962, when large military clashes on the Indian-Chinese border were at their peak, President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, Ben Bella, Head of the Algerian Government, President Bourguiba of Tunisia, Shermarke, Prime Minister of the Somali Republic, and many other prominent leaders of Afro-Asian countries called upon the People's Republic of China and India to put an end to bloodshed, start negotiations and settle the dispute in a peaceful way.

After the cease-fire on the Indian-Chinese border last October due to the initiative of the Chinese, all people of good will hoped that the conflict would be settled quickly and an end would be put forever to this tragic chapter in the relations between India and China. There was all the more ground for hope as the Chinese Government found a way to adjust unsettled territorial problems with other neighbouring countries. Border agreements were reached with Nepal and Burma, moreover

as Chou En-lai, the Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, pointed out, "the question of the border between China and Burma was much more complicated than the question of the Chinese-Indian border".

The Chinese Government has taken a number of steps towards settling its relations with Pakistan which, as is generally known, belongs to SEATO and CENTO, the military-political blocs set up by the Western powers.

In their statements the Chinese leaders declare that the Afro-Asian peoples are, allegedly, "sneering" at the Indian Government's stand on the border conflict. But they keep silent about the fact that in these countries people either express their bewilderment over the Chinese Government's stand on this matter or openly condemn it. The people in that part of the world are worried by the situation on the Sino-Indian border; they think that, given good will and a desire to settle the border conflict at round-table talks, peace and tranquillity could have long ago been established on the Sino-Indian border. But these hopes have not come true yet.

It is known that on the initiative of Sirimavo Bandaranaike, the Ceylonese Prime Minister, the leading statesmen of six non-aligned countries (Ceylon, the UAR, Ghana, Burma, Indonesia and Cambodia) worked out proposals aimed at the peaceful settlement of the conflict at the Colombo Conference last December. The conference participants hoped that their proposals could be conducive to the consolidation of the armistice and, in case they were carried out, would pave the way for talks between representatives of the two countries. It is characteristic that although the Government of the People's Republic of China tries to ascribe all the blame for

the conflict onto the Indian Government, the non-aligned Afro-Asian countries, who attended the Colombo Conference, deemed it necessary to appeal to none other than the Chinese Government to withdraw its troops 20 km. back from the line on which they found themselves as a result of the large-scale hostilities waged in the autumn of 1962.

The proposals of the Colombo Conference expressed nothing more than the friendly wishes of states who are earnestly striving to find a mutually acceptable solution of the border conflict.

Unfortunately, Peking did not heed the voice of reason which expressed the will of the Afro-Asian people.

What is the matter? What happened to prevent the peaceful settlement of the conflict?

There cannot be any doubt that if both sides had sat down and discussed calmly, soberly and without bias their mutual claims, the conflict would have been liquidated long ago and the source of tension eliminated for ever in that area of the world. As the press of many countries points out, while the Indian Government reacted favourably to the proposals of the Colombo Conference, accepted them fully without any reservations, and expressed its readiness to start talks with the PRC on the basis of these proposals, the Chinese Government has not yet accepted the proposals of the friendly neutral countries and has not shown its readiness to start talks on the proposed basis. The Chinese Government found it possible to limit itself to a statement approving these proposals "in principle". No constructive steps have been taken by the Chinese Government.

In the Afro-Asian countries the fact is noted that the Chinese Government itself twice, in October and Novem-

ber 1962, called on the countries to "show initiative" and "facilitate" the commencement of direct Sino-Indian negotiations. But when this help was offered, the Chinese Government did not avail itself of the good services of these countries.

The press in many Afro-Asian countries notes that at the outset the Chinese Government declared it would accept the Colombo Conference proposals "in principle". Later it claimed that it could not fully accept them because "not everything was clear" and it called for explanations. When these explanations were provided the Chinese Government stated that they had been supplied by representatives of only some of the Colombo Conference countries and consequently, as **Jen Min Jih Pao** put it, they "are not documents of legal conference". Other arguments questioning the competence of the Colombo Conference also appear in the Chinese press.

In its statement of August 20 the Chinese Government again claimed that it was prepared to accept the Colombo proposals "in principle". However it does not go beyond these general declarations.

No wonder, that now many are beginning to say that while praising to the skies the initiative of the non-aligned nations and declaring that it "appreciates" their kind services and "gives them their due", the Chinese Government is actually ignoring their efforts and showing no desire to avail itself of the Colombo proposals.

The people of the Afro-Asian countries associates the PRC leadership's frontier policy with its attitude to a wider field of international relations and draws the appropriate conclusions. Peking, says, for instance, the Nigerian **West African Pilot**, "does not believe in peace-

ful coexistence and the sooner we realise that the better for the whole world".

The Afro-Asian peoples are greatly perturbed by the tremendous damage that the Sino-Indian frontier conflict is doing to the cause of the solidarity and unity of the peoples struggling against imperialism and colonialism for national liberation and peace. They cannot fail to see behind the PRC Government's policy the craving to set India at loggerheads with the other Afro-Asian states.

It is noteworthy that of late the Chinese leaders have been heavily promoting the claim that the Nehru Government is an imperialist, expansionist one, out to create a tremendous empire larger even than the British one. In the light of such allegations it is hard to believe that the Chinese leaders are sincere when they profess desire for a peaceful adjustment of the frontier dispute with India.

One gets the impression that in the PRC capital they do not want to realise who stands to gain from the present conflict, which has already inflicted tremendous damage on people and is continuing to do so. As is known, the imperialists seized on the Sino-Indian conflict at once in an attempt to fan the flames of war in the Himalayas. This they link up with their far-reaching plans; they shower India with offers of arms and of joint military actions. The imperialists are particularly delighted that one of the parties in the conflict is a socialist state. They would like to exploit this fact so as to discredit the ideas of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and the friendship and cooperation between the socialist countries and the newly independent Afro-Asian states. Meanwhile, behind all this is the desire to capitalise on the conflict to keep a dangerous hotbed of tension in existence.

Indeed, what has the Sino-Indian conflict already led to and what have the consequences been?

This conflict has already done much damage to the unity and cohesion of the Asian and African countries in their joint struggle against imperialism and colonialism. It has also greatly harmed the unity and cooperation between the newly-liberated states and the socialist countries, between India and the People's Republic of China in particular.

As a result of the hostilities China and India have already sustained great and unjustified losses. The frontier controversy between the two countries, which had been living for centuries at peace and friendship, has led not only to the disruption of the close ties of good-neighbourliness, but also to grave economic consequences. Suffice it to mention that during recent years India's allocations for military purposes have quadrupled. They have put a heavy burden on the shoulders of the working people. Additional taxes and duties have been introduced.

The reactionary forces in India are using the conflict for rousing chauvinistic passions, for launching an offensive against the progressive forces of the country, for pushing India off her neutral course and drawing her into the military-political blocs of the West. At meetings and gatherings, in the press and inside Parliament leaders of the reactionary parties "Swantrata", "Jan Sangh", the so-called Praja Socialist Party and the most extremist nationalistic elements of the ruling Indian National Congress Party fan in every way possible chauvinistic anti-Chinese propaganda, come out against negotiations with the People's Republic of China which could result in a peaceful settlement of the conflict, call for a firm line

with regard to the People's Republic of China. A state of emergency has long since been introduced in the country, the democratic rights of the people have been curtailed. Many hundreds of Communists and trade union leaders have been arrested and imprisoned. The Indian reactionaries clamour for reduction of economic development programmes, for the utilisation of the limited resources of the country for military purposes and for the building up of an enormous war machine.

One of the latest statements of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China expresses satisfaction over the fact that during the by-elections to the Indian Parliament held last May, candidates from the Indian National Congress Party were defeated. However, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China said nothing at the time about the fact that the dyed-in-the-wool reactionaries Kripalani and Masani came out on top. As a matter of fact, the Chinese leaders describe the success of these reactionaries at the elections as a victory for Indian democracy.

The PRC leaders' unwillingness to comprehend the situation is also revealed in their appraisal of the situation in the Parliament. The newspaper **Jen Min Jih Pao**, for example, speaks with an unconcealed delight about the discussed non-confidence vote with regard to the Nehru Government, held in the Indian Parliament. The paper is not interested in the fact that the initiators of the non-confidence vote were again the very same extreme Right-wing group who are trying to bend the country's external and internal policies in a reactionary, pro-imperialist direction. A legitimate question arises: What considerations guide those in Peking who actually subscribe to the actions of these quarters?

The material damage which the frontier conflict has done the two countries can be reckoned in both rupees and yuans. But how is one to tally the moral and political damage inflicted upon the cause of friendship and cooperation between the Chinese and Indian peoples? This cannot be expressed in any currency. During the Sino-Indian conflict the venomous germs of nationalism and chauvinism multiplied at miraculous speed. Anti-Chinese sentiments were fomented in India and anti-Indian sentiments in China. The present situation objectively leads to the aggravation of mutual hostility in both countries.

Matters have gone so far of late that the conflict is being exploited to poison the atmosphere at various international forums. That was what happened, for instance, at the Moshi Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference and also at the World Women's Congress in Moscow where the Chinese delegation tried to force discussion of this matter.

All these facts clearly show the serious consequences which the Sino-Indian border conflict already has led to. Particular alarm is caused in this connection not only by the absence of any tangible effort to settle the conflict but also by accumulating evidence of an acute relapse.

The continuing Sino-Indian frontier tension is fraught with grave danger. Indeed, when soldiers of neighbouring states stand opposite one another with their rifles at ready, the risk of a chance rifle shot provoking bloodshed is quite a natural one, especially if there had been violent fighting between them before.

All those who sincerely support peace and friendship among nations rightfully expect those upon whom settlement of the conflict really depends to rise above considerations of formality and prestige and to start negotiat-

ing to find a mutually acceptable solution. The peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian dispute would benefit the peoples of India and China, abolish this grave source of tension and do the cause of peace in Asia and all over the world a good turn.

There is no sensible justification for the maintenance of tension in this part of the world. The elimination of the Sino-Indian conflict would strengthen peace in South-East Asia and the world generally and enable the two peoples to fully concentrate on the problems of economic advancement which confront them.

The Soviet people desire to see good and neighbourly relations restored between Asia's two biggest powers — the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India. As regards frontier disputes, we adhere to Lenin's views and are convinced that there are no disputes that cannot be settled peacefully, through negotiation, without shedding blood. It is precisely from these considerations that the Soviet people regard the events on the Sino-Indian border. As for the Soviet Union, it respects its neighbours, realising that good and neighbourly relations can exist, only if the established frontiers between states are respected.

N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, provided a clear description of the standpoint of all Soviet people when at the USSR Supreme Soviet session last December he expressed the hope that the governments of the People's Republic of China and India would "settle the misunderstanding with due account for mutual interests in the spirit of traditional friendship between the peoples of China and India". The USSR's approach is the consistent and honest policy of the Soviet Government and the Leninist Central Committee of the

Communist Party of the Soviet Union for upholding peace and strengthening friendship among nations. The knottiest of negotiations are better than war. Disputes should be resolved by peaceful, not military, means, at the round table. The Soviet people resolutely call for the peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian frontier conflict and the earliest elimination of this dangerous hotbed of grave tension in this part of the world.

苏共领导联印反华的真相

*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1963年第一版

编号：（英）3050—768

0 0 0 4 0

3—E—583P