CHAPTER IV

'PANCHSHEEL'

(A LAND MARK IN SINO-INDIAN RELATIONS)

One of the landmarks of Nehru's foreign policy was Sino-Indian Agreement on Tibet on 29 April 1954. It is better known as the Agreement on Panchsheel and peaceful co-existence because it enunciated the five principles of State relations. Before dwelling upon the five principles as enunciated therein, it may be relevant here for the benefit of the general public to give a background of Indo-Chinese relations which culminated in the above agreement.

When India attained Independence in 1947, it had two subsisting problems with China. These were border demarcation between the two countries and the legal status of Tibet. The problems were non-issues in 1947, because there was fight going on between the Chiang Kai-shek Government and Mao's Communist forces for the control of the mainland. There was no effective Chinese Government which was fighting for its survival. Such a government could hardly have been in a position to negotiate or pose any problem. But the problems could be potentially explosive. Ultimately, when the Mao forces finally succeeded in driving out the Chiang Government from the main land to Formosa and established the People's Republic of china in October 1949, it announced shortly thereafter
that its People's Liberation Army would soon march into Tibet to liberate it. India protested only to get a rebuff. It was not in a position to open another frontier, besides that of Pakistan, with China. It preferred to watch the situation. Eventually the People's Liberation Army occupied Tibet in October 1950.

Panchsheel or Five Principles, is an old Sanskrit phrase. It was revived by President Sukarno when he gave a similar name (Pantjasila) to the five principles of his national policy. These were not the same as the Five Principles embodied in the Sino-Indian Agreement on Tibet of 29 April 1954.

How did the idea arise, how were the five Principles of peaceful co-existence evolved? Whose brainchild was it? Different people have given different versions and made conjectures about it.

The credit for formulating and popularising the Five Principles goes to Nehru, if any one person can claim it. But, it was really a consensus that evolved, developed and took shape in the discussions and negotiations preceding the Sino-Indian Agreement on Tibet. Apart from earlier discussions, negotiations were held in Peking from the last day of December 1953, till the end of April 1954.
"We welcome association and friendship with all and the flow of thought and ideas of all kinds, but we reserve the rights to choose our own path. That is the essence of 'Panchsheel'."¹

- Jawaharlal Nehru

The literal meaning of Panchsheel - a word of Sanskrit derivation - is 'five principles or rules of individual conduct about 2,500 years ago. After attaining enlightenment of the supreme wisdom, Buddha preached his great doctrine of man's release from the chain of transmigration by realising the basic truth of existence. He insisted that a man who wanted to obtain the means of release from the circle of birth and death, must first be a moral being and follow the right rules of conduct, the Sheel. Thus were laid down ten negative prohibitions and eighteen positive injunctions of Buddhism, five out of all are to refrain from injury to living things, not to take that which is not given, not to commit sexual immorality, to refrain from falsehood and to refrain from liquors which engender slothfulness. These five fundamental principles or concepts of morality are called pansion Buddhism. The observance of these rules of conduct was enjoined by Asoka

¹ Jawaharlal Nehru's Speech to the Members of the Parliament on 29 April 1954, Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.
after his conversion to Buddhism and his renunciation of war for all times. It was Indonesia that first brought the term Panchsheel. 'Pantjasila', as the Indonesia calls it, into the domain of politics.

On June 1, 1945, Dr. Sukarno, President of the Indonesian Republic stated the five basic principles of his State Policy and he termed these pantjasila. These were belief in God, humanitarianism, nationalism, democracy and social justice.

Evolution

The five principles of international conduct which later became famous as Panchsheel were first formulated on April 20, 1954 in the agreement between India and China on Tibet. All these talks took four months. A last minute minor hitch was created by Chang and was resolved between him and Raghavan. The Agreement was signed on 29th April 1954. The main high lights of the Agreement were:

1. The Five Principles or Panchsheel

2. Recognition of the six (border) passes in the middle sector.

3. Establishment of Consulates General (India's in Lhasa and Shanghai, China's in Calcutta and Bombay).
4. **Setting up of Trade Agencies** (India's at Yatung, Gyantse and Gartok and China's at New Delhi, Calcutta and Kalimpong).

5. **Establishment of ten trade marts in Tibet** for customary border petty trade by Indian traders (without any on the Indian side) and ensuring entry and security of Indian and Tibetan pilgrims to each other's holy shrines (Bodh Gaya, Sarnath and Sanchi in India, Kaila, Mansarower and Lhasa in Tibet).

In 1954, Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru draw the attention of members in the Lok Sabha to the five principles enumerated in this preamble and strongly commended them as the basis of international goodwill and friendship.

In the Joint Statement issued by the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru and China Premier Chou-En-Lai on June 20, 1954 they reaffirmed these principles and felt that they should be applied in their relations with other countries in Asia as well as in other parts of the world. "If these principles are applied", the statement added, "not only between various countries but also in international relations generally they would form a solid foundation for peace and security and the fears and apprehensions that exist today would give place to a feeling of confidence."
These five principles were termed Panchsheel by Jawaharlal Nehru for the first time on September 23, 1954 at a banquet given in honour of the Indonesian Prime Minister.²

"This afternoon, Sir, you were speaking to the Members of our Parliament and you referred to certain basic principles which govern Indonesia. You call them the Pantjasila, which is our Sanskrit word Panchsheel.

We talk also of another Panchsheel or principles, which have recently come to the fore. You may call them Panchsheel in the same way. On the face of it, it is difficult to imagine how anyone can oppose them or dislike them unless one thinks that behind them in hidden some evil motive."

Powerful support to Panchsheel was pledged by the 29 Asian African nations at the Bandung Conference held in Indonesia in the third week of April 1955. The Conference felt that the maintenance of world peace was all the more necessary for the Asian and African countries so that they could achieve "social progress, better standards of life and greater freedom." The principles of Panchsheel were

---

² Jawaharlal Nehru's Speech to the Members of the Parliament in September 23, 1954, Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.
fully embodied in the ten-point declaration which set out the basis for the governance of relations among the countries represented at the conference.

The ten principles were -

1. Respect for fundamental human rights and for the purpose and principles of the charter of the United Nations.

2. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations.

3. Recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations large and small.

4. Abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

5. Respect for the right of each nation to defend itself, singly or collectively, in conformity with the charter of the United Nations.

6a. Abstention from the use of arrangements of collective defence to serve the particular interests of any of the other countries.

b. Abstention by any country from exerting pressure on other countries.
7. Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country.

8. Settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, such as negotiation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement as well as other peaceful means of the parties own choice, in conformity with the charter of the United Nations.

9. Promotion of mutual interest and co-operation.

10. Respect for justice and international obligations.

Commenting on the Bandung Conference, Jawaharlal Nehru, in a statement to the Indian Parliament said: "We in India have in recent months sought to formulate principles which should govern our relations with other countries and often spoken of them as the five principles." In the Bandung Declaration, we find the full embodiment of these five principles and the addition to them of elaborations which reinforce these principles ... The House will remember that when the five principles, or Panchsheel, as we have called them emerged, they attracted much attention as well as opposition from different parts of the world.
We have maintained that they contain the essence of the principles of relationship which would promote world peace and co-operation."

Jawaharlal Nehru felt that the concept of Panchsheel served as a guarantee of international peace and amity and, at the same time, was a code of conduct for application to international problems, or Panchsheel meant that there might be different ways of progress, possibly different outlooks, but that, broadly, the ultimate objectives might be the same.

The Sino-Indian Agreement on Tibet enunciated the five principles, which were as follows:

a. Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;

b. Mutual non-aggression;

c. Mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs;

d. Equality and mutual benefit; and

e. Peaceful co-existence

It is desirable to discuss these principles in some detail in view of their importance in world affairs.
a. Mutual Respect for Each Other's Territorial Integrity and Sovereignty

This principle would mean that both the contracting States should recognise each other's existing borders and promise that they would not do anything to promote secessionist or separatist activities there. They also promised to uphold the sovereign rights of the state over its territory. Article 2(4) of the U.N. Charter obliges a state not to resort to use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any other State. This principle not only shuns the use of force against the integrity of the other State, but also obliges the State to respect the territorial integrity of the other State. In one way, it is an obligation on the State for not laying any claim on the territory of the other state. Any such claim would amount to the violation of the principle of mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity.

It was indirectly hinted to China that it should not encourage or promote subversive or secessionist activities in the bordering territories of India. It was also an attempt on the part of India to make China respect the present border arrangements which operated within the territory. It was, therefore, a dampener for China. As far as India was concerned, she had no designs to usurp any Chinese territory nor help in any disruptive tendencies
within that territory. It was, therefore, agreed to have mutual respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the other state.

b. Mutual Non-Aggression

It was a promise by the two contracting States not to commit aggression against each other. In one way, it was an extension of two principles of the Charter to settle disputes by peaceful methods and not to resort to the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of a country. The two States had agreed that there was no scope for committing aggression against each other. They would prefer to resort to peaceful means if any dispute were to arise between them. They seemed to have adjured violence in their relations with each other.

c. Non-Interference in Each Other's Internal Affairs

The two powers agreed to the principle of non-interference in each other's internal matters. The clause was necessary to allay the fears of the Chinese Government regarding the bonafides of India's claim for commercial and cultural interests in Tibet. Bitten by British imperialism, China may have felt that India would follow British policies in Tibet; India had no political or territorial ambitions in Tibet but was interested in peaceful settlement of the matter including maintenance of Tibetan
autonomy. India's concern over China's occupation (liberation) of Tibet had been misunderstood by China. It was therefore natural for China to ask for the Principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of the other State. For India also, it was necessary to pre-empt any kind of future designs on the part of the Chinese Government in fomenting border troubles through encouraging fissiparous tendencies in the north-eastern territories. There was also the fear of China's ideological intrusions in India as was apparent in Mao's greetings to the Telangana Communists.

The principle was consistent with Article 2 Clause 7 of the U.N. Charter which bears United Nations intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a State.

d. Equality and Mutual Benefit

The principle of equality is a basic principle of international law. All states are equal and sovereign, irrespective of their size, population or potentialities. No state is superior to another. It was, therefore, necessary to restate this principle on the ground that both the States have reached the agreement on the basis of equality and sovereignty. It was also necessary to dispel any impression that the agreement was reached under any
pressure which might have compromised the principle of equality. The United Nations also recognise the principle of sovereign equality States under Article 2, clause 1 of the charter.

e. Peaceful Co-existence

The principle of co-existence was enshrined in the Agreement to assert that despite the differences in the ideologies and functioning of the two governments, each State had the right to co-exist without any fear of being dominated by the other or its philosophy. It may be remembered that while India was a working democracy having a blend of capitalism and socialism China was a Communist country with seeds of dictatorship. It was hoped that the two largest countries in the world with such varying ideologies and types of Government could live as peaceful neighbours on the policy of live and let live. There could be no alarm or fear psychology that one State would dominate or swamp the other. Both could co-exist and thrive.

It was also envisaged that peaceful co-existence was of mutual benefit to both the countries. It was hoped that they would pursue the policy of good neighbourliness which would be of great assistance to the two countries in their future build-up and development.
The Panchsheel agreement was technically an agreement between India and China. But it could be considered as a formula for conducting foreign relations with other States throughout the world. Indeed, if all States were to pursue their foreign policies in line with the above principles there would be no war nor tension in the world. The agreement was aimed to cover the whole gamut of Indo-Chinese relations in future. It was hoped that China would conduct its relations with India on the basis of the Panchsheel.

Objectives of Panchsheel

According to Jawaharlal Nehru's statement when he was addressing the Parliament members of the Lok Sabha, the ultimate objectives of Panchsheel were the following:

1. Panchsheel lays down the very important truth that each nation must ultimately fend for itself. Jawaharlal Nehru was not thinking in terms of military potentiality, but in terms of striving intellectually, morally, spiritually, and in terms of opening out all our windows to ideas from others, and learning from the experience of others.
2. Each country should look upon such an endeavour on the part of the others with sympathy and friendly understanding and without any interference or imposition.³

Panchsheel and Co-existence

In this atomic age, when scientific advancement has brought nations within easy reach of mutual annihilation and the extinction of civilization, co-existence of races, cultures and political systems is no more a philosophical ideal. It is a practical way of life. Even those who have not formally pledged their adherence to Panchsheel, have not denied or under-estimated the need for its acceptance.

While Nehru addressing the Indo-American society on September 27, 1955 the presence of Mr. Sherman Cooper, the U.S. Ambassador to India, asserted that his country had always adhered to Panchsheel in 'words and deeds'. At a press conference at New Delhi on December 10, 1956 he reiterated his country's support to these principles and said that there was no disagreement on them. The Earl of

³ Nehru's Speech in Lok Sabha, September 17, 1955. Regards the five Principles of Peaceful co-existence were first formulated in the preamble to the agreement between India and China in regard to Tibet, which was signed on April 29, 1954. These principles, which later came to be known as Panchsheel are: (1) Mutual respect for each other territorial integrity and sovereignty, (2) Mutual non-aggression, (3) Mutual non-interference in each others' internal affairs, (4) Equality and mutual benefit and (5) Peaceful co-existence.
Home, British Secretary of State for Common Wealth Relations, declared Panchsheel as the basis of the Common Wealth countries. At the big four Summit Conference at Geneva in July 1955, Mr. Eisenhower said he felt that the problems that faced the world today were not insoluble... "Of course, they are difficult, but their solution is not beyond the wisdom of man", he said it was not always necessary that people should think alike and believe alike before they could work together. The essential thing was that "none should attempt by force or treachery to make his beliefs prevail and thus to impose his system on the unwilling", Elsewhere president Eisenhower remarked. "There is no alternative to peace. There would not be much left of the world unless war is prevented in this atomic age."

Panchsheel just seeks to give to the principles of co-existence physical content so that the underlying idea of international peace and co-operation can be canalized into the economic and cultural enterprises of nations which seek the fulfilment of their aspirations in the spirit of give and take. Panchsheel can work as a guarantee against outside interference in the internal affairs of a country and thereby eventually end the frittering away of resources on defence it will assuredly provide the climate within which every race and every country can develop itself on its own individual pattern, and thus add to the gaiety and richness of human civilization.
Panchsheel and the United Nations Charter

The doctrine of Panchsheel is a restatement, in more specific terms, of the principles embodied in the U.N. charter, to which all countries differing in their political ideologies, economic systems and cultural patterns have subscribed. The first principle of Panchsheel, i.e., "mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty" is contained in Article 2(a) and (4) of the United Nations Charter.

Article 2(1) states "The organisation is based on the principles of the sovereign equality of all its members."

Article 2(4) asks member nations "to refrain from their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state."

The second principle of Panchsheel, i.e., "mutual non-aggression" occurs repeatedly in the Charter Article 1(1), 2(3) and 2(4) emphasises this point in particular. Article 1(1) binds the members to "maintain international peace and security, while Article 2(3) states that "all member States shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means."
Non-interference in each others internal affairs, as defined in the third principle of Panchsheel, is laid down in Article 2(7) of the United Nations Charter, which say:

"Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorise the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the members to submit to such matters to settlement under the present charter."

"Equality" and "mutual benefit" mentioned in the fourth principle of Panchsheel, are covered by Articles 2(1) and 2(5) of the Charter. Article 2(1) lays down the "principle of the sovereign equality of all its members", while Article 2(5) implies the principle of mutual benefit it states.

"All members shall give the United Nations every assistance and in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action."

The fifth and the last principle of Panchsheel which emphasises peaceful to co-existence, is one of the cornerstones of the United Nations Charter. The preamble to the Charter requires members States "to practise tolerance and
live together in peace with one another as good neighbours" and "to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples."

Panchsheel and International Law

A basic principle of India's foreign policy laid down in Indian constitution is to "foster respect for international law." Panchsheel amply fulfils this purpose. It is repeatedly pointed out by all the Asian and European leaders who have declared their support to Panchsheel that its principles should be made the basis of international relations which are also regulated by international law. This has been defined as the body of rules and principles of action which are morally binding upon civilized States in their relations with one another. The immediate object is to prevent human suffering and further respect for national sovereignty Panchsheel, by offering a body of principles which can regulate international relations. Both appeal to the fundamentals of human conscience, and seek to regulate the ordinary conduct of international relations. Thus, there is an integral relationship between Panchsheel and international law.

Panchsheel and the Indian Working Policy

The basic principles of India's foreign policy have been embodied in the Constitution under the directive principles of State policy. Article 51 of the Constitution
enjoins the State to promote international peace and security, maintain just and honourable relations between nations, foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealings as organized people with one another, and encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration. Explaining the relationship of Panchsheel to India's foreign policy at Calcutta on November 30, 1955, Jawaharlal Nehru said, "India does not propose to join any camp or alliance. But, we wish to co-operate with all in the quest for peace, security and human brotherhood.

Peaceful co-existence is not a new idea for us in India. It has been our way of life and is as old as our thought and culture. From this it has naturally followed that we should keep ourselves from military and like alliances and have not joined any of the great power groups that dominate the world today. It is in no spirit of pride or arrogance that we pursue our independent policy. We should not do otherwise unless we were false to everything India has stood with all and the flow of thought and ideas of all kinds, but we reserve to right to choose our own path - That is the essence of Panchsheel, it has been sometimes held that the principles of panchsheel lead

directly to neutrality. Jawaharlal Nehru has renounced this word most emphatically in the context of the India's foreign policy. Neutrality can notes a "refusal to express positive views with positive action" while India's role in international affairs has consistently upheld the principle of non-alignment with power blocs, it has not prevented her from taking a positive stand on any matter of international dispute.

Violation of Panchsheel by China

Subsequent events, however, belied Nehru's expectations regarding the Chinese behaviour. The Chinese behaviour after the agreement literally became a Chinese puzzle. China had already started building roads in Aksai Chin in Ladakh to connect the Chinese province of Sinkiang with Tibet. There were also intrusions in Barahoti. This was despite the fact that when Nehru referred to the Chinese maps during his meeting with Chou in October 1954 in peking, Chou alleged reproduction of the old maps and that the new Government had no time to revise them.5 He further assured Nehru that boundaries between the two countries were clear and there could be no argument about them. In November-December 1956, Chou declared in India that the McMahon line would be the demarcating line between

---

not only India and China but between China and Burma as well. Reproduction of old Chinese maps in a Chinese Pictorial in July 1958 however, made the Chinese intentions obvious, although intriguing.

The atmosphere warmed up in early 1959, when the Dalai Lama declared Independence of Tibet and supported the Khampa Tribal revolt in Tibet. This resulted in China's action in Tibet which resulted in the flight of the Dalai Lama from Lhasa and his eventual arrival in India in March 1959. Indians welcomed the Dalai Lama after anxiously waiting for his arrival in the Indian territory. Anti-Chinese riots broke out in various parts of India with the burning of effigies of the Chinese leaders - Mao Tse Tung and Chou-En-Lai. There was spontaneous Indian support for the Dalai Lama much to the discomfort of the Indian Government. While Nehru tried to deal with the situation tactfully and diplomatically, he was criticised by the Chinese leaders for falling into an imperialist trap, a favourite Chinese phrase for those whom they did not like. The Chinese leaders hardly realised that in a democratic set up, the voice of the people could not be stifled and the people had the right to criticise even if they were wrong. In democracy, even a right cause could be

6. S.Gopal, Ibid.
criticised. There is freedom of expression and freedom of press. A totalitarian State cannot understand the voice of the people which is free in a democracy but which is conditioned within the territory by the voice of the leadership.

Nehru did not lose his head in the midst of an upsurge of Indian opinion in favour of the Dalai Lama and against China. In his meeting with the Dalai Lama, Nehru is reported to have impressed upon him to face facts. "The whole world cannot bring freedom to Tibet unless the whole fabric of the Chinese State is destroyed." At the most, India may be able to help the Tibetans to have a square deal." Soon there were border clashes at Longju in August 1959. The Army Chief, General Thimmaya, had tendered his resignation. This was followed by Chou's letter of 8th September 1959 reaffirming old maps and claiming 40,000 square miles. There was another border clash in Kongka Pass in October 1959 and there were some casualties. Indians had also by now learnt of the construction of the road across Akasai Chin. Nehru was now convinced that China had played foul with him and India would have to defend herself against Chinese incursions. However, he kept the doors of


negotiations open. With the publication of the white paper by India, the world had now come to know of the boundary dispute between India and China. India had also realised by now that her natural borders with China, the Himalayas were being challenged by the Peking regime. Nehru was dismayed and remarked that "we have not received a fair treatment in this matter and have been treated rather causally by the Chinese Government and an attempt is made to bully us." Referring to the Chinese claim of the Himalaya, Nehru remarked: "This is a claim which whether India exists or does not exist cannot be agreed to. There the matter ends." He felt that "just as there is certain paranoia in individuals, sometimes there is a paranoia in nations."

Nehru had apprised the two Big powers regarding the developments on the Indo-China borders and the Chinese belligerent attitude towards India. This was the time when the Soviet Union and China were developing a coldness towards each other. Khrushchev was sympathetic to the Indian cause. India continued to hope for a peaceful settlement. In February 1960, therefore, Nehru invited Chou-En-Lai to visit India. Nehru took this initiative in the larger interest of world peace. He had noted that there


10. Ibid., p.214.
was some thaw between the United States and China. Nehru had also a picture of the history of China which had the tendency to adopt expansionist policies when she was strong. He did not feel comfortable that while other States were near a detente, India may be accused of hostilities in the East, which could have world-wide repercussions. Hence the invitation to Chou.

The meeting came off in April 1960. Apart from diplomatic courtesies the atmosphere was chilly. Nehru claimed that the frontiers were fixed, fairly delimited and were peaceful except for recent incursions. Chou insisted that the borders had to be negotiated. 11 Despite these rigid stands, it was agreed that officials of the two countries should meet to study the evidence as to the alignment of the frontiers. Until then, it was agreed to avoid further border clashes.

While speaking on the report of the officials, Nehru advised in April 1961 against creating "unbridgeable chasms", we try not to allow ourselves merely in anger to do something which may create further problems and difficulties. Broadly, our attitude has been to strengthen ourselves to prepare for any contingency and not in the slightest to give in on any matter which we consider

important."12 It may be relevant here to say that officials Report had established India's claim to be superior to that of China.13

In between, while Nehru did not speak of India's justified stand on the Sino-Indian borders, Chou mounted verbal attacks on India and Nehru. He accused India of raising the Tibetan bogey to make it a buffer State and provoking border clashes to secure foreign aid and attack progressive forces within the territory.14 He also accused Nehru of playing into imperialist hands. The Chinese condemned Nehru's role in the Belgrade Conference. India's role in the Congo and his visit to Washington.15 China's verbal aggression continued. On the basis of China's bellicose attitude and continuation of Chinese incursions in every sector, Nehru ordered in November 1961 that military patrols should proceed as far as possible towards the international borders to prevent Chinese advances or incursions in the Western sector while Indian forces should establish "effective occupation" in the middle and eastern sectors.16 he instructed for the establishment of rear and intermediate bases.

14. Ibid., p.204.
15. Ibid., p.207.
16. Ibid., p.208.
While Nehru had ordered the patrolling of borders to prevent further Chinese incursions he left the doors open for talks. Thus when the Burmese Prime Minister U. Nu, visited India in January 1962 after visiting Beijing he thought that China could be reasonable. Nehru reiterated that if China gave any such indication India would favourably respond. But, there was no response from China. Nehru believed in the creation of favourable world public opinion. He thought that while India should be prepared for the worst, she should keep the doors open for negotiations. He, therefore, ordered the army to keep alert and remain trim. But, matters were drifting the other way leaving no scope for negotiations. Longju again became problematic in May 1962 when China warned that it "will not stand idly by" and the Chinese Consulate in Calcutta was telling its fellow travellers that the war was not far off much to the disbelief of Nehru in 1962 where he expressed his willingness to discuss the official report even after the Chinese had fired on Indian patrols after a suspended lull of three years. Nehru considered war to be bad for India, China and the world. As he remarked: "continuing hostility between India and China will affect us, affect China and affect Asia and will have other far-reaching effects for generations." 


On 8th September 1962, Chinese forces sought to menace the Indian post at Dhola near Thagla Ridge. The army was asked to ensure that the Chinese were not allowed to cross the border and if they did not withdraw, firing may be resorted to.19 There was exchange of fire near Thagla Ridge on 20th September 1962. Although things were going rough Nehru still proposed talks subject to Chinese withdrawal to the pre-8th September 1962 positions. The proposal was made in India's communique to China on 16th October 1962. But Nehru was not complacent and had little hope of any positive response from the Chinese side in the light of Mao's remarks about Nehru as reactionary bourgeoisie whom China was not ready to befriend.20

On 20th October 1962 Chinese troops moved along the border with heavy military equipment of mortars and mountain artillery and some tanks (Refer Appendix F). India faced several reverses. Then Chinese occupied all the territory which it had claimed in the western sector. On 16th November, Walong fell. On 19th November, Bomdila fell. There was fear of loss of Assam, Tripura, Manipur and Nagaland in the east and some danger to the Punjab, Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. Although the Indian

army was confused, Nehru sought to boost the army's morale by taking personal charge temporarily after Menon's resignation as Defence Minister. However, Chou declared unilateral cease-fire on 21st November 1962.