

**STATEMENT  
OF  
THE GOVERNMENT  
OF THE  
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC  
OF CHINA**

**( May 24, 1969 )**

**STATEMENT OF  
THE GOVERNMENT OF  
THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC  
OF CHINA**

(May 24, 1969)

**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS  
PEKING 1969**

## PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This booklet contains the important statement issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China on May 24, 1969. This statement justly and sternly refutes the statement produced by the Soviet Government on March 29 this year, which stands facts on their head and calls black white. The Chinese Government's statement exposes the towering crimes of the tsars, old and new, in their aggression against China, reaffirms the Chinese Government's consistent stand on the settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question, and expresses the common will of the 700 million Chinese people.

Also included in this booklet is the Note of the Hsinhua News Agency on the Publication of the Full Text of the Soviet Government's Statement of March 29.

*Printed in the People's Republic of China*

## C O N T E N T S

STATEMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE  
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA  
(May 24, 1969) 1

NOTE OF THE HSINHUA NEWS AGENCY ON  
THE PUBLICATION OF THE FULL TEXT  
OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S STATE-  
MENT OF MARCH 29  
(May 24, 1969) 39

**STATEMENT OF THE  
GOVERNMENT OF THE  
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA**

(May 24, 1969)

On March 29, 1969, the Soviet Government issued a statement on the Sino-Soviet boundary question. On April 1, 1969, Vice-Chairman Lin Piao of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China pointed out in his report to the Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China: In its statement, the Soviet Government was "still clinging to its obstinate aggressor stand, while expressing willingness to resume 'consultations'. Our Government is considering its reply to this."

The Communist Party of China and the Chinese Government have always held that boundary questions should be settled by negotiations through diplomatic channels and that, pending a settlement, the status quo of the boundary should be maintained and conflicts averted. This was our stand in the past and remains our stand at present. The development of the Sino-Soviet boundary question to its present state is wholly the responsibility of the Soviet side. The Chinese Government hereby states the truth about the Sino-Soviet boundary question and its consistent position as follows:

**I. CHENPAO ISLAND IS CHINA'S TERRITORY AND THE CHENPAO ISLAND INCIDENT WAS DELIBERATELY PROVOKED BY THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT**

Chenpao Island has always been China's territory. Before 1860, the Wusuli River

where Chenpao Island is situated was still an inland river of China. It was only after the Opium War in the 19th century when the capitalist powers, one after another, imposed unequal treaties on China that the Wusuli River was stipulated as forming part of the boundary between China and Russia in the "Sino-Russian Treaty of Peking" of 1860. According to established principles of international law, in the case of navigable boundary rivers, the central line of the main channel shall form the boundary line and determine the ownership of islands. Situated on the Chinese side of the central line of the main channel of the Wusuli River, Chenpao Island indisputably belongs to China and has always been under China's jurisdiction.

The Soviet Government invoked the map attached to the "Sino-Russian Treaty of Peking", asserting that in the area of Chenpao Island the demarcation line

shown on this map "passes directly along the Chinese bank of the Ussuri River" and vainly attempting to prove thereby that Chenpao Island belongs to the Soviet Union. But this attached map can in no way help it out of its present predicament.

The map attached to the "Sino-Russian Treaty of Peking" was drawn unilaterally by tsarist Russia before the boundary was surveyed in 1861. And in 1861, China and Russia surveyed and marked only the land boundary south of the Hsingkai Lake but not the river boundary on the Wusuli and Heilung Rivers, and a red line was drawn on the attached map on a scale smaller than 1:1,000,000 only to indicate that the two rivers form the boundary between the two countries. The red line on this attached map does not, and cannot possibly, show the precise location of the boundary line in the rivers, still less is it intended to determine the ownership of islands.

Hence, it can in no way prove that Chenpao Island belongs to the Soviet Union.

In fact, after the conclusion of the "Sino-Russian Treaty of Peking", the two sides always took the central line of the main channel for determining the ownership of islands and exercised jurisdiction accordingly. This was also repeatedly borne out by letters from the frontier officials of tsarist Russia to the Chinese side. For instance, in his letter of May 8, 1908 to a Chinese official, the frontier commissar of the Amur Region of tsarist Russia Kuzmin made it clear: "If countries are divided by a river, then the line running along the middle of the river should be taken as the boundary line between them. On navigable rivers, this line should be drawn along the channel." Again, in his letter of September 6 of the same year to the Chinese official, Kuzmin stated: "Islands in the rivers are divided by the river channel."

During the Sino-Soviet boundary negotiations in 1964, the Soviet representative also had to admit that the red line on the map attached to the "Sino-Russian Treaty of Peking" cannot show the precise alignment of the boundary line in the rivers, nor can it possibly determine the ownership of islands; he could not but agree that the central line of the main channel should be taken for determining the boundary line on the rivers and the ownership of islands.

It should also be pointed out that Chenpao Island was originally not an island, but a part of the bank on the Chinese side of the Wusuli River, which later became an island as a result of erosion by the river water. To this day, Chenpao Island still connects with the Chinese bank at low water, and the river-arm to the west of the Island has never become a waterway.

The Chenpao Island incident was deliberately provoked by the Soviet side. In

recent years, Soviet troops have repeatedly been sent in helicopters, armoured cars and vehicles to intrude into China's territory Chenpao Island for provocations. During the first two months of this year alone, they intruded into the Island as many as eight times. They kidnapped Chinese inhabitants, assaulted and wounded Chinese frontier guards and seized arms and ammunition. With regard to the provocations by the Soviet side, the Chinese side all along exercised the utmost forbearance, persisting in reasoning things out on the basis of the facts and demanding that the Soviet side stop its intrusions and provocations. However, thinking that China was weak and could be bullied, the Soviet side became ever more unbridled. When they intruded into China's Chenpao Island on February 16, the Soviet troops flagrantly clamoured that they would use force of arms should the Chinese frontier guards go there for patrols again. Follow-

ing that, the Soviet Far Eastern frontier troops entered into No. 1 combat readiness. On March 2, large numbers of Soviet troops in armoured cars and vehicles intruded into China's territory the Chenpao Island area simultaneously from Nizhne-Mikhailovka and Kulebyakinye, launched a sudden attack on the Chinese frontier guards on normal patrol duty and were the first to open fire with guns and cannons, killing and wounding many Chinese frontier guards on the spot. Driven beyond the limits of forbearance, the Chinese frontier guards were compelled to fight back in self-defence. On March 15, Soviet troops again intruded into Chenpao Island and shelled areas deep within Chinese territory on the Chinese side of the river, thus creating a new incident of bloodshed. Such is the truth about the Chenpao Island incident. No amount of lies will help the Soviet Government escape the responsibility for its crimes.

## **II. THE TREATIES RELATING TO THE PRESENT SINO-SOVIET BOUNDARY ARE ALL UNEQUAL TREATIES IMPOSED ON CHINA BY TSARIST RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM**

Tsarist Russia, a European country, was originally not contiguous to China. Tsarist Russia began to expand eastwards in the 16th century, and it was not until the latter half of the 17th century that there arose the question of a boundary with China. In 1689, China and Russia concluded their first boundary treaty, the "Treaty of Nipchu", which defined the eastern sector of the Sino-Russian boundary. In 1727, China and Russia concluded the "Burinsky Treaty", which defined the middle sector of the Sino-Russian boundary (the larger part of this sector of the boundary has now become Mongolian-Soviet boundary). As for the western frontier of China, it was then at the Balk-

hash Lake, a great distance from the boundary of tsarist Russia.

After the Opium War of 1840, China was gradually reduced to a semi-colony, while Russia was gradually becoming a military-feudal imperialist country. Beginning from the fifties of the 19th century, tsarist Russia colluded with the Western imperialist countries in pursuing the aggressive policy of carving up China. Within the short space of half a century, it forced China to sign a series of unequal treaties, by which it annexed more than 1.5 million square kilometres of Chinese territory, an area three times that of France or twelve times that of Czechoslovakia.

While the allied Anglo-French imperialist forces were attacking Tientsin and threatening Peking in their aggression against China, tsarist Russian imperialism seized the opportunity to compel the authorities of the Ching Dynasty by force of arms to sign the "Sino-Russian Treaty

of Aigun" on May 28, 1858, by which it annexed more than 600,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory north of the Heilung River and south of the Outer Khingan Mountains and placed the Chinese territory east of the Wusuli River under the joint possession of China and Russia.

Taking advantage of the military pressure brought about by the occupation of Peking by the allied Anglo-French forces invading China, alleging that it had made contributions in mediation and threatening that "it is not difficult to renew the war", tsarist Russia forced the Ching Dynasty Government to sign the "Sino-Russian Treaty of Peking" on November 14, 1860, by which it forcibly incorporated some 400,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory east of the Wusuli River into Russia.

By the "Sino-Russian Treaty of Peking" and by the "Tahcheng Protocol on the Delimitation of Sino-Russian Boundary"

which tsarist Russia forced the Ching Dynasty Government to sign on October 7, 1864, tsarist Russia further annexed more than 440,000 square kilometres of territory in the western part of China.

In 1871, tsarist Russia sent troops to forcibly occupy China's Ili area, who entrenched themselves there for as long as ten years; on February 24, 1881, it forced the Ching Dynasty Government to sign the "Sino-Russian Ili Treaty". By the "Sino-Russian Ili Treaty" and the subsequent protocols on boundary delimitation, tsarist Russia further incorporated more than 70,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory into the territory of tsarist Russia.

The great teachers of the world proletariat Marx, Engels and Lenin had long made brilliant conclusions on the unequal nature of these treaties. Commenting on the "Sino-Russian Treaty of Aigun" in 1858, Marx said that ". . . by his second opium-war he [John Bull] has helped her

[Russia] to the invaluable tract lying between the Gulf of Tartary and Lake Baikal, a region so much coveted by Russia that from Czar Alexey Michaelowitch down to Nicolaus, she has always attempted to get it".<sup>1</sup> Engels also pointed out in the same year that Russia despoiled "China of a country as large as France and Germany put together, and of a river as large as the Danube" and that "Not satisfied with this, she has obtained the establishment of a Russo-Chinese Commission to fix the boundaries. Now, we all know what such a commission is in the hands of Russia. We have seen them at work on the Asiatic frontiers of Turkey, where they kept slicing away piece after piece from that country, for more than twenty years".<sup>2</sup> Things turned out to be exactly as Engels had wisely foreseen. After 1858, tsarist Russia was "slicing away piece after piece" of Chinese territory with the signing of each treaty and with every survey of the boundary. Lenin

also bitterly denounced tsarist Russia more than once for its crimes of aggression against China. Lenin pointed out that **“ . . . the European governments (the Russian Government among the very first) have already started to partition China. However, they have not begun this partitioning openly, but stealthily, like thieves”** and that **“The policy of the tsarist government in China is a criminal policy”**.<sup>3</sup>

While glibly talking about being “true to Lenin’s behests” in its statement of March 29, the Soviet Government in the very same statement directly opposed the brilliant conclusions made by Marx, Engels and Lenin and thoroughly betrayed their teachings.

In order to suit the needs of its social-imperialist policy, the Soviet Government even described tsarist Russian imperialist aggression against semi-colonial China after the mid-19th century as “disputes” between “Chinese emperors and tsars”, in which there was no question of who was

the aggressor and who the victim of aggression, nor was there any question of whether the treaties concluded between them are equal or not. This is a gangster logic in defence of tsarist Russian imperialist aggression.

In his time the great Lenin warmly supported China and all other oppressed countries in opposing aggression by tsarist Russian imperialism and all other imperialists. He said that **“ . . . if tomorrow, Morocco were to declare war on France, or India on Britain, or Persia or China on Russia, and so on, these would be ‘just’, and ‘defensive’ wars, irrespective of who would be the first to attack; any socialist would wish the oppressed, dependent and unequal states victory over the oppressor, slave-holding and predatory ‘Great Powers’**”.<sup>4</sup> Today when people review these teachings of Lenin’s, they can only come to one conclusion: Such energetic propagation of the imperialist gangster logic by the Soviet Government is not

only "alien to the Leninist policy", but is also a most shameless betrayal of Leninism.

### **III. THE FACT THAT THERE EXISTS A BOUNDARY QUESTION BETWEEN CHINA AND THE SOVIET UNION CANNOT BE OBLITERATED**

There exists a boundary question between China and the Soviet Union not only because tsarist Russia annexed more than 1.5 million square kilometres of Chinese territory by the unequal treaties it imposed on China, but also because it crossed in many places the boundary line stipulated by the unequal treaties and further occupied vast expanses of Chinese territory. Even tracts of Chinese territory which have always been under the Chinese Government's jurisdiction have been drawn as Soviet territory. For instance, in the Pamir area, tsarist Russia occupied

more than 20,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in violation of the stipulations of the "Protocol on Sino-Russian Boundary in the Kashgar Region" of 1884. Again for instance, in the sector of the Wusuli and Heilung Rivers, the Soviet Government, in violation of the "Sino-Russian Treaty of Aigun", the "Sino-Russian Treaty of Peking" and the established principles of international law, has gone so far as to draw the boundary line almost entirely along the Chinese bank and in some places even on China's inland rivers and islands, marking as Soviet territory over 600 of the 700 and more Chinese islands on the Chinese side of the central line of the main channel, which cover an area of more than 1,000 square kilometres.

With regard to the unequal treaties imposed on China by tsarist Russia, the great Lenin always stood for their annulment.

On September 27, 1920, the Government of Soviets led by Lenin solemnly

proclaimed: It "declares null and void all the treaties concluded with China by the former Governments of Russia, renounces all seizure of Chinese territory and all Russian concessions in China and restores to China, without any compensation and for ever, all that had been predatorily seized from her by the Tsar's Government and the Russian bourgeoisie".

Furthermore, the "Agreement on General Principles for the Settlement of the Questions Between China and the Soviet Union" signed on May 31, 1924 stipulates that at the conference agreed upon by both sides, they are to "annul all Conventions, Treaties, Agreements, Protocols, Contracts, etcetera, concluded between the Government of China and the Tsarist Government and to replace them with new treaties, agreements, etcetera, on the basis of equality, reciprocity and justice, as well as the spirit of the Declarations of the Soviet Government of the years of 1919 and 1920" and "to re-demarcate their na-

tional boundaries . . . , and pending such re-demarcation, to maintain the present boundaries".

In pursuance of the 1924 Agreement, China and the Soviet Union held talks in 1926 to discuss the re-demarcation of the boundary and the conclusion of a new treaty. Owing to the historical conditions at the time, no agreement was reached by the two sides on the boundary question, no re-demarcation of the boundary between the two countries was made and no new equal treaty was concluded by the two countries, and thus this proletarian policy of Lenin's failed to come true.

The above facts fully show that the treaties relating to the present Sino-Soviet boundary are all unequal treaties, that they should all be annulled and that the Sino-Soviet boundary question remains an outstanding issue. In its statement, the Soviet Government did not even say a single word about the fact that under the above-mentioned Declarations and Agree-

ment, it is "all" the treaties concluded with China that are to be annulled and it is "all" the seized Chinese territory that is to be renounced, but uttered the nonsense that the 1924 Agreement did not "consider" the boundary treaties "as being among the unequal treaties" and that "there was no talk of their being annulled". This is indeed a "juggling with history, adapting it to its territorial claims".

Chairman Mao spoke highly of the declaration of the annulment of the unequal treaties between China and Russia made by the Government of Soviets led by Lenin. However, from Chairman Mao's words no conclusion whatsoever can be drawn that there does not exist a boundary question between China and the Soviet Union. The same is true of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's remarks. As for the "Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance" and the "Sino-Soviet Agreement on Navigation on Boundary Rivers", they are in no sense a treaty or agreement

for the settlement of the boundary question, still less can they prove that there does not exist a boundary question between China and the Soviet Union.

#### **IV. THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT HAS VIOLATED THE STATUS QUO OF THE BOUNDARY AND PROVOKED BORDER CONFLICTS**

It is understandable that the boundary question existing between China and the Soviet Union was not settled when China was under reactionary rule. The founding of the People's Republic of China created all the necessary conditions for a reasonable settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question. Owing to various reasons, no start was made to settle the question at the time, yet the Sino-Soviet border was all along tranquil.

Since 1960, the Soviet Government has gone farther and farther down the

road of betraying Marxism-Leninism. It restores capitalism at home and pursues a social-imperialist policy abroad, it allies with U.S. imperialism and opposes socialist China, and it has incessantly violated the status quo of the boundary and tried to occupy Chinese territory which has always been under the Chinese Government's jurisdiction, thus aggravating the Sino-Soviet boundary question. The Soviet Government directed Soviet frontier troops to push their patrol routes into Chinese territory, build military installations within Chinese territory, assault and kidnap Chinese border inhabitants, sabotage their production and carry out all sorts of provocative and subversive activities. In 1962, the Soviet Government incited and coerced more than 60,000 Chinese citizens in the Ili and Tahcheng areas of Sinkiang, China into going to the Soviet Union, and it has up to now refused to send them back.

Since 1964, the Soviet Government has sent large reinforcements to the Sino-Soviet border, stepped up its violation of the status quo of the boundary, carried out armed provocations and created incidents of bloodshed. From October 15, 1964 to March 15 this year, the Soviet side provoked as many as 4,189 border incidents, two and a half times the number of those it provoked from 1960 to 1964, with its tactics getting even more vicious and its behaviour even more unbridled. Soviet troops intruded into Chinese territory, indulging in murder and arson, killing barehanded Chinese fishermen and peasants by beating and running armoured cars over them or even throwing them alive into the river. Lenin indignantly condemned the Russian government for its atrocities of slaughtering peaceable Chinese inhabitants in these words: "**... they flung themselves upon it [China] like savage beasts, burning down whole villages,**

shooting, bayonetting, and drowning in the Amur River unarmed inhabitants, their wives, and their children".<sup>5</sup> What difference is there between the present-day atrocities committed by the Soviet Government against Chinese inhabitants on the Wusuli and Heilung Rivers and the atrocities by the tsarist Russian government which were bitterly denounced by Lenin in those days!?

The Chenpao Island incident is the inevitable result of the Soviet Government's violation of the status quo of the Sino-Soviet boundary and pursuance of its social-imperialist policy over a long period of time. The sanguinary conflicts on Chenpao Island were deliberately engineered by the Soviet Government in order to cover up its capitulation on the Berlin question and curry favour with U.S. imperialism, so that it can further ally with U.S. imperialism against China. By this action, the Soviet Government tells the United States

that China is the common enemy of the United States and the Soviet Union.

#### **V. IT IS THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT THAT EXPANDS ITS TERRITORY EVERYWHERE**

In its statement, the Soviet Government slanderously asserted that China "queries the present boundaries of the countries neighbouring on China" and that "claims are being advanced on neighbouring territories", vainly attempting to show that the Chinese Government pursues a policy of expansion. Such clumsy tactics are indeed both ridiculous and pitiable! The whole world knows that since the founding of the People's Republic of China, the Chinese Government has satisfactorily settled complicated boundary questions left over by history and concluded boundary treaties with neighbouring countries such as Burma, Nepal,

Pakistan, the People's Republic of Mongolia and Afghanistan, with the exception of the Soviet Union and India. China does not have a single soldier stationed in any foreign country. China has no territorial claims against any of her neighbouring countries, and has not invaded or occupied a single inch of territory of any foreign country.

Today, the Soviet Government is not only forcibly occupying the territories of other countries and refuses to return them, but has under new conditions advanced new theories for aggression — the theories of “limited sovereignty”, of “international dictatorship” and of the “socialist community”. It has already turned some East European countries and the People's Republic of Mongolia into its colonies and military bases. It flagrantly sent several hundred thousand troops to occupy Czechoslovakia and brutally suppress the Czechoslovak people. It regards heroic Albania as a thorn in its flesh. It menaces

Rumania and Yugoslavia. It has dispatched its fleet to the Mediterranean Sea, trying hard to control the Arab countries by taking advantage of their difficulties. Its aggressive designs are even more ambitious, and its claws have stretched out even farther, than those of tsarist Russia.

Harbouring ulterior motives, the Soviet Government, moreover, talked glibly about Soviet assistance to China in its statement. It is true that under the leadership of the great Lenin and Stalin, the Soviet people rendered assistance to the Chinese people, which the Chinese people will never forget. In turn, the Chinese people led by their great leader Chairman Mao also rendered assistance to the Soviet people, which the Soviet people will never forget either. Such mutual support and assistance between the Chinese and Soviet peoples in revolutionary struggles will certainly continue in the future. However, it must be pointed out that in the

past decade the Soviet Government has completely betrayed the internationalist foreign policy of Lenin and Stalin, done all evils against China and committed towering crimes against the Chinese people. It is not qualified at all to talk about assistance rendered to the Chinese people at the time of Lenin and Stalin. At present, the Soviet Government is everywhere perpetrating acts of aggression and plunder against the people of other countries under the signboard of "assistance". Such practice of the Soviet Government is exactly the same as that of U.S. imperialism.

**VI. THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT STANDS  
FOR PEACEFUL NEGOTIATIONS AND  
IS AGAINST RESORT TO  
THE USE OF FORCE**

The Chinese Government has consistently stood and worked for the settlement of

boundary questions with its neighbouring countries through negotiations and for the maintenance of the status quo of the boundary pending a settlement. As early as August 22 and September 21, 1960, the Chinese Government twice took the initiative in proposing to the Soviet Government that negotiations be held. Furthermore, on August 23, 1963, the Chinese Government put forward to the Soviet Government a six-point proposal for maintaining the status quo of the boundary and averting conflicts. Sino-Soviet boundary negotiations finally took place in Peking in 1964. During the negotiations, the Chinese side took the reasonable stand that the treaties relating to the present Sino-Soviet boundary should be taken as the basis for settling the boundary question, and it made the maximum efforts and showed the greatest sincerity for the settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question. If the Soviet Government had

the slightest sincerity, it would not have been difficult to settle the Sino-Soviet boundary question. What Premier Chou En-lai said in answering the provocative question of an American correspondent at a press conference held in Kathmandu on April 28, 1960 precisely expressed this idea of the Chinese Government. However, the Soviet Government clung to its big-power chauvinist and territorial expansionist stand; it not only wanted to keep under its forcible occupation the Chinese territory which tsarist Russia had seized by means of the unequal treaties, but also insisted that China recognize as belonging to the Soviet Union all the Chinese territory which it had occupied or attempted to occupy in violation of the treaties, and as a result the negotiations were disrupted. Hence, while China has now settled boundary questions with many of her neighbouring countries, only the boundary questions between China and the Soviet

Union and between China and India remain unsettled.

While expressing willingness to resume "consultations" in its statement of March 29, the Soviet Government tried hard to deny the existence of a boundary question between China and the Soviet Union, which actually amounts to saying that there is nothing to discuss at all.

While indicating in its statement that "urgent practical measures should be taken to normalize the situation on the Soviet-Chinese border", the Soviet Government has continued to direct Soviet troops to open fire with light and heavy machine-guns and heavy artillery on China's' Chenpao Island and areas deep within Chinese territory, and to this day the firing has not ceased; at the same time, it is carrying out provocations in other sectors of the Sino-Soviet boundary. Reading from a prepared text, the Soviet frontier representative even brazenly threatened on April 3: "The Soviet Union

will not cease fire unless the Chinese Government holds negotiations with the Soviet Government, nor will it cease fire unless the Chinese withdraw from Damansky Island" (N.B. China's Chenpao Island).

Furthermore, the Soviet Government has canvassed among the imperialist countries headed by the United States, begging for their support. Meanwhile, setting in motion all its propaganda machines, it has done its utmost to spread lies and slanders, tried to fan up national chauvinist sentiments, made war clamours and branched nuclear weapons at China.

The above series of facts show that it is highly doubtful as to how much sincerity the Soviet Government has, after all, for negotiations.

The development of the Sino-Soviet boundary question to its present state is not the responsibility of the Chinese side. Nevertheless, the Chinese Government is

still ready to seek an overall settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question through peaceful negotiations and is against resort to the use of force.

The Chinese Government holds that it must be confirmed that the treaties relating to the present Sino-Soviet boundary are all unequal treaties imposed on China by tsarist Russian imperialism. But taking into consideration the fact that it was tsarist Russian imperialism which compelled China to sign these treaties when power was in the hands of neither the Chinese people nor the Russian people and the Soviet people bear no responsibility and that large numbers of Soviet labouring people have lived on the land over a long period of time, the Chinese Government, out of the desire to safeguard the revolutionary friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples, is still ready to take these unequal treaties as the basis for determining the entire alignment of

the boundary line between the two countries and for settling all existing questions relating to the boundary. Any side which occupies the territory of the other side in violation of the treaties must, in principle, return it wholly and unconditionally to the other side, and this brooks no ambiguity. The Chinese Government maintains that what should be done is to hold negotiations for the overall settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question and the conclusion of a new equal treaty to replace the old unequal ones, and not to hold "consultations" for "clarification on individual sectors of the Soviet-Chinese state border line".

Of course, on the premise that the treaties relating to the present Sino-Soviet boundary are taken as the basis, necessary adjustments at individual places on the boundary can be made in accordance with the principles of consultation on an equal footing and of mutual understanding and

mutual accommodation. But it is absolutely impermissible to take such a truculent attitude: What the tsars occupied is yours, and what you want to occupy is yours, too.

In order to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question, the Soviet Government must stop all its provocations and armed threats on the Sino-Soviet border. Neither a small war, nor a big war, nor a nuclear war can ever intimidate the Chinese people. The Chinese Government once again proposes: Each side ensures that it shall maintain the status quo of the boundary and not push forward by any means the line of actual control on the border, and that in sectors where a river forms the boundary, the frontier guards of its side shall not cross the central line of the main channel and of the main waterway; each side ensures that it shall avert conflicts and that under no circumstances shall the frontier guards of its side fire at the other side;

there should be no interference in the normal productive activities carried out by the border inhabitants of both sides according to habitual practice.

The Chinese Government holds that negotiations are intended for settling questions and not for deceiving the people. To make serious negotiations possible, it is essential to adopt an honest attitude, and not a hypocritical attitude. In its note of April 11 to the Chinese Government, the Soviet Government suggested that "consultations" start right on April 15 in Moscow and, without waiting for a reply from the Chinese Government, it published the note on the following day. This attitude of the Soviet Government's is far from being serious, to say the least. The Chinese Government proposes that the date and place for the Sino-Soviet boundary negotiations be discussed and decided upon by both sides through diplomatic channels.

The Chinese Government hopes that the Soviet Government will make a positive response to the above proposals.

The Soviet Government will have completely miscalculated if it should take the Chinese Government's stand for a peaceful settlement of the boundary question as a sign that China is weak and can be bullied, thinking that the Chinese people can be cowed by its policy of nuclear blackmail and that it can realize its territorial claims against China by means of war. Armed with Mao Tsetung Thought and tempered through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the 700 million Chinese people are not to be bullied. The Chinese people's great leader Chairman Mao has taught us: **"We will not attack unless we are attacked; if we are attacked, we will certainly counter-attack."** "As far as our own desire is concerned, we don't want to fight even for a single day. But if circumstances force us to fight, we can fight to the finish." This is the answer of the Chinese

Government and people to the Soviet Government's policies of war and nuclear blackmail.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Marx, "The British and Chinese Treaty", *Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Chinese ed., Vol. 12, pp. 625-26.

<sup>2</sup> Engels, "The Progress of Russia in Far-East", *Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Chinese ed., Vol. 12, p. 662, p. 664.

<sup>3</sup> Lenin, "The War in China", *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 4, pp. 335-36, p. 338.

<sup>4</sup> Lenin, "Socialism and War", *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 21, pp. 280-81.

<sup>5</sup> Lenin, "The War in China", *Collected Works*, Chinese ed., Vol. 4, p. 336.

## NOTE OF THE HSINHUA NEWS AGENCY ON THE PUBLICATION OF THE FULL TEXT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S STATEMENT OF MARCH 29

(May 24, 1969)

On March 29, the Soviet Government produced a statement on the Sino-Soviet boundary question. In this statement, flaunting the signboard of resuming "consultations", the Soviet Government did its utmost to distort the truth about the Chenpao Island incident and the Sino-Soviet boundary question and wantonly slandered and attacked China with its habitual tactics of standing facts on their

head and of a thief crying "stop thief", attempting to cover up its crimes of pursuing its social-imperialist policy of aggression, encroaching upon Chinese territory and provoking armed conflicts. On April 11, the Soviet Government further addressed a note to the Chinese side, pressing the latter to arrive in Moscow within four days for "consultations" with it on the Sino-Soviet boundary question and, without waiting for a reply from the Chinese Government, it made public the note on April 12. On April 14, the Chinese Government told the Soviet Government in explicit terms: "We will give you a reply, please calm down a little and do not get excited." However, unable to restrain itself, the Soviet Government hastily jumped out and clamoured that the Chinese Government had tried by every possible means to conceal from the Chinese people the content of the statement of the Government of the USSR.

We now publish in full the text of the statement of the Soviet Government. This statement is an excellent piece of teaching material by negative example. From this statement, people can see even more clearly the true features of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism, and they can also see to what depths the new tsars of today have sunk in trying to realize their fond dream of territorial expansion!

Here we would like to ask the Soviet Government to do the same and publish in full the text of the statement of the Chinese Government in the Soviet press. Please do so if you do not have a guilty conscience and are not cowardly and if you do not want to "conceal" it from the Soviet people!

中华人民共和国政府声明  
(一九六九年五月二十四日)

\*

外文出版社出版(北京)  
1969年(64开)第一版  
编号:(英)3050-2043  
00012  
3-E-1204Pc