

to send accredited negotiators before June 25 and the continued opposition of the Tibetans—which might, I thought, be considered by His Majesty's Government sufficient justification for departing in some slight degree from the policy which on June 2, before they were completely aware of the nature of the Tibetan position, commended itself to them. Lord Lansdowne had said in April in the House of Lords, referring then to the policy laid down in the telegram of November 6, 1903, that he did not mean to say that, "whatever happened, we were never to move an inch beyond the limits therein laid down." And I thought that the policy settled in London, before Government were aware of the conditions I should find at Lhasa, would admit of some little elasticity.

Then, as regards the nature of the pledges themselves. The pledges given were that, "so long as no other Power endeavours to intervene in the affairs of Tibet, they [His Majesty's Government] will not attempt either to annex it, to establish a protectorate over it, or in any way to control its internal administration."

The question was, "Did the right to occupy the Chumbi Valley for seventy-five years, as security for the payment of an indemnity, involve a breach of this pledge?" Burma, in somewhat similar circumstances, we had annexed, but that meant turning out the native rulers, constituting a Government of our own, and stationing garrisons at the capital and throughout the country. Over Native States in India we established protectorates, but that necessarily involved subordinating their foreign relations to our own. In many of them we controlled the internal administration, but only by agents of Government being deputed especially for that purpose. Would the occupation of Chumbi, a valley lying altogether outside Tibet proper, on the Indian and not on the Tibetan side of the watershed, a valley which had not always belonged to Tibet, mean annexing Tibet, establishing a protectorate over it, or controlling its internal administration? This was the question I asked myself, and I answered it in the negative. I said to myself it involved none of the