

residents in Chiamdo had to serve the Lamasery. At the end of last year there was a great deal of unrest, this traveller reported, among the Tibetans in this and other parts of Tibet owing to the appointment of Chao, whom they feared and hated, and everywhere they were preparing and drilling soldiers, and in some places had already declared their independence, and refused to give transport to Chinese officials travelling.

Chao, however, early in 1910 was entirely successful in his operations, and occupied Chiamdo, Draya, and Kiangka without suffering any casualties.

Such were the relations between the Chinese and Tibetans in those parts not directly under the Lhasa Government. That they must have profoundly affected the inhabitants of Tibet proper must be very evident, and what the effect was I will relate after I first traced the relations between the Tibetans and ourselves at this time and followed the adventures of the Dalai Lama himself.

Returning, then, to the relations between ourselves and the Tibetans on the other side of Tibet, we find representations being made by both parties as to what each considered breaches of the Treaty by the other. The Tibetans objected to our administering Chumbi during our occupation, and we objected to their reconstruction of the fortifications of Gyantse Jong.

The Government of India replied to the Tibetans that the action taken by us in the Chumbi Valley called for no explanation or defence, as it was in strict accordance with the terms of the Treaty. As we subsequently gave up the Valley, the point is not of any importance.

On the other hand, by levying trade dues at Phari, by the stoppage of free trade *via* Khamba Jong, by the stoppage of the letters of the British Trade Agent at Gartok, and by their failure to pull down defence walls on the road between Gyantse and Lhasa, Captain O'Connor considered\* that the Tibetans had clearly contravened the provisions of the Treaty.

\* Blue-book, IV., p. 41.