

**PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT IN THE LOK SABHA ON 23 MARCH  
1959**

**"A CLASH OF WILLS"**

Recent reports about happenings in the Tibet region of China have naturally aroused a great deal of interest in the country. The sequence of events is not clear to us. But I should like to make a brief statement on the principal facts in so far as we know them. Last week, on the 17th March, in the course of the discussion on the Demands for the Ministry of External Affairs, I referred briefly to the tense situation there. I mentioned that there had been a clash of wills although no major violence had occurred recently.

We have since received fuller information from our Consul General in Lhasa. It appears that various rumours in regard to the Dalai Lama caused excitement in Lhasa. About two weeks ago, a large crowd of Tibetans entered the premises of the Indian Consulate General. They spoke to our Consul General about the rumours and their apprehensions. Three days later, a large number of Tibetan women came to our Consulate General and requested our Consul General to accompany them to the Chinese Foreign Bureau and be a witness to their presenting certain demands. The Consul General told them that this was not proper and he could not accompany them or associate himself with any demonstration. The Consul General brought these incidents to the notice of the Chinese Foreign Bureau at Lhasa. He had rightly decided not to interfere in these internal affairs.

On the 20th March, fighting suddenly broke out between the Chinese troops and Tibetan elements. There was firing in the vicinity of our Consulate General and some stray bullets hit our building. For some time it was not possible for the Consul General to go out of the premises. All our staff and their families are safe and no significant damage to property has been reported. Apparently, the situation in Lhasa has somewhat quietened down.

There are about thirty members of our staff in the Consulate General at Lhasa. Together with their families the number is about 100. There are about sixteen other nationals in the Lhasa region about whom we have no full information at present.

As soon as the fighting broke out in Lhasa, we requested the Chinese Government, through our Ambassador in Peking and the Chinese Ambassador here, to ensure the fullest protection to our personnel and properties in Lhasa and they promised to do so. On the 21st March, a representative of the Chinese Foreign Bureau in Lhasa called on our Consul General and suggested to him that for the better protection of himself and his staff, they should move into the Foreign Bureau. We have instructed our Consul General to inform the Foreign Bureau that it will not be right or proper for our Consul General to leave the premises. A large number of Indian nationals are involved, including the families of our personnel, and there are valuable properties and records within our premises. In accordance with international law and usage, our Consul General and his staff and our records and properties are entitled to the fullest protection and we have no doubt that the Chinese Government will see the reasonableness of our request.

This outbreak of violence in Lhasa itself is a new development. Previously there had been conflicts in various parts of southern Tibet between the Khampas and the Chinese forces. But the Lhasa region had remained quiet.

The House will appreciate that this is a difficult and delicate situation and we should avoid doing anything which will worsen it. We have no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of China with whom we have friendly relations. In 1954 the Sino-Indian Agreement was concluded. It was in that fact, for the first time, the principle of Panch Sheel was stated.

There is a long tradition of cultural and religious ties between India and Tibet region of China. In this region lie many places of Pilgrimage which are considered holy by both Hindus and Buddhists and large numbers of our people visit them every year. The Dalai Lama, whom we had the honour and pleasure of receiving in our country in 1956-57, is held in high

eneration by our people and we hope he is safe. We earnestly trust that the present troubles will be resolved peacefully.

Our Consul General at Lhasa and his staff are in a difficult situation for reasons beyond their control. I have no doubt that the House will wish me to send our best wishes on this occasion to him and to our other representatives in the Tibetan region.

**PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT IN THE LOK SABHA**  
**ON 30 MARCH 1959**

MR. SPEAKER: It is clear that there is no question of censure involved in this. All Hon. Members are anxious to know as to what exactly is the matter.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: These adjournment motions as adjournment motions, if I may say so, can hardly arise. But so far as I am concerned, I do not wish to take shelter under any technical plea of not giving any information that I think ought to be given. Indeed subject to certain very broad considerations to which Shri Tyagi referred I wish to place all the information that we get before the House as it comes and in and I propose to do so in the future too. It is not necessary for Hon. Members to demand a statement from me but I shall do so whenever any important piece of information comes. I shall place it before the House.

At the present moment we have a mass of statements in the press, rumours, allegations, statements of the Chinese Government from which it is a little difficult to sort out exactly the truth of what is happening. We have one thing on which you can certainly say that there it is. There are press communiqués issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China. I do not understand why hon. Members bring in the news agency in this matter. It is a Government communiqué and the news agency did a completely right thing in placing the official communiqué before us and before the public. You may not like the wording of the communiqué or the content of it. That is a different matter. But it is the duty of a news agency to deal with such an important matter and not to suppress it but to place it before the public.

**MASSING OF TROOPS**

May I also refer to what, for instance, Hon. Members Shri Imam has talked about the massing of troops. Now I am completely unaware of this. In fact, I have not heard a rumour to that effect, leave out the facts. And

he wants an adjournment motion because there is massing of troops on the Indian border.

MR. MOHAMMED IMAM: That is the word I used in my adjournment motion.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: All kinds of things are appearing in the press which again are based sometimes presumably on reports not from within Tibet but from outside Tibet, whether it is Hong Kong or whether it is any other place. I do not say that any such rumour must necessarily be wrong. How can I say that? But, normally speaking, they are not correct. Any how, my information is that there are no massing of troops on the Indian border, so far as I know. How can I discuss it when I do not accept that fact?

But, the major things that we have to consider are as I said on the last occasion, the contacts of India with Tibet are very old, geographical, of course, trade, of course, but much more so, cultural and religious. Vast numbers of pilgrims go from here there and some come from Tibet to India. So that, this contact, this relationship is something deeper than the changing political scene. Naturally we are affected by it. Apart from that, as I said on the last occasion, large numbers of people in India venerate the Dalai Lama, respect him very greatly and he was our guest, honoured guest some time ago. Because of these contacts our reaction to anything that happens in Tibet is bound to be very deep, as we see it. It is not for me to object to those reactions. But, we have to bear them in mind.

#### ASYLUM QUESTION

May I say that all these questions that have been recently put about giving political asylum are, probably, of no service at all to the people who might seek political asylum in India? It is no good. One has to see the difficult situation as it is and not merely create conditions which make it more difficult to deal with the situation or deal with the persons seeking political asylum. There it is. Whatever I say in regard to that will make

more difficult for these people, I say. So that, on the one side there is this feeling of a certain kinship, If I may use that word, cultural kinship between the people of India and the people of Tibet.

That, of course, does not mean that we interfere in Tibet, in any way. We did interfere, not we, I mean, but the previous Government of India took an expedition to Lhasa under Col. Younghusband, 55 years ago. It very much interfered, imperialist intervention. They sat down there and imposed the British Government's will , acting through the then Government of India, on Tibet and imposed our troops there in Tibet, in Yatsung, Gyantse. All kinds of extra-territorial privileges were imposed on Tibet because Tibet was weak and there was the British Empire. With some variations, we inherited these special extraterritorial privileges when India became independent.

Regardless of what happened in Tibet or China or anywhere, we could not, according to our own policy, maintain our forces in a foreign country, even if there had been no change in Tibet. That was a relic of British imperialism which we did not wish to continue. We had to withdraw them back. It so happened that soon after this change in the Government in China-about that time, soon after-their armies marched into Tibet. What I am venturing to say is that the policy we adopted towards Tibet would have been withdrawn our forces, etc. That was the main thing we did.

MR. BRAJ RJ SINGH: There, everybody agrees.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : Apparently people seem to imagine that we surrendered some privileges in Tibet. The privileges which we surrendered in Tibet were privileges which we do not seek to have in any other country in the world, Tibet or any other. It was patent from the strictly practical point of view, even apart from sentiment, that we could not do anything in Tibet either in law, constitutionally or practically.

TIBETAN AUTONOMY

Our attitude and historically, previously- I am not going to the past history of 500 years-the position of all previous Governments in India and elsewhere has been the recognition of some kind of suzerainty or sovereignty of China over Tibet and Tibetan autonomy. That was normally the basis of approach. The measure of the autonomy has varied , because the strength of China, or the weakness of China, the strength of Tibet, and the weakness of Tibet has varied in the course of the last hundreds of years. But, that Many Governments in Tibet have repudiated that. So, there is . Anyhow, we could not become judges or interfere or intervene either in law, or in fact, or in the circumstances, we could do nothing. That is just past history.

May I say one thing to the House? When the Premier of the Chinese Government came here three or four years ago or two and a half years ago, he discussed this question of situation in Tibet with me at his own instance. I did not raise it so far as I remember. He told me then that Tibet had always been, according to him and according to the Chinese position, a part of the Chinese State; that is, they have always claimed it and they have had it according to him; but yet, Tibet was not China. Tibet is not China; Tibet is not a province of China. Tibet is an autonomous region which has been a part of the Chinese State. That was, as far as I remember, his words. Therefore, we want to treat it as an autonomous region and give it full autonomy. That is how he explained the Chinese Government's attitude to Tibet. All I can say is that we had to recognise Chinese Sovereignty over Tibet. But I was glad to hear Mr. Chou En-lai laying such stress on Tibetan autonomy. I said , if this was fully acted upon and was well known to Tibetans, possibly the difficulties would be less, because, I remember , difficulties had arisen already, three years ago.

For nearly three years, there has been what is called the Khampa revolt in China. Khampa region, although it consists of people of Tibetan origin, is not technically Tibet now. About 50 or 60 years ago, the Khampa region in eastern Tibet was incorporated in China. It was never really adequately controlled or ruled by any authority, Tibetan or Chinese, because

Khampas are mountain people, rather tough people, not liking anybody ruling them.

#### KHAMPA REBELS

When the Chinese Government came in, quite apart from Tibet proper, the Khampa region was in China proper. They started introducing their new reforms or changes, whatever they did in land or otherwise in the Khampa region. That brought them into trouble with the Khampas in Tibet-not actually in Tibet, but the Tibetans in China, you may say. That trouble started two or three years ago or more than that-about three years ago, locally confined there. Then it spread and it spread to the south and south-east chiefly. Naturally one does not have details. But, it was a kind of guerrilla activities which went on causing much trouble to both the parties and damage and all that. That has been continuing. When the Premier Chou En-lai talked to me, this Khampa trouble had started. It is a kind of trouble which is of great military importance to every Government not that; it is a nuisance and it prevents things from settling down. That has been continuing. Nothing new has happened except that in some border some convoy has been attacked or taken away or something has been happening. The new thing, what has happened in Lhasa, may I say, has not flown from that it is really a completely new development. The very matter was mentioned by me in this House and to the press here the moment we heard of fighting there. Previous to that, only a few days previously, I had spoken in this House and talked about the conflict of wills there.

I thought that expression was a good expression to describe what was happening there because there was no violence at that stage. Nobody had hit anybody. But this conflict had come out in the open in the sense of people talking in the open. It lasted three, four or five days when actual firing began. I cannot say who began it, but it began. Normally, one would say that where it is a question of military might, the Chinese Government is much stronger than some kind of local recruits of the Tibetan army. It is obvious. So, that has been the background of it.



Now, it is unfortunate that all this damage is done. I do not know what damage has been done, but some considerable damage has been done to some of the old monasteries in Lhasa, and may be, some valued manuscripts have suffered thereby ; and all that has happened, and our sympathies go out very much to the Tibetans.....

MR. JAIPAL SINGH: Hear, hear.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: ...quite apart from the actual incidents, what happened, who was to blame and who was not to blame.

In the press today, the Chinese news agency has published some letters, which , it is said, have been written by the Dalai Lama to the Chinese Governor, the Military Governor of Lhasa, just in this month. I would not like to say anything about those letters. I should like to have a little greater confirmation about them, about what they are, in what circumstances they were written, whether they were written at all. It is very difficult ; because all these things are being said by various parties, it is exceedingly difficult to sift the truth out of this lot of chaff. And whatever I may say, whatever my Government may do, may have far-reaching consequences.

#### NO DICTATION

We talk about Tibet, and we want to have friendly relations with the people of Tibet and we want them to progress in freedom and all that. At the same time, it is important for us to have friendly relations with this great country of China. That does not mean that I or this Government or this Parliament or anyone else should submit to any kind of dictation from any country, however great or big it may be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That is not the point. But it also does mean that in a difficult situation, we should exercise a certain measure of

restraint and wisdom in dealing with her, and not in an excited moment do something which may lead our country into difficulties. (Interruptions) Today is the 30th of this month. It was on the 20th, the early morning of the 20th, that firing began-it is now ten days- in a country from which no news comes, except rumour. The only news that has come to us or to the wide world- I am leaving out China; they might have some special ways of getting news-the only news that came was from our Consul General's telegrams to us. We got them pretty rapidly.

But what can the Consul General report? Remember that too. The Consul General reports by and large what he sees from the window of his consulate. Obviously, he cannot tell us what is happening all over Tibet. He does not know. He is in touch with Lhasa, and more or less Lhasa is what he can see from his consulate, just round about what buildings firing took place, and he can report it. He cannot even tell us what is happening in Lhasa itself. He cannot tell us precisely and definitely what has happened to our nationals who are spread out. He can tell us definitely that our staff in our consulate is safe. He can tell us that so far as he knows our other Indian nationals are safe, but he is not certain because he just cannot reach them, so that all news has been cut off, and it comes to us in extremely small dribbles, news that we can rely upon. And it becomes difficult for me to make statements or say that we shall take some action, because of vague rumours which are obviously not always reliable.

Now, may I just say one word-I think I have answered it about the people from Ladakh? It has been the old custom of people from Ladakh to go to Lhasa, and they do not take any travel papers or anything. They go for courses of instruction. Lhasa is in sense their spiritual centre, their educational centre, from the Buddhist point of view. So, plenty of people go there. At the present moment, I have been informed that four abbots from Leh are there, as well as I forget the number-about 30, or 40 or 50- or it may be somewhere about a hundred-monks and others who have gone there. We have not got them on our register there, because they

simply come and go, and do not report to us. But as soon as I heard about this two days ago, we are making inquiries about them.

#### CHINESE STATEMENTS

Now, I come to the statements issued presumably by the Chinese Government. Now, these statements give a narrative of facts according to them, and I have nothing to say to that. I can neither confirm it or deny it, because it is not in my knowledge to make a firm statement; if it was I would make it.

As I said, so far as the letters which are said to have been written by the Dalai Lama are concerned, they are rather surprising letters. But more I cannot say; I should like to know more about them before I say.

There are two things mentioned in this statement of the Chinese authorities. One is about Kalimpong. About that, as soon as that appeared, the External Affairs Ministry, through a spokesman, contradicted that statement or corrected it. I suppose Hon. Members have seen it, but I shall read it out or part of it, if they have not:

*Asked for his comments on the description of Kalimpong as "the commanding centre of the rebellion" in the news communiqué released....an official spokes-man of the Ministry of External Affairs emphatically repudiated the suggestion. He said that a number of people from Tibet have been residing in Kalimpong for many years...*

*Many years meaning twenty, thirty, forty, fifty and more-... and among them are some who arrived during the last three or four years. It is not many, it may be in dozens, perhaps.*

*The Government of India have repeatedly made it clear to them that they should not indulge in any propaganda activities against a friendly Government on Indian soil. The last warning was given about six months ago since then these persons have remained quiet. There have been no unlawful activities in Kalimpong or elsewhere either by these people or others. It is , therefore, entirely incorrect to say that Kalimpong is the centre of any rebellious activities. The check-posts on the Indian-Tibet are*

*adequately manned and the strictest watch is always maintained on movements between India and Tibet.*

#### CHINESE COMPLAINT

Now, an Hon. Member wanted precise information as to whether the Chinese Government had complained to us about Kalimpong. I shall tell him, so far as I can remember, in the last few months, maybe, a year, there has been no complaint; but there were on two occasions perhaps, two or maybe three in the last three or four years, references to Kalimpong, to some people who came from Tibet, important people, that "You are welcome to come here, but we cannot allow Indian soil to be used for subversive activities or even aggressively propagandist activities against friendly Governments." That general policy of ours applies to every Embassy that is here ; may be sometimes, they overstep the mark or we do not object when we might have objected. That applies to every Embassy here or every foreigner here. So that was the rule that we followed. And on two or three occasions, some leaflet came out in Kalimpong, which we thought was undesirable, and we drew the attention of the people who had brought it out, saying "You should not do this, this kind of thing from Indian soil." And our instructions and warnings had effect, so far as we know we are not aware, in fact, in the last many months, of any activity in Kalimpong; it may be in people's minds there ; naturally, they may have feelings; they may have sentiments. But I am merely saying that it is wrong to say that Kalimpong was a kind of centre from which activities were organised.

MRS. RENU CHAKRAVARTTY: Has the Prime Minister read Elizabeth Patridge's article which has come in one of the papers where she says that she has contacted the rebels? It has come out in the papers.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have not read particular article. I do not know to which article the Hon. Lady Member is referring. In one or two cases foreign correspondents have gone and talked to people their in Kalimpong,

or it may be elsewhere, but they have not mentioned names or the place or the individuals contacted. And they have given an account from the point of view, more or less, of those people in Tibet, who were on the site of the revolt. That I cannot catch, I cannot get it, but broadly speaking, it is wrong to say that Kalimpong has been the centre. Certainly, we have very good control of our check-posts, of people coming and going from Tibet to India, and nobody in Kalimpong can easily come or go, and you cannot control something where the movement is not easy.

I am told that when we enquired about Elizabeth Patridge's article, we found she had not gone anywhere near the border ; she had written it from far away.

#### DISCUSSION IN PARLIAMENT

The second point to which reference has been made by Hon. Members is to what is said in those press statements about our discussions here. It is not necessary for me to say that it is open to this House, this Parliament, and it is completely free to say or do what it chooses, to discuss any matter it chooses subject always to the necessities of good sense and wisdom of which you, Sir, are the best judge. Nobody else outside this House is going to judge.

Unfortunately, the methods of government and the way legislatures and organisations function in China are different from ours. Perhaps it is not quite realised there, the background or the way of our functioning. Quite apart from what we do, or whether what any Hon. Members says is right or wrong thing, as many Hon. Members on the opposite side know very well.

MR. HEM BARUA: You enjoy that right equally

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is suppose, a little difficult for people trained in a different tradition for a long time to understand the normal ways in which a parliamentary system of government functions, and we should not be over-eager to find fault with somebody who does not agree with us,

who describes our system in a different way, but certainly it should be made perfectly clear to all concerned that this Parliament is not going to be limited in the exercise of its right of discussion, saying or action or anything, by any external or internal authority, whoever it may be. Having said that, obviously that right has to be exercised always with wisdom and always thinking of the consequences , and how that right should be exercised.

**PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT IN THE LOK SABHA**  
**ON 2 APRIL 1959**

Mr. Speaker, Sir I must express my deep regret for my absence yesterday from the House as I had gone out of Delhi. Since my return this morning, I have tried to get myself acquainted with what happened in the House by reading the official reports. I have not read any newspaper yet. I do not know what the newspapers say. I think the official reports would naturally be more reliable. I must say, reading them, although I got a gist of what happened, I sensed that much of what happened yesterday was -shall I say- I wish to say nothing disrespectful but there was an exhibition of a certain lack of restraint, if I may say so, and certain strong feelings which came in the way of the consideration of the matter that was placed before you and before the House.

Now, the matter is important and I can very well understand the strong feelings and the matter is important not because of the one or two or more adjournment motions that were moved here not because of what lies behind those motions. It is that which, has led to strong feelings in the House and in the country. The actual motions were perhaps not very important but the other thing is important. Because the other thing is important, it is all the more necessary that we should not be led away by relatively extraneous or minor matters into doing or saying things which affect the other major things at issue. They are big things at issue and in that matter I cannot say that every Member of this House is of identical opinion. But I do think that nearly all the Members of this House will broadly agree- I imagine so and anyhow whether large or not, we have to realise-the importance of what is happening and the consequences of what is happening. We have to shape our policy keeping full regard naturally, the first thing, for the honour and dignity of the causes for which we stand. Also, we must remember that when conflicts arise which lead to this certain degree of passion on various sides one has to be particularly careful, especially this Honourable House whose words go out to the ends of the earth. We have to be particularly careful at a moment

of difficulty such as this, that we function and we say whatever we have to say with dignity and as I ventured to say last time, wisdom. That does not mean moderating the policy. We follow the policy which the House will ultimately agree to.

#### COMMUNIST PARTY STATEMENT

Now, Sir, the two matters, as far as I can gather, that were raised yesterday in two adjournment motions were a statement issued by the Communist Party of India and the circulation of an article in the People's Daily of Peking, circulation presumably by an agency attached to the Chinese Embassy here. These were the two matters, if I am not mistaken.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, they are the two matters.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Before I deal with them, may I, Sir, mention one thing. Perhaps you have, Sir, another adjournment motion today. I have received notice of it and I do not know whether you have been pleased to consider it, but I might also deal with that adjournment motion. There is an adjournment motion- there are two in fact-asking me, first of all, as to whether there is any truth that the Chinese authorities have expressed a wish to search the premises of Indian missions in Tibet or asked us to vacate those premises. Now, here is an instance of every humour, which are appearing in newspapers in great abundance, affecting the people being brought into the House by way of an adjournment motion or some other motion. There is no truth in this at all. Nobody has asked us to vacate our premises. Nobody has asked us to us to search our missions abroad. But everything comes in the shape of an adjournment motion or asking me to make a statement. It is very difficult to keep pace with the amount of statements which are appearing in the press now, coming chiefly from Kalimpong or Hong Kong - those appear to be the two sources of information. Anyhow, there is no truth in that.

Then , again, there was another adjournment motion asking me whether it is true that the Chinese Embassy sent for a top leader of the Communist



Party of India to discuss various matters, with them. Now, how am I to know, Sir? I do not. I have no information on the subject. I can say nothing.

#### TIBETAN'S VISIT

Another matter-it is not the subject of an adjournment motion, I think I was asked to make a statement on it-is the visit, as it is said, of a group of Tibetans to me a day or two ago. Now, day before yesterday a large number, about 125 people came to visit me. Normally speaking, Sir, every morning in my house a few hundred people come. It an open door more or less. Large numbers of peasants, students and other come because, unfortunately, I am supposed to be one of the sights of Delhi.

Anyhow, about these 125 people, they said they had come to Delhi and wanted to pay their respects to me. I said, certainly come. The great majority of them were Indian nationals, chiefly from Darjeeling, Kalimpong and those northern areas. Some were from Calcutta, that is to say, Indian nationals of Tibetan origin representing some association in Calcutta, Banaras, Kalimpong and others. There were a few, I forget how many people from Tibet proper who had gathered here some days ago. They came. We had no discussion. They did give me a paper, a kind of a memorandum which I took, and then I bid good-bye to them. That is all that happened.

Coming to the two matters which were referred to yesterday, one was the statement of the Communist party of India. Now I have, naturally, endeavoured to get a copy of that statement and read it carefully, I presume that it is a correct copy that I have. I have no reason to doubt its correctness, but I cannot guarantee that.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been given an alternative copy. If there is any difference I will point out.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Well, I am not going to read it, Sir, but I take it that I have a correct copy. I have read it carefully and, if I may express

my opinion about it, the whole background of the statement is not one with which I would agree. I do not agree. But the question before us, I take it, is not whether we agree with the statement or not, slant given in that statement or not, but, rather, if any great impropriety has been committed by the issue of that statement. I am not myself quite clear how, normally speaking, if a statement is issued by a political party outside that statement becomes the subject matter of an adjournment motion in this House. It is not clear to me. Of course, each case depends upon the content but, broadly speaking-whether one agrees with the statement or disagrees is a completely different matter-political parties sometimes attack each other, criticise each other, or say something which another party may consider very objectionable. But, nevertheless, it is not clear to me how this matter can be raised by way of an adjournment motion.

Now, it has been stated that it was raised because this statement challenged the bona fides of what I had said two days before about Kalimpong. I have read the statement carefully. What I would say is this, that it does not precisely and explicitly do that. But it does certainly throw a hint that what I might have said, whether through misinformation or otherwise, might not be correct, so that I do not quite know what to do about it.

#### KALIMPONG

I shall repeat and, perhaps, a little more fully what I did previously what I said about Kalimpong. You will remember, Sir, that in certain statements issued by the Chinese Government Kalimpong was referred to as the commanding centre of the Tibetan rebellion, and I said this is not true at all, and the External Affairs Ministry had also denied this. At the same time, I had said that I have often said that Kalimpong has been centre of trouble.

Kalimpong, Sir, has been often described as a nest of spies, spies of innumerable nationalities, not one, spies, spies from Asia, spies from Europe, spies from America, spies of Communists, spies of anti-

Communists , red spies, white spies, blue spies, pink spies and so on. Once a knowledgeable person who knew something about this matter and was in Kalimpong actually said to me, though no doubt it was a figure of speech, that there were probably more spies in Kalimpong than the rest of the inhabitants put together. That is an exaggeration. But it has become in the last few years, especially in the last seven or eight years. As Kalimpong is more or less perched near the borders of India, and since the developments in Tibet some years ago since a change took place there, it became of a great interest to all kinds of people outside India, and many people have come here in various guises, sometimes as technical people, sometimes as bird watchers, sometimes as geologists, sometimes as journalists and sometimes with some other purpose, just to admire the natural scenery, and so they all seem to find an interest ; the main object of their interest; the main object of their interest, whether it is bird watching or something else, was round about Kalimpong.

#### UNDESIRABLE PERSONS

Naturally we have taken interest in this. We have to . While we cannot say that we know exactly everything that took place there, broadly we do know and we have repeatedly taken objection to those persons concerned or to their Embassies. We have pointed this out and we have in the past even hinted that some people better remove themselves from there, and they have removed themselves. This has been going on for the last few years so there is no doubt that so far as Kalimpong is concerned there has been a deal of espionage and counter-espionage and a complicated game of chess by various nationalities and various members of spies and counter-spies there. No doubt a person with the ability to write fiction of this kind will find Kalimpong an interesting place for some novel of that type.

MR. NATH PAI: What is the Home Ministry doing about it? It seems to be absolutely ineffective.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Absolutely yes, first of all, because when we suspect a person of espionage we keep a watch over him. If he does something patently wrong we take action, but there are certain limitations in the law, as the House very well knows, and we cannot function merely because we suspect somebody, and we have taken action in the past in regard to some people.

Mr. P.N.SINGH: In how many cases action has been taken?

Mr. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I cannot say that-actions of various types, as I said.

#### CHINESE STATEMENT

Now, about this particular matter, the statement by the Chinese Government, please remember the statement, "this was the commanding centre of Tibetan rebellion". I cannot say-how can I that nobody in Kalimpong has indulged in espionage against the Chinese Government or against any Chinese Government or against any other Government. I cannot say. Somebody whispers something to somebody else's ear. But I did repudiate and I repudiate to day that to say Kalimpong has been the commanding centre gives it a place in this matter which is, I think, completely untrue.

Now, in the past several years-and I said so on the last occasion the Chinese Government has drawn our attention to what they said were activities in the Kalimpong area, that is activities aimed against them. And repeatedly we have made enquiries; apart from our normal enquiries we have made special enquiries. I say this because I find that in the Communist Party's statement we are asked to have an investigation. In so far as espionage activities are concerned we have investigated them several times. One cannot investigate these activities in any other way except through intelligence methods. That is being done. We have fairly full reports about it. I have got I need not go into it - a fairly full note as to when the protest came from the Chinese Government. Three or four

years ago it was mentioned to me and it was mentioned to our Ambassador some years ago, and we enquired and we took action. Sometimes we found that their protests or the facts that they stated did not have any particular basis. They would say, for instance, that an organisation in Kalimpong was doing something or other. We found there was no such organisation in Kalimpong at all. There were organisations there; there were of course people in Kalimpong. Everybody knows that. There are some emigrants from Tibet. There are old Tibetans, that is to say, who have been there for a generation or more, but whose feelings may be against the Chinese Government. That is so; there is no doubt about it, and we cannot do anything about it but we did make it perfectly clear to them in accordance with our normal policy that they must not indulge in any propagandist activities and much less, of course, in any subversive activities.

#### NO SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY

In the nature of things they could not do much even if they wanted to intimate except perhaps-I cannot guarantee that-occasionally send a message or receive a message. It is very difficult to stop that but that is on a very small scale. They could not do very much in India except again to whisper something in somebody's ears. That I cannot stop. They may have whispered something here and there. But it is obvious to me that they could not do much and they did not. Once or twice a certain leaflet or certain document was issued ; somebody issued it. The moment it was issued we took action. We tried to trace it and we told them that they must not have been done. This has happened on three or four occasions. Again I repeat - we were charged with - it was said that Kalimpong was a commanding centre of the Tibetan rebellion. I denied that statement and I further said that apart from the last few years when there has occasionally been a paper or a leaflet or occasionally somebody in Kalimpong has perhaps met somebody else, privately and not publicly - that can always take place-and more particularly in the last five or six months, more particularly I might say since we received the last protest from the

Chinese Government- I think the last was early in August last year-we took particular care to enquire again and we had no complaints since then. So, even if some activities took place there by some people there previously they were of a relatively small nature except of course contacts, and what can we say about contacts in a place which, as I said , is so full of spies-there may be contacts, somebody meeting somebody. But in the last six months, we have taken particular care and we have had no cause to think that any such action or activities had taken place there. I cannot conceive that Kalimpong could be-it has been described by the Chinese Government as the commanding centre- a commanding centre with Indian Government not knowing about it. It is quite inconceivable to me. Some old message can go or come and that is possible, but it cannot be and to imagine that the Tibetan rebellion was organised from Kalimpong does seem to me a statement which cannot be justified.

MR. TRIDIB KUMAR CHAUDHURI: Did the Chinese Government in August complain that somebody was organising a rebellion from there?

#### TALK WITH CHINESE PRIME MINISTER

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: No Sir, Not that. They did not talk about rebellion. But so far as our records go, the first mention of it was made informally to us in 1956-57, when Premier Chou En-lai came here and it was mentioned to me and I replied that our policy was that we did not wish our soil-Indian soil-to be used for any subversive activities against a friendly country. But I also pointed out that there were obvious limitations under our law to take action on the basis of suspicion, and I requested his Government to supply me with special cases and that we would immediately enquire and take action if necessary. Then a year and a half later, the same matter was mentioned to our Ambassador in Peking. At that time a photostat copy of a pamphlet which has been circulated in Kalimpong was sent to us. This was about fifteen or sixteen months ago, i.e. in January , 1938. There is no doubt about it that pamphlet was anti-Chinese. But no enquiry and examination, we found that there was no

such association as had been described in that pamphlet itself ,as a matter of fact, was two years old and had been issued in autumn of 1956- some ancient pamphlet which they have got. That pamphlet was a bad one from our point of view, too, but some bogus name was given and somebody had issued it there.

There were, in fact, two association in Kalimpong-one Tibetan Association, which has been in existence for 25 years and odd and the other, the Indo-Tibetan Association brought into being in1954.

The office-bearers of either of these associations were prominent emigrants, but neither of these associations were supposed to be engaged in political activities. In July, 1958, the Foreign Office in Peking presented a memorandum protesting against the use of Kalimpong area as a base for subversive and disruptive activities and five points were mentioned. Some names of persons were given. We immediately enquired into the activities of all these persons and we made detailed reports. We found that no doubt these persons held views which might be said to be anti-Chinese, but we could not get any information of any activity, propagandist or subversive.

#### COLLUSION CHARGE

The charge was made that they were in collusion with the United States and with the Kuomintang authorities of Formosa or their representatives. Some of the prominent emigrants in Kalimpong had previously been in the United States and had lived there for sometime. And , no doubt, they had their contacts there. We had no doubt about their views about it. But we have made it clear to them, even when they settled down in India, that we do not want Indian soil to be used for any subversive activities. Once when some letter or something was sent, we particularly looked into it and all those six who had been named in the Chinese Government's not were given specific warnings on the 14th of August through the Deputy Commissioner of Darjeeling and to our knowledge, since that date, they have not done so. But as I said, I cannot guarantee any secret thing.

There are three organisations mentioned in the Chinese note, viz., the Tibetan Freedom League, the Kalimpong-Tibetan Welfare Conference and the Buddhist Association which were alleged to be engaged in collecting intelligence from Tibet. We could not trace any of these three organisations and so far as we know, they are not in existence. Two other ones which I have mentioned previously were in existence and so far as we know, engaged in non-political activities.

MR. M.P.MISHRA: How did the Chinese get the information?

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The third objection in the Chinese note was to the reactionary views of a monthly called the Tibetan Mirror, which is edited by an Indian national of Ladakhi origin. As a matter of fact, we issued a warning to the editor, but we pointed out to the Chinese that many newspapers in India were far more Anti-Government, i.e. anti-Government of India, and we could not and did not take any legal action against them.

MR. TYAGI: Peking must be inspiring them.

#### CHINESE NOTE

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: A statement was further made in the Chinese note that agents and saboteurs were sent into Tibet and arms were smuggled and dispatched to the rebels. But no evidence was given and we are not aware of a single case. It is not an easy matter to cross the border between India and Tibet. Nobody can guarantee an individual perhaps going cross, but to take arms, etc., was exceedingly difficult, practically impossible, without our knowledge.

Then the Chinese Government protested against agents of the Kuomintang operating in Kalimpong, particularly one gentleman whose name was given. We enquired into this matter...



MR. SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: May I ask whether all these details are necessary?

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I thought they were not necessary; I agree with the Hon. Member. But this matter has been discussed at such considerable length and warmth. We found that this gentleman who had been named had been in Calcutta two years earlier and had presumably returned, because we could not trace him.

Another note was presented to us by the Chinese Ambassador on the 4th August—that was in July, the previous month—drawing our attention to the setting up of a committee in Kalimpong for giving support to resistance against violence by the Tibetan reactionaries and that this committee was forcing people into support of the signature campaign, and also drawing attention to the alleged meeting of fifteen aristocrats wanting to make an appeal for support for Tibet. We enquired into this matter and we gave him our reply that so far as the leaders were concerned, we had already warned them.

The House will see that all this took place in August and there has been to our knowledge nothing which we could have called objectionable, except private expression of opinion—that we cannot guarantee—during this period. Therefore, I venture to say that, in spite of the presence of people in Kalimpong to whom the Chinese Government might object because they were opposed to Chinese Government's policy and all kinds could be made into the basis of a statement that Kalimpong was the commanding centre of the Tibetan rebellion.

MR. KHADILKAR: I would like to know one thing. We have heard so many notes that we have received regarding Kalimpong from Chinese Government. As he mentioned, in 1956, when Chou-En lai was here and when fortunately or unfortunately; Dalai Lama was here, he was reluctant to leave this country and asked for a sanctuary. Through the intervention of our Prime Minister an assurance was given that no repressive measures would be taken by the local Chinese command and on that specific

assurance, he returned. The Prime Minister promised that he would pay a visit soon to see that assurance was carried out.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: What the Hon. Member has said is not at all correct, not at all. There is no question of my getting an assurance from Premier Chou En-lai or his giving it or my asking for it. No such question arose at all. There was a question whether Dalai Lama should visit Kalimpong or not. It was in that connection that was said. Naturally, we were anxious about Dalai Lama's security when we went to Kalimpong or anywhere. We discussed this with Premier Chou En-lai and ultimately the Dalai Lama decided to go there. We had informed the people-the Tibetans and people of Tibetan origin-in Kalimpong that they will have to behave when the Dalai Lama went there. They did it when he went there. So, there is no question of assurance and all that. I do not know from where the Hon. Member got all that.

MR. KHADILKAR: The second information is from Thought.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I would not say anything against that periodical but I can say this particular information is completely basically untrue. I cannot say about one or two sentences, as I have not seen it. But most of the rest of it is untrue.

MR. SADHAN GUPTA: It is only a thought.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Coming to the statement issued by the.....

MR MOHAMMED IMAM: I would like a clarification. It is till August there were anti-Chinese activities at Kalimpong by the spies? Were these things that provoked the Chinese to occupy Tibet? What was the immediate cause that provoked the Chinese Government to occupy Tibet?

MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise.

MR. TYAGI: It is another thought.

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Presumably, the spies came afterwards. About the article in the People's Daily of Peking, first of all, it is not for us to object to any article that appears in a newspaper in Peking. Obviously, if we started objecting we may disagree with them; there are many articles in the world press with which we are not in agreement; some are even very censorious of India or Indian policy—we can answer them. The only point is whether the circulation of that article here was proper or improper. That is it. Now I should like to point out that article appeared in Peking well before they could have had any report of my statement here. I took two days to come across here. But when it appeared in Peking it had no relation to my statement. It appeared, I cannot say the exact time but probably sometime or a few hours before. They could not have had it. But even if they had it, they have every right to do what they like.

Now about the Embassy circulating papers, a question was raised here of, shall I say, breach of diplomatic privilege. There is no such thing. It depends, of course, on how it is done. But reproducing a newspaper article in their own country can certainly not be thought of in that light. It may be an impropriety, it may not be the right thing to do. It is very difficult to draw the line. We have throughout been trying to impress on the various Embassies here that we do not approve of the cold war being brought into India. That is, articles being circulated here, attacking apart from India other countries, in that sense. And on the whole, I would say we have succeeded, not completely; but I must say the foreign embassies here have been good enough to avoid doing many things which I attitude. Now, I do not wish to mention countries, but I may mention one country. If the articles that have often appeared in the Pakistan newspaper were circulated here frequently, well, we would not approve of it, and in fact we have not in the past approved it, because sometimes we consider these articles very objectionable. We cannot stop them. But surely they should not be circulated by an Embassy here. I have given one instance. I can

give many other instances. This is an instance of the very regrettable cold war between Pakistan and India. But in the bigger sphere of the cold war in the world many articles appear which use the strongest language in attacking the other country. We try not to have them circulated here. Well the foreign Embassies have been good enough to cooperate with us in this matter. In this particular matter, as I said, it is anybody's opinion whether this was a very proper thing to do or an improper thing to do, although I would like to draw attention to the actual phrase of it to which objection has perhaps been taken. It is slightly different from the phraseology in the Chinese Government's reference to Kalimpong. Here it says the reactionaries in Tibet etc. "Utilising Kalimpong, which is in a foreign land, as a centre for collusion with imperialism", slightly different from saying that Kalimpong is the commanding centre for collusion. Maybe, that may be explained by saying that somebody met somebody and whispered and as such, that is collusion certainly.

I am merely putting various aspects of this matter. It is an unsavoury matter altogether. But I want the House to deal with this matter with dignity and restraint, because behind all these minor matters lie much bigger matters which we have to face today, tomorrow and the day after, and we should not allow ourselves to be diverted from that major and difficult issue by relatively minor issues.

MR. H.N.MUKERJEE: The Prime Minister has made a statement which surely we appreciate, the tone of it and the details which he has given us. But I find that the material in regard to the investigation of our charges regarding espionage and allied activities concludes round about.

**PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT IN THE LOK SABHA**  
**ON 27 APRIL 1959**

I have made several statements in the House in regard to the developments in Tibet. The last statement was made on April 3, in which I informed the House that the Dalai Lama had entered the territory of the Indian Union with a large entourage. I should like to bring this information up to date and to place such additional facts as we have before the House. A few days ago, the Dalai Lama and his party reached Mussoorie, where Government had made arrangements for their stay. I have had occasion to visit Mussoorie since then and have had a long talk with the Dalai Lama.

In the course of the last few days, reports have reached us that considerable numbers of Tibetans, numbering some thousands, have recently crossed into the Kameng Frontier Division of the Northeast Frontier Agency and some hundreds have also entered the territory of Bhutan. They sought asylum, and we have agreed to this. Such of them as carried arms were disarmed. We do not know the exact number yet. Temporary arrangements are being made in a camp for their maintenance until they can be dispersed in accordance with their wishes and the necessities governing such cases. We could not leave these refugees to their own resources. Apart from the humanitarian considerations involved, there was also the law and order problem to be considered. We are grateful to the Government of Assam for their help and cooperation in this matter.

**SECURITY MEASURES**

So far as the Dalai Lama and his party are concerned, we had to take adequate measures on grounds of security and also to protect them from large numbers of newspaper correspondents, both Indian and foreign, who, in their anxiety to obtain first-hand information in regard to a matter of world importance, were likely to harass and almost overwhelm the Dalai Lama and his party. While we were anxious to give protection to the Dalai

Lama and his party. While we were anxious to give protection to the Dalai Lama and his party, we were agreeable to giving these newspapermen suitable opportunities to see him. I had received an appeal from nearly 75 representatives of news agencies and newspapers from Tezpur requesting me to give them such opportunities. A senior officer of the External Affairs Ministry was, therefore, deputed to proceed to Tezpur in advance to deal with the press representatives and photographers who had assembled in that small town of Assam. This officer made the necessary administrative arrangements to meet, as far as possible, the wishes of the newspapermen to see the Dalai Lama and to photograph him. Soon after entering India, the Dalai Lama indicated his wish to make a statement. We were later informed that this statement would be released at Tezpur: Our officer made arrangements for the distribution of a translation of the statement to the newspaper correspondents.

#### IRRESPONSIBLE CHARGES

In view of certain irresponsible charges made, I should like to make it clear that the Dalai Lama was entirely responsible for this statement as well as a subsequent briefer statement that was made by him from Mussoorie. Our officers had nothing to do with the drafting or preparation of these statements.

I need not tell the House that the Dalai Lama entered India entirely of his own volition. At no time had we suggested that he should come to India. We had naturally given thought to the possibility of his seeking asylum in India and when such a request came, we readily granted it. His entry with a large party in a remote corner of our country created special problems of transport, organisation and security. We deputed an officer to meet the Dalai Lama and his party at Bomdila and to escort them to Mussoorie. The particular officer was selected because he had served as Consul General in Lhasa and therefore was to some extent known to the Dalai Lama and his officials. The selection of Mussoorie for the Dalai Lama's stay was not finalised till his own wishes were ascertained in the matter and he agreed to it. There was no desire on our part to put any undue restrictions on

him, but the special circumstances, certain arrangements had necessarily to be made prevent any mishap. It should be remembered that the various events in Tibet, culminating in the Dalai Lama's departure from Lhasa and entry into India, had created tremendous interest among the people of India and in the world press. After arrival in Mussoorie, steps were taken to prevent the Dalai Lama from being harassed by crowds of people trying to see him as well as by newspaper men. Apart from this, no restrictions about movement were placed on him. He has been told that he and his party can move about Mussoorie according to their wishes. It should be remembered that the Dalai Lama has recently not only had a long strenuous and dangerous journey, but also had harrowing experiences which must affect the nerves of even a hardened person. He is only just 24 years of age.

#### SERIOUS DEVELOPMENTS

These are some bare facts, but behind these facts lie serious developments which may have far-reaching consequences. Tragedy has been and is being enacted in Tibet, passions have been let loose, charges made and language used which cannot but worsen the situation and our relations with our northern neighbour. I am sure that the House will agree with me that in considering matters of such high import, we should exercise restraint and wisdom and use language which is moderate and precise. In these days of cold war, there has been a tendency to use unrestrained language and often to make wild charges without any justification. We have fortunately kept out of the cold war and I hope that on this, as on any other occasion, we shall not use the language of cold war. The matter is too serious to be dealt with in a trivial or excited way. I would, therefore, appeal to the press and the public to exercise restraint in language. I regret that occasionally there have been lapses from this on our side. In particular, I regret that grave discourtesy was shown some days ago to a picture of the head of the Chinese State, Chairman Mao Tse-tung. This was done by a small group of irresponsible people in

Bombay . In the excitement of the moment, we cannot allow ourselves to be swept away into wrong courses.

#### COLD WAR LANGUAGE

It is not for me to make any similar appeal to the leaders, the press and the people of China. All I can say is that I have been greatly distressed at the tone of the comments and the charges made against India by responsible people in China. They have used the language of cold war regardless of truth and propriety. This is peculiarly distressing in a great nation with thousands of years of culture behind it, noted for its restrained and polite behaviour. The charges made against India are so fantastic that I find it difficult to deal with them. There is the charge of our keeping the Dalai Lama under duress. The Chinese authorities should surely know how we function in this country and what our laws and Constitution are. Even if we were so inclined, we could not keep the Dalai Lama under some kind of detention against his will, and there can be no question of our wishing to do so. We can gain nothing by it expect the burden of difficult problems. In any event, this matter can be easily cleared. It is open to the Dalai Lama at any time to go back to Tibet or whatever he wants to. As the Panchen Lama has made himself responsible specially for some strange statements , I have stated that he would welcome him to come to India and meet the Dalai Lama himself. Should he choose to do so, every courtesy will be extended to him. I have further said that the Chinese Ambassador or any other emissary of the Chinese Government can come to India for this purpose and meet the Dalai Lama. There is no barrier for anyone to come peacefully to India, and whether we agree with him or not, we shall treat him with courtesy due to a guest.

#### UNJUSTIFIED ADVENTURE

Another and an even stranger allegation has been made about "Indian expansionists" who, it is alleged , are inheritors of the British tradition of imperialism and expansion. It is perfectly true that British Policy was one of expansion into Tibet and that they carried this out by force of arms



early in this century. That was, in our opinion, an unjustified and cruel adventure which brought much harm to the Tibetans. As a result of that, the then British Government in India became independent, we inherited some of these rights. Being entirely opposed to any such extraterritorial rights in another country, we did not wish to retain them. But in the early days after independence and partition, our hands were full, as this House well knows, and we had to face very difficult situations in our own country. We ignored, if I may say so, Tibet. Not being able to find a suitable person to act as our representative at Lhasa, we allowed for some time the existing British representative to continue at Lhasa. Later an Indian took his place. Soon after the Chinese armies entered Tibet, the question of these extraterritorial rights was raised and we readily agreed to give them up. We would have given them up anyhow, whatever developments might have taken place in Tibet. We withdrew our army detachments from some places in Tibet and handed over Indian Postal and telegraph installations and rest houses. We laid down the Five Principles of the Panch Sheel and placed our relationship with the Tibet region on a new footing. What we were anxious about was to preserve the traditional connections between India and Tibet in regard to pilgrim traffic and trade. Our action in this matter and whatever we have done subsequently in regard to Tibet is proof enough of our policy and that India had no political or ulterior ambitions in Tibet. Indeed, even from the narrowest practical point of view, any other policy would have been wrong and futile. Ever since then we have endeavoured not only to act up to the agreement we made, but to cultivate the friendship of the Chinese State and people.

#### MATTER OF REGRET

It is therefore a matter of the deepest regret and surprise to us that charges should be made which are both unbecoming and entirely void of substance. We have conveyed this deep feeling of regret to the Chinese Government, more especially at the speeches delivered recently in the current session of the National People's Congress in Peking.

## FRIENDLY RELATIONS

I stated some time ago that our broad policy was governed by three factors: (1) the preservation of the security and integrity of India ; (2) our desire to maintain friendly relations with China ; (3) our deep sympathy for the people of Tibet. That policy we shall continue to follow, because we think that a correct policy not only for the present but even more so for the future. It would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia, India and China, which have been peaceful neighbours of ages past, should develop feelings of hostility against each other. We for our part will follow this policy, but we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries which are so important from the wider point of view of the peace of Asia and the World. The Five Principles have laid down, inter alia, mutual respect for each other. Such mutual respect is gravely impaired if unfounded charges are made and the language of cold war was used.

## KALIMPONG

I have already made it clear previously that the charge, that Kalimpong was a centre of the Tibetan rebellion, is wholly unjustified. We have a large number of People of Tibetan stock living in India as Indian nationals. We have also some Tibetan émigrés in India. All of these deeply respect the Dalai Lama. Some of these have been exceedingly unhappy at developments in Tibet ; some no doubt have anti-Chinese sentiments. We have made it clear to them that they will not be permitted to carry on any subversive activities from India and I should like to say that by and large they have acted in accordance with the directions of the Government of India. I cannot obviously say that someone has not done something secretly, but to imagine or say that a small group of persons sitting in Kalimpong organised a major upheaval in Tibet seems to me to make a large draft on imagination and to slur over obvious facts.

## KHAMPA REVOLT

The Khampa revolt started in an area of China proper adjoining Tibet, more than three years ago. Is Kalimpong supposed to be responsible for that? This revolt gradually spread and no doubt created a powerful impression on the minds of large numbers of Tibetans, who had kept away from the revolt. Fears and apprehensions about their future gripped their minds and the nationalist upsurge swayed their feelings. Their fears may have been unjustified, but surely they cannot be denied. Such feelings can only be dealt with adequately by gentle methods than warfare.

#### TALKS WITH CHINESE PREMIER

When Premier Chou En-lai came here two or three years ago, he was good enough to discuss Tibet with me at considerable length. We had a frank and full talk. He told me that while Tibet had long been a part of the Chinese State, they did not consider Tibet as a province of China. The people were different from the people of China proper, just as in other autonomous regions of the Chinese State the people were different, even though they formed part of that State. Therefore, they considered Tibet an autonomous region which would enjoy autonomy. He told me further that it was absurd for anyone to imagine that China was going to force communism on Tibet. Communism could not be enforced in this way on a very backward country and they had no wish to do so even though they would like reforms to come progressively. Even these reforms they proposed for a considerable time.

About that time, the Dalai Lama was also here and I had long talks with him then. I told him of Premier Chou En-lai's friendly approach and of his assurance that he would respect the autonomy of Tibet. I suggested to him that he should accept these assurances in good faith and cooperate in maintaining that autonomy and bringing about certain reforms in Tibet. The Dalai Lama agreed that his country, though, according to him, advanced spiritually, was very backward socially and economically and reforms were needed.

#### DIFFICULT CIRCUMSTANCES

It is not for us to say how far these friendly intentions and approaches materialised. The circumstances were undoubtedly difficult. On the one side there was a dynamic, rapidly moving society; on the other, a static unchanging society fearful of what might be done to it in the name of reforms. The distance between the two was great and there appeared to be hardly any meeting point. Meanwhile changes in some forms inevitably came to Tibet. Communications developed rapidly and the long isolation of Tibet was partly broken through. Though physical barriers were progressively removed, mental and emotional barriers increased. Apparently, the attempt to cross these mental and emotional barriers was either not made or did not succeed.

#### FEELING OF NATIONALISM

To say that a number of "upper strata reactionaries" in Tibet were solely responsible for this appears to be an extraordinary simplification of a complicated situation. Even according to the accounts received through Chinese sources, the revolt in Tibet was of considerable magnitude and the basis of it must have been a strong feeling of nationalism which affects not only upper class people but others also. No doubt, vested interests joined it and sought to profit by it. The attempt to explain a situation by the use of rather worn-out words, phrases and slogans, is seldom helpful.

#### WIDESPREAD REACTION

When the news of these unhappy developments came to India, there was immediately a strong and widespread reaction. The Government did not bring about this reaction. Nor was this reaction essentially political. It was largely one of sympathy based on sentiment and humanitarian reasons. Also on a certain feeling of kinship with the Tibetan people derived from long-established religious and cultural contacts. It was an instinctive reaction. It is true that some people in India sought to profit by it by turning it in an undesirable direction. But the fact of that reaction of the Indian people was there. If that was the reaction here, one may well

imagine the reaction among the Tibetans themselves. Probably this reaction is shared in the other Buddhist countries of Asia. When there are such strong feelings, which are essentially not political, they cannot be dealt with by political methods alone, much less by military methods. We have no desire whatever to interfere in Tibet; we have every desire to maintain the friendship between India and China; but at the same time we have every sympathy for the people of Tibet, and we are greatly distressed at their hapless plight. We hope still that the authorities of China, in their wisdom, will not use their great strength against the Tibetans but will win them to friendly cooperation in accordance with the assurances they have themselves given about the autonomy of the Tibet region. Above all, we hope that the present fighting and killing will cease.

#### MUSSOORIE MEETING

As I have said above, I had a long talk with the Dalai Lama three days ago at Mussoorie. He told me of the difficulties he had to face, of the growing resentment of his people at the conditions existing there and how he sought to restrain them, of his feelings that the religion of the Buddha, which was more to him than life itself, was being endangered. He said that up to the last moment he did not wish to leave Lhasa. It was only on the afternoon of the 17th March when, according to him, some shells were fired at his palace and fell in a pond nearby, that the sudden decision was taken to leave Lhasa. Within a few hours the same day he and his party left Lhasa, and took the perilous journey to the Indian frontier. The departure was so hurried that even an adequate supply of clothes etc. could not be brought. When I met the Dalai Lama, no member of his entourage was present. Even the interpreter was our own. The Dalai Lama told me that the two statements which had been issued were entirely his own and there was no question of anybody coercing him to make them. Even though he is young, I could not easily imagine that he could be coerced into doing something he did not wish. All my sympathy goes out to this young man who at an early age has had to shoulder heavy burdens and to face tremendous responsibilities. During the last few

weeks he has suffered great physical and mental strain. I advised him to rest for a while and not to take any hurried decisions. He felt very unhappy at conditions in Tibet and was especially anxious that fighting should stop.

**PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY TO THE DEBATE  
IN THE RAJYA SABHA  
ON 4 MAY 1959**

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Mover of this Motion spoke in such dignified and restrained language that I feel deeply beholden to him. He set a good example for all of us. In the course of this discussion this example has been more or less followed, not entirely; but I do not wish to object to anything that has been said or the manner of saying it. Unfortunately in some other countries, and in China more specially, the way we function in our Parliament here or outside is perhaps not fully appreciated; that is to say that it may not be quite appreciated that here everyone has a right to say—here in Parliament and indeed outside Parliament also and in the press everyone has a right to say whatever he feels like subject to some very very broad limitations of libel or slander, and that what he or she may say may indeed be in condemnation of Government, as it often is; it does not represent Government's policy. I say this because objection is taken, has been taken in China to remarks made by Hon. Members in Parliament or outside or the press. It is different here from what it is in China, and I am not saying that it is better or not here or it is different here. Here one can see even in the last few weeks an amazing unanimity and similarity of words, expressions and slogans coming from various quarters, which shows an amount of uniformity which is truly formidable, and it has its virtues no doubt but I am not criticising anything. But what I wish to say is that things said in Parliament sometimes convey a very different impression outside, and people do not realise that in such Parliaments as these are every viewpoint has the fullest expression and need not necessarily be right or wrong.

**KNOWLEDGE ABOUT FACTS**

In this connection—not by way of again criticism but because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred to a very unfortunate incident that happened in Bombay where Chairman Mao Tse-tung's picture was shown grave discourtesy— I

should like to refer to that firstly to express my regret again for it and at the same time to say that the facts of this particular incident as we know them, and know them correctly—we are presumed to know them a little better than people sitting in Peking—nevertheless oddly enough our version of the facts is not wholly accepted by the Peking Government on a small matter, which is surprising. We are sitting here, we ought to know better what takes place in our country, about facts, whatever other opinions may be. However, it is very regrettable incident with which obviously Government had nothing to do. The party which organised it, I believe, is not represented in this House even. But what is not realised is that in the city of Bombay pictures even of a leader of ours like Mahatma Gandhi have been burnt by some groups or others. Two and a half or three years ago my humble self also has been treated in that way in Bombay and elsewhere. Well, we take that in our stride and, as the Hon. Member who spoke last mentioned, a few years back President Eisenhower's effigy had the honour of being burnt near the Ochterlony Monument. I regret all these cases, but what I am mentioning is that these things happen in a country like ours because of our laws, etc. They happen. Quite apart from law, I think it is a grave breach of decency to do this kind of thing or do anything else. We regret it. But people outside this country, some people, do not realise this and seem to imagine that somehow or other the Government or some Government officials must have connived at it, otherwise it could not have taken place, or they think that we should take the people who have done this by the scruff of the neck and throw in the dungeon.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Let them do it themselves.

#### IMPORTANT ISSUES

MR. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am saying that it is rather difficult because it produces misunderstandings as to the way of functioning, our parliamentary procedures and the like, and other procedures where a Government does not permit opposition of any kind.



Hon. Members have referred to a statement made by me a few days ago which was read out in this House also. So far as the major facts are concerned I have stated them there and I have really nothing to add, even though after that statement was made it was not accepted-the facts I mean; even the facts were not fully accepted by the Chinese authorities and the Chinese press, which is unfortunate because again I would say that as to what happens in India I would imagine that we could be better informed than the Chinese authorities who presumably can only be informed through certain intelligence agents that they may have at Kalimpong or elsewhere. But I do not wish to enter into polemical argument about these minor matters because the issues before us are far more serious, far deeper, far deeper than Tibet, the whole of Tibet, although Tibet is important and we are discussing events which have cast their shadow round about Tibet too. That shown that they are really deeper than that, and therefore we have to be particularly careful as to what we say and what we do. Now I accept the limitations and also the responsibility of what one should say on such occasions.

First of all, we must be alive to what we are aiming at. We are not, I hope, merely aiming at denouncing somebody or some Government or some phrase. There has been too much of this denunciation and slogan-raising, I regret to say, in China recently, and some of the slogans have been quite extraordinary. But I do not think we should be so thin-skinned as to get upset by some slogans in the excitement of the moment. We must not be let off our main path because that is of very considerable consequence in the future.

I should like again to read a few lines of what I said in that previous statement to indicate what we aim at. I said this:

It would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia-India and China which have been peaceful neighbours for ages past should develop feelings of hostility against each other. We for our part will follow this policy, but we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries which are so important from the wider point of view of the peace of Asia

and the world. The five principles have laid down, inter alia, mutual respect for each other. Such mutual respect is gravely impaired if unfounded charges are made and the language of cold war used.

#### PANCH SHEEL

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta asked rather rhetorically, "Do we stand by Panch Sheel?" Well, sometimes I wonder if the words we use are used in the same meaning or with some different meaning in our minds but- I have no claim to superiority-so far as India is concerned, we have earnestly striven to stand by these principles and I do not think we have offended by principle. It is not for me to stand up and criticise or justify other countries, but we have tried to do that not because of some temporary policy, not because these five principles have been declared in some agreement-that was merely a confirmation of what we thought, as to what we said-but because we have felt that that is the only way to function in this world of ours. Some people say, "Oh! After all that has happened, you still hold by that." It is a curious question. If these principles are right, we hold by them and we should hold by them, even though nobody in the wide world is holding by them. Naturally, we have to adapt our policies to what happens in the world; we cannot live in isolation. But a principle should be acted upon even though somebody else has not acted upon it. One tries. Anyway, we are imperfect beings in an imperfect world. So I should like to assure the hon. Member opposite that so far as the Government is concerned-I cannot speak for every ordinary individual in India-we hold by those principles and we shall endeavour to act up to them whatever other countries may or may not do. Some people certainly-as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said- taking advantage of these occurrences in and relating to Tibet have raised a cry that India will now have to consider how far she can adhere to the policy of non-alignment. All that shows a strange misunderstanding of our ways of thinking in our policies. Non - alignment- although the word is itself a kind of negative word-nevertheless has a positive concept, and we do not propose to have a military alliance with any country come what may, and I want to be

quite clear about it, because the moment we give up that idea of non-alignment, we lose every anchor that we hold on to and we simply drift. We may hand on to somebody or some country. But we lose our own self-respect, of the country's. If one loses one's self-respect, it is something very precious lost. Therefore this business of thinking always in terms of getting something from this country or the other country is not desirable. It is perhaps not very relevant. It is said often in Pakistan, let us have a common defence policy. Now I am all for settling our troubles with Pakistan and living a normal, friendly, neighbourly life. We try for that. But I do not understand when people say they want a common defence policy. Against whom? Immediately the question comes up: "Against whom is this common defence policy?" Are we going to become members of the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO or some body? We do not want to have a common defence policy which is almost another meaning of some kind of a military alliance. The whole policy that we have pursued is opposed to this conception. We want friendly relations with Pakistan. We hope we shall get them. But we are not going to tie ourselves up, our conceptions, our policies, with other countries involving military defence and attacking and all that.

#### PRESENT DIFFICULTIES

So the present difficulties that we have to face in relation to the happenings in Tibet will, I hope, gradually pass. But it is a tragedy not only for Tibet, but a deeper tragedy for many of us that something that we have laboured for all these years, which may be said to be enshrined if you like in the Panch Sheel or in Bandung, has suffered very considerably in people's minds. I may say I shall hold on to it, but the fact is in people's minds there is that crack, there is that suffering, there is that uneasiness, that something they valued might slip away. These words like all other words Bandung, Panch Sheel, it does not matter what word you use begin to lose their shine and to be hurled about without meaning, and in fact, just like even the word "peace" becomes almost like a thunderbolt or a minor war the way it is used. Sometimes the manner of using it-it is the

manner-that counts. I have come more and more to believe that means are even more important than ends. They show to us that the way one does things is even more important than what one does. And that is why I have been aggrieved beyond measure at these various recent developements and at what is being said in China-the charges made against India. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta did not say a word about all these, not a word. I can understand where these things lead to. Hon. Members of this House being seasoned public men and women may restrain themselves, may not allow themselves to be affected too much. But it is difficult for the general public not to be affected by such charges and they are charges, I do submit, which do not stand the slightest scrutiny. What have we done about this matter, about Tibet, apart from some speeches or things?

We have received the Dalai Lama and party, and subsequently we have received some thousands of refugees. We have given them asylum, and it is admitted-I don't think anybody denied it that as a sovereign country we have every right to do so, and nobody else can be a judge of that except ourselves. Now is it suggested that we should have refused to give asylum to the Dalai Lama when he asked for it? Well, if it is suggested by someone outside India I can tell them- I do not know about the handful out of the four hundred millions of people of India; I doubt if even a few thousands would have agreed with that policy- I can tell them this that the hundreds of millions of India would have become angry at that action of ours if we had refused asylum to the Dalai Lama and his party. Almost everybody in India-a few may not have approved of our policy, and it would have been an impossible thing, an utterly wrong thing, for us to do otherwise from any point of view, political, humanitarian or whatever you like. So this is what we have done. Of course we are charged with as having connived at Kalimpong; of Kalimpong being the commanding centre-this is the word they used, I think-of this rebellion in Tibet. Now it is said that the commanding centre has shifted to Mussoorie I know words have lost their meaning, because I find it very difficult to deal with these charges. And why has the commanding centre gone to Mussoorie?

Because the Dalai Lama is there and because the brother of the Dalai Lama who normally lives in Darjeeling, I think, went to see him, and after seeing him went back to Darjeeling or Kalimpong. These are very serious charges against a country's leaders being made irresponsibly in this way by the leaders of a people whom we have not only honoured and respected by whom we have considered particularly advanced in culture and politeness and the gentler art of civilisation. It has been a shock to me beyond measure because, quite apart from everything else, I have looked up to the Chinese and I look up to them still because of their great accomplishments, because of their great culture and all that, and it has been a shock to me that this kind of thing should be said and done in the excitement of the moment. I hope that excitement will pass.

#### EARLIER DEVELOPMENT

Now, Sir, I want to tell the House exactly how these matters came into our ken. On the 11th of March, for the first time we got a message from our Consul General in Lhasa saying that there was some excitement in the town and that a large number of people had come and visited him consisting of representatives of the public and some Tibetan officials, monks, heads of monasteries, etc. They had come to him with a series of complaints about the Chinese authorities there and they said that they were very much in distress. Now our Consul General in Lhasa was naturally very embarrassed. What is he to do? He did not wish to interfere; it was non of his business to interfere and he told them: "Well, I cannot do anything for you" and he reported to us. That was on the 11th- the message dated the 10th reached us on the 11th. That was the first information we had, that something was afoot there. After that the Consul General sent us brief reports about the general excitement in the town, the tense situation and people holding meetings, not public meetings but group meetings and all that. On the 14th he again sent us a message that a crowd of 5,000 Tibetan woman had come to the Consulate General with the same kind of complaints and asked him to accompany them to the Chinese Foreign Office in Lhasa to bear witness to what they

said. At that again the poor Consul General was exceedingly embarrassed. It was non of his business to do this and he said: "I cannot go", and he asked, "What do you mean by that?" Well, in short the said, "I just cannot go." Quite rightly, he reported it to us. We drafted a message it was kept ready to be sent-to say: "Don't get entangled in what has happened and was happening in Lhasa." This was on the 14th. So this kind of thing went on. And it was at this time, when speaking, I think, in the Lok Sabha, I said that there was a clash of wills in Lhasa-whether that was a correct description, I do not know. The point was there was no actual fighting going on at this time; that came a few days later. On the 20th March when it started, how it started, I do not know, nor did our Consul General know sitting in the Consulate, and he could not be expect4d to know when it started. And as we now know, he did not know it then. On the 17th night the Dalai Lama and party left Lhasa, rather secretly. According to them, on the 17th afternoon at 4 o'clock, two shells or bombs, something like that, fell into a lake in the Summer Palace. Well, this made them think "Now this is the last moment, and now the Palace is going to be shelled and there is going to be war everywhere, and they left Lhasa. As far as I know-I am not sure even then it was not fully his intention to leave Tibet. But as Lhasa was being shelled, subsequently that intention must have developed. Anyhow, in the course of a week, from the 11th to the 20th or the 21st, during these, say, ten days this was the news that came to us. We could do nothing about it and before the 10th or 11th we knew nothing about the situation except that we naturally knew that all kinds of cross-currents were at work at Lhasa and in Tibet. Then the question came before us, of the possibility of the Dalai Lama coming here, and we decided that we should receive him. He came. As the House might know I resisted and I was asked repeatedly:

"Are you going to throw your doors open to any number of refugees from Tibet?" I resisted that, although in my mind I knew that I could not very well refuse asylum to people who swear in great difficulty; I could not; but I did not want to say it and invite people to roll into India from all over the place. So that is the short story of what has happened and what we have

done. And now we are called expansionists and imperialists and what not, all kinds of phrases, which I suppose would not make any real difference to what we are; nevertheless coming from those whom we consider friends they do hurt us.

#### 1950 MEMORANDA

Now I want just to give you a few facts. Again an extraordinary thing appeared in the newspapers in Peking. They go back now to what had happened in 1950, that is, to some memoranda that we had sent, when Chinese armies were entering Tibet. Very polite memoranda they were. The answers were not very polite, but the point now is that they refer to them, that what we wrote to them was after consultation with the British Government, that though we called ourselves independent we really acted as stooges or tools of the British Government.

It is, of course, completely wrong and untruthful. There was no question of our consulting the British Government. Our view on Tibet was different from that of the British Government.

#### PANCHEN LAMA'S STATEMENT

Now, one thing about the Panchen Lama's statement. I was rather distressed to read it, that a statement should be made, so lacking in generosity and dignity, by a person who had been our honoured guest. I do not know about the petty things he says that somewhere his staff was not given proper accommodation. I cannot answer that, whether at Aurangabad or some such place there was some difficulty because the entourage of the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama was so big-hundreds of people with them. It was not quite so easy to make as much preparation as we wanted.

#### LATEST POSITION

About the refugees, now the latest position is that approximately 6,500 refugees are on their way down through the Kameng Division of NEFA, 1,500 are trekking through Bhutan and 700 have come to Sikkim-round

about 9,000. The Bhutan Government have asked us to receive the Tibetan refugees coming through their territories and we have agreed to do so. Thus we have about 9,000 refugees for whom we have made ourselves responsible for some kind of arrangements. A few of the refugees, when they entered India, were armed. They were disarmed on entry into India.

The refugees coming through NEFA will be accommodated temporarily in a camp at Mismari in Assam. Though the Assam Government are making arrangements for their shelter, medical relief, etc., the West Bengal Government have agreed to construct temporary camp somewhere in Cooch-Bihar for the refugees who are coming through Bhutan. We are grateful to these two State Governments.

Special officers to deal with the refugees have been appointed by the External Affairs Ministry. They are proceeding to Assam and West Bengal. It is not proposed to keep these refugees in these temporary camps for a long time and other arrangements will have to be devised for them. I cannot just say at present what or where, but it is obvious we are not going to keep them in camps.

One Hon. Member - I think Dr. Kunzru, may be Mr. Shiva Rao said something that we should allow these refugees to earn their own living and give them freedom to do many things. Broadly speaking, of course we intend that. We are not going to keep them as prisoners in camps. In fact, our instructions to our officers at the border were to tell them that we do not assume responsibility for their indefinite upkeep. For sometime we would help them. And naturally to some extent we are responsible when these people are coming in. We cannot let them loose on India. Again, there is the question that they cannot easily be kept anywhere except in cooler climates-and we cannot send them to the rest of India simply-in mountain regions.

#### UNITED NATIONS

I think Mr. Shiva Rao said something about China and the United Nations. I do not suppose it is necessary for me to say so, but obviously our policy



in regard to the entry of the People's Government of China into the UN remains as it was. It is not that it is based on certain facts-by these things; it is not because we get angry with something that happens in China that we change our policy. That would mean that we have no firm policies, that we are deflected by temporary happenings in the world. Just one thing more. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta talked about national uprising. Again it depends upon how you use that word. I do not know exactly what happened in Tibet. But, as I said in my previous statement, according to Chinese accounts this has been a fairly big affair, a very large-scale affair. Also looking at the surrounding circumstances as well as the past history of Tibet, one can very well imagine that apart from the so-called people representing vested interests-they would be there-it is a fact that large numbers of Tibetan people- I cannot say whether they are in a majority or a minority, but large numbers undoubtedly-went to the extent of taking this step which they did, which really meant a very dangerous step. Anyhow it is there and one feels strongly about it. Now so far as we are concerned, we have not interfered either from Kalimpong or Mussoorie or otherwise. We have exercised our undoubted right to give asylum. I have said that Dalai Lama is perfectly a free agent to go where he likes in India or go back to Tibet.

#### BARBED WIRE CHARGE

Some people-some foreign pressmen-said about two days after he had come to Mussoorie that we are keeping him behind barbed wire. That sounds rather horrible. The fact was that the Mussoorie police, to lighten their burden because of all kinds of curious people trying to go into the compound of the house, had put a little barbed wire on that compound before he came, to be able to protect him, for his security and general protection. But that was not to keep him in, and he goes, I believe, round about Mussoorie. He can go back to Tibet the moment he likes. It is no use my going on repeating what I have said earlier that the Dalai Lama is not kept under duress here, that he did not enter India under any duress, excepting the duress of circumstances, if you like compulsion of

events. And, certainly, I can speak from personal knowledge, having met him and talked to him, that he is staying there of his own free will in India and even at Mussorie. With all respect, I would say that anyone who denies this fact, well, is totally ignorant of facts and speaks without knowing.

Further, Hon. Members might have seen in the newspaper headlines—because odd remarks are given as headlines—that I said I would be happy if the Dalai Lama went back to Tibet. I did so. Somebody asked a question and I said, “Naturally I would be happy if he went with dignity.” But that did not mean at all that I am going to push the Dalai Lama out or put him in an embarrassing position. It is entirely for him to decide what to do, when to do it. The only advice I gave him when I was with him was: “You have had a very hard journey and very harassing experiences. If I may, as a person very much older than you, suggest it you might rest for a few days, and calmly think about the events and then do what you like.”

#### SENSATIONAL REFERENCES

One more matter, if I may say so, specially to the press. I do not particularly fancy this constant sensational way of referring to the Dalai Lama as the God-Kind, and, in fact, I do not think he likes it either. This is not the India way; it is a foreign way of doing things. It sounds sensational no doubt. I hope that that word will not be used. It is good enough to refer to him as the Dalai Lama. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kunzru, would you like to say anything?

DR. H.N. KUNZRU: There is nothing to reply to. I thought my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, might raise some point but he has hardly spoken to the point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we pass on to the next item.