

Lok Sabha

8 May 1959

Answers to Questions

DISCUSSION RE: SITUATION IN TIBET

Mr. Speaker: Shri Khadilkar.

Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): What is the time allotted for discussion? Up to what time will it go on?

Mr. Speaker: The time allotted is 2 and half hours. It is now, say, a quarter past twelve.

The discussion has to conclude by a quarter to three.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Does it mean that 20 or so minutes more at the end, for the non-official business, will be given?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. That would not be cut. Hon. Members are aware that the time allotted is 2 and half hours. So, I shall restrict each speech to 15 minutes. In the case of the hon. Member who raises the discussion, I will allow him some more minutes, say, five minutes more.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I do not wish to take too much time of the House. 20 minutes will be ample for me.

Mr. Speaker: Not 20 minutes for everyone.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am saying that I shall also abide by the rule, -about 15 minutes as far as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Normally I do not impose any restriction upon the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me an opportunity to raise a discussion on the situation in Tibet. After listening to the comparison in statement about that recent developments in Tibet, by our Prime Minister I had expected that the Chinese Government would take note of it and would stop further campaign, in which we have been accused of interference, expansionism and several other charges have been levelled against us. Unfortunately, the same type of charges have been repeated in this country by the communist party organ and almost every point that was covered by the statement has been challenged in a signed article in the last issue of New Age. I felt that the communist party would not at least fail to take note of what the hierarchy which they accept. I mean the Communist hierarchy what at least Lenin said about the freedom of nationalities. But I do not want to repeat here what Lenin said about the question of autonomy or self-determination of people of distinct nationality.

These charges were repeated by responsible persons.

We have been painted in the same way as the Americans were painted or even now are being painted in the campaign against them.

We have been tarred with the same brush so far as the Chinese Press is concerned. At Mussoorie, the Prime Minister suggested that let the Panchen Lama come over to India or any dignitary of the Chinese State and let them talk the matter over. I felt that it would have been proper and I fervently

hoped that China would accept the invitation and instead of bringing it down to the level of a propaganda of a vicious nature, Tibetan issue would be lifted up and taken on a diplomatic level. But unfortunately, it seems that the diplomatic channels are still blocked. I do not know why.

The propaganda that was carried on from the platform of the Chinese People's Congress is now being carried on through the columns of the Peking People's Daily. Readers are ventilating their views and only yesterday, the Peking People's Daily has said. "We shall hit back" in blunt terms. Not only that; I am really surprised that this propaganda is carried on at a still lower level. There are workers' rallies and students' rallies all over China where the minds of the people especially of the younger generation are being poisoned against our country.

I want to know what we have done concerning Tibet. Have we taken some new line? Have we not stated in 1949-50 what we are stating today, or, are we stating something else that we had not communicated before? This is the question. Therefore; I would like to point out what we frankly told before and what we are saying about the Tibetan uprising now. There are several charges; I do not want to repeat them here. They have been answered by our Prime Minister in a most dignified and restrained manner. The Prime Minister knows fully well that in our country, though Government can decide, and even the Prime Minister can say something, but, as it was said once upon a time by Roosevelt, perhaps the Government can remain neutral, but people cannot remain neutral.

They make up their decisions. It is a vital moral issue. All the minds cannot be just controlled. In this country, you cannot switch off and switch on the propaganda machine, as is being done in China. It is most unfortunate. For instance, take the case of interference. I was astounded to read it-a most fantastic charge-and I was reminded of a small incident in jail. While

we were prisoners in 1932, in our neighbouring yard, behind a wall, a young prisoner was mercilessly caned. He was shrieking and we could not bear it. We rushed to the door of the yard and protested against the hitting. All the warders came; the Superintendent arrived on the spot and said, "What is this?" We said, we have a right to protest. He ordered us to be locked up in the barracks. Later on, the jail superintendent had recorded in our record books that for interference in the administration of the jail, our privileges were cut off.

The charge of interference in the Tibetan affairs is of a similar nature. Are we going to be silenced because it is a friendly country with whom we have tried to cultivate friendship despite certain issues hanging on fire and because our foreign policy is being guided by certain basic fundamental human values? Are we not to test the events in Tibet on the same touchstone? Are we to be inhibited hence-forward when we are dealing with our neighbour with a different system of Government? While we deal with the problems like Algeria and the Algerian Government in exile do we not openly take sides? Their Prime Minister was here and he was received by our Prime Minister as well as our people. Our relations with France are not in any way hostile.

We have expressed our views about Central Africans and the sort of terror practiced against the African people by the British imperialists. So far as Tibet is concerned, is it proposed that India should watch the events in Tibet considering that it is a military problem and a domestic problem. As Robespierre, one of the French Revolution leaders, said, China can send missionaries, though they are not welcome, with guns and settle that affair. Can we adopt that attitude? Is it consistent with our policy? What is our policy?

I would just not like to go over all the statements and communications that were exchanged in 1950 between our Government and the Government of

China. But I would just point out what we have stated there and what the people of Tibet feel about it. It is not a question of what we feel or what the Chinese feel; it is a question of what the Tibetan people feel about it. I would like to point out that in 1950, the Tibetans made a representation to the United Nations. What did they say in that representation? They have stated there that: "The Chinese claim Tibet as a part of China."

The Tibetan feel that racially, culturally, geographically, they are far apart from the Chinese. If the Chinese find the reaction of the Tibetans to their unnatural claim not acceptable, there are other civilized methods by which they can ascertain the views of the people of Tibet."

We are also saying the same thing. And at that time, fortunately, when this statement was submitted to the United Nations, no suspicion was expressed that there was, in drafting it, some hidden hand under the influence of some foreign power, Indian hand behind it. This was the voice of the Tibetan people as it was represented to the United Nations. Therefore, this we accepted, and while carrying on the negotiations, we stated in our note of the 26th October, 1950:

"In the present context of world events, invasion by Chinese troops is deplorable and, in the considered judgment of the Government of India, not in the interest of China or peace".

What we have told them today? Have we changed today? We are saying the same thing.

Of course, the Chinese reply was very curt. They said: it is entirely a domestic problem of China.

Again, when it was a question of communication, trying to understand each other's problem, we stated, and stated in a very frank manner, that the Government of India was convinced that the problem could be settled by

peaceful negotiation, adjusting the legitimate Tibetan claim to autonomy within the framework of Chinese suzerainty.

This is very important. No section of responsible opinion, no party in this land, has seriously advocated the independence of Tibet. But certainly we want Tibetan people assured freedom to shape their own lives and their own destiny.

We do not want to create a new Himalayan cock-pit. If Tibet is declared independent, there is a possibility of lots of complications. Do we not realise that? (Shri Ranga: who said that?) But at the same time we must realise that when we relinquished whatever rights we had acquired after Britishers left-and I must say we must feel proud about it; our Prime Minister said "we do not want to have those extra-territorial rights"-when we relinquished them, we never claimed anything in return. It was a unilateral declaration. But I am confident that the Prime Minister would have felt, while making this moral gesture, that the Chinese would also try to respect the rights of the Tibetan people, instead of asserting them on the basis of the old title deeds of doubtful value, title deeds which were imposed on the Tibetan people by the old feudal emperors.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): They have respected them by publishing maps wherein a portion of India is included in China.

Shri Khadilkar: I am coming to that.

Therefore it is surprising, and the charge is again repeated that we are influenced by some foreign power. With all the force at my command, I would appeal to this House to tell the Chinese people that it is insulting; because when we got freedom, if we take the gamut of experience of the last ten years of our relationship with China, in the early period their

remarks about our Prime Minister and of our Government, to put it very mildly, were never flattering. They doubted whether we had achieved freedom.

With all this background we have to consider the repetition of this charge of foreign influence.

And in this correspondence also I find this, namely, "you are being guided by some foreign influence"- in order to create the impression that because we were under foreign domination, such a suspicion could be thrown with advantage. It is done with a view to create a sort of inhibition in our mind while dealing with our neighbour with whom we want to maintain the most friendly relations. This is the position.

Therefore, so far as the Tibetan uprising is concerned, on this occasion, we must realise that it is the Tibetan people who have created the problem for China. Whether it is to be dealt with militarily or not we are to sit quiet, that is different matter altogether.

We cannot sit quiet. Of course, they have a military might.

They can send in divisions and say "we have restored peace"-as it is said that you can create a desert by ruthless repression and call it peace and later on you can build up socialism there. Our idea of socialism is totally different. I am a Marxist, and Marxism means the highest type of humanism. If somebody is going to vulgarise Marxism and parade over the world a new type of slavery, I will never tolerate it. (Interruption). Certainly it is not your monopoly.

Therefore, so far as Tibet is concerned, who in this country desires that the old relic of society should be preserved as a museum piece? I am told-I do not know, but I am prepared to believe it-that even the young Panchen Lama does not want to preserve that old society. He wants to change it. But he wants to change it and transform it with the consent of the people-that is the main difference-not with the military machine, not with the military

strength, but with the consent of the people. That is a certainly different method. And, as we have said, Chinese method and our method is different. So, our approach to Tibetan affairs is the same. It has been very consistent. We have not changed it. Only, it is a question of how China is going to deal with Tibet and deal with a friendly country like India.

It is a great tragedy, because, for the first time, when a country like China is dealing with another friendly country which is not in the least imperialist and which tries to crystallise its relationship in a positive way, as it is based on Panch Sheel, we get this experience. China should realise it how we would feel about it.

That must be clearly understood in this context, and if we ignore it in a certain cloudy, idealistic thinking, I do not think it would benefit the world, nor would it help to consolidate world peace.

Things have come to a pass where we have to face realities.

Therefore, my first submission is that so far as our Prime Minister's statement is concerned and the Government of India policy is concerned, we are consistently following this policy; and though we have given up our extra-territorial rights, we have never accepted Chinese sovereignty-that distinction is there -,we have only accepted Chinese suzerainty. We shall accept it in the larger interests.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Why should we?

Shri Khadilkar: Then there is another question.

When I said we must take into consideration the gamut of experience of our relationship within the last ten years, there are other factors also.

When dealing with India, the Chinese Communist Government is a government necessarily inspired by certain nationalist feelings, nationalist sentiments. Indian Communists can afford to disregard Indian national

sentiments; that is their tradition; they have not grown up in our nationalist tradition which is the misfortune of Indian communism.

Shri Muhammad Elias (Howrah): You are there to defend it!

Shri Khadilkar: Yes, do not worry about it.

Therefore, what I am going to say on this occasion need not to be taken as something Chauvinistic. Our civilization is woven round like Himalayas, and all our culture, our thought has some imprint of the Himalayas from the ancient ages. If some power, with big military might, sits at the top of the Himalayas and says "we are the masters of the situation to deal with this problem", I feel they are not properly appreciating the Indian sentiment, the Indian mind so far as the Himalayas and our traditional flow of civilization in this land are concerned.

An Hon. Member: The Ganga comes from Himalayas.

Shri Khadilkar: I would appeal to the Chinese to give more thought to this aspect of the problem.

When I mention the Himalayas; I also feel that after the consolidation of freedom in China there is an area of geographical indecision on our border.

We need not bring it over in this controversy. But one thing is certain.

When they are saying every time "Oh, you are still being influenced by some foreign power", we must also tell them that whatever the British did and whatever legacy they have left, we accept it consistent with our national interest.

We do not want to encroach upon anybody's freedom, but at the same time as the Prime Minister said the other day, we will have to judge, issue to

issue, what is to be done, what is not to be done, from the point of view of our national security.

After repeated requests these cartographic errors, or mistakes as they are called, it is are not yet rectified. I am not sure but I am told that the same Chinese map was exhibited at the recent Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference, dominated by my hon. Friends on the right.

They exhibited the same wrong map in Calcutta. They never raised any voice of objection. In that map-I have examined that map very carefully and I have a photograph of it...

An Hon. Member: Not only the Congress but all Parties were there.

Shri Khadilkar: I have examined that map.

All things that were of the old regime of Chiang Kai Shek have been rectified and only the border remains to be rectified. Do we not know what happened as regards the indecision of the border, when the question with Burma came? When the question of two provinces of Burma on the border, Kachin State and Wa came, there was trouble. Therefore I would appeal to my Chinese friends in all humility, but in all earnestness, that they should try to settle this issue. As another big power in Asia, we cannot be subdued, we cannot be cowed down hence - forward. 'Oh! You are under foreign influence and therefore you are not your own masters'- this argument should not be bandied about any Communist hence-forth in this land. This is my humble submission. There is another danger which my Communist friends ought to appreciate. What is that danger? After freedom, we consistently followed the policy of non-alignment and non-commitment.

Western protagonists of the cold war feel that this uncommitted area is a vacuum because there are no strategic bases. In such a situation if China, by her present policy is going to push or pull us in this or in that direction

and thus putting us into the cold war conflict, we must guard against that. We are the masters or the makers of our policy. We have adopted it after a good deal of thought. Therefore, at this juncture I would appeal to the Chinese-it is no use appealing to my hon. friends here-that it is not in the interest of world peace...

An Hon. Member: Always appeal to the principles.

Shri Khadikar: I would appeal to the Chinese that it is not in the interest of world peace to weaken the hands of Shri Nehru.

Why I say this is because he plays a role, when the world is divided in two camps he supplied the bridge to avoid conflict.

In effect, the two ideologies are contending for world supremacy. Indian policy reflects, if I may say so a new ideology emerging, which represents a certain synthesis, where representatives of contending powers can sit together and discuss, debate and try to settle issues in a peaceful manner.

That was Panchsheel and that was the spirit of Bandung.

We welcomed China at Bandung in the same spirit. We thought that with China, India and Soviet Union, we can certainly consolidate peace in Asia and Africa and can avoid the danger of war.

Let me remind my Chinese friends that people in India, Africa, Asia, and everywhere-particularly in India-feel that after the Second World War, a force of liberation was released. It has helped to demolish the old Imperialist powers and strengthen freedom in the countries formerly under colonial domination. Do you want to create a sense of frustration or suspension if not of resistance in the minds of our people? You must give thought to it very patiently and very earnestly and appreciate the spirit in which we are operating in this land and are appealing to the people of the world.

In conclusion I would like to say one word.

As it has been said - my Communist friends know it-by a great Communist leader, you should never get dizzy with success. I would appeal to the Chinese friends in all sincerity that we want their friendship. But we want their friendship with honour and with mutual trust. Otherwise with mutual suspicion, when there are issues, they are kept at the background.

When these issues come up before the public, immediately forgetting friendship if they are going to attack our bona fides, we must resist Chinese attempts and resist it with all the might at our command.

We are not big because we have got a big army.

We have been judged in the wide world by the people of the world because in international politics we have introduced a new element - that is my conviction - to judge events on certain basic human values-values of freedom, values of compassion and so many other things. I do not want to repeat them.

Are we going to judge Tibetan events not according to the same values, not on the same touchstone? I feel that we must stick to it and whatever be the charges made in the heat of the controversy they should not deter us from this course.

With these words, I would appeal that we should not take seriously what that teenage Lama said in China.

An Hon. Member: Panchen Lama.

Shri Khadilkar: Panchen Lama, I am sorry. It was, to my mind, impertinence. I could have excused it in a young man of his age, but how it was released to the press by the friendly Chinese power is something that I cannot understand.

To say that our monuments are not well kept, to say that we had given discriminatory treatment to him and at the same time to say that the Dalai Lama here is under duress is just absurd. When there is an open invitation for him to come and meet and settle the issue, he didn't. I hope the Chinese will appreciate the deep sentiment and the vital interest not the political interest but a very vital interest that we have in Tibetan freedom and the whole Himalayan region, if I may say so.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): Sir, the subject is important, the time allowed is very short and I will try to be as brief as possible. It is nothing unusual for countries to criticize each other in their internal and external policy. Nobody take this criticism to be interference in the internal affairs of the country. If it were so then the hard criticism that is being leveled by China against Yugoslavia would be considered internal interference in the affairs of that country. But in the Communist world there are two standards of judgement - one for themselves and the other for others with whom they think they are in opposition.

Recently, China has become supersensitive to any criticism.

When a person is supersensitive, I am afraid, he has a bad conscience. Even the mildest remarks of the Congress President were denounced. Why? – because she said that Tibet was a country. I can understand the wrath against me because I have never believed in the bona fides, I have never believed in the professions or the promises of the Chinese. Mine has been the solitary voice in this House-almost solitary-raised against this rape of a nation. As early as 1950, I said in this House that the Communist Government in China was in charge of the country.

The Government of India, therefore, thought it right that it should not be denied the membership of the UN and we advocated the cause of China. But if we had waited a little, we would have been more cautious. Soon this

nation that had won its freedom so recently, strangled the freedom of a neighbouring nation with whose freedom we are intimately concerned. Our Government's attitude is understandable only on the assumption that Tibet is a far off country and is none of our concern.

"But supposing what has happened in Tibet happens in Nepal, then I am sure we will, whether we are well prepared or not, go to war against China. In that case what would become of our advocacy of China to the membership of the United Nations?"

Then, Sir, again in 1954, I said in this House: "Recently we have entered into a treaty with China. I feel that China, after it had gone Communist, committed an act of aggression against Tibet.

The plea is that China had the ancient right of suzerainty. This right was out of date, old and antiquated. It was never exercised in fact. It had lapsed by the flux of time. Even if it had not lapsed, it is not right in these days of democracy, by which our Communist friends swear, by which the Chinese swear, to talk of this ancient suzerainty and exercise it in a new form in a country which had and has nothing to do with China.

Tibet is culturally more akin to India than it is to China. I consider this as much colonial aggression on the part of China as any indulged in by the Western nations.

Whether certain nations commit aggression against others does not always concern us. But in this case we are intimately concerned because China has destroyed a buffer state. In international politics, when a buffer State is destroyed by a powerful nation, that nation is considered to have committed aggression against its neighbours."

Sir. England went to war with Germany not because Germany had invaded England but because it had invaded

Poland and Belgium.

Sir, further, I said in this House: "It is also well-known that in the new map of China other border territories like Nepal, Sikkim, etc., figure.

This gives us an idea of the aggressive designs of China. Let us see what the Chinese themselves did in the Korean War. As soon as the U.N troops, or more correctly the American troops, reached the borders of China, it felt insecure and it immediately joined the Korean war...

I do not say that because China conquered Tibet we should have gone to war with it. But this does not mean that we should recognize the claim of China on Tibet.

We must know that it is an act of aggression against a foreign nation."

Again, Sir, in the same year, I said: "A small buffer state on our borders was deprived of its freedom.

When we made a feeble protest we were told that we were the stooges of the Western powers. If I remember alright we were called 'running dogs of imperialism'."

Again, Sir, in 1958 talking about Panchsheel, I said: "This great doctrine was born in sin, because it was enunciated to put the seal of our approval upon the destruction of an ancient nation which was associated with us spiritually and culturally."

Sir, at that time, some hon. Member intervened and asked: "Is that nation suffering?"

My reply was: "Whether it is suffering or not is not the question. It was a nation which wanted to live its own life and it ought to have been allowed to live its own life. A good government is no substitute for self-government."

Sir, some of our friends in the Rajya Sabha have said that we should continue to plead the cause of China for the membership of the United Nations. I respect their opinion. They think that as a member of the United Nations, China would be subject to some public opinion there. This is not a

fact. There is South Africa, there is France, there is Russia and many other aggressive nations. Because they are members of the United Nations they have not ceased to be aggressive.

We are again told that though China might have broken Panchsheel, we must stick to Panchsheel. Sir, I do not consider that the principles of the Panchsheel are moral imperatives. Even moral imperatives cannot be stuck to unilaterally in the international world. Panchsheel implies a mutuality of respect for each other's integrity and sovereignty. How can there be respect for these things unless there is mutuality? Panchsheel also implies peaceful co-existence. How can there be peaceful co-existence unless it is an idea that applies to more nations than one? You cannot have peaceful coexistence alone. It is an impossibility. Panchsheel therefore implies mutuality and you cannot practise it if others violate it. And we have seen how nation after nation having sworn by Panchsheel have been violating it. In the present case, China has not only violated them, but has accused us of violating them. Chor Kotwal Ko Danda.

Sir, I feel even if we go on emphasizing our friendship with China by saying Chini-Hindi bhai bhai, at the end of days, I say, this nation will never be friendly to us. Why? Because a friendly nation does not go and howl at another nation in the public market. If they have to say that Kalimpong was- what do they call it-the "command centre" then it was open to them to have brought it to our notice through diplomatic channels. And they did it six months earlier; the case was investigated & the charges was found unfounded and a report was sent to them. They had nothing further to say. Why was this method of diplomatic approach not employed on this occasion? Why this howling at a friendly nation in the market place? I cannot quite understand how it is possible to be friendly with this nation with this mentality.

Yet our efforts to save it will only result in this that they will not give us credit for good intentions. They will only give us credit for cowardice. It will never appear to a bully that you are doing things out of your goodness; it will only appear to him that you are frightened.

Not only do they not care for us, but I say this Communist China does not care for the whole of Asia. It does not care even for the opinion of Asia. If it had cared, it would have realized that it was alienating the whole of Asia, especially, South East Asia. To whom will South East Asia look for support? It will more and more look to America even as the more powerful nations of Europe are looking to America. If they are afraid of China, (fear makes strange bad fellows) and I have absolutely no doubt that they will look to America for support.

They cannot look to Russia.

Therefore, the Chinese have destroyed the very confidence of the Asian nations.

There is another reason also.

The Asian nations know that there is Formosa, that there are the off-coast islands, that there is Hong Kong. All this is Chinese territory. It is populated by Chinese people.

They (Communist China) do not go that side and conquer that territory and incorporate it with China to which it rightly belongs. But, they go to an alien nation and an alien people and they conquer them. The Asian nations are not stupid. They know that they do not do it not because Chiang Kaishek has more power than Communist China, but because America is behind it. They know, if they attack these places persistently, America would step in.

They know that if America steps in, there will be the Third World war of which they are mightily afraid. They are not ready for it. Even if Russia may be ready, China is not ready.

They are doing things which injure not only India, but their own case.

Selfishness always works like that.

When selfish and aggressive people take to violence, they defeat their own objects. Not only has China earned a bad name, it has made the Asiatic people to look towards directions from which they wanted to wean them.

China has extended the area of cold war. It has made matters worse instead of bettering them. I do not think even the conquest of Tibet was an adequate price for what they have earned for themselves and the way in which they have done it.

Therefore, I am glad that at least in this, we are not involved and our Prime Minister in the Rajya Sabha made it clear that whatever may happen, in this cold war, we maintain our position of non-alignment. He has declared his position. But, what do the Chinese say?

An Hon. Member: Let them say, what they like.

Acharya Kripalani: They say, by name, "Shri Nehru had been pushed by the West into an important role in their so-called sympathy with Tibetan movement." Whatever the Chinese may say, I believe our foreign policy is safe in the hands of our Prime Minister. I further say, that they should thank their stars that it is in the hands of our Prime Minister.

But, whatever the Chinese may say, we are not concerned with them. We are, as I said once before here, more concerned with our fellow countrymen. May I ask them (the Communists) a few questions: whether they approve of the wild, violent and not true to facts propaganda that is carried on from day to day in China? Do they believe that the Dalai Lama was really kidnapped?

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj: Panchen Lama is in duress.

Acharya Kripalani: After what our Prime Minister has repeatedly said, do they believe that the Dalai Lama issued these letters under duress? Do they believe that these letters had something to do with the officers of our Foreign department?

An Hon. Member: Of course, they do.

Acharya Kripalani: All right. Do they believe that the Dalai Lama is under surveillance in India? If they believe why do they get their information from Peking? Why don't they go to Mussoorie. I am sure, if applied to the Prime Minister, or

even without application, they will be allowed to go to Mussoorie and see things for themselves. But they want to see things through Peking and from nowhere else. They will not take facts even from the Prime Minister. They will not go there.

They will take it from Peking blindly. May I ask, do they believe that India has expansionist designs on Tibet or, for the matter of that, on any other country? Above all, do they believe in the maps that have been published by China? That is the crucial question.

Then, we will know where we stand and where they stand in this country. If they do not believe, have they advised their dear friends in China to suppress these maps? These are maps, we are told, that were published by Chiang Kaishek. Do they want China to follow in the footsteps of Chiang Kaishek, I ask my Communist friends. We are interested to know things from them categorically.

Their representatives are here. Let them answer all these questions. If they do not answer them, then, I say that they have got no case and China has got no case.

One thing more and I have done. I would draw the attention of the Prime Minister to what is said in China that the Dalai Lama and his companions are under surveillance. I know whatever restrictions are placed upon their liberty are for safety reasons.

They are also imposed so that the Tibetans may not say in India things that may be distasteful to China, they may not say things that might touch the sensitive soul of the Chinese.

An Hon. Member: Have they a soul?

Acharya Kripalani: We are putting these restrictions on their account, and those for whom we are doing all these things, do not want them. I see no reason why more freedom of expression and more freedom of movement should not be allowed to the Dalai Lama and his companions when the Chinese do not appreciate our good offices and even when they find evil in our good deeds. In the Kingdom of Hell, Satan said, "Evil be thou my good". When they suspect us of evil, let us allow the Dalai Lama and his companions to come out and meet the newspaper people and other people and political associations and political people and give out their mind. Only then will my communist friends be convinced.

Dr. P. Subbarayan (Tiruchengode): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the two speeches that have preceded mine with the care that is due. My hon. Friend Acharya Kripalani ended by asking some questions of our communist friends and I hope they will face them boldly and answer them. I want also to ask them a question. In spite of the repeated statements which have been made by the Prime Minister, still the Chinese People's Daily has said that the Prime Minister has spoken for the expansionists. I would like to know what is

meant by expansionists and how the Prime Minister has spoken for the expansionists when he has taken great care to state our policy.

They have said that the Prime Minister has supported the expansionists. I cannot see how they came to this conclusion when he has been most careful to state that our policy is not changed.

As he has stated in this House while he made his statement on Tibet, there were only three points which he laid down.

The first was the security of India. Nobody can deny that because any Government worth its name, the security of the country is the most important.

We may believe in non-violence, and we try to follow that policy in the best way we can, but at the same time, the world being what it is, we have got to take care that our security, is not disturbed.

Secondly, what did the Prime Minister say? He said that friendly relations with China should be continued, and we want to develop that further because for at least two thousand years, friendly relations have continued between China and ourselves. Was there anything wrong in what he said? Have our Communist friends ever thought of this situation? Have they ever said that there is this one man in this country who is standing between peace and war? I ask them that question, because he has consistently maintained it in spite of all that has happened in this world, that India stands for non-alignment, not out of any selfish interests, but out of the interests created in India because of the policy laid down by the great Mahatma. I remember once Mahatmaji said. "When I am gone, he will speak with my voice".

And he is doing it every time he speaks on the world situation.

That is, to maintain peace, to get nations together, get them round a table and settle quarrels by negotiations rather than by the arbitrament or arms—that has been the policy of India. I do not think that in spite of what has

happened in Tibet, in spite of the distress it has caused to the Indian people, we have in any way travelled away from the position we have taken up. Therefore, it is up to all Indian parties including my communist friends, to strengthen the hands of the Prime Minister, if they do believe in world peace. It is no use talking about world peace and at the same time doing things which really do not go to maintain world peace.

There is, no doubt, a cold war and we have avoided the cold war; and in bringing the Bandung Powers together, we tried our best to keep the cold war away from the east, or from Asia if I may so put it.

But what has happened? The way in which the Chinese public opinion has reacted, the way in which the Chinese are behaving goes to prove that they are as much in the cold war as the European nations are.

Shri M. C. Jain (Kaithal): More than that.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: Somebody said 'more than that' It may be more, but I am not going as far as that. I am only saying that they are as much in it...

Acharya Kripalani: They want to bring India also into it.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: The Chinese want to bring us? If the hon. Member say that, I agree with him. By 'they', I suppose the hon. Member means not the whole of the Asian Powers but only China. Of course, China is interested in the cold war because Russia is interested in the cold war, and naturally, they want to bring the cold war to our shores too. But I am glad to say that the Prime Minister has avoided this attempt to bring India into the cold war; he is still trying by whatever means he has in his possession to keep Asia out of the cold war.

Shri Ranga: As much of it as possible.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: As he has said himself: we still attach more importance to means than to ends.

As long as we can say that we are looking at the means and not at the ends, we shall be going in the right direction. But as regards our friends on the opposite side, I think they do believe, whatever they may affirm, that ends justify means.

That is what we want to get away from.

The end can never justify the means. If you really go about in the right way and in the right direction, you would have accomplished what you want, and what you have accomplished will always remain, because the means you adopted to get the success you have had has been righteous means. As long as that policy is maintained. I do not think that even the Communist Party can quarrel with the foreign policy as followed by the Prime Minister. I think what has always influenced him is the question of means and not the ends at all.

Though the situation is most delicate, I would still like to ask our friends this question. There have been these Chinese maps published where the MacMohan Line has been entered into, if I may so put it in that manner. Of course, they have said that this was a map produced in the times of Chiang Kaishek. Have they tried to correct that position? Have they tried to admit the rights we have in the borders which have been there and which belong to us? Can at least the Communist friends who claim influence with their counter-parts in China not maintain the position that this country holds and at least claim the part of the county which belongs to us as ours? This is not doing anything wrong either to their conscience or to their policy or to their tenets. It is only maintaining our own position.

It has been said time and again that we do not want to interfere with the internal policy of any Government. Do they not realise that when the treaty was made between India and China, we gave up rights which we had at the time. We could have said if we wanted that we were the successors to the British Government, and we were entitled to the position we held in Tibet. And yet, because we felt that we should not follow the imperialist line, we on our own free will, gave up the position we held there. Is that not proof enough to say that we are no more expansionists? And yet this word 'expansionist' is being bandied about from day to day. Is this the way to create friendly relations? I would beg my Communist friends and the Chinese authorities not to talk of expansionism because there is no question of expansionism in this country at all. We want to maintain the territory which we have, and we want to live in terms of amity and friendship with all nations, no matter of what colour the nations are. Our position is one of friendly relations with all countries including our neighbour Pakistan. They are now coming out with the statement because this has happened, that there may be a mutual military pact. I am glad the Prime Minister has categorically said that we do not want to enter into any military alliances of any kind whatsoever. We maintain our position for peace, we maintained our position as a non-aligned nation, at the same time, acting as occasion demands provided we are on the path of righteousness.

Shri S.A. Dange (Bombay City-Central): The problem presented during this debate is a very complicated problem. It is not the problem of Tibet. It is the problem of our foreign policy. As far as that policy is concerned, it is well known that the Communist Party supports in general the foreign policy of the Government of India as enunciated by Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

While we are supporting that policy, it does not mean that either the Prime Minister or the other countries, whatever their governments, are quite infallible. I do not attribute infallibility either to the Prime Minister here or to the Prime Minister of China or to the Prime Minister of Russia or to the Prime Minister of America.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: There is no Prime Minister in America.

S.A. Dange: Therefore, while supporting the general foreign policy of Government, we can have points where here and there we might have differences of opinion.

So, if it comes to a question of policy, our policy stands as it was. There is general support to the Prime Minister's policy of peace. Now, he himself has stated that on this question of Tibet, what ultimately has happened is that a little crack has taken place in the feelings of friendliness between China and India and that Panchsheel has suffered a crack. Now, when a crack takes place, naturally two sides have to advance together to heal the crack. For us in India, it is our business to see how our side heals the crack. It is for the Chinese side to see how they advance on their side to heal the crack.

Therefore, I am looking at the question from that point of view only.

Some speakers have asked us many questions. Unfortunately, I have not got the text of the questions here. Neither could I take them down as I am not shorthand writer.

An Hon. Member: You can remember them.

Shri S.A. Dange: Well, my memory is not so sharp as yours, sorry. Even then, I do not mind answering those questions as far as I can remember them, here if there is time, outside on the rally, if you want it. Yes.

So, let us have a debate, and let us have a friendly debate, and I think this question should be resolved through a friendly debate. (Interruptions).

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): We were not interrupting them. What is this?

Shri S. A. Dange: Why do you interrupt, please?

It is a friendly debate as far as India and China are concerned.

That is what I read in the press, and as far as the Prime Minister is concerned, he has taken his stand on that.

I do not think he has been accused of expansionism as a part of his policy, nor do we maintain that Prime Minister Nehru's policy is a policy of expansionism. We do not maintain it, we do not say it, and we do not even think it. But whether the speech that was heard here and some other speeches reflect expansionism or not? That is the point.

Some Hon. Member: No no. (Interruptions).

Shri S. A. Dange: Please. Do not interrupt at least on our side.

So, do not some of the political parties, when they make their statements, have some suggestions of expansionism? But that suggestion is rather made on the basis of either.

Tibet and we have cultural links therefore we are culturally one, so, culturally Tibet is ours, but politically it is Chinese. The Chinese have committed aggression against Tibet which is culturally ours; therefore, we must defend it. Slowly it goes over to expansionism.

This is where that 'culture' logic leads us.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Chinese logic!

Shri S. A. Dange: It is not that Acharya Kripalani is capable of expansionism or anything, that is not the suggestion at all, because to practice expansionism, two things are required: firstly, political guts and secondly, real hard guns.

Acharya Kripalani: The Chinese have got.

S. A. Dange: Fortunately, the PSP has not got either of them. So, I am not accusing them of expansionism though they may like to bask in the idea of being a greater and greater party and country and all that.

So, I am not taking up the question that they are raising just now here.

Firstly, I am dealing with the position as it has been stated by the Prime Minister, that he has no ideas of expansionism. I agree with that.

The question is: certain statements have been made by the Chinese side, and certain statements of theirs have been denied by the Prime Minister, e.g. the Dalai Lama being held under duress. I do not think the first statement made was that the duress was practiced by the Government of India. The Dalai Lama escaped under duress by the rebels, and in fact, when the Prime Minister-he will excuse me-sometimes mentions that the Chinese do not observe the truth, may I ask him one question? At one time it was suggested by him also that perhaps the Dalai Lama's letters were not his own at all. Later on, the Dalai Lama himself acknowledged that the letter were his. Now where was the propriety and the truth in this case?

Therefore, when the Prime Minister says that he feels hurt, I am sure he will also admit that the other side will also feel hurt. Therefore, the hurt is on either side, and therefore it should be healed only by friendship.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): On which side do you stand?

Shri S.A. Dange: I stand here in the Parliament of India. I hope you understand that. So, when I am saying that I support the foreign policy of the Government of India and the Prime Minister particularly, I think you should know where I stand and where the party stands.

Therefore, the first part of the problem is like this. The Prime Minister and even many of his supporters in the Congress Party want this thing to be decided peacefully without any cold war being imported, and by friendly discussions and talks. But on the Chinese side, of course, there is a difficulty. The difficulty is simply this.

If China as acknowledged by the Prime Minister was to have suzerainty over Tibet, and if Tibet is acknowledged to be an autonomous region of the Chinese Republic, then naturally, diplomatically or in terms of international politics, the question does not rise why we should discuss the Tibetan problem in India or anywhere else, in UNO or some place. It is certainly the right of every country to decide the question of its own autonomous region. That is the only correct position, and that position was also conceded even by the Prime Minister, That the problem of an autonomous region should certainly be the responsibility of the suzerain Republic of China.

But, if we then try to tell them that they must do this and that, and if they consider that as an interference, then what is wrong? They themselves have asked the question-it has appeared in the press already and I will repeat it for the benefit of hon. Members. If they were to set up a committee on linguistic provinces of India, would that be right? Though these States are autonomous, they are within the Union of India. Therefore, the Chinese Government would not be correct in taking up the position that they should discuss and ask the Prime Minister as to what is happening in U.P which has a common boundary with Tibet, or in Assam which has a common boundary with Tibet. Since they have shown that much restraint, I think it would be

right and friendly for us also to show some restraint, though some of us may sympathise with the Tibetans.

Now, the question is: what is this sympathy for the Tibetans? If it is a question of sympathy for the Dalai Lama as the head of the Buddhist religion, still he is the head of the Buddhist religion, then Panchsheel is not concerned with Buddhism, nor is the Government of this concerned with Buddhism, because it is a secular State. It is concerned with Buddhism as much as it is concerned with Hinduism, Christianity, Islam and so on. If it feels very much attracted towards the maintenance of the head of the Buddhist Panth in Mussoorie, it should equally feel interested in maintaining the heads of Islam or Hinduism or the other religions in India. If the poor among the Buddhists are to be maintained, to be helped-I have no objection-every religions group may also ask: what about our poor being maintained?

Now, the point may be raised that this is a question of law and order, defence and security and so no. If that much is the problem, I do not mind it. If 10,000 refugees got frightened in Tibet and they crossed over, I do not challenge the honesty of the Government of India on that account because they allowed asylum to certain refugees. Well, we are a very hospitable country since time immemorial and we give hospitality to both guests and invaders and every one. So, hospitality is in our blood. I only want that these groups do not create new centres of friction between us and the Chinese. That is all that I want to see, and that is exactly what the others do not wish to see.

So far as the Government of India are concerned, so far as words and theory are concerned, they are taking up the attitude more or less of maintenance of Panchsheel, maintenance of friendliness and so on. I would plead that this bitterness and challenging each other's honesty and statement of facts should stop, because, after all, the Prime Minister himself the other day in

the Rajya Sabha, dealing with the Dalai Lama's coming here and so on, was not sure of his facts, because he cannot verify all the facts. Not that all the facts supplied to him by his officers are always wrong. No. But an officer can go wrong. Officers' facts can be wrong.

Therefore, he said: I believe it is so, I am not sure etc.

That is certainly the correct way to say.

So, I would say that the problem should be resolved on the basis of not importing cold war elements as far as the Prime Minister and his supporters are concerned. For example, his statement which was made on April 27, is very good: but what do I find there? I do not think it was right to give currency to the idea in that statement that the Dalai Lama had fled-it was his statement that I am quoting, not that the Prime Minister, is maintaining it that way-because Buddhism was in danger and his religion to him was more precious than his life. If that was so, he should not have fled. That is another matter. But then, if it is so, are we supporting that system of Buddhism? Are we officially going to lend support to it? That would be a problem and that problem, as the Prime Minister stated in his statement, he has not resolved. Of course, there is a sort of sympathy towards him. In fact, in that statement he gave us the fact that the poor young man is just 24 years old. Certainly, a 70 year old statesman ought to feel a fatherly interest in a young man of 24. Certainly, the Lama is inexperienced and all that, and I am sure the Prime Minister will advise him properly. But nobody charges the Prime Minister with holding the Dalai Lama in duress. But then if you go round and tell the Indian people that he thinks he is fighting for Buddhism and the protection of his religion by coming here, then I think that statement should be verified and the Prime Minister should later on make that position clear.

As regards the questions which have been asked by these political parties, I think I have answered one or two questions about the duress, about

expansionism and so many other things. But I am not prepared to believe that some of these gentlemen do not have expansionist words at least.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): What about the map?

Shri S. A. Dange: If our territory is shown in the Chinese map as theirs, the Chinese should correct it.

An Hon. Member: 'If '.

Shri S.A. Dange: Yes. I have not seen the map, because I did not attend that Afro-Asian Conference which Congressmen and other parties and especially Shri Khadilkar attended with a magnifying glass!

Shri Ansar Harvani (Fatehpur): How long will it take the Chinese to correct the map? (Interruptions).

S. A. Dange: The Prime Minister himself has made a statement that he is taking up the question with the Chinese Government and that they are going to settle it by peaceful means.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): But he has also said that the replies are very unsatisfactory.

Shri S. A. Dange: We should be realistic enough to know that if a line in a map is removed, that part of the country does not go out of our hands. If people believe it will, they have a poor idea about maps and their values and a poor idea about India's own integrity also.

My hon. Friend, Acharya Kripalani, has given a very good advice to the Chinese. Of course, every one of us has to give advice to everybody else. He asked: if they are so minded, instead of going over to Tibet, why did they not go over to conquer Formosa and Quemoy? May I ask a separate question? Instead of going over to Tibet, why not ask the Government of India to invade Goa first? (Interruptions). Advice is very simple. It is easier to liberate Tibet, if it is being enslaved by China. But you dare not offend American imperialism because it will intervene. You know that China will never go to war with India, whatever you do. Therefore, you have the guts to fight about it, but you have not the guts to fight about Goa.

So, this advice about invading this territory and that territory is always useless.

We know why we do not go to Goa, why we do not do it.

Therefore, this question of Tibet, as it is being understood, by my hon.

Friends of the P.S.P is, I think, a question which they more or less look at as a handle to fight the Communist Party.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Yes. (Interruptions).

Shri S. A. Dange: They are not worried about Tibet at all.

They are not worried about anybody. Their whole problem is 'How can we fight the Communist Party?' Gentlemen, you can fight us. We are here in our country. Let us fight.

I am told Acharya Kripalani the other day asked-he will correct me if I am wrong; I was not present here....

Acharya Kripalani: All these things are excused.

Shri S.A. Dange: Thank you very much for your magnanimity. I hope you do the same thing with regard to others also.

I am told Acharya Kripalani made a statement and asked: If the Chinese armies invade India, where will the Communists be? Will they be with us?

Acharya Kripalani: I asked a question. Let him reply to it now.

Shri S. A. Dange: I will reply now. Now, the Communist Party is not in the habit of waiting for foreign armies to liberate India.

We know these gentlemen who were waiting for Hitler to come through Stalingrad and to liberate them. We know that.

They were waiting for the Japanese army to enter Calcutta to liberate them. We are not waiting for any army to come.

We are not in the habit of waiting for foreign armies (Interruptions). At that time, it was claimed that they were the followers of Mahatma Gandhi.

Mahatma Gandhi never debated the question of the Germans or the Japanese liberating them. But these gentlemen right in Yeravada, next door to me, were discussing that question, not the Acharya himself.

They were discussing 'what would happen when Hitler would break through Stalingrad and we would just be out of Yeravada?'

These were the dreams. But we have not got that habit of waiting for foreign armies to do our job, because we can do it ourselves. We can die fighting for that job. We can either accomplish it or we can fail to accomplish it.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): You were collaborating with the British during that time.

Shri S. A. Dange: We know your collaboration, what it is.

Now, it has been denied by some of these friends that they do not talk of expansionism. In that case, here is a statement. I was just told that Shri Majumdar, Chairman of the Tibetan Conference-to be held in Calcutta-which is being inaugurated by Acharya Kripalani, which is being presided over by Shri Jaya Prakash Narain and the dear young lady who just now interrupted-said that they must fight for the independence of Tibet and end the suzerainty of China over Tibet.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: For your information, we may add that we are not attending that conference; we have nothing to do with that conference.

Shri S. A. Dange: Very good. So they will not now fight for the independence of Tibet. That is a good thing.

Now, there are one or two points. I do not know if I have left any question unanswered.

Acharya Kripalani: You have covered everything.

Shri S. A. Dange: That is good. He was doubtful whether I would answer his questions. I think that he is satisfied that

I have covered everything.

With regard to Tibet, there is one last point I want to make.

What is the foundation of the whole thing? It is said that the Tibetan people have risen in revolt against imperialist invasion. On this point, we should at least, to some extent, believe the facts given by China. Just as we expect them to believe facts inside our country as given by us-as the Prime Minister asks, 'Why don't you accept the facts as we give about our country?'

similarly they would ask 'Why don't you believe facts as we give them for our country?' There should be mutual belief.

With regard to Tibet, it is well-known that there is a serf system. There were 200,000 lamas attended by 800,000 Tibetans.

They have a system by which these 800,000 give thousands maunds of ghee and butter as khand or rent to the monasteries; the land is concentrated in the hands of the Bhikkus and there is a general feeling of revolt in the minds of the Tibetan peasantry.

This is the relation that subsists in Tibet, and naturally we, as a progressive country, ought to side with the Tibetans.

We as a progressive country, swearing by socialism, trying to carry out land reforms, trying to liberate serfs in our country-that type of serfdom does not now exist here-we should sympathise with those Tibetans who are trying to overthrow that system. Even the Time magazine, which represented the visit of Shri Morarji Desai so well in America, has written that this lama system, this monastic system in Tibet is a system based on serfdom.

Now, these gentlemen want to continue that system. The Chinese and Tibetan peasantry want to do away with it. Naturally, there was bound to be clash. I do not say there was clash.

There was clash. But then stories told us as if there was misfiring of guns and that was why the Lama could go away or was kidnapped.

There was something of an uprising but the Chinese at first could not handle it-all these stories are funny stories. Will the Chinese who could put well-armed shells at Quemoy which prevented the Seventh Fleet from coming nearer, will they misfire a shell on the Dalai Lama's palace?

An Hon. Member: Why not?

Shri S.A. Dange: The Chinese guns were not manned by Acharya Kripalani.

They would hit well; because they aim well, they hit well, which, of course, could not be understood by my friend and he believes in these stories.

It was not a war of aggression nor was it a national uprising.

Therefore, when we sympathise with China, I will plead with the Prime Minister, please sympathise with the serfs first, with those who are rising against the Lama system, next, with those who want to protect the serfs, that is the Chinese system of Government and its system of laws and constitution and, if we have any quarrel with them with regard to certain accusations, let us sit down and argue about those accusations and settle them without bringing in the arguments put forth by these other political parties.

Therefore, I do make a distinction between the standpoint of the Prime Minister and the standpoint of the other parties, the use which the other parties are making of this happening and the way in which the Prime Minister wishes to resolve that deadlock. That deadlock should be resolved on the basis of Panchsheel; that crack must be healed. But the crack cannot be healed by simply saying: 'We sympathise with the Tibetans.' The crack can be healed by saying: 'Yes', as he himself has said, 'You have a right over Tibet; it is an autonomous region of yours and the Tibetan system of serfdom must be overthrown surely and you are trying to carry out the reforms'. Those who want to rebel against it, if they want to run away, let them run away.

An Hon. Member: Kill them.

Shri S. A. Dange: If they have come with arms, then, certainly they will be fought. It is not a question of killing.

After all, these refugees have come here.

Well if it is a problem of their disturbing your economy, if you wish to assist them for a time, do. But, are we going to maintain them at State expense? Are they really refugees of our country, as we treated the refugees from Pakistan? In fact, the Pakistan refugees were treated worse than the refugees of Tibet in some respects. Surely, I want to know why there is so much love flowing towards these Tibetan refugees. The love for the other refugees is a little drying up and they are being thrown into Dandakaranya. Why are we very solicitous of the 7,000 ft. temperature for these Tibetan refugees which they require, for their health would suffer if they come down to the plains?

I am not an expert on Buddhism but I thought that the Great Buddha did not live in the palace of the Birlas in his own days. Neither did he eat from their plates.

You know the story of the Buddha.

When once a rich woman offered him rice in a gold plate, he ate the rice and threw the gold plate in the river.

An Hon. Member: Here is a Buddha!

Shri S. A. Dange: But the present inheritor of Buddhism will eat the rice and sell the gold plate in the black market. This is not the way in which we ought to show our sympathy... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I never try to interrupt the hon. Member. But taking a particular point and then saying that the present Buddhists-the Buddhists all over the world and let nothing be said against them here-will eat the rice and sell the gold plate in the black market is not right. He need not depend upon this point for developing his argument. There are Buddhist

and Buddhist; there are Hindus and Hindus. Shall we say that all Hindus are bad simply because one man is bad?

Shri S. A. Dange: I am not referring... (Interruptions).

Shri Raghunath Singh: Sir, this should be withdrawn. Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri S. A. Dange: I am not referring to the Buddhists as such at all. I am referring to the monasteries we have built; I am referring to the muths we have built. Even the Prime Minister and the Congress Party are moving a Bill in order to control the funds of muths. Does it mean that these muths have become bad and black-marketeers. But, a religion deteriorates from its pristine purity and becomes its own opposite when it tries to cultivate wealth, land and serf rights and so on. The system deteriorates. That is why I say this.

I am quite sure that the Dalai Lama is a good Buddhist. I am quite sure that the 10,000 Buddhist refugees who have come here are good Buddhists. Like good Buddhists, let them go round and live according to what Buddha preached. They should not compel us and ask funds from the Government of India.

Dr. Ambedkar when he wrote his book on Buddhist Sangha said few things are necessary for the Buddhist, viz., three pieces of cloth, a needle and thread and a bowl in order to take rice and drink water. They go begging and live on alms given and, for the rainy season, take shelter in a cottage. This is the original system.

Therefore, I am just pleading that the really good democratic principles of Buddhism should be practiced by the present inheritors of Buddhist traditions.

That is what I am pleading for. I am not charging that they have gone into the black market or anything like that. It is a misunderstanding which has been created (Interruptions). Therefore, I certainly accept...

Mr. Speaker: General remarks about a whole community may be resented.

Shri S. A. Dange: I am saying that the innate Buddhist instincts of these people will enable them to relieve the Prime Minister and the Treasury of the burden of looking after their health, looking after the questions of their shelter and after the question of law and order.

Finally, I would appeal to the Prime Minister not to get under the pressure of certain political parties to hustle up the question in such a way that the Panchsheel is more or less blown up in action.

Though preserved in theory, it may be blown up in practice. That is what I would plead with him.

Certainly if there is a vendetta against the Communist party, let us fight it within the border; let us fight it out. But that is not the question.

The question here is not of the Communist party and the other parties, the Communist Party of India or the P.S.P. The question here is of friendly relations between China and India.

I am quite sure that the Acharya is dead set that the Chinese can never be friendly with us. But I do not think that is the attitude either of the

Government of India or of the whole of Congress Ministry. Therefore, I would again plead, let sober thoughts prevail and let this bitterness not increase. As far as I know the Chinese themselves have tried to be sober (Interruptions). Let me cite one example. I may tell you from my own experience that in the Chinese Press and in the Soviet Press, since friendly relations were established with India and the Panchsheel declarations were signed, their Press has refused scrupulously to publish news of firing and strikes in India. I raised this question: 'Why did not these people publish these news?' They said, 'it might hurt the feelings of the Prime Minister. It might hurt the feelings and disturb Panchsheel. Therefore, we do not wish to publish the happenings about these things'. That Press has scrupulously kept away the news even when a hundred people were being shot dead in the streets of Bombay. Why have they done it? They have done it because they want to keep friendly relations with our country. If such a Press is a little bitter on this Tibetan question, let us understand that there is ground for being bitter. Therefore, let us overcome it and state facts as they are. I hope the whole thing will be resolved by mutual negotiations and the Panchsheel crack will be healed, though it may be to the disliking of Acharya Kripalani who wants to lead his Army into China.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Sivaraj.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): Sir, the atmosphere has become poisonous.

If you allow me then it will become clear. (Interruptions.) May I say a word, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput-Reserved-Sch. Castes): Sir, the Prime Minister's statement both in the Rajya Sabha and elsewhere has dealt with every aspect of the situation without fear or favour of China and in a sober and solemn manner, befitting his position as the Prime Minister of India and also as one of the world's great leaders. In fact, in...

Mr. Speaker: There is too much noise in the House. Will the hon. Member come forward?

Shall I call upon the Prime Minister at 2-30?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know when you may conclude this debate. By 2.30? There is other business at 2.30.

Mr. Speaker: It must be concluded by 2.45. The debate started at a quarter past 12. We have allotted 2 and half hours. If it is the desire of the House, this may go to some other day; I have no objection.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not my desire, of course; not at all.

Mr. Speaker: We must conclude it by 2.45.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If necessity arises I shall speak only for five minutes!

Some Hon. Member: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: I shall request the hon. Prime Minister to speak at 2.30. He could go on for 15 minutes.

Shri Siva Raj: I was saying that the Prime Minister-both in the Rajya Sabha and elsewhere-has dealt with the problem in a very sober and a solemn manner and befitting his position. In that view, I feel that this discussion that we have today is somewhat superfluous, but I welcome this discussion. In the first place, because it affords yet another occasion for this House and the people of India to express their views and thereby to strengthen the hands of our Prime Minister in tackling what is undoubtedly a very delicate and difficult problem.

I also welcome this discussion because it gives me an opportunity on behalf of the Parliamentary group of the Republican Party of India to associate itself with the sentiments expressed by Shri Khadiilkar and other Members who have dealt with this question.

I would like to take this opportunity to state the views of our party. In the first place I want to state that we fully endorse the views shared by the Prime Minister in this matter.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Secondly, we feel that in the final analysis this question should be left to be solved and settled by China and Tibet together.

We also would like to see that the Prime Minister uses his good offices and his eminent position to bring them together for such a settlement.

We feel that it is our moral obligation to make the Dalai Lama feel at home and to give all protection.

We also feel that the Tibetans must be given the freedom of movement to carry on their lawful avocations and trade even as the Chinese had been enjoying and are enjoying in our land.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There ought not to be loud talks. We can presume that those who stay in this Hall do stay for the sake of listening and not of talking.

Shri Siva Raj: But what we could not understand is China's attitude towards India. We do not understand why China is so irritable. Its irritability is one which we cannot understand. It may be due to the fact that China thinks that India is a stumbling block to her career of red imperialism. Or does she think that India is really making great success of democracy and democratic planning? Or, does she understand our friendliness or rather misunderstands our friendliness for our weakness? Anyway, this question has touched and aroused the moral conscience of the world for whatever reason it may be.

One of the reasons why I was not happy about this debate so far is that there has never been that correct approach to the discussion of this situation. Some speeches were either political in their approach or they had an ideological approach. The real approach ought to be moral. The point is that we have always supported the idea of any people enjoying their own freedom and their own way of life. Rightly or wrongly, the Tibetans have chosen a way of life and I find that it is the most democratic way of life in the sense that they choose their leader, the Dalai Lama, in a very democratic way and thereafter chose to worship him. We are of course accustomed here to put stones in temples and worship them, but there they choose a living human being and worship him.

That is the set-up that they have got and the people willingly sacrifice and surrender whatever rights they have in devotion and worship of the Dalai Lama.

I think my friend Shri Dange was speaking without his books when he referred to the kind of Buddhism that exists in Tibet. There, it is the case of the whole population of Tibet sacrificing what little they have to see that the Dalai Lama is respected, worshipped and almost protected by their devotion. Whatever may be the reason that had prompted this movement in Tibet, the fact remains that China as a suzerain power should have stood her words, namely, guaranteeing the autonomy of Tibet. It would not be proper for China to interfere with the internal life and internal affairs of Tibet. What they should be worried about was to see whether Tibet will by her action affect her security and their peace and their tranquility.

The Chinese ought to be worried about their border. One will begin to doubt the sincerity of China when she says that she is for the autonomy of Tibet. Of late, she has changed her position and says Tibet is not a protectorate, it is not a country and so on and so forth. So far as we are concerned, we have always expressed—not merely from the floor of this House but the people of India in different ways have expressed sympathy and concern over the sufferings of people who are agitated and struggling for liberation and freedom. If in Tibet, it happens that the people want to have their own way of life and practice it in their own country, it ought to be our concern to see that the country, namely, China, is approached in a manner so as to help those people to realise their ambition.

We feel that the Prime Minister should use, as I said, his good offices to get round China to his point of view. As the Prime Minister himself has pointed out, these feelings—not one of hostility actually but feelings of misunderstanding—towards India are temporary, and it is possible for the Prime Minister with his influence in world politics to bring about a settlement

between Tibet and China. I do not want to take one side or the other. It is very unfortunate that the debate has so far proceeded on party lines. There is no room for party discussions at all on this question. Whatever we may do, let us not forget our mission, as a country which through the ages, more particularly during the period of Asoka, spread her message of peace and goodwill and human happiness.

“The Tibetan regional government would voluntarily carry out the reforms, without interference from the Chinese Central Government and that latter would assist the Tibetan people.”

“Tibet would enjoy regional autonomy”

“The Republic of India and the People’s Republic of China on trade and intercourse between the Tibetan region of China and India.”

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this matter concerning the developments in Tibet has come up before this House as well as before the other House on several occasions in the course of the last few weeks and I have had occasions to make many statements on the situation arising from these developments. I should have thought that enough had been said for the time being about the basic facts. So those facts as known were challenged, in statements from China. Some of the statements from China in so far as they relate to India were not accepted as facts by us. And I wondered at one time whether it would serve any useful purpose for us to carry on this argument which could only mean really a repetition of what had been said. Nevertheless, it is perhaps a good thing for us to have this brief discussion here. But in the course of this discussion so many basic facts have been challenged, or basic ideas have been challenged, that it raises much wider issues than what has happened in Tibet.

The hon. Member who just spoke before me with warmth said many things which challenged all the basic assumptions of our policy which have been accepted by this House and I think by the country as a whole with remarkable unanimity. Nevertheless, we challenged all those basic assumptions. Either he has never believed in those basic assumptions or what has happened in Tibet has made him change his opinion.

Now, I do not propose in these few minutes to discuss all the basic assumptions of our policy. All I would like to say now is that I do not hold with the hon. Member who has spoken. I do not agree with much that he has said and so far as Government is concerned, we are not going to follow the policy that he has suggested that we should follow. I should like to make that perfectly clear.

I may say in passing remarks that we have laid no limitations on the Dalai Lama, except the limitations of good sense and propriety of which he himself is the judge. But for the hon. Member to suggest that we should allow him to do something which he has not himself suggested, that is, making India the headquarters of some kind of a campaign and that we should allow the hon. Member and his party to join in this campaign is something which seems to be so odd. I cannot imagine how even he could have made it if he had thought about it. I need not say much about it, because it has no relation to facts, no relation to what is happening in the world, or in India, or in Tibet, or in China or anywhere.

He also laid stress on the 1954 Agreement, the agreement with China in regard to Tibet. He said we should never have done it. Again I do not quite understand what is meant by this-kind of statement or this kind of viewpoint. What exactly he expects us to do is not clear except may be perhaps to hold public meeting in Ramlila Maidan and deliver speeches. That is not the way that foreign policy of a country is conducted, by public meetings held in various places in India. Public meeting are important no doubt. But

we have to come up against not only basic policies and assumptions, but hard facts in regard to foreign policy.

I have no doubt in my mind that the agreement we made with China with regard to Tibet was a right agreement. It was a correct agreement and we shall stand by it and it is not correct even for him to say that that agreement has been broken. It may be said that he thinks that certain implications of that agreement have not been, according to him, or according to anybody else, carried out.

That is a different matter. But there is no question of that agreement having been broken. It lasts; it functions.

I do not know how many people here know the background of all these problems. We have been moved naturally, we have had a kind of emotional upheaval, by recent happenings and it is quite understandable that that should be so because of certain intimate emotional and other bonds with Tibet, with the people of Tibet or the mountains of Tibet; or Kailash or Manasarovar and so on, a mixture. We can understand that. And we can respect this emotional response. Nevertheless any policy that we lay down or attempt to follow cannot be based on an emotional upheaval. They have to bear some relation to facts.

I do not know how many hon. Members here know the history, the background of Tibet, of China, of Mongolia, of Bhutan and Sikkim and Nepal in the last few hundred years. I wonder how many have cared to look into them. I do not know whether the hon. Member who just spoke knows anything about it at all. I happen to know something about it and I have taken the trouble to read quite a number of books of history, Chinese chronicles, Indian reports, etc. Here is the history of six or seven hundred years, or more, from the moment when Chengiz Khan invaded Tibet, when Kublai Khan also held Tibet in a peculiar way, considering the then Dalai Lama as a spiritual guru. It is a curious combination. Politically he was

dominant in Tibet, but Kublai Khan considered the Dalai Lama as his spiritual leader. So that you see a curious combination coming up. And in fact for a considerable period the relationship of Tibet with China was very peculiar; in a sense, I believe I am not wrong in saying, the Chinese rather looked down upon the Tibetans from the Mongol times. The Chinese rather look down upon every country other than their own. They consider themselves as the middle kingdom, as the celestial race, a great country, whether it was the Tang kingdom, or the Ming kingdom or ultimately the Manchus for a long period. The relations between China and Tibet varied from sovereignty or suzerainty, or half- sovereignty or semi-independence for a long periods till the Manchu dynasty right up to the beginning of the twentieth century held full sway over Tibet, quite a considerable sway. Even in the last days of the Manchu dynasty, when it fell, it held some considerable influence in Tibet. When the Manchu dynasty fell round about forty or fifty years ago it weakened. It weakened, but whoever held China, whether it was the Emperor, or whether it was President Yuan Shih Kai, whether it was the war lords after them or whether it was Marshal Chiang Kai Shek's regime, or whether it was the Peoples' Government, they had one consistent policy from Emperor to the communists, of considering themselves as overlords of Tibet. No doubt, when Tibet was strong, it resisted that from time to time. There have been occasions when, twice at least, Tibetan armies reached the capital of China-it is rather old history-as the Chinese armies came repeatedly into Tibet. There have been occasions when Nepalese army went into Tibet and Tibetan army came into Nepal. There was one occasion at least when a certain General from Kashmir, Zoravar Singh, who carried out a brilliant campaign across the Himalayas in Tibet only, of course, to meet a stouter enemy than Tibetan or anybody, the cold of Tibet. The temperature of Tibet put an end to him and his army there. All this is history, mixed history. There is no doubt that the countries with whom Tibet

has been most intimately connected in the past have been Mongolia and China, naturally for historical and other reasons, religious reasons, cultural reasons.

But all these do not count. In considering the present day situation, we have to take things as they are and have been recently.

We cannot think of Changiz Khan's time or Kublai Khan's time or the Manchu Emperors or Chiang Kaishek or anybody else. In regard to the present situation, what exactly are we after? If we accept the hon. Member Shri Vajpayee's statement, we should, more or less, prepare for an armed conflict on this issue. We cannot pat somebody on the back and tell him to fight and say, we will cheer you from the background. That is an absurd situation.

We must be clear in our mind what we are saying or aiming it. I take it that we aim at, whatever problems may arise first of all, a peaceful solution for those problems. Peaceful solutions are not brought about by warlike speeches and warlike approaches. It is obvious that if some people in China think that by threats and strong speeches, they can frighten India, that is wrong. It is equally obvious that if some people in India think that by threats and warlike speeches, they can frighten China, that is equally wrong. Obviously not. Great countries, India or China, are not pushed about in this way. They react in the opposite direction.

So far as China is concerned, -not with us, but with other countries, we know very well; with USA, with other countries- China herself is a part of a military bloc system on that one side and China herself is intimately concerned with cold war. Not with us; but because of this bloc system. They have got used to ways of expressing their opinion which, personally, I find, is not the right way in international parlance.

And now about the cold war technique, we have recently had some experience of that in regard to India. It is true, we have reacted against it.

We did not like it. The question arises whether we should adopt that technique or not. It is an important thing, because it concerns our policy too. I think that neither that policy nor that way of expression which may be called cold war expression is right for any country: certainly not for us, unless we want to change our policy completely. We do not want to change it. We think it would be harmful from every point of view to change this policy. We should pursue that policy. That policy is based not so much on what the other country does, but on its inherent rightness in so far as we can understand it.

We may be swept away now and then. It is a different matter.

We are human beings. But, if we think coolly and calmly, we must realise that we must adhere to that policy. If so, our expression of opinions, our challenges, our threats, etc., should not be made if they do not fit in with that particular policy.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

That, I would submit to this House, is not a sign of weakness. I do not think any country in the world thinks that India, in the past few years, has adopted a policy of weakness. Some have accused us of bending backwards and of siding with this side or that side. I think they have begun to realise that if we are sometimes short of speech, friendly in speech, it does not denote weakness, but a certain conviction that that is the only right way to deal with international problems or, for that matter of national problems. Therefore, I submit that we must not talk about these warlike approaches and threats. We must not be overcome by anger even though, sometimes, we may feel a little angry about events that are happening.

We must show by our firm policy, and calm demeanour that we will continue that friendly effort that we have always made even when it comes right up to our borders.

There is a great deal of sympathy for the people of Tibet, undoubtedly.

Certainly not because the people of Tibet have a feudal regime. They have been cut off and have had a static social system which may have existed in other parts of the world some hundreds of years ago, but has ceased to exist elsewhere. Nobody wants that here. As a matter of fact, I am quite sure, even the Dalai Lama does not want it in Tibet. Here, we see a strange thing, a society which had been isolated completely for hundreds of years suddenly coming out into the open, events throwing out into the mad world of ours, cold wars and all kinds of things happening, dynamic policies and ferocious policies and authoritarian policies. Imagine the contrast in these two. There is a vast gulf. It is inevitable that painful consequences flow from this type of thing.

You can learn lessons from them.

You can try to moderate the effect of that impact.

You cannot simply wish it away. It was the policy, I believe, of the People's Government of China, who realized that a country like this cannot be treated in a sudden way, to go slowly about the so-called reforms or whatever it may be. Whether that policy has changed or not, I cannot say. May be, it has changed somewhat. That is quite possible. Whether other changes are taking place in China, I cannot say. It was definitely a policy and they stated it publicly and privately that they realized this.

There is another difficulty in my or our dealing with these matters and that is, that the words we use have a different meaning for other people. For instance, we talk of the autonomy of Tibet. So do the Chinese. But, a doubt creeps into my mind as to whether the meaning I attach to it is the same as they attach to it. I do not think so. There are so many other words. I am not

talking of any deliberate distortion. Quite apart from any distortion, the ways of thinking have changed. They have changed anyhow and the cold war methods have made them change even more. It is frightfully difficult really to talk the same language, the same language of the mind, I mean.

Difficulty arises because of that also, and tremendous misunderstandings arise. However, I cannot go into all these matters.

One thing, I may say is that some reference was made, I think by Shri S. A. Dange to some convention on Tibet by a certain Mazumdar. I have not heard of it except today. In fact, just when I came, I heard something about it.

Whatever I have seen till now and whatever that convention appears to aim at or whatever it seems to represent, to me it seems to be very wrong. It is a wrong approach, an approach which will do no good to anybody at all, and may do a good deal of harm if really it was the approach of any responsible people in India. For, we must realise first of all one common thing. What do we want? What are we aiming at? How can we get there? What can we do about it?

I take it that we are sad, we are distressed at events in Tibet. Why are we distressed? Presumably because we feel that a certain people are being sat upon, are being oppressed. Whether those certain people, according to Shri S. A. Dange, are feudal landlords or some people like that or according to others, they are common people of Tibet.

Whatever it may be, there it is. I have no doubt in my mind that it is difficult to draw the line in such cases between the top feudal elements and others. They all can be mixed together. And as a result, for the moment, they are all uprooted.

Now, where a society has existed for hundred and hundreds of years-it may have outlasted its utility but the fact of their uprooting is a terribly painful process. It can be uprooted slowly, it can be changed even with rapidity, but with a measure of co-operation. But any kind of a forcible uprooting of that

must necessarily be painful, whether it is a good society or a bad society. If we have to deal with such societies anywhere in the world, which as a social group may be called primitive, it is not an easy matter on how to deal with it. All these difficult things are happening.

They should have happened; they would have happened, may be a little more slowly but with a greater measure of co-operation, because only such a change can take place effectively and with least harm to those people concerned. They may be helped by others, may be advised by others. Every good thing that is done by imposition becomes a bad thing. It produces a different reaction. I cannot judge what is happening in Tibet. I do not have facts, neither does anybody in this House, except broadly some odd fact are here and there. But I am merely venturing to say that all these complicated systems are not so easy to disentangle. Anyhow, whatever it may be, it has undoubtedly brought a great deal of suffering to the people of Tibet. And I should have liked to avoid it. But what can I do?

People talk in a strange way. The representatives of a number of countries are being summoned and orders being issued asking them to do this and that. I am surprised that they should think on those lines, as if this can be done.

Here is, after years of effort, going to be, possibly what is called a summit conference somewhere in Europe, where the great powers of the earth, Russia, America, England and France and may be somebody else Italy, Italy or whatever it may be, would be summoned to decide the fate of the world. What they will decide, I do not know. I wish them well. I wish they will come to some understanding. But the way hon. Members here say casually that we should issue orders and decrees and get together and decide or it will be the worst of you seems almost really a comic opera approach; it has no relation to reality.

It is a basic fact that China is a great country, and India is a great country, great in extent, great in background, great in many things. I am not talking so much about military power, although from the point of view of defence or offence, no doubt, their potentials are considerable.

Now, looking at the subject from any long perspective, or even in the short perspective, it is a matter of considerable consequence that China and India should be friends, should be co-operative. It does not mean that they should go the same path, but they should not come in each other's way; they should not be hostile to each other; it is neither good for India nor for China. And China may be a very strong country as it is, and is growing stronger, but even from the Chinese point of view, it is not a good thing to have a hostile India. It makes a great deal of difference to have that kind of thing- I am not talking in military terms but otherwise. It is to the interest of both these countries, even though they function in different and in many ways not to be hostile to each other. If China starts telling me what to do, I am likely to be irritated. If I go about telling China what to do, China is likely to be irritated, even more than I am, because I am supposed to be a soft person and the Chinese are not supposed to be very soft about these matters; may be; so, there it is.

Now, maintaining our dignity, maintaining our rights, maintaining our self-respect, and yet not allowing ourselves to drift into wrong attitudes and hostile attitudes and trying to help in removing or in solving such problems as arise, we may help a little.

They cannot be solved quickly – that is the very utmost that one can do in the circumstances, or at any rate, creating an atmosphere which may help in doing this. How far it will go, I do not know.

So, I venture to say that this should be our broad approach to this matter. We cannot go any further. We might possibly help in that approach there.

After all, this House and the country have expressed in fairly effective language their reactions to Tibet development and events in Tibet. Nobody doubts them. But I might say that our going on talking in fiery and hostile language will not carry conviction to any; it will only lead to greater gulf being created and less possibility of any help being rendered in understanding or in finding a solution.

Therefore, I would beg to suggest that we should not allow ourselves to be swept away in these matters.

One thing which was referred to by two or three Members was the question of maps. Now, there is now doubt about it that this continuance of what are called old maps by China, which show certain, fairly large areas of Indian territory, as if they belong to the Chinese State, has been a factor creating continual irritation in the minds of people in this country. It is not some crisis that has arisen, but it has been difficult for our people, naturally, to understand why this kind of thing continues indefinitely year after year. It is not, mind you, a question of some old little pocket here and there which may be in dispute on which we can argue - there are two or three pockets about which we have had, and we are going to have discussions - but this business of issuing these maps which are not true to fact, which can hardly be justified on the ground of history, of Marshal Chiang Kai-shek's regime or any previous regime.

I shall just say one word more. I think Shri S. A. Dange talked about the palace of the Dalai Lama and all that. I think that is an exaggeration. First of all, it is not his choice. It is our choice. And it is rather slightly bigger than a normal house in Mussoorie. We had to find a biggest house because of the number of people involved.

As I have said, there is no question of surveillance on him except for security reasons, and we have not prevented him from meeting anybody if he wants to meet. He has met, in fact, large numbers of people; some people go for

darshan to him, and some individuals, often Buddhist representatives from Ceylon and other places are coming to see him. Nobody prevents anyone. Certainly, as for the odd newspaper man, especially from foreign countries, who comes here in search of sensation, we even don't prevent such persons but at the same time we do not welcome him, because such persons reduce everything to high sensationalism.

The other day, I said in the other place that all this business of God King etc. is not to my liking. He is the Dalai Lama, referred to as the Dalai Lama; and it creates sensation-mongering, saying God-King all the time. I may say that the Dalai Lama himself does not like this business.

Therefore, we do not want this whole occurrence to be reduced or kept up to the sensational level.

That was why we were not at all anxious that so many correspondents should go there and beseech him; and then there will always be difficulties, interpreters and all that; and confusion will arise and contradictions and all that.

Acharya Kripalani: You may allow some Communist friends to go and see him.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We shall allow both our Communist friends and our PSP friends, both of them. It is not really question of our allowing, we do not give permits. It is for him.

Acharya Kripalani: You may give them some extra facilities.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, we have to face the large problem of these refugees. It is a difficult problem, and it has been thrust upon us.

If I may say just one word, before the 11th March-that is not so long ago, about seven weeks ago ? We had no inkling of what might happen in Tibet. On the 11th March, we got the first word of some demonstration in Lhasa by Tibetans, and on the 17th, six days later, came this business of, so it is said shelling the Dalai Lama's palace. Shri Dange said something about bad marksmanship. I am only saying what he said. It is not bad marksmanship, but deliberately they were sent there as a kind of warning.

Anyhow, then the situation developed on the 20th; fighting took place there. The situation developed so rapidly after that, and the House knows what happened afterwards. The Dalai Lama left on the 17th evening, and arrived here at the end of the month, so that we really were rather overtaken by events.

We did not know that the Dalai Lama was coming here till about two days before he actually entered India. We had imagined when we knew he was traveling south that he might come, but it was only two days before that, that we heard that he would like to come, so that we were overtaken by events.

We had decided to accept him. Later, when others came, we decided to allow them to come too, and there they are all these refugees, apart from the Dalai Lama.

The present estimates are about 10,000 -and all kinds of refugees- the old, the aged, some young people, some women, and it is obviously going to be a bit of a problem for us. We are not going to keep them in barbed wire enclosures forever. For the present, we are keeping them in two or three camps.

Shri M. P. Mishra (Begusarai): Are all of them fed and lodged?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But the sooner we spread them out, the better it is. May be someone will have to remain for some time; I do not know.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampore): I have one question to ask, only one small question.

One thing has intrigued many observers greatly, that is that the Dalai Lama has been elected by the People's Congress in China as one of the Vice-Chairmen.

An Hon. Member: The Panchen Lama.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: The Panchen Lama and the Dalai Lama. I am sure of my facts. That is correct.

Because he is also a part of that State, has our Government received any request from the Chinese Embassy here that the Chinese Ambassador or any of his representatives should see the Vice-Chairman of the People's Republic?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir.

We have received no such request. I stated, as you might remember, that the Chinese Ambassador would be welcome to see him if he so wishes.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Only one question I have to ask you.

Is it not a fact that what has happened in Tibet is only an extension of the war between the U.S. and USSR? They want to have a hold on Tibet so that India would not go together with America and England in case of war between U.S. and USSR.

What has happened in Tibet is that they want Tibet to come entirely under the USSR and China, because I was in Tibet, I was traveling in China, I was helped by Soviet Russia and by China to go to Tibet. I know what they are thinking; I know their psychology. So, I beg you to consider this Tibetan question from the standpoint that it is a war move between U.S. and USSR.

Mr. Speaker: How long ago was the hon. Member there?

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I was staying in Peking and Nanking and traveling all over China, and I took one year to go from Peking to Tibet and back. I went by the northern route and came back by the southern route to China. I specially studied it because Soviet Russia and China helped me. I may tell you one thing more. In 1925 Soviet Russia and China were rivals in connection with Tibet.

Mr. Speaker: The House is satisfied with what he has already said.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): I want to ask the hon. Prime Minister if these 10,000 refugees that have come from Tibet are all well-to-do feudal lords, or are they the common people of Tibet.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot give any description of all of them. They have not reached, they are on the way, but it is hardly likely that Tibet will produce 10,000 lords.