

DEBATE IN THE LOK SABHA

On May 8, 1959, the Lok Sabha debated Tibet. The following are extracts from the proceedings¹:

MR. KHADILKAR:

After listening to the statements given in a comprehensive manner and the developments that took place in Tibet, I 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 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... These charges were repeatedly by responsible persons. We have been painted in the same way as the Americans were 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 or any dignitary of the Chinese State come over to India and let him talk the matter over. I felt that it would have been proper and I fervently hoped that China would accept that, instead of talking at this level of a propaganda of a vicious nature, it 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.

Chinese Propaganda against India

¹ Source: Sen, Chanakya, *Tibet Disappears* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1960)

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 People's Daily and the Peking Daily. Readers are ventilating their views and only yesterday, the Peking 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 lower level. There are workers' rallies and students' rallies all over China where the minds of the people and 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? Had 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 did 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, we can remain neutral, but people cannot remain neutral. They make 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.

Question of Interference

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 ward, 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 ward and protested along with him. 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 record books that for interference in the administration of the jail, our privileges were cut off. The charge of interference regarding the Tibetan affairs is of a similar nature. Are we going to be silenced because it is our friendly country with whom we have tried to cultivate friendship despite certain issues hanging 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 henceforward when we are dealing with our neighbour with a different system of Government, while we deal with the other problems like Algeria and the government-in-exile? Their Prime minister was here and he was received by our Prime Minister as well as our people here. Our relations with France are not in any way hostile .We have expressed our views about Central Africans and the sort of terror practised 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 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 here that:

The Chinese claim Tibet as a part of China. The Tibetans 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 civilised 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 shown that there was in drafting it, some hidden hand under the influence of some foreign power, Indian hidden hand behind it. This was the voice of the Tibetan people as it was presented to the United Nations. Therefore, this we accepted, and while carrying on the negotiations, we stated in our note of the 26th October 1959:

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 have we 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.

No Independent Tibet

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 negotiations, 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 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 lot of complications. We do realise that. We do not want that. But at the same time, we must realise that when we relinquish them, we never claimed anything in return. It was a unilateral declaration. But I am confident that the Chinese would also try to respect the rights of the Tibetan people, instead of asserting from the old title deeds of doubtful value, title deeds which were imposed on the Tibetan people by the old feudal emperors.

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 say this to the Chinese people; 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 nerve flattering. They doubted whether we had achieved freedom. With all this background we have to consider this. 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, we are suspicious about it. So the idea is 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.

Indian Policy Consistent

Therefore, so far as the Tibetan rising is concerned, on this occasion, we must realise that it is the Tibetan People who have created the problem of China. Whether it is to be dealt with militarily and we are to sit quiet that is a different matter altogether. We cannot sit quiet. Of course, they have military might. They can send in divisions and say "We have restored peace"- as it is said that you can create a desert 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.

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 Dalai 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, our method is different.

So, our approach to Tibetan affairs is the same, 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.

Suzerainty, Not Sovereignty

It is a great tragedy, because for the first time, when a friendly 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 Panchsheel, we get this experience as to what 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 benefit or 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 extraterritorial rights, we have never accepted Chinese sovereignty-that distinction is there-we have only maintained Chinese suzerainty. We shall accept it in the larger interests.

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 necessarily inspired by certain nationalist feelings, nationalist sentiments. Indian Communists can afford to disregard Indian nationalist sentiments; that is their tradition; they have not grown up in our nationalist tradition which is the misfortune of Indian communism.

The Himalayas and the Indian Mind

Therefore, what I am going to say on the occasion need not be taken as something chauvinistic. Our civilisation is woven round the Himalayas, and all our culture, our thought has some power, with whatever 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 tradition , the Indian mind so

far as the Himalayas and our traditional flow of civilisation in this land are concerned.

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. 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 have shifted it. We do not want to encroach upon anybody's freedom, but at the same time from the point of view of security, 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. After repeated requests these cartographic errors, or mistakes as they are called, are not yet rectified. I am not sure because I have seen the map at the 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.....

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, Kachins and Pao 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 the issues. As another big power in Asia, we cannot be subdued, we cannot be cowed down henceforward. Oh, you are under foreign influence and therefore you

are not your own masters-this argument should not be bandied about by any Communist henceforward 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 followed consistently the policy of non-alignment and non-commitment. Western protagonists of 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.

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 played a role, when the world is divided in two camps he supplied the bridge to avoid conflict.

In effect, the two ideology emerging, by which there is a certain amount of synthesis, where we 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 as an elder brother. We thought that with China, India and the 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 war a force of liberation was freed. It has helped to demolish the old imperialist powers and strengthen freedom in the colonial regimes. Do you want to create an attitude of frustration, 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 about success. I would appeal to the Chinese friends that in all sincerity 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 are placed before the public, immediately forgetting friendship if they are going to attack our bona fides, we must resist it- and resist it with all the might at our command.

We are being judged not because we have got a big army. We have been judged in the wide world by the peoples 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 teenager Lama said in China. It was to my mind , impertinence. I could have excused in a young man but how it was released by the friendly Chinese power, 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 Dalai Lama here is under duress is not all right. When there is an open invitation to come and meet and settle the issue, I hope the Chinese will appreciate the deep sentiment and the vital interest, not the

political interest but a very vital interest, we have in Tibetan freedom and the whole Himalayan region, if I may so.

ACHARYA KRIPALANI:

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 criticise 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 the hard criticism that is being leveled by China itself against Yugoslavia would be considered internal interference with that country. But in the Communist world there are two standards of judgment - one for themselves and the other for others with whom they are in opposition.

"The Rape of a Nation"

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 UNO 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.

England went to war with Germany not because Germany had invaded England, but because it had invaded Poland and Belgium.

Sir, again 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

aggression designs of China. Let us see what the Chinese themselves did in 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 recognise 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 aright we were called the "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 sought to have been allowed to live its own life. A good government is no substitute for self -government"

China and the United Nations

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 Panchsheel is a moral imperative. 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 coexistence. how can there be peaceful coexistence unless it is an idea that applies to more nations than one?. 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.

China Not Friend of India

In the present case China has one better. It has not only violated them, but has accused us of violating them.

Sir, I feel even if we go on emphasising our friendship with China and saying Chini-Hindi Bhai Bhai (India and China are Brothers) to the ends of days, I tell you that this nation will never be friendly to us. Why? Because a friendly nation does not go and how at the 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 through diplomatic channels. And they did it six months back; the case was investigated and the charge was found unfounded and a report was sent to them.

They had nothing further to say. Why \Was not this method of diplomatic approach on this occasion employed? 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. 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 being frightened.

China Does Not Care for Asia

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, in its selfishness, it would have realised that it was alienating the whole of Asia, especially, South-East Asia. To whom will South-East Asia look for support? They 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 bed 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 thing also. The Asian nations know that there is Formosa, that there are the off-coast islands, there is Hong Kong. This is Chinese territory. It is populated by Chinese people. They 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. Why do not they do that? The Asian nations are not stupid. They know that they do not do it not because Chiang Kai-shek has more power than Communist China, but because America is behind it. They know, if they attack them 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 dear, whatever may happen, in this cold war, we maintain our position of nonalignment. He has declared it. But, what do the Chinese say?

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 hand" of our Prime Minister. I further go and say, that they should thank the 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 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?

MR. BAJAJ: Panchen Lama is in duress.

MR. 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? 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 they applied to the Prime Minister, or even I, 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 it 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 Chinese 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 arc maps, we are told, that were published by Chiang Kai-shek. Do they want China to follow in the footsteps of Chiang Kai-shek, I ask my Communist friends. We are interested to know these 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.

More Freedom for Dalai Lama

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 for this that they 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?

MR. 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 they do not appreciate our good offices and even when they find evil in our good also. 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 bodies and political people and give out their minds. Only then will my Communist friends be convinced. Even then they will not be convinced; non so blind as would not see.

MR. S.A DANGE:

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.

AN HON.MEMBER: There is no Prime Minister in America.

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

Crack in Sino-Indian Friendship

So if it comes to a question of policy, our policy stands as it ws. 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 not minor questions here and there but 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 there are always to a crack, and both the sides have to advise together to heal the crack. For us there is the Communist Party 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 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 a shorthand writer.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can 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.

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.

Nehru Has No Expansionism

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 the speech that was heard here, and some other speeches reflect expansionism or not? That is the point. So, do not some of the political parties, when they make their statements, have some suggestions of expansionism? But that suggestion is rather made culturally. Tibet and we have cultural links, therefore, we and Tibet are culturally one, so, culturally Tibet is ours, but politically Chinese. The Chinese have committed aggression against Tibet, therefore, we must defend it. Slightly it goes over to expansionism. This is where that logic leads us.

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

MR. KRIPALANI: The Chinese have got.

MR. 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 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 practised 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 letters were his. Now, where was the propriety and the truth in this case?

Both Sides Are Hurt

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, he hurt is on either side, and, therefore, it should be healed only by friendship.

AN HON. MEMBER: On which side do you stand?

MR. 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. This 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 is acknowledged by the Prime Minister as having the power of 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 arise why we should discuss the Tibetan problem in India or anywhere else, in the UNO or some other place. It is certainly the right of every country to decide the question of its own autonomous region. That is the only position, and that position also will by and by be 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 the hon. Members. If they were to set up a committee on linguistic provinces, 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 UP 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 sympathize with the Tibetans.

Now, the question is: what is this sympathy for the Tibetans? If it is a question of the Dalai Lama as the head of the Buddhist religion, and

Panchsheel is not concerned with Buddhism, nor is the Government of India concerned with Buddhism, because it is a secular State. It is concerned with Buddhism as it is concerned with Hinduism, Christianity, Islam and so on. If it feels very much attracted towards maintenance of the head of the Buddhist Panth is 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 religious group also may ask: what about our poor being maintained?

Question of Security

Now, the question may be raised that this is a question of law and order, defence and security and so on. If that much is the problem, I do not mind it. If ten thousand refugees got frightened I 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 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 correct to say.

No Cold War

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? 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 disputing, not that the Prime Minister is maintaining in 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 he stated in his statement, he has not resolved. Of course, there is a sort of sympathy towards him. In fact, in the statement he gave us the fact that the poor youngman is just 24 years old. Certainly a 70 - year - old statesman ought to feel a fatherly interest in a young man of 24. Certainly he is inexperienced and all that, and I am sure he 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 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.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the map?

MR. DANGE: If or territory is shown in the Chinese map as theirs, the Chinese should correct it.

AN HON. MEMBER: If?

MR. DANGE: I have not seen the map, because I did not attend that Afro-Asian Conference which Congressmen and other parties and especially Shri Khadiolkar attended with a magnifying glass?

AN HON. MEMBER: How long will it take the Chinese to correct the map? (Interruptions)

MR. 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.

AN. HON. MEMBER: But he has also said that the replies are very unsatisfactory.

MR DANGE: We should be realistic enough to know that if a line in a map is moved, that part of the country does not go out of our hands.

If the 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, Kripalani, has given a very good advice to the Chinese. Of course, everyone of us has a right 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 Goa than 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 PSP is, I think, a question which they more or less look at as a handle to fight the Communist Party. (Interruptions) 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 made a statement and asked: If the Chinese armies invade India, where will be the Communists?

Will they be with us?

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...

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. (Interruptions)

Now, it has been denied by some of these friends that they do not talk of expansionism. In that case, there 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. (Interruptions)....

Sympathy for Whom?

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 are 200,000 lamas attended by eight hundred thousands Tibetans.

They have a system by which these eight hundred thousand give thousands of 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 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 a clash. I do not say there was no clash. There was clash. But then stories were told as if there was a misfiring of guns and that was why the Lama went 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-aimed 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?

Mr. DANGE. The Chinese guns were not manned by Acharya Kripalani. They would hit well; because they aim well.

It was not a war; it was not 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 those accusations and settle them without bringing in the arguments of other political parties.

The Crack Must Be Healed.

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 the 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 said. "You have a right over Tibet; it is an autonomous region of yours and the Tibetan system of serfdom must be overthrown 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...

Tibetan Refugees

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 are being treated 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 7000-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 pattals? You know the story of the Buddha. When once a rich woman offered him rice in a gold plate, he ate the rice and throw the gold plate in the river.

But at the present inheritors of Buddhism will eat the rice and sell the gold plate in the black market. This is not the way in which ought to show our sympathy... (interruptions)

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

I am quite sure that Dalai Lama is a good Buddhist. I am quite sure that ten thousand Buddhist refugees who have come are good Buddhist. Like good Buddhists let them go around 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 these things are necessary-three pieces of cloth, a needle and a 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 system. Therefore, I am just pleading that the really good democratic principles of Buddhism should be practised 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)

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 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 to 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 of India or the PSP. The question here is of friendly relations between India and China.

I am quite sure that the Acharya is dead set that the Chinese 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 the 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 tired 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 Panchsheel declarations were signed, their press has refused scrupulously to publish news of firing and strikes in India. I raised this question... They said it might hurt the feelings of the Prime Minister. It might hurt the feelings and disturb Panchsheel. Therefore we don't wish to publish the happening about these things. The press has scrupulously kept away the news even of a hundred people 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 the army into China.

Mr. PANT ON TIBET

(Report of a speech by Mr. Govind Ballabh Pant, India's Home Minister, during the Lok Sabha debate on Tibet on 1 April 1959)

Here, we are in a delicate position. We want to maintain that friendliness with China which is a neighbour, a great country and with whom we have entered into an agreement also and with which our association goes back to many many hundred of years. But at the same time Tibet is a closer neighbour, very weak neighbour which deserves compassion and pity if nothing else. It consists of almost disarmed people who give their time to prayer and devotion and who have hardly mundane interests. People like that, I think, should be viewed with sympathy by everyone...

And when they are in trouble and they are faced with a very trying ordeal I think we cannot but feel some sympathy for them. In fact, we have cultural ties, we have religious ties. Both of us belong to those communities which still have faith in religion and in God. So, there are many ties that bind us. In spite of that, so far as political relations go, we want to adhere to the policy which we have accepted in our relations with China. And both of us have agreed to the basic principles of "Panchsheel". Well after that clear enunciation of the policy one would have expected that his [Mr.Nehru's] words would not be disputed but the People's daily has taken a different line. Perhaps, the Chinese Government may not have noticed what the Prime Minister has said. if they had, perhaps they would not have repeated what had been repudiated and denied categorically by the External Affairs Ministry and the remarks made by the spokesman of that Ministry had been endorsed by the Prime Minister. He had also referred to the matter in full detail.

So, I quite understand how some of our colleagues should feel perturbed and concerned when a solemn statement made by the Prime Minister is in any way disputed by any section of our people in this country. The words used in the statement, I am told-I do not know whether I am right, I will stand corrected if I am wrong are that Kalimpong was the commanding centre of the revolt. These are words which had appeared in the report that is published by the Chinese Communist agency and if these words have also been confirmed by the central office of the Communist Party after they had an opportunity to listen to what the Prime Minister had said..."

(Interruptions from Communist benches)

MR.SPEAKER: "Order, Order. When I asked Members to give me an authoritative statement they could not give. Unless they gave an authoritative statement we will go by newspaper reports. Let there be no interruptions. At the end, if an explanation is necessary I will give them [Communist Members] an opportunity".

The Home Minister said that if what had been stated in the adjournment motion had been said he considered it not only unfortunate but extremely deplorable. That had appeared after the Prime Minister had made a statement in this House and the spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry had definitely stated that this charge was utterly unfounded and baseless. In the circumstance, said Pandit Pant, if Members here felt such statements were likely to give a wrong impression to people outside, "I think that feeling must be respected. It does give rise to some sort of misunderstanding". There was another statement which was equally important and worth noticing. That had accused the Indian Government of violating the

Panchsheel which enjoyed strict neutrality and non-interference in each other's affairs.

Continuing, the Home Minister said it was far from his intention to cause any irritation to anybody. He would try to deal with the matter in a dispassionate and detached manner so far as he possibly could. "if there is any sort of allegation or insinuation or suggestion in the statement that the Government of India had failed in observing the principles of Panchsheel, of which our Prime Minister is the father..."

MR. K.T.K TANGAMANI: "Shadow father"

PANDIT PANT: "The words [Panchsheel] were ushered into existence really by him. Many of the sovereign States have now accepted it and have agreed to pay their homage and allegiance to it. It will be a matter of regret if the Prime Minister were to be repudiated by some of our own countrymen".

MR.SPEAKER: "He is entitled to read what has been made in the statement. I allowed Prof. Mukherjee to have his say and let the Home Minister explain his standpoint. I will decide what is to be ultimately done".

PANDIT PANT: "I am basing my remarks on what has been said in the text of the adjournment motion. I am not referring to anything extraneous. Everything I have said is germane to and arises out of the text of the adjournment motion itself. What I am saying is that, if it is correct, I take it that the mover has taken great care to see that the words he has used are really authentic and correct-and if anybody here in this country has said that the Indian Government has infringed

the basic principles of Panchsheel that will be a matter of deep regret for everyone of us here, because the Prime Minister has persuaded many other countries, China too. So , it would be a matter of real sorrow and even of anguish to some of us if it was said that the Government of India had failed to act up to their profession in regard to the solemn doctrine of Panchsheel".

MRS .LAKSHMI MENON'S REMARKS

The following is an extract from a speech by Mrs. Lakshmi Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, in the course of the April 1 debate. Mrs. Menon rose to join issue with Mrs. Chakravathy (Communist)

The Member thinks that the Prime Minister has been making statements without making inquiries. I take very strong exception to that. Secondly, the matter had been brought to the notice of the Government by the Chinese Embassy last July and a thorough enquiry was made into all the allegations made by the Chinese Government. And, we have sent an "aide memoire" in August last repudiating all the charges. As a result of our inquiry not one of them [Charges] had been found correct. There is no reason why we should make any enquiry just because the Communist Party wants it.

With regard to the second thing, whether there was any violation as such but it is highly diplomatic privileges, actually there is no violation as such but it is highly improper for any mission posted in any country to make any critical statement about the Government or the Government's activity. It is not the function of an embassy to make a critical estimate of that Government's policy or criticise the activities of that Government. In this case, the Prime Minister's integrity, his honesty, has been challenged. We take very strong exception to it.