

INDIAN LEADERS ON TIBET



Department of Information and International Relations
Central Tibetan Administration
Dharamsala - 176215
H.P.

1998

FOREWORD

TIBET was an independent country in fact and law for more than two thousand years prior to the Chinese invasion in 1949. For centuries, Tibet served as an effective buffer state between the world's two most-populous nations, India and China, ensuring peace and tranquility in the region.

Throughout its history, Tibet had maintained very close and friendly relations with India. The border between Tibet and India had remained free passage for the pilgrims and traders of both the countries until Tibet was forcibly occupied by China. This has resulted in His Holiness the Dalai Lama taking refuge in India along with some 80,000 Tibetans.

We, the Tibetans, have been fortunate to have had steadfast support from our Indian friends during the past 39 years of our exile in India. Prominent Indian leaders like Shri Rajagopalachari, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Acharya Kripalani have championed the just cause of the Tibetan people in the early years of our exile. Since then, there have been many other leaders who have raised the Tibetan issue from time to time. In fact, these Indian national leaders while supporting the cause of Tibet voiced the deep feelings of the people of India.

As early as in 1949, when the Chinese invasion of Tibet had just started, it was Dr. Rammanohar Lohia who first warned the Indian government of the implications of Chinese occupation of Tibet. He was also the first Indian crusader for the rights of the Tibetan people who, at a press conference in London in 1949, termed the Chinese invasion of Tibet as a 'baby murder'.

The first All India Convention on Tibet was held at Calcutta on 30-31 May, 1959, under the presidentship of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. A year later, in 1960, the Afro-Asian Convention on Tibet and Against Colonialism in Asia and Africa was convened in New Delhi by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan to consolidate and articulate the international support for the cause of the Tibetan people. This Convention brought together in India outstanding political personalities and human rights activists from nineteen countries.

Since then, international support for the Tibetan cause has been increasing, and we do need it. But, the most important factor is the Indian political support which we believe is key to regaining our freedom.

The pages that follow provide illuminating insights into the issue of Tibet: especially as viewed from the Indian standpoint. The views, herein, expressed by the eminent Indian leaders in the past, especially at the time of the Chinese invasion of Tibet, have a great significance in understanding the implications of the Chinese occupation of Tibet on India, particularly on India's national security, and therefore, must be brought to the knowledge of the present Indian leaders, policy makers and the general public.

Tempa Tsering
SECRETARY, DIIR.

Dated: 10 February 1998

CONTENTS

1. C. Rajagopalachari, the Last Governor-General of India. 7
(Brutal Colonialism in Tibet)
2. Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the First President of Indian Republic. 8
(Excerpts from his last public speech, Gandhi Maidan, Patna, 24 October, 1962)
3. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the First Prime Minister of India. 9
 - (i) Address to the Lok Sabha, 7 December, 1950.
 - (ii) Statement to the Lok Sabha, 27 April, 1959.
 - (iii) His Last Letter, 24 May, 1964.
4. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, the first Deputy Prime Minister of India. 11
(His Letter to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, 7 November, 1950)
5. Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, Eminent Socialist Leader of India. 18
 - (i) Chinese invasion of Tibet, October 1950.
 - (ii) China's second assault on Tibet, April 1959.
6. Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar, the Father of Indian Constitution. 23
(Discussion on Panchsheel Agreement in the Parliament, 1954)
7. Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan 24
 - (i) Statement from Patna, 27 March, 1959.
 - (ii) The Tragedy of Tibet *(Presidential address delivered at the All India Convention on Tibet, Calcutta, 30 & 31 May, 1959)*

- (iii) On India's Responsibility, (*Extract from his speech at the Tibet Convention, Madras, 3 June, 1959*)
- (iv) Why Support Tibet? (*Speech at the Indian Council of World Affairs, Sapru House, New Delhi, 10 July, 1959*)
8. Acharya J.B. Kripalani **49**
(*Lok Sabha Debate, 8 May, 1959*)
9. Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhyaya **53**
(*India's Stake in Tibet's Freedom, 27 April, 1959*)
10. Giani Zail Singh, Former President of India. **58**
(*Speech at the inaugural session of the International Convention on Tibet and Peace in South Asia, New Delhi, 12-14 August, 1989*)
11. Atal Behari Vajpayee, Member of Parliament and Leader of Bharatiya Janta Party. **60**
- (i) Tibet's Independence: Lok Sabha, 8 May, 1959.
- (ii) India's Tibet Policy: Lok Sabha, 4 September, 1959.
- (iii) Indian People's Support for Tibet: Lok Sabha, 17 March, 1960.
- (iv) India's Position on the Question of Tibet in the UN: Lok Sabha, 22 November, 1960.
12. S. Nijalingappa, Former President of Indian National Congress and Ex-Chief Minister of Karnataka State. **72**
(*Inaugural address delivered at the International Convention on Tibet and Peace in South Asia, New Delhi, 12-14 August, 1989*)
13. Rabi Ray, Former Speaker of Lok Sabha **76**
(*Speech at the International Convention on Tibet and Peace in South Asia, New Delhi, 12-14 August, 1989*)

14. George Fernandes, Member of Parliament and Leader of the Samata Party. **80**
(Keynote address at the International Convention on Tibet and Peace in South Asia, New Delhi, 12-14 August, 1989)
15. Statement of the Indian Representative at the UN General Assembly in New York, and the Resolutions adopted by the UNO on the 'Question of Tibet' in 1965. **90**
16. Resolutions of Indian Political Parties on Tibet: **97**
- (i) Resolution of the National Committee of the Socialist Party on Invasion of Tibet, Nagpur, 22 November, 1950.
 - (ii) Resolution of the All India Tibet Convention, Calcutta, 30 & 31 May, 1959.
 - (iii) Resolution of Bharatiya Jana Sangh on Tibet's Independence, 8 July, 1959.
 - (iv) Indian Parliament Members' Support for His Holiness the Dalai Lama's Five-Point Peace Plan for Tibet, New Delhi, 23 August, 1988.
 - (v) Indian Parliament Members' Letter to Chinese Prime Minister Li Peng, New Delhi, 27 April, 1989.

C. Rajagopalachari, the last Governor-General of India, on Tibet

Brutal Colonialism in Tibet

IT is difficult to find suitable words to express the sympathy that I feel in respect of this movement - of what I may call in a different sense - a movement for the liberation of Tibet. The issue of Tibet is not a question of legalistic exploration as to the sovereignty of Tibet but a question of human rights which must be decided on the plane of justice and humanity and not on the basis of any legal puzzle. Sovereignty and Suzerainty are terms which have varied from time to time in respect of their content. Whatever legal jargon might have been used from time to time, in respect of the relation between Tibet and China, in particular, and the outer world, in general, no one can doubt the fact that Tibetan people have a right to rule themselves.

His Holiness the Dalai Lama in his message had made things quite clear and pointed out how even on a legalistic plane there can be no doubt about the rights of the Tibetan people to rule themselves irrespective of any belonging to other nationalities. This invasion of Tibet which terminated in His Holiness taking refuge in Indian territory is brutal colonialism. There can, therefore, be no second thoughts in the matter. All Indian people wants Tibet to be released from the grip of China.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the first President of Indian Republic, on Tibet

*(Excerpts from his last public speech, Gandhi
Maidan, Patna, 24 October, 1962.)*

FREEDOM is the most sacred boon. It has to be protected by all means - violent or non-violent. Therefore, Tibet has to be liberated from the iron grip of China and handed over to the Tibetans....

The Chinese invaders have plundered Tibet and destroyed its peaceful citizens. Tibet is nearer to India in religion and culture. We have, therefore, to try hard to rescue Tibet from the bloody clutches of plunderer and let its people breathe in free air. If China stealthily infiltrate our land, they should be ruthlessly turned back.

The world stands witness to the fact that India has never cast a vicious glance on any country. But in war, we have to give a fight at any place or land convenient to us in facing enemy.

When we were raising slogan of 'Hindi-Chini, Bhai-Bhai', China was busy nibbling our land and through brute betrayal captured about 12 thousand square miles of our land. When [we] just stepped forward to evict them from those illegally captured posts, the Chinese had the guts to blame offensive on us. Today, on the high altitudes of Ladakh region, our military has built up check-posts, our engineers have constructed roads to assure security. In NEFA region also, the Chinese managed to capture a few check-posts stealthily but we have hundreds of check-posts, and this stealthily occupying a couple of posts does not affect us. We have a formidable and a strong army fully equipped with modern arms, and it is fighting. There is no cause to get panicky. It is imperative that like a disciplined nation, we should face the invaders. There is no doubt that we will clear our motherland of these invaders.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India, on Tibet

(i) Address to the Lok Sabha, 7 December, 1950:

IT is not right for any country to talk about its sovereignty or suzerainty over an area outside its own immediate range. That is to say, since Tibet is not the same as China, it should ultimately be the wishes of the people of Tibet that should prevail and not any legal or constitutional arguments. That, I think, is a valid point. Whether the people of Tibet are strong enough to assert their rights or not is another matter. Whether we are strong enough or any other country is strong enough to see that this is done is also another matter. But it is a right and proper thing to say and I can see no difficulty in saying to the Chinese Government that whether they have suzerainty or sovereignty over Tibet, surely, according to any principles, principles they proclaim and the principles I uphold, the last voice in regard to Tibet should be the voice of the people of Tibet and of nobody else.

(ii) Statement to the Lok Sabha, 27 April, 1959:

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

Even these reforms they proposed to postpone for a considerable time.

(iii) His Last Letter, 24 May, 1964:

Dehradun
May 24, 1964

My dear Dr. Gopal Singh,

Your letter of the 20th May. It is not clear to me what we can do about Tibet in present circumstances. To have a resolution in the United Nations about Tibet will not mean much as China is not represented there. We are not indifferent to what has happened in Tibet. But we are unable to do anything effective about it.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd) Jawaharlal Nehru.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, the first Deputy Prime Minister of India, on Tibet

*(His Letter to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru,
7 November, 1950)*

New Delhi
7 November, 1950

My dear Jawaharlal,

Ever since my return from Ahmedabad and after the Cabinet meeting the same day which I had to attend at practically 15 minutes' notice and for which I regret I was not able to read all the papers, I have been anxiously thinking over the problem of Tibet and I thought I should share with you what is passing through my mind.

2. I have carefully gone through the correspondence between the External Affairs Ministry and our Ambassador in Peking and through him the Chinese Government. I have tried to peruse this correspondence as favourably to our Ambassador and the Chinese Government as possible, but I regret to say that neither of them comes out well as a result of this study. The Chinese Government has tried to delude us by professions of peaceful intentions. My own feeling is that at a crucial period they managed to instil into our Ambassador a false sense of confidence in their so-called desire to settle the Tibetan problem by peaceful means. There can be no doubt that during the period covered by this correspondence the Chinese must have been concentrating for an onslaught on Tibet. The final action of the Chinese, in my judgement, is little short of perfidy. The tragedy of it is that the Tibetans put faith in us; they chose to be guided

by us; and we have been unable to get them out of the meshes of Chinese diplomacy or Chinese malevolence. From the latest position, it appears that we shall not be able to rescue the Dalai Lama. Our Ambassador has been at great pains to find an explanation or justification for Chinese policy and actions. As the External Affairs Ministry remarked in one of their telegrams, there was a lack of firmness and unnecessary apology in one or two representations that he made to the Chinese Government on our behalf. It is impossible to imagine any sensible person believing in the so-called threat to China from Anglo-American machinations in Tibet. Therefore, if the Chinese put faith in this, they must have distrusted us so completely as to have taken us as tools or stooges of Anglo-American diplomacy or strategy. This feeling, if genuinely entertained by the Chinese in spite of your direct approaches to them, indicates that even though we regard ourselves as friends of China, the Chinese do not regard us as their friends. With the Communist mentality of "whoever is not with them being against them", this is a significant pointer, of which we have to take due note. During the last several months, outside the Russian camp, we have practically been alone in championing the cause of Chinese entry into the UNO and in securing from the Americans assurances on the question of Formosa. We have done everything we could to assuage Chinese feelings, to allay its apprehensions and to defend its legitimate claims in our discussions and correspondence with America and Britain and in the UNO. In spite of this, China is not convinced about our disinterestedness; it continues to regard us with suspicion and the whole psychology is one, at least outwardly, of scepticism, perhaps mixed with a little hostility. I doubt if we can go any further than we have done already to convince China of our good intentions, friendliness and goodwill. In Peking we have an Ambassador who is eminently suitable for putting across the friendly point of view. Even he seems to have failed to convert the Chinese. Their last telegram to us is an act of gross discourtesy not only in the summary way it disposes of our protest against the entry of Chinese forces into Tibet but also in the wild insinuation that our attitude is determined by foreign influences. It looks as though it is not a friend speaking in that language but a potential enemy.

3. In the background of this, we have to consider what new situation now faces us as a result of the disappearance of Tibet, as we knew it, and the expansion of China almost up to our gates. Throughout history we have seldom been worried about our north-east frontier. The Himalayas have been regarded as an impenetrable barrier against any threat from the north. We had a friendly Tibet which gave us no trouble. The Chinese were divided. They had their own domestic problems and never bothered us about our frontiers. In 1914, we entered into a convention with Tibet which was not endorsed by the Chinese. We seem to have regarded Tibetan autonomy as extending independent treaty relationship. Presumably, all that we required was Chinese counter-signature. The Chinese interpretation of suzerainty seems to be different. We can, therefore, safely assume that very soon they will disown all the stipulations which Tibet has entered into with us in the past. That throws into the melting pot all frontier and commercial settlements with Tibet on which we have been functioning and acting during the last half a century. China is no longer divided. It is united and strong. All along the Himalayas in the north and north-east, we have on our side of the frontier a population ethnologically and culturally not different from Tibetans or Mongoloids. The undefined state of the frontier and the existence on our side of a population with its affinities to Tibetans or Chinese have all the elements of potential trouble between China and ourselves. Recent and bitter history also tells us that communism is no shield against imperialism and that the Communists are as good or as bad imperialists as any other. Chinese ambitions in this respect not only cover the Himalayan slopes on our side but also include important parts of Assam. They have their ambitions in Burma also. Burma has the added difficulty that it has no McMahon Line round which to build up even the semblance of an agreement. Chinese irredentism and Communist imperialism are different from the expansionism and imperialism of the Western Powers. The former has a cloak of ideology which makes it ten times more dangerous. In the guise of ideological expansion lie concealed racial, national or historical claims. The danger from the north and north-east, therefore, becomes both communist and imperialist. While our western and north-western threat to

security is still as prominent as before, a new threat has developed from the north and north-east. Thus, for the first time after centuries, India's defence has to concentrate itself on two fronts simultaneously. Our defence measure have so far been based on the calculations of a superiority over Pakistan. In our calculations we shall now have to reckon with Communist China in the north and in the north-east, a Communist China which has definite ambitions and aims and which does not, in any way, seem friendly disposed towards us.

4. Let us also consider the political conditions on this potentially troublesome frontier. Our northern or north-eastern approaches consist of Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim, the Darjeeling [area] and tribal areas in Assam. From the point of view of communications, they are weak spots. Continuous defensive lines do not exist. There is almost an unlimited scope for infiltration. Police protection is limited to a very small number of passes. There, too, our outposts do not seem to be fully manned. The contact of these areas with us is by no means close and intimate. The people inhabiting these portions have no established loyalty or devotion to India. Even the Darjeeling and Kalimpong areas are not free from pro-mongoloid prejudices. During the last three years we have not been able to make any appreciable approaches to the Nagas and other hill tribes in Assam. European missionaries and other visitors had been in touch with them, but their influence was in no way friendly to India or Indians. In Sikkim there was political ferment some time ago. It is quite possible that discontent is smouldering there. Bhutan is comparatively quiet, but its affinity with Tibetans would be a handicap. Nepal has a weak oligarchic regime based almost entirely on force; it is in conflict with a turbulent element of the population as well as with enlightened ideas of the modern age. In these circumstances, to make people alive to the new danger or to make them defensively strong is a very difficult task indeed and that difficulty can be got over only by enlightened firmness, strength and a clear line of policy. I am sure the Chinese and their source of inspiration, Soviet Russia, would not miss any opportunity of exploiting these weak spots, partly in support of their ideology and partly in support of their ambitions. In my

judgement, the situation is one in which we cannot afford either to be complacent or to be vacillating. We must have a clear idea of what we wish to achieve and also of the methods by which we should achieve it. Any faltering or lack of decisiveness in formulating our objectives or in pursuing our policy to attain those objectives is bound to weaken us and increase the threats which are so evident.

5. Side by side with these dangers, we shall now have to face serious internal problems as well. I have already asked [H.V.R.] Ienger to send to the E. A. Ministry a copy of the Intelligence Bureau's appreciation of these matters. Hitherto, the Communist Party of India has found some difficulty in contacting Communists abroad, or in getting supplies of arms, literature, etc. from them. They had to content with the difficult Burmese and Pakistan frontiers on the east or with the long seaboard. They shall now have a comparatively easy means of access to Chinese Communists and through them to other foreign Communists. Infiltration of spies, fifth columnists and Communists would now be easier. Instead of having to deal with isolated Communist pockets in Telengana and Warangal we may have to deal with Communist threats to our security along our northern and north-eastern frontiers where, for supplies of arms and ammunition, they can safely depend on Communist arsenals in China. The whole situation thus raises a number of problems on which we must come to an early decision so that we can, as I said earlier, formulate the objectives of our policy and decide the methods by which those objectives are to be attained. It is also clear that the action will have to be fairly comprehensive, involving not only our defence strategy and state of preparations but also problems of internal security to deal with which we have not a moment to lose. We shall also have to deal with administrative and political problems in the weak spots along the frontier to which I have already referred.

6. It is, of course, impossible for me to be exhaustive in setting out all these problems. I am, however, giving below some of the problems which, in my opinion, require early solution and around which we have to build our administrative or military

policies and measures to implement them.

- (a) A military and intelligence appreciation of the Chinese threat to India both on the frontier and to internal security.
- (b) An examination of our military position and such redistribution of our forces as might be necessary, particularly with the idea of guarding important routes or areas which are likely to be the subject of dispute.
- (c) An appraisal of the strength of our forces and, if necessary, reconsideration of our retrenchment plans for the Army in the light of these threats.
- (d) A long-term consideration of our defence needs. My own feeling is that, unless we assure our supplies of arms, ammunition and armour, we should be making our defence position perpetually weak and we would not be able to stand up to the double threat of difficulties both from the west and north-west and north and north-east.
- (e) The question of Chinese entry into UNO. In view of the rebuff which China has given us and the method which it has followed in dealing with Tibet, I am doubtful whether we can advocate its claim any longer. There would probably be a threat in the UNO virtually to outlaw China in view of its active participation in the Korean war. We must determine our attitude on this question also.
- (f) The political and administrative steps which we should take to strengthen our northern and north-eastern frontiers. This would include the whole of the border, i.e. Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim, Darjeeling and the tribal territory in Assam.
- (g) Measures of internal security in the border areas as well as the States flanking those areas, such as U.P., Bihar, Bengal and Assam.
- (h) Improvement of our communications, road, rail, air and wireless, in these areas and with the frontier outposts.
- (i) The future of our mission at Lhasa and the trade posts at Gyantse and Yatung and the forces which we have in operation in Tibet to guard the trade routes.
- (j) The policy in regard to the McMahon Line.

7. These are some of the questions which occur to my mind. It is possible that a consideration of these matters may

lead us into wider questions of our relationship with China, Russia, America, Britain and Burma. This, however, would be of a general nature, though some might be basically very important, e.g. we might have to consider whether we should not enter into closer association with Burma in order to strengthen the later in its dealings with China. I do not rule out the possibility that, before applying pressure on us, China might apply pressure on Burma. With Burma, the frontier is entirely undefined and the Chinese territorial claims are more substantial. In its present position, Burma might offer an easier problem for China and, therefore, might claim its first attention.

8. I suggest that we meet early to have a general discussion on these problems and decide on such steps as we might think to be immediately necessary and direct quick examination of other problems with a view to taking early measures to deal with them.

Yours,

Sd/- Vallabhbhai Patel

The Hon'ble Shri Jawaharlal Nehru
New Delhi.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, Eminent Socialist Leader of India, on Tibet

(i) Chinese Invasion of Tibet, October 1950:

CHINA has invaded Tibet, which can only mean that the giant has moved to rub out the life of a child. Tibet's present rulers may or may not be reactionary and tyrannical but of her independence from foreign control there can be no doubt. If internal conditions of a country, which do not directly affect the stability of another, can be a justification for invasion, it is China today which has moved into Tibet but on that logic America may someday move into Russia and Russia into India, and there is no knowing where this sort of thinking may stop.

I had refused to take sides in the war between North and South Korea, precisely because this was directly a war between the Atlantic and the Soviet Camps. But Tibet belongs to neither camp. To call the invasion of Tibet an effort to liberate three million Tibetans is to make language lose all meaning and stop all human communication and understanding. Freedom and slavery, bravery and cowardice, loyalty and treason, truth and lie, will become synonyms.

Our friendship and esteem for the people of China will never dim, but we must state our conviction that the present government of China will not be able to wash out the infamy of this invasion and baby murder.

Defeated in Korea, the Soviet camp may have attempted to bolster up its prestige through conquest of Tibet and that emphasises the need for China to free herself from the foreign policy of the Soviet camp.

China's claim that she wishes to secure her western frontiers in Tibet is thoroughly mischievous. Every nation will then try to secure its frontiers all over the world. Furthermore, Tibet's ties

are stronger with India than with China, ties of language and trade and culture, not to speak of the strategic affinities between India and Tibet, particularly western Tibet. The present government of China has offended not only against India's interests by mobbing into Tibet.

If the government of China takes its stand on some wholly inoperative but technical and doubtful issue of sovereignty, let the will of the people of Tibet be ascertained in a plebiscite.

The India government will do well to advise the China government to withdraw its army and, in view of the genuine friendship between the two, to offer its services in the arranging of such a plebiscite.

(ii) China's Second Assault on Tibet, April 1959:

WHEN the 'Baby Murder' in Tibet took place nine years ago most of the people who today are raising a hue and cry over the second instalment of Chinese assault on the Tibetan people were, as far as I remember, silent. Something ought to have been done then, something ought to have been said. Which, however, does not mean that nothing should be said now. But while saying it people should not forget their weaknesses; as they say, when the peacock dances it should do well to be aware of its legs. A fundamental lack in foreign policy opinions is that they are formed not on the anvil of the question of justice and injustice, but around such passing considerations as interests, party interests or personal interests. Nine years ago the India government, and to some extent the Indian people, had such friendly relations with the China government that no party or leader in India dared to speak boldly on the Tibetan issue. The situation has now altered. The surfacial relations between the two governments are perhaps intact, but underneath a tension has been smouldering for the last one or one-and-a-half years. That is the reason why people were found tongue-tied in those old conditions are now shouting themselves hoarse in defence of the Tibetan people.

The state of public opinion on foreign policy matters is everywhere marred thus with superficiality, more so, in India,

where the native government and the British Ruler possess the monopoly of deciding as to which issues should agitate people's mind, by giving excessive publicity to relevant news and information. The sooner the people of India try to observe deeper than such superficial layers, the better for the country.

The foreign policy of India is called neutral, and, in a sense, it is so because it is not slave to either of the power blocs but does alternate service to both. During the past one or one-and-a-half years the India government's policy has tended more towards the camp of capitalist democracy and America just as in the four or five preceding years the shift was in favour of the Soviet bloc. The alignment, however, is never definitive but the balance of the two scales is tilted a bit one way or the other. It is in this context that the Tibetan issue is being treated. A country's foreign policy should be objective, rational, concrete and, as far as possible, idealistic. Today it is subjective and emotional. What doubt can there be now that had India's prime or foreign minister been a man of Bengali ancestry, the core of the conflict with Pakistan would have been formed out of the problem of refugees from East Bengal; had he been a man of Tamil ancestry, the problems of Indians in Sri Lanka would undoubtedly have become the biggest single issue of India's foreign policy; now that he is a man of Kashmir ancestry the Indo-Pakistan conflict has sharpened around the issue of Kashmir which has, consequently, become the biggest single problem of our foreign policy!

Every Indian has a special affection for Tibet. On the one hand, there are such reasons as Manasarovar. The Indian heart overflows with a calm but curious joy at the mention of the name of Manasarovar. On the other hand, the childlike and innocent people of Tibet have an irresistible appeal to us. There is not the least doubt that Tibet and especially its western part has greater cultural, religious and geographical affinities with India than with China. Many people may not be knowing that the Tibetan alphabet is a variation of the Indian alphabet, and the Tibetan outlook is a curious blend of knowledge and innocence. A Tibetan Buddhist nun at Sarnath once said: "Man everywhere is bad, but a little less so in India and a little more so in Tibet, which is why someone or other of the Buddhist

preachers and doctrines had to go to Tibet”.

There can be no second thoughts as to whether the Dalai Lama should be accorded shelter in India. If the government has any, it would be guilty of another baby murder. A self-respecting nation must provide protective asylum for political sufferers from foreign countries.

We have no partiality towards the Dalai Lama or the other Lama. Nobody should have any. Those who today show preference for one to the other have cold-war ties with either America or Russia. The thought of Tibet and its Lamas does arouse in the mind a natural romance but such sentiments should only strengthen our demand for the religious independence of Lamas and not their political authority.

The political authorities of the Lamas must be brought to an end. It is said that the Chinese are doing that. But the China government is doing that at the point of bayonet, and thus it may turn out to be worse than the Lama rule itself. The efforts of sane people should be directed towards awakening the Tibetan masses so that their attitude towards the Lamas may change and the rule of the Lamas may be liquidated.

The Chinese assault on Tibet is a brutal act. But its evil inheres in communism as much as in capitalism. The Russian aggression on Hungary, the Chinese aggression on Tibet, the Anglo-French attack on Egypt--all these are outbursts of the same evil. The two blood-thirsty giants--communism and capitalism--are sitting across man's breast and a man is a fool to be trying to prefer one to the other. The events of the world get distorted when they are seen either through the Atlantic or the Soviet spectacles. The so-called neutral spectacles of India also obstruct clear vision. We always wish for a rapprochement between America and Russia, that Eisenhower and Khrushchev should embrace each other and behave like brothers, which in fact they are. Both America and Russia are great--great in wealth and great in arms--and all other countries are dependent on them for something or other. That gives rise to the tribe of jackals and foxes in international politics. All nations of the world behave either as jackals or as foxes towards these two colossi. Some jackals are tied to one or the other of the two lions. But there are also foxes who change their masters according to

convenience. The India government and people have acquired the traits of the latter.

A misunderstanding, in connection with India's foreign policy, has been persisting and that is about Mr. Krishna Menon, who has for a very long time been looked upon as pro-Communist and pro-Russian. However, throughout he has remained loyal to the British. The British foreign and military offices have a wide network of agents all the world over, who are given absolute freedom in all other matters except that they should help preserve the influence of the British empire. Sometimes this work is done not through the foreign office but through the left parties of Britain. It looks at times as if not only Mr. Menon but people greater than him are also tethered to this elastic British policy.

Another point may be noted about the Chinese aggression. China has already achieved steel production of one crore tons. After four or five years India will reach the target of 60 lakh tons, by which time China will be producing one crore and 70 lakh tons. We do not attach the highest importance to material prosperity; but how does the world look upon it? All the sins of Russia, even its sins in Hungary, could be washed away by the invention of sputnik. Great thinkers and great philosophers of the world bowed their heads before the technological power of the Soviet government. People worship power, however, merciless. The India government and the Praja Socialists do it as much as people elsewhere. Then, the increasing steel output of China will also have its inevitable effect. So long as the India government and people do not bring about radical changes in the socio-economic conditions they won't be able to take out the Chinese dragon's teeth. Everything depends on American-Soviet relations. If they are not coming closer the tension with regard to Tibet will grow. The innocent, childlike countenance of the Tibetans will incite the capitalist world and enrage the Communists. Nothing more will happen. If war was not waged over white Hungary, it won't certainly be waged over coloured Tibet!

Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar, the father of Indian Constitution, on Tibet

*(Discussion on Panchsheel Agreement in the
Parliament, 1954)*

INDIA accorded recognition to China in 1949. Dr. Ambedkar wished that India should have accorded this recognition to Tibet instead of China and there would be no Sino-Indian border conflict.

He was then the Member of Rajya Sabha and he said the following to Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in front of the full house:

“Our Prime Minister is depending on the Panchsheel which has been adopted by Comrade Mao and the Panchsheel in which one of the clauses is the No-Aggression Treaty on Tibet. I am indeed surprised that our Hon’ble Prime Minister is taking this ‘Panchsheel’ seriously. Hon’ble Members of the House, you must be knowing that Panchsheel is one of the significant parts of the Buddha Dharma. If Shri Mao had even an iota of faith in Panchsheel he would have treated the Buddhists in his country in a different manner. Panchsheel has no place in politics. The truth inherent in Panchsheel is that Morality is forever changing. There is nothing called Morality. You can abide by your promises in accordance with today’s Morality and by the same propriety you may violate your own promise simply because tomorrow’s Morality will have different demands ... in my opinion our Prime Minister will realise the truth in my words when the situation matures further ... I don’t really know what is going to happen. By letting China take control over Lhasa (Tibetan Capital) the Prime Minister has in a way helped the Chinese to bring their armies on the Indian borders. Any victor who annexes Kashmir can directly reach Pathankot, and I know it for sure that he can reach the Prime Minister’s House also.”

Lok Nayak Jaya Prakash Narayan on Tibet

(i) Statement from Patna, 27 March, 1959:

THE situation in Tibet must cause serious anxiety to all the peoples of Asia, particularly to us in India. The recent statement of the Prime Minister in Parliament is not likely to allay this anxiety.

From the time Red China decided to gobble up Tibet, our policy in regard to it has been marked by prevarication. We began by describing the Chinese advance on Tibet as aggression but immediately after recognised Chinese suzerainty over that unfortunate land. Tibet has never been a part of China, except by conquest when Lhasa paid tribute to Peking. But there was also a period when Peking paid tribute to Lhasa. The Tibetans are not Chinese and there is no evidence in history that they ever wanted to be a part of China.

The Chinese on their part have been an imperial power and in their expansionist drives they have always led campaigns against the Tibetans, who being numerically weak have sometimes been forced to accept nominal Chinese over-lordship. In this respect here Chiang-kai-Shek and Mao-Tse-Tung stand on the same ground. But that does not alter the fact that the Tibetans are entitled to their own freedom and, at the least, to the moral support of the world opinion.

When the Chinese communists took over Tibet they promised to respect the unique position of the Dalai Lama and the autonomy of his government. Those who were acquainted with the nature of communist rule understood even then that national autonomy under communism was an utter sham and that it would only be a matter of time for the Chinese to drive the nails deeper into the coffin of Tibetan independence. Present events are proving how right was that understanding.

The question is what can we do to help the Tibetans. It is true, as the Prime Minister said in Parliament in 1950, that we

cannot, like Don Quixote, go about fighting everything. No one expects India to go to war with China for the sake of Tibet. But every upright person, every freedom loving individual should be ready to call a spade a spade. We are not serving the cause of peace by slurring over acts of aggression. We cannot physically prevent the Chinese from annexing Tibet and subduing that peaceful and brave people, but we at least can put on record our clear verdict that aggression has been committed and a freedom of a weak nation has been snuffed out by a powerful neighbour. Let us too not waver to tear the veil from the face of communism, which under the visage of gentle Panch Sheel hides the savage countenance of imperialism. For in Tibet we see at this moment the workings of a new imperialism, which is far more dangerous than the old because it marches under the banner of a so-called revolutionary ideology. Tibet may be a theocratic rather than a secular State and backward economically and socially. But no nation has the right to impose progress, whatever that may mean, upon another nation. Every nation, small or big, has the right to choose its own way of life and the least we can do is to stand unwaveringly by this right.

We are rightly linked with China by the bonds of friendship and I for one am keen that these bonds be kept firm and secure. But friendship cannot mean abetment of crime. True friendship indeed, as I am sure some Chinese proverb will have it, requires that when friends go wrong they should be firmly told about it. India does not believe in power-politics and she should have the courage to stand by the truth in every circumstance. We have nothing to lose. The Chinese need our friendship as much as we need theirs. But if the price of friendship is duplicity and condonation of wrong, we must have the courage and honesty to refuse to pay the price. The tragedy of Tibet then will not have happened in vain.

(ii) The Tragedy of Tibet

(Presidential Address delivered at the All India Convention on Tibet held at Calcutta on 30 & 31 May, 1959)

Acharya Kripalaniji and Friends,

I am sure there would be no need for another speech on Tibet after Acharya Kripalaniji's inaugural address. However, as President of the Convention, I believe I am expected to say a few words.

Let me begin by paying a tribute to Acharya Kripalani for the great service he has done to India and the cause of international justice and peace. His has been almost the only voice in the Lok Sabha which from the beginning of the Tibet affairs has been raised on the side of truth and justice. It is a sad commentary on the party system that even though overwhelming opinion in the Lok Sabha has been with him on this question, the House has had to follow a different lead.

I should like at the outset to emphasise the need of more intimate study of international questions on the part of the public. The Prime Minister is considered to be the sole authority on foreign affairs. But events like Hungary and Tibet show how such a situation results in most unfortunate mistakes. With a better informed and active public opinion, such mistakes could perhaps have been avoided. It has been found that after the event, the Government has on occasions responded to public criticism, but it would have been much better not to have committed the mistake at the outset. The role of the Press cannot be over-emphasised in this respect. The Council of World Affairs, its branches and other similar institutions should receive greater attention from the educated section of the people. In the Lok Sabha both the opposition as well as the ruling party must produce more serious students of foreign affairs.

The broad policy of independence, sometimes miscalled neutralism, has no doubt over-whelming support of the people and, to my mind, is the only correct policy for us to follow. But the trouble is that this policy is not always strictly and impartially

followed. This has cost us not only our good name and moral prestige, but has made us acquiesce in the suppression of human and national freedom.

Let me now turn to Tibet. One of the great tragedies of history is being enacted in full view of the world. Tibet is being gobbled up by the Chinese dragon. A country of less than ten million soul is being crushed to death by a country of six hundred and fifty million people. Patriotism, courage, faith can perform miracles. The Tibetans love their country; they are brave; they are devoted to their religion and their Dalai Lama. Yet, 1 to 65 is an odd that even a nation of Herculesees will find it difficult to overcome.

A Benighted Land

The attention of the world is currently turned elsewhere. Moreover Tibet for most countries in the world, except its immediate neighbours, is an obscure, distant, benighted land not worth bothering about. This makes the tragedy of Tibet deeper.

India, as an immediate neighbour of Tibet, and as a country regarded for its moral position, its detachment and freedom from power politics has a great responsibility in this matter. The world looks to India for a lead and India must not fail.

It is not only the question of the fate of ten million people. That of course is important and would be so whatever the number. But there is also the question--and this is of much greater importance--of the basis of international justice and peace. Is world peace possible if the strong are free to oppress the weak with impunity? Such a world would be dominated by a few powerful nations and peace would consist in an uneasy balance of power between them and the small nations would be at their mercy.

International Morality

This surely is not the picture of the future world order that India has in view. We believe that just as inside nations, the rule of law must be established to secure human rights, so as in the international community too must the rule of law be enforced so

as to ensure the freedom and rights of nations. That rule of law can only be based on an international morality which is universally accepted. Even the strongest power then might find it difficult to go against the moral verdict of the world. From my point of view, the greatest virtue of our foreign policy of non-attachment and independence of judgement is that it enables us to contribute, because of that very non-attachment, to the developments of international morality.

India, therefore, must not shirk her responsibility at this testing moment. Her responsibility is far greater at this time than it was at the time of Hungary. This is so not only because Tibet is our frontier and what happens there affects our security, not only because of our spiritual and cultural bonds with Tibet. The Panchen Lama, by the way, twitted us the other day for showing such solicitude for Buddhism abroad when we had not cared to preserve it at home. The learned Lama forgets that the Buddha's teachings have very largely become a part of Hindu life and thought and the Buddha himself is worshipped as our last Avatar. Howsobeit, our bonds with Tibet are there and they no doubt determine our attitude towards their present plight. But our concern for and responsibility towards Tibet spring mainly from the fact that Tibet is a neighbour who has been wronged. The responsibility is increased when it is recalled that the neighbour had put trust in our assurances.

Glib Talk of War

In this connection, there has been some glib talk of war. If you do this or that, it would mean war with China, it is said. It is amazing that people should talk of war in this loose manner. The whole world knows, and China more than them all, that India has no desire whatever to start a war with anyone. On the other hand, India has repeatedly reiterated her firm desire to continue her bonds of friendship with China. But if China seeks to exploit that desire for unjust purposes, India cannot be a party to it. Nor can India be browbeaten into doing something that she considers wrong nor prevented by threats from doing the right.

The main elements of the Tibet situation have been clear enough from the beginning.

Tibet a Country by Itself

Tibet is not a region of China. It is a country by itself which has sometimes passed under Chinese suzerainty by virtue of conquest and never by free choice. Chinese suzerainty has always been of the most nominal kind and meant hardly more than some tribute paid to Peking by Lhasa. At other times Tibet was an independent sovereign country. For sometime in the 8th century Peking paid an yearly tribute of fifty thousand yards of Chinese brocade to Tibet.

After the fall of Manchu empire in 1911, Tibet functioned as an independent country till 1951 when the Chinese Communist Government invaded it. In between there were attempts to re-impose Chinese suzerainty by the treaty in which the British Government took a leading hand. Pressed from both sides by two powerful forces, Tibet had little choice. Nevertheless, nothing came out of these attempts and till the Communist invasion, Tibet was a free country.

The British had their own selfish motives for agreeing to Chinese suzerain powers in Tibet. Being imperialists themselves they had, of course, no qualms in the matter. Their motive was to bribe the Chinese in recognising the monopoly of economic rights of Britain in Tibet.

Policy Born in Sin

It was this policy born in imperialist sin that free India inherited. Very rightly India renounced all the rights she enjoyed in Tibet by virtue of that inheritance. But, curiously, she re-affirmed that part of the sinful policy that related to China. India gave her assent to China's suzerain powers in Tibet.

That was a major mistake of our foreign policy. The mistake was two-fold. The first was that we accepted an imperialist formula. The very idea that one country may have suzerain powers over another is imperialist in conception. The second mistake was to believe that a powerful totalitarian state could be trusted to honour the autonomy of a weak country.

It is true that we could not have prevented the Chinese from annexing Tibet. But we could have saved ourselves from being

party to a wrong. That would have been not only a matter of moral satisfaction, but it would have also set the record right, so that world opinion, particularly in the Afro-Asian part of the world, could have asserted itself. That might have even halted the Chinese. The Communists are anxious to present themselves as liberators, so when Afro-Asian opinion had condemned their Tibet action as aggression they would have found it immensely difficult to go on with it. India's acceptance of the suzerainty formula gave to the Chinese action a moral and legal sanction and prevented the formulation of Afro-Asian opinion on the question. It thus prevented the true aggressive character of Chinese communism from being realised by the backward peoples of Asia, aggravating the danger of their being enslaved in the name of liberation.

Conflict of Policies Inevitable

It has been said, more in whisper than aloud, that non-recognition of China's claims of suzerainty would have earned for us the hostility of the Chinese Government. In the first place, issues of right and wrong cannot be decided on consideration of pleasure or displeasure of the parties concerned. In the second place, it should have been foreseen that sooner or later the Chinese would try to destroy the Tibetan autonomy and then a conflict of policies would become inevitable.

Furthermore, we could have made it clear that even though we were opposed to China's suzerainty over Tibet, we were on our side, keen and determined to pursue our policy of friendship. India had strongly opposed recent Anglo-French aggression in Egypt, but on that account she did not change her policy of friendship towards England and France. Nor was India's action construed by these powerful countries as hostile, nor did they themselves on that account become hostile to India.

There are some who say that facts of history must be taken into account and if Tibet has sometimes been under China, it is irrelevant to raise the question of Tibetan independence now. This is an amazing argument. Any one who believes in human freedom and the right of all nations to independence, should be ashamed to talk in this fashion. According to the logic of this

viewpoint, Hungary, for example, having long been part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, should never be entitled to independence. Would any sensible person agree with this view? Let us not therefore slip into the habits of lazy thought and give approval to wrong of history.

An Illusion in Making

For years an illusion was in the making. It was said that China was different. It had an ancient civilisation. Therefore, Chinese communism was different from Russian. And so on and on. That illusion has been shattered--to the great good fortune of the peoples of Asia, who have been warned in time.

China rants incessantly about imperialists and expansionists. But China herself has been revealed as a cruel imperial power. If communism had been truly liberating and anti-imperialist force, the Chinese Communists, on assumption of power, should themselves have proclaimed the independence of Tibet and foresworn the old imperialist notion of suzerainty and made a treaty with Tibet of equality and friendship. But communism under Russian and Chinese guidance has become expansionist and aggressive, just as nineteenth century capitalism under the leadership of Britain, France, Germany had become aggressive and expansionist. Somewhere or the other Marxism had gone wrong. Lenin wrote a famous thesis on imperialism as the last phase of capitalism. Some one should write another thesis on communism as the first phase of a new imperialism.

Here it may be well to cast a glance at the conduct of India which has been in such clear contrast with that of China. India also had inherited certain rights in Tibet from the previous Indian Government. But she unilaterally renounced them all. During the British period, Nepal was prevented from having any direct foreign relations; that matter was in the hands of the Indian Government. After independence, India surrendered those rights too and now Nepal is fully sovereign democratic state with the full concurrence and support of India. Other instances may be given of India's clean record. It may be said without fear of contradiction that there is not a single Indian who wants to annex a single inch of foreign territory.

To return to Tibet. As on previous occasions of imperialist pressure from China, the Dalai Lama had no option but to agree to Chinese suzerainty and be content only with autonomous powers. This was in fact what the Dalai Lama himself hinted at in that most dignified statement that he had issued from Tezpur.

Not a Question of Reforms

Having annexed Tibet by invoking an outworn, imperialist formula, the Chinese Communists were in no hurry to go on with their plans of subjugating the country. They also needed time to build roads and military establishments and to haul up arms to the roof of the world. When they had sufficiently entrenched themselves, they began to tighten their screws. It was not a question of reforms. The question plainly was that of subjugation of Tibet. The Chinese interfered in everything, in the matter of religion as well as administration. Revered Lamas were purposely ill-treated, humiliated, imprisoned, tortured. The sanctity of shrines and images was violated. Monasteries were demolished and their properties confiscated. A new system of administration was imposed in which Chinese posted to all key points. The post and telegraph, the mint and the hydro-electric plant were taken over. Printing of Tibetan currency was prohibited. Chinese postal stamps were introduced. The powers and functions of the Dalai Lama were clipped. A vast scheme of colonisation by China was set on foot, so that large parts of Tibet should cease to be Tibetan and become Chinese. That was a process of stealing Tibet from the Tibetans that caused deep anxiety and aroused bitter resentment. Centuries-old granaries, some of them with grain reserves to last for years, were emptied and the grains seized by the Chinese. Reserves of gold and silver bullion were appropriated on the pretext of taking it on loan. The so-called land reforms were introduced, softly at first, but later with the usual Communist disregard for popular feeling. Forced labour, so foreign to Tibetan tradition, was introduced on a big scale. The press and all other means of information were taken over by the Chinese.

All this was happening over a number of years and to some of the administrative and constitutional changes the Tibetans

were forced to give their assent. The rest was done at the sweet will of the overlords.

Resistance to such a state of affairs was natural. Soon it took the form of a national resistance movement.

Rebellion National, not Class

Marxism of Karl Marx was meant to be an objective science of society. But present day communism is nothing if not a complete travesty of objectivity. Had it not been so, all the wild charges could never have been made against India and Indians. Had it not been so, again, the Tibetan upsurge could not have been represented by the Chinese as only a minor disturbance caused by a handful of reactionary Lamas and landlords. It is not that communists do not know the truth. It is only that communism cannot bear the truth. Truth is communism's deadly enemy.

There is no doubt that the vested interests are also with the resistance, but its character is national rather than class. The Tibetans are fighting to win their national freedom and not to defend the feudal rights of a few nobles and monasteries. The leaders of the movement are not feudal reactionaries, but the most progressive element in Tibetan society who stand for reform and changes.

The true history of the Tibetan national movement has yet to be told. There are Tibetans now in India who can give the world an authentic account. But one does not know when they will consider the opportune moment to have arrived to tell their story. In spite of all that has happened they perhaps feel that a settlement with the Chinese might still be possible. One admires the faith of these brave religious people and prays that their faith may be vindicated. One necessary condition for that seems to be unambiguous expression and assertion of world opinion on the side of truth and justice.

There is a point of view that is not so much expressed publicly as privately canvassed. It is said that even if the Chinese are behaving a little roughly in Tibet, why be so squeamish about it? Are they not forcibly rescuing the Tibetan masses from medieval backwardness and forcing them forward towards progress and civilisation?

Thrusting Progress Down the Throat

It is strange that as soon as some people put themselves outside their own country, they become screaming imperialists. If the right is conceded to nations to thrust progress forcibly down the throats of other nations, why were not the British welcomed as torch bearers of progress in India? But the defenders of the Chinese civilisers of Tibet will be the first to disown any such sacrilegious thought. They might, however, be thrown into real confusion if the Russians or the Chinese were to take it into their heads to march upon India to save her from foreign imperialists and lead her to progress?

Secondly, the question may be asked what is progress. To some, industrialisation, rising production statistics, communes, Sputniks, might mean progress. There is another view that regards progress in terms of humanity - the growth of human freedom, the decline of selfishness and cruelty, the spread of tolerance and cooperation, and so on. For me Stalin was no improvement on the Czar and all the Sputniks of Russia leave me cold when I know that a sensitive and honest writer, Pasternak, the first literary genius in Russia since Gorki, is condemned raucously by so-called men of letters who have not even read the offending work. From the point of view of the Progress of Man, as distinct from the Progress of Things, Russia appears to me to be living in the Dark Ages.

It was hoped that China's ancient civilisation would prevent that great country from being plunged into the same darkness, but Tibet has shown that the sun of humanity is as much under eclipse in Peking as it is in Moscow.

Apart from the progress of things, importance is attached to change of institutions. Destruction of temporal and spiritual feudalism might be considered to be an advance, but when that is replaced by a still more severe feudalism of Party and Bureaucracy. I for one am not prepared to call it an advance, far less a revolution. The yoke of native medievalism was surely going to be thrown off sooner or later. But who can tell when the foreign yoke of Communist medievalism will be overthrown? Who can tell when Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania will be free? And Hungary and the rest of them.

How can Tibet be Saved?

The question that I wish to consider finally is one that is on everyone's lips now: how can Tibet be saved? He would be a bold person who would venture to suggest a definite answer. A few considerations may, however, be advanced.

There is one thing of which I am absolutely clear: the need to create a powerful opinion on this question. The Tibet situation should be presented to the world in all its naked reality. No attempt should be made for reasons of diplomacy to play down, cover up, belittle or misrepresent what is happening in Tibet. Diplomacy has a vast deal to answer for in history, and I do fervently hope that diplomacy, like the cold war, is kept out of the issue. The broad facts of the Tibetan situation are clear. Those facts must be broadcast, and on their basis a strong and united world opinion must be created--against Chinese aggression and for Tibet's independence.

Let no one cry "cold war" at this. This is not a part of Bloc politics. This is a fight for the Rights of Man. Did any one think that the world-wide condemnation of the Anglo-French attack on Egypt was a part of the cold war?

A Formula in Ruins

The Government of India is committed to the formula of Tibetan autonomy under Chinese suzerainty. That formula is in ruins. So is the much-trumpeted Panch Sheel. But, nevertheless, this whole question will have to be reconsidered sooner rather than later. What happens when the autonomy of a country (or a region for that matter) is destroyed? What happens when that autonomy is not restored? What happens, in short, when aggression takes place and succeeds? It would not do to evade these questions. Till these questions are answered, there is no hope of the Government of India discovering the next step. Paralysis of action in a fast-developing situation may be dangerous. However, of one thing I feel certain: the Prime Minister will never do a shoddy deal and pass off subjugation as autonomy.

It will be recalled that when the Chinese aggression began in 1950, the Tibetan Government had moved the United Nations.

The El Salvadorean delegate had formally called on the UN to condemn China for her unprovoked aggression against Tibet, and had proposed the creation of a special committee to study what measures could be taken by the General Assembly to assist Tibet. The matter went to the Assembly's Steering Committee which, on the strength of the assurances of India's representative, decided to shelve the Tibetan complaint indefinitely.

Raising Tibet at the UN

The full facts of that affair and our part in it have not been made public and I can not say where the matter stands now according to the workings of the United Nations. Nevertheless, it seems to be utterly wrong that such an important event as the suppression of the freedom of a nation should take place and the world organisation should not even take notice of it. It is not that the mere raising of an issue in the United Nations means that a solution will be found. We have some experience of the working of that august body ourselves. But, after all is said and done, the UN is the only organisation the human family has that gives some guarantee that the world will not be converted into a jungle where the strong will eat up the weak. I have no doubt there will be many constitutional barriers and such things as vetoes in the way of the Tibet issue entering the portals of the UN. But if rule and procedures and technicalities stand in the way of international justice, it is not the latter but the former that should suffer. In whichever form the Tibet question is presented to the UN, I have no doubt that the Afro-Asian bloc must present a common front. This is the least that the countries of Asia and Africa must do to defend the right of small nations to freedom and also to assure against the danger to their own freedom from the both old and new imperialisms.

Tibet is not Lost

It is not for me to advise the Tibetans. There is one thought, however, which I cannot help expressing. Tibet, being a devoutly Buddhist country, could perhaps have turned its moment of

tragedy into one of profound victory if it could have turned to the Compassionate One and met hate with love, oppression with suffering, violence with non-violence. Maybe, even then Tibet would have been destroyed, but not the soul of Tibet, not the Religion of the Buddha.

Then, is Tibet lost for ever? No. A thousand times No. Tibet will not die because there is no death for the human spirit. Communism will not succeed because man will not be slave for ever. Tyrannies have come and gone and Caesars and Czars and dictators. But the spirit of man goes on for ever. Tibet will be resurrected.

(iii) On India's Responsibility

*(Extract from his speech at the Tibet Convention,
Madras, 3 June, 1959)*

ONLY few days ago I spoke on Tibet at the All India Tibet Convention in Calcutta. Therefore, there is not much that I have to say this evening. However I should like to say a few words by way of clarification. It may be put to me that by speaking of Tibetan independence I am queering the pitch for those who may be trying to bring about a peaceful settlement. I am anxious not to queer the pitch for any one, nor do I doubt that the Tibet question can be solved in no other way than peacefully. It is for that reason that I have emphasised the need of a strong and united world opinion so that its moral pressure might persuade the Chinese Government to seek a peaceful settlement.

Speaking about Tibet in December 1950 the Prime Minister used the following words: "I see no difficulty in saying it to the Chinese Government that whether you have suzerainty over Tibet or sovereignty over Tibet, surely, according to any principles, principles you proclaim and the principles I proclaim, the last voice in regard to Tibet should be the voice of the people of Tibet and of nobody else." I should like whole heartedly to support the Prime Minister's words. If the demand for independence is found objectionable because it prejudices the issue, no civilized person or nation could object to the right of

self-determination. The Calcutta Convention also has, with my full approval, passed a resolution in these very terms.

The Chinese Government have tried to by-pass the question of self-determination by pretending that the Tibetan national revolt is the work of a handful of reactionaries. The fact that the Dalai Lama himself had to flee from Tibet proves the national character of the upheaval as also the fact of massive Chinese intervention putting an end to the autonomy of Tibet. The Chinese have tried to get around this fact too by pretending that the Dalai Lama was forcibly abducted by reactionaries and is still held under duress. It is under this pretext that they have elected the Dalai Lama as a Vice-President of the Chinese Republic. The whole world knows, however, that the Dalai Lama left Tibet of his own free will, because the Chinese left him no other option.

In such a situation the Tibetan people cannot exercise the right to self-determination unless the Chinese armed forces are withdrawn from Tibet and the Dalai Lama is restored to his previous position of authority and power.

When in November, 1950, the invasion of Tibet by Chinese armed forces was referred to the General Assembly of the UN by the El Salvadore delegation and the matter was sent to the General Committee, the latter dropped the question "for the time being" because India's delegate, the Jamsaheb of Nawanagar, assured the Committee that the Chinese forces "had ceased to advance after the fall of Chamdo, a town some 480 kilometres from Lhasa" and that "the Indian Government was certain that the Tibetan question would still be settled by peaceful means". It is clear from recent events in Tibet that the Chinese Government have again resorted to large-scale and ruthless violence. Under these circumstances, it is reasonable to hope that the action of the UN that was abandoned for the "time being" would be resumed again. India has a clear responsibility in this matter because of the assurance that she gave to the General Committee.

(iv) Why Support Tibet?

*(Speech at the Indian Council of World Affairs,
Sapru House, New Delhi, 10 July, 1959)*

I am very thankful to my old friend Prof. Poplai--by the way, it may not be known to many of you that Prof. Poplai was one of those friends who gave me shelter in their homes when I was living "underground" in Delhi during the August Revolution--for his kind invitation to address this distinguished audience.

I should like to begin with a few preliminary observations.

First of all, let me make it clear that I stand before you as an individual, and all that I shall say tonight will be my personal opinion.

Secondly, I have seen reports in the press that my little incursion into the diplomatic role has caused embarrassment in certain quarters. If there is any truth in these reports, I should like unreservedly to offer my apologies. Nothing could have been farther from my mind than to cause embarrassment to any one.

Thirdly, let me make it clear that my stand on Tibet is not due to the fact that I am opposed to China and wish to see her harmed. Nothing can be farther from the truth. I have friendship at heart for China and wish her well. My stand on Tibet is based on the merits of the situation, and it is my belief that even when a friend is in the wrong, it is one's duty to tell him firmly about it. It is in that spirit that I am criticising China and opposing her action in Tibet.

Nor has my Tibet stand anything to do with my attitude to communism. When one speaks of communism, one is immediately faced with a semantic problem. Communism means different things to different people. I am a great admirer, for instance, of many features of Yugoslav communism, but I have been a strong critic of Stalinist communism. However, as I have just said, my views on Tibet have nothing to do with communism. I would have taken the same view if Chiang-Kai-Shek had been ruling in Peking.

Having made these preliminary remarks, let me now turn to the main subject. I feel that the whole Tibet question has

undergone a revolutionary change since His Holiness the Dalai Lama put the case for his country fairly and squarely before the world on June 20 last. It would be silly for any one who knows anything about Tibet to doubt the authority and authenticity of the voice of the Dalai Lama. His voice is the voice of the head of the Tibetan State, irrespective of whether the international status of that State was one of autonomy or independence. Again, the voice of the Dalai Lama is the authentic voice of the people of Tibet, who worship him as no other living person is worshipped anywhere in the world.

Apart from the unique position that His Holiness commands in Tibet, the Dalai Lama has an international status and personality. Throughout the Buddhist world, and particularly in the Mongolias and China herself and other regions where the Mahayana School of Buddhism reigns, the Dalai Lama is held in the highest regard as a spiritual Master.

To me the Dalai Lama has a significance even greater than these unrivalled positions imply. That is the peculiar spiritual quality of the man himself. Even such a rationalist as Prime Minister Nehru has spoken of the “halo” and “radiance” of the Great Lama.

It was my good fortune to have had my first meeting with the Dalai Lama at Bodh Gaya in 1956. Even at that time I had found him to be filled with anxiety for the future of his country. Recently again I had the privilege of having long conversation with him at Mussoorie. On both occasions I was conscious of being in the presence of an extraordinary person, who seemed to be complete master of himself and was filled with an inner joy and peace that were radiated all around.

When such a rare and authoritative person spoke out his mind about a matter on which he more than any one else was entitled to speak, it was natural that the whole situation should have been revolutionalised. It is therefore strange to find persons talking even now in terms that have no relevance to the changed situation. The main elements, as I see them, of the present situation are:

1. The Dalai Lama has proclaimed independence to be the goal of his country.

2. He has said that his government signed the 1951 Sino-Tibet Agreement because of China's armed intervention had left no alternative, and, further, that the autonomy pledged in that agreement has been forcibly abrogated by China.
3. He has disclosed the fact of large-scale and brutal repression, including massive killing and deportation of the Tibetan people by the Chinese authorities.
4. He has further disclosed that the Chinese are colonising Tibet on a vast scale.
5. He has revealed how the Chinese are attempting deliberately to destroy the noble religion of the Buddha.
6. In spite of all that has happened, he has declared his desire for a peaceful settlement.
7. He has appealed for help from India and the world to secure justice for his country.

In view of these statements from a person of the status of the Dalai Lama, to go on repeating parrot-like the outworn formulas about China's suzerain rights in Tibet and about Tibet being an internal affair of China is, to say the least, to shut one's eyes to realities and to acquiesce in one of the great wrongs of history. Such moral abdication will only lead to more wrongs and ultimately to war.

There are three points of view from which the present situation in Tibet can be looked at.

The first is the point of view of those who never accepted suzerainty formula and always stood for full independence for Tibet. For them the events in Tibet and the declarations of the Dalai Lama have come only as confirmation of their own view. The present situation is more or less what they had anticipated from the beginning.

The second is the point of view of those who accepted the suzerainty-with-autonomy formula. It is painful to reflect that this formula was accepted even by countries that had but recently won their own freedom. This is an age above everything of anti-imperialism and national freedom, and the very concept of

any country's suzerainty over another is alien to it. At any rate, those who had been themselves victims of imperialism should have given it no quarter. The right of Tibet to national freedom should have been accepted without question.

However, the fact is that the imperialist formula was accepted by India and most countries of the world. The question now is whether that formula stands in tact in the present situation. The answer obviously is in the negative.

When a question was recently asked in the British Parliament about the policy of her Majesty's Government in regard to Tibet, Mr. R. Allan, who replied for the Foreign Secretary, said :

"I would refer my Hon. Friend to the statement made by my predecessor in reply to questions in the House on 6th November, 1950. He said: 'We have over a long period recognised Chinese suzerainty over Tibet, but only on the understanding that Tibet is regarded as autonomous'. This is still Her Majesty's Governments' position."

Mr. Allan has hit the nail squarely on the head : suzerainty was to be recognised only on the understanding that Tibet remained autonomous.

Well, Tibet is no longer autonomous, China has deliberately, and against the advice and warning of her friends, forcibly extinguished the autonomy of Tibet. Can China's suzerainty survive the assassination of Tibetan autonomy? The answer is clearly 'no'. China can no longer claim any suzerain powers in Tibet. Quislings sitting in Lhasa cannot change this situation in the least.

In these changed circumstances there is hardly any difference left between those who stood for Tibetan independence and those who were not prepared to go beyond autonomy.

The question that arises now is, what needs to be done. The least that to my mind should be done is for the countries that had accepted Chinese suzerainty to declare that they do not recognise the forcible annexation of Tibet by China and demand the right of self-determination for Tibet. I would be meaningless to ask for restoration of the status quo ante because of the failure of China to keep her pledged word.

When a free nation is attacked it is called aggression and

other nations move in concert to prevent the aggression and save the victim. In such situations the free nations unhesitatingly acknowledged their moral responsibility. Should it be otherwise in a case where the pledged autonomy of a nation is threatened or destroyed? Can an international instrument such as the Sino-Tibetan Agreement of 1951 be only a private concern of China?

It seems clear to me that as soon as that Agreement was signed it became a property of the whole world and all the nations separately, and jointly, became charged with the moral obligation to see that the Agreement was honoured in practice by both sides. If this were not so, what was the value of that Agreement made between a powerful and big nation and a weak and small one? What also was the value then of any country's recognition of the respective rights and powers of both sides to the Agreement? I am not a student of International Law, but I refuse to believe that after that Agreement no matter what China did in contravention of it remained an internal affair of China, with which no one had any right to interfere. Clearly, if either party to the Agreement broke its terms unilaterally, the other had a right to appeal to other nations and to expect their support and help.

It is said to reflect that while a great tragedy has befallen Tibet and the 1951 Agreement has been torn to shreds and Tibet has appealed for help and support, the world is content to look on with glassy eyes, too dazed or frightened or short-sighted to act. This can only encourage the wrong doing and lead us all nearer to the brink of danger.

There is a third point of view from which to look at the recent happenings in Tibet. That is the human point of view. The miseries and misfortunes of the Tibetan people, the injustices and wrongs to which they have been subjected, the crimes and atrocities that have been committed there have all combined to lift up the issue of Tibet from the tangled domain of legal and constitutional disputations to that of simple, unvarnished humanity. The human issue that has been raised in Tibet is beyond all legal and constitutional and diplomatic argument. It has nothing to do with the issue of autonomy vs. independence or with the rights of China. The human issue is a universal issue and concerns the entire human family. In its very nature, it cannot be an internal

affair of China. Is there an Indian who regards the treatment of Negroes and Asians in South Africa as an internal affair of that country? Has not that question been raised in different international bodies? Is there not a Declaration of Human Rights that the UN adheres to and holds itself morally responsible to protect? Therefore, before every legal and constitutional question, this supreme question of suppression of human rights in Tibet must be faced by the peoples and governments of the world. Not to do so is abdication of humanity.

Even when all this is conceded there is a view that regards it futile to do anything about Tibet, because the Chinese are firmly established there and nothing can dislodge them. This view holds that therefore the wisest course is to keep quiet and forget all about Tibet. To my way of thinking this is not only immoral but even politically unwise. If this were the attitude to be adopted towards every so-called accomplished fact of history, this world would become a veritable hell and every wrong committed by the strong would be perpetuated for ever. It is difficult to see if any thing possible to be done in the immediate future to obtain justice for Tibet. But, let us remember that there is nothing in history that is unchanging. Even the greatest empires have withered away with the passing of time. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that there will never be any change in China and Tibet. And because there is this ever-present possibility of change, it would be inexpedient to keep quiet only because a wrong appears to be irremediable at present. If nothing is done about it in the present, if the wrong is not even clearly defined, if the conscience of the world is not aroused, the danger is that the present wrong may never be righted.

It is for this reason that I have been advocating, mobilisation and informing of public opinion on the question of Tibet and the need for governments, particularly of Asia and Africa, to declare their position unequivocally. Our attempt to form an Afro-Asian Committee on Tibet is also a step in the same direction. Leaders and organisations of Asia and Africa have raised their voice individually but if they come together and speak in unison, the effect would be far greater.

It is also for the same reason that I consider that the Tibet question should be raised in the United Nations. As I said at the

Calcutta Convention, "It seems to be utterly wrong that such an important event as the total suppression of the freedom of a nation (to which I might add genocide on a massive scale and attempted absorption of a whole racial stock by colonization) should take place and the world organisation should not even take notice of it. It is not that the mere raising of an issue in the United Nations means that a solution will be found. We have some experience of the working of that august body ourselves. But, after all is said and done, the UN is the only organisation the human family has that gives some guarantee that the world will not be converted into a jungle where the strong will eat up the weak".

It is true that every issue that is sent to the UN gets involved in the cold war. But that has not prevented India and other countries from appealing to the UN when the occasion demanded it. Therefore, there is no reason why the cold war should come in the way of Tibet alone being taken up by that body.

"It will be recalled"--to quote again from my Calcutta speech--"that when the Chinese aggression began in 1950, the Tibetan Government had moved the United Nations. The El Salvadore delegate had formally called on the UN to condemn China for her unprovoked aggression against Tibet, and had proposed the creation of a special committee to study what measures could be taken by the General Assembly to assist Tibet". When the question was taken in the General Committee, Mr. Kenneth Younger of the United Kingdom proposed that consideration of the issue be postponed because a possibility has arisen of peaceful settlement. The Indian representative, the Jam Saheb of Nawanagar, who followed, supported Mr. Younger's proposal and assured the Committee that the Chinese forces "had ceased to advance after the fall of Chamdo, a town some 480 kilometres from Lhasa" and that "the Indian Government was certain that the Tibetan question would be settled by peaceful means".

Subsequent events have shown that the assurance of the Indian Government was premature. The question has not been solved by peaceful means at all. On the contrary, it is being sought to be solved by ruthless military means. In this situation our responsibility becomes clear, as also the responsibility of

Her Majesty's Government. It would not be a good precedent to set up if we were quietly to acquiesce in the use of violence for the settlement of international disputes for fear of causing offence to the offending power. We were not afraid of offending Britain and France when we condemned their action in Egypt. We are not afraid again of offending France when we so correctly uphold the right of Algeria to national independence.

As for the United Nations, it seems but proper to take up again an issue that had been dropped on grounds that have been falsified.

In this connection the question is raised of China not being a member of the UN. I have always supported the Prime Minister's stand in favour of China's admission into the UN. The Tibet affair has further strengthened me in that view. China at present is in the position of an out-law from the family of nations and is therefore not susceptible to any moral pressure of the UN. I believe China finds the present position rather convenient. On the one hand, she is under no international restraints and, on the other, she exploits American opposition to her UN membership in order to whip up war hysteria among her people by depicting almost the whole world as her enemy.

I should like, however, to make it clear that while I support China's membership to the UN, I do not think that her not being a member should stand in the way of the Tibet issue being raised in the world organisation.

I should like to say a few words now about the recent controversy regarding the status of the Dalai Lama. I am sure that the Dalai Lama does not want to embarrass India which has given him asylum. But we on our part must appreciate his position. Let us understand that the Dalai Lama has not come to India for a change or to preach Buddhism. He has come here to fight for his country and his people. Whether he will succeed or fail is not the point. Any patriot in his position would have done the same thing. In fact, I am sure that in his position I would not have been so patient and restrained. And if I may treat on delicate ground, with due apologies, will you please imagine what would have happened if Sri Jawaharlal Nehru at the age of 25 had found himself in the place of the Dalai Lama. I personally do not find it difficult to imagine the storm and

thunder that would have burst upon the world from the hills of Mussoorie! Therefore, let us give this young man his due and not preach to him how to behave. It is a different matter what freedoms we are prepared to give him. When he said at his press conference that wherever he was with his ministers, the people of Tibet regarded them as the government of Tibet, he was only stating a truth, which no one who knows Tibet will dispute. Whether we are prepared ourselves to look upon him and his Kashak as the lawful government of Tibet in exile is again a different matter. For those who never accepted Chinese suzerainty over Tibet, the question is not difficult to answer. The Government of India, however, has its real difficulties in this matter and every one concerned, including the Dalai Lama, must appreciate them. I am sure that the Dalai Lama will do so.

Be that as it may, there is one thing which should be appreciated on our part. To expect that the Dalai Lama will forsake the cause of Tibetan freedom and confine himself purely religious pursuits is to under-estimate the strength of the urge of nationalism, to misunderstand the personal character of the Dalai Lama and to forget that he traditionally combines in himself spiritual and temporal powers and functions.

I spoke just now of the strength of the nationalist urge. Let us be reminded that even communism has not been able to break that strength. I am not sure if the national republics of the USSR would not want to re-assert their national autonomy at the first real opportunity. The undying urge to national freedom has been proved in the case of Yugoslavia, Hungary and Poland. The Chinese themselves have had bitter proof of it. Since 1951 they have been taking away from Tibet hundreds of Tibetan youths for indoctrination. But they have discovered to their dismay that the Tibetan young men, inspite of ample doses of indoctrination, remain ardent partisans of Tibetan freedom!

Some may wonder why I have so ardently taken up the cause of Tibet. Well, firstly, because I believe in human freedom and the freedom of all peoples. I believe in the freedom of Algeria, for instance, as much as in the freedom of Tibet. Secondly, because I believe in international peace, which is impossible without international justice. Thirdly, because Tibet is our neighbour and it is our neighbourly duty to help her. Fourthly, as

a Hindu I am an ardent devotee of the Lord Buddha and feel a spiritual kinship with all Buddhists. Fifthly, I came to know His Holiness the Dalai Lama, I have come deeply to respect and love him. And lastly, because I am one of those fools of history who are forever fighting for what the worldly wise consider to be lost causes.

Acharya J.B. Kripalani on Tibet

(Lok Sabha Debate, 8 May, 1959)

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 takes this criticism to be interference in the internal affairs of the country. If it were so the hard criticism that is being levelled by China itself against Yugoslavia would be considered internal interference with 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.

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 bonafides, 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 had 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 other 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 aggressive 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 it right 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’ble 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. 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? You cannot have peaceful coexistence alone. It is an impossibility. Panchsheel, therefore, implies mutuality

and you cannot practice 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 none 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 end of days, I tell you that 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 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.

Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhyaya on Tibet

India's Stake in Tibet's Freedom (*27 April, 1959*)

NOW that the Dalai Lama has reached Mussoorie and has been comfortably lodged in the Birla Niwas, the dramatic and sensational part of the episode, beginning with his escape from the clutches of the Chinese Communist Army, and his request for asylum in India, has ended. The people gave him a warm ovation wherever he went on his way to Mussoorie. He has been deeply touched by his spontaneous and enthusiastic manifestation of the great love and reverence that the people of Bharat have for the Tibetan leader. Some people may interpret the public enthusiasm as owing to the spiritual and religious hue of the Indian soul and to the saffron robes of the visitor. This aspect of the matter can neither be ignored nor minimised. But it is essentially our concern for the peaceful Tibetan people, and our deep resentment at the way the Communists have behaved, that the people have such intense feelings. It may also be that there is the growing realization of the potential danger to our own safety and security that has led people to throng in thousands round the man whose sufferings are intimately connected with our own. It is, therefore, natural that the people eagerly look forward to future steps on the part of the Dalai Lama and the Government of India.

The Prime Minister, even before he met the Dalai Lama, has given an idea of the way he wants him to behave. Replying to a question in the Rajya Sabha, he said that the Dalai Lama would be free to carry on his religious activities. The Prime Minister maintained that "it was the ordinary right of any country to limit the activities of foreigners who create difficulty with other countries." Nobody will like to or can in fact, question our right to impose restrictions we deem necessary. But the main question is: What is necessary for us?

India is confronted with a very delicate situation in the matter.

China is a friendly country. We have been friends in the past, and would like to continue so in the future. Besides the cultural traditions of the two countries, the need for preserving world peace also demands it. The Prime Minister argues that in addition to USA and USSR, China and India, which are developing fast with vast resources and vaster numbers, 'would largely shape the destinies of the world and peace in Asia in particular' in years to come. He, therefore, feels that this aim would be largely achieved if there existed a tradition of friendship between the two Asian countries.

To establish this tradition he has at times gone out of his way to please and placate China. At a time when the newly formed Communist Government of China was friendless and isolated, Pandit Nehru came forward to recognize and recommend to the world a Government which most people felt nothing more than a band of foreign agents who organised themselves into the Communist Party of China, and ultimately, through a number of tactical moves, aided by the peculiar circumstances of the Sino-Japanese war, and the corrupt and inefficient administration of Chiang Kaishek, successfully usurped power in the name of the people. Though a number of Western powers were antagonized, the representative of India in the UN, and in various other world organisations, were allowed to persist in season and out of season, in demanding a seat for Communist China. All this was done on altruistic grounds to support the good case of a friendly neighbour.

But Tibet presented a case where altruism could be practiced only at India's cost. Pandit Nehru, who is not reputed for following a foreign policy fashioned to further the nation's enlightened self-interests, too readily succumbed to the fanciful theory of Chinese suzerainty over Tibet, when the newfangled principles of Panchsheel were fanfared to the world. China agreed to preserve Tibet's autonomy - perhaps only to provide some excuse to Pandit Nehru to calm his conscience at the abject surrender of noble cause to appease the monstrous dragon. But a government wedded to totalitarian methods, could not long, keep up the facade. Tibet's autonomy was automatically atomised when the Chinese introduced their so-called "reforms" in all walks of life. How could an intensely religious and spiritual

people co-exist with an utterly materialistic people with foreign modes and mores? Far from the ecological aspect of a people's organic development, the Chinese could not even maintain an autonomous administration in Tibet. Offices and Departments were all manned by the Chinese, and vast tracts were acquired to settle the surplus Chinese population by the introduction of cooperative farming. Under these circumstances a clash was inevitable.

What should the Government of India do? It is a moot question. Pandit Nehru's recent statements show that he is satisfied with giving an asylum to the Dalai Lama. As a religious head, he may continue to function. But will that be sufficient to achieve the objective? It is true that the Dalai Lama, by his mere presence on the Indian soil, will serve as a focal point for the Tibetan guerillas who, it is considered, will continue to be active in spite of the military might of the aggressor, due to the peculiar terrain of the country. It will mean a little headache to Peking, but that will not go to secure autonomy, let alone independence, to the Tibetan people.

India has a stake in the matter. Tibet's autonomy is vital to us. If we cannot secure it, not only our integrity and independence will be threatened, but it may become well nigh impossible for us to continue a policy of non-alignment. So far as China's intentions are concerned, they are well known. Already she has committed what is known as "cartographic aggression". Now Chou En-lai is reported to have come forward with a suggestion that undefined boundaries between China and other Asian countries should be settled by peaceful negotiations. Obviously she does not recognise the McMahon Line, which forms the boundary line between India and Tibet. The seeds of discord between the two countries have been sown and at any time the People's Government of China may direct its 'liberating' hordes to ransack Indian villages. Pandit Nehru has admitted that the Chinese have already occupied a few strategic Indian village in the district of Almora. Pandit Nehru has so far taken no action.

Besides India, China has her greedy eyes on Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. Nepal, as an independent state, is responsible for her own defence. Communist China's activities in Tibet have posed a serious question to her rulers about Nepal's future

defences. Whatever significance we may attach to news published in the Pak Paper **Dawn**, the King of Nepal is reported to have sought assurances from Pandit Nehru of active help in case of communist aggression failing which Nepal would consider the desirability of joining SEATO, to increase her defense potential. What has Pandit Nehru to say to this regard? Due to this opposition to military pacts on fundamental grounds, he may not agree to give any categorical assurance to Nepal. If he does agree, he will have to consider ways and means of increasing our defense potential, which is already too low and inadequate even to meet the aggressive designs of Pakistan.

If Nepal goes to the American bloc, it will greatly influence India's foreign policy. In fact it needs some reorientation. Pandit Nehru may not like to do anything that may please Communist China, but her attitude will depend on what Panditji does but not on what suits her. A booklet published by the UAR Information Department aptly writes: "Nehru and Nasser led the Bandung movement many years ago. The Communist newspapers were praising Nehru as a man of peace. Now Moscow imagines that he has lost his utility."

"Thus the idea of planting a Communist base in India has emerged and local communists are being provided with money to spread propaganda against Nehru."

Because of this scheme Peking does not seem to be so particular in avoiding points of conflict with India. In spite of the fact that Pandit Nehru has adopted a very lukewarm attitude on the Tibetan issue, Peking continues to accuse India of complicity in the matter. Dalai Lama's statement, according to Chinese News Agency, is said to have been prepared by some Indian official of the External Affairs Ministry. They have not withdrawn the allegation that Kalimpong is the seat of the rebellion. Even a veiled threat of raising the issue of Kashmir and Nagaland has been held out by the Chinese. This shows that China is out for trouble, Pandit Nehru's wishes will not avert it.

A strong and definite stand on the issue of Tibetan autonomy alone can set China right. Such a stand is necessary to preserve friendship between the two countries. Friendship must be based on trust and respect, equality and mutual benefit and not on fear

and misunderstanding arising out of a hesitation to look differences in the eye and seek an open reconciliation.

The Dalai Lama, therefore, should have all the facilities to direct his people in their fight for independence. The people of India wish it. The interests of India demand it. If Nehru fails to follow this policy, he will cut himself as under from the current of the national feeling and sentiment in this regards. It is admitted that this policy will man certain risks. But we have to bear them. If we hesitate we may have to take greater risks in future involving fundamental changes in our policies.

Giani Zail Singh, former President of the Indian Republic, on Tibet

*(Speech delivered at the inaugural session of the
International Convention on Tibet and Peace in
South Asia, New Delhi, 12-14 August, 1989)*

YOU all know the purpose of the meeting which I have come to inaugurate. I apologize for coming quite late. My doctor had advised me not to go out and my secretary telephoned immediately to say that I would not be coming. I said that I will definitely go. There was an agreement that I would not deliver a speech, but would participate and meet the friends who fight for human rights.

I am not saying anything as a former President of India, or on behalf of the government. Whatever I shall say will be in my personal capacity and it should not be misconstrued.

Whenever people of various ideologies have had any difficulty and suffered, we, the Indians, gave them support. They came and lived here as the Tibetans are living here today. This is the basic tradition of India which we have preserved.

You will be glad to know that even though our government keeps quite aloof from conferences of this kind, yet the voice of the people cannot be suppressed. A government does not make its people; rather the people make the government.

In the changed circumstances, I think our old friends who are our friends even today, i.e., China and her leaders, claim that Tibet is a part of their country. India too, accepts this position. But if the Tibetan's viewpoint, emotions, ideas, and ways of living are suppressed and others remain silent I do not think it is a good thing. Wherever humanity is suppressed, wherever the people's voice is suppressed by force and attempts are made to keep them tied, the people of India cannot remain silent.

I wanted to say many things to the delegates of this

conference. My speech is quite brief and my friend will read it out to you. I am glad that leaders of the two superpowers have turned friendly during the last one year or two. I am also glad that Mr Gorbachev, whom I regard as an angel of peace, has demolished the totalitarian regime in his country and taken resolute steps towards democracy. The countries of the Warsaw Pact have also achieved democracy. So many changes have taken place and I think the voice of the people behind these changes is the Lord's voice. The people's call is the call of the Supreme Being (*Paramatma*). This is what I believe.

*“Zulm dekha to shahanshahon ki hasti mein;
Khuda Dekha to logon ki basti mein.”*

*I saw oppression in the figure of the monarchs and
I saw God in the habitations of the people.*

Gorbachev's ideas have exerted their influence in the Soviet Union and on some other issues as well. I am not despondent and believe that our voice will definitely reach the Chinese leaders. It will also help the struggling Tibetans and give them courage.

Atal Behari Vajpayee, Member of Parliament and Leader of Bharatiya Janta Party, on Tibet

(i) Tibet's Independence

(8 May, 1959, Lok Sabha)

SINCE the beginning of the communist government in China, India, in spite of a great friendship with Chang-Kai-Shek, has welcomed the new China and we have tried more than anybody else so that China gets respect in the nations of the world. Sometimes, it seems that we are taking much more initiative than China herself in this regard. We have defended China because we thought that, although we differ on communism, if the people of China take to this road, it is their business, and India and China can remain friends in spite of differences in our ways of life.

But the first blow to this friendship was struck when the armies of China 'liberated' Tibet. At that time, our Prime Minister had asked: liberated from whom? Tibet was not under any domination. India is the closest neighbour of Tibet. In the history of the past, if we had wanted we could have tried to annex Tibet, but today the leaders of China, who accuse India of being expansionist, forget that we never tried to annex Tibet. Tibet is a small country. But we respected its distinct existence. We respected the independence of Tibet, and we hoped that China would do the same. But the ways of the Communists are different. Their use of words is different. When they want to enslave people, they say that they are going to liberate them. Today when they want to oppress people, they say that they are going to reform them. If reform is at all necessary, the inclination towards reform should come from those who have to make

reforms. Reform can't be imposed from above.

But what is happening in Tibet is not reform. Following the agreement of 1950, China should have respected the autonomy of Tibet, but China has interfered in the internal affairs of Tibet. Lakhs of Chinese from China have been brought to Tibet so that the Tibetans may become a minority in their own country and so that in the future Tibet may become an inseparable part of China. From Tibet thousands of young people have been sent to China to get education in the new religion, but when they came back and Chinese leaders saw that it had had no effect on them, their Tibetan colour had not been erased, their distinctiveness was firm and their enthusiasm for protecting their way of life was indelible, then they got alerted and they tried to erase the way of life of Tibet. The present struggle arose because of a big nation desiring to swallow a small nation.

Accepting Chinese Sovereignty Over Tibet is a Big Mistake

My submission is that when we accepted the sovereignty of China on Tibet we made a big mistake. That day was a very unfortunate day. But the mistake has been made. Perhaps we thought that the matter would be solved, that there would be no more fight, and we did not want to give others the opportunity to take advantage of differences between us and China. But what was the result? Not only did China break the agreement with Tibet, but they also violated the agreement with India which was in the background of this agreement. Where has the Panchsheel agreement gone? Those who proclaim Panchsheel say that according to Panchsheel, democracy and dictatorship can live together. If for the communist imperialism, the peace-loving and religion-loving people of Tibet can't keep their way of life, then it is meaningless to say that in such a big world, communism and democracy can co-exist. We don't want to interfere in the internal affairs of Tibet. But Tibet is not an internal affair of China. China is bound to respect the autonomy of Tibet, to refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of Tibet. But this agreement was broken and I believe that now India, the Indian government, should revise its position. Agreements have two sides, they are to be respected by both sides. If China violated

the agreement, we have the right to reconsider our situation. What is the reason for the people of Tibet to be deprived of their freedom?

Why can't Tibet remain free? People say that it was not free before. Does it mean that a country which was not free before cannot have the right to be free? That where there was servitude before, servitude should remain? If we support the independence of Algeria, and if this support does not mean interfering in the internal affairs of France, then how can the support for Tibetan independence be an interference in the internal affairs of China? My friend Shri Khadilkar has just said that no party in the country supports the independence of Tibet. I beg to disagree. I represent a small party, but our party defends the independence of Tibet. Whether the cause of Tibet's independence is right or wrong cannot be decided by the number of people who raise their voices. The Chinese imperialism today may suppress by their brutality the cry of Tibetan independence, but the thirst for independence cannot be extinguished. In this movement the repression will act like a wind-storm in a fire, and to-morrow, if not today, the people of Tibet will definitely get their freedom.

But the question is: what can we do for it? I have said that we made a mistake in 1950. Now we have to bear the consequences. But the time has come to repent, to recognise the mistake. I hope that on this occasion the Prime Minister will truly represent the crores of people of this country. Except a few of our friends, all India is unanimous on this question that what is happening in Tibet should not happen. But is it possible that Tibet can enjoy autonomy under the Chinese rule? It seems to me that the communist system and autonomy are two contradictory things. Under communist rule, autonomy cannot exist. In 1930, Mao Zedong had said: we have made the constitution in such a way that if somebody wants to go out, he can. The Tibetans did not speak about going out. They wanted to keep their separate existence, but even this permission was not given to them.

He also said that they wanted to see a flower blossom which will have a thousand petals. Forget about thousand, even the soft bud of Tibet is being crushed. What the imperialists do in

Tibet, they accuse us. We never tried to annex Tibet. We have advocated for a place be given to China in UN, we could advocate also for a place given to Tibet. Ukraine is a part of the Soviet Union, but it has a separate seat in the UN. So could not Tibet, even though being with China, have a distinct seat in UN? But we have not done this, because of our friendship with China. What have we received in return for this friendship?

We want friendship even today, but we should not build the palace of this friendship on the dead body of Tibet's independence. We can't close our eyes on injustice. It has been the tradition of India, and in this tradition the Prime Minister has conducted the foreign policy of this country, that wherever there is injustice, murder of humanity, tyranny, we raise our voice in protest, we speak the language of truth and we fearlessly protect the rights of those who are trampled upon. Today Tibet is the criterion of the policies of Nehruji, Tibet is the touchstone of the firmness of the Indian government, Tibet is the touchstone of the desirability of Panchsheel. It is not with the declarations of Panchsheel that the feeling of Panchsheel will be respected. The touchstone of Panchsheel is the behaviour. The Prime Minister may act with restraint, nevertheless if the problem of Tibet is not solved with it, we will have to recognize that it is necessary to bring a little firmness, a little activity into this policy.

Whether the Dalai Lama should remain in Tibet or should go is not a big question. The Tibetans will decide among themselves. But Tibet is the touchstone for big nations swallowing small nations. If small countries are swallowed in this fashion, world peace cannot be firmly established. In South-East Asia, there are many countries where Chinese people live in great number. Because of Tibet, in all these countries a wave of apprehension has arisen. As far as India is concerned, China has a wicked policy on us. In the maps of China a province of us is said to be theirs. The communists of China have expelled Chang-kai-Shek but have kept his maps. If they had wanted they could have rejected also his maps. And our communist friends have not seen these maps. I don't believe what they are saying. But this is an indirect attack of China on India. China has occupied two places in Uttar Pradesh. These events point to the danger ahead. We don't have to be terrified but we have to adopt a strong

policy.

I will make another submission. The Dalai Lama has come to India. He is a fighter for freedom, he fights for the freedom of his country, and as a result he had to leave his country and come to India. I would like that he be allowed to lead the fight for the independence of his country from India. Although the restrictions have been placed for security reasons, they should be relaxed. In the days of the British Raj, if our patriots could go to other countries and, from there, fight for India's independence and be objects of respect for us, there is no reason why the Dalai Lama should not be given this liberty.

If the Dalai Lama is successful in making a compromise with China, and our Prime Minister can be a mediator in this relation, nothing will make the people of this country happier. But if the leaders of China can't be brought to the right path, if they can't be persuaded by political or diplomatic pressure, and having awakened the public opinion in Burma, Lanka and Indonesia, and organising and making a strong demonstration of it, if China cannot be influenced, then India will have no other option left, except to allow the Dalai Lama to fight for the freedom of his country.

The youth of India consider the independence of Tibet as something precious not because they have a close relationship with Tibet, but because we have lived in servitude, we know the suffering and pain of servitude, we know the price of freedom - they should be given the liberty to act. If the people of Tibet fight for freedom, the people of India will be with them. We will give them our sympathy and we would expect China not to give imperialist talks. The days of imperialism are over. But this is a new imperialism. The danger is that it comes under the pretence of revolution, it comes disguised in the garb of revolution, it comes raising the slogan of a new order, but colonialism it is, imperialism it is. In the history of the past, we fought against the imperialism of the white people but now on the roof of the world appears the imperialism of the yellow people. We should face it also with determination.

(ii) India's Tibet Policy

(4 September, 1959, Lok Sabha)

THE problem of Tibet is before us. The first time when the Tibetan question was raised in the UN, our representative, as the Prime Minister said, had expressed hope that the problem of Tibet will be resolved peacefully by talks with China, but the history of these 9 years is the proof that there was no effort to solve the problem of Tibet peacefully.

China has used force in Tibet. China has tried to erase the free existence of Tibet and in my last speech I had said that today the question is not only of autonomy or freedom of Tibet but the question is whether Tibet will continue to live as a separate country with all its characteristics? If the hopes of the Indian Government that the Tibetan question would be solved peacefully had been realised, India and this House would have been happy. But there is no hope that it can be solved through mutual talks. The Prime Minister in his speech did not express this hope either. We have received the Dalai Lama and his companions in India, this is very good and everybody welcomes it. But does the duty of India towards Tibet stop with giving shelter to the Dalai Lama? Will the Dalai Lama and his companions be able to go back to Tibet with honour? Can the autonomy of Tibet, which China guaranteed, return? Will Tibet be able to defend its existence? No answer was given to these questions.

The Prime Minister said that his policy is to keep friendship with China. The whole country agrees with this policy. Not only with China, even with Pakistan we want friendship. We want friendship with all the countries, but the question is: what will be the basis for this friendship? At what price shall we achieve this friendship? We want friendship with France but we can't for its sake refuse to support the independence of Algeria. We want friendship with Portugal also, but we cannot, for that, stop demanding the freedom of Goa. We want friendship also with South Africa, but we cannot, for that reason, stop raising the question of Blacks in the United Nations. Each year we raise the question of Indians in Africa. Each year South Africa refuses

to accept the decisions of the UN, but we raise this question because we think that there is no other way for solving these questions than to awaken the world opinion.

When I proposed to bring the Tibetan question to the UN, my intention was clear that we believe in the UN, it is why we should bring this question there. And we believe in the genuineness of Tibet's complaint, it is why also we should bring this question there.

Now, whether it will be useful to bring the question of Tibet there or not, I think that it is best if we don't decide about it. We should go according to the decision of the highest authority of Tibet, the Dalai Lama. Can somebody decide better than the Dalai Lama where lies the interest of Tibet? The Dalai Lama, on the 30th of August, has appealed to all the civilised nations, in which India is included, asking them to bring the Tibetan question to the UN. The Prime Minister now refuses to accept my proposal, so he refuses also to accept the appeal of the Dalai Lama. If the Dalai Lama believes there can be some gain in bringing the problem of Tibet to the UN, I think that India should raise this question. The Prime Minister has not made it clear either what will be our policy if any country brings the Tibetan question to the UN. We cannot prevent a country from bringing this question. At that time, shall we say that this question should not be raised? A clear direction should be given to our representatives who will take part in the General Assembly. I doubt if the leader of our delegation who are going to participate in the General Assembly can truly represent the Indian feelings. Already before, on the question of Hungary they did not correctly express the feelings of the people of India. The Prime Minister said something and the leader of our delegation said something else. I am afraid that this history will repeat itself on the question of Tibet. It is why, if the Indian Government does not raise the question of Tibet, and if some other country raises the question, India should support it, as the amendment proposed by the Congress member, Dr Gohokar. Last time we did not support it, it is why no country in the world moved. After all, we have the greatest interest in Tibet, we have the most sympathy for Tibet, Tibet is our neighbour.

I want to ask: if another country raises the question of Tibet, what will be the policy of India? I want to know what is the opinion of the government about the amendment proposed by the Congress member? It is not my amendment. The Prime Minister did not clarify the stand of the government in this regard.

There are practical difficulties with regard to the question of Tibet, all right, but there is no other solution in view except bringing the matter to the UN. There will be heated discussions there, all right. But if we believe in the UN and if China wants to enter the UN, the world opinion should have an effect on China. Now there is only one option for India: appeal to the soul of the world, awaken the consciousness of the world, awaken the world's public opinion against the violation of human rights in Tibet. And if there is no effect on communist China, at least we will have this satisfaction that we have done our duty. We want to know what is the policy of the Indian government towards Tibet. Is it the policy of sitting immobile? Is it a policy of indecision? A policy of helplessness? After all, what are the steps we are taking for resolving the Tibetan problem peacefully? I have said that the problem of Tibet is not solved by only giving shelter to the Dalai Lama.

I want to add one more thing. Now India has decided that we will again raise the proposal for bringing China in the UN. We have been raising this question for the past 7 years. But in today's circumstances, is it necessary that we make this proposal? China may want to enter the UN, but taking into account what is happening between us and China, should we take the initiative for giving place to China in the United Nations? I believe the time has come for the Indian Government to drop this proposal. If any other country of the world wants to bring this question, let us support it. If we are not ready to raise the question of Tibet, then considering what China does to us, why should we take the initiative to make China enter the UN? And finally, as I have said, friendship with China does not mean that they keep kicking us and we keep kissing their feet. Friendship can be based on self-respect. China is the aggressor, China has stepped on our border. She is knocking at our door, and the Prime Minister says that we are not ready to talk about the

border. I believe we should not now raise the question of China. I appeal to this House to accept my proposal and prove that, although due to some international difficulties the Indian government cannot raise the question of Tibet, the feelings of the people of India are with the people of Tibet, they are with the Dalai Lama.

(iii) Indian People's Support for Tibet

(17 March, 1960, Lok Sabha)

TODAY it was reported in the newspapers that amongst the Tibetan refugees sent from Misamari camp to Dharamshala, five died in the transport and we don't know the whereabouts of 30 Tibetans, maybe they disappeared on the way. It is also said that the Government did not make arrangements for their medical treatment. During the travel there was no interpreter with them, who could understand their difficulties and try to remedy them.

After the decision was taken to settle the refugees in Dharamshala, and the Government asked us money for that, there should have been such an arrangement for taking them there so that there is no reason to complain from anybody.

The Tibetan refugees have come to our country due to tragic circumstances. I feel that our duty does not end with settling them. People have often mentioned in this discussion the Tibetan Convention which is about to take place in Delhi. I am sorry to see that our government, and especially our Prime Minister, have expressed their displeasure about this convention. It is true that this convention is something that comes from the people. It may be that the government does not feel it is its duty, but the people of the country understand what is our moral duty towards Tibet. India who has come out of a foreign domination cannot be prevented from expressing her sympathy towards countries who are enchained under a new domination. The Prime Minister has perhaps forgotten, may I remind him of what he said on the 7th of December 1950, standing in this very same House and I quote his words here:

“It is not right for any country to talk about its sovereignty or suzerainty over an area outside its own immediate range. That is to say, since Tibet is not the same as China, it should ultimately be the wishes of the people of Tibet that should prevail and not any legal or constitutional arguments. ... it is right and proper thing to say and I can see no difficulty in saying to the Chinese Government that whether they have suzerainty or sovereignty over Tibet, surely, according to principles, principles which they proclaim and the principles which I uphold, the last voice in regard to Tibet should be the voice of the people of Tibet and of nobody else.”

These words cannot be forgotten, but if we look today at the conduct of the Indian Government with Tibet, we see a great difference. Our Prime Minister has struggled all his life against imperialism and colonialism. It is possible that due to certain difficulties today he can't really speak his mind. But I don't believe that when there is an attack on humanity and a violation of human rights, there is no anger in his heart.

If he cannot speak, if he cannot support the demands of the people of Tibet, then I feel that if the people of India organize a conference and want to express the sympathy of the countries of Asia and Africa for Tibet, at least he should not express his displeasure. We can understand the policy of the Communist party, this is the same Communist party which supported the communal demand for Pakistan and on that same principle they are not ready to apply the principle of right of self-determination to Tibet. Comrade Krutchev can apply the right of self-determination to Pakhtunistan but here the Communist Party will not speak about Tibet. Let them not speak; but they don't want to let us speak either and they praise our Prime Minister because due to the difficult circumstances he cannot express openly his support for the people of Tibet.

I am not prepared to agree that the feelings of our Prime Minister are not with the people of Tibet. China had promised Tibet to respect its autonomy and on the basis of this assurance Tibet has given a small part of its sovereignty to China; but when China violated this agreement, the part of sovereignty that Tibet has surrendered goes back to Tibet, it is why to say

that Tibet cannot demand its autonomy is, I think, wrong from a legal point of view. If the government cannot do anything because of certain difficulties, it should refrain from saying things which hurt the feelings of the people willing to express their sympathy.

I believe that the security of India is linked with the autonomy of Tibet. If we support the independence of Algeria, and if the Communist Party also does it, nobody should object against any kind of demand for the autonomy of Tibet. But China claims that Tibet is a part of China, in the same way Portugal claims that Goa is a part of Portugal. We cannot accept this claim of Portugal, and we cannot accept that claim either. China removed Tibet from the map of the world. I am sorry to see that in the maps printed by the Government of India also, Tibet is not there. Tibet has been erased from the map. The name of Tibet is not on these maps. There is only the name of China on them. China has erased Tibet, does it follow that Tibet is also erased for us? I don't believe that any thing good is going to come out of that. This policy is not correct for India from the moral point of view, but even if we look at it only from the point of view of national interests, the fact that Tibet is being annihilated cannot be for the good of India in the long run.

(iv) India's Position on The Question of Tibet in the UN

[22 November, 1960, Lok Sabha (extract)]

IT is sad that we decided not to support Thailand and Malaysia in their protest about the violation of human rights in Tibet. If India does not recognise the right of self-determination to Tibet, it can be explained because India has received in the legacy from the British that China has suzerainty over Tibet. But as far as the violation of human rights is concerned India can't remain a silent spectator. To say that this question is a matter of the cold war and that we don't want that on this question the cold war starts, or to say that China is not present there and that therefore there is no sense in raising this question there, these are arguments I don't understand. If China is not there [dans le

un], what can we do about it? But we have the responsibility to express the feelings of India vis-a-vis the people of Tibet. If we speak about ending the imperialism and colonialism, if we are against French imperialism in Algeria, we cannot close our eyes on a new imperialism rising at our border, on the top of Himalayas. My request is that the Indian Government should reconsider its policy in this regard.

Yes, it is true that if the question of Tibet is raised in the UN, no solution is going to be found. But we have raised many questions there, the solutions of which were not found and in doing so we had the satisfaction that we had done our duty. When we claim to raise our voice in the whole world against colonialism and imperialism, we can't sit with our eyes closed on the events taking place in Tibet.

S. Nijalingappa,
former President of Indian
National Congress and
Ex-Chief Minister of
Karnataka State, on Tibet

*(Inaugural address delivered at the International
Convention on Tibet and Peace in South Asia,
New Delhi, 12-14 August, 1989)*

IT is a matter of pleasure that I have been asked to inaugurate this meaningful convention. We are meeting for some great cause for a very good purpose. The cause of Tibet is not the cause of the Tibetan people only. It is a cause for the entire world. It is for this reason that you friends have come from many parts of the world. It is not the first time that it has drawn the attention and concern of the people of this country.

Unfortunately, things have gone wrong in China. With their long history, all the influence they have been subjected to for thousands of years by Buddha and subsequently by great thinkers of their own country, that they should have taken this step is a matter of sorrow and surprise. Possibly you all remember that there was an agreement between Chou En-lai and Jawaharlal Nehru and that gentleman from Ceylon, that is, what is known as 'Panch Shila' (the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence). It is a first class philosophy and policy that has been accepted in many parts of the world. Unfortunately, one of the parties, namely, China, violated it and attacked Tibet. One of the items in Panch Shila was that a strong country or party should not attack a weak party. I do not know why China did it. It was wrong. Gandhiji had said that a wrong step retraced is a step in progress and I hope that they will also retrace their step.

What is happening in Tibet is military occupation and

subjugation - people being imprisoned, their monasteries disturbed or destroyed, their fundamental rights denied and abused. And they are suffering under this unholy occupation. I sympathise with them as all of you do. My own impression, my own opinion, is that the ordinary man, the mass of the people in China, sympathise with the people of Tibet. It is only the rulers, the leaders of China, who have no concern for them. Therefore, I appeal to the leaders and the people of China to retrace their step. If you go and ask these people of China, they will not agree with this unholy occupation ...

His Holiness the Dalai Lama is one of the finest, noblest and most spiritual men I have come across in the world. He has given a plan for removal of occupation, for an understanding between China and Tibet. Those five points are exceedingly fine, adoptable. The whole world thinks that it is the only plan that can be implemented to bring about peace in Tibet and China. We think that China has its own purpose, its own troubles and we have seen this a few days back - how Marxist China is preventing democracy coming up. I am compelled to say this because the whole world is becoming smaller, thanks to scientific developments, especially in the last two hundred years. Distances are being annihilated. Therefore, it has become necessary that all people of the world should become citizens of one world. Whatever happens in one part of the world will have repercussions in the other parts...

And regarding Tibet, all of us feel for them, and His Holiness the Dalai Lama's plan must be accepted. I can only appeal from this place as your friend, as a small man, but I belong to the entire world. I want to see a world before I die where friendship prevails. Love for one another prevails. If we go mad, all our achievements will be destroyed.

I hope responsible citizens of the world will realize this and therefore I do not want to go on expanding on the subject but Tibet deserves attention. They are different from China, there is nothing common except that they are human beings, both of them. What is there that is common? They live in a quiet place, far removed from the world, land-locked, away from others, on the top of the world. They are peace loving, they are not causing any offence to anyone. I think there was a time, very recently,

that China accepted the independence of Tibet. What else? They are culturally different, religiously different even physically different. It is just because China has developed strength after they got freedom and after they began to develop themselves. Merely because the Tibetans are weak, they are small in numbers, about seven million, now reduced to six million thanks to the cruelty of the Chinese leaders.

So it is but natural that we from every part of the world will meet, we have been meeting - it is the fifth or sixth time that we are meeting. We meet and appeal to them, appeal to China ... Democracy has to prevail. It is thanks to the philosophy which has been accepted and partly implemented by Gorbachev, that even Russia is changing. China also should change. It is good. I wish democracy will prevail at last: at least fundamental rights must prevail. So I wish China would recognize that they [Tibetans] have as much fundamental rights as the Chinese have. Tibetans must be freed from this absolute slavery. That is what it is. Therefore, I am saying that you will take a decision and this conference is not only for the liberation of Tibet but also for peace in South Asia. South Asia, according to me, consist of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and a country we had our differences with just now, Nepal, and some other small countries...

I am glad that the oldest member of parliament, the oldest parliamentarian has come here and participated in this convention. I am so happy about it. So you will take the decision ... to tell China to go out, to allow the Tibetans to develop. Do not have your army there or your civilians - pull them back. You are going to dump atomic waste in Tibet. Why? In the first place atomic energy I do not like. The atomic waste can do harm thousands of years later. There are various other methods of energy. Do not exploit atomic energy. Do not misuse it. We can carry on with other sources of energy. And do not have that waste in Tibet. It is a dangerous practice. So I appeal to China and also I appeal to this conference, to our friends in Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh - it is high time that we go to the right to bring about peace. I will close. We have a prayer in Sanskrit:

*Shaa na vavatu, saha nau bhunaktu saha viryam
karavavahai, Tejasvinava adhitamastu ma
vidvisavahai Aum santh,santh,santh.*

[--Taittiriya Upnishad.]

*May He protect us both, may He be pleased with us,
May we work together with vigour,
May our studies illumine us,
May there be no enmity between us.*

I appeal to every citizen of the world, to every human being, to observe this philosophy - Let us live together, eat together, work together, think together, and bring peace, prosperity and progress in this world.

Rabi Ray, former Speaker of Lok Sabha, on Tibet

(Speech at the International Convention on Tibet and Peace in South Asia, New Delhi, 12-14 August, 1989)

I want to make some remarks before I deal with the subject. I was hearing the learned discourses of my distinguished friends since yesterday and I want to make a revelation that during the freedom struggle of independence, as far as I know, I cannot recall a *single* communist leader of China, including Mao Tse Tung or any other leader [who] uttered *anything* in support of the freedom movement of India. Although the fact remains that it fell to the lot of reactionary Chang Kai Shek who came all the way to India in the Second World War and joined with President Roosevelt, the then President of the United States of America, to support the freedom movement of India. I had to reveal this to tell you that *at no point of time* the present communist leaders of China or their predecessor, the father of cultural revolution in China, Mao Tse Tung, had supported the freedom movement of India.

Another point I want to tell you is that there is a misconception in India and outside India that those illustrious sons of India - whom in his message His Holiness the Dalai Lama has praised because they supported the freedom movement of Tibet, the late Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Dr Rammanohar Lohia, Jayaprakash Narayan and Rajagopalachari - there is a misconception spread by the media, the electronic media and not printed media, that Mr. Nehru who acquiesced in the baby murder of Tibet in 1949 is a forward looking Prime Minister, a forward looking politician, whereas Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Dr Rajendra Prasad, Dr Rammanohar Lohia, Rajagopalachari, since they supported the freedom movement of Tibet they were backward looking. I think you will all agree with me when I say that on the point of freedom movement in Tibet, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru was backward looking and Dr Rajendra Prasad, Dr Rammanohar Lohia and Mr.

Vallabhbhai Patel were forward looking. I have no doubt in my mind and I wish you also not to have any doubt in your mind. Because if you do not take care, and if you do not take precaution we will fall a prey to this misconception spread by the electronic media and the apologists for the powers that be.

I would like to tell you that when Chou En Lai, (I think he must have visited India during the 'Hindi-Chini, Bhai-Bhai' movement at least twice) he, of all persons, contacted a person from Nagaland and told him that you are a Mongolian, we have common relations with you. And I may tell you who are present here, do not believe in these myths of Mongolian, Aryan, Asian, etc. We don't want to fall prey to these misconceptions and we will do a yeoman service to Tibet if we do not believe in these misconceptions.

Because may I tell you that in the ancient texts there is a word '*Jambudvipa*' and that includes Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Burma, Malaya, Tibet and of course, Himalayan Bhutan and Sikkim. They have absolutely nothing to do with the tribes of China - the Hans and Manchus - and they have so much cultural relationship with us Indians, and we unwittingly, without going into the facts of history, without knowing how the documentation has taken place and researches been made, claim that these are myths. If we fall a prey to these illusions then we lose sight of the freedom movement of Tibet. We should take care because I want to tell you that so far as cultural relationship between India and Tibet is concerned, we believe that this relationship is based on seven counts: 1. language, 2. script, 3. way of life, 4. religion, 5. history, 6. land contours and 7. people. On these seven counts, we must know and we must conclude that relationship between Tibet and India is age-old and no artificial barriers can deflect us from keeping this relationship with Tibet.

Another thing I want to tell the Chinese is that the name 'Asia' in the Indo-Aryan languages derives its word not from Chinese or any other language but from the Indian word *Ushas*, the land of morning sun or the eastern land. Our ancestors at one point of time were great enough to give areas now populated by the Chinese the name 'Asia.'

In so far as the relationship between China and India is

concerned, these names and nomenclatures have a great place. Because Chinese told us that Mt. Everest is an English word that does not mean that because the nomenclature is in English that it does not belong to Nepal or India. But the local name in Nepal is 'Sagarmatha'. Unfortunately, we use these nomenclatures and fall a prey to these machinations of the Chinese people who say that this word, this nomenclature, is in English.

I must tell you that so far as cultural relationship between India and Tibet is concerned there is a great poet Kalidas who in his *Kumar Sambhava* writes in Sanskrit:

*Asty uttarasyam disi devatatma himalayo nama
nagadhirajah/ purvaparau toyanidhi vagahy
asthitah iva manadandah.*

The poet Kalidas calls Himalayas the king of mountains and soul of direction and describes it as seated between the eastern and western oceans as though measuring the world. I challenge the Chinese people if they can give a *single* quotation from their ancient texts about the Himalayas, and then you will agree with me when I say that we will not claim anything on Tibet if any Chinese scholar can give a quotation half as beautiful from their ancient literature. Because so far as the cultural heritage and cultural precedents are concerned, we have enough proof to show that cultural relationship between India and Tibet is deep rooted and no artificial barrier can separate us from Tibet.

Lastly, I want to tell you that the first Indian, the first crusader for the rights of Tibetans, is, I think, late Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, who, in the key days of 1949, at a press conference in London, said that Chinese people by occupying Tibet have committed 'baby murder' and Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru's Government of India had acquiesced in it. At that particular point of time Mr. Krishna Menon was High Commissioner in London and he must have told Pandit Nehru here and a campaign was started of vilification of Dr. Lohia at that point of time. We all here owe a deep debt of gratitude to the first Indian crusader for the rights of the people of Tibet.

I must conclude my speech by quoting from Dr Rammanohar Lohia's speech and I think that is the apt quotation that I want to give you which will prod you to think about the freedom of Tibet. He says: "I hope that a strong and peaceful people of India will one day be able to persuade a strong and peaceful people of China to recognise the independence of Tibet, ..."

George Fernandes, Member of Parliament and Leader of Samata Party, on Tibet

(Keynote address delivered at the International Convention on Tibet and Peace in South Asia, New Delhi, 12-14 August, 1989)

IT is our honour and privilege to have in our midst on this historic occasion Nijalingappaji, who still looks deceptively younger than his eighty-seven years. He was among the first to respond to my invitation and consented to inaugurate the convention. He flew from Bangalore day before yesterday specially and only for this convention. There was no other work here.

Nijalingappaji has more than sixty-five years of public life behind him and is among the few survivors of that epic struggle, the movement for India's freedom led by Mahatma Gandhi. Lawyer, legislator, parliamentarian, member of the Constituent Assembly that drafted free India's constitution, twice Chief Minister of Karnataka and President of the Indian National Congress. A man who spent years in prison in the course of the struggle for freedom. Who could be better qualified than him to inaugurate this convention?

When I met Giani Zail Singh, to request him to preside over the opening session of this convention, I discovered that his time this morning had been allotted to another function in neighbouring Haryana state. Yet, without a moment's hesitation he said that the cause of the Tibetan people would take precedence over every other engagement. As a freedom fighter, Gianiji drew inspiration from two of the greatest soldiers of that struggle, Sardar Bhagat Singh and Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, and spent a long spell in prison. He has had long experience as a legislator and as a former Chief Minister of Punjab. Gianiji is a man of knowledge and wisdom, and his speech at his convention has given ample evidence of that knowledge and that wisdom.

As the former President of the Indian Republic, his presence, at this convention has given it an authority which few others could have bestowed on it. We are grateful to Gianiji for his concern for and support to the Tibetan people.

The purpose behind the International Convention on Tibet and Peace in south Asia is as much to remind the world of the plight of the Tibetan people who are still waging a heroic, though desperate, struggle to assert their national identity and to secure the freedom of their country, as to assure the Tibetans that there are many people world-wide who support that call and would do all that is in their power to help them achieve their objective of a free and independent Tibet.

That was also the purpose of the earlier Afro-Asian Convention on Tibet and Against Colonialism in Asia and Africa that was organised in Delhi from April 9 to 11, 1960, by a committee which was headed by Jayaprakash Narayan. The resolution adopted at that convention had said, inter alia: "Believing that all efforts to subjugate [the] human spirit and destroy freedom should be resolutely and ceaselessly resisted, and believing in the right of people to govern themselves, this Convention supports and demands the right of the Tibetans for self-determination which the Tibetans could freely exercise only after the withdrawal of the occupation forces and only after excluding the Chinese settled in Tibet after 1950, by the choice of complete independence or any other political form the Tibetan people desire. The Convention urges all freedom-loving nations of the world to help the Tibetan cause by peaceful ways and work resolutely for its realisation."

These words gave effective expression to the sentiments of Jayaprakash Narayan conveyed in his opening address to the convention when he said, "I hope this convention will unequivocally proclaim the right of the Tibetan people to freedom and self-determination and respectfully urge upon all the nations of the world to lend their moral and political support to the cause of Tibetan independence."

The first international hearing on Tibet, organised in Bonn by Ms Petra Kelly and General Bastian, leaders of the Green Party of the Federal Republic of Germany, adopted a declaration which said, inter alia, "We affirm our belief in the freedom of

Tibet and the inalienable right of the Tibetan people to assert this freedom and call upon the People's Republic of China to respect the right of the Tibetan people to determine their own future, free of foreign interference, in accordance with the UN General Assembly Resolution 1723 of 1961 and to allow free access to Tibet to independent international human rights organizations and press."

The participants in the first Himalaya Bachao Conference (Save the Himalayas Conference) held in Delhi in December, 1962 had individually taken a pledge that had been drafted by Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, which said: "No matter what the Indian government does, I shall continuously strive so that India gets back the boundary of 15th August, 1947, and Tibet and the rest of Himalayas their freedom." This pledge was reiterated by the participants in the Himalaya Bachao Conference which was organised again in Delhi on February 20, 1989.

It is my conviction that India failed Tibet at a crucial moment in its history when, in the aftermath of Mao's revolution in China, it became obvious that the Chinese would move in to occupy Tibet. That failure - and I call it a grave mistake - has had disastrous consequences, not only for the people of Tibet, but also for the people of India. It brought the Chinese armies right on the doorsteps of India for the first time ever, and we all know with what results.

What treachery, or pusillanimity, or naivete, or combination of all these preceded the betrayal of Tibet may never be known. In a letter to the prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, on November 7, 1950, after the Chinese army had overrun Tibet, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, then Deputy Prime Minister and Home Minister, observed: "The Chinese Government have tried to delude us by professions of peaceful intentions. My own feeling is that at a crucial period they managed to instil into our Ambassador a false sense of confidence in their so-called desire to settle the Tibetan problem by peaceful means. There can be no doubt that during the period covered by this correspondence the Chinese must have been concentrating for an onslaught on Tibet. The final action of the Chinese, in my judgement, is little short of perfidy. The tragedy of it is that the Tibetans put faith in us; they chose to be guided by us; and we have been unable

to get them out of the meshes of Chinese diplomacy or Chinese malevolence.”

True, in the immediate aftermath of Chinese occupation of Tibet, Prime Minister Nehru had declared in the Indian Parliament on December 7, 1950: “Since Tibet is not the same as China, it should ultimately be the wishes of the people of Tibet that should prevail and not any legal or constitutional arguments.” He had then proceeded to assert, “According to the ... principles I uphold, the last voice in regard to Tibet should be the voice of the people of Tibet and of nobody else.”

There is another very candid statement of Prime Minister Nehru on Tibet made only three days before his death which throws light on what influenced his decisions on Tibet. In a letter to the famous historian, Dr. Gopal Singh, written on May 24, 1964, from Dehra Dun where he was convalescing before the fatal stroke claimed his life on May 27, Nehru says: “It is not clear to me what we can do about Tibet in the present circumstances. To have a resolution in the United Nations about Tibet will not mean much as China is not represented there. We are not indifferent to what has happened in Tibet. But we are unable to do anything effective about it.”

This four-sentence letter sums up everything. India acted with a sense of helplessness in formulating its policy on Tibet. There may have been - and there were - other factors that influenced that policy. Yet it was the belief that we were weak against China that was perceived as strong that clinched it. What Nehru forgot was that by acquiescing to China’s occupation of Tibet, he provided it with a legitimacy which China has used as its card ever since. If in matters of personal relations between people, it is never too late to admit a mistake whenever it might have been committed, there is no reason why in a matter where the freedom of a whole nation is involved India should not have the courage to admit its mistake.

A weak attempt was made by India in 1965 to correct this mistake. Speaking in the United Nations General Assembly on a resolution on Tibet, the official Indian delegate dwelt on the sufferings of the Tibetan people and pointed out: “The naked truth which all of us must face is that the Chinese government is determined to obliterate the people of Tibet.” He then

proceeded to support the urge for freedom of the Tibetans by declaring that “no people can remain for long suppressed,” and said: “I have faith in the world community. I believe it will be able to help restore to the Tibetans all the freedoms which we have enshrined, with such dedication, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” Unfortunately, the faith and the belief were not taken to their logical end.

For patriotic Indians the question of Tibet cannot be one of mere concern for the plight of the Tibetan people and for their struggle for freedom. Tibet’s links with India go back far beyond recorded history. Early Tibetan histories trace the origin of the kings of Tibet through some thirty-six generations to a semi-divine figure, Nyatri Tsen-po, beyond whom extends the shadowy figures of divinities. Later Buddhist chroniclers sought the first royal ancestor in India, either among the legendary Pandavas or in the family of the Buddha. Though both periods are incredibly remote, it is not impossible that some adventurous warrior crossed the Himalayas and won acceptance as leader of a Tibetan clan.

Whether or not Tibetans have [a common] ancestry, religion and culture have bound them with India long before recorded history. The Tibetan script was born from the Indian alphabet and two of the most sacred places of the Hindus - Kailash, the abode of Lord Shiva, and therefore, the after-death paradise, and Mansarovar - are located in Tibet.

While during the last thirteen hundred years Tibetan kings and warriors have waged wars with China and occasionally subjugated her and in celebration of their victory married Chinese princesses, Tibet’s relationship with India has been mostly in the realm of culture and learning, with Tibetan scholars and religious leaders coming to Indian Buddhist universities in pursuit of knowledge.

All the exercises in obfuscation on the part of China can not hide certain historical facts about Tibet’s independent status before the Chinese army marched in 1950. First, the communist revolution in China, with all its triumph and tragedy of more than two decades including the Long March which caught the imagination of the world, did not affect the people of Tibet. Second, it was only in January 1950 that Beijing claimed that

Tibet was part of the People's Republic of China and asked Lhasa to send a delegation to Beijing for negotiation. Third, when the Indian government asked for 'moderation' by China in dealing with Tibet after announcing that India will not intervene militarily in Tibet, Beijing told India that negotiations would be carried to a settlement. Fourth, the Tibetan delegation did not proceed to Beijing in the first place. Instead it came to Delhi in April, where, upon arrival, the leader of the delegation said, "We want to be left alone to pursue our own life." Fifth, during the summer, a Tibetan delegation and the Chinese communists sounded each other out, with India acting as mediator. Sixth, on October 23, it was announced from New Delhi that the Tibetan delegation was leaving India for the conference in Beijing. Seventh, on October 24, Radio Peking announced: "People's Army units have been ordered to advance into Tibet free the three million Tibetans from imperialist aggression and to consolidate the national defenses of the western borders of China."

I have not elaborated any of these points. Each of them could be developed at great length but I am sure you will understand the import of the seven points that I have mentioned. This sequence of events states in loud and clear terms that Tibet was an independent country when the Chinese unleashed the might of the People's Liberation Army against it. In the face of these and other historical facts, for any power in the world to claim that Tibet was a part of China is a negation of known concepts of the nation state and to subscribe to the perverted ideas of imperialist hegemony of a big country over its small and helpless neighbour.

Tibet's independent status in world history has a special relevance for India and her security. Its vast expanse of over 500,000 square miles which is a little less than half of India's 1,261,000 square miles, has been a perfect buffer between the three great Asian powers - China, India and Soviet Russia. Even if the nuclear bomb and intercontinental ballistic missiles have given new meaning to the concept of buffer states, the very presence of Chinese ICBMs with nuclear warheads on the soil of Tibet is enough to prove that for India Tibet still remains crucial to its defence and security.

Of all Indian leaders, it was the Socialist Dr. Rammanohar Lohia who first warned the country of the implications of Chinese occupation of Tibet. In the immediate aftermath of the triumph of the revolution, when the Chinese communists marched their troops into Amdo in north-eastern Tibet bordering on China, and engaged a war-weary world and a newly freed India in a debate on the different meanings of ‘sovereignty’ and ‘suzerainty’, it was Dr. Lohia who, at a press conference in London in 1949, held steadfast to his conviction that Tibet was an independent nation and the Republic of India headed by Jawaharlal Nehru should have no reservations in saying so and acting to uphold Tibet’s independence. Prime Minister Nehru displayed both a lack of nerve and understanding of India’s security interests by surrendering Tibet to China. What followed thereafter, is one sordid chapter after another of China’s arrogance and aggression, India’s cowardice and surrender, and the resultant murder of the Tibetan people by China’s communist rulers in October 1950.

“Baby murder” in the literal sense is what the Chinese have been up to in Tibet. The world has been flooded with eyewitness accounts of forced abortions, sterilisations, and infanticide by the Chinese in Tibet, even while there is a massive transfer of [Han] Chinese into Tibet. All this obviously in pursuit of a policy to wipe out the Tibetan identity. The continuing attacks on the human rights of the Tibetans can have few parallels. If the People’s Liberation Army can be ordered to massacre protesting Chinese students in Tiananmen Square in Beijing with the whole world witnessing the incident, one can well imagine the atrocities the Tibetans have been subjected to in the four decades they have been under Chinese occupation.

There are many who believe that it is now too late in the day to think about the freedom of Tibet. Such people belong to the category of those who have lost faith in themselves and have never understood the indomitable nature of the spirit of the human being. To them history is as static as the Himalayas appear to be, though over the ages, the Himalayas too have kept evolving and changing. To them the Tiananmen Square demonstrations are inconceivable and the ever-growing people’s movements in the many republics of the Soviet Union for the

assertion of their independent identity are just not visible.

This International Convention must awaken the conscience of all those who have come to accept the occupation of Tibet by China as an unalterable fact of history, particularly of governments that believe that between the human rights of the Tibetan people and the possibilities and the opportunities offered by a billion-people market, lucre has to take precedence. The wisdom and farsightedness of His Holiness the Dalai Lama has produced a Five Point Peace Plan to find a solution to the Tibetan problem. These five points have received universal support from parliaments and parliamentarians the world over. Here in India, Members of Parliaments belonging to almost all political parties from the Congress to the Communist Party of India have supported this plan in a joint memorandum they addressed to the Speaker of the Lok Sabha.

Our convention should urge the government of the People's Republic of China to respond positively to the peace plan and to open negotiations with representatives of the Dalai Lama to find an amicable way out of the continuing impasse. The Indian government should have no difficulty in endorsing such an unexceptionable peace plan, particularly when every political party in the country has endorsed it. If Tibet becomes a zone of peace, free from Chinese troops and nuclear weapons, there will be no reason for India to maintain a large army on the Himalayan heights. This would immediately enable both India and China to reduce their military expenditure and use the money thus saved for economic development. The countries of Europe are reducing their troops, and in the process, their military expenditure. Why should not India and China follow a similar course? I do not wish for a moment to overlook the constraints under which governments have often to act. But beyond the governments, and over them, are the peoples of this world. And more often than not, the people's views on many vital matters are contrary to those of their governments.

When the government of the United States was determined to carry on with its war in Vietnam to its murderous end, it was the American people who fought their government and ultimately compelled it to withdraw from Vietnam. The people of Poland who built Solidarity and espoused the cause of democracy were

suppressed by the state, which had a different view on how to run the country. But ultimately the state lost out to the people. The point is that there will always be a people's policy on national and international issues which is totally different from the government's policy and our effort should be to create and assert a people's policy on Tibet in India and elsewhere in the world, not excluding China.

This people's policy must extend unqualified support to the peace plan of His Holiness the Dalai Lama even while espousing the cause of the Tibetan people. In India, such a people's policy must continuously reiterate the nation's resolve to recover the 14,500 square miles of territory near Siachen which is now illegally held by China. It must spearhead a sustained campaign for a South Asian detente, beginning with a freeze on weapons procurement and moving towards a reduction of arms and armed forces. It must call for abjuration of all nuclear weapons by all countries of South Asia, including testing of nuclear devices.

The nations of South Asia, though divided by frontiers created by tragic circumstances of history, are bound together by five thousand years of a common heritage of language, race, religion and culture. Yet the winds of change blowing in Europe and many other parts of the world have not only not touched the nations of South Asia, but there has been a perceptible increase in tensions between them. The defence budgets of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Nepal are much more than what their people can afford, and precious and scarce resources that should have been utilised to provide food, clothing and housing to their people are being squandered in arms races that benefit only the world's arms manufacturing nations. A totally demilitarized Tibet and India and China living in peace and friendship could trigger off changes in South Asia that will end tension in the region and pave the way for a better life for its people.

All this may sound like pious and wishful thinking, when one looks at the tragedy of Tiananmen Square. It is true that when communism is trying to make efforts to acquire a human face and a humane philosophy in Eastern Europe including Russia, it has manifested itself in its barbaric worst in China. The arrogance of China's leadership is essentially because of its conviction

that when it comes to numbers it can beat everyone. Mao said it in so many words when he conjured up visions of China surviving a nuclear holocaust and rebuilding itself when the rest of the world is destroyed. China's leadership also believes that no matter how repressive their governance the rich and powerful industrialised democracies in the world will do business with it for profit, while paying lip sympathy to the victims of suppression from Lhasa to Tiananmen Square.

Of course, China is big, and its population has now touched eleven hundred million. So is India a big country, peopled by over eight hundred and ten million. For every eleven Chinese there are eight Indians, and that is not such a lopsided ratio as some may wish to think. No, I am not advocating a confrontation with China, now or ever. But India has to tell China that to live as two peaceful neighbours they must settle the issues that divide them. On October 24, 1962, a great son of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who was the first President of the Republic, exhorted the Indian people at Patna's famous Gandhi Maidan: "Freedom is the most sacred boon. It has to be protected by all means... Tibet has to be liberated from the iron grip of China and handed over to the Tibetans."

Tibet's independence and neutrality are vital for India's security without in any way hurting China's interests. And only a strong and united India can effectively impress this on the Chinese. A people who are subject to cowardice, with an elite living a life of vulgar ostentation and the vast masses of the poor living in misery and wretchedness, will never be able to stand up to China and must necessarily go for soft options. The Indian people should lose no time to throw up a leadership that will build a strong and well-knit nation through an egalitarian social and economic order. Such an India will be able to join issue with China and not only be able to recover its territory but also hope in correcting the mistakes of another generation of Indians in surrendering Tibet to China.

Statement of the Indian Representative at the UN General Assembly in New York, and the Resolutions adopted by the UNO on the 'Question of Tibet' in 1965

A significant development during the session in 1965 was India's support of the resolution. During the previous sessions in 1959 and 1961, India had abstained from voting. India's new stance on the question can very well have a favourable impact on it for the future as other countries cannot ignore her knowledgeable position in the situation. The full text of the Indian delegate's address to the General Assembly is given below:

Mr. R. Zakaria (India): As representatives are aware, for the past fifteen years the question of Tibet has been from time to time under the consideration of the United Nations. It was first raised here in 1950 at the fifth session of the General Assembly, but it could not be placed on the Agenda. In fact, my country opposed its inclusion at that time because we were assured by China that it was anxious to settle the problem by peaceful means. However, instead of improving, the situation in Tibet began to worsen, and since then the question has come up several times before the General Assembly of the United Nations. Our delegation participated in the discussion at the Fourteenth Session in 1959 and although we abstained from voting we made it clear that because of our close historical, cultural and religious ties with the Tibetans, we could not but be deeply moved and affected by what was happening in that region. We hoped against hope that wiser counsel would prevail among the Chinese and that there would be an end to the sufferings of the people of Tibet.

However, the passage of time has completely belied our hopes. As the days pass, the situation becomes worse and cries

out for the attention of all mankind. as we know, ever since Tibet came under the stranglehold of China, the Tibetans have been subjected to a continuous and increasing ruthlessness which has few parallels in the annals of the world. In the name of introducing “democratic reforms” and of fighting a “counter-revolution”, the Chinese have indulged in the worst kind of genocide and the suppression of a minority race.

To begin with, we in India were hopeful that, as contacts between the Chinese and the Tibetans under the changed set-up became closer and more intimate, a more harmonious relationship would emerge. In fact, in 1956, as a result of his long talks with Mr. Chou En-lai, the Chinese Premier, my late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru felt confident that a mutually agreeable adjustment between the two peoples would be established. Even the Dalai Lama expressed a similar hope to our late Prime Minister, but, as subsequent events have proved, the Chinese never believed in living up to their assurances. They promised autonomy to Tibet and the safe-guarding of its culture and religious heritage and traditions but, as the International Commission of Jurists in its June 1959 report on Tibet has emphasised they attempted on the contrary:

“To destroy the national, ethnical, racial and religious group of Tibetans as such by killing members of the group and by causing serious bodily and mental harm to members of the group.”

The world is aware that it was in protest against the oppression and enslavement of Tibet that the Dalai Lama, who is held in the highest esteem by all Tibetans and, indeed, respected as a spiritual leader by all Indians, fled from Lhasa and took asylum in India. Today there are thousands of Tibetan refugees in my country approximately 50,000 who have left their hearths and homes and fled from their country to join their leader and seek refuge in India. The flight of these refugees still continues, for the Chinese have transformed Tibet into a vast military camp, where the indigenous Tibetans are made to live like hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Although the relationship between Tibet and India is centuries

old and has flourished all through the ages in all its manifestations, whether religious, cultural or economic, we have always taken care not to make that relationship a political problem. In recent years, despite the fact the Dalai Lama and thousands of his Tibetan followers have come to our land, and despite the fact that China has turned Tibet itself into base for aggression against our northern borders, we have not exploited the situation. Undoubtedly, our national sentiments are now and again aroused as a result of the atrocities and cruelties committed by the Chinese against Tibetans, but we have exercised the greatest caution, for we believe that what should concern all of us is the much larger human problem, namely, the plight of these good and innocent people who are being victimized merely because they are different, ethnically and culturally, from the Chinese.

Here I feel that it would not be out of place to put before this august Assembly the following facts which stand out stubbornly and irrefutably in connexion with Chinese policy in Tibet:

1. The autonomy guaranteed in the Sino-Tibetan Agreement of 1951 has from the beginning remained a dead letter.
2. Through increasing application of military force, the Chinese have in fact obliterated the autonomous character of Tibet.
3. There has been arbitrary confiscation of properties belonging to monasteries and individuals and Tibetan Government institutions.
4. Freedom of religion is denied to the Tibetans, and Buddhism is being suppressed together with the system of priests, monasteries, shrines and monuments.
5. The Tibetans are allowed no freedom of information or expression.
6. There has also been carried out a systematic policy of killing, imprisonment and deportation of those Tibetans who have been active in their opposition to Chinese rule.

7. The Chinese have forcibly transferred large numbers of Tibetan children to China in order to denationalize them, to indoctrinate them in Chinese ideology and to make them forget their own Tibetan religion, culture and way of life; and
8. There has also been a large-scale attempt to bring Han Chinese into Tibet, and thereby make Tibet Chinese and overwhelm the indigenous people with a more numerous Chinese population.

These atrocities, carried out ruthlessly, with utter disregard for Tibetan sentiments and aspirations, and in complete violation of universally recognized human rights, and up to a frightful programme of the suppression of a whole people. It surpasses anything that colonialists have done in the past to the peoples whom they ruled as slaves. That is why the United Nations General Assembly took note of the situation in Tibet and passed two resolutions, one in 1959 and the other in 1961, deploring the denial of these human rights to the people of Tibet by the Chinese Government and appealing to it to restore these rights to the Tibetan people. But all such pleas have fallen on deaf ears.

Is this situation not a challenge to human conscience? Can we, dedicated as we are here to the Charter of the United Nations, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, remain mute spectators to the ghastly tragedy that is being enacted by a ruthless and oppressive regime in Tibet? In a recent appeal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the Member States, which is contained in document A/6081, the Dalai Lama, who has been a model of restraint, serenity and, indeed, of humanity, has warned the Organization that the Chinese, if unchecked would 'resort to still more brutal means of exterminating the Tibetan race'. There is no limit to the hardships that the Tibetan people are suffering. Even their supply of food is restricted and controlled by the Chinese who first feed their military forces in Tibet, and then whatever remains is given to the indigenous Tibetans. My delegation naturally feels concerned about the terrible deterioration of the situation in Tibet. On December 17, 1964, for instance, the Dalai Lama was formally deprived of his position as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Autonomous Region of Tibet and denounced

as 'an incorrigible running dog of imperialism and foreign reactionaries', this was immediately followed by the deposition on December 30, 1964, of the Panchen Lama, whom the Chinese tried assiduously to take under their wing, and by his condemnation as leader of the 'clique of reactionary serf owners'.

Thus the Chinese have severed the remaining political links between Tibet and its two politico-religious structures, and have given a final blow to what they fondly used to call, in the past, "The Special Status of Tibet".

Moreover, the campaign to dispossess Tibetan peasants of their land and to distribute their properties is also being accelerated with the definition of what precisely constitutes feudal elements being expanded, from time to time cover a wider and wider range of peasants. In fact, these so-called land reforms are being used by the Chinese Government to advance its own political purpose and to turn the Tibetan peasants into slaves of its system. The naked truth - which all of us must face - is that the Chinese Government is determined to obliterate the Tibetan people, but surely no people can remain for long suppressed. I have faith in the world community. I believe it will be able to help restore to the Tibetans all the freedom which we have enshrined, with such dedication, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

For our part, we assure the United Nations that - as in the past - we shall continue to give all facilities to the Tibetan refugees, and do our best to alleviate their sufferings and hardships. The Dalai Lama has been living in India for some years now, and is carrying on his religious humanitarian activities without any restrictions from us. We shall continue to give the Dalai Lama and his simple and peace loving people these facilities and all our hospitality.

It is for these reasons that we support, fully and wholeheartedly, the cause of the people of Tibet. Our hearts go out to them in their miserable plight and in the terrible suppression that they are suffering at the hands of the Government of the People's Republic of China. Although that regime has given us, and continues to give us, provocations, we have refused to use the Tibetan refugees as pawns in our conflict with China. We

do not believe that the sufferings of one people should be made a weapon in the armoury of another.

In the end, may I express the fervent hope on behalf of the United Nations that there would soon be an end to the reign of misery and oppression in Tibet and that the people of Tibet will be able to share with us all those human rights and that all of us, in different lands, are so fortunate to possess and enjoy.

My delegation will, therefore, vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.473, and I commend the same to this august Assembly.

UN General Assembly Resolution 2079 (XX) New York, 1965

The General Assembly

BEARING in mind the principles relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Reaffirming its resolution 1353 (XIV) of 21 October 1959 and 1723 (XVI) of 20 December 1961 on the question of Tibet,

Gravely concerned at the continued violation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Tibet and the continued suppression of their distinctive cultural and religious life, as evidenced by the exodus of refugees to the neighboring countries,

1. Deplores the continued violation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Tibet;
2. Reaffirms that respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is essential for the evolution of a peaceful world order based on the Rule of Law;

3. Declares its conviction that the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Tibet and the suppression of the distinctive cultural and religious life of its people increase international tension and embitter relations between peoples;
4. Solemnly renews its call for the cessation of all practices which deprive the Tibetan people of the human rights and fundamental freedoms which they have always enjoyed;
5. Appeals to all States to use their best endeavors to achieve the purposes of the present resolution.

Resolutions of Indian Political Parties on Tibet

(i) Resolution of the National Committee of the Socialist Party on Invasion of Tibet, Nagpur, 22 November, 1950

THE National Executive of the Socialist Party defines the invasion of Tibet by China as an act against Asia and the world, the Tibetan people and India. As the independence of Tibet from foreign control has not at all been in doubt and as Tibet belongs neither in name nor in reality to the Atlantic or the Soviet camp, the invasion is all the more reprehensible. To attempt to justify the invasion of 8 lakh square miles of territory on basis of sovereign rights which are in doubtful and untenable as they are imperialist, is an irony of which no modern government should have been thought capable.

The people of Tibet alone may decide in a free vote or plebiscite their form of government or of alliances with the outside world and the Indian Government should press upon the Chinese government to achieve a settlement with Tibet along these terms. The Socialist Party must however warn all Asian people against the danger so demonstrably exhibited by Tibet, where status quo and reactionary element has clashed with an expanding communism intent on slaughters and rule and have been worsened in the battle. Without in any way attempting to interfere with the religious freedom, the Socialist Party urges the people of Tibet to adopt a policy of socialism at home and the Third camp abroad. Such a policy will give contentment and strength to the people of Tibet and will make all encroachments by either the Atlantic or the Soviet camp impossible.

India and Tibet have lived in a relationship compared with which the relationship between Tibet and China is certainly not closer. The future of Tibet therefore concerns the Indian people directly. The Socialist Party urges the people of India to assist

the Tibetan people in maintaining their independence and evolving a policy of socialism and the Third camp.

(ii) Resolution of the All India Tibet Convention,
Calcutta, 30-31 May, 1959

THIS Convention places on record its deep sympathy with the Tibetans in their struggle for freedom and the sufferings and tribulations through which they have passed in recent years due to the aggression of China. The Convention is firmly of the opinion that the Tibetans have the same claim to the right of self-determination as any other nation of the world. Racially, linguistically, and culturally different from the Chinese, they are a nation according to all standards of nationality. Although China claimed and intermittently exercised suzerainty over Tibet since the eighteenth century, that suzerainty was not based on the willing consent of the Tibetans, and they had virtually shaken it off in the second decade of this century. The Sino-Tibetan Agreement of 1951 which re-imposed Chinese rule over Tibet was the result of force and violence and lacked that basis of morality and law which springs from popular consent. Even the limited rights of autonomy, which were conceded to the Tibetans under that Agreement, were systematically and deliberately violated by the Chinese in subsequent years, and the present national uprising in Tibet is the cumulative result of such violation.

This Convention emphasizes the fact that India had long and intimate cultural relations with both China and Tibet and has always maintained friendly relations with both. It stresses the necessity and desirability of maintaining such relationship, and therefore, notes with regret the present strained relation between the two. After a careful consideration of all the relevant issues this Convention feels bound to place on record its protest against China for the denial of the fundamental human rights to the Tibetans, the violation of Agreement with Tibet, dated May 23, 1951, the ruthless suppression of the national uprising in that country, causing untold miseries and hardships to the people, and the destruction of Tibetan monasteries, involving loss of priceless treasures of art and manuscripts. This Convention

repudiates the claim of China that she has a right to impose, by force, the so-called social, economic and scientific progress upon another nation, against its will, simply because she considers it backward and superstitious.

This Convention regrets that the Government of China thought fit to carry on a campaign of slander against India, a friendly nation, by spreading mischievous and baseless allegations such as that the statement made by the Dalai Lama at Tezpur was influenced by the officers of the Government of India, or that the political commotion of Tibet was caused by the machination and wirepulling of Indian 'imperialists' and 'expansionist'. This Convention also deplors the threat held out by some Chinese leaders to India that unless she stops expressing sympathy with the Tibetans she will be crushed to pieces under the iron fist of 650 million Chinese people.

This Convention endorses the view of Prime Minister Pandit Nehru that the changed political condition in Tibet constitutes a major problem affecting the security of India. The Convention feels that the seriousness of this problem is aggravated by the existence, in this country, of political party or parties who have given clear evidence of their anti-national outlook and extra-territorial allegiance by their attitude towards the present Sino-Tibetan question. It cannot but be a matter of deep concern to India if any political party demonstrates, by either words or deeds, that it places the interest of a foreign country above the national interest of India, as conceived by the overwhelming majority of her people.

This Convention whole-heartedly approves of the action of the Government of India in giving political asylum to the Dalai Lama and the thousands of Tibetans who have sought shelter in this country, and endorses the views and sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha on April 2, 3 & 27 regarding the nature and origin of the national upsurge in Tibet.

This Convention hopes that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru will exert his great influence in the world on behalf of the oppressed people of Tibet and in co-operation with Afro-Asian countries, devise ways and means to secure the right of self-determination to them, thereby allaying the fears and suspicions aroused in the minds of the weaker and peace-loving nations of Asia by

the Chinese aggression in Tibet.

This Convention authorises its President, Sri Jayaprakash Narayan, to set up an Afro-Asian Committee on Tibet with a view, among other things; (1) to mobilise world opinion particularly in Asian and African countries; (2) to arrange for appointment of an International Commission of neutral countries with a view to report on the alleged violation of the human rights including the destruction of monasteries in Tibet.

(iii) Resolution of Bharatiya Jana Sangh on Tibet's Independence, 8 July, 1959

SINCE March last, the outrageous atrocities of the Chinese occupation authorities in Tibet have shocked public opinion in India and elsewhere in the world, and in India all the more because of her very close and long-standing relations with Tibet. They have, however, had their origin some 9 years ago, when in 1950-51, Communist China overtook Tibet by sheer force of arms and imposed an agreement upon the Tibetan Government of His Holiness the Dalai Lama under duress, effecting the subjugation of Tibet and conceding her only a semblance of autonomy. At the time, India did protest against the forcible occupation of Tibet, but very feebly; and that feeble protest was contemptuously brushed aside by the Communist rulers of China. What followed, however, was still more unfortunate. In 1954, India entered into an agreement with China popularly known as 'Panchsheel Agreement', by which India formally recognised Chinese occupation of Tibet, and handed over - not to the Tibetan Government but to the Chinese occupation authorities - Indian outposts and installations in Tibet, and all India's rights there which had been in force for half a century, mainly for security reasons in defence of India's rightful interests. Further, in 1956, when the Chinese authorities in Tibet made their occupation still more rigorous, His Holiness the Dalai Lama felt so uncomfortable that he came over to India. But about the same time Communist China's Prime Minister also came down to India, and assured the Prime Minister of India that Tibet's autonomy would be respected and that there would be no

interference with economic, social and religious life and institutions. On this assurance being conveyed to His Holiness the Dalai Lama by the Prime Minister of India and at his request, the Dalai Lama returned to Tibet.

Chinese Atrocities

All these assurances have been thrown to the winds and the Communist regimentation is now being introduced. Tibet's social economy is being upset, her religious institutions and monasteries are being defiled and desecrated, and millions of Chinese Hans are being settled in Tibet to out-number and swamp the Tibetans on their own soil. The position has become so unbearable that even the peaceful, harmless, and religious minded people of Tibet have arisen in widespread rebellion against the Chinese who are seeking to put down the national uprising by merciless slaughter. His Holiness the Dalai Lama has been forced to seek asylum in India, along with thousands of Tibetans fleeing from the Chinese terror. In deference to India's public opinion, the Government of India has very properly offered asylum to them all.

Security of India Imperilled

It appears, therefore, that for the tragedy that has now overtaken Tibet, India cannot escape her share of responsibility. In fact, it has been the weak-kneed and short-sighted policy followed by the Nehru Government that has encouraged Communist China in her aggressive policy in Tibet, and which has brought a big military and aggressive power, right on the borders of India herself, imperilling her own security.

Bharatiya Jana Sangh feels that it is morally incumbent on India to redeem her past remissness with regard to Tibet, and so India should take immediate and effective steps to see that China's aggressions in Tibet may cease, her armies of occupation are withdrawn from Tibet, and that Tibet's independence is secured.

Jana Sangh accordingly proposes that:

(1) India herself should move the United Nations to take up Tibet's case. In fact, the Tibet issue had been raised in the UN when China overran her about 9 years ago, but it was at India's request and insistence that the matter was shelved and practically dropped. Now that China has gone back upon her pledge of respecting Tibet's autonomy, and her words have proved undependable. India owes it to herself to raise the Tibetan issue at the UN.

(2) India should approach the Free Nations of Asia (outside Communist orbit) on the issue of China's aggression in Tibet - so that they might make common cause in support of Tibet's independence. Already, China's aggression in Tibet has caused apprehension in Eastern Asia; and people there are beginning to feel that the occupation of Tibet is only the first step of China's ambition towards imperialistic expansion. The banding together of the Free Nations of Asia in an attitude of protest may produce some sober effect even on the ruthless and ambitious rulers of Communist China who may yet pause in their predatory activities. Even at this late stage, China may care something for Asian opinion.

(3) In the meantime, full facilities should be given to His Holiness the Dalai Lama to function in India on the political plane as the Government of Tibet. If Tibetan independence is to be striven for and secured, it will not do simply to grant him asylum and to keep him in a sort of enforced retirement free to function only in his spiritual capacity, but he should be allowed in India to work for cause of Tibet's independence.

Further - apart from all other considerations - from the point of view of India's own safety and security alone, it is essential that China must clear out of Tibet, and that Tibet should become an Independent State. India should, therefore, direct all her efforts towards securing Tibet's independence.

(iv) Indian Parliament Members' Support for His Holiness the Dalai Lama's Five-Point Peace Plan for Tibet, New Delhi, 23 August, 1988

A memorandum in support of His Holiness the Dalai Lama's Five-Point Peace Plan for Tibet, signed by 212 Members of Parliament, representing various political parties in India, was presented to the Speaker of Lok Sabha, Mr. Balram Jakhar, today by Prof. Madhu Dandavate.

The memorandum states: "We the undersigned Members of Parliament fully support His Holiness the Dalai Lama's Five-Point Peace Plan which, we consider, is a historic step towards resolving the important question of Tibet, alleviating suffering of the Tibetan people and relieving regional tensions."

The Dalai Lama made public his Five-Point Peace Plan for Tibet last September. They included:

1. Transformation of the whole of Tibet into a zone of peace;
2. Abandonment of China's population transfer policy which threatens the very existence of the Tibetans as a people;
3. Respect for the Tibetan people's fundamental human rights and democratic freedom;
4. Restoration and protection of Tibet's natural environment and the abandonment of China's use of Tibet for the production of nuclear weapons and dumping of nuclear waste;
5. Commencement of earnest negotiations on the future status of Tibet and of relations between the Tibetan and Chinese people.

The Members of Parliament in their common memorandum further noted that "His Holiness the Dalai Lama's offer of finding a negotiated settlement with regard to the future status of Tibet is a gesture of statesmanship and we hope the new leaders in China will reciprocate to it positively, keeping in view the larger interests of both the Chinese and Tibetan peoples."

(v) Parliament Members write to Chinese Prime Minister Li Peng, New Delhi, 27 April, 1989

SHRI Ranjit Singh P. Gaekwad, a Congress (I) Member of Parliament in Lok Sabha from Gujarat along with 54 other Members of Parliament of India have written a joint letter yesterday, dated 27 April, 1989, to the Prime Minister of People's Republic of China, Mr. Li Peng.

The signatories - 55 Members of Parliament - are: 36 from Congress (I), and the leaders of various opposition parties in India including Professor Madhu Dandavate, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee, Shri Indrajit Gupta, Lt. Gen. Jagjit Singh Aurora, Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy, Shri Dinesh Goswamy, Shri Ibrahim Suleiman Sait.

Signatories of the opposition parties are: Janata Dal (JD), Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), Communist Party of India (CPI), Revolutionary Socialist Party (RSP), Akali Dal, Assam Gana Parishad (AGP), Muslim League (ML), All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (AIADMK) and National Conference (NC).

Shri Mukund Bhai Parekh - a prominent social, trade union and Sarvodaya worker and a journalist - was authorised to hand over in person the above letter of MPs, dated 27 April, 1989, to the Ambassador of People's Republic of China in India at the Chinese Embassy, New Delhi, on behalf of Members of Parliament.

The joint letter was received from Shri Mukund Bhai Parekh by Madam Chi, the Chinese Protocol, along with another Chinese official on behalf of the Chinese Ambassador in India, Mr. Tu-Gouwai. The text of this joint letter reads:

"It is very sad to learn that many Tibetans have lost their lives and the situation in Tibet is worsening day-by-day under the imposition of martial law in Tibet.

Tibet being a neighbour and having close cultural and religious links with India, the Indian people have deep sympathy with Tibetans and are very much concerned with the happenings in Tibet since last 2 years.

Your Government's action to shoot peaceful demonstrators

without warning, senseless killings and imposition of martial law in Tibet is very much regretted.

On behalf of the Indian people, we, the following Members of Parliament, urge your Government to restrain from taking such repressive measures in dealing with the Tibetans who are expressing their resentment. Every problem of the world today is being resolved through dialogue, understanding and cooperation. It is very unfortunate that the Government of People's Republic of China has chosen to use might to solve the problems in Tibet. As the use of violence and force would further aggravate the problem, we urge your Government to apply reasons and wisdom and deal leniently with the Tibetans.

The Dalai Lama of Tibet has proposed a 'Five-Point Peace Plan for future of Tibet'. So, we sincerely urge upon yourself to start negotiations with the representatives of Dalai Lama for the peaceful solution of the Tibetan people."

Besides this joint letter, the leaders of Telugu Desam Party Shri Upendra (M.P., Rajya Sabha) and Shri C. Madhava Reddy (M.P., Lok Sabha) as well as the General Secretary of All India Forward Block (FB) Shri Chitta Basu (M.P., Lok Sabha) have assured that "they are completely supporting the cause of the Tibetan people" and will write separate letters to the Prime Minister of India, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, in this connection very soon.

CPI Leader in Lok Sabha, Shri Indrajit Gupta, has written that "we urge upon the Chinese authorities to start negotiations with the representatives of the Dalai Lama for a peaceful solution of the Tibetan people's problems, which cannot be solved through violent and forcible means."

“The invasion of Tibet which terminated in His Holiness taking refuge in Indian territory is brutal colonialism.”

— C. Rajagopalachari

“Freedom is the most sacred boon. It has to be protected by all means — violent or non-violent. Therefore Tibet has to be liberated from the iron grip of China and handed over to the Tibetans.”

— Dr. Rajendra Prasad

“... surely, according to principles I uphold, the last voice in regard to Tibet should be the voice of the people of Tibet and of nobody else.”

— Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru

“The tragedy of Tibet is that the Tibetans put faith in us: they choose to be guided by us and we have been unable to get them out of the meshes of Chinese diplomacy or Chinese malevolence.”

— Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel

“Tibet’s ties are stronger with India than with China, ties of language and trade and culture, not to speak of the strategic affinities between India and Tibet.”

— Dr. Rammanohar Lohia

“Instead of according recognition to China in 1949, had India accorded this recognition to Tibet, there would have been no Sino-Indian border conflict.”

— Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar

“Is Tibet lost for ever? No. A thousand times No. Tibet will not die because there is no death for the human spirit.”

— Jayaprakash Narayan

“... from the point of view of national interests, the fact that Tibet is being annihilated cannot be for the good of India in the long run”.

— Atal Behari Vajpayee