

## Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru

*Series II, Volume 51*

*1-31 August 1959*

### **(b) China and Tibet**

#### **173. In the Lok Sabha: Indian Trade Agency Buildings in Gyantse<sup>1</sup>**

Shri Dinesh Singh:<sup>2</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) Whether the Trade Agency buildings in Igantse (Tibet) washed away by floods, have been rebuilt; and

(b) If not, the reasons for the delay?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

(a) Not yet, Sir.

(b) A variety of difficulties have been experienced locally which have prevented the commencement of the construction of the Agency buildings. The present Trade Agency building was washed away in floods in 1954. Our engineers were of the view that for the future safety of the Trade Agency buildings it would be necessary to construct protective works along the embankment of the adjoining river. Plans of protective works were drawn up and submitted to the Chinese for concurrence. After protracted negotiations on 2nd June, 1959, the Chinese authorities informed our Trade Agent<sup>3</sup> that we could start construction of the buildings and also of protective works provided these were within our boundary and not likely to damage their highway or bridge further down-stream.

---

<sup>1</sup> 6 August 1959. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXII, col. 924

<sup>2</sup> Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Banda, Uttar Pradesh

<sup>3</sup> R.S. Kapoor.

Accordingly preliminary construction of protective works and the Agency site was recently started but the Chinese authorities have since ordered to stop the construction.

We have assured the Chinese authorities that our plans would not cause any damage and we have suggested, if necessary, senior engineers from both sides should meet on the spot and approve agreed plans to prevent further scouring of our property. We are awaiting Chinese concurrence to this suggestion.

\* \* \*

#### **174. In the Lok Sabha: Indian Traders in Tibet<sup>4</sup>**

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Braj Raj Singh about "flagrantly discriminatory practices adopted by the Chinese authorities at Lhasa against Indian traders in Tibet such as freezing of stocks of merchandise belonging to Indian traders, purchasing of stocks of Indian traders at arbitrary prices by Chinese authorities, creating payments difficulties and placing of obstacles in the transport of goods... This constitutes a clear violation of the letter and spirit of the Sino-Indian trade agreement on Tibet... and blow to Panchsheel."

How long has this been going on?

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): This has been going on since this trouble arose in Tibet.

Mr. Speaker: How is it a matter of urgent public importance when it has been going on for some months?

---

<sup>4</sup> 6 August 1959. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXII, cols 930-934

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It has been a very serious thing. It has been said by the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh that our trade is shrinking a good deal. In addition to that this affects our Panchsheel principle also because our relations with a friendly country China, might be embittered on account of this. Then the economic condition of these people, that is, the Bhutias, shall become very bad due to the shrinkage of this trade. In addition this shrinking trade will affect the border supplies in India also. So this should be considered and a full statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on this.

Shri S.M. Banerjee (Kanpur): May I submit for your information that the Chief Minister of U.P. has said in the State Assembly that it has not affected the trade of U.P. It is in the papers.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I shall read from the statement of the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh where he says that it has to a very great extent affected the trade there.

"Dr. Sampumanand, who was replying to questions from Shri Pratap Singh (PSP), said that economic conditions of Bhutias had undoubtedly been adversely affected by the decline in the trade with Tibet. The Chinese policy seemed to be to discourage trade with India across this sector."<sup>5</sup>

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary to read further. He has read enough.

---

<sup>5</sup> According to the National Herald of 6 August, Pratap Singh "wanted to know the steps the Government were taking to help the Bhotiya traders of the state whose economic security had been jeopardised following the disruption of their age-old trade with Tibet;" Sampurnanand replied "that there was nothing new or urgent about the problems of Bhotiya traders. Since the Chinese occupied Tibet, he said, the Indian traders encountered many difficulties. Perhaps the Chinese wanted to put restrictions on Indian traders. But, the Chinese did not altogether stop the trade with India..."

Shri Braj Raj Singh: "The Chief Minister said that Bhutia trade from Almora to Tibet had not completely ceased although the volume was decreasing steadily. He did not offer any comparative data to illustrate his assessment."

And so on it goes.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I do not think that this is a matter for an adjournment motion. But I can very well understand hon. Members being interested in these reports and in these developments. It is true that Indian trade within Tibet has suffered very considerably in the last few months, more especially since these disturbances in Tibet. I will give some figures. In February last our trade with Central Tibet was Rs. 15 lakhs imports and Rs. 10 lakhs exports. By June the corresponding values declined to Rs. 2 lakhs imports and Rs. 3 lakhs exports. So there is a big fall.

We have received many reports about the difficulties in the way of Indian traders. They cannot travel about. They cannot get transport. They cannot send their goods. All these difficulties have arisen. About another thing I do not know how far it is true, that is, as stated in this adjournment motion about the goods of Indian traders having been frozen, but the fact is that they cannot easily be moved for lack of transport.

Also, there has been a recent order - so we are told - declaring Indian currency as well as Tibetan currency in Tibet as illegal. But although the order has been passed it is not quite clear to us whether it has been enforced or not fully. Anyhow, such an order would not be in keeping with the agreement - at any rate with the spirit of the 1954 agreement.

There is no doubt that there are these difficulties. In fact, we had many other difficulties too in regard to other matters in Tibet, for example, regarding the functioning of our trade agencies. We have been

communicating with the Chinese Government on this subject quite fully and repeatedly.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: What has been the result of those communications? What is the reaction of the Chinese Government?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have received in regard to some minor matters some replies etc. Of course, there have been local references by our Consul General in Lhasa. The results of those local references have not been satisfactory and some little time ago we sent a full memorandum to the Chinese Government in Peking about it.<sup>6</sup> To that we have had no formal reply except that they are considering it.

Shri Vajpayee<sup>7</sup> (Balrampur): May I know if our trade agents are free to move in those areas or whether certain restrictions have been placed on their movement?

Mr. Speaker: In Tibet?

Shri Vajpayee: Yes, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I think that normally there is some restriction about the distance, that is, about two or three miles or beyond some restrictions without a permit they cannot go. Also, there is a difficulty sometimes of transport not being available.

---

<sup>6</sup> See note, the Ambassador of India to China [G. Parthasarathi] to the Chinese Foreign Office, 25 July 1959; Government of India, Ministry of External Affairs, Notes, Memoranda and Letters Exchanged and Agreements Signed between the Governments of India and China, 1954-1959, White Paper (n.p., n.d.) [New Delhi, 1959], pp. 92-95

<sup>7</sup> Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Jan Sangh, Lok Sabha MP from Balrampur, UP

Shri Goray<sup>8</sup> (Poona): May I know whether there is any discrimination between the Nepalese traders and the Indian traders as is reported in the Press?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would not be able to say that because there are relatively few Nepalese traders. Maybe, occasionally they might have been shown somewhat different treatment, but I do not think there is any marked difference.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): Is it true that our Trade Agent had to change his route on account of a direction from the Chinese Government? Originally he was to go by a different route but he had to take a longer route which meant more delay.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is so. Our Trade Agent in West Tibet in Gartok<sup>9</sup> had actually gone almost to the pass through which he could enter Tibet when he was told to go across another pass which meant several weeks journey backwards and forwards.<sup>10</sup>

Shri Braj Raj Singh: What effective steps does the hon. Prime Minister want to take?

Mr. Speaker: We are having a regular discussion on this matter. I only wanted to make up my mind as to whether this matter was of such importance, whether it arose only recently, whether it has not been going on for some time and whether it is a proper method for ventilating this grievance or having discussion. I am not satisfied that adjournment motion

---

<sup>8</sup> Narayan Ganesh Goray, PSP, Lok Sabha MP from Poona, Bombay

<sup>9</sup> Laxman Singh Jangpangi

<sup>10</sup> See the informal note, the GOI to the Chinese Counsellor in New Delhi, 8 July 1959; White Paper, pp. 86-88

is the proper method of having a discussion on this subject. Restrictions have been placed from time to time. The Government is also taking steps and is doing all that is possible to do. Under these circumstances I do not feel I am competent or it will be proper that I should give consent to this motion.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Are we having a debate on foreign affairs this session?  
We are not.

Mr. Speaker: That is another matter. Let us see.

\* \* \*

### **175. In the Rajya Sabha: Dalai Lama's Press Conference<sup>11</sup>**

Dr. Z.A Ahmad:<sup>12</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the press conference held by the Dalai Lama on June 20, 1959;
- (b) whether Government were informed, prior to the conference of the nature of the statements the Dalai Lama was going to make at the press conference; and
- (c) whether Government have expressed their reaction to the propriety or otherwise of making such statements?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) Yes.
- (b) No.

---

<sup>11</sup> 10 August 1959. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXVI, Nos 1-13, cols 35-37.

<sup>12</sup> CPI, Rajya Sabha MP from UP

(c) In a statement made on behalf of the Government of India, it was stated that the Government would not recognise any Tibetan Government on Indian soil.

Dr. Z.A Ahmad: I want to know whether statements of the type that were made by the Dalai Lama would be repeated. I ask this question in view of the fact that the Prime Minister earlier made a statement and expressed the hope that he would not like the Dalai Lama to say or do anything in India which would embarrass the Government. Now, these statements are of that nature and if the Dalai Lama is not frankly told that such statements should not be made, I am sure such statements would be repeated causing embarrassment to the Government.

Shri V.K. Dhage: What was the question?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, I did not understand the question.

Mr. Chairman: The question is whether the Dalai Lama has been told that he should not repeat such statements since they cause embarrassment to the Government.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is a difficult matter, Sir, to draw a hard and fast line. On the one hand, what the hon. Member has said is correct; on the other hand, it did not seem proper to us to put any undue restrictions on the Dalai Lama. He is a man of note and position, ability and intelligence, and he is anxious not to embarrass us. At the same time, no doubt he suffers from inner compulsions to say what he feels. And it becomes a little difficult for any hard and fast line to be drawn.



Dr. Z.A. Ahmad: Sir, there are ways and ways of doing things. I think if the matter is considered important there are ways and ways which the Government can adopt to ensure that such things do not happen in future.

Dr. AN. Bose: May I ask how the statement of the Dalai Lama has caused any embarrassment to our Government? All that we know is, he said that wherever the Dalai Lama is, the people of Tibet regard him as their Government. He did not even claim it to be a Government on his own; far less, did he want the Indian Government to recognise it as Tibetan Government. So my question is, why should the Indian Government take it as an embarrassment to them?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Because it might be misunderstood. The hon. Member is right; he did not make a claim that he was functioning as a Government. That is perfectly true; nevertheless what he said might have led some people to imagine things.

Shri Son using Dhansing Patil:<sup>13</sup> Did the statement made by the Dalai Lama cause embarrassment to the Government or to the questioner and his party?

(No reply)

\* \* \*

## **176. In the Lok Sabha: Tibetan Refugees<sup>14</sup>**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) how many Tibetans have crossed into India so far ;

---

<sup>13</sup> Congress, Rajya Sabha MP from Bombay

<sup>14</sup> 11 August 1959. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. xxxn, cols 1620-1627

- (b) what facilities have been provided by the Government of India to rehabilitate them;
- (c) the expenditure incurred monthly on the rehabilitation of these refugees;
- (d) the names of the countries from which contributions have been received for their relief and rehabilitation stating the amount in respect of each;
- (e) the names of the agencies entrusted with the relief work; and
- (f) whether Government have received any communication from the Tibetan Government expressing their willingness to take them back?<sup>15</sup>

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): (a) to (f). A statement giving the information required is placed on the Table of the House.

#### STATEMENT

The total number of Tibetan refugees who have come to India is 12,396. Arrangements have been made for the employment of unskilled refugees on road-works in Sikkim and NEFA. Those who are old and infirm have been sent to Dalhousie and will be maintained at the expense of the Government. A number of refugees with relations in India have been permitted to join their families in the Darjeeling district.

Student Lamas are being accommodated at Buxa, where they will pursue their religious studies. Children below the age of 16 years will be sent to schools.

Refugees who are not being maintained by Government and who are being dispersed for road works are being given resettlement grant of Rs. 50 in

---

<sup>15</sup> The question was asked by Ajit Singh Sarhadi, Congress MP from Ludhiana, Punjab, and 39 other MPs

addition to the cost of transportation and shelter at the work-sites. Arrangements have also been made to give instruction in Hindi in Camps and on the work-sites so that refugees can adjust themselves to the conditions in India. It is also intended to select some refugees for training in crafts and vocations after careful appraisal has been made of their aptitudes.

Since dispersal from Camps has begun recently, it is not possible to indicate monthly expenditure on the rehabilitation of refugees.

All voluntary relief activities are being coordinated by the Central Relief Committee for Tibetan refugees presided over by Acharya J.B. Kripalani. The Indian Red Cross Society has associated itself with the Central Committee.

All contributions coming from India or foreign voluntary agencies are received by the Central Committee. It is understood that contributions have been received from the American Tibetan Relief Committee, the Catholic Relief Committee, the Indian National Christian Council and the Co-operative for American Relief Everywhere. As most of the contributions are in kind, it has not been possible to estimate their value.

The Government have received no communication regarding the return of these refugees to Tibet.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi: May I know if there is any long range policy about the resettlement of the refugees and if there has been any talk with the Dalai Lama on the subject?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): In the statement the hon. Member will see the steps that have been taken. Gradually, one evolves a policy and one cannot lay down a firm and fixed long range policy; much depends upon the circumstances. It would appear that a considerable number of them will remain in India and we have to

fashion our policy accordingly. Almost everything that is being done about them, the steps to be taken in regard to the refugees, etc. had been done after consultation with the Dalai Lama.

Shri Tangamani: May I know how much money has so far been spent by the Government of India on these 12,396 refugees who have crossed over to India?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot give any kind of an accurate figure. I believe that the Finance Minister agreed primarily to allot about Rs. 10 lakhs for this purpose but the actual expenditure is being met partly by the External Affairs Ministry and partly by the State Ministries concerned. We do not know how much the State Ministries have spent and we will get their accounts later.

Shri Supakar:<sup>16</sup> May I know if the present scheme is to permanently rehabilitate the refugees? How many persons will be permanently resettled here?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have said that the likelihood of these refugees going back to Tibet in the foreseeable future is very small. We cannot speak of individuals but only of groups. Therefore, we must expect a great majority of them to remain here. Now, there are various types. Some are young men and boys for whom we arrange normal education. Some are young Lamas for whom also we arrange for that type of education. Then there are old Lamas and a number of them have been provided for in

---

<sup>16</sup> Shradddakar Supakar, Ganatantra Parishad MP from Sambalpur, Orissa.

various places In their own profession of lamahood - if I may say so - in Sikkim, a few in Darjeeling.

Some have gone to their friends or relatives round about Darjeeling or Kalimpong.

The main body of them, young persons, have, for the present, been given work to do: road-making and that type of thing. Some again are being taught handicrafts.

Shri Nath Pai: We should like to have an idea as to the daily cost of maintenance of these 12,000 refugees and secondly whether the Government is contemplating making any approach to the United Nations refugees section because there is a section which contributes for this purpose and also whether the Dalai Lama is contributing to the maintenance of them and what part of the expenditure is coming by way of public contributions?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have not thought of appealing to the U.N. in regard to this matter.<sup>17</sup> Some moneys have been received from foreign sources, not by the Government, but by the Central Relief Committee here, of which Acharya Kripalani is the Chairman. There is collaboration between the Government and Acharya Kripalani's committee in this matter. I cannot say what funds are at their disposal and how much they have got from foreign sources, etc. But much of it is in the shape of goods and medicines, this and that - a good deal of it, in medicines. I do not know about the cash; perhaps not too much. I am sorry I cannot give any figure as to how much is spent.

---

<sup>17</sup> See Nehru to Dag Hammarskjold, 23 July 1959, SWJN/SS/50/item 160

Shri Nath Pai: Is the Dalai Lama contributing anything to their maintenance?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as I know he has not contributed anything to these people's maintenance but to some extent he has met his own expenditure: not, I mean, the housing and the rest, but the odd expenditure, I believe.

[Translation begins:

Shri Bhakt Darshan: I wish to know whether the influx of refugees from Tibet has stopped or this process is still continuing?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It had almost stopped, but some days ago, about a week back we heard that a hundred refugees came to Bhutan. The Government of Bhutan requested us to kindly take them in; so, we said alright, we will take them, because they were not willing to shoulder this burden.

Shri Bibhuti Mishra:<sup>18</sup> I wish to know whether the Central Relief Committee extends some help with regard to the refugees who have come from Tibet to Nepal.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, to my knowledge, no question has arisen regarding aid to them; neither anyone has asked for it, nor, as far as I know, the Government there has done anything. Whatever few people have come, they have spread out among their relatives and friends. No arrangement has been made from here.

Translation ends]

---

<sup>18</sup> Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Bagaha-SC, Bihar

Shri Narayanankutty Menon:<sup>19</sup> May I know whether the Government have taken any decision to extend the same type of relief to a large number of Indian nationals repatriated from Malaya and Ceylon, who are still unemployed and are wandering as refugees in the South Indian States?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir, the conditions are entirely different.

Shri Assar: Have our Government enquired from Dalai Lama or his officials about the bona fides of the Tibetan refugees to ensure that there are no Chinese spies?

Mr. Speaker: That is what he has already answered.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How can the Dalai Lama tell us about 12,000 people who have come from various parts? But, apart from that, naturally, we are interested in finding out who and what these 12,000 odd persons are. We try to make such enquiries from such sources as are available to us to get that information.

Shri P.C. Borooah:<sup>20</sup> From the statement it is found that most of the contributions were in kind. May I know whether any exemption from custom duty in respect of gifts received from abroad or exemption from excise duty in respect of goods received from within India was given; if so the total amount for which exemptions were allowed?

---

<sup>19</sup> T.C. Narayanankutty Menon, CPI, Lok Sabha MP from Mukundapuram, Kerala

<sup>20</sup> Prafulla Chandra Borooah, Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Sibsagar, Assam

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Exemptions from customs and also free passage for these goods are allowed, but there is no possibility of knowing how much by way of money it amounts to.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: In the statement it is said that those who are old and infirm have been sent to Dalhousie and will be maintained at the expense of the Government. May I know what is the number of such old and infirm refugees who have been sent over to Dalhousie, and what is the monthly expenditure incurred by the Government to maintain them?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The figure I have got thus far is that 320 persons have been sent to Dalhousie. It is not a question of old and infirm so much as the old senior Lamas who cannot be put to work; that is to say, it is practically a Lama Centre, where they can carry on their Buddhist vocations and studies in life, which has been, in a sense, created in Dalhousie, and these people have been sent there.

Shrimati Mafida Ahmed: Is it not a fact that permits were issued to the Tibetan refugees to stay at Mismari Camp only for three months; if so, may I know whether it has been extended and if so, what is the extension period?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The Mismari Camp is only a transit camp. As soon as they are found fit to be sent to any of these recognised places, work sites or other places where they can settle down, then they will be sent away and the camp will be wound up.

Shri N.R. Munisamy: As a result of our having afforded asylum to Dalai Lama and Tibetan refugees there is a good deal of anti-Indian feelings against the Indians residing in Tibet at the instance of the Chinese. May I



know whether any steps have been taken by Government to clear this misunderstanding?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have mentioned, Sir, the other day that the Indian nationals there are mostly traders, apart from our own Mission folk and some few others. A number of difficulties have been placed in the way of Indian trade which is gradually vanishing, and we have drawn the attention of the Chinese Government to this matter.

\* \* \*

### **177. In the Rajya Sabha: Indian Traders in Tibet<sup>21</sup>**

Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the answer given to Unstarred Question No. 21 in the Rajya Sabha on the 23rd April, 1959<sup>22</sup> and state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Tibetan Government have imposed restrictions on the movement etc. of the Indian traders in Yatung, Phari and Gyantse and that they are being compelled to come back to India; and
- (b) the number of Indian traders in Yatung, Phari and Gyantse and their number in the whole of Tibet?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

(a) Since the recent disturbances in Tibet, movement from one trade centre to another is being controlled through the Chinese Military control authorities and the Preparatory Committee. Although no open orders

---

<sup>21</sup> 13 August 1959. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXVI, Nos. 1-13, cols 451-457

<sup>22</sup> See SWJN/SS/48/pp.475-477

regarding restrictions on movements of Indian traders of Yatung, Phari and Gyantse have come to our notice, it is a fact that travel permits are not being given freely.

Indian traders are encountering various difficulties but it cannot be stated that they are being compelled to return to India.

(b) The total number of Indian traders keeps fluctuating at different times. At present there are 97 traders in Yatung, Phari and Gyantse. The total number of traders in the whole of Tibet at present is near about 2,117.

[Translation begins:

Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan: Is it true that many traders who have been living there for generations wish to come to India. but they are not considered Indians and permission is not granted to them?

Translation ends]

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It is true and a statement on the subject was made yesterday or the day before in the other House and it has appeared in all the papers about the difficulties experienced by people of Indian origin, by Kashmiri Muslims and Ladakhis, who are in Tibet.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Lakshmi Menon informed the Lok Sabha on 11 August that a large number of persons of Indian origin who wanted to register themselves as Indian nationals faced many difficulties; that the Chinese Government's note of 17 July claimed that those who had been living in Tibet for long were in effect Chinese nationals; and that India had urged China to permit persons of Indian origin to seek the protection of the Indian Consul-General in Lhasa or to return to India. She said there were 97 registered Indian traders in Yatung, Phari and Gyantse and nearly 2,000 seasonal traders currently visiting Western Tibet; that, as far as GOI could ascertain, there were 124 families of Kashmiri Muslims with a total number of 583 persons in the Lhasa-Shigatse area; that before the disturbances nearly 400 Lama students from Ladakh were studying in various monasteries in Tibet, and

[Translation begins:

Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan: Is it true that the Indian Trade Agency there cannot function properly because many things are being done which are opposed to the Trade Agreement between India and China?

Translation ends]

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Yes, Sir. The answer was given that many restrictions are imposed on traders and these make it very difficult for our traders to carry on their trade.

Shri B.K.P. Sinha: Under international law, a man's nationality is determined not only by his residence but also by volition, his desire to accept the nationality of the country. May I know, Sir, whether the Chinese Government or the Communist system accepts this principle of nationality or do they have some other principle of nationality?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I do not know what the Communists accept, but as far as Tibet is concerned, I have already told him.

Shri N.M. Lingam: Since this is a serious violation of the 1954 agreement between India and China in regard to Tibet and Indian traders therein, will the hon. Deputy Minister please tell us what steps Government have taken to bring this to the notice of the Chinese Government?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: From time to time these difficulties are brought to the notice of the Chinese Government through our Ambassador in Peking.

---

approximately 40 Ladakhi Lamas were among the refugees who had come to India from Tibet. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXII, cols 1724-1727.

Shri M.H. Samuel: May I know, Sir, if Government have any information on the subject, as to whether there is a large concentration of Chinese troops on the Sikkim and Bhutan borders and that China has claimed these territories also as part of her territory?

Mr. Chairman: That is another question.

Shrimati Lakshrni Menon: That does not arise out of this question.

Shri Jaswant Singh: I would like to know whether the Deputy Minister has accepted that Indian traders are facing difficulties in Tibet - both those who are residents there as well as the seasonal traders who go there and join in the summer. I would like to know what steps Government are taking to see that these Indian traders are given due relief and help.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The normal step, Sir, is to approach the Chinese Government both in Tibet and in Peking. And we have approached them and sent them full details of this repeatedly - and in some detail I pointed this out and reminded them about this.

Shri Jaswant Singh: But then I would like to know what the Chinese say in regard to the difficulties that the Indian traders are facing; whether they are prepared to help them or they have not given any reply to our representations.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have not had any answer to our latest memorandum from Peking, but the local people in Tibet, the local Chinese

Authorities in Tibet, give various answers to various things, which according to our opinion are not always relevant.

Shri N.M. Lingam: Since this development is a sequel to the Tibetan upheaval and since generally the attitude of China is becoming more and more hostile to India, has Government considered the question of taking up the whole question of Indo-Chinese relations, after the happenings in Tibet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the hon. Member means by the 'whole question'. As questions arise, they are taken up, sometimes more than one question. There are several matters like this which we have taken up with the Chinese Government and have addressed them on the subject. Some replies came sometime ago. We have addressed them again. As for the first part of his question, it is rather difficult to say what the reason is for this kind of thing. To some extent there has been pressure on the Indian traders even before these Tibetan developments. I know that when I passed through a little comer of Tibet last year, at Yatung,<sup>24</sup> the Indian traders came to me and complained of various disabilities from which they suffered.<sup>25</sup> A year or two before they were in a much more prosperous condition, but now disabilities are gradually coming in. I had taken up the matter then. But it is true that all this has increased considerably in the last two or three months or so.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha:<sup>26</sup> We would like to know from the Prime Minister about the welfare particularly of our Indian nationals there. We

---

<sup>24</sup> Nehru was in Yatung on 18 September 1958 on his way to Bhutan; on his return journey from Bhutan, he reached Yatung at noon on 29 September and left for Sikkim on the morning of 30 September

<sup>25</sup> See SWJN/SS/48/item 133; also SWJN/SS/44/p. 20

<sup>26</sup> Independent, Rajya Sabha MP from Bihar

know that they are in difficulties with regard to trade and other things as the Prime Minister has said. But do our missions there keep themselves properly informed about the welfare of our people and that they are not being harassed for one reason or the other? We are very anxious about that aspect of the question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Apart from the traders there and apart from the people in our missions, there are two main groups, both of these groups coming from Ladakh. One is a group of Ladakhi Muslims and the other a group of Ladakhi Buddhists. The Buddhist lamas, etc. go there to study, live in monasteries, and the Muslims go there for various purposes and remain there for quite a considerable time. Now, with regard to these latter groups, there is an argument going on between the Chinese government and ourselves as to whether they are to be considered Indian nationals or not. I do not want to take up in answer to the question the story of this argument. We think they are Indian nationals; they claim to be Indian Nationals; they want to be Indian Nationals. But the Chinese Authorities in Tibet have not accepted this claim and pointed out that they have been there for a long time and they have not got their requisite papers, etc. which they did not have in the normal course previously. They were not called upon to do so. So, in so far as these people, that is, the Ladakhi Muslims, are concerned, our information is that considerable pressure has been brought to bear upon them, and they have not been easily accessible to our missions there. But for the other Indians, there are real economic troubles.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: Is there any restriction on other Indians visiting our missions or is there none? The other Indians, these Ladakhis, can they go freely to our Indian mission or not?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think there are any rules prohibiting them from coming. But the fact of the matter is that it is difficult to travel without all kinds of permits. There is no conveyance available, no vehicle available. The road may be not open to traffic. So, it is not strictly speaking, easy for people to go from one town to another.

Shri B.K.P. Sinha: May I know what practical consequences will follow out of the denial of Indian nationality to these traders or other citizens of India?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: One practical consequence will be that they will not be followed to leave Tibet. Otherwise, they are entitled to leave Tibet and go back to what they consider their original homes in Ladakh.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy:<sup>27</sup> The Prime Minister was pleased to say that they have submitted a memorandum to the Chinese Government and that they have been waiting for a reply. May I know when this memorandum was sent and whether the Government of India will think of approaching them again if they do not get an answer?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So many memoranda have been sent to the Chinese Government, formally and informally - not one, they are quite a number. I should think that one of our principal memoranda was sent about, maybe, three weeks ago.<sup>28</sup> But since then, other matters have been brought to the notice of the Chinese Government.

---

<sup>27</sup> Congress, Rajya Sabha MP from Andhra Pradesh

<sup>28</sup> . See item 174, fn 54

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether our mission people visit our Indian nationals there. There may be practical difficulties for them to go to the mission, but what about our mission people going and keeping in touch with our nationals?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not difficult within the same town, say, Yatung, where people can visit each other more or less. But it is difficult for them to go for instance, to Gyantse because of transport difficulties.

\* \* \*

### **178. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Statement on Ladakh, Sikkim and Bhutan<sup>29</sup>**

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Sarvashri Vajpayee and V.L. Patil<sup>30</sup> The grave threat to India's security and territorial integrity emanating from the offensive propaganda campaign let loose by the Chinese Communists for the 'Liberation' of Ladakh, Sikkim and Bhutan.

Shri S.M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What about the other motion about the crisis in U.P.?<sup>31</sup>

Mr. Speaker: I am coming to that. Crisis in V.P. is a domestic matter.

Shri S.M. Banerjee: It is very important, Sir. All people.....

---

<sup>29</sup> 13 August 1959. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXII, cols 2243-2247

<sup>30</sup> Uttamrao Laxmanrao Patil, Bharatiya Jana Sangh, Lok Sabha MP from Dhulia, Bombay

<sup>31</sup> Refers to dissident Congress MLAs expressing their lack of confidence in the Sampurnanand ministry in a statement in the UP Assembly; see item 77, fn 309



Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have disallowed it.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Sir, in a House of only 431 if 97 are ...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If he is more interested there let him go and sit there (Interruption). Order, order. I am not going to allow this indulgence of discussing matters which I have disallowed, which according to me are domestic matters.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, there was another adjournment motion on the subject of Tibet in my name also.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Shri Braj Raj Singh also has given notice of the same adjournment motion.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It was not the same motion, Sir; there were some other matters. My point is, sometime back there was a news items in the papers, which has not been contradicted to my knowledge at least that there was some plan of forming a Himalayan Federation consisting of Ladakh, Tibet, Bhutan, Sikkim and parts of our NEFA area. There had been rumours of a news in the Press that there had been exhortations in Tibet exhorting Tibetans to liberate these areas. This is a very serious matter. Insecurity may prevail allover India on account of this.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): Sir, there is news in the papers that on the 17th July there was a mass meeting in Lhasa in which Communist leaders in Tibet made speeches calling for the liberation of Ladakh, Bhutan and

Sikkim.<sup>32</sup> Secondly, there is a news that huge Chinese forces are being concentrated on the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan.<sup>33</sup> I would like to know what is the position. My adjournment motion is not in the nature of a censure motion against the Government. The only thing we want is that security of India must be safeguarded and any threat that is coming from any quarter must be met.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, I submit that my adjournment motion may be read in the House so that hon. Members may know what it is.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has explained it in a much better way than what is contained in the adjournment motion.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, I entirely agree with the hon. Member that the integrity of India should be safeguarded at all costs. There can be no doubt about it; every Member in this House agrees.

Now, coming to this particular motion, it is based apparently on a news item today which itself is based on some despatch to a London newspaper.

---

<sup>32</sup> Basing itself on a dispatch by George Patterson, the Kalimpong correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, *The Hindustan Times* on 13 August 1959 reported a mass meeting in Lhasa on 17 July, "Chang Kuow-Hua [Zhang Guohua] the head of the Chinese mission in Tibet" as saying at the meeting: "Bhutanese, Sikkimese and Ladakhis form a united family in Tibet and the great motherland of China. They must once again be united and taught the Communist doctrine."

<sup>33</sup> In its report on the Lhasa meeting of 17 July, *The Hindustan Times* of 13 August 1959 referred to "independent evidence" of measures being taken by the Chinese in pursuance of the "new campaign:" "For instance, they are known to have concentrated unusually large forces in the strategic sector bordering on Sikkim and Bhutan. One of the points of concentration is Rinchengong, a village on the trade route from Sikkim to Lhasa and situated on the Amo Chu river, which flows into Bhutan.

In this newspaper reference is made to a speech that Mr. Chiang-ko-Hua is supposed to have delivered on a certain day. I have not seen that report of the speech - I do not know. A report of that speech was given in the official Chinese paper called China Today. I have read that report. This particular passage is not there. That of course does not lead us to believe that it is not possible, but it is not there. Anyhow, it would be a very exceedingly foolish person who would say the remarks attributed to this gentleman about Ladakh, Sikkim and Bhutan. We shall try to find out whether any speech was delivered on that date and, in so far as we can, what the contents of that speech were. We have had no information from any reliable source of such statements being made by any person who can be considered reliable. Therefore, it is rather difficult for me to deal with something in the air.

As for the report that there are large forces, Chinese forces, there are Chinese forces, pretty large forces, I believe, in Tibet. It might even be called 'very large forces' all over Tibet, which came there when this rebellion started there. We have no exact information as to the extent of those forces. I do not think that any large forces are concentrated on our frontiers. Some are there, no doubt. Anyhow, we are quite awake and alert over this matter, and if we get any reliable information I shall place it before the House. I may say that in one of our last notes to the Chinese Government, which was sent I think on the 23rd July, we protested inter alia against the propaganda in the Chinese official organ describing Indians as imperialists.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> In fact, the note was given to the Chinese Foreign Office by G. Parthasarathi on 25 July 1959; see item 174, fn 54

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, the Prime Minister may be asked to say something about the Himalayan Federation also. We just want to get some information about it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister has placed all the available information before the House.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): May I know whether it is a fact that the Chinese Government have sent some communications to our Government, recently, suggesting that the McMahon Line no longer prescribes or describes the international boundary as it was not ratified by the Chinese Government, and as it was only a British creation there should be some sort of redrawing of the line?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir; we have received no such communication now or at any earlier stage. So far as we are concerned, the McMahon line is the firm frontier, firm by treaty, firm by usage, firm by geography. There are minor pockets, small areas in the McMahon line or elsewhere on the frontier where some arguments have occasionally arisen, where questions, sometimes of a mile or two this way or that way, have arisen in the past and discussions have taken place and will continue, no doubt. So, sometimes we have these arguments about these matters; in fact, we are having, I think, about one or two matters even now, but they do not affect the major frontier line called the McMahon line.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know from the Prime Minister that when Mr. Chou En-lai made a reference to their undefined frontiers with their southern neighbours - when he said like that - did he include India with the Southern neighbours? Did he have that in mind?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot say or interpret Premier Chou En-lai's speech and what he had in mind. But the impression that was given to us by Mr. Chou En-lai some years back was, having regard to all the circumstances, they accepted this, what is called McMahon line - unfortunately we might have a better name for it; but still, they accepted that as the international frontier.<sup>35</sup>

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy<sup>36</sup> (Kendrapara): Has any map been published showing some portions of India in the Chinese territory?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No new maps have been published; I do not know.

Shri Vajpayee: May I know whether it is a fact that as many as 20 divisions of Chinese troops are stationed in Tibet at present?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I could not say; I do not know that exactly.

Mr. Speaker: In the circumstances, I do not think it necessary to give my consent to this adjournment motion.

\* \* \*

### **179. In the Lok Sabha: Expenditure on the Dalai Lama<sup>37</sup>**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

---

<sup>35</sup> During Chou En-lai's visit to India in December 1956 and January 1957; see Nehru's note to N.R. Pillai, 1 January 1957, SWJN/SS/36/pp. 610-616, here pp. 614-615, and note to Subimal Dutt, 11 November 1958, SWJN/SS/45/p. 699.

<sup>36</sup> PSP, Lok Sabha MP from Kendrapara, Orissa

<sup>37</sup> 14 August 1959. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXII, cols 2445-2446

- (a) the total amount of money which was spent in receiving the Dalai Lama at the Indian border and bringing him to Mussoorie for his stay;
- (b) the amount of money which the Government of India have spent so far in making all arrangements for the Dalai Lama and his party's stay and boarding at Mussoorie so far;
- (c) and whether Government of India have given some officers special responsibility to look after the Dalai Lama and his party at Mussoorie?<sup>38</sup>

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):

(a) The exact expenditure is not known, as information from Assam and West Bengal Governments, who have incurred the expenditure is still awaited. The information so far available indicates that a sum of approx. Rs. 23,089 was spent while the Dalai Lama and his Party were in NEFA, Varanasi and Sarnath including the cost of his special train and catering from Varanasi to Debra Dun.

(b) The exact expenditure is not known. Some bills are yet to be paid and some are expected. The amount spent till 15-6-1959 is approx. Rs. 85,217 and the monthly estimated expenditure thereafter is likely to be Rs. 29,256.

(c) Yes. A liaison officer has been attached to the Dalai Lama's party.

\* \* \*

### **180. To Subimal Dutt: Ladakh-Tibet Border, Chushul Airfield<sup>39</sup>**

---

<sup>38</sup> The question was asked by Chintamani Panigrahi, Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Puri, Orissa, and three other MPs.

<sup>39</sup> Note, 15 August 1959.

I give below an extract from a letter from Yuvaraj Karan Singh of J&K State:

"The second matter is with regard to our Laddakh [sic]- Tibet border. Recently a patrol party of C.R.P. was kidnapped by the Chinese while they were on our side of the border, and I learn that the Chinese have built roads, check-posts, bunkers and other fortifications well inside Indian territory. As you know, the border with Tibet is still undemarcated, but that does not mean that gradual encroachment and occupation of our territory can be countenanced. I submit that this is a matter of grave concern and deserves to be looked into carefully and expeditiously. I understand that the Chusul [sic] airport,<sup>40</sup> upon which you will recall we landed in 1952, is now out of commission. This is close to the border and hence strategically very important. Psychologically also, both vis-a-vis the Chinese and the local population, it would be a good move for us to use this airport at least occasionally. It is important that the Ladakh- Tibet border should be strengthened, for unless adequate measures are taken at this stage we may have to face a very serious problem in a few years when the Chinese have consolidated their positions in our territory. The situation appears to be developing into something more than mere 'cartographical aggression'.<sup>41</sup>"

2. The other day I wrote on a file that we should use the Chusul airport and send a military detachment to the check-post nearby. Last night I had a talk with the Defence Minister. I have used the word 'military' there rather vaguely. What I meant was an armed detachment. I have no idea what

---

<sup>40</sup> The Chushul airfield, located close to the border with China at a height of over 13,000 feet in the Chushul Valley in Ladakh.

<sup>41</sup> The extract is from Karan Singh to Nehru, 9 August 1959; for the full letter, see Jawaid Alam (ed.), *Jammu and Kashmir 1949-64: Select Correspondence between Jawaharlal Nehru and Karan Singh* (Penguin: New Delhi, 2006), pp. 263-264.

kind of people are at present at our check-posts in Ladakh. Presumably they go from Leh and are part of our Army. Or are they armed police? Anyhow, this area is wholly different from the NEFA areas where the Assam Rifles function.

3. I have suggested to the Defence Minister to find out about these check-posts of ours on the Ladakh border.

Who are they?

How do they go to the check-posts, that is, do they go on foot from Leh or by air?

How are supplies sent to them, by air or by the bridle path?

How many are they? and such other information.

4. It seems to me clear that we should use the Chusul airport from time to time and that our check-posts there should be strengthened. To what extent, I cannot say. It is not necessary to keep very large bodies of men at these check-posts, but they should not be too small either.

\* \* \*

### **181. To Tan Yun-Shan: Strained Relations with China<sup>42</sup>**

August 15, 1959

My dear Professor Tan<sup>43</sup>

Thank you for your letter of the 11th August. I am indeed myself distressed at many recent developments which have resulted in some strain on the friendly relations between India and China. As you know, I have always attached great importance to these friendly relations both in the present

---

<sup>42</sup> Letter.

<sup>43</sup> Founder-director of Cheena Bhavana at Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan



and for the future. We are two great countries, neighbours of each other, and it would be a tragedy if we do not have those friendly relations.

I am glad you are going to China. I am sure your talks there will be helpful. Should you wish to come to New Delhi, I shall gladly meet you.

Yours sincerely,  
Jawaharlal Nehru

\* \* \*

### **182. To V.K. Krishna Menon and MEA: US Attitude on Tibet<sup>44</sup>**

Mr. Winthrop Brown,<sup>45</sup> the U.S. Charge d' Affaires came to see me today. He said that he had been instructed to see me to let me know the attitude of his Government in regard to the Tibet issue being brought up before the UN General Assembly. His Government realised that India had a special interest in Tibet. The US Government had on the whole avoided saying much on the subject. They felt, however, that if a proposal was made to discuss Tibet in the UN, they should support it. He was anxious to see me today to inform me of this as there was a resolution in Parliament tomorrow on this subject.

2. I told him that in the course of press conferences and elsewhere, I had indicated that we did not think it necessary or desirable to take this matter of what had happened in Tibet to the UN and I intended taking up broadly

---

<sup>44</sup> Note to V.K. Krishna Menon, N.R. Pillai, Subimal Dutt, and M.J. Desai, 20 August 1959

<sup>45</sup> Winthrop Gilman Brown (b. 1907); US government official and diplomatist; served in US Embassy, London, and State Department, 1941-57; Minister-Counsellor, New Delhi, 1957-60; Ambassador to Laos, 1960-62, and to Republic of Korea, 1964-67; Special Assistant to Secretary of State for Liaison with Governors, 1967-72; Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, East Asian and Pacific Affairs, 1968-72. International Who's Who 1977-78 (Europa).

this attitude in Parliament if the Resolution came up for discussion there.<sup>46</sup> I asked him in what way this might come up before the UN. There will have to be some resolution or motion in the UN. He said that he did not know nor had this question been considered in detail by his Government. But they felt that if a motion for discussion was brought up or if the Dalai Lama himself wished to appear to state his case before the UN, the US Government should support this.<sup>47</sup> In doing so, they were anxious to make it clear that it was not their desire to make this in any way a cold war issue. I said that whatever their desire might be, this would inevitably become in some way or other a cold war issue. Presumably the motion would be to condemn the Chinese Government. I pointed out that the Soviet

---

<sup>46</sup> On 21 August, Atal Bihar Vajpayee moved the resolution in the Lok Sabha regarding reference of the Tibet issue to the UN; discussion on the resolution was not concluded that day. Nehru spoke on it on 4 September 1959; see Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXII, cols 3682-3690, and SWJN/SSI52/item 97

<sup>47</sup> At a meeting in the US Department of State on July 28, it was decided to inform the Dalai Lama of the US Government's intention "to do whatever we can" to assist him in connection with submitting Tibet's case to the UN General Assembly if he made a public appeal for UN action. Accordingly, he was informed that they would so assist him; that his initial public statement of appeal for UN action should be made in the near future; that this appeal should make mention of the suffering and denial of human rights endured by Tibetans and avoid charges of aggression; and that thereupon the US would consult with governments of friendly countries in his behalf. Following up the recommendation of the US Embassy in New Delhi that before encouraging other countries to support the Dalai Lama's appeal for UN action the US Government should approach Nehru and inform him of their intentions, the meeting decided that Nehru should be so informed immediately after consultation with the British had been initiated and their reaction to US plans obtained. On 30 July, Allen Dulles, the Director of the CIA, told a meeting of the National Security Council: "He [the Dalai Lama] is trying to get his case before the United Nations on the grounds of genocide. The U.S. has put out feelers in Buddhist countries about accepting the Dalai Lama, but no country has been receptive, probably because there is reluctance to alienate Communist China and because there are so many different sects of Buddhism." Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958-1960, Vol. XIX, Documents 382 and 383

Government and indeed their press etc. had not taken up the Tibet issue at all. Indeed there was very little said about it in the Soviet Union. This was surely not due to any sympathy on their part for the Dalai Lama or for Tibet. Whatever the reasons were, they had kept rather quiet about this matter. The Charge said that he realised this though he did not know why the Soviet Government had adopted this attitude.

3. I pointed out that our basic objection to this matter being raised in the UN was that the People's Government of China was not represented in the UN and it did not seem to us to be proper to deny them that representation and, at the same time, to condemn them. So far as we were concerned, we did not at all like much that had happened in Tibet during recent months, and we had expressed our views in Parliament and elsewhere clearly, though in restrained language. I further added that our information was that the Secretary-General of the UN, Mr. Harnmarskjoeld, was also of the opinion that it would not be proper to bring up this issue before the UN for the two main reasons. One was that the Chinese Government had not subscribed to the Charter and was not in the UN and, secondly, it could not be said that there had been an invasion of Tibet by the Chinese authorities as Tibet was considered to be a part of the Chinese State.

4. Mr. Brown again repeated that his Government did not want to make this a cold war issue. But they felt that if this question was brought up, the US Government would support a discussion in the UN.<sup>48</sup>

\* \* \*

---

<sup>48</sup> On 28 September 1959, the representatives of the Federation of Malaya and Ireland asked for inscription of the question of Tibet in the agenda of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly. The Yearbook of the United Nations 1959

### **183. To Suniti Kumar Chatterji: The Chinese National Day<sup>49</sup>**

August 21, 1959

My dear Shri Chatterji,<sup>50</sup>

I have your letter of August 20th.<sup>51</sup> I do not understand why at any time it should be necessary to celebrate the Chinese National Day by meetings etc. lasting a month. Even normally this would be odd. To do it in present circumstances would be odder still and, in fact, it would only be interpreted as some kind of a direct censure of our present policy.

There is no harm in your celebrating the day by some kind of a meeting on that day, but I would not recommend any exuberance on that occasion.

So far as our National Day is concerned, that is, January 26th, there was a normal celebration at our Embassy. A reception was given by our Ambassador and the Foreign Minister of China<sup>52</sup> attended it. It should be remembered, however, that this was before the recent developments in Tibet and the reactions in India and China.

I suggest, therefore, that you might have a more or less formal celebration on the 1st of October without any great fuss.

Yours sincerely,  
Jawaharlal Nehru

\* \* \*

### **184. To Subimal Dutt: Dalai Lama<sup>53</sup>**

---

<sup>49</sup> Letter

<sup>50</sup> The Chairman, Legislative Council, West Bengal, and the President of the Calcutta branch of the India-China Friendship Association

<sup>51</sup> See Suniti Kumar Chatterji to Nehru, 20 August 1959, Appendix 35.

<sup>52</sup> Chen Yi, the Foreign Minister of China, 1958-72

<sup>53</sup> Note, 21 August 1959

Broadly, I agree with FS's note. We should allow these people to go to Manila.<sup>54</sup>

I do not like the idea of a spread out tour.<sup>55</sup> We should discuss this matter with the Dalai Lama when he comes here.<sup>56</sup> Perhaps, these people might go to Burma en route as it is on the way and is a Buddhist country.

2. There is one other matter which should be enquired into. Is it possible for the Magsaysay Award to be given by proxy to someone else? I have a vague idea that this is not permitted by the Manila authorities.<sup>57</sup>

3. A similar Award was made to Acharya Vinoba Bhave.<sup>58</sup> He said he could not go, and no question arose of someone else going on his behalf.

\* \* \*

### **185. In the Lok Sabha: Indians in Tibet<sup>59</sup>**

---

<sup>54</sup> The Ramon Magsaysay Award of 1959 in the Community Leadership category was to be conferred on the Dalai Lama in Manila on 31 August 1959. The Tribune, 17 August 1959, and the website of the Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation (RMAF): <http://www.rmaf.org.ph/Awardees/Citation/CitationDalaiLam.htm> accessed on 1 June 2013.

<sup>55</sup> See also Nehru's note to Subimal Dutt, 22 July 1959, SWJN/SS/50/item 159. According to a PTI report in The Tribune of 28 August 1959, the Dalai Lama himself intended to visit Buddhist countries, like Burma, Ceylon, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam and Japan, to promote a better understanding and appreciation of the Tibetan question in those countries.

<sup>56</sup> The Dalai Lama arrived in Delhi on 2 September 1959; see also item 190.

<sup>57</sup> Gyalo Thondup, the brother of the Dalai Lama, received the award deputing for the Dalai Lama. The RMAF website

<sup>58</sup> Received the Magsaysay Award for Community Leadership in 1958

<sup>59</sup> 24 August 1959, Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. xxxm, cols 4073-4077

Mr. Speaker: I have received another adjournment motion from Shri Vajpayee which reads:

"This grave situation arising out of the hostile attitude of the Chinese Communists towards Indians as evidenced from the warning contained in a recent note to the Indian Consul-General in Lhasa and also the virtual house arrest order served on Indians residing in Tibet under the pretext of a safety warning to keep within doors."

May I know whether the hon. Prime Minister is willing to make any statement?

Shri Vajpayee: May I make any [sic] submission first? News emanating from Tibet is very disturbing. It has been reported that the Indians in Tibet have been asked not to leave their homes without permission, which means that they are virtually under house arrest. They are not even free to go to the Indian Consul-General, where a police picket is still there. And any Indian who goes to the Indian Consul-General is being cross-examined by the police. In addition to that, it has been reported that the Chinese authorities have asked our Consul-General to advise the Indians not to visit Tibet even on pilgrimage. Are we to understand that the national uprising in Tibet has still not been crushed and there is no peace, even the peace of the grave, and so new restrictions have been imposed on Indians? I want that the situation should be clarified so that our friendly relations with China may not still further be impaired.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): The hon. Member has said many things just now for which I do not know what support and evidence he has. So far as this motion for adjournment is concerned, I have read it two or three times without being able to understand exactly what the hon. Member means by it. It says:

"The grave situation arising out of the hostile attitude of the Chinese Communists towards Indians as evidenced from the warning contained in a recent note..."

I take it that the note referred to is the one issued about intending pilgrims. I do not know why that should be taken to mean a hostile attitude to anybody. It may mean, as he himself has hinted, that conditions in certain parts of Tibet are so insecure that pilgrims are not safe. I shall read out the exact message that we received in regard to this matter.

The Chinese Foreign Bureau in Lhasa conveyed to our Consul-General there the following message. I am giving it as received. The English is not sometimes very clear.

"In view of that, at present the PLA ..." that is, the Chinese Army...

Shri C.D. Pande (Naini Tal): People's Liberation Army to liberate Tibet.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: People's Liberation Army.

"In view of that, at present the PLA are launching a punitive expedition towards, a tiny minority of remnant rebels at Ari area, the Consulate-General would be kind to tell the Indian pilgrims that for the sake of safety it is better for them not to come for pilgrimage or come as fewer as possible this year. If they insist to come the responsibility of safety should be borne by themselves."

Now, the meaning is quite clear that they are carrying on expeditionary or other hostile activities there and conditions are not safe for people and for pilgrims and they warn pilgrims that they should not come or, if they come, they should come as few as possible at their own risk.

It is true that under the terms of our agreement with China, pilgrims are allowed free access,<sup>60</sup> but where conditions become bad internally, whoever

---

<sup>60</sup> Under the Agreement of 29 April 1954

may be responsible for it, we can hardly go on saying that we will go and you will be responsible for it. Technically it may be true. Anyhow, this indicates that conditions are not normal there and that some kind of conflicts are proceeding.

Shri Vajpayee: May I know the date on which that note was received?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I should imagine - I do not know - about two or three days ago or just in the last few days. It is quite recent. I am not sure of the date but I saw it, I think, about two days ago, probably.

As for the reference to Indians being kept within doors, I am not aware of that at all or of any order to the effect that Indians should keep within their houses.

Shri Naushir Bharncha<sup>61</sup> (East Khandesh): It has appeared in the papers.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry that I am not aware of that fact in spite of what the papers say. In other words, what the papers say, so far as I am concerned, is not correct. I cannot guarantee everything, but we are likely to have more correct information of the international conditions in Tibet. After all, we do get messages from our Consulates and Trade Agents. I cannot say about what happens in the interior, somewhere there is no Consulate or Trade Agent, but we have not received any such information from our Consulate or Trade Agents.

What has happened is that sometimes, when the disturbance took place in the cities there,<sup>62</sup> for a few days or maybe, two or three weeks, people were not encouraged to go out from certain areas in the cities, in Lhasa

---

<sup>61</sup> Naushir Cursetji Bharucha, Independent, Lok Sabha MP from East Khandesh, Bombay

<sup>62</sup> In March 1959



from the Consulate area to other areas. They were not allowed and movement in these areas was restricted. But that was at that time. So far as I know, no such house arrest business is taking place and movement is not restricted except outside the city area, that is, probably some kind of a permit is required to go outside the city areas or outside a certain major part of the city to certain other part of the city, like at Yatung. So, I do not think that this motion of adjournment...

Shri Hem Barua: May I know whether it is a fact that all attempts made by our Ambassador in Peking to meet Mr. Chou En-lai to discuss the position of Indians in Tibet have so far not succeeded? If it is so, what is the information with the hon. Prime Minister about it?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Chou En-lai is the Prime Minister of China. Most Prime Ministers normally do not discuss these matters with foreign Ambassadors. It is the Foreign Ministers who discuss these matters. I may discuss them in my capacity as Foreign Minister. Prime Ministers are not easily accessible. They are more accessible in India than in most other countries.

Shri Hem Barua: Did our Ambassador make certain attempts to discuss the matter there? That is what I wanted to know.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of our Ambassador discussing it with anybody. Our Ambassador, at our instance, handed certain memoranda and notes to the Chinese Government and we expect from them formal replies. There is no question of having a casual conversation with our Ambassador.

Shri Vajpayee: May I know if it is a fact that the Police is still posted in front of the office of the Indian Consul-General in Lhasa and the Indians who go there are being interrogated by the Police?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Sir. I am not quite sure exactly what the position now is, but there were some sentries posted in front of the Consulate-General, who checked people without permits trying to come in. In particular, the report we got was that some of those Ladakhi Muslims, who wanted to come to consult our Consulate-General, were stopped from coming.

[Translation begins:

Bhakt Darshan (Garhwal): Opposing this adjournment motion I wish to know from the Prime Minister with your permission that whether the Indian Government has accepted the advice given by the Chinese Government to Indian pilgrims to come in as small numbers as possible, and whether impediments are being put up before the Indian pilgrims going there?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no sense in accepting or not accepting it. We have informed the Uttar Pradesh Government that this message has come from there and pilgrims should be informed that there is danger in going there. Still, if some pilgrims wish to go, no one will stop them.

*[Translation ends]*

Mr. Speaker: In view of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister, I do not think it is necessary for me to give my consent to this motion for adjournment.

\* \* \*

**186. To Mohammad Mujeeb: Tibetan Students at Jamia Millia Islamia<sup>63</sup>**

25th August, 1959

My dear Mujeeb,<sup>64</sup>

Your letter of August 24th about Tibetan students at the Jamia. Will you please let me know (1) what the normal expenditure of these students is and (2) what your immediate need may be?

Yours sincerely,  
Jawaharlal Nehru

\* \* \*

**187. In the Rajya Sabha: Activities of Chinese Authorities against India<sup>65</sup>**

V.K. Dhage: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the report which appeared in the 'Hindustan Times' (Delhi Edition) of the 13th August, 1959, to the effect that the Chinese authorities in Tibet have begun a war of nerves against the people of the Himalayan region bordering on Tibet and, in particular, against the people of Bhutan and Sikkim;<sup>66</sup>

(b) whether Government are aware that, in a pamphlet issued by the Chinese authorities, Indians have been described as inheritors of British regime, and that a cry has been raised for the 'liberation' of the Bhutanese, Sikkimese and Ladakhis from their capitalistic oppressor, namely India;

---

<sup>63</sup> Letter

<sup>64</sup> Vice-Chancellor, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi

<sup>65</sup> 25 August 1959. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXVI, Nos. 1-13, cols 1702-1705

<sup>66</sup> See item 178, fns 82 and 83

and (c) if the answer to parts (a) and (b) above be in affirmative, what steps Government propose to take in the matter?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) and (c). Government have seen this report; they have however no information about the contents of the speech by the General referred to in this report. They have also no information about the pamphlet to which reference is made.

Instances of anti-Indian propaganda in the Tibetan region have however come to the attention of Government and Government have drawn the attention of the Chinese authorities to this.

Shri J.C. Chatterji:<sup>67</sup> As a protest against the fact that our Lhasa Consulate office is being kept under restraint by the Chinese, are we also going to put the same sort of restrictions on the Chinese Consulate office at Kailmpong?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not quite correct to say that our Consulate General is under restraint. There are some difficulties there in regard to people who want to visit the Consulate General. Sometimes they do not find easy access to it. Some of them, more especially those people who are Ladakhi Muslims, who want to come there are not permitted to do so usually by the sentry. But the people in the Consulate can go about in Lhasa at any rate, not outside Lhasa; for that they require permit.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know nothing about this. I hope no gold bars will come from outside to India.

---

<sup>67</sup> Jogesh Chandra Chattetjee, Congress, Rajya Sabha MP from UP

Shri J.C. Chatterji: Is there any truth in the newspaper reports that the Chinese are trying to extend their influence in Bhutan, Sikkim, Ladakh and the border areas of Nepal?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is the main question. It has been answered. There are some reports of these things. We have no information as to their validity or of any responsible person having said this. But the fact remains that so far as Bhutan and Sikkim are concerned, they are in treaty relations with us and we are responsible for their defence. I cannot imagine any foreign authority doing anything which is an infringement of their sovereignty. In any event any such infringement would be an infringement of our undertakings with Sikkim and Bhutan, and we shall certainly resist every such intrusion.

Shri J.C. Chatterji: Are the Government thinking of devising ways and means for encouraging our people particularly of the border areas so that they may not be cowed down by the aggressive moves of any foreign power?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what he means. Ways and means to, what shall I say, to raise the morale of the people there? I hope the morale of the people in the border areas is good.

Shri J.C. Chatterji: It has been reported in the papers recently that some Chinese gold bars were recovered from some Assam tribals. Has it anything to do with the Chinese aggressive moves?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What did they recover from the Assam people? Gold bars?

Shri J.C. Chatterji: Chinese gold bars were recovered from some tribals in Assam.

Shri V.K. Dhage: Is it a fact that on the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan military concentration is taking place by the Chinese?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We do not know, Sir.

Shri V.K. Dhage: Is it a fact that there is a certain sort of concern in the minds of the people in Bhutan and Sikkim with regard to the Chinese activities?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Sir, that is natural. Ever since the troubles in Tibet, as refugees are coming in, there has been a measure of anxiety in the minds of the people and the authorities in Bhutan and Sikkim.

Shri V.K. Dhage: May I know whether there has been any proposal from the Prime Minister of Bhutan to interview our Prime Minister here?<sup>68</sup>

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It does not require any proposal. Whenever he comes here, he is our guest, and I see him frequently. There is no very great formality about these things, and I believe he is coming here soon.

[Translation begins:

Shri P.N. Rajbhoj: Will the Prime Minister kindly inform whether the Government of Bhutan has requested for aid from the Indian Government

---

<sup>68</sup> The Hindustan Times Weekly reported on 23 August that Jigme Dotji, who "returned recently from Bhutan to Kalimpong, where he spends part of the year," was expected to visit New Delhi in the near future for consultations with Nehru

for its security under the Indo-British Treaty for Perpetual Peace and Friendship [sic] which was signed in 1949?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of a request for any special aid, military aid. Yes, the Bhutanese have been taking, purchasing, some small amount of ordinary military equipment from us in the past. But they, too, know this and we also know it that if any invasion takes place against them, then it is our responsibility to help them.

Translation ends]

Shri Jaswant Singh: The Indian traders of the Bhotia class who used to trade in Tibet have had their business practically suspended and we have not been able to safeguard their interests. I would like to know whether any action has been taken to protect their interests or whether the Chinese authorities did not permit us to take such action.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The next question deals with this point, Sir.

\* \* \*

### **188. In the Rajya Sabha: Indo-Tibetan Trade<sup>69</sup>**

Shri Maheswar Naik: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Indo-Tibetan trade has been affected by the political disturbances in Tibet;
- (b) what was the volume of trade between India and Tibet prior to the Tibetan upsurge; and
- (c) what is the latest position?

---

<sup>69</sup> 25 August 1959. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXVI, Nos. 1-13, cols 1706-1710

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

(a) Yes, Sir. The Indo-Tibetan trade has suffered considerably during the last few months especially since the disturbances.

(b) and (c). The total volume of Indo-Tibetan trade during the quarter Jan-March, 1959, was Rs. 81.98 lakh approximately. The figure, however, declined to Rs. 26.821 lakhs approx. during the quarter April-June, 1959.

Shri Maheswar Naik: May I know whether Government have taken any measures for the restoration of normal trade between the two countries?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, Sir, I do not recall all the measures but we certainly want normal trade to be restored and we are pointing out to the Chinese authorities in Tibet the difficulties that have arisen in regard to it. For instance, one of the major difficulties is the question of payment and the currency. Many of our traders cannot deal in the goods there except in Chinese currency and they find it difficult to dispose of the goods there. All these difficulties have arisen and we are pointing out these things as much as we can because we cannot interfere in the internal trade arrangements otherwise.

Shri Maheswar Naik: May I know whether it is a fact that all sorts of impediments are being put against the Indian trade being run smoothly and that particularly the Indian.-traders who are engaged in trading in Tibet are not allowed to even borrow money from the local moneylenders?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is what I said, Sir, that there are difficulties. I do not know whether one such relates to the question of borrowing money but I imagine it is difficult to borrow money.



Shri Jaswant Singh: The question is not only of the Indian currency being made legal tender or not. The Indian traders who have been doing business in Tibet have had to completely suspend their business and I would like to know what the Government is doing either to restore normal conditions there or to rehabilitate the traders. This is a very serious matter because a very large number of people are affected by this.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have just answered, Sir.

Shri Jaswant Singh: There is a second part to my question, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We cannot force trade on another country. If a country deliberately wants to stop it, it can do a hundred and one things over-hand and under-hand to make it difficult for the trader to function. We cannot deal with such a matter. If there is any breach of treaty regulations, then we can take up that matter.

Shri Jaswant Singh: The main question was, Sir...

Mr. Chairman: "Did they suffer? Do you rehabilitate them?" That is the second part of the question, is it not?

Shri Jaswant Singh: Yes, Sir. I want to know whether Government is taking action to rehabilitate them.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, have the Indian traders there suffered? Are any measures taken to rehabilitate them? That is what he wants to know.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: None whatsoever. We have absolutely no such idea and we are not thinking of any such action. First of all, such a question does not arise and secondly these traders in the past have not done badly at all. It is only in the present that they are not well off.

Shri Jaswant Singh: It is their misfortune to be Indians, Sir.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: May I know whether the Government of India was consulted or at least was informed by the Chinese authorities of their intention to declare the Indian rupee as not legal tender in Tibet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no mention of this in the Treaty. All that the Treaty says is that customary rules will continue to prevail. You can interpret that as you will but there is no special reference in the Treaty to the rupee being legal tender or not.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: The first part of my question has not been answered, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Were we consulted? That is number one.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Was it unilateral? That is the second part of the question and the third part is, was it in the trade agreement? One question in three stages, is it?

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: Yes, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir, we were not consulted and we can hardly raise an objection to the fact we were not consulted by them before they made changes. The point is that where such changes are made, they must not in the interests of the countries concerned, have an immediate upsetting effect on past transactions. It is open to any country to make a change for the future so that the traders and others know where they stand but making a change which applies to past transactions does create a tremendous amount of difficulty because after they have paid for some goods, then let us say, 50 per cent or 75 per cent of the value suddenly disappears. Therefore, normally it should not apply to past transactions.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: But are they applying to past transactions?

(No reply)

Shri Maheswar Naik: It is reported that Indian traders resident in Tibet are not being allowed to enter the Indian Consulate-General. Is it a fact and, if so, have the Government thought it necessary to take any action in that regard?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think there is any difficulty in regard to the Indian traders coming to the Consulate-General but some people like the Ladakhi Muslims who claim to be Indian nationals and whom we are prepared to accept as such but who are not accepted as Indian nationals by the Chinese authorities at present have difficulties in coming to the Consulate-General.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: I want the Prime Minister to inform us on this point. The Treaty obligation was that the customary rules and customs will

prevail. One of the customary rules was that the Indian rupee will be the legal tender in Tibet. Now that unilateral action has been taken by the Chinese authorities to declare it as not legal tender, will the Government of India take up this matter with the Chinese authorities? That is number one. Number two is ....

Mr. Chairman: You are putting a series of questions.

Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha: Have the Government any information about the amount of Indian rupee involved in this, the extent to which the Indian traders there have suffered?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are constantly taking up this and like matters with the Chinese Government, putting to them whatever we think were the errors committed in regard to their obligations arising out of the Treaty. This is being constantly placed before them. I have no idea of the amount involved.

\* \* \*

**189. To Subimal Dutt: Lala Lajpat Rai, Dalai Lama<sup>70</sup>**

I have read this report.

2. Shri Purushottam Trikumdas<sup>71</sup> is not quite correct in his reference to Lala Lajpat Rai. It is true that he carried on some kind of a propaganda for

---

<sup>70</sup> Note, 25 August 1959

<sup>71</sup> Purushottam Trikumdas (1897-1969); founder-member, Congress Socialist Party, and member of its National Executive for several years; chairman, Legal Inquiry Committee on Tibet appointed on 21 August 1959 by the International Commission of Jurists. Bimal Prasad (ed.), Jayaprakash Narayan: Selected Works, Vol. 1, (New Delhi: Manohar, 2000), p. 88

Indian freedom but this was on a very limited scale and in effect reached very few people. Even so, he had to pull himself up in the United States and in Japan.<sup>72</sup> That was the wartime and his activities were strictly limited. As it happens, I have been reading recently his own account of his stay in the United States then.<sup>73</sup>

3. As for the Dalai Lama issuing some kind of a statement giving his views, as you have said, he is free to do so.<sup>74</sup>

\* \* \*

---

<sup>72</sup> Lala Lajpat Rai first visited USA in 1907; the second time he sailed from London for New York in November 1914, but was not allowed to return to India until the end of 1919. This period included his sojourn in Japan, July-December 1915. Adward Freehafer, the Director of the New York Public Library (NYPL), was reported to have presented a manuscript deposited by Lala Lajpat Rai to M.C. Chagla in April 1959. According to a statement laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha by K.L. Shrimali on 28 August 1959, the manuscript titled "Recollections of Life and Work for an Independent India while living in the United States during 1914-17," being a condensed account in Lala Lajpat Rai's own handwriting of his visits to USA and Japan "and a record of his doings and those of his compatriots who were promoting the cause of India's freedom in the United States," had been entrusted by the author to B.W. Hubesch of the Viking Press Inc., New York, for safe custody in 1919; in 1943, Mr Hubesch transferred it to the NYPL requesting it to hold it in its custody till India became free when the Library was to present it to the Indian Archives. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXVI, cols 2093-2097

<sup>73</sup> Nehru was apparently referring to Lala Lajpat Rai, *The United States of America: A Hindu's Impression* (1916).

<sup>74</sup> According to *The Statesman* of 31 August, the Dalai Lama, in a signed statement brought from Mussoorie by a messenger and distributed to the press in Delhi on 30 August, stated that the situation in Tibet had become "immeasurably darker and gloomier" since his press conference in June 1959 and the sufferings of the people there were "beyond description;" announced his firm intention to raise the Tibetan issue in the UN; and appealed to "all civilized countries of the world" to lend their fullest support to "our cause of freedom and justice."

### **190. To Subimal Dutt: Dalai Lama's Visit to Delhi<sup>75</sup>**

The Dalai Lama should be received at the station by the Chief Commissioner,<sup>76</sup> Deputy Minister and some officials of the EA Ministry.

2. I do not think it is necessary for any formal functions to be organised on behalf of Govt. He may be invited to private informal meals. I shall certainly invite him to such a meal.

3. It is likely, however, that some non-official organisations might want to organise some functions in his honour. If such a request comes, we shall have to examine it on its merits.

4. Intimation might be sent to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs about the time of arrival of the Dalai Lama. This is just by way of information in case some MPs wish to be present at the station then. We do not suggest that people should be sent for this purpose.<sup>77</sup>

\* \* \*

### **191. In the Lok Sabha: The Bara Hoti Plateau<sup>78</sup>**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 2337 on the 8th May, 1959 and state:

---

<sup>75</sup> Note, 25 August 1959. File No. 29 (19)-BST/59, MEA

<sup>76</sup> AD. Pandit, the Chief Commissioner of Delhi

<sup>77</sup> The Dalai Lama, accompanied by eight ministers and advisers, arrived in Delhi by train on 2 September. He was received at the railway station by Lakshmi Menon and AD. Pandit as a guest of the GOI. Also present there to greet him were Sucheta Kripalani, the Congress General Secretary; Ganga Saran and N.G. Gornny, the PSP leaders; Balraj Madhok, the Delhi Jan Sangh chief; Shiv Charan Das Gupta, the DPCC President; the local municipal councilors; and Miguel Serrano Fernandez, the Ambassador of Chile to India. A large crowd, including workers belonging to the Congress, the PSP and the J an Sangh, greeted the visitor with the cries of "Dalai Lama Zindabad." In the evening the Dalai Lama had a 90-minute meeting with Nehru. The Times of India, 2 and 3 September 1959

<sup>78</sup> 28 August 1959. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXIII, cols 4756-4760.

(a) whether the negotiations with the Chinese Government regarding the occupation of the Bara Hoti Plateau and other places situated on the border of Tibet adjoining Uttar Pradesh by the Chinese soldiers have since been concluded; and

(b) if so, the outcome thereof?<sup>79</sup>

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon); (a) and (b) The negotiations have not yet been resumed.

Shri Ram Krishan Gupta: May I know since when this area is under the control and occupation of the Chinese Government?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It is neither under the control nor occupation of the Chinese.

Shri D.C. Sharma: May I know if the Government is aware of the approximate number of the Chinese soldiers who are stationed on this border between Tibet and U.P.?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): How can we say the numbers of Chinese forces on the other side? But at these places, that is, the Hoti border, thus far, in the past years I mean, small patrols have come - may be, 10, 20, 25, 30 not more than that - and on our side also relatively small patrols of police have gone; there have been no large numbers involved anywhere.

[Translation begins:

Shri Bhakt Darshan: Is it true that during this summer when our soldiers reached this place after the snows melted, there was no trace of Chinese

---

<sup>79</sup> The question was asked by Ram Krishan Gupta and seven other MPs.

soldiers there? Does this imply that the Chinese Government has taken back its claim?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: As far as I know last summer when our police party reached there after the snows melted, the Chinese were not there. This is true. But what it implies I cannot say.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: What is the situation now? Under whose occupation is Bara Hoti village? Is our patrol party there or not?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It should be kept in mind that the flat area there comprises of about one and a half square miles. It is a small plain area and in the winter one cannot even go there. During summers goats and sheep, etc., come there for grazing and come mostly from Tibet because there are very big mountains on this side. Only our police party from Uttar Pradesh is present at the spot now, no one else.

[Translation ends]

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla:<sup>80</sup> The hon. Deputy Minister said that negotiations with the Chinese Government have not yet concluded. May I know whether we sent any letters to them; if so, whether those letters have been replied or even acknowledged by them?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: On this particular matter, I do not think many letters have been sent; maybe, perhaps, it might have been mentioned in some communication, but he had those discussions and they were adjourned saying that there will be a future meeting. Since then, as the House very well knows, so many other things have happened, so many

---

<sup>80</sup> Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Baloda Bazar-SC, Madhya Pradesh



other developments have taken place that, that rather minor matter has gone into the background.

Shri Bhakta Darshan: Last year when it started to snow and our policemen returned, the Chinese came and occupied that spot. I wish to know whether some such arrangement is being made to enable our policemen to remain there even during winter so that if Chinese soldiers come, they may be removed.

[Translation begins:

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I see no special reason to do so. You are right in saying that last year, about one and a half years ago, when our people came away from there, a few Chinese soldiers came there even during winter. Now, apparently, I see no special reason to make our people suffer miserably for this, to make them sit there in winter, in the cold.

Translation ends]

Shri Braj Raj Singh: In reply to a previous question it was stated that negotiations shall be carried on with the Chinese Government on this, and now it is stated that the negotiations have not yet come to any conclusion. Are we to presume that the negotiations have now been abandoned?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, they have not been abandoned. May I say this in answer to the previous question that it was decided at the time of those negotiations that no fully armed party should remain there and that that area of 1 ¼ square miles should be considered, well, if you like, a neutral territory till a decision is made. So it is still pending a final decision. Our police party that is there has not, in accordance with that decision, taken even the normal arms which, I think, may be required to scare away wild

animals, etc., because the decision was that no party, either Indian or Chinese should go there with guns and the like.

Shri Vajpayee: May I know if the Government have any information in regard to the strength of the Chinese forces who occupy Bara Hoti and if there is any likelihood of further encroachment into our territory?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I think I have answered that question. It was in Hindi which I think is sufficiently understood by the hon. Member.

[Translation begins:

Shri Bhakt Darshan: Some time back, perhaps two or three years ago, the Chinese Government had agreed that a representative from its side and a representative of the Indian Government will go there and put an end to this matter. I wish to know whether the Chinese Government has given up that idea or it is still ready to send a representative there from its side.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Talks were held with the Chinese representative, but in Delhi; not there. It was agreed in that meeting that the place be visited and surveyed. But I could not understand, and even now I cannot understand that how will anybody decide this matter sitting on the mountain peaks. The area is not populated. It is a matter of maps. It can be settled with whatever papers they may have or whatever reports we may have. How will it be decided sitting there or walking about on the mountain?

Translation ends]

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: The hon. Prime Minister has just now said that it has been decided between the Government of China and the Government of

India that no armed forces will be allowed at Bara Hoti plateau. If this plateau is within our boundary, may I know the reason why we accepted the condition of the Chinese that our forces also will not go there with arms?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is in our territory; nevertheless, it was a small disputed area. For three or four years, small groups, platoon of the Chinese and platoon of our forces sat there, both facing each other; not exactly coming into conflict but they were sitting there, both of them, and they were camping in the same place. We were discussing, according to the maps and charts what should be the future of this little strip. We agreed that neither party should sit in armed troops to occupy it while we were discussing it.

\* \* \*

### **192. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Occupation of Ladakhi Territory<sup>81</sup>**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state;

- (a) whether it is a fact that a portion of the Ladakhi territory has been recently occupied by the Chinese forces; and
- (b) if so, the action taken in the matter?<sup>82</sup>

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):  
(a) and (b). There is a large area in Eastern and North-Eastern Ladakh which is practically uninhabited. It is mountainous, and even the valleys are at a high altitude generally exceeding 13,000 ft. To some extent, shepherds use it during the summer months for grazing purposes. The Government of

---

<sup>81</sup> 28 August 1959. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXIII, cols 4793-4800

<sup>82</sup> . Question by Radha Mohan Singh, Congress, Lok Sabha MP from UP, and six other MPs

India have some police check-posts in this area, but because of the difficulties of terrain most of these posts are at some distance from the international border.

2. Some reports reached us between October, 1957 and February, 1958 that a Chinese detachment had crossed the international frontier and visited Khurnak Fort, which is within Indian territory. The attention of the Chinese Government was drawn to this, and they were asked to desist from entering our territory. They were also informed of our intention to send a reconnaissance party in that area. It may be mentioned that there is no physical demarcation of the frontier in these mountainous passes, although our maps are quite clear on this subject.

3. Thereafter, at the end of July, 1959, that is, last month, a small Indian reconnaissance police party was sent to this area. As this party consisting of an officer and five others was proceeding towards the Khurnak Fort, it was apprehended by a stronger Chinese detachment on the 28th July, some miles from the border inside our territory. It appeared that the Chinese had established a camp at a place called Spanggur well within Indian territory.

4. On learning of this, a protest was immediately lodged with the Chinese Government of the violation of our frontier and the release of our reconnaissance party was asked for. In their reply, the Chinese claimed that that part of the territory was theirs, but added that they would release the persons who had been apprehended. We sent a further note to them expressing surprise at this claim and giving them the exact delineation of the traditional international frontier in this sector. We urged once again that the Chinese party well within our territory should be withdrawn. No reply

has yet been received to this note. Our party was released on the 18th August.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether this place is about fifteen miles within our territory and also whether this is the only place which is under occupation by the Chinese troops or they have occupied some other areas also?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is somewhat difficult to deal with this question, as an adjunct to the main question. Of course, there have been some frontier troubles in two or three places widely separated; and it would be hardly correct to say that our area is under occupation of the Chinese, that is, under any kind of a fixed occupation. But their patrols have come within our territory two miles or three miles or thereabouts. That is our knowledge, so far as we know.

Shri P.C. Borooah: Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the news item published in the Assam Tribune of 26th inst. that one thousand Chinese troops equipped with the most modern weapons entered Indian territory in the NEFA, and the Chinese flag had been hoisted there?

Mr. Speaker: The main question refers to Ladakh.

An Hon. Member: What happened to them?

Shri Goray: On this issue, there is an adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: That is all right; but that does not refer to Ladakh. There is no meaning in expanding a particular question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I say that there is likely to be very considerable confusion if we mix up these various areas?

Mr. Speaker: I have got an adjournment motion here on that, and I shall presently be asking the hon. Prime Minister as to what he has to say on that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What the hon. Member has just referred to is an entirely different area, and the statement in the Assam Tribune is entirely wrong, if I may say so.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will kindly confine themselves to the occupation of the Ladakhi area. There are other questions with respect to the other areas, and we shall come to them.

Shri Goray: May we know whether the Chinese had built a road across this territory joining Gartok with Yarkand and whether this road has been there for the last year or so? It passes through the Ladakhi territory.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, that is in northern Ladakh, not exactly near this place but anyhow in the Ladakhi territory.

About a year or two ago, the Chinese had built a road from Gartok towards Yarkand, that is, Chinese Turkestan; and the report was that this road passed through a corner of our north-eastern Ladakhi territory.

The House will appreciate that these areas are extraordinarily remote, almost inaccessible, and even if they can be approached, it takes weeks and weeks to march and get there.

In that connection, a reconnaissance party was sent there. I cannot exactly say when, but I think it was a little over a year ago, some time last year; I

could give the exact date, but that is immaterial here; this reconnaissance party was sent there. In fact, two parties were sent; one of them did not return and the other returned.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: When it did not return, we waited for it for two or three weeks, because these were remote areas. When it did not return, we suspected that it might have been apprehended or captured by Chinese authorities on the border.

So, we addressed the Chinese authorities; this was more than a year ago; we addressed them about a month after this incident; and they said, yes, some of our people had violated their border and come into their territory, and they had been apprehended, but because of their relations with us etc. they were going to release them, and they did release them afterwards, that is, after they had been with them about a month or so. That is concerning this road about which the hon. Member was enquiring. In all this area, there is no actual demarcation. So far as we are concerned, our maps are clear that this is within the territory of the Union of India. It may be that some of the parts are not clearly demarcated or anything like that. But obviously, if there is any dispute over any particular area, that is a matter to be discussed.

I may say that this area has nothing to do with the MacMahon Line. The MacMahon Line does not extend to the Ladakh area. It is only on the other side. This was the boundary of the old Kashmir State with Tibet and Chinese Turkestan. Nobody had marked it. But after some kind of broad surveys, the then Government had laid down that border which we have been accepting and acknowledging.

Shri Goray: Does it mean that in parts of our country which are inaccessible, any nation can come and build roads and camp there? We just

send our parties, they apprehend the parties and because of our good relations, they release them. That is all? The road remains there, the occupation remains there and we do not do anything about it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know if the hon. Member expects me to reply to that. There are two or three types of cases here. These are border and frontier questions. In regard to some parts of the border, there can be no doubt from any side that it is our border. If anybody violates it, then it is a challenge to us. There are other parts regarding which it is rather difficult to say where the immediate border is, although broadly it may be known. But it is very difficult even in a map to indicate it; if a big line is drawn, that line itself covers three or four miles, one might say, in a major map. Then there are other parts still where, there has been no demarcation in the past. Therefore, it is a matter now - it should be a matter - for consideration of the data etc. by the two parties concerned and decision taken in a normal way, as and when there is some kind of a frontier dispute.

In this particular matter, we have been carrying on since then our correspondence, concerning this particular North-East area, and suggesting that this should be considered by the two Governments.

Shri Vajpayee. The hon. Prime Minister just now said that if anyone occupies our territory, it is a challenge. May I know what positive steps are being taken, or have been taken, to enforce security measures on this border area?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Which border area?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There are thousands of miles of border. The hon. Member should be a little more specific in his question. If he is referring to



this particular corner, the Achin [sic] area, that is an area about some parts of which, if I may say so, it is not quite clear what the position is. It is not at all that particular area. About other area, the position is quite clear. The difficulty comes in regarding some places where there is no absolute certainty about it; in other places, we are quite clear and certain about it. The border is, I believe, 2500 miles long.

Shrimati Mafida Ahmed: May I know whether Government's attention has been drawn to a statement of the President, 'Azad' Kashmir, blaming India for the Chinese occupation of Ladakh and urging the Security Council to take over the responsibility of the frontiers of Jammu and Kashmir? If so, what is the reaction of Government to that?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I believe I did hear about it. I attach no importance to it.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: I would like to know if these troubles on the border are over the same areas of our territory which the Chinese had indicated as their territory in their maps, and if so, the implication thereof.

Mr. Speaker: Any further encroachments within the limits of the map?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This particular question that I answered related to one area. There are other areas too where we have had, and we are, in fact, having some trouble now. I do not want to mix it up with this. Then there will be confusion in one's mind. This is a frontier of over 2,000 miles.

Shri Vajpayee: What is the use of repeating that it is a long frontier? Are we not in a position to defend it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. No harsh words need be used.

Mr. Speaker: The Ladakh area. All the questions now will be confined to this area.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I was only venturing to say that by putting two or three places together, there would be confusion in the Members' minds. Let us take them separately so that they may be separate compartments.

There is no question of defence or not. For instance, take the Assam Tribune's statement. There is utter confusion in the Assam Tribune's mind about various territories which are thousands of miles apart which have nothing to do with each other. It has lumped them up and said - I believe in the statement in the Assam Tribune that 1,000 Chinese came over the Nathula Pass in the Kameng Frontier Division. It shows utter confusion in the mind of the writer of this. He does not know his geography, although he lives in Assam. It has nothing to do with it. The Nathula Pass is between Sikkim and Tibet and nothing has happened there. Nobody has come across there. It is said that a thousand men came there and put up the Chinese flag. It is completely baseless - I am referring to the statement so far as Nathula Pass is concerned. So far as I know, I have not heard of a Chinese flag being hoisted anywhere there.

As I was saying, there have been cases, and there are continuing cases in one or two places, of Chinese aggression. Therefore, I want to keep these separate so as not to produce confusion in the mind of hon. Members here. If this question is over, I shall proceed to the other question and deal with as they come.

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. lady Member wanted to know if any portion of Ladakh is included in the map prepared by the Chinese Government and

if this is beyond that line even with respect to Ladakh. That was that [sic] I thought when I allowed the supplementary.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Chinese Government's maps are on such a small scale and in broad splashes that some parts of Ladakh appear to be included in them. But they are not accurate enough. What we are discussing, and the question which I have answered, relates to about two or three miles. Two or three miles are not visible in those maps. But it is a fact that part of Ladakh is broadly covered by the wide sweep of their maps.

Some Hon. Members rose.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I know if the camps that have been put up by the Chinese have been removed?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Next question.

\* \* \*

### **193. In the Lok Sabha: Situation on the Northern Border<sup>83</sup>**

Mr. Speaker; I have received notices of some adjournment motions from Shri Hem Barua, Shri Goray, Shri Braj Raj Singh, Shri Harish Chandra

---

<sup>83</sup> 28 August 1959. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXIII, cols 4860-4871

Sharma,<sup>84</sup> Shri Vajpayee and another hon. Member. Shri Hem Barua's motion relates to this.

"The serious threat to peace and solidarity of our North-East Frontier arising out of the reported entry of about 1,000 Chinese troops into the Indian territory through Nathu La Pass on the Kameng Frontier Division, NEFA, and the hoisting of the Chinese Flag on the Indian side, recently." Now, the other four relate to the same matter.

Shri Vajpayee: (Balrampur): My adjournment motion does not relate to this matter because it has already been contradicted by the hon. Prime Minister<sup>85</sup>.

Mr. Speaker: Very well, Shri Goray's is the same thing.

Shri Goray (Poona): It is different, Sir. As the Prime Minister has pointed out, there were some mistakes about location and all that. I have said that in the Subanseri and Kameng division [sic] of Nepal there have been incursions of Chinese troops. Some of our patrols have been pushed back. My information is that they were disarmed and thrown out. We want to know what is the policy of the Government because it is a very grave question and it is likely to affect the politics not only of this country but other countries also in South-East Asia. So, I would like this whole question to be discussed. Let the House know where it stands. The Prime Minister said that if we want to take any firm action, this House will have to bear the burden. We are ready to bear the burden but let us know for what we are asked to bear it.

---

<sup>84</sup> Independent, Lok Sabha MP from Jaipur, Rajasthan

<sup>85</sup> See item 192

Mr. Speaker: Shri Hem Barua refers to the NEFA territory and the Kameng Frontier Division and the hoisting of the Chinese Flag on the Indian side. Shri Goray included Subanseri and Kameng Division of Nepal adjoining Tibet. He also says:

"It would appear that the Chinese troops have undertaken a systematic probing of our frontiers in Ladakh and Nepal."

Shri Braj Raj Singh has included Ladakh and says:

"...unless checked might prove harmful to the country's safety."

Shri Vajpayee's motion reads:

"To discuss the explosive situation arising out of the reported exchange of fire between Chinese forces and Indian border pickets in NEFA area recently."

Then, there is another one. I did not even propose to read this but all the same it is connected with this.

Shri Kamble's<sup>86</sup> motion reads:

"Alleged extensive probing by Chinese forces of India's defences and the vacillating and indeterminate attitude of Union Government (Ministry of Defence) resulting in (i) complete absence of policy and (ii) not taking the Parliament into confidence."

So, they are all related to the alleged disturbances and incursions by the Chinese troops in many places in the NEFA area. In one or two motions,

---

<sup>86</sup> There are two persons with the name Kamble in the Lok Sabha: Bapu Chandrasen Kamble, Independent, MP from Kopergaon-SC, Bombay; and Dr Devrao Namdevrao Pathrika Kamble, Congress, MP from Nanded-SC, Bombay.

Ladakh and Nepal are also included. We had enough discussion regarding Ladakh and Nepal. Now, the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): About the Nathu La Pass...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. After all, the hon., Member can depend only on newspaper reports. Let us hear the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Hem Barua: I just want to say a word. I am very happy the Prime Minister has contradicted this news, because we do not want this sort of awkward interventions. About the Nathu La Pass the Prime Minister said that it does not lie there. The newspaper also has not mentioned that the Nathu La Pass is lying there. The only thing that that newspaper has said is that it has to pass through the Nathu La Pass, and that is the Pass which was used by Dalai Lama while he entered into this country.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Hem Barua: That might be a mistake, but the paper has not said that it is lying there.

Shri C.D. Pande (Naini Tal): Some mistake in geography.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, I can very well understand the anxiety of the House to have information as fully as possible about this situation on our border areas. It is rather difficult for me to deal with these various adjournment motions as they are often based on wrong names, wrong areas, wrong locations. So instead of my endeavouring to deal with each adjournment motion, I shall give some specific information.

Shri Hem Barua's motion is completely upside down - one name here, one place there - and has no connection with the events or anything. He has derived it from some paper. (Interruption). Sir, may I continue?

In the course of the last two or three years, sometimes, not very frequently, there have been cases of some kind of petty intrusion on our border areas by some platoon or something of the Chinese troops, which was nothing very extraordinary, because there is no demarcation at all and parties sometimes may cross. We drew the attention of the Chinese Government in 1957-58 to this and they withdrew; there the matter ended. One instance I have already quoted, which was a more serious one. In Ladakh last year, a small police party was apprehended by them, and that matter is still under dispute or under correspondence. Now, in June this year, the Chinese Government protested to us that Indian troops had shelled and intruded into Chinese territory by occupying a place on the border, Migyitun, and some other place along the frontier - this is Tibet-NEFA - and they accused us that our troops had entered into some kind of collusion with the Tibetan rebel forces or "bandits", as they call them, carrying on illegal activities against the People's Government of China. We replied that there is no truth in this allegation, and we expressed surprise that the Chinese Government should give credence to these wrong allegations. Ultimately nothing happened there. We stayed where we were, and there was some dispute about the line.

Now, there are two matters that I would particularly like to mention; one, of course, is of very considerable importance and it is topical now. I shall come to it later. The first one is that on the 7th August an armed Chinese patrol, approximately 200 strong, violated our border at Khinzemane north of Chuthangmu in the Kameng Frontier Division. When requested to withdraw, they pushed back, actually physically pushed back, our greatly out-numbered patrol to a bridge at Drokung Samba. Our people consisted

of ten or a dozen policemen and they were about 200, about ten times us. They actually physically pushed our men back. There was no firing. Later on, the Chinese detachment withdrew and our forces again established themselves. All this was over a question of about two miles. I might say, according to us, there is an international border. Two miles on this side is this bridge and two miles on that side is our picket or the small force. So, our patrol party was pushed back to the bridge and two miles away they stood facing each other. Then both retired. It is not quite clear to me why they did so; it is a mountain and perhaps during night time both the forces retired. Whatever it was later on the Chinese withdrew and our picket went back to the frontier and established a small picket there. The Chinese patrol arrived later and demanded immediate withdrawal of our picket and lowering of our flag there. This request was refused. Then there was some attempt by the Chinese forces to outflank our people, but so far as we know our people remained there and nothing further happened; that is, on the border itself. That is one instance which happened about two weeks ago. The present incident I am talking about is a very recent one and, in fact, is a continuing one. On the 25th August, that is three days ago, a strong Chinese detachment crossed into our territory in the Subansiri Frontier Division at a place south of Migyitun and opened fire. Hon. Members will remember, I just mentioned Migyitun in connection with the Chinese protest that we have violated their territory and were in collusion with some Tibetan rebels. That was their protest made in June last, and there the matter ended. Now, round about that area, a little further away but not far from it, this Chinese detachment came and met, some distance away, our forward picket of about a dozen persons. It is said that they fired at our forward picket. They were much larger in numbers; it is difficult to say in what numbers, but they were in some hundreds, 200, 300 or, may be, even more. They surrounded this forward picket which consisted of 12 men - 1



N.C.O. and 11 Riflemen of the Assam Rifles. They apparently apprehended this lot. Later, apparently, 8 of these 11 Riflemen managed to escape. They came back to our outpost. The outpost is at a place called Longju. Longju is about 3 or 4 miles from our frontier between Tibet and India as we conceive it. Longju is five days' march from another post of ours in the interior, a little bigger post called Limeking. Limeking is about 12 days' march from the next place behind it. So, in a way, this Longju is about three weeks' march from a road-head. I merely mention this to give the House some idea of communications, transport, distance and time taken. I was saying, on the 25th they captured this forward picket of ours, but 8 of them, having been captured, apparently, escaped and came back on the 26th the next day. The Chinese again came and opened fire and practically encircled this picket and the post. In fact they came forward and encircled this post, Longju, and although there was firing for a considerable time, we had no account of any casualties. Our people apparently fired back too. When those people were more or less surrounded at Longju they left that picket and withdrew under this overwhelming pressure. This has happened only the day before yesterday evening. So, we have not been able to get any exact particulars of what has happened.

The moment this information came, we immediately protested to the Chinese Government about it and took certain other steps in that area to strengthen our various posts, Limeking and others, as we thought necessary and feasible. We have, in fact, placed all this border area of NEFA directly under our military authorities. That is to say, it was dealt with by the Assam Rifles under the Assam Rifles Directorate which has been functioning under the Governor and the Governor was the agent of the Government of India in the External Affairs Ministry. The Assam Rifles will of course remain there and such other forces as will be necessary will be

sent but they will function now under the army authorities and their headquarters.

All these have taken a little time. As I pointed out, it takes weeks. In this particular place, Longju, I imagine that this small picket of ours - it was probably altogether about 38 - may have run short of ammunition because there was no supply coming in. We tried to send supplies by air. They were dropped but they missed them. It is a mountainous area; it is not easy. It is slightly risky to send para-troopers there, risky to the men in those mountainous areas. We do not think it was desirable or worthwhile to do so at that place, - dangerous. Anyhow, we have taken such steps as were feasible.

In fact, while I was sitting here, I have heard from our Ambassador from Peking. When he handed over this note to the Chinese authorities, the reply was that their information was different. The Director said that the information that the Chinese Government had received was contained in the note handed over to Kannampilly,<sup>87</sup> one of our men there. Regarding the incident at Migyitun according to their report, it was the Indians who fired first; the Chinese frontier guards had opened fire only in self-defence. They had received no information yet of the clash at Longju on the 26th August. This is the Chinese answer. The Director said that the situation in this sector of the border was tense because Indian troops were continuously pushing forward. We see here the same kind of language, repetition of the reports we have, say, between India and Pakistan; that is, we make a statement and an exactly opposite, contrary statement is made by the other side, as to who started firing.

I confess that in these matters I give credence to our own reports and I believe it is true because I would rather believe my own men who are there and who are trained men not used to exaggeration and also because the

---

<sup>87</sup> Karunakara Menon Kannampilly, Counsellor, Indian Embassy, Peking, 1958-61

circumstantial evidence also supports their account. In fact, our Ambassador pointed this out to the Chinese people. So, that is the position. While I do not wish to take an alarmist view of the situation - in themselves these are minor incidents [-] it is a little difficult to understand what lies behind these minor incidents. In any event, we have to be vigilant and protect our borders as best as we can.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): I think we must have a two hour discussion for this subject.

Shri Goray: The point is this. It is not a question of taking any alarmist view of the position or anything like that. The real issue is about what is happening in Ladakh, Bhutan, Sikkim and in NEFA. The Prime Minister said that these localities are separated from each other by hundreds of miles. It is true, but it seems that the guiding hand behind them is the same. Therefore, the question is, what is our evaluation of the Chinese policy towards us. As I said, it is not a question of the effect it produces on us. If India fails to do its duty, I suppose the next will be Burma. After that, it will be Indonesia. It may then be Laos. All these South-East Asian countries look to us for guidance and if we fail to protect our borders, do you mean to say that smaller countries will derive encouragement? Therefore, I want this House to discuss this matter thoroughly and the House should be taken into confidence.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Are all these incidents an indication that there is a Chinese design to determine the border as is shown in the map of theirs by saying that they have come under their occupation? If one studies all the incidents - I have tried to study them - it is an indication that this is part of such a design. Their maps show that all these portions are theirs, a

transgression of the so-called MacMahon line. So, is it an indication of the Chinese design to occupy them and say, "This is the border between India and China?"

Shri B. Das Gupta<sup>88</sup> (Purulia): In view of the incidents off and on in Ladakh, etc., may I ask whether any proposal has been sent to the Chinese Government for any talks regarding this matter between the two Governments?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram): Regarding the check post, the Prime Minister said that it is very difficult to drop paratroopers. May I know whether it is possible - I do not want to suggest that it should be done straightaway - to bomb that area in order to extricate it from Chinese heads?

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): May I know whether this incursion into NEFA which has been repeated in quick succession is due to the cartographic inaccuracy in the maps about which we have complained to the Chinese Government and the Chinese Government have told us that this is the handiwork of the Chiang Kai-shek regime?

Mr. Speaker: That is the same as Shri Khadilkar's point.

Pandit Govind Malaviya<sup>89</sup> (Sultanpur): Our Prime Minister has clearly indicated the general attitude of the Government in this matter. We are in a delicate situation where, on the one hand, China is a friend of ours and we

---

<sup>88</sup> Bibhu Bhushan Das Gupta, Manbhum Lok Sevak Sangh, Lok Sabha MP from Purulia, West Bengal

<sup>89</sup> Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Sultanpur, Uttar Pradesh

have a broad foreign policy which has the approval of every section of the House, and on the other, we have got to safeguard our frontiers. I wonder whether this going into minute details will help anybody or the Opposition. Why should we raise questions about these details and small things here and there? The problem is a big one. Can we not at present leave matters to the Government in such big questions and can we not have one policy on such big matters? In internal matters, we may have different policies but on matters of national honour, let us maintain a unanimous stand.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may kindly leave it to the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: On the question of broad policies, well, broad policies are in our mind. We have to face here a particular situation. Any country which has to face that situation has to stand up to it. There can be no doubt about it. There is no alternative for us but to defend our country's borders and integrity [sic] having said that, at the same time, we must not, as often happens in such cases, become alarmist and panicky and thereby take wrong action.

Obviously, apart from some past information, I have given the latest information to the House, including the telegram, which came to me while I was sitting here. In this telegram, apart from other things, our ambassador has said:

"I pointed out that four persons" - it is really three - "were still missing as a result of the incident of the 25th August and that on the 26th August, Chinese troops had overrun Longiu, which the Chinese knew very well to be within Indian territory. I reiterated our Government's wish that the Chinese Government should take immediate steps to see that there was no

assertion of supposed claims by force. Differences should be settled by negotiations. "

We have taken the line that minor border incidents and border differences should be settled by negotiations. We must distinguish between this and that broad approach of the Chinese maps which have with a stroke of the brush coloured hundreds of miles of Indian territory. That is totally and manifestly unacceptable and we have made it clear. We stick to the MacMahon line. But it is quite another thing that in this long line there may be minor arguments about a mile here or a mile there. Those arguments have been there before the Chinese came to Tibet. Even with the Tibetan authorities, these arguments about a mile of grazing ground here or there have been there. We admit that these are differences which exist and which should be settled. We think we are right but let us sit round a conference table and settle them. We are prepared to take up any matter like that, but when it comes to huge chunks of territory, it is not a matter for discussion. The one or two instances that I have stated are, again, according to us, clearly intrusion into our territory. But suppose that there is some question of a Tibetan or Chinese case about a mile here or there well, we are prepared to discuss it. But from such information as we have received and which I have placed before the House, when their forces come, envelop our check-posts and capture them after firing, it is not the normal peaceful way of approaching these questions, even if there is a dispute.- Therefore, this matter becomes a much more serious one than some incidental or accidental border affray.

I think Shri Khadilkar or someone else asked about what lies behind this. I cannot say. It is not fair for me to guess - it will be guess work, of course but I cannot imagine that all this is a precursor to anything more serious. It seems to me so foolish for anybody, including the Chinese Government, to function in that way, and I do not give them the credit or rather the

discredit for folly. Therefore, I do not think they will do it. But so far as we are concerned, we should naturally be prepared for any eventuality and without fuss or shouting keep vigilant.

Some hon. Member, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, I think, gave me some advice and gave some advice to our military as to how they should act, where they should air-drop and where they should not. These are things for them to consider, not for us, as to where it is possible, where it is desirable or where it is not.

An hon. Member suggested a discussion on this. I am always in favour of a discussion in this House, but I do not see how a discussion in this case will serve anyone's purpose. When things are happening, I shall place the facts before the House as they take place and if any step is to be indicated, I shall place that also before the House.

Shri Vajpayee: May I suggest that the Government should issue a White Paper detailing all these developments, our border dispute with the Chinese and this cartographic aggression, so that world opinion may be well-informed?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am prepared to consider that. It will take a little time to issue such a paper.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the elaborate statement made by the hon. Prime Minister, I do not think it is desirable that I should give consent for discussion on these adjournment motions. Consent is refused.

\* \* \*

#### **194. To Subimal Dutt: Chinese Trade Agency in Kalimpong<sup>90</sup>**

---

<sup>90</sup> Note, 29 August 1959

I have read these notes. The Chinese Charge complained about not being permitted to buy a house in Kalimpong.<sup>91</sup> That is correct. He also said something about the plans for building their Chancery in the Diplomatic Enclave in Delhi which, according to him, were sent four or six months ago. All the answer he got was that the plan was not approved for want of Government concurrence, whatever that might mean. I think this matter should be inquired into. There is no reason why we should come in the way of their building their Chancery or Embassy. If there is any technical hitch, this should be removed.

\* \* \*

**195. To Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit: China, Eisenhower, Macmillan<sup>92</sup>**

No. Primin-21138.

Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit from Prime Minister.

You must have received full text of my statement in Parliament about Chinese intrusion on our frontiers adjoining Tibet.<sup>93</sup> Also telegram from Foreign Secretary explaining our position. No further developments have taken place on the frontiers. We shall keep you informed. What has happened is no doubt serious and we are taking such measures as we can. We should avoid treating it as immediate grave crisis.

2. I see from newspapers that you are meeting President Eisenhower tomorrow.<sup>94</sup> Please convey my greetings to him and repeat our invitation to him to come to India whenever it is convenient to him.<sup>95</sup> You may also

---

<sup>91</sup> See also SWJN/SSI50/item 158

<sup>92</sup> Telegram, 30 August 1959

<sup>93</sup> See item 193

<sup>94</sup> President Eisenhower arrived in London on 27 August on a five-day visit to the UK. The Times, 28 August 1959

<sup>95</sup> See item 210



briefly tell him about our frontier developments on basis of information you possess.

3. Please convey following message on my behalf to Macmillan.

[Begins.

My dear Prime Minister,

Day before yesterday I made a full statement in our Parliament about certain developments on our northern frontier with Tibet. This must have come to your notice. These recent happenings are really culmination of progressive Chinese unfriendliness towards India. The situation is causing us concern but I do not expect any major crisis arising in the near future. It is very difficult for us to know what the Chinese authorities may have in mind except that they are angry with us chiefly because of our treatment of the Dalai Lama and our general attitude about Tibet. I do not think, however, that they are likely to take any extreme step.

Our frontiers with Tibet are remote and difficult of access from our side. It takes nearly a month to reach the affected regions by bridle path through forests and across high mountains. To some extent, it is possible to airdrop men and supplies in places not too far from the frontier though even this can be done only in a limited number of places because of the difficult terrain. We are, however, taking steps to guard our frontiers.

While we shall take a firm line on this issue, we shall try to avoid any step which might lead to a break with China. We have to keep in view not only present but the future also and it would be most unfortunate if the relations of India and China became permanently hostile to each other. Our frontier with the Chinese State extends to about 2,500 miles.

The question of taking the Tibet issue to the United Nations has been raised. Some people may even say that the present Chinese intrusion across our borders might also be taken to the United Nations. We do not

propose to do so as we feel this will not serve any useful purpose and might only make matters worse. I shall keep you informed of important developments directly or through your High Commissioner here.<sup>96</sup>

Kind regards,

Jawaharlal.

Ends.]

\* \* \*

### **196. In the Rajya Sabha: Chinese Road Construction in Ladakh<sup>97</sup>**

Shri D.P. Singh:<sup>98</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased, to state:

(a) whether the report which appeared in the Times of India (Delhi edition) of August 26, 1959, that the Chinese have built a road across Indian territory in Ladakh,<sup>99</sup> is correct;

(b) if so, when the road was built and how much Indian territory is involved in the construction of the road;

(c) when Government learnt about this encroachment by the Chinese on Indian territory; and

(d) what steps have so far been taken by Government to drive out the Chinese from the Indian territory occupied by them?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) to (d). According to an announcement made in China, the Yecheng-Gartok Road, which is also called the Sinkiang-Tibet Highway, was completed in September 1957. Our attention was drawn to a very small scale map, about

---

<sup>96</sup> Malcolm MacDonald

<sup>97</sup> 31 August 1959. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXVI, Nos. 14-24, cols 2281-2288.

<sup>98</sup> Devendra Prasad Singh, PSP, Rajya Sabha MP from Bihar

<sup>99</sup> The newspaper reported Chinese construction of a road in Aksai Chin in 1958 linking Gartok in western Tibet with Yarkand and Kashgar in Sinkiang, and GOI's first information about this when an Indian party were arrested and released in 1959

2 ¼ x 1 ¾ inches, published in a Chinese newspaper, indicating the rough alignment of the road. It was not possible to find out from this small map whether this road crossed Indian territory although it looked as if it did so. It was decided, therefore, to send reconnaissance parties in the following Summer to find out the alignment of this road. Two reconnaissance parties were accordingly sent last year. One of these parties was taken into custody by a superior Chinese detachment. The other returned and gave us some rough indication of this newly constructed road in the Aksai Chin area. According to their report, this road enters Indian territory in the south near Sarigh Jilganang lake and runs north-west leaving Indian territory near Hajilangar in the north-west corner of Ladakh.

2. Representations were made to the Chinese Government in a note presented to the Chinese Ambassador at New Delhi on the 18th October, 1958, drawing their attention to the construction of the road through Indian territory and the arrest of 15 members of the Indian reconnaissance party within the Indian border. The Chinese Government in their reply, presented on the 1<sup>st</sup> November, 1958, notified the release of the party and claimed that the road ran through Chinese territory. A further note expressing our surprise at the Chinese contention was presented to the Chinese authorities on the 8th November, 1958. Reminders have been given subsequently. No further answers have been received.

3. The Aksai Chin area has a general elevation of over 17,000 ft. The entire Ladakh area including Aksai Chin became a part of the Jammu and Kashmir State as a result of a treaty signed in 1842 on behalf of Maharaja Gulab Singh on the one side and the Lama Gurusahib of Lahsa [sic] - this is the name written in the agreement which I am quoting - and the representative of the Emperor of China on the other. Ever since then

this area has been a part of the Jammu and Kashmir State. Various attempts at demarcating the boundary between J&K State and Tibet were made subsequently by British officers. The Chinese Government was asked to send their representatives to co-operate in this work. They did not take part. The Chinese Commissioner, however, stated on the 13th January, 1847 as follows:

"I beg to observe that the borders of these territories have been sufficiently and distinctly fixed so that it would be best to adhere to this ancient arrangement, and it will prove far more convenient to abstain from any additional measures for fixing them."

The British officers were also of the same opinion. Although no actual demarcation was made on the ground, maps were prepared on the basis of old usage and convention. These maps have been used in India for the last hundred years or so. They include the Aksai Chin region as part of Ladakh. Since the boundary of the Aksai Chin region' with China-Tibet has not been marked on the ground, once or twice questions have been raised about the exact alignment of this boundary. Old Chinese maps have shown a different alignment.

Shri D.P. Singh: May I know, Sir, why Parliament was not taken into confidence earlier in regard to this matter?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There was not much to take into confidence about, Sir. This was - I gave the date - about November last, and we sent them our protest and subsequent reminders. This is an area peculiarly suited, obviously, for some kind of consultations and decision as to the facts, because the facts are very complicated, the Chinese claiming that area. In fact, without our knowledge they have made a road in that extreme corner and we have been dealing with it in correspondence. No particular occasion

arose to bring the matter to the House, because we thought that we might make progress by correspondence and when the time was ripe for it we would inform Parliament.

Shri D.P. Singh: In view of the fact that the Chinese claim that this admittedly Indian territory is within their frontier and that our protest was lodged as far back as July or August 1958, and in view of the fact that the Chinese claim is unjustified and no reply has been sent to the Indian Government, does not the Government contemplate ousting the Chinese from this Indian territory by force? Will not the Government of India at least consider the advisability of bombing the road, built in our territory, out of existence?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir. Government will not consider that course, because that is not the way Government would like to function in such matters. The hon. Member started by saying that this is admittedly Indian territory, but the Chinese would not agree to it. That is a contradiction in terms. As a matter of fact, it is Indian territory and we claim it so because we think that the weight of evidence is in our favour - maps etc. But the Chinese produce their own maps, equally old, which are in their favour. And the territory is sterile. It has been described as a barren, uninhabited region without a vestige of grass and 17,000 ft. high.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: And the hon. Member wants it to be bombed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In places like this, decisions can only be made by conferences by agreement. Countries do not - should not go to war without proceeding in those other ways over such matters.

Shri D.P. Singh: What are we to do when the Chinese Government does not even answer our protest sent as far back as August or so.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member's dates are not quite correct. They did send an answer, and we sent an answer to that.

Mr. Chairman: The last was on 8th November, 1958. After that did you send any reminders?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: After that we sent them reminders to which they did not send an answer. That is true.

Shri Y.K. Dhage: In spite of reminders?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In spite of reminders. We can only send further reminders.

Dr. Raghubir Singh:<sup>100</sup> The hon. Prime Minister said there are some old Chinese maps in which this territory has been shown to be our territory...

Several Hon. Members: No, as their territory.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is different. There is no question about that. There was a report this month, in August, not about this area, but an area near Ladakh, a considerable distance away from this area, on the eastern area of Ladakh border of Tibet, where a Chinese detachment was seen by a reconnaissance party, a small Indian patrol in that area; and ultimately I think 7, 8 or 10 persons - I do not remember the number - were

---

<sup>100</sup> Congress, Rajya Sabha MP from Madhya Pradesh

apprehended by the Chinese and later released. The same claim arises here, they say it is their territory and we say it is ours. And the matter arose, as I said, this month and we are carrying on correspondence about that territory. These places are not demarcated on the land. We go by our maps which the Chinese do not recognise and they go presumably by their maps, whatever they have. And this was four or five miles according to our maps, may be seven or eight miles, I am not sure, where the Chinese patrol came. And we are told that they have established a small check post a little within our side of the international border there, just on the eastern Ladakh border of Tibet. This is near a place called Chusun near which we have one of our own check posts.

Dr. Raghubir Sinh: Oh, then I am sorry.

Shri T.S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:<sup>101</sup> Pending their reply, Sir, may I know whether the building of this road has been stopped?

Mr. Chairman: The road has been built, I think.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The road was built. Roads in these areas, Sir, are rather of a peculiar type. In these very high areas the ground is so hard, harder than normal cement, and the only thing you have to do to build a road is to even the ground a little and remove stones and shrubs. I cannot even now say when it was built. But reports about it, as I said, reached us from a small Chinese map two years ago. There is also from the Chinese point of view, another question that arises, i.e. whether it is part of Chinese Sinkiang or part of Tibet, because according to some Chinese claims, it belongs to Chinese Sinkiang - some old claims which were advanced later on.

---

<sup>101</sup> Congress, Rajya Sabha MP from Madras

Shri V.K. Dhage: May I know whether there are any persons under arrest with the Chinese still?

Shri Jaswant Singh: The Prime Minister stated a little while ago that this portion of Ladakh is absolutely desolate and unfertile and that not even a blade of grass grows there. Even then, China is attaching importance to that area and is building a road there. I would like to know, when China is attaching so much of importance to this desolate bit of land, why, when the territory is ours or is under dispute even, we do not attach any importance to this area?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: They have all been let off.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I talked only about the Yehcheng area, not about the whole of Ladakh although the whole of Ladakh, broadly speaking, is 11,000 to 17,000 and 20,000 feet high. Presumably the Chinese attach importance to this area because of the fact that this route connects part of Chinese Turkestan with Gartok-Yehcheng. This is an important connection.

Shri D.P. Singh: May I know whether Government have received any further reports to say that the Chinese have extended their occupation and control over larger areas than when we got information first about this road?

Shri Rajendra Pratap Singh: May I know whether Government has any check posts on that Ladakh border?



Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Not about that particular area, Sir, but I think there is another question, I am not quite sure...

Mr. Chairman: There is another question?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have some check posts. For instance, I have just mentioned a check post called Chusun. It is not only a check post but is an improvised airfield where some four years ago I happened to go also.

[Translation begins:

Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan: Is it true that even on the Almora side of U.P., which borders Tibet, the Chinese have occupied one or two places on the Indian border?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, sir, in our information this has not been done.  
Translation ends]

\* \* \*

### **197. In the Rajya Sabha: Chinese Incursion in NEFA<sup>102</sup>**

Diwan Chaman Lall:<sup>103</sup>

Shri V.K. Dhage:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether there have been any incursions by Chinese nationals on Indian territory in North East Frontier Agency during the last few days; and if so, what is the position in regard to this matter?

---

<sup>102</sup> 31 August 1959. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXVI, Nos. 14-24, cols 2288-92

<sup>103</sup> Congress, Rajya Sabha MP from Punjab

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): On the 7th August 1959, an armed Chinese patrol entered Indian territory by crossing the border at Khinzemane in the Kameng-Frontier Division of N.E.F.A. They pushed back our patrol, which was greatly out-numbered, a mile or two to a small bridge at Drokung Samba. Later the Chinese detachment withdrew.

2. On the 4th August another Chinese patrol tried to out-flank Khinzemane, but did not succeed and withdrew. We have had no further reports from this area since then and it may, therefore, be assumed that our position at this border remains undisturbed.

3. There was another Chinese incursion into Indian territory in a different area in the N.E.F.A. on the 25th August. This was in the Subansiri Frontier Division a little south of Mygitun and slightly beyond Longju where there was an Indian outpost. This Chinese detachment came up against an Indian forward picket and opened fire on them. This Indian picket consisted of 1 N.C.O. and 10 Riflemen of the Assam Rifles. Our picket was apprehended by the Chinese, but later eight of the eleven Riflemen managed to escape to our outpost at Longju on the 26th August, the Chinese troops approached Longju and opened fire on our post. It appears that our men at this post had to abandon their position on being encircled. We have had no further information of subsequent developments in this area.

4. We protested immediately to the Chinese Government about this intrusion of their troops into Indian territory and their opening fire on our men. The Chinese Government have themselves lodged a protest with us based on the allegation that our armed troops intruded into their territory south of Mygitun and opened fire on their guards at this place. According to

this Chinese note, the Chinese frontier guards fired back in self defence. In this Chinese note it is also mentioned that the dead body of an Indian was recovered by them. I may add, Sir, that since this reply was drafted, the reply that I have just read out, we have received some little further information from two of our men from Longju who were contacted and, according to them, our party had come away from Longju, about two days' march from Longju and had established a forward post at Gallen. It is not clear whether the Chinese patrols have occupied Longju or are merely moving round about it.

Diwan Chaman Lall: May I ask whether it is a fact that some more incursions have taken place recently? There were some reports in the press to the effect that some more outposts belonging to the Assam Rifles have been occupied. Is that statement correct?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We have no information on that subject and on the whole, we get fairly quick information about the N.E.F.A. border and I should imagine that these reports are not correct.

Shri V.K. Dhage: May I know what steps are being taken to prevent such incursions?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is hardly possible for me to tell the House what military or like steps we have taken in such matters. It is not possible, if I may put it that way, to prevent an incursion over a two thousand mile frontier but it is possible to take some steps to repulse that incursion or to strengthen our defences but the House should remember that while it is our duty, of course, to defend our borders and to strengthen them and thus protect the integrity of India, one does not normally, in the case of big countries, suddenly start as if there was a war between them and hit out all

round. One considers these things and one tries to settle matters by talks etc. At the same time, one defends oneself at the time of an attack. It does not obviously make very much of a difference physically to China or to India whether a mile or two in the high mountains belongs to them or to us but it does matter very much if a treaty is broken or an aggressive attitude is taken. Where these matters occur, we have to follow a double policy, one, of course, of defence, and the other, always to settle these matters by conferences.

Shri H.P. Saksena:<sup>104</sup> May I know, Sir, if the Government of India look upon these unprovoked incursions by the Chinese into our territory as friendly acts?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Prima facie, it would appear that they are not very friendly.

Shri M.H. Samuel: Is there any information about the eight men who escaped from Longju? Have they reported back to any of our outposts?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have just said that two of them were contacted and they gave us some information. I do not quite know where the remaining six are. It is possible that they may be with our other men. It is very difficult. We can get information from an outpost but people in between two outposts cannot send messages.

Shri Jaswant Singh: I would like to know whether, in regard to this particular territory where incursions have been made by the Chinese, there

---

<sup>104</sup> Har Prasad Saksena, Congress, Rajya Sabha MP from UP

is any doubt about the ownership of the territory, or, are we certain that it belongs to us?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, the Chinese not only doubt it but claim ownership of that particular strip. I do not know how far it is correct but they claim that particular strip and they said to our men that that strip belongs to them. Whether they are justified in doing so or not is another matter.

Diwan Chaman Lall: May I ask whether it is possible for the Prime Minister to indicate the reasons why the Chinese have taken to this aggressive action against us in these areas at this time?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is obviously a matter of conjecture. First of all, I would like to distinguish between the position in the North-East and the position in Ladakh. The position in Ladakh is different from the position in the North-Eastern Frontier Agency and these borders. All these borders are parts of the so called MacMahon Line. If you accept the MacMahon Line you accept all that frontier really from Burma onwards to a good long way, to Nepal. That does not apply to the Ladakh border which was for all these long years under the Jammu and Kashmir State and nobody knew exactly what was happening there although some British officers went a hundred years ago and drew a line and the Chinese did not accept that line. That matter is clearly one for consideration and debate but that does not apply to this area. Here there was a MacMahon Line and undoubtedly this is in our view a clear case of aggression. Why they have done so, I cannot naturally say exactly. It is a conjecture.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: May I know whether the hon. Prime Minister agrees with the impression of the Communist Party in India when they say that they are only acts of slight misunderstanding between the two countries and they are nothing unfriendly or nothing over which we should be worried - these incursions into NEFA borders?

(No reply)

\* \* \*

**234. For Harold Macmillan<sup>105</sup>**

No. Primin-21123.

High Commissioner from Prime Minister.

Please convey following message to Mr. Macmillan.

Begins.

My dear Prime Minister,

I am grateful to you for your two messages. I am very glad to have the news about the Queen that you have sent me.<sup>106</sup> The recent tour has been from all accounts very strenuous<sup>107</sup>. Having some experience of strenuous tours myself I have come to the conclusion that there must be free days for rest. I hope that in any future tours that the Queen might undertake the programme would be lighter and rest days will be provided. Anyhow this strain is over now, and I am glad she is well and is having full rest now at Balmoral.

2. I have already sent a number of messages about Laos to you and Selwyn Lloyd. I have felt all along that it is essential to keep the frame-work of the Geneva Agreement working. Otherwise there will be no firm anchorage. If

---

<sup>105</sup> Telegram, to Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, 7 August 1959

<sup>106</sup> The Queen's pregnancy was announced the same day, 7 August; Andrew, her third child, was born on 19 February 1960

<sup>107</sup> Of Canada, 18 June to 1 August

the two Co-Chairmen agree to any procedure in keeping with the Geneva Agreement and with the consent of the parties concerned, that will be welcome. But it is obvious that the consent of both the parties is necessary. It would be desirable also to keep the Commission in the picture in some form or other.

3. We have all learnt with great satisfaction of President Eisenhower's invitation to Mr. Khrushchev and a return visit by the President to the Soviet Union later. I think that this is very good news indeed. It indicates an earnest desire to try to break down the barriers of suspicion and thus make it easier to arrive later at some agreements.

4. Talks about the Indus Waters Plan are now proceeding in London.<sup>296</sup> There are still some hurdles to be crossed, but I hope that we shall ultimately succeed in arriving at a settlement.

5. The developments in Tibet have given us many headaches and have had a powerful effect on opinion here. It is not our practice to make public condemnations but we have made our position clear to the Chinese Government and to our people. We have at present about 12,400 refugees from Tibet in India. Most of them have come directly to India. Some have come via Bhutan as the Bhutan Government was anxious to get rid of them. About a hundred more have recently come to Bhutan who will ultimately be transferred to India.

6. To begin with, we kept these refugees in some big camps, but we have been trying to disperse them as far as possible. We are arranging educational facilities for the young boys and some selected Lamas. The aged ones have necessarily to be looked after by us. For most of the others, except some Lamas, we are trying to find some work. We may be able to settle some on lands in the North-East Frontier Agency. There are also arrangements to train selected refugees in crafts. The senior Lamas are being given facilities to continue their studies according to Tibetan-

Buddhist traditions. In all these matters we have proceeded in consultation with the Dalai Lama.

7. The Dalai Lama and his party are still at Mussoorie. There appears to be little chance of his returning to Tibet in the foreseeable future. He has no present intention of going outside India. Probably he will pay a visit to us in Delhi next month. He is a charming and intelligent young man.

8. It is a little difficult to get any detailed or accurate information about conditions in Tibet. But it would appear that the Chinese Government sent large forces to Tibet and have succeeded in crushing the rebellion there except for a few small pockets. There is a military administration all over Tibet and an attempt is being made to push through their reforms which means confiscation of lands belonging to the landlord classes and the principal monasteries and distributing them among landless people. There is also a definite attempt to destroy the influence of the Lamas. There are also reports of considerable numbers of Chinese being brought to settle in Tibet.

9. We have had some difficulties about the treatment of our nationals in Tibet and we have been carrying on correspondence with the Chinese Government on this subject.

10. You mentioned the question of newsprint. I am enquiring into this matter.

With kind regards,  
Jawaharlal.

Ends.

\* \* \*



## **Harold Macmillan to Nehru<sup>108</sup>**

[Refer to items 114, 218 and 234]

Dear Prime Minister,

It is some time since we exchanged messages. I was so glad that Krishna Menon was able to arrange things with our people about the Avro aeroplane.

We are giving a lot of thought to the whole future of the aircraft industry. The trouble is the frightful cost of these new machines; and I suppose they will get more and more expensive.

The Parliamentary Session has just ended but not, I fear, the Geneva Conference. Quite frankly, I have been disappointed at the rather legalistic approach of some of our friends. I am afraid my visit to Russia and my talks with Mr. Khrushchev caused some anxieties among the Western Leaders. But this mood is passing and I feel confident that there is a genuine relaxation of tension. The negotiations have really made considerable advances from both sides. Anyway instead of talking about an "ultimatum" or "unilateral action on either side", the Foreign Ministers are now talking about an interim period or moratorium.

Meanwhile, President Eisenhower's invitation of Mr. Khrushchev to America seems to help in this process. If, as I hope, the President pays a return visit all this will take time and will allow the heat of dispute engendered by the ultimatum of November 27, 1958, to cool off. Of course, it may delay the Summit but it will make it more likely to succeed when the time comes.

I hear good news about Mr. Black and the Indus Waters Plan. We have been asked to put up still more money and we shall certainly try to do so. I have always felt that if this technical and economic problem were out of the way it would make the whole difference politically.

---

<sup>108</sup> Message, sent from London. This was contained in a letter of 2 August 1959 of Malcolm MacDonald to Nehru; the actual date of Macmillan's message is not available

I am sorry you have this trouble in Kerala. But, if I may be allowed to say so, you have been very patient. Now, action is clearly necessary.

We get little information about Tibet. I would be grateful if you would send me any impressions you may have. Will the Chinese go the whole way in trying to substitute a Marxist system for the traditional one?

We have rather disturbing news from Laos. I hope it may be exaggerated. We will keep in close touch with you over it.

We shall indeed be sorry to lose your sister. I don't suppose she tells you now much she is respected - and loved - over here. But it is true. She has done a truly wonderful piece of work.

With kind regards,

Harold.

P.S.

Mr. Durga Das, the Editor of *The Hindustan Times* for whom I have a great regard, called to see me the other day. He seemed very disturbed at the small amount of newsprint that you can import into India with all the other calls upon your financial resources. He felt that with the immense growth of literacy this was very sad and gave the Communists a chance of distributing their material. It is not my business but do you think there is anything that I can do to help? I would willingly discuss it with President Eisenhower and my own colleagues and see whether some assistance could be given. Please forgive me if I am interfering.

\* \* \*