

Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru

Series II

Volume 27

Page 3

VISIT TO CHINA¹

A Great Event in History'

Question: Does your visit² have any special significance in view of the recently concluded SEATO?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Numerous conferences like the SEATO³ are being held here, there and everywhere. But these two great nations-India and China have lived for 10,000 years and want to do it another 10,000 years or more. The meeting, therefore, between the Prime Ministers of India and China is a very big thing itself and a world event.

In my recent speech in Parliament, I referred to India's having the possibility of being the fourth great country of the world because of its size etc.⁴ In saying so I was not thinking in terms of what were called "great powers", nor had I any intention of comparing India with the great nations of Europe or elsewhere. I was merely pointing out the capacity and potentiality of India and not talking in terms of armed powers.

We would, however, like to compete with them in the urge for peace and the welfare of the people. The whole idea of rivalry and competition between nations, big or small, have become out of date now and the idea of cooperation

¹ Press conference at Government House, Calcutta, 15 October 1954. From the National Herald and The ,Amrita Bazar Patrika, 16 October 1954. Extracts.

² In response to an invitation from the Prime Minister of China. Nehru visited China from 18 to 30 October 1954.

³ The South East Asia Collective Defense Treaty, also known as the Manila Treaty, was signed by eight nations on 8 September 1954 with the avowed objective to check the spread of communism in the region and to present a united retaliation in case of aggression. See also .Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 26. pp. 319-324.

⁴ On 10 September 1954. See Selected Works, (second series). Vol. 26. pp. 332-344.

should take its place in order to solve the problems of the world.

I do not understand why some people in other countries did not appreciate the Five Principles, which India had agreed to with China.⁵ except for the reason that they did not like any understanding or cooperation between India and China.

One of the major factors today is the revolutionary change that has taken over the face of Asia. This has many aspects, different from one another and the process is a continuing one. The fact that this is not liked elsewhere does not make it less significant, nor does it check it. Indeed, the obstruction placed in its way only made it more self conscious and more determined to go ahead, and for Asia to lead its own life.

I am going to China with no set purpose but simply to pay a friendly return visit to that great country and to continue the talks which we had started in Delhi with a view to greater understanding of each other.⁶

It is essential for the peace not only of Asia, but of the world, that the two great countries like India and China should understand each other and have friendly relations.

Q: Some London newspapers have commented that your aim at Peking would be to extract promises of good behaviour from the Chinese communists.⁷

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: These comments were based on fear psychosis-fear of communism or fear of American expansion. I am not afraid or rather, to put it differently, I believe in a country having the strength to live its own life. If it has to rely on others to protect it, then it has already lost something that is vital to itself. Therefore, I think, that the policy based on combinations of military powers is not likely to yield the expected results; on the other hand, combinations, which make countries dependent on others or entangled with others, inevitably come in the way of their following a policy of their own

⁵ On 29 April 1954. See Selected Works, (second series). Vol. 25, pp. 468-469.

⁶ Chou En-lai visited India from 25 to 28 June 1954. See Selected Works, (second series). Vol. 26. pp. 366-401.

⁷ It was widely speculated that Nehru during his meetings with Mao and Chou would seek commitment on two issues, viz.. Chinese Government would not support communist parties in Asian countries and would accord constitutional right to overseas Chinese to become nationals of the countries of their residence.

choice.

In every matter, national or international or, for the matter, of their domestic affairs, they must have a list of priorities. In international matters, the first thing today is avoidance of war because the coming of any war will upset everything else. Therefore, every policy should be judged primarily from the point of view of maintenance of peace. By peace it is not meant just an absence of shooting; war or continuance of cold war. By peace is meant something more than the creation of an atmosphere or climate of peace. That is a surer guarantee of security than many armed pacts or threats of armed actions by this group or the other.

It was clear that war today had ceased to lead to the results aimed at. War had ceased to be a continuation of politics now, because the objective aimed at could not be attained through war. If that is so and if the result of war is uttermost destruction and, probably putting an end to what we know as modern civilization, then we must avoid it at all costs.

Military pacts are in the nature of sanctions. When the UN Charter was framed it was realized that it was not much good, I mean, having sanctions against what were called great powers. Because the application of these sanctions meant war on a big scale, it had been laid down in the UN Constitution that the five so-called great powers had a veto on the Security Council, which means, in fact, that no action could be taken against any one of these great powers by the others through the UN. Now, that is not democracy, but a recognition of the existing state of affairs in the world.

Similarly, now, the big pacts, whatever virtue they might have had in the past, did not really make much difference either to the military strength of the rival blocs or in terms of peace. They only irritated and made the other party more military-minded. The word coexistence had, therefore, been used, but some countries objected to this. Yet, there was no alternative to coexistence, except war and mutual destruction.

We have to accept the fact that different countries have different political, economic and social systems and that they should have perfect liberty to adopt and maintain their own systems. Interference brings about conflict. In the case of small countries, they may surrender because of fear, while in the case of big

countries, there is conflict.

Therefore, coexistence must necessarily be accompanied by "non interference" with other countries, internally or externally. That does not mean not having cooperation. Indeed, there should be an attempt for more and more cooperation, but any attempt at interference must necessarily result in friction. The Five Principles we have agreed to with China, are theoretically the perfect approach between two countries to rule out aggression or interference. If practically applied between countries, they rule out chances of conflict or even of friction. I, therefore, do not understand why some people in other countries do not appreciate these Five Principles except for the reason that they do not like any understanding or cooperation between India and China.

Q: What in your opinion is an alternative to SEATO?

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: What is the alternative to hitting a man in the face? I say don't hit.

Q: What is the objective of the proposed Afro-Asian Conference?

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: It is an old idea put forward at the Colombo Conference by the Indonesian Prime Minister⁸ and welcomed by others. The only difficulty was in giving shape to the idea, which is now being done. The idea had no particular objective, except to encourage cooperation and understanding between these countries. Obviously, one of the essential things that came to our mind was that these countries should help in the preservation of peace....

Page 6

Foreign Policy and Fear Complex⁹

⁸ Ali Sastroamidjojo had proposed it on 30 April 1954 during the sixth meeting of the Colombo Conference. See Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 25, pp. 431-433. See also post pp. 106-129.

⁹ Summary of talks with Mao Tse-tung, Beijing, 19 October 1954. Also present were the Indian Ambassador to China, N. Raghavan; Premier, Chou En-lai; Vice-Chairman C'hu Teh; Chairman of the Congress of Standing Committee, Liu Shao-chi; Vice-Chairman of the Standing Committee, Sung Ching-ling; Vice-Premier, Chen Yun; Chinese Ambassador to India, Yuan Chung-hsien; V.V. Paranjpe and Pu Shou-chang acted as interpreters. JN Collection. Also

Chairman Mao Tse-tung enquired after Nehru's health and after the usual courtesies he said that he was very glad to meet the Prime Minister and had been looking forward to his visit. He dwelt on the age-old associations and the new friendship between China and India. He said that today both India and China were struggling for peace. He had read with great interest the Prime Minister's speech of the 29th September, 1954, and appreciated what he had said then.¹⁰ China and India had more or less common history in recent times. India had suffered from the effects of colonialism for the last 200 or 300 years; so also had China, for more than a hundred years. There were many common features. Both suffered from colonial exploitation and after both the countries became free, it was important for both the countries to have peace in order to carry on peaceful reconstruction of their economies. Both countries were backward industrially. India, he understood, was more advanced, but all the same with their large populations, industrial reconstruction had to proceed with quickness in both countries. Given peace it might take about twenty years for China to be an industrial nation. China wanted peace.

Some other nations, however, did not like to leave China alone. Obstructions were placed in the way of her trade and her reconstruction.

Trade even through the Chinese waters was being interfered with. Just a few yards away from the Chinese mainland, islands which belonged to China were under occupation. US was carrying on a policy of increasing tension right around China. Part of China, viz., Formosa, US had virtually occupied and was extending all assistance and encouragement to it. Taiwan had to be liberated. She was a standing threat to the Chinese mainland. From Taiwan and other territory air raids were made on China¹¹ and US had been air-dropping Chinese agents in groups of seven and ten with wireless transmitters and other

available in India-China Relations 1947-1964, Historical Division, MEA, File No. 12/86/NGO/54 & 12/88/NGO/54.

¹⁰ Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 26, pp. 318-332.

¹¹ On 3 September 1954 an artillery duel broke out between Communist China and Nationalist China over Quemoy island. Air raids by both parties were started on 5 September. On 6 September the US Seventh Fleet patrol was strengthened over 30 islands in possession of the Nationalists. The US Government reiterated its stand on defending the Nationalist hold from communist attack "at all cost."

equipments. Various such groups had been rounded up and caught.¹² China was not a threat to anyone and wished to live in peace with other countries. US, however, did not permit her to do so.

In this matter even countries like England and France were being forced and intimidated by US to follow their line. Even with regard to Chinese admission to the United Nations and the recognition of her status, these nations under pressure from the United States had, unlike India and other Asian countries and also some north west European countries, been supporting US in her attitude. The Chairman then referred to the Manila Conference and SEATO, in which countries like UK supported the American Government.¹³

Nehru began by expressing his appreciation of the very warm welcome that he had received that morning from the people of Peking.¹⁴ He said he was overwhelmed by the demonstration that he had received and thanked the Chairman, the Premier and members of his Government. He said it was true that both India and China had a tradition of close and friendly association dating back from the early ages. This association continued more or less till India lost her freedom about 150 or 200 years ago and when China also became subjected to similar forces as those to which India had been subjected. Another link between India and China was common or similar experiences resulting from such colonialism. Both India and China were great countries with vast populations. Both had similar problems and need for reconstruction. There was, therefore, much common ground between the two countries and there was a closeness of association, though they might differ in

¹² According to a communiqué of the Chinese Ministry of Public Security. 230 KMT and US agents had been captured since 1951, of whom 106 were killed while being rounded up. The most controversial of these were the cases pertaining to thirteen American secret agents involved in air-dropping agents, maintaining contacts with agents and conducting reconnaissance etc. See post. pp. 46. 213-215.

¹³ Despite the commitment at Geneva regarding non-precipitation of war or warlike situation, Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Minister, had reasoned that "mutual defence arrangements cannot really be considered harmful for any nation, least of all for those who practice it themselves."

¹⁴ Over a million people lined the twelve mile long route from the airport and for the first time the Chinese dispensed with the bullet proof cars and Nehru rode in an open car. Desmond Donnelly of the Daily Mail described the reception as 'a Roman triumph'.

ideology. There might be differences in outlook or ideology, but there was great goodwill and friendship between our two countries and peoples. This was an important feature in a world full of strife. The great need of the world today was peace and the people of India as well as the people of China were devoted to the cause of peace.

However, Nehru said he wanted to mention that there was a certain amount of fear in the minds of smaller nations in Asia, fear of these two big and Great countries, China and India. This might be baseless fear. The fact remained that there was such fear. The very strength of these two countries might be the reason for such fear and there might be other reasons also. Nevertheless, the fact had to be faced that there was fear of China and...

Mao Tse-tung: Of communism?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We cannot analyze this fear and find out what exactly causes it, but it is important that we should remove this fear from the minds of smaller countries. It cannot be completely explained, but there is no doubt that the fear complex has affected many countries and has influenced their policies.

Mao: But US cannot be afraid? On the other hand, US is intimidating others.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: Even in US some observers have seen that there was fear and policies were influenced by fear.

Mao: What are they afraid of?

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: It might be that they are afraid of losing their vested interests. US is a very powerful nation today and perhaps they are afraid of losing their power. After the last World War, European nations had become weak and European colonialism became a diminishing quantity, which would ultimately disappear. Some European countries have already realised this though not sufficiently enough. America, on the other hand, has emerged out of the War as a very strong power and she is anxious that this power may not be affected or diminished by other powerful nations. It is this fear complex that

is affecting them.

Mao: How can America be afraid? On the other hand, she is frightening others through her activities. We cannot have even good sleep, you know. She is intimidating Britain, France and other nations to follow her policy. She does not care for the opinion of others, but she wants others to follow her opinion. Even for the SEATO she did not care for the opinions of India, Burma or Indonesia and intimidated or brought pressure on countries like Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan and others to fall in with her policy.

Nehru said as far as he could see SEATO was American reaction against the Geneva Conference. The Americans did not like the settlement arrived at Geneva and wanted to show that their views still counted and that their strength and influence in Asia had not become less.¹⁵

Mao said that he agreed that it was a sort of demonstration against the decisions at the Geneva Conference and American inability there to make their presence felt.

Nehru explained that all the same there was the fear complex in America. Perhaps she was afraid of the Soviet Union and countries like Britain and France, who left to themselves might follow a different policy and were following American policy for fear that they might not be able to stand by themselves in the case of another war. They think that if they do not follow US, US might leave them to their own fate in case of another conflict. That is one explanation of British support to the United States. Otherwise the interests of European colonial nations and those of America conflict in the East and in many countries European colonial nations are losing ground to Americans. Yet, we find them supporting American policy.

Mao enquired why countries like India did not then follow the American policy? Nehru answered that India was not afraid of any country in the world. The one

¹⁵ The decision for cessation of hostilities in Indo-China, arrived at Geneva went directly against the foreign policy priorities of the US. The Spectator commented: "1-he star of Peking has caused the star of Washington to pale in an area where only a few years ago General McArthur was usurping the functions of God. With care and skilled determination the SEATO could serve in some measures to rebuild this vanishing authority."

thing that India's great leader Mahatma Gandhi had taught Indians was not to be afraid and it was this fearlessness that enabled Indians to win their freedom from British imperialism. Yes, said the Prime Minister, India was not afraid and followed her own policy, what she considered right and just.

Mao said that America had so much of strength and wealth etc.

Nehru said that slowly Western nations had to realise that it was not so much money that counted. Both India and China put together had about 1000 million people of the world and human beings counted.

Mao agreed that human beings counted the most.

Nehru continued that ultimately US and other nations would realise that it was not possible to set at nought such a great country with such vast populations as China and in the end Chinese legitimate rights would have to be conceded.

Nehru then again referred to the fear of isolation in the minds of West European nations in the event of any armed conflict with Russia. All that they could do now was to try and influence American opinion without leaving the American camp.

Mao said that Eden while at Geneva was in favour of Eastern Locarno. All the same the British supported US at the Manila Conference.¹⁶

Nehru said that according to his information the British were not happy about it. Nehru referred to the joint declaration made by Prime Minister Chou En-lai and himself while the former was in India.¹⁷ If the principles which were embodied in this declaration were given effect to and if other countries in Asia were made to feel that those principles would be effectively implemented, a good deal could be achieved in removing suspicion and fear. If those principles of non-interference, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity etc. are acted upon, many of the troubles that afflicted nations would be removed. The

¹⁶ During the Geneva Conference, Anthony Eden had proposed that an arrangement could be arrived at for the defence of South East Asia-in line of the Locarno Treaty-in which both the superpowers stood guarantee for its working. At the Manila conference, Lord Reading, the British delegate, argued that while the Geneva Conference had put an end to war, Manila was to ensure that "sacrifices were not exacted a second time."

¹⁷ Issued on 28 June 1954 in New Delhi, the statement laid down the mutually agreed principles-Panch Shila-governing the relationship between the two countries. See Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 26, pp. 410-412.

nations in Asia would have, however, to be convinced that the principles would be effectively implemented.

Mao agreed that the principles had been stated in the declaration and they could watch and see that they would be implemented. However, he thought that it would be wrong to make war as an instrument of policy. He had a good deal to say about it and that he would like to continue the conversation with Prime Minister later.

Page 11

Foreign Policies of America and China¹⁸

Jawaharlal Nehru: In a recent statement the Pakistan Prime Minister was reported to have said that he did not believe in neutrality and that he was in favour of going all along with America.¹⁹ It was further very odd that he should have criticised the Indonesian Premier for not agreeing with his views and I think that it is highly improper for the Pakistan Premier to have said that if general elections were held in Indonesia today the party of the Indonesian Premier would lose. In my view many countries in Asia, Europe and South America were not yet definitely committed and hence they can still understand and listen to reason. I think that was the best way on which they should proceed. Of course, some countries deliberately did not want lessening of tensions, but our purpose should be, and I hope that it is also the purpose of China, to avoid war.

¹⁸ Minutes of talks with Chou En-Lai, Beijing, 20 October 1954. The meeting was also attended by N.R. Pillai, Secretary General, MEA. and N. Raghavan, on the Indian side and Vice Foreign Minister, Chang Han-fu; Chinese Ambassador to India, Yuan Chind hsien; and Director of Asian Department of the Chinese Foreign Office, Chen Chia-kang. on the Chinese side. V.V. Paranjpe and Pu Shou-chang acted as interpreters. JN Collection. Also available in India-China Relations 1947-1954, Historical Division. MEA. File No. 12/86/NGO/54 & 12/88/NGO/54.

¹⁹ Speaking at the National Press Club, New York, on 18 October 1954, Mohammad Ali was reported to have criticised the policy of neutralism followed by certain countries. He said that peace could only be guaranteed by armed strength and that Pakistan believed in complete alliance with USA and the West in this matter.

Chou En-Lai: On the basis of the conversations of yesterday,²⁰ and what you said today, China and India understand each other's position. We both feel that some countries, especially American Government do not want to soften the tense situation. We want to avoid or postpone a world war so that the people of the world can live together in peace. But the question is, why does America want tension? Why does it want to maintain this tension? You had said the other day to Chairman Mao that America wants to protect and maintain her vested interests. -But in our view it is something more than that. She wants to enlarge her interests through war.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: America is very confused. She has no clear thinking but only certain passions. Even in the past she had no clear foreign policy and often her foreign policy depended on internal questions. Five years ago, i.e., in November 1949, immediately after the Republic of China was established, I went to Washington and on my way to Washington stopped in London where I had a talk with Mr Bevin,²¹ the then Foreign Secretary of United Kingdom, on the question of recognition of new China. Mr Bevin said: "Yes, we want that but let us all recognise her together. We shall try to get America in also." I later on saw Dean Acheson²² in Washington, who also said: "Yes, but I cannot do so now be due to pressure of public opinion."

Large sections of American public opinion, I believe, are even today convinced that China will have to be recognised. In any case they will be compelled to do so sooner or later.

Chou: Yes, their policy is sometimes confused but still the basic intention (motive) is all along there. They want to maintain and expand their interests and therefore, they are expanding their military bases and they want to lead and dominate the world. They had openly, said that they want to control the world.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: I agree.

²⁰ This refers to conversations of the two Prime Ministers during an informal dinner at Chou's residence on 19 October.

²¹ Ernest Bevin (1881-1951). Nehru on his way to USA was in London from 9 to 10 October 1949.

²² US Secretary of State. 1949-53. Nehru met Acheson on 12 October 1949. For record of his talks. see Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 13. pp. 295-298.

Chou: We can see that the US is using intimidation to threaten the world and some countries had to follow under these intimidations. Even Britain and France are afraid that by following US they will lose their interests and yet they have to follow. Thus, also Pakistan is participating in the SEATO. It is not justified at all, but America is trying to encourage an expansionist desire in Pakistan.²³

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: There are two elements in it. America is using two methods: (i) pressure or intimidation; and (ii) offer of money. Many of these nations are afraid that if they break with America they are too weak to defend themselves. But while following America sometimes they nearly break with her, as happened at Geneva and this crisis has been coming repeatedly in recent days.

Chou: America is trying to create a fear which does not exist and on the other hand, it is trying to encourage Pakistan to expand. I spoke many times to Pakistan Ambassador here and Pakistan delegations which came here. I told them that they will suffer by allying themselves with Britain and the US. It is good for them if they unite with India. And I also told the same thing to our Indian friends. I told Pakistan friends also why not Premiers of Pakistan and India come together and talk and settle the Kashmir question. Wouldn't it be good? And many of the Pakistan delegates seemed to sympathise with this view. I just wanted to inform you of it.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: I have been always willing to talk things over with Pakistan Premier and the last time we met, we came to a preliminary agreement but then Pakistan accepted American military aid and things became different. I told him that the context had changed and the basis also was changed.²⁴ I may mention here some of the background of Pakistan.

During our independence struggle a number of people sided with Britain and

²³ During the SEATO Conference, John Foster Dulles had said that the treaty would greatly minimize the threat of communism by retaliating in so united and so strong a manner that "the aggressor would lose more than it could hope to gain." Zafrullah Khan, who represented Pakistan in SEATO Conference, had said that in order to protect the vital interests of Pakistan in South East Asia. it was necessary to create a trouble free treaty zone.

²⁴ In his letter on 29 September 1954. See Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 26, p. 475. See also Vol. 25, pp. 319-322.

opposed our struggle. Leaders of Pakistan today are those who opposed us and they came to power on a religious cry, not economic. You see even in the old days these leaders supported the British Government. Pakistan people and Indian people are the same people, only with different religions.

Chou: We do not know much about situation in Pakistan but we understand a little about them. Acceptance of American aid and opposition to an area of peace would have unfavourable effect on Asia as also on Indo-Pakistan relations. I explained this several times to them but it seems difficult to make them understand.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: Pakistan has become virtually a colony of the US. There are thousands of Americans in Pakistan today and it depends on America for everything.

Chou: So Britain is also feeling now the bad effects of their policy of divide and rule, but are they now realising that it was to the disadvantage of Britain? °

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: Britain is sorry for it. But what can it do?

Chou: America's present tactics may be grouped into two categories:

(i) Fear of communism: Chairman Mao had also mentioned this, but I may repeat again, if there is this kind of fear between smaller and bigger countries, to be concrete, between China and other countries then we are willing to undertake commitments to do beneficial things to avert this fear and to bind ourselves by the Five Principles. If there is fear of China in other parts of Asia, we have given our commitment to the Five Principles and we want to base our relations with them on these Principles. We have made efforts in that direction and we will continue to abide by these Principles. I had expressed to Mr Menon²⁵ that we are willing to have relations even with Thailand and Philippines. I also told Mr Casey²⁶ that there was no possibility of China's threatening Australia. We are prepared to bind ourselves by mutual commitment to avert fear.

(ii) Danger of world war: America's attempts to enlarge war is making everyone afraid. This is a possible and real question and we must all endeavour for peace and eliminate this kind of danger.

²⁵ V.K. Krishna Menon.

²⁶ R.G. Casey, Foreign Minister of Australia. 1951-60.

The possibility of a major war always exists and therefore, we must make efforts for disarmament and banning of destructive weapons and I hope India and China will make efforts to this end. There is another very real question, whether some local incidents may develop into a war. To be more specific, America is trying to use Formosa to threaten the Far East and the world. But I can positively say that at present a major war will not break out. Our stand is to prevent her from expanding and to isolate her. If we tolerate what America does then she will expand. Therefore by countermeasures we must isolate US. If, however, we take the attitude of appeasement to remove disputes, then US will make further advances and others will also submit to the US intimidation. The US is actually aiming at and intending to use Taiwan and conclude more treaties like SEATO. Therefore, we must not be fooled, for that will injure the interests of all people. What we want to do is to isolate US and see that she does not start a war. It is a complicated question and we would like to tell you that we are concerned about it.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: The question then becomes one as to how to prevent present dangers. You said that you cannot follow a policy of appeasement to the US or any other power and should work for peace. That is exactly what the US and many countries in Europe say. They say we do not want to appease the Soviet Union or China and they use practically the same phrases.

The facts are-of course, I do not want to make any invidious comparisons-but there are only two countries in Asia apart from the USSR which have a stable and strong government, have the support of the people and are economically progressing. Other countries in Asia are politically and economically weak and therefore, they are afraid. In western Asia, e.g., in countries like Egypt, even murders of statesmen are frequently heard of. This brings instability. And because of such weakness and fear they can be won over and made to cooperate with US.

You said that the US wants more treaties with South East Asian countries. They are good countries, but they are weak, afraid, and are unstable.

Countries in West Asia are still weaker and they have moreover something which is very important, viz., oil. We must try to keep them on the right side. As rightly said by you, we must remove fear and this can be done through the

Five Principles, but the bona fides must be proved.

Chou: If you allow me, I would like to say a few words here. As regards the point of appeasement, there cannot be any comparison. You said that both sides use the same phrases, but there is a difference in quality. America does not recognise us and on the other hand, aggresses Chinese territory --Taiwan. We do not invade America nor do we withhold recognition from America. But when we say no appeasement, we mean that there should be no aggression. But when they say no appeasement, their intention is not to allow us to exist. We are prepared to apply the Five Principles to all countries including the United States. We have not been forming any treaties like SEATO and there is no intimidation to make them submit to our interests. But the United States, on the other hand, is using exactly these methods and what we say is that they should not bully us.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: As I said, I am not comparing, but I was just quoting what their argument was. This is what they say, not what I say, but it very much affects public opinion in these countries. Many of them further say: "Why should the Soviet Union or China want war? They will merely infiltrate and gain whatever they want without war."

I was talking about Africa. We have a very large population there. A very dangerous development is now taking place in Africa. The Western nations, after having lost their colonies, are now trying to consolidate themselves in Africa and their rule there is worse than that in the colonies. They are establishing dominions there, not self governing dominions, but dominions dominated by the white men. There is, thus, the South African Federation and they are similarly trying to establish a dominion in East Africa. This white domination is entirely fascist in outlook.

There are some people in Africa who are opposed to India and we cannot do much about them. But there are many Africans who are also friends of India. We are trying to give them whatever help we can. There are at present forty-five African scholars studying in Indian universities and we have also sent about one hundred technical experts to Africa and the Middle East. Africa is not playing any important role in the world today but it is a dangerous zone and we are concerned about it. In North Africa, in the colonies under French

colonial rule, there is also a very strong nationalist movement. Then there is Egypt and there is the African Africa. I am mentioning these things just to give a brief outline of the world picture. Africans must be helped to develop, for they are not strong to take action by themselves. I am mentioning this because however big a problem may be we have to see the whole picture. We are connected with East and West Asia and Africa. We had a lot to do with Europe, but we had little to do with America and very little contact with South America. Our Vice President is at the moment touring the South American continent.²⁷ I am just mentioning this to show that we are in touch with various countries. I may now refer to an important thing to which you also had referred. The Western nations have a certain jealousy when they see a strong Asian country. They do not like it. In fact, I recently read from an American journal where they said that first they talked of helping India, but now they feel that if India becomes strong then it will be bad for the US.

As regards the question of disarmament, it is a difficult question, industrially developed countries can arm themselves quickly. Factories that can produce aeroplanes can easily produce bombs. But disarmament must come. I agree, but there must first be a little less tension. The main question is how to remove fear and entanglement from power blocks. You referred to the proposed Asian-African Conference. The proposal was made by the Indonesian Prime Minister. We welcome it and it will be held. But it will be a mixed Conference. Even in Colombo Conference, Pakistan had one voice and others had another.²⁸ So, it will not be a united Conference, but still to have a Conference is good and I think, if Asian and African countries can come together, even if they differ, we can still influence them.

The Colombo Powers are scheduled to meet at Djakarta at the end of December.

I have already referred to the subject of how to remove fears and apprehensions in West Asia and South East Asia. These countries continuously face American propaganda which serves to increase their fears about

²⁷ S. Radhakrishnan undertook a six-week tour of Europe, US.A. Canada and Latin America during October-November 1954.

²⁸ See Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 25, pp. 431-433 and Vol. 26, p. 375.16

communist aggression.

I met the Burmese Prime Minister, U Nu, on my way here and also his entire Cabinet.²⁹ They were still full of fears of what may happen. One subject to which you also referred in Delhi was about the question of overseas Chinese.³⁰ Your statement then that those who take other nationality will have nothing to do with China had very good effect, but the Burmese said why China should have issued maps where parts of Burma³¹ and even of India are shown as parts of China. There is a very small thing to which also a reference was made. One man named K.I. Singh, who had created some trouble in Nepal sometime ago, led to Tibet. He was then reported to be in China. Later on, news came that he was being openly entertained. When persons who are traitors to their countries are thus openly feted then people naturally get apprehensive.

Chou: I will reply to the specific questions raised by you later, but I will first like to say a few words. We very much approve of softening of tensions, but I must reiterate that the US is using the question of Taiwan to create tensions. And if we do not oppose she will expand. If we take counter-measures it will lessen what she is doing. If America withdraws from Formosa, tension will be reduced. So the responsibility is not ours; but it is not so easy. America will not immediately withdraw; it will require time. But we want our friends to understand that the responsibility for solving this question is not on us and we would like you to explain to others that the responsibility is not ours.

As regards the African-Asian Conference, I would like to know what is the scope of the Conference. I would like to know more about it and about its

²⁹ Nehru stopped over at Rangoon on 16 October 1954.

³⁰ The question of 12 million Chinese overseas was discussed on 26 June 1954, during the fourth meeting between Nehru and Chou in New Delhi. The problem arose because the new Constitution of China did not recognize the right of the Chinese overseas to divest themselves of Chinese nationality, since most of them were suspected to be KMT sympathisers. The problem was particularly acute in Myanmar and Indonesia. where the resident Chinese were alleged to be either conduits of the Chinese Communist Party or KMT.

³¹ Chinese maps showed large parts of the Kachin state, in north east Myanmar, as forming part of China. A part of the disputed area had been leased by China to the British Government in 1897 and Beijing contended that it was not in consonance with the new status of the two countries that the lease should be continued, and that territory should lapse to China, which had never yielded sovereignty over it.

membership. What is the opinion about China participating in such a Conference?

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: I am sorry I cannot give a very precise reply because the Conference is still under consideration, but practically every country is being invited and the agenda will avoid any internal matters of dispute between countries. There will probably be some such broad questions like peace, colonialism etc.

Chou: We want to express our attitude on this question and kindly forward it to the concerned countries. We support the convocation of such a Conference and we are willing to participate in it because it is in the interest of peace in Asia and the world and it will work towards an area of peace. We want to increase the area of peace and not exclude any nation. Although the countries may have differences and the problems faced by them are complicated yet there is bound to be some common points.

As regards the question of infiltration, this is entirely a matter for the people of various countries. You referred to it in Delhi and you said that decisions were made by the people of each country and therefore, no interference was permissible from outside. As far as we are concerned, we will make greater efforts to implement the Five Principles. We can build greater confidence and show to the world an example that not only can we strictly abide by the principles but we can do it well. We can do it by specific examples and during your visit here we can talk more about some more specific questions.

As regards questions raised by our neighbouring countries, they can be easily explained.

Overseas Chinese: I had said in Delhi and in Rangoon that we have to effectively settle the question of overseas Chinese. What I then said is still valid. To be more specific, the question of dual nationality will be settled and we start first with Indonesia. After my return from Geneva and after receiving the Labour Delegation here,³² I suggested to the Indonesian Ambassador here that negotiations should be started immediately on this question and that the

³² An eight-member delegation, led by Clement Attlee, leader of Labour Parliamentary Party, UK, visited China from 15 to 31 August 1954.

Indonesian Ambassador should be the Chief Delegate. The negotiations will soon start probably by the end of October. To remove false reports abroad and suspicions, I openly mentioned this (the question of dual nationality) in my political report. And I said that we would settle this question with all countries with whom we have diplomatic relations. We think there should be no dual nationality. An individual is either Chinese or a national of the country where he resides. It is a question left to us by history. But we would like to make it clear that it should be decided voluntarily and on the basis of parentage. If you remain Chinese then you cannot participate in the activities of the country where you reside. The Ambassador has conveyed this to his Government and they have signified their agreement. But we must put it down in the form of a treaty. It is a difficult question and any incomplete statement just now will only help create rumours, KMT might exploit the situation to force the overseas Chinese to give money or to become soldiers. It will also give trouble to respective governments and create reactions in overseas Chinese; it will also enable Thailand and Philippines to take more repressive measures. Therefore, I mentioned this to the Indonesian Ambassador and their delegations and asked them not to make any incomplete statement before a treaty has been finalised and they also sympathised with my view. I will also discuss this question with U Nu when he comes here and start discussions with Burma.

Maps: It is a historical question and we have been mostly printing old maps. We have made no survey of the borders and not consulted with our neighbouring countries and we have no basis for fixing the boundary lines. We made our maps and revised them from the maps of other countries. At least we do not have any deliberate intentions of changing the boundaries as KMT had. The whole thing is ridiculous. The question of boundaries between China and Burma was not settled even in Manchu regime and you will find differences even in our boundaries with the Soviet Union and Mongolia. We can further discuss the matter with U Nu but we want time for preparation:³³ U Nu had

³³ U Nu visited China in December 1954. A joint communiqué issued on 12 December stated: "In view of the incomplete delimitation of the boundary line between China and Burma, the two premiers held it necessary to settle this question in a friendly spirit at an appropriate time through normal diplomatic channels."

said that he wanted to go to Yunnan Province. We agreed. He said he would like to go via Yunnan. We agreed.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: I thought he wanted to go by road.

Chou: Yes. But then, there are natural difficulties and moreover there is the question of safety.

Singh's case: As regards Mr Singh, it is a simple question. Singh came across the border to China from Nepal with thirty-seven persons armed with nineteen rifles and 500 bullets. We immediately disarmed them, gave them asylum according to the international practice, because he is in favour of peace and cooperation. But if he engages in any activity for overthrow of Nepal Government we would not allow him to do so. It will amount to interference in the internal affairs of another country. I might mention that sometime ago Dalai Lama was not friendly to us and wanted to seek asylum in India. Sardar Panikkar³⁴ then raised the question with us and said that if Dalai Lama came to India, India will have to give him asylum and all facilities as a religious leader. We agreed. Actually, however, he went only some distance from Lhasa but came back. His brother and sister-in-law are still in India. And in fact, they have many contact in Tibet. We do not mind it.

Nepal: We want to have diplomatic relations with Nepal and they have already expressed their agreement.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: I am glad you have mentioned this also. Nepal's foreign affairs are looked after by us and we have been giving them aid and training facilities for their personnel, but we do not interfere in their internal affairs. But you will understand that traditionally Nepal and India are closely linked together and according to the treaty the foreign policy of India and Nepal is to be coordinated.³⁵ Nepal Government had also mentioned to us about your desire to establish diplomatic relations with them and we told them that we had no objection. But I think the question may better be discussed in detail

³⁴ K.M. Panikkar was the Indian Ambassador in China at that time.

³⁵ The Treaty of Peace and Friendship, signed on 31 July 1950, between India and Nepal specified that both would consult each other to devise effective counter measures in case of a threat of aggression and give preference to each other's foreign policy priorities without any prejudice. See also post, pp. 195-197.

after the King of Nepal, who is in Switzerland for treatment, returns to Nepal. As regards maps, I just casually mentioned to you some of the anxieties of our neighbours. We are not worried on this point. Our frontiers are clear but I mention it in the case of Burma because questions of this kind become a handle in the hands of enemy. Supposing we publish a map showing Tibet as a part of India, how would China feel about it? But as I said, I am sure, the maps were old maps and you did not mean it.

Finally, there is one small matter which I would like to mention here with some hesitation. It is regarding some Bishop who has been recently arrested here.³⁶ I am handing over the telegram itself to you for such action as you may deem fit.

Chou: Yes, I know. Taking advantage of your presence here these people would always like to give you some trouble.

Page 21

Situation in South East Asia³⁷

Chou En-lai: What is the situation in Indonesia? We have invited the Indonesian Prime Minister but he wants me to go to Indonesia first. What do you think about my visiting Indonesia?

Jawaharlal Nehru: An analysis is rather difficult. The Government there is not stable. It is not so much due to external trouble but internal. The trouble is mainly in Java where a bigoted Moslem sect is in revolt.³⁸ Now it has been curbed but not crushed and it creates certain difficulties and I know about it

³⁶ The case was of one Tarcisius Martina, Prefect Apostolic of Yihsien. In a telegram of 6 November to Y.D. Gundevia, who had conveyed to Nehru the message from the Vatican about the arrest, Nehru wrote that the Prefect had been convicted and Chou En-lai had assured that the Government might take a lenient view of the case.

³⁷ Minutes of talks with Chou En-Lai. Beijing, 21 October 1954. JN Collection.

³⁸ Darul Islam, a motley group of army auxiliaries, was fighting the national and Dutch army in the central West Java since 1948. Led by one Kartosuwirjo, the group held that Soekarno had betrayed the revolution and along with the Nahdatul Ulama (Orthodox Muslim Party); The group demanded incorporation of Islamic principles in the Constitution of Indonesia. Darul Islam was finally crushed in 1962. .

from the security measures which had been taken when my sister, Mrs Pandit visited the country recently. But it does not affect the Government. Still the Government is unstable. The Government there is a kind of coalition.³⁹ The Prime Minister's party is a small party and other parties give it a majority. If they go away then Government cannot stand. I cannot say what Government there would be in the next few months. And in view of this instability Premier Chou may better wait, for if the Government changes in between, it may be embarrassing.

President Soekarno⁴⁰ is a good man. The present arrangement is that the Colombo countries will meet at Djakarta around December 28.⁴¹ I heard an interesting news today that the Pakistan Prime Minister was cutting short his stay in the United States to enable him to hurry back to Pakistan because of internal difficulties.⁴²

Chou: Are there any foreign factors in Indonesian troubles?

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: There is of course a good deal of American influence and pressure, if not to join SEATO, at least to be party to it. American influence in Indonesia was fairly strong three years ago because America helped Indonesia against the Dutch, I mean diplomatically and they brought pressure on the Dutch to agree to the Indonesian demands. Therefore, the influence was strong. Later on came the San Francisco Treaty⁴³ and the then Indonesian

³⁹ The Government led by Ali Sastroamidjojo of the Partai Nasional Indonesia (Indonesian National Party) was a coalition of twelve parties, including the Partai Komunis Indonesia (Communist Party) and Masjumi Party (Progressive Muslims). The PNI had a strength of thirty-seven in a house of 229.

⁴⁰ Ahmed Soekarno.

⁴¹ The meeting took place in Bogor on 28 and 29 December 1954. See post. pp. 106-129.

⁴² Mohammad Ali cut short his visit due to the provincial bickering over the adoption of the new Constitution and an imminent stand off between the Constituent Assembly and the Governor General, whose powers had been drastically curbed by a resolution adopted by the Assembly in September 1954. On 24 October. Ghulam Mohammad, the Governor General of Pakistan, proclaimed a state of emergency, dissolved the Constituent Assembly and reconstituted the Cabinet.

⁴³ Also known as the Japanese Peace Treaty; it was signed on 8 September 1951 by forty-eight countries, except China, USSR and India, who perceived it to be grossly unequal. For India's viewpoint see Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 16 Pt. II, pp. 603-624.

Government despite popular opposition signed the Treaty. Consequently, the Government became unpopular and had to resign. Since then American influence has been declining but the aid in materials etc., however, continues. Since independence Indonesia is poor in trained personnel. It has not even enough administrative personnel and it has kept a considerable number of Dutch Advisers and that is the weakness of their position. Although there is conflict between the Dutch and the Indonesians on the question of Western New Guinea (Irian),⁴⁴ still they are retaining Dutch Advisers.

Chou; What about Ceylon? Our trade is continuing with Ceylon,⁴⁵ but Ceylon seems to be unwilling to establish diplomatic relations. Of course, it cannot be imposed and we cannot hurry. But what is your estimate?

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: Ceylon is independent in law and constitution. But the structure remains the same as in the colonial days. In all these countries like India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, the main struggle for independence was fought in India. Pakistan never fought for anything. Ceylon also never fought. Because India won her freedom they also got Freedom. The British thought that it would be useful to give them independence. There is a major British Naval Base at Trincomali. Of course, the British do not interfere. The Ceylonese have their own produce like rubber, tea etc. The present Prime Minister of Ceylon⁴⁶ is a landlord and is therefore conservative.

There is no feeling, as far as I can see, against China. But there is fear of America. You will remember that in the Colombo Conference all the five powers advocated China's admission to the United Nations.⁴⁷

I just had a visit from the Ceylonese Prime Minister on the problem of overseas

⁴⁴ During transfer of sovereignty by the Dutch to the Republic of the United States of this segment was supposed to register either as Indian or Sri Lankan nationals. See Indonesia in 1949, it was agreed that the status of the isle of West Irian (Western New Guinea) would be settled through negotiations between the two parties.

⁴⁵ A trade pact regarding exchange of Chinese rice for Sri Lankan rubber was signed in Beijing on 6 October 1954.

⁴⁶ John Kotelawala.

⁴⁷ The Conference was held from 28 April to 2 May 1954. See Selected Works, (second series) Vol. 25, pp. 423-426.

Indians.⁴⁸ We have a total number of around twelve million overseas Indians compared to China's eleven million. In Ceylon there are half a million overseas Indians. Many of the Indians went to Ceylon to work in tea estates sixty, or seventy years ago, but now the Ceylonese want to turn them out. We will accept any Indian there as our national provided he comes under law and he asks for it voluntarily. Even the Ceylonese language is an Indian language and the Ceylonese are Indians. About two to three hundred years ago many Indians migrated to Ceylon. They are considered now as Ceylonese. But about sixty or seventy years ago British tea planters took with them many Indians to work on the estates. These are the ones whom they want to turn out.⁴⁹

Chou: What about Siam? We want to have contacts with them. What are the chances? We would like to deal with them in accordance with the Five Principles.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: We have an Ambassador in Siam⁵⁰ but our contacts are not intimate. Recently, Siam wanted to send to India a rice selling delegation, but we do not want rice from them. Her economy is based on rice and so far they have done well. The nation is prosperous and there is no economic distress and the peasantry is not dissatisfied. Government, however, is of a very curious kind as His Excellency, perhaps, knows the Navy fights with the Army.⁵¹ But the peasantry is not troubled with what goes on at the top. The Government is, however, very much tied up with the United States.

Four years ago, we convened a conference in Delhi.⁵² Many countries were invited. All countries participated except Turkey and Siam, We were privately told by these two countries that they did not want to displease America. But later America herself told us that she was not opposed to it and that put them in a very embarrassing situation.

⁴⁸ See post, pp. 133-175.

⁴⁹ Out of a total population of Indian origin of eight lakh, seven lakh were estate laborers. This segment was supposed to register either as Indians or Sri Lankan nationals. See also post, pp. 137 and 139

⁵⁰ P.A. Menon

⁵¹ Thailand was governed by a military regime from 1946 to 1957.

⁵² Asian Conference on Indonesia held in New Delhi from 20 to 23 January 1949. See Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 9, pp. 143-182.

I feel Siam may not immediately respond but may do so later on. Recently it is experiencing some economic difficulties on account of the fact that the rice market has become a buyer's market. We do not buy rice from them because if we wanted to buy it, we would buy it from a more friendly country like Burma.

I could have visited Bangkok on my way here but I did not do so. Another thing is that the Thai Government is corrupt and many high Government officials made money by smuggling arms to KMT troops in Burma.

Chou: What about the three States in Indo-China? This time you would pass through all of them either while coming or going. Vietnam is not yet unified. What about Laos and Cambodia? Is it possible for India and these two countries to have good relations?

JN: I passed through Laos and Hanoi on my way here.⁵³ I met the Crown Prince⁵⁴ and the Ministers of Laos and had a long talk with Ho Chi Minh.⁵⁵ On the question of representation, we are recognizing them in practice but a formal recognition presents some difficulties because of our Chairmanship of the Commission.⁵⁶ If we recognize only some, then there are difficulties; if we recognize all then Vietnam is still divided. Practically we recognize them all and we have decided to set up consulates in all four places.

As His Excellency might undoubtedly know among all these South East Asian countries there is influence of India and China both. Hence, for example, the name Indo-China. In islands like Indonesia influence of India is greater while on the mainland the Chinese influence is greater. Culturally Cambodia is more

⁵³ On 17 and 18 October 1954.

⁵⁴ Crown Prince Savang. The Laotian Cabinet, headed by Prince Souvanna Phuma, had submitted its resignation to the Crown Prince Savang on 18 October 1954. due to the crisis following the assassination of Defence Minister Kou Varavong on 18 September 1954. His resignation was not accepted.

⁵⁵ President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. 1945-54.

⁵⁶ The question of recognition came up because by that time Sri Lanka and Myanmar had already accorded their recognition to Laos and Cambodia. Following the Agreements at Geneva three International Commissions composed of representatives of Canada, Poland and India, and presided over by the Indian representatives were set up in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam in order to supervise implementation of Geneva Agreements.

Indian.

In Laos especially there is the problem of withdrawal of foreign troops. If all the foreign troops are withdrawn the situation is easy but if it is not so, then there will be difficulties.⁵⁷ The Prime Minister of Laos was apprehensive about withdrawal of foreign troops because there was American pressure on them not to withdraw French troops on the excuse that the resistance troops were not withdrawn. Therefore, if the resistance troops are withdrawn the matter would be easy. Exactly one month from today, 21st of November 1954 has been fixed as the date for withdrawal. If there is withdrawal then it will be easy for internal unity and to make readjustments, otherwise on some ground or the other Americans might intervene. Therefore, I feel the armies of both sides should be withdrawn and position be made more clear. The impression that I got was that the Prime Minister of Laos is a good man and wants to come to terms.

Chou: Your Excellency must have talked with Ho Chi Minh. In our view every article of the Geneva Agreement must be implemented. We wish that the situation in Laos may be stabilized. We support its unity and hope that this will be useful for expanding areas of peace and India in its capacity as Chairman can expedite the implementation of this Agreement.

JN: Of course, India is anxious to help but according to Geneva Conference decisions, Commissions do not interfere in internal matters. Till now the Commission consisting of Canada, Poland and India have reached unanimous decisions. How far they can continue to do so, I do not know.⁵⁸ Of course, they had discussions and arguments before arriving at these decisions but they are facing their own difficulties. I am repeating these difficulties which were

⁵⁷ In April 1953, the Vietminh forces, aided by forces of Pathet Lao -- the resistance Government composed of the relics of Lao Issarak, under Prince Souphannouvong invaded Laos and captured large territories from the French army. Following the Geneva Agreements, it was decided that all foreign troops were to be withdrawn within 120 days and pending a political settlement, the fighting units of Pathet Lao were to move into the north eastern provinces of Phongsaly and Sam-Neua. vacating the captured territory.

⁵⁸ Joint Commissions comprising equal number of military representatives of the warring sides in each State, were set up to ensure the observation of the provisions of ceasefire agreement. See also post, p. 101.

reported to me by our officers there. Firstly, there are the Joint Commissions.⁵⁹ Then a large number of men are required. We have got about 600 men there and we require civilian officers, members to the Delegations and military officers to work on mobile teams.

Chou: Menon asked the question and I then told him that you would require between 500 to 1,000 persons. We can understand that it is difficult to spare so many officers. India has of course a very arduous task and we will always support you. We hope you will achieve more success.

Then comes the Korean question. I discussed the question with Menon. Mr. Menon asked me if the question was put up before the UN, whether China wanted India to put forward a resolution and what kind of a resolution would be agreeable to the Chinese side. Then my reply was not so specific but now I can give a more specific reply;

- 1) In our opinion the Conference may be enlarged by adding neutral Asian countries to the already existing 19 nations;
- 2) all South East Asian countries should participate in it;
- 3) the place may be Geneva or Delhi; and
- 4) time: Next year (i.e.1955).⁶⁰

We exchanged views with Kim II-sung⁶¹ on this question when he came here. If the proposal is put forward in the UN it will be from one side only and agreement of three sides (viz. China, North Korea and South Korea) will have to be taken. At that time Mr Menon had agreed to this principle. We feel that it will be best if the Indian Government put forward this resolution. I had

⁵⁹ According to the Geneva Agreements, the recommendations of the International Commission was to be by majority except when dealing with violations or threatened violations of the Agreements which might lead to a resumption of hostilities, when decisions had to be unanimous.

⁶⁰ Nehru informed Krishna Menon about Chou En-lai's proposals on 22 October 1954. On 23 October Menon replied that India's efforts should be concentrated on a) Geneva Conference continuing; b) preventing armistice machinery from being terminated; c) preventing rigid resolution in UN insisting international supervision on elections which were being pressed for by the US. He felt that Chou's proposal of Delhi as the venue would be 'unpractical' and cause embarrassment to India.

⁶¹ President. People's Republic of Korea.

promised Mr. Menon that I would convey his views to the Soviet Union and Korea on my way back and the Soviet Union and Korea agreed to these views. I discussed the matter also with Mr. Molotov⁶² of the USSR on my way back from Geneva.

This resolution may not be easily passed but America cannot also oppose it very easily, America can hardly say that it does not want to give a chance to discuss the Korean question. On the second adjournment at Geneva, Eden told me that Smith⁶³ had asked him to tell me that US did not desire to exclude China from Korean discussions.

But then these discussions have to be held outside UN, since China is not a member of the UN.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: I have not much to add to what you have already said.

I may, however, reiterate two things:

- 1) We should not allow the situation to deteriorate any further; and
- 2) we should try to devise ways and means to arrive at a settlement.

The first one is a negative step while the second is a positive one and that step should be so timed as to produce results and naturally if we want results, we must have a conference. As to who should be in the conference, I have nothing to say. India will participate in it if she is invited to do so. But two things are important:

- 1) The timing of the conference; and
- 2) what will be brought up at the meeting.

Of course each side will have something in its mind and will have its own ideas. But then this way they will only go away without reaching any agreement.

As regards timing, at present the proposals would not be appropriate and would be rejected not on logical grounds but because most of the countries will think it useless and US will not agree. US will not agree till the elections are over.⁶⁴ You must be knowing that a Soviet Resolution on Taiwan has been

⁶² V.M. Molotov. Foreign Minister of USSR.

⁶³ Walter Bedell-Smith. US Under Secretary of State, 1953-54.

⁶⁴ The elections were to take place in November 1954.

postponed by the Steering Committee of the UN.⁶⁵ This shows that there is a tendency to postpone decisions till after the elections. Further, in making any such proposals always preparatory work is necessary, I mean sounding other countries in Europe and Asia so that they will be prepared for it. If the minds of these countries are not prepared and it suddenly comes up before the UN they may not be able to take any action. Many countries' knowledge on Korea is vague and not clear.

However, I will inform Mr Menon of your views and at the same time we might also keep this in mind.

The US declared at Geneva that she regarded the Conference as ended while Your Excellency said that we would consider the question again, that is. keep the question open. We must, therefore, prepare ground for it and consider the question after the American elections.

Chou: I am grateful to you for your attention to this question. As regards deterioration of the question, it would not deteriorate any more. We have withdrawn some of our troops and our side will not commit any provocative actions. Mr Rhee⁶⁶ will also not be able to create much trouble. Therefore, the agenda question will not deteriorate. Whatever happens, they will not break. In any case we can prevent small scale conflict.

Let us now talk of our own problems. It would suggest that taking advantage of your visit here we should promote economic cooperation and I would like to mention some specific questions in this connection:

1) Aviation intercourse: We desire that Indian Airlines should come into Canton via Hong Kong so that they can be connected with China. From next year we will completely have our own aviation services and we want to develop them and this has prospects in the future. Similarly, on the basis of equality our airlines also should extend to Calcutta. Of course, we will not be having any airlines to India immediately while India may be able to start airlines to China

⁶⁵ The Soviet resolution on Taiwan urged the General Assembly to consider acts of aggression by US against People's Republic of China through Taiwan and sought the Assembly to (i) condemn US action; (ii) recommend withdrawal of US military forces; and a declaration on stoppage of military activity in the region. The resolution came up for discussion on 30 January 1955.

⁶⁶ Syngman Rhee. President, Republic of Korea.

immediately. But since we are friendly countries Indian extension can start and we are giving it as a gesture to a friendly country. If we agreed here, we can only exchange views now but the matter may be taken up through diplomatic channels later on and an agreement can be reached.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: The question of airlines requires careful consideration and these facilities are always reciprocal. We have air agreements with United States, United Kingdom and some other countries. At present we are running an international airline to London via Europe. It used to be a jointly operated, private and State enterprise, but since last year it has been taken over by the State.⁶⁷ We have extended it to the East. Our idea was to extend it to Japan but the terms are not yet agreed to. We had an agreement with the United States. We wanted to change it because it was disadvantageous to us. We talked for a year but still no agreement was reached. We have given notice, therefore, to them to cancel the agreement. Anyway, as I said it, the matter is for close consideration. (am glad you have agreed to it in principle.

Chou: Of course, it will take time but we agree on principle and the other details can be worked out through diplomatic channels.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: Yes, but diplomatic channels will be helped if you send an expert to Delhi to help.

Chou: Yes, it is a good idea. I would also like to mention that we should have more mutual assistance and cooperation in technical field. In the past some Indian firms have asked Dr Hou⁶⁸ to go to India for caustic soda, for he has made certain contribution in this field in China and we would like him to go to India.

Some Indian experts may also come here for sanitation and other matters and we would help such mutual cooperation.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: I agree. Your Excellency had mentioned about sending two students to India to study statistical instruments. I say that they are most

⁶⁷ On 1 August 1953.

⁶⁸ Hou Teh-pang (b. 1890); industrial chemist: educated at MIT and Columbia University, USA: Vice-Chairman, All China Federation of Scientific Societies. 1950; Vice-Minister of Chemical Industry, 1957; President, China Chemistry and Chemical Engineering Society. 1959; author of Manufacture of Soda Ash.

welcome, but language may be a difficulty and I do not know about it. But in a technical subject it may after all be not much of a difficulty. I am very happy that you agree to such exchange and cooperation. But in this respect further developments are to be made. Our experts and writers should not only visit China but can also lecture and do research here. We welcome Chinese experts in every department. A Science Congress is held in India in the beginning of January every year and you can send scientists to attend it. I wonder whether you sent any scientists last year.

Chou: We would participate hereafter.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: We want to encourage intercourse between China and India not only in scientific and trade matters but others as well. We might encourage individuals apart from delegations to visit any of the other country at their own expense and they should be given facilities to come and go about. We can also exchange books and journals.

Tibetan Pilgrims: There is a small matter which I may take this opportunity to mention to you. Some complaints have recently been received from pilgrims going to Tibet. Some of them are apparently being harassed by guards and I hope that Your Excellency will look into the matter. As you are aware, every summer there is a large pilgrim traffic between India and Tibet. As an example of the sort of harassment to which these pilgrims are subjected, I would mention that one of my friends was stopped by the border guards who told him that he could not be regarded as a pilgrim because he was not wearing a monk's gown.

Nepal: You had mentioned Nepal's case. I would like to say a few words about it. From the beginning Nepal has been a headache to us. In recent history Nepal was controlled by an autocratic family of Prime Ministers and the King was a prisoner. There were frequent assassinations and India is full of ex-Prime Ministers from Nepal who, however, brought with them wealth to last for generations.

Britain did not interfere in Nepal's domestic affairs but controlled its foreign relations. Two or three years ago the young King favoured a popular party and there was a petty uprising by the popular party which would have been easily suppressed, but Nepal Government was afraid of what view India might take.

The King, afraid of being killed, took refuge in our Embassy at Kathmandu with his family, including grandsons, except one grandson, The Prime Minister deposed the King next day and the two-year old grandson was enthroned. We understood that Britishers had decided to recognise this small King but at this time we told them that we would not tolerate it and would not recognize him. This put England in a difficult position since especially Nepal was surrounded on all sides by Indian territory and they hesitated. The Nepal King came to India and stayed as a guest for about three months. Finally, the Prime Minister agreed to come to terms with the popular party and a compromise government was formed. Later, however, the old Prime Minister was pushed out completely."⁶⁹

Conditions in Nepal are unstable and hundred years of despotic Rana rule has left it without any initiative. Our desire is that Nepal should be independent and in fact we do not want to exercise the rights which Britain did. But her foreign policy must be coordinated with ours. America, however, is creating a lot of trouble. Although America has no embassy in Kathmandu, the American Ambassador in India⁷⁰ is accredited to Kathmandu. They are further sending books for libraries and lot of money is thrown about.⁷¹ Nepalese are easily bribed and they are thus inducing Nepal to allow America to establish an embassy there, but on our advice they postponed.

The main difficulty is that if China opened an embassy there, America will also do likewise. Therefore, Nepal should be treated with indulgence. After the King's return from Switzerland-and in view of the frequent changes in the Prime Ministers he is a more important and popular figure-this can be considered. It would suggest that you can accredit your Ambassador in Delhi⁷² as concurrently Ambassador to Nepal, thus obviating the difficulty of Nepal being also forced to allow Americans to open embassy in Nepal.

Chou: (1) As regards visits by individuals, we agree.

⁶⁹ See Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 15 Pt. I1, pp. 355-404.

⁷⁰ George V. Allen.

⁷¹ During 1950-55, out of a total US economic assistance of \$ 841 million for Colombo Plan countries, Nepal was allotted \$ 4 million. See also Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 25, pp. 452-53.

⁷² Yuan Chung-hsien.

(2) As regards the pilgrims, they will be treated according to the provisions of the agreement.⁷³ We would like to check up on the matter and if there is something incorrect it will be corrected.

(3) Nepal: We can consider Nepal's difficulties and not allow US to have any excuse. We are willing to appoint our Ambassador in Delhi as concurrent Ambassador to Kathmandu. If any new developments and difficulties occur in future kindly keep us informed through your embassy here or our embassy in Delhi, so that we shall have intimate relationship. But in doing this we do not want to add any trouble. Our purpose is to increasing our solidarity with South East Asian countries in the interest of peace and not create any trouble.

JN: America is creating a lot of trouble in Nepal. They were doing anti-Indian propaganda and we had to warn them that India has a special position in Nepal and it must be recognised.

Finally, I would mention only one small matter regarding supply of cocoons to Kashmir.

Chou: It is an economic matter and of course, it can be done. May be you send a man here to select a variety and talk the matter over.

I have arranged for you to meet my two associates, Vice Premier Chen Yun⁷⁴ and Li Fu-chen. Mr Chen Yun knows every thing about our financial and economic matters and if you want any material on any specific topic you can tell him directly and they will arrange to give you....

JN: We would like to send a small team consisting of younger people to come here and study and discuss certain aspects of your national planning. We have already sent one delegation to Soviet Union to study their planning.

Chou: It may be advantageous to you. You can compare. Perhaps we are more backward than the Soviet Union but still...⁷⁵

Now all the problems have been basically covered. After your return from northeast would you like to issue a joint communiqué?

JN: A formal communiqué may not be necessary. I would refer generally to

⁷³ Sino-Indian Agreement on Tibet 1954. See Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 25, p. 168

⁷⁴ Vice Premier, State Council of China, 1949-75, 1978-80; Vice Chairman, Chinese Communist Party, 1956-59, 1979-81.

⁷⁵ Omission in the source.

talks in my press interviews and statements here and in India. A vague communiqué does not help and a detailed one may create difficulties.

War and Peace⁷⁶

Mao Tse-tung: How the talks between the two Prime Ministers are proceeding?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We have discussed a great variety of questions and the talks were very satisfactory,

Mao: It is but natural. We have no quarrels between us. We had some quarrels with the Labour Party Delegation.⁷⁷ We spent three and a half hours in talks with the Labour Party Delegation, out of which two hours were spent in quarrels. But we quarrelled happily. They then talked about a great variety of topics and they spoke of doubts and disagreements and we did likewise. They asked us whether we wanted to destroy or undermine Labour Party. I said we would not and we could not do so. If British Labour Party is to be destroyed, that is to say, if that is to happen then British working class should do it.

According to their observation their course was better. They think they are socialists and we are communists and their road is better and effective. I said the question of your effectiveness may better not be talked. However, if you insist then we would express our views. Your policy, I said, would not reach the goal of socialism. You are still an imperialist country. They denied it. They asked whether we could cooperate with such sort of people. And I said entirely so. We said cooperation between two countries of different ideologies is entirely possible. Not only the British Labour Party but even if Churchill's Party wishes to cooperate we will also cooperate. We are also willing to cooperate with America if they want it. And there were some other matters of dispute. This was the Attlee Delegation.

They were further worried (concerned) about our population being too large. They seem to have the idea that greater population would mean aggression. In our view our population problem would be solved under the new social system. It could be solved within the country.

⁷⁶ Minutes of talks with Mao Tse-tung, Beijing, 23 October 1954. .IN Collection. Extracts.

⁷⁷ The delegation from UK visited China from 15 to 31 August and met Mao on 24 August 1954.

Does any of the South East Asian countries have the same doubts regarding our population?

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: Yes. I mentioned last time that some of the South East Asian countries have apprehensions. Even in the past the Chinese and Indian populations spread out to these countries and so there is not only the fear of population, but in addition, of the strong nation behind it. But their apprehensions are not the same as of some European countries. This applies to India also. In Africa, European settlers are carrying on an anti-India campaign where they are describing India as "Indian imperialism" while actually it is they who are imperialists.

I might mention that I met one or two members of the British Delegation who gave me a brief account of their talks held here.

Mao: Yes. We must talk out differences if any. That is good. Whatever places Labour Delegates wanted to see we allowed them to see. We do not favour Hitler's assertion, also made by the Japanese before, regarding 'have not' countries.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: Even before Hitler, Kaiser Wilhem talked the same way in Europe. About fifty years ago he had drawn a cartoon entitled "Yellow peril" in which he showed herds from Asia marching against Europe and he himself defending it. And by that probably he referred to Japanese.

Mao: Yes; ten years ago Japan was just this "yellow peril". Now we need at least scores of years of peace to develop our country and to raise the livelihood of our people. We do not want war. If we can create these conditions it will be good. We will cooperate with anyone who is in favour of this objective. India is undoubtedly in favour of this. So also Burma and Indonesia. Even countries like Thailand, we do not think, are contemplating aggression. We want to improve our relationship with the Thai Government, but Thai Government is peculiar. They do not want to pay any attention to us. Another case is that of Philippines. They all the same say that we want aggression, but they do not say anything when we say we want to establish and improve relations. On the one hand, they say, they are afraid but when we want to issue something like a statement issued by India and China, about non-aggression,

etc., they do not do it. We cannot find any reasons for it. They are depending on America and follow the same track.

Speaking of the United States, in the last conversation there was one question we did not finish, viz. the question of war. Do you think that US wants war and would use war to achieve her interests?

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: The Chairman has made many observations and I refer to some of them. Countries like Burma, Indonesia, and India not only support peace but they entirely favour peace. It is not only because peace is good, but out of selfish reasons. It is an absolute necessity. Otherwise all these countries face danger and destruction and it is an urgent necessity. There is no European country which is not desirous of peace and actively afraid of war. So is Asia too.

As regards US, the question is too difficult to have a simple answer. Because there are many elements in the US policy. I believe the majority of people in the United States want peace and there are many even in the Government who want peace. However, in the last few years there has been a growing tendency in US towards war, especially in the Defence Department and the military officials who have gained far greater strength in their foreign policy. Many of these high military officers think in terms of war but many in the civilian administration do not. Thus there is a conflict between civil and military administration's and many military generals openly talk of war.

Eisenhower does not want war but he may be driven into it. He is weak and he does not understand politics.

I happened to meet Dulles in Paris six years ago.⁷⁸ Then the elections were to take place and he hoped to become the Secretary of State. However, in the elections Truman won and Dulles did not then become the Secretary of State. He then said that of course they did not want war but he thought war would come because of the aggressive activities of the communist countries. He said war will not solve any question or questions. It is ultimately the system which pays greatest dividends that will win. Of course, he was speaking in business language. What he meant was the system which will show greater results.

⁷⁸ Nehru was in Paris in October-November 1948 to attend UN General Assembly session and met Dulles.

Mao: Indeed, Dulles talked quite well!

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: A man like Dulles is a great menace. He is a Methodist or a Baptist preacher who religiously goes to Church and he is narrow-minded and bigoted. He thinks every one must agree with him and a man like him might take any move.

I had a long talk with Eisenhower when he was the President of the Columbia University.⁷⁹ He then said to me that he had seen much of war and he no more wanted war. And it did seem to me that he meant it. But unfortunately he is so completely in the hands of third rate advisers that he moves from one opinion to another. In about one month's time elections will be held in America and I think Democrats will get majority in the Congress. It will mean a lessening of tensions and from the point of view of war it will be better.

The only persons who think that they will really profit by war are, perhaps, Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee.

Mao: We must study the questions of the advantages of war. We have seen two Wars and we must study who profited from them. The last two Wars benefited three kinds of countries while all other countries suffered. We might perhaps classify them into three categories:

1. US imperialism: They profited by both Wars and made profits;
2. Countries led by communist parties or the working class; and
3. (3) Oppressed people led by patriotic groups and parties who are still not communists like India, Indonesia, Syria and even Egypt.

If war comes people have to be mobilised and kept under constant tension but then organisation of the people gives rise to revolution as in China and India.

By the way, do you call your struggle a revolution?

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: Most certainly we do.

Mao: Our countries, China and India, achieved independence as a result of the Second World War. As a consequence of War another group of countries like Japan, Germany and Italy became weak. But some of the other countries who won the War also became weak. Thus, Chiang Kai-shek weakened and we stood up; Britain weakened and India, Burma, Egypt, etc., stood up; France weakened and Ho Chi Minh rose. I do not know what the American military

⁷⁹ See Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 13, pp. 314-320.

groups have in mind. They are probably benefited and advanced by the two Wars and they think they will profit in a third world war. But as a result of the third world war it is not certain that America will be benefited and on the other hand she may find herself in trouble. Majority of Islamic countries like Syria in Western Asia and countries in Latin America and even perhaps America proper may possibly shake off the yoke of American imperialists. Revolutionary force of the people always needs a chance to come up. For example, the Bolsheviks. If they had no chance of the First World War, revolution would have been difficult. So also in China. We got a chance because of the Japanese War and we came up. This is also true of patriotic parties in the South East and West Asia. The real result of the Two World Wars is like this and in our view if a third world war is started, it will be to America's disadvantage. If a third world war starts, major portion of the world will be in a revolutionary stage. I am not saying it to make the people afraid but because it is really so as shown by the Second War.

Coming to the weapons, US depends on artillery, navy and bomb. They think they are strong, but there is no basic change except that more people would be killed. In olden days they used "cold weapons" (i.e., knives, swords etc). Now hot weapons (rifles, guns etc.) are used. Cold ones kill less people and hot ones kill more people; atomic weapons will kill still more people. But besides increasing the rate of mortality they make no difference. In a third world war many more people would be killed.

We have no atom bomb. I do not know whether you have it. We have just started scientific research and we have no money. We cannot possibly undertake it now. But atom bomb is possessed by both America and USSR. So, regarding arms, both sides are equal. The deciding factor is the people, the people who handle these weapons. Most important thing is as to what the soldiers think is to their best advantage. Communist Party like your Congress Party had no weapons to start with, but now we have. Another experience in both the World Wars is that countries on the defensive won and who started the War were defeated. In the First War, Germany marched as far as Paris to the west and Petrograd to the east. In the Second War also the defensive side won though Britain and France were a bit weakened; i.e., to say wars have not

been advantageous to the aggressor. Therefore, our conclusion is that there should not be another war.' We should have long-term peace.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: Chairman has been good enough to give analysis of wars and their effects. Chairman is an expert and his views deserve to be respected. I should say that there is a large measure of agreement between us on many points but with reservations on some.

(1) Even without war, India would have attained freedom. Actually war provided a pick-axe in the hands of the British to hold on for a long time in India.

(2) The US gained by War yet the position after War was not to her liking. USSR also had gained and America was facing many problems and although she had won, she was unhappy.

Chairman's arguments would lead to the conclusion that war though bad and therefore, should be avoided, still if it comes, should be welcomed.

I venture to disagree about weapons. It is not a matter of quantity but of quality. It is not mere greater killing but more than that. For, the killing is on such a vast scale that America will not profit and no other counter will profit also.

I am not an expert but I have studied science and I am in charge of the work on atomic research in my country. I have studied a little about some of the new developments in European countries. If a war starts it will result in the destruction of military and industrial centres of both sides.

America thinks that they can destroy every administrative (governmental), industrial, productive and army centres of the USSR. Of course, Soviets also will not keep quiet. They too will destroy American centres. But the hydrogen bomb releases a chain reaction which is uncontrollable. The mere process of that energy creates another energy which will kill and none will be able to control them. The nature of war will be quite different and it will essentially destroy the industrialised countries.

I agree with Chairman's viewpoint that in final analysis human beings count. But third world war may bring in accompanying changes and enormous destruction and there might well be chaos. Again, if all highly trained persons were destroyed we cannot easily start again. I am saying from a purely

practical viewpoint third world war will be quite different from the ones before. We cannot measure now its results. May be, there is no peace at all because there is no one (i.e., to say no organised machinery or government) to make peace. Of course, this is all guess work. China perhaps might suffer less because it is the industrialised nations which will suffer most, since there are nerve centres which can be destroyed easily.

There is another aspect to be considered and that is the brutalising effect of war on humanity. War may result in degradation of large number of human beings. Therefore, on every count war has to be avoided.

Chairman is right when he says that in the two Wars the aggressor was defeated and yet a little twist, speaking from a purely practical viewpoint, may have given advantage to the aggressor. Hitler was a foolish person and he lost many opportunities. It would have been better for him if he had been more patient and wise. In the First World War Germany was defeated but it was - just touch and go. It was not so sure.

There are many forces at work in the world and some are exaggerated by war, but some are exaggerated even without War. Even today British and French imperialism exist. Of course, European imperialism today is a dying thing. The French imperialism ceased after the First World War, while the British imperialism ceased after the Second War. It was hastened by war. There is no doubt about it. I do not think European countries are likely to continue as imperialist powers, because there is no strength left in them to do so. Their source of strength has dried up. American imperialism, however, is of a different type.

Mao: They (Britain and France) are not strong. But still they have colonies and semi-colonies.

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: Yes, but they are weakened and there is no strength left in them. Only place they can hold on to is Africa.

Mao: Is Egypt still under British direction?

JAHAWARLAL NEHRU: No. The American influence is more than the British influence.

Mao: Our conclusions are equal (the same). Regarding analysis, we agree on some and do not agree on others. Prime Minister Nehru's analysis of facts

regarding US, viz., that US profited on one side and is facing difficulties on the other, is very good.

And also his analysis of weapons being qualitatively different-if we see the development of weapons there is the arrow stage, the cannon stage and the atom stage-this is also correct.

But when I talked of war-about the result of weapons of war, whatever weapons are used-cold, hot or atomic and how large the scale of war may be-the result is destruction of the other side. But truce was arranged on the 38th parallel. Here, truce was arranged without any power being totally destroyed. If you look back on past wars, in most cases the defeated suffered most destruction; the losing side lost not only men but also in material. So victory or defeat hinges on the scope of destruction suffered.

JN: May I venture to ask you a question? I should have thought that the scope of destruction suffered by the USSR in the Second World War was far greater than any other country, but because of perseverance it still won.

Mao: I was talking about final result when I said so. The German armies were totally destroyed, but the Soviet Armies were not.

Again the Prime Minister's estimate that as a possible result of the third world war one may find oneself in a chaotic situation, this may be correct. It is also true that energy released by atom will destroy not only men but material, agriculture, and human beings in tens of millions. But if one government goes away there will be another and as long as there are people men will always find a way out. The surviving people will also find a way to keep themselves alive. However, people at present are different from those in the past. There is a high degree of consciousness and aspirations for liberation and independence. This is so even in the US. So, in the final analysis it is better not to fight. If we act as Chief of Staff to Eisenhower, we would advise him not to go to war. (All smile): This work, however, can be more easily done by the Prime Minister (i.e., Nehru) rather than us. If we do it, he will think we are intimidating him with revolution and he will say: "I am not afraid of revolution."

JN: We cannot directly influence America. But we may be able to influence her indirectly through countries like Britain, France or Canada.

I recently received a message from Churchill which in brief said that he was anxious over the tendencies towards war and he was trying to curb such tendencies in America. He said he was also thinking about the final admission of China to the United Nations.

Mao: Not only war but tensions also may seem to be to the advantage of those responsible for them, but they are disadvantageous to them. Is it after all better to let people have peace or to allow them to stay in tense situation every day? Tense situation every, where will awaken people and will be helpful to revolution.

Between India and China there is no tension, there is no psychological war. We do not spread psychological war among the people. We do not guard against each other as US and USSR do.

JN: In the United States the argument is advanced that they do not want war but they must keep up the tension so that the Congress will sanction money for the armies.

Mao: That is only one advantage they are considering but they are also making countries follow them by intimidation, building military bases, etc. It is not merely a question of appropriations.

What do you think about convening a World Peace Congress? Do you think it is possible? Over a hundred nations all over the world can participate and there should be a sort of treaty for peace and non-aggression.

JN: Well, I cannot say. But with every passing year the possibility of war is getting less and if fifteen years pass without a war the possibility will be very remote indeed. Not that it is the people who will have changed but nobody would dare use such destructive weapons and a time may come when war would be avoided by a world agreement and mutual adjustment.

Mao: Is there any hope within ten years?

JN: Fears of consequences of war are growing and they will grow as the people know more about the weapons and after fifteen years the weapons will be such that no one dare use them for war. It would mean destruction of both sides. Of course, I am giving my assurances.

Mao: Naturally we cannot stand guarantee for what they are doing.

JN: If, for example death rays are invented, not to speak of nations, any group

of people can destroy the world.

Mao: One thing is there that is fear of weapons, but there is fear of revolutions also.

JN: Of course. But weapons may be in hands of even certain groups. And as the science of communications advances there may be more types of guided missiles. There is, for example, a machine which plays chess. There might be created a machine which can fight and of course a machine would do it more efficiently. As science advances rapidly it may give enormous power to a group or a small number of anti-social persons.

Mao: Finally we must work together for preventing war and for a lasting peace.

JN: Undoubtedly so.

Mao: We have just started our Five Year Plan. If there be a war, all our plans will be destroyed. We have spent all money on construction. If war should come we have to gather everything to wage the war and all construction will be stopped and war plan will have to come and it would postpone industrialization of China. Of course, it is difficult to sink entire China into the sea and so too India, no matter how many people are killed.⁸⁰

Sino-Indian Friendship⁸¹

Mr Mayor⁸² and Citizens of Peking,

Four days ago I arrived in this ancient and historic city and you have me a magnificent welcome. During these four days I have been surrounded and overwhelmed by friendship and hospitality and affection and I cannot tell you how deeply moved I have been. This demonstration of affectionate welcome to a visitor from another country has seemed to me to have a symbolic significance.

I came to this great country of China, which is itself a little world, from another

⁸⁰ At the end of the minutes Paranjpe recorded that the discussions went on to subjects like evolution of humanity. geological past of India and China till dinner.

⁸¹ Speech at a public meeting in Beijing, 23 October 1954. File No. 8/294/54-PMS. Also available in The Hindu. 24 October 1954.

⁸² Peng Chen. the mayor of Beijing.

great country which is also a little world of its own. Both have long roots in the past. Going back to the dawn of history, both have received through the ages innumerable streams of thought and culture from outside and have absorbed them and made them their own, giving them the impress of their own powerful personalities. They have changed and adapted themselves from time to time, and now, after long years of suppression, they have changed again and are blossoming out in various ways. These new and revolutionary changes in China and India, even though they differ in their content, symbolise the new spirit of Asia and the new vitality which is finding expression in the countries of Asia. Both our countries as well as the other countries of Asia have tremendous problems to face and we face them with assurance and self confidence and with the firm desire to build our countries and bring happiness and contentment to our vast populations. That is the desire of every country in Asia.

We bear no ill will to any other country or people and desire to live at peace with the world. Although we have suffered at the hands of others in past years, I hope that we will bear no grudge against them and that no others will interfere with us.

Each of our countries was conditioned in its own way by its natural genius and the circumstances that faced it. We attained our freedom pursuing different paths. In India we were fortunate in achieving independence through peaceful methods and by a peaceful settlement and today we have no ill will against those who; in previous years, dominated over us. China's struggle was more arduous and more full of conflict.

The emergence of China and India as free and sovereign countries, as well as the freedom that has come to other countries in Asia, has changed the face of this ancient continent. The old balance of forces, which resulted in the domination of Asia, has gone and a new equilibrium is gradually arising through pain and turmoil.

While these great changes have taken place in the political, economic and social spheres, another mighty revolution is gradually taking shape. We stand at the threshold of a new age when man will command the tremendous forces released by atomic energy. Even as the Industrial Revolution, which began

nearly 200 years ago, changed the face of the world, we are likely to see a greater change in the present generation.

It is in this mighty context and in this perspective that we have to look at the problems of today. These great forces can destroy the world and can also advance humanity to unimaginable levels of human well-being.

It is this vital choice that the world has to make today. The choice is between peaceful progress and war, a war that will not be like the wars of old, but something infinitely worse and more destructive, something that might destroy civilization as we know it and degrade human beings to the level of the beast. There can be only one answer to this question. But the mere avoidance of war is not enough. We have to remove the causes that lead to war and promote actively a climate of peace and goodwill. Fear and hatred and violence have darkened man's horizon for many years. Violence breeds violence, hatred degrades and stultifies, and fear is a bad companion. We have to get out of the vicious circle of conflict and try to build a new world based on friendly cooperation, where there is no domination or exploitation of one country by another, of one class by another, of one race by another. In our endeavours to build this new world, I earnestly hope that our methods will be those of peace and cooperation, for, I am convinced, that evil and violent methods cannot lead to good results.

China is a proud country with the culture of ages behind her. She rejoices in her new found freedom and strength and look forward with hope and confidence to the future. As an individual I may count for little but I am also proud of my country and my heritage and, as a representative of my country and people, I can speak with strength and confidence in the future. But it is with no sense of pride but rather of humility that I face these great problems which confront us and which demand not pride of spirit and national vain glory and assertiveness, but rather the spirit of accommodation and friendly cooperation between all nations, great and small, to whatever continent they may belong. In this approaching atomic age, the rivalries and conflicts of the past have no place and we have to think and act in a different way. If this world and what it has achieved are to survive.

Great nations are today ranged against each other and there is said to be a

conflict between East and West. We talk of disarmament, but each great country adds to its armed strength, and new and terrible weapons of war are forged. That is not the way to peace. We must recognize that the only way to live in this world is through coexistence and cooperation and recognition of the right of each country to live its own life. There can be no East and West ranged against each other in the future. There could be only one world devoting itself in friendly cooperation between its different parts to the advancement of humanity. The recent agreement in Geneva, in which the representatives of China played such a distinguished part and which brought peace to Indo-China, has shown us the way to peaceful settlements by negotiation of difficult problems. There is no reason why we should not apply this method to other problems also, even though there are difficulties and the way may be long. That is the only path we can tread.

The Five Principles declared on behalf of China and India lay the foundations of this new approach. I earnestly trust that they will be accepted and acted upon not only by the countries and peoples of Asia but also by other countries and peoples. Thus, we shall enlarge the area of peace and remove the fear of war and the tensions that exist today.

I have come to you as a messenger of peace and goodwill and I have found here both the spirit of peace and goodwill. So, I have felt in harmony with my surroundings and my faith in the future has strengthened.

I shall ever remain grateful to you, people of China, for the way you have honoured me and my country with your friendship and affection. May China and India in cooperation with other countries, work for peace and succeed in this endeavour.

Exchange of Views on World Issues⁸³

Jawaharlal Nehru: In connection with your proposed visit to Indonesia, I wish to correct some of the earlier views I had expressed. Previously I thought that the time may not be suitable for you to undertake a visit just now, but now I feel that no new change is likely to take place in the Indonesian Government

for sometime and it might be all right for you to go there as suggested earlier.⁸⁴

Secondly, I want to draw your attention to some of the recent changes in Pakistan. As you perhaps have already learnt, a state of emergency has been declared in Pakistan and the Constituent Assembly has been dissolved. A new Cabinet is being organized. What you should take note of is that the position of the Pakistan Prime Minister has suffered and is going to suffer a great change. We are likely to have a visit within a few months from Marshal Tito.⁸⁵ He is going to Burma and on his way he desired to visit India. He wanted to come and we said yes, you are welcome. There are, however, no specific matters to be discussed.

Chou: I would like to say a few words about Yugoslavia. Recently, Yugoslavia's attitude has been fairly good and she supports peace. She shows willingness to work for peace and has taken a positive attitude in opposing splitting of Europe.⁸⁶ She has also shown readiness to resume normal relations with us and we are in touch with them.⁸⁷ We should not reject any country which desires peace, but we should help it. During his (Marshal Tito's) visit to India, Prime Minister Nehru would be able to promote this work.

JN: Perhaps you might be knowing that Canada has put forward a resolution in

⁸⁴ The change in Nehru's views was prompted by the smooth passing over of a brewing cabinet crisis in Indonesia, which resulted in the resignation of three ministers belonging to the PIR (Greater Indonesia Party), on 22 October 1954. A move to topple the PNI Government was averted by securing support from the Independents.

⁸⁵ Josip Broz Tito, President of Yugoslavia, visited India from 16 December 1954 to 3 January 1955.

⁸⁶ The bone of contention between the Western bloc powers and Yugoslavia was Trieste. Under military occupation of US, UK and Yugoslavia, the Free territory of Trieste was divided in zone 'A' (including city of Trieste. under US and UK forces) and zone 'B' (including the Istrian peninsula. under Yugoslav occupation). Earlier Tito had threatened that any attempt to hand over zone 'A' to Italy would be considered as 'aggression' on Yugoslav territory. On 5 October 1954, UK, US, Italy and Yugoslavia signed an MOU terminating military occupation of both zones and agreed to hand over zone 'A' to Italy and zone 'B' to Yugoslavia.

⁸⁷ On 10 January 1955, Yugoslavia and China agreed to establish diplomatic relations.

the United Nations and France, England and America have also supported it.⁸⁸ I hear that Russia is also putting forward a resolution in support. Although USA is rather trying to belittle it, still I might mention that to a certain extent our representation has been a little helpful.⁸⁹

Chou: It is for the first time that four major Powers plus Canada with India's help are sponsoring a resolution. It also shows that USSR is willing to cooperate. The attitude of Britain and France is good. Attitude of America is doubtful. I am sure things will take time but it will come slowly.

JN: I wanted to mention another matter: I had conveyed your views on Korea to Mr. Menon and his reply was received this morning. According to him, a draft has been proposed by sixteen countries but it is not yet signed. There seems to be some conflict between the US and Britain. The US still insists on UN supervision to which China and Korea do not agree, while the UK is trying to get the US to agree to a less rigid formula. Our attempt there is to make the report purely factual without any recommendations. If there are recommendations then a conflict arises. We do not want the UN to be committed to anything. We would like to have only a statement of facts and there is likelihood of this succeeding.⁹⁰

Chou: Does it mean that no recommendations will be made on this agenda item?

JN: Yes; if any recommendation is made, it will be a bad recommendation. To prevent that we suggest there should be no recommendation. Of course, we hope that mutual consultations would continue and there should be a

⁸⁸ The resolution calling for resumption of discussion on the recommendations of the "London Sub-Committee" of June 1954 on reaching an agreement regarding establishment of an International Disarmament Commission, including ban on nuclear weapons. was passed by the UN Political Committee on 27 October 1954 and by the General Assembly on 4 November 1954.

⁸⁹ The new Soviet proposal, put up on 1 October 1954, asked the UN disarmament Committee to prepare a draft on International Convention "aimed at strengthening of peace and security by prohibiting nuclear, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction." This resolution abandoned the previously held Soviet insistence on international inspection of atomic resource sites. The Indian resolution as a supplement, sought an arms truce along with disarmament.

⁹⁰ See post. pp. 211-213.

continuation of the Geneva Conference. Krishna Menon says that any proposal to have a new conference now will be unwise. So, first there should be consultations. I feel some way can be found if we look upon Geneva Conference as continuing and not ask for a new conference.

Your Excellency (Premier Chou) had also suggested that India should join the Conference. We feel it would be unwise to make it a condition because it will meet with difficulties. Instead, we feel that the Geneva Conference should be convened and then the suggestion made there. Chou: Good idea. We want to see Asian countries participating.

JN: The whole line of thinking I suggest is:

- (i) To regard Geneva Conference as continuing and eventually we can get the UN to accept it;
- (ii) the Armistice Commission should continue; and
- (iii) to prevent the UN passing any rigid resolution which may come in the way later.

Chou: I agree entirely~.

JN: His Excellency (Premier Chou) had suggested that the conference may be at Geneva or Delhi. We feel Delhi may raise difficulties, so Geneva is better.

Chou: Geneva is not bad, but it is more appropriate that a conference on Asia should be held in Delhi. But of course, that is if other countries agree, otherwise Geneva is also good.

JN: We would like to have it in Delhi. But I suggested Geneva to avoid misunderstanding.

Chou: What about conditions in Pakistan? What is your opinion about the coup d'etat?⁹¹ It may be difficult to say anything now but I would like to know your views.

JN: New elections will be held. It was obviously because the Government was cracking up and could not simply hold. They will try to maintain and gain time. Last Government also did likewise till they could not hold on any longer. Fresh elections would mean the Constitution will be over-thrown. You know the elections in Pakistan in the past have been very corrupt and they are mostly arranged elections. But if fair elections are held they will affect the present

⁹¹ See ante, p. 21.

leadership. Your Excellency (Premier Chou), we had many talks so far and I have profited by them. I hope we will have many more talks and we must talk more because it is helpful to our understanding.

Chou: Now that mutual visits have started, there is no need hereafter to be formal. We can increase individual contacts. Next time I go to India there should not be so much formality so that it will be easy to go there.

JN: Yes, but at least on this count you should not complain. You have shown equal formality in receiving me here.

Chou: Hereafter it will be all informal.

JN: I agree.

Chou: I have told you about material on Taiwan and I have brought with me a map and some statistics regarding parachuted secret agents etc.. Premier Chou gives the material to PM). Among the eighteen Americans who were airdropped five died in coming down. We have enough evidence from the captured about their engaging in espionage activities.

JN: Has it been published?

Chou: Only partly. Some of it has been exhibited by our Ministry of Public Security and some newspapermen were asked to go and see for their reference. Mr Bahadur Singh was also invited.⁹² There are two cases of American agents and we are going to publish their sentences. As usual, they have been dealt with according to our lenient policy towards foreigners.⁹³ Even the US papers have admitted that after the Geneva talks with Americans around eight or eighteen Americans who were guilty of crimes here were released.

Another tale is about aircraft intrusions. We have published the total number of sorties and have itemized it. These have also been published. The number of British vessels affected is specially large.

You will be leaving tomorrow. We have arranged for you to over-fly Huai River for forty-five minutes. Madame Pandit also had been there before. Is there anything more to say?

⁹² J. Bahadur Singh was Political Adviser to the Indian Chaiman, NNRC in Korea from 1953-54.

⁹³ See post, p. 214.

JN: There are many matters, but we must stop now.

Chou: I hope we shall be meeting again next year.

JN: I hope so.

Large Measure of Agreement with China⁹⁴

During my few days' stay in Peking and elsewhere in China, I have often spoken in public. I should like to repeat to the press what I have said before, and express my gratitude for the warm and friendly welcome that I have received here. It is my belief that my visit, brief as it has been, will help not only to bring our two countries nearer to one another, but also the cause of world peace which we both cherish.

Peace is the fundamental basis for the progress that we want to make in our respective countries. Peace, therefore, is not merely a pious wish with us but an absolute necessity.

Both our countries are engaged in the great adventure of raising the standard of living of hundreds of millions of people and making all of them full sharers in freedom and prosperity. That is a magnificent task. We have set our feet firmly on the road that leads to it, and I have every faith that we shall continue to march along that path. In some ways our problems are the same and the conditions we have to face are also similar. Thus, we can learn much from each other.

I hope that the contacts between the two countries will grow in many ways. It is important that we should know each other. In the world today isolation for any country is out of tune with the great developments that have taken place. The barriers between different countries should be removed so that free intercourse might take place and bring better knowledge and understanding between different countries. To that end, we in India are anxious to help, not only in China but elsewhere.

I greet the people of China, and wish them well. To the Government of the People's Republic of China of which the cherished head is a figure of historic

⁹⁴ Press conference, Beijing, 26 October 1954. From Jawaharlal: Nehru: Press Conferences 1954. Information Service of India, Government of India. New Delhi.

stature and great achievement, Chairman Mao Tse-tung, I offer my deepest thanks for their gracious and generous hospitality.

I am told that certain press reports in London and New York have stated that there were sharp differences between Prime Minister Chou En-lai and myself in the course of our talks. These reports are wholly without foundation. Although India's basic approach is somewhat different from that of China's in regard to some matters, there have been no differences in our talks and I am happy to say that there has been a large measure of agreement.

Question: Both China and India are willing to see the Five Principles enunciated in the Nehru-Chou statement extended, so as to enlarge the area of peace.

Could you give us your views?

Jawaharlal Nehru: These Five Principles are excellent. I do not think there can be anything better as a statement of relationship between different countries. The question is how to apply these Five Principles and thereby create full confidence in various countries of the world. At present there is a certain lack of confidence all over the world. Every country seems to suspect some other country. If these Five Principles were applied, that apprehension and fear would grow less, and inevitably the chances of full cooperation will arise. The first thing would be for the different countries to deal directly with each other. The barriers between them being removed, they can show in their dealings how they can live up to these Five Principles.

Q: What do you think of the South East Asian Treaty Organization and its impact on the situation created by the Geneva Conference?

JN: First of all. I would say that the Geneva Conference was an excellent example of people with different viewpoints meeting together and hammering out a settlement. It shows the advantage of people meeting and discussing, even though they differ. The South East Asian Treaty Organization seems to me to come somewhat in the way of the atmosphere of meeting together and settling differences and, therefore, it has been a drawback to that extent. It is based, like other such organizations, on fear and on something approaching military sanctions which add to the element of apprehension and tension.

Q: What has the Prime Minister to say about peaceful settlement of the Korean question?

JN: This is a difficult question for me to answer. I will say this, that when there are difficult problems they should be tackled step by step. The first step that we should take is to keep the Geneva Conference on Korea going. Korea still remains to be discussed. I think that if this process is adopted and at a suitable and proper moment further discussions take place, the powers concerned will be able to find some way out.

Q: Could you tell us something about your talks with Dr Ho Chi Minh?

JN: I had very friendly talks with Dr Ho Chi Minh.⁹⁵ Primarily, they were concerned with the situation in Indo-China. Dr Ho assured me that they wanted to abide by the Geneva Agreements completely, and they would do so. We hope that this will result in friendly and satisfactory settlements between the powers concerned. Dr Ho expressed his friendliness to France and said that, in spite of past history, he would like to maintain friendly contacts with France. He also told us that the International Commission⁹⁶ was functioning very well. In fact, till that time all the decisions of the International Commission, consisting of India, Canada and Poland, had been unanimous. Dr Ho also referred to Laos and Cambodia, and said that he would welcome their free and independent existence. He hoped to have friendly contacts with neighbouring countries, including Thailand.

Q: Did you discuss the question of Taiwan^o.

JN: Yes, the question of Taiwan was referred to. The Chinese attitude to Taiwan is very well known. So far as we in India are concerned, we recognize only one Government of China, namely the People's Government of China. We do not recognize any other. So in theory no question arises for us.

In practice it is a difficult question, which we hope will be settled peacefully.

May I in this connection remind you of the recent agreement we arrived at in India with the French Government about certain French Settlements in India?

The French had been there for over 300 years, and it was a difficult question involving the prestige of a great country like France, and our own interests, We proceeded along peaceful lines and negotiated repeatedly. After several

⁹⁵ Nehru had a three-hour talk with Ho Chi Minh on 17 October 19~4. No record of this talk is available.

⁹⁶ See post, p. 94.

attempts we ultimately arrived at a friendly agreement with the French Republic and only two or three days ago this agreement was signed and these French settlements were handed over to India in a very friendly way.⁹⁷ This is a good example of settlement of difficult problems by agreement and with cooperation. In fact, our relations with France are now better than they had been in the past, and we hope that these French settlements which now form a part of India will remain centres of French culture.

Q: What are the prospects of a settlement in Goa?

JN: There is every hope, but no great expectation.

Q: What convinced you of the Chinese desire for peace?

JN: That is the resultant impression of many things - the talks I had with the leaders of the Chinese people, the vast number of smiling Chinese faces I saw and the appreciation on the part of the Chinese Government and people that any kind of war would come in the way of peaceful reconstruction of their country.

Q: Would you describe Dr Ho Chi Minh as a man of peace?

JN: Dr Ho Chi Minh struck me not only very much as a man of peace, but as an extraordinarily likeable and friendly person.

Q: What are your views about the holding of the Asian-African Conference?

JN: We-the Colombo countries-have already agreed in principle to hold such a Conference, since we feel that it will help in mutual understanding and in promoting peace, but details have not been decided upon. Probably in the course of a month or so, the Colombo countries might meet to consider this question.

Q: Would Dr Malan, the South African Premier, attend that Conference?

JN: Well, that raises various questions. The first is of inviting him to join the Conference and the second, his agreeing to join. I think both are unlikely. I might add that Dr Malan is not Afrscan but Euro-African.

Q: What are your impressions about China and the places you have seen?

JN: I have seen Peking, Mukden and Dairen. In the north-east, industrialization is proceeding apace, and I have no doubt that the pace will be fairly swift not

⁹⁷ The Agreement with France was signed on 21 October 1954 and the de facto transfer of the settlements took place on 1 November 1954. See post. pp. 220-221.

only there but elsewhere. In India we have the problem of industrialization as well as the problem of land. We are probably more industrialized at present than China is, and we are also trying to raise the pace of industrialization. So far as the land question is concerned we have proceeded more slowly than China. We have put an end to the big landlord system in India. That is the first step. Other steps are being contemplated now. In the main, however, we are concentrating on an intensive development of community life in innumerable villages, and they are bearing good results.

To Chou En-lai⁹⁸

Canton 29
October 1954

My dear Prime Minister,

I have repeatedly expressed my gratitude to you and to your Government, both formally and otherwise. On the eve of my departure from China, I am writing to you this personal letter. As you were good enough to state, our relations have ceased to be purely formal and it is my privilege to claim friendship with you.

No words of mine can tell you how deeply impressed I have been with my visit to this new China and with the welcome that I have received both from the leaders and the Government of China and the people. That welcome was tremendous enough to have moved anyone. I have had a good deal of experience of mass gatherings and popular welcomes in my own country, as well as in other countries and I have grown receptive to not only what I see but what I feel. I have felt, during these ten days of my stay in China, something deeper than a popular welcome of an individual, whoever he might be. It has seemed to me that there was some emotion behind it, some conscious or sub-conscious awareness of the significance of my visit at this juncture of the history of our two countries. Your visit to India had that significance also and the people of my country showed their awareness of it by the welcome they gave you, even though you came suddenly.

⁹⁸ JN Papers. NMML. A copy of this letter was sent to N. Raghavan.

My visit to China was in continuation of your visit to India and a further link in the chain that is binding our countries to each other. It was this feeling in the popular mind, whether in India or in China, that these two great countries, both with their tremendous past and their great promise for the future, are drawing closer to each other and are destined to cooperate in the building up of that future. That, I believe, influenced our peoples.

To some extent, even peoples of other, countries have realised the significance of this new development in the relationship of India and China, and so, apart from individuals, these visits have become important events in a historic process. I welcome this because I firmly believe that we can be of help to each other and to the larger causes of Asia and the world.

In some matters we may not agree, but I do not think this need come in the way of our cooperation. If we had time and leisure, I would have liked to discuss many matters with you. That would have helped me to understand a little more the viewpoints and urges and objectives of China. I have endeavoured to understand them from reading the statements of the leaders of new China and I believe I have some knowledge of them now. Nevertheless, a personal talk is always more helpful rather than formal writings and declarations. Perhaps also I might have been able to explain to you and your colleagues how we function and what we hope to achieve in India.

The history of the last fifty years in China and India has been very different. It is natural, therefore, that the two countries and their peoples should have been conditioned differently, apart from the conditioning of past ages. We have to function in terms of our environments and the conditions that have made us and govern us today. I cannot say how I would have functioned in China or another country, because, if I lived there, I would have been conditioned differently. Nor, perhaps, can anyone living in another country say how he would have functioned if he lived in India. We have, therefore, to function in our respective environments in accordance with the backgrounds of our people and the objective conditions that we find among them at present.

As you know, our people have been powerfully influenced by Mahatma Gandhi's life and teachings. That itself was an outcome of the past and recent conditions in India and reflected the basic urges of the Indian people. We have,

therefore, adopted peaceful methods, believing not only in their validity but also in their practical utility. I cannot say what we would have done if conditions had been different. Nor can I presume to say anything about another country where these conditions were entirely different and the choices were limited.

Therefore, I do not presume to criticise any other country or any other way. But in my own country I have to function according to our own likes and our understanding of our people and our problems. We try to learn from the experience of other countries as well as from our own experience and our successes and failures. Because of this attitude, we try to be tolerant to others and seek to understand them, even though we may differ from them. We believe firmly that each country has to function according to its own genius and with roots in its own soil, though it should always learn from others. We believe also that in the world today there are great forces at work which inevitably bring different nations together, even though they might differ from each other. We should help that process in an understanding way and always avoid adding to those differences and the bitterness that comes from them. While this is our attitude generally towards all countries, it is natural for us to be drawn closer to some of them, more especially to our neighbour countries. That drawing together may be due to political reasons, which are important. But far more important is the emotional tie, which brings two countries and their peoples together. I believe that recent events have shown that there is this emotional tie, in addition to political considerations, between China and India. That, I am convinced, is a matter of great significance and historical importance.

During my journeys across China and the varied impressions that I have gathered, this feeling has been uppermost in my mind and I have continuously thought not only of present day problems but of the future. I think that it may be given to our countries to serve the cause of peace and human progress in a big way. Certainly the future of Asia can be influenced considerably, and that means influencing somewhat the rest of the world also.

I am anxious, as you are, that the contacts between India and China should grow. There is everything in favour of this. except one basic difficulty. 'I hat

difficulty is of language. Unfortunately, very few of our people know each other's languages and few know another common language. Language plays an important part in the relationship between countries, because it is only language that leads to real understanding. I can only hope that more and more of our people will learn each other's languages or be able to converse in some common language. I am afraid I am too old now and too much occupied otherwise to endeavour to learn the Chinese language.

Among minor matters, I hope that a wireless telephone communication be established between Peking and Delhi. I was surprised to learn that there is such a link between Peking and Karachi, but none with Delhi.⁹⁹ I hope also that more news would be exchanged between the two countries and that newspapermen will be able to help in this process.

I have written to you frankly as to a friend. I hope you do not mind. I thank you again for all that I have received and experienced during this memorable and unforgettable visit of mine to China.

With all good wishes to you and to China,

Yours very sincerely.

Jawaharlal Nehru

Page 54

Voyage of Discovery¹⁰⁰

I came to Calcutta sixteen days ago on my way to the east and am returning today. I feel very happy to be back among my own people and in my country. But I am very sad too about the passing away of my dear friend and colleague for thirty-five years, Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai.¹⁰¹ The news reached me in

⁹⁹ On 31 October 1954, Nehru wrote from Saigon to Jagjivan Ram, Minister of Communications, that it was necessary to establish wireless links with Beijing, when "even Karachi" had it. And that he was surprised that the Chinese were perfectly willing and "it was our own Government which was reluctant".

¹⁰⁰ Speech at a public meeting, Brigade Parade Ground, Calcutta, 2 November 1954, From AIR tapes, NMML.

¹⁰¹ Kidwai died on 24 October 1954

Peking and it grieved me deeply. After so many years of close contact and working together, I am a little baffled as to how we are going to carry on without him. Well, these things have to be faced and the life of a nation goes on. No matter what blows life deals, we cannot allow any setback to the nation. I heard after coming here that one of your deputy ministers and some assembly members were killed in an accident a couple of days ago.¹⁰² That too was a shock.

I had held a press conference here on the day I left at which I had been asked about the reasons for my visit.¹⁰³ I remember that I had said on that occasion that my visit to China would be a historic one. I did not mean that I was making history. But a visit of India's Prime Minister to China, on their invitation is something which is bound to have a great impact on the history of Asia. I have become more than ever convinced in the last sixteen days that my visit to China, or let me say that the visit of anyone from India to China at this time, is a historic event. It is bound to have an impact on the Sino-Indian relations and also on Asia. In fact, I would say that it is bound to affect international relations too, to some extent.

I was in China for eleven days which is not enough to see very much of such a huge country. You must bear in mind that China is double or more the size of India, which is itself a very large country. I visited Indo-China too in the course of my trip. The fighting has stopped. But the major issues of dispute have not been solved. I stopped in Laos and in Hanoi, Saigon and Phnom Penh on the way back.¹⁰⁴ Then just yesterday I visited a place which I have wanted to see for years. I went to the ancient city of Angkor Vat¹⁰⁵ which lies in ruins and yet is regarded as one of the most extraordinary examples of architectural

¹⁰².Shashi Khan, MLA and Chairman of Santipur Municipality and three others, including his elder brother Phanindranath Khan, were killed and Deven Dey, Deputy Minister, West Bengal Government, and Chief Whip; Congress Legislative Party, was seriously injured in a motor accident at a railway level crossing between Santipur and Krishnanagar in Nadia district on 30 October 1954

¹⁰³.See ante, pp. 3-6

¹⁰⁴.On 30 and 31 October and 1 November, respectively.

¹⁰⁵ On 1 November 1954. It was built by Suryavarman II (1113-50); known for its sculptural design and craftsmanship.

excellence to this day. Every stone in that ancient city reminded me powerfully of the glory of India's past, her culture, civilization, religion and the influence that she exerted on the countries all around her. It was most evident in Cambodia and when I stood at the ruins of Angkor, I was struck by the greatness of the people who could conceive of and execute a plan of such bold design and architectural beauty. They must have indeed been people of broad vision and great daring and courage. It was a joint effort of India and Cambodia and the end product rivals anything that you can find even in India in beauty.

So, if you want to learn about India's past, perhaps the best way is to go outside the country. The people of India travelled far and wide in those days and married and settled down in other countries. In this way, we spread our culture. There are not many instances in history of military conquest by India over other countries. We went out to trade, carrying the message of our religion and culture and civilization to far-off places, and conquered them with our love. Similarly, it is strange that in two thousand years of contact between India and China, there is no mention of war at any time between the two countries. Isn't it extraordinary that two such powerful countries should have existed side by side for two thousand years without fighting a single battle? During this long period in history, both China and India exerted a great influence on the countries all around them, in South East Asia particularly, in every imaginable field, in religion, culture, civilization and the arts. Yet, they never came into conflict. The people of those countries were influenced by both our cultures.

So, we must try to remember this extraordinary fact that great nations can influence one another through the medium of culture and peacefully give and take, and not necessarily through military might always. All these thoughts passed through my mind because my visit to South East Asia and particularly China was a voyage of discovery. At one time, as you may perhaps know, I was very curious to discover and know India. I wrote a book about it in jail.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ The Discovery of India, written during his imprisonment in Ahmednagar Fort Jail. The book was first published by the Signet Press, Calcutta in 1946. See Selected Works, (first series), Vol. 13, pp. 401 and 480.

It is to some extent a history of India in the present times and her people, cities and villages. But to understand their thoughts and behaviour, I delved into India's past and tried to understand it. The history of ancient India can, of course, be read in books. But more important are the monuments and ruins of the olden days which provide a vivid picture of India's past glory and cannot be obtained from any book.

So I set out to discover India and the more I searched the more I understood. I began to realize that India is something so profound that it is very difficult even to understand her fully. You can see her myriad forms, in Calcutta, Bombay, Kashmir and Madras, or again at the borders of Burma and Tibet, which is a wholly different world altogether. So India has innumerable forms. Very often, we cannot think beyond our own little city or village or province. But we must understand that all of us are citizens of India and as such, small parts of the bigger whole which is India. I have always been in search of that India. But then came a time when India became free and the shackles of two hundred years of foreign rule were broken. During those years, we were cut off from our own neighbours like China, Japan and in West Asia, Afghanistan, Iran, etc., and instead we were forced into close proximity with England and Europe. We became well versed in English language and literature. Not that there is anything wrong with that, for knowledge is always a good thing. So we learnt about European civilization and culture and in the process, forgot a little about our own. We were also cut off from our Asian neighbours. The moment we became free, however, our thoughts once more went towards them. Most of us today would be able to write learned articles about European history and literature. But how much do we know about the history and literature of, say China, or Indonesia, or other Asian countries like Iran or the Arab countries? I think very few of us know very much about our own neighbours. That is because our minds have become conditioned in a certain way which is not surprising when a country is dominated by a foreign power. But once we became free, the barriers of the recent past were broken down and our thoughts turned once more to our neighbours, which was absolutely necessary. We began to search into our past to find the answers to our problems in the present. As a result, we have been drawing closer, day by day,

to our neighbouring countries. In that sense, my visit to China and other regions of South East Asia was a voyage of discovery. We read about our neighbours in newspapers and books and form some impressions, right and wrong. But it is difficult to have a clear mental picture of any country merely from such sources. The fact is that Asia has been in a process of change for the last few years after centuries of stagnation under colonial rule. Now that the obstacles to change have been removed and new forces are coming into play, Asia has become a revolutionary place where all kinds of upheavals are taking place. What does that imply? Years of stagnation and absence of change and progress have created tremendous problems for all Asian countries which need a solution. If they fail to solve them at the proper time, the problems will resolve themselves by revolutionary and chaotic methods.

The Asian countries under colonial rule have chosen different paths to freedom. As you know, in India, it is the Indian National Congress, formed nearly seventy years ago, which spearheaded the struggle for freedom. It started in a small way but soon became a huge national organization backed by the people's support. We had great leaders to show us the path and the greatest of them all, Mahatma Gandhi, led us to freedom through the unique path of peace and nonviolence. He taught us to cast out fear and hatred from our hearts. Many were skeptical but history records how we followed the path shown by him and succeeded.

Modern India and all of us who live in it today have been moulded by the events of the past sixty or seventy years. We were born in that atmosphere and moulded by it. But the circumstances were different in other countries of Asia. For instance, there was a great revolution in China which was preceded by decades of turmoil and chaos and constant internal strife which brought great ruin in its wake. The people of China had to bear tremendous hardship. I am telling you all this because it is wrong to judge another country by one's own history. We cannot expect everyone else to follow the path that we did. Every country has a different history and its people are moulded by that history. I do not have the right to demand that the people of China must follow the path that we took, because their history and experience have been quite different. They moulded them as a people and as a nation, and contributed to

their strength as well as weakness. Similarly, they do not have the right to dictate to us as to what we should do. Every nation grows according to its own experience. We may learn something from others and teach them something in return. For instance, the British and the French came to India more than two hundred years ago and gradually they established their dominion over various parts of the country. There is no sense in criticising the British or the French because we fell due to our own incompetence and weakness. We lacked strength and unity and there was constant internecine strife among the rulers in the country. We completely lacked the spirit of nationalism. Most important of all, we had lagged behind in science and technology, while the West had made rapid strides in them and became militarily strong and wealthy. We continued to repeat the old lessons learnt by rote and did not bother to learn anything new. We lagged behind and lay ourselves open to conquest by foreign powers. Therefore, it is extremely important to learn from the experience of other countries.

It has become extremely important for us to learn about the scientific inventions and discoveries of the past two centuries because as you know, the modern age is the age of science. We are surrounded by the wonders of science. Therefore, we cannot afford to lag behind in this field. That does not mean that we should copy the West or Japan, because what we need is original research and thinking and the capacity to increase production. So the first step that we had to take was to lay the foundations of scientific education and practical training. Our educational system is good in its own way. But we need to make some changes in it to include knowledge of modern science. Our task of building a new India will become easier if we understand the importance of scientific education and training.

As I had said recently, although it is very difficult to provide jobs for all our BA and MA degree holders, thousands of overseers can get jobs immediately. Things are changing in the country. What was done under the British is no longer enough. We have to take up new tasks in order to build a new India. That is why we took up the Community Development Projects and introduced the National Extension Service which are spreading rapidly in the rural areas. We are training thousands of young boys and girls under these schemes.

We must keep before us a vision of the future that we wish to build and then train our youth accordingly to enable them to participate in the task of nation building. There is no point in people going through schools and colleges and being fit for nothing except white collar jobs. We need to do things in a new way in order to build a new India.

We have been moulded by our own history, whereas China has a different history behind it. China is also a very ancient country with thousands of years of history behind it. I think India and China are perhaps the only two countries in the world with such a long record of unbroken history, in spite of the innumerable ups and downs, victories and defeats. Culturally, these two countries can boast of thousands of years of continuity though everything else may have changed.

So, I was very curious to see what an ancient country like China looks like now. I cannot say that during my ten days stay in China, I could see this great country in its entirety. But I was able to form a pretty good picture in my mind even in that short time. I could not go into the interior of China to see her villages. But I visited the great and historic cities like Peking, which is the capital, Mugden and Anshan in the north where the great steel mills are located, Shanghai, Nanking and Hangchow which is a very beautiful city, and Canton in the south. I saw millions of people in these cities, and that gave me the opportunity of knowing them a little. I meet millions of people in my own country and there is a mutual recognition of one another's thoughts and desires at these meetings. There is a definite bond between the people of my country and myself. I do not know Chinese at all, which is a very difficult language, but in spite of the difficulties in communication I felt a sense of discovery and recognition merely by looking into the eyes and faces of the millions of Chinese I met.

First of all, I would like to tell you that the welcome which I received from the Chinese people-you may have read accounts of it in the newspapers can be compared only with the warm and loving reception that I am given in our own country. I need not say more than that because I have always received the love and affection of the people of India in great abundance. It is something rare indeed to have been accorded a similar reception in another country.

There is no doubt about it that I had gone to China at the invitation of the Chinese Government. But the people in the cities participated in large numbers and very enthusiastically in my receptions. There were large numbers of boys and girls among them and the enthusiastic reception given to me made a profound impression upon me. Then I thought about the reasons for this warm welcome for it is obvious that it was not because of me, Jawaharlal, or my qualities.

They welcomed me with affection because I had gone there as the Prime Minister of India. So, in fact, their affection and enthusiasm was for India, not me personally. I have no doubt that it showed a deep desire in their hearts to have friendly relations with India. I liked that very much because I myself feel that it is crucial for Asia and for the two countries to be friends even though we follow slightly different paths. India and China are two great countries of Asia and if there is peace and friendship between us, it is bound to have an impact on Asia and the cause of world peace as well. So I liked what I saw and the fact that the people of China wanted friendship with India made a deep impression upon me. Secondly, as you know, there are thousands of Chinese living in Calcutta. They are extremely hard working and efficient and disciplined. If the kind of discipline and organization which we find in the twenty-five, thirty thousand Chinese in Calcutta translated into the fifty or sixty crores of Chinese in China, it is bound to be a great power. There is no doubt about it that military weapons and armaments are great sources of power. But you must remember that ultimately, the strength of a nation depends on the organization and ability of its people. We got freedom because we learnt the importance of unity and discipline. Most of you, who are in schools and colleges today, may not be able to visualize the events of thirty or forty years ago, for you read about them only in history books. But those were difficult years and we succeeded in our struggle for freedom by facing up to the challenges with courage, unity, strength and fearlessness, not by shouting slogans. I want you to understand that the people of China have a tremendous amount of organized strength, discipline and enthusiasm which counts for a great deal in any country. Particularly, in a large country like China where the people are intelligent and hard working; discipline and organization make the

country extremely strong. I was profoundly impressed by the extraordinary discipline among the youth there. We can learn a great deal from them in this respect. If our youth are disciplined, they can become a powerful factor because discipline, particularly self discipline, makes a nation strong. Wherever I went, people would line both sides of the streets. But there was no pulling and pushing or spilling on to the streets. People stood where they were, not moving a step this way or that. It creates an impression of great strength and discipline. We can also learn something from this. I invite you, the people of this great city of Calcutta to try a dose of self discipline, for it will immediately make you three or four times as strong. You can show yourselves and the world how to go about your tasks without breaking the rules or making a noise. Like China, we in India also face great tasks. The great task before China is the reconstruction of a nation of fifty or sixty crores of people, which is almost one fourth of the entire population of the world. Every fourth person in the world is a Chinese, just as every fifth or sixth human being is an Indian. When India and China were under colonial rule, the people did not count for more than sheep, for they had no status. But ever since we became free to give full rein to our energies and choose our own path, our numbers have acquired a new significance. After all, the people of the areas that I visited, China, Burma, Indonesia and other South East Asian countries along with India together constitute half the population of the entire world. I do not want you to think that mere numbers make a country great. After all, we were thirty-five crores of people during British rule too. But we were in a state of bondage. So what counts in a nation is the ability and discipline of mind and body, and the courage and daring of its people. Quality is always superior to quantity and ultimately that can be seen from the work of a people. Now we face the problem of reconstruction in India just as in the past we faced the problem of freeing India from foreign rule. We have to deal with the problems of poverty and unemployment of millions of people, which is not an easy thing to do. We have adopted the five year plans in order to tackle these problems. When I went to China, I found that they too were facing similar problems though their method of dealing with them was different. They have also taken up a Five Year Plan. But they feel that it may take three or four more Five Year

Plans before they can find a satisfactory solution to the problems of their country. They were not trying to find excuses. It was a calm assessment on their part that it would be another 15-20 years before they could bring prosperity to the people. It is obvious that these are not things which can be solved by magic, no matter what ideology a country follows, whether it is socialist, communist or something else. Everything takes time and very hard work. There is no other alternative. It is true that the direction in which a country chooses to travel is very important because if we are on the wrong course, we may never reach our destination. If we are on the right path and adhere to it with courage and strength we shall, step by step, attain our goals in time and bring prosperity to the people.

In a sense, the problems of India and China cannot be said to be absolutely identical though they are similar. They too have a huge population, most of it in the rural areas and though the people are extremely hard working, they are very, very poor. So they must work for better living standards for the people to provide them with the daily necessities of life like food, clothes, shelter, medical facilities, education, training and employment. In China, too, there is great problem of unemployment. In spite of some slight differences, broadly speaking, they are the same. The Chinese are also busily engaged in trying to solve their problems as we are in India. They have started their first Five Year Plan just this year. They admitted quite frankly that it would take them fifteen to twenty years more to solve the problem of unemployment fully. Some people seem to think that the magic formula of socialism, communism, Gandhism or capitalism can solve these problems instantaneously which is not true. It is only through hard work that any country can progress. We must of course decide upon the goals we wish to achieve and the path we should follow to attain them. Once that is done, we must march ahead boldly and the farther we go, the greater will be the strength that the nation gains. Once the ball is set rolling, it automatically gathers momentum. The difficulties arise in the first few years, particularly in poor countries because there is no surplus to invest in tasks of development. Once production increases and the national income rises, rapid progress becomes possible because the more the surplus at our disposal, the greater will our capacity be to take on tasks of development.

One problem that both of us have in common is the raising of the standard of living of the people. It would be interesting to compare notes every five years to see which country is faring better. In some areas, India leads at the moment, just as in some others, it is China which is ahead of us. As I mentioned just now, we want friendship with China and we must learn what we can from them just as they can learn something from us too. 'Then we must observe which country makes greater progress in five years. It is a test for China and India.

In this context, the question of war and peace in the world become crucial. If a war breaks out in the world, our progress as well as theirs will come to a grinding halt. We do not wish to go to war with anyone and we have said repeatedly that we will not strike a blow unless we are attacked. We advocate the cause of world peace because apart from the fact that peace is superior to war, a war in modern times brings tremendous destruction and ruin in its wake. The time has now come when war can solve nothing. I am quite convinced about that. Apart from the fact that there can be no victor or vanquished in a war today, it can annihilate the world completely.

So, for all these reasons, particularly the Asian countries which have recently freed themselves from colonial rule and desirous of progress in peace, are opposed to war anywhere in the world. This is fundamentally the reason for China's opposition to war. They too need time to solve their country's problems and to make progress. I have no doubt in my mind that the Government as well as the people of China are not in favour of war and will make every effort to prevent one. I feel that the common people all over the world are opposed to war. But somehow, the situation has become extremely complicated because of mutual distrust, bitterness; hatred and suspicion. It is an extraordinary situation and nobody knows what may happen at any moment. We have to remain constantly vigilant and strive to prevent things coming to a head.

All of you know how our foreign policy has evolved during the past few years. It is not my personal policy. I think no matter which party comes to power, it would have to follow more or less the same policy, because it is born out of our history and experience. Most people in the country have accepted our foreign

policy as the most appropriate one. But there have been some criticisms too. However, in the last few years, our policy has succeeded to a great extent and the world has also acknowledged this. It is a different matter that some people continue to be critical of it. But it has been proved beyond question that the policy of non-alignment has not evolved out of pressure or fear. We may make mistakes but they are our own mistakes, not made out of fear or pressure. Secondly, our policy is an honest one, for we do what we think is right. The world has now become convinced of our good faith. There are some countries which are so full of anger and anxiety over the prosperity of others that they do not like the idea of any country standing aloof from their camp. They feel that those who are not with them are against them. I cannot understand why India should become involved in the quarrels and animosity of other nations. Why should we become anyone's enemy and abuse them? India will follow her own policy quite independently of others. At the same time, we do not wish to criticize the policies of other countries or abuse them. This is not the way to solve any problem. It only increases tension and bitterness. It is not civilized to abuse one another and in fact, there is very little of civilized behaviour in international dealings.

However, I hope you will agree with me when I say that our foreign policy has been fairly civilized and we have served the world through it. We have managed to prevent a war at a time when the world was on the brink of one. It would be wrong of me to boast that we are making a great impact upon world affairs. The world is much more complete for that. But sometimes even a small push in the right direction goes a long way. In Korea and Indo-China, our efforts to bring about peace have paid off. Therefore, I am more than ever convinced that this is the right policy for us to follow. There can be no greater disaster than to have another war in the world. We should try to prevent it with all our might. We cannot do it on our own. But we shall make every effort on behalf of peace. I found that in China too, the Government and the people are completely opposed to war. It is not out of fear that they want to avoid war. It is pretty clear that their attention is directed towards the task of reconstruction and of solving the problem of poverty. Therefore, if India and

China and other countries of South Asia throw the weight of their opinion in favour of world peace, I am sure it will have an effect.

As you know, China has a different system from the one that we have in India. We are a parliamentary democracy, with a Parliament in Delhi and legislatures in the states, an elected executive and freedom of the press and a strong Opposition and so on. In China, they have a totalitarian system and nobody is allowed to voice any criticism of the Government. No newspaper there can publish anything against Government. During the fortnight I spent in China. the thing that I missed most was news from India or the world. Here we are used to innumerable newspapers daily. In China, I could get some news about what was happening in the United Nations and some local news. Then I used to get daily reports from Delhi at our embassy there. But to a man used to scanning a number of newspapers everyday, their absence leaves a void. I am trying to show you the difference between the two systems. As I told you earlier, the history of China has been full of wars and strife. They have had to bear great hardships which have moulded their character. At the moment, they have taken on a historic task. Who am I to criticize their way of doing it? Similarly, I do not think they have the right to interfere in our internal affairs. You may remember that when the Prime Minister of China visited India, we had agreed upon Five Principles. They were: friendship between the two countries; non-aggression; non-interference in each other's internal affairs; mutual respect for the sovereignty and independence of each other. These Five Principles cannot be criticized by anyone and in fact, if they were adopted by the whole world, there would be no question of war. Some people say that though as principles, Panch Shila is excellent, how can we trust them to abide by them and not to break their promise? Now this is a very difficult question to answer. How can I take on the responsibility for the future? It is enough for me that we in India and China want to follow the right path, and if we continue to do so, we shall make it difficult for anyone to be led astray. If we lack mutual trust, then written treaties are also of no use. The fact is that trust begets trust and confidence begets confidence in return. At the same time, a nation should not become slack but remain eternally vigilant and strong in every way.

China is twice the size of India and its centralized Government gives it added strength. In India, as you know, the different provinces have their own governments and so there is a bifurcation of authority between the Centre and the states. In China, the Centre rules with an iron hand from top to bottom. This is a source of strength as well as weakness, in a sense. There is no doubt about it that work gets done faster under this system because when the Centre takes a decision, it is implemented throughout the country. There are other advantages too.

On the other hand, the federal system with state autonomy also has many good points because the masses participate to a greater extent in the task of government. We want that every village should participate in governing the country. Well, I shall not debate on this further here: I am merely pointing out the difference between our way of working and theirs. I have no right to judge, for they are the best judges of what is good for them. I feel that the democratic system is best suited for India. We can make alterations in a federal system if we think they are necessary. As you know, one of its disadvantages is that it has led to greater provincialism and parochialism which weaken the country. China's great strength lies in her unity. As far as I know, there is no provincialism in China and casteism is of course unknown. Casteism has put a great weight upon India and has been responsible for a great deal of our backwardness and caused setbacks time and again in the past. We cannot march full steam ahead until we root out casteism completely. When we talk about political equality in the country it means the right to vote for everyone which is no doubt a good thing. But equality is meaningless if some people are millionaires and the others are starving. There should be equality in other respects, equality of opportunity and standard of living, etc. I do not mean to say that everyone is exactly alike. As you know, there are physical and mental differences between people. Some are tall, some short, some strong and others are weak. But everyone must have equal opportunities to make progress.

We have established political equality among the people. Now we must ensure economic and social equality by reducing the disparity between the haves and the have-nots and providing equal opportunities for all. So long as the caste

system continues there can be no equality. You must understand this clearly. It is absurd to think that there can be equality while we continue to live in separate compartments. Casteism, provincialism and communalism weaken the country. The communalists try to bring religion into politics. The Hindu Mahasabha, the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh, to a large extent the Jana Sangh, and the Muslim League are all tarred with the same brush. They have done incalculable harm to the country by bringing religion into politics. We must combat their designs.

When I look at China, I find that they do not labour under these disadvantages. There is no provincialism in China, as far as I know, unless it is hidden. It is not visible to the eye. Nor have they had any problem about religion. Buddhism went from here to China and Taoism and Confucianism were her ancient religions. But it is very difficult to differentiate between them because all three have influenced one another. Now, of course, people are interested in other things. And because they do not suffer from things which weaken India like provincialism, communalism, and casteism, it is easier for them to move forward quickly.

As you are perhaps aware, a commission has been set up to go into the question of the reorganization of our states. I do not know what the commission is doing at the moment but there is a great uproar over the issue. Such excessive provincialism is not becoming. We must take the necessary steps with calm minds.

Our goal is to work towards world peace. Our foreign policy aims at achieving this goal because if there is a war, all our work will come to a standstill. We must cooperate with other countries with similar goals and make an effort at least to save Asia from a holocaust. We must cooperate fully with China in bringing about peace in South East Asia.

The other problem which all of us in Asia face is of reconstruction and development. I am aware that our achievements during the last six or seven years have by no means been negligible. At the same time, there is a great deal of poverty and unemployment in the country. As I said, we cannot change anything by magic. It requires time and intense efforts. Anyhow, we have laid the foundations. We have made progress in the field of science. We have had

great success in tackling the food problem. We have the situation well under control. As you know, the role played by Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai in this was remarkable.

Further, we have laid the foundations of industrialization by setting up basic heavy industries. Then we have started the Community Development Schemes and the National Extension Service in the rural areas and we have great hopes from them. I think already sixty or seventy thousand villages have been covered and within the next few months, another one lakh villages will be taken up. We have decided to take up fifty thousand villages every year. It is not merely to put down on paper. It means making arrangements for providing amenities to the rural areas. The best thing is that the people are responding with enthusiasm and cooperation, which reveals their ability to take on great tasks. This is not a government job. It is the people who have to work for their own betterment. The government and the people must cooperate.

The time is approaching for us to draw up the Second Five Year Plan. We want it to be bolder and more ambitious. We want to pay more attention to industries, particularly as a means of solving the problem of unemployment. We are laying the foundations for building the edifice of a new India. The problems that we face are very similar to what other countries in Asia are facing. Therefore, we must cooperate with one another. I think India is leading in industries. For one thing, there are more trained and skilled technical personnel in India, and though our own need is very great, we have sent more than a hundred of them to various Asian and African countries to help them. We must help our neighbours.

I want you to look at the situation in India and the world. It is a great testing time for all of us, particularly our youth, for we have been given yet another opportunity to build a new and prosperous India in mutual harmony and cooperation. We, who belong to the older generation have done our share and will continue to do so as long as we have life left in us. Please do not think that I shall run away from my responsibilities. But ultimately the burden of building a new India which will influence the world by her devotion will fall on the youth.

As I told you, I also visited the countries of Indo-China where a number of our officers have been sent as delegates to the International Commissions. Three Commissions have been set up under the Geneva Agreement—one each in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia or the ancient Cambodia. The Chairmen of all three Commissions are Indians¹⁰⁷ and there are a number of other Indian officers in senior positions. Apart from that, there are military teams attached to these Commissions to supervise the implementation of the Geneva Agreement. These small teams are sent wherever a dispute or complaint arises. There are three countries - India, Canada and Poland - in the International Commissions. Canada and Poland are regarded as representing two opposing sides and India has been kept in the chairmanship role because both sides have trust and confidence in us. So India's responsibilities have increased enormously. I want to tell you that wherever I went, I heard praise of the way Indians were working. Both sides were full of praise. Some of our troops are also stationed in South East Asia, less than a thousand of them, for supervisory purposes. I heard praise for their work everywhere, particularly for their discipline and attitude of friendliness and cooperation towards the local people. It made me very happy to hear all this because any Indian who goes abroad, in any capacity, is responsible for maintaining the dignity and honour of India. Respect for India goes up when good people go out to other countries. So I was very happy.

Well, my fifteen-day tour is over. I am once again on Indian soil and will take up my regular work of trying to improve the levels of living of the people with their cooperation. The outcome of this great venture ultimately rests in the hands of the people of India. How fast we progress and the direction in which we move depends on them. But I feel that my tour of South East Asia was an important event in the history of India, and to some extent, the history of Asia. Jai Hind.

¹⁰⁷ The three Chairmen of the International Supervisory Commissions were M.J. Desai for Vietnam, G. Parthasarathi for Cambodia and J.N. Khosla for Laos. See also post, p. 94.

To Edwina Mountbatten¹⁰⁸

Raj Bhavan Calcutta

2 November 1954

My dear Edwina,

... This visit to China as well as the Indo-China countries has indeed been an event which has some historic significance. For me, it was a further discovery of Asia and it has left a powerful impress on my mind. China, of course is dominant in this impression-huge, massive country with an enormous population. But the point is that this enormous population, or much of it, is unified, organized and disciplined. It is a hardworking population with great capacity. One has a tremendous sense of vitality and strength. People sitting in the United Nations in New York may argue about China's admission to the UN or the recognition of China by this country or that. The fact is that it makes little difference to China. But it makes a great deal of difference to the countries as to what they do or do not do in this matter. The gain from recognition and from admission to the UN, will be largely of the other countries. China has passed the barrier when it could be made to suffer much from non-recognition. It is a world in itself and it has more or less intimate contacts with many countries. It can carry on in this way without much difficulty, though of course, it would be easier if the present friction and blockades were removed.

I had a welcome in China, such as I have in the big cities of India, and that is saying a great deal. I do not think there was any precedent for it in China. A week or two before I reached Peking, some of the big people of the Soviet Union were received there with all honour¹⁰⁹ But they had, what might be called, an official welcome. They were placed on the high seats and much praise was showered upon them. The welcome given to me was both official and popular. It is said, probably correctly, that a million people took part in it on the day of my arrival in Peking. They lined the twelve-mile route from the aerodrome and crowded the streets. There was perfect discipline and there

¹⁰⁸ JN Collection. Extracts.

¹⁰⁹ A high level Soviet delegation led by Nikita M. Khrushchev, Secretary, Soviet Communist Party, visited China from 29 September to 1 October 1954.

were few policemen about, though no doubt there must have been plenty of other people to maintain this order. School boys and girls and college students and workers in factories had turned out with banners. And then there were others who joined them. I was taken in an open car with Chou En-lai and I was standing in it. That seemed somewhat odd in, what is called, a 'Police State'. Indeed, I was told that this was the first time Chou En-lai or anyone of his high position in China, had appeared in public in this way. Normally, they appear from time to time on high balconies to see a review or a parade. Evidently, Chou En-lai wanted to show me that they could function as we had done in Delhi, when he came, and better. Anyhow, it was an impressive spectacle.

It was not only the numbers but their obvious enthusiasm. There appeared to be something emotional in it. For once, official direction and public feeling completely coincided, though no doubt they do so to some extent often enough. I had a feeling, and others confirmed it, that my going to Peking brought certain reactions on the Chinese people. Thus far, they had dealt with or welcomed people from the Soviet Union or other communist countries. There was certainly more of fellow-feeling for them. But my arrival there produced a somewhat different type of release. They felt happy that a great country like India, which was not in the communist fold, was friendly to them. Their outlook widened and their self assurance increased. A sense of Asian cooperation, apart from communism and the like, produced this sense of relief and release. India became, in their eyes, a friend and her stock went up. As a representative of India, I became a symbol, which they honoured and cheered. There were many functions and I am surprised that I have survived all of them, especially the banquets which took place every day. You know Chinese banquets, how long they are, how full of toasts. Most of these banquets had as many as 700 or 800 guests of all type-apart from the official hierarchy and the diplomats, there were scientists, medical men, professors in the colleges, etc., actors and actresses and specially honoured workers at the end. Even there, there was genuine enthusiasm. I would have been less than human if I had not been influenced by all this.

The impression of the vitality of a people that I got was very great. The younger people were especially full of it. They were nearly all clad in the official uniform or something like it-buttoned up coats and trousers, dark blue. This produced a certain impression of drabness, but also of discipline and efficiency. Women are evidently playing a big part in China and some of them hold high posts in the factories and elsewhere.

Although I arrived in an open car standing up, most of the time I went about in a car which was evidently used by the big leaders there. This was a bullet-proof car with nearly four inch thick glass. I was rather surprised to see the number of automobiles. There were not so many of course as in a big Indian city, but still the number was considerable and this in spite of blockades and the like. There were Soviet cars, Czech cars and trucks and a good number of American cars. Usually, when I moved, there was a procession of twenty cars following me.

Apart from the feasting and the long talks I had with the big leaders and others, I spent some time in visiting famous sights and some new factories. Also the Peking opera as well as the Shanghai opera which, on the whole, I rather liked.

It is clear that the Chinese Government and people are determined to go ahead and further that they will do so unless some catastrophe comes. They do not boast as the Russians are apt to do. They were continually pointing out their own deficiencies and sometimes laying stress on India being more advanced in some ways. They were all Chinese, in spite of communism and the like. Their courtesy, their artistic sense (so sadly lacking in India), their hospitality, their references to old Chinese literature and culture. Mao Tse-tung on two or three occasions, quoted to me from some ancient Chinese poet.¹¹⁰ Mao is a pleasant faced person in good health but looking slightly aged. Chu Teh, number two, had a square face of granite, pleasant enough when he smiled and when both of his eyes completely disappeared. I do not think he is too much interested in the niceties of politics or even of communistic dialectics.

¹¹⁰ In a banquet hosted by Nehru on 26 October, Mao quoted a 2000 year old Chinese poem by Chu Yuen that 'no sorrow is greater than to bid farewell and no joy greater than to make a new acquaintance'.

But he is honoured for his past career and is the Commander-in-Chief now. Number three was Liu Shao-chi, a person with an intellectually rather harsh face, though by no means unpleasant. He is the theoretician of the Party and the Government. Number four was Chou En-lai, who was by far the easiest to get on with and with a wider knowledge of the world. Number five, Madame Sun, who remained quiet throughout our talks. These talks were conducted en bloc, though I had separate talks with Chou En-lai.

I saw no one in Peking without shoes and people seemed to be well-fed. I visited the big state department stores. Some of them as in Shanghai. were very big seven-storied buildings, full of various kinds of goods, though there were no luxury articles. There were hundreds or thousands of petty shops privately owned.

I did not see much of village life except for a cooperative farm I visited near Mukden in Manchuria. Among the cities I visited, apart from Peking, were Canton, Nanking, Shanghai, Hangkow, Mukden, Anshan (where the steel works are) and Dairen. Also Hanchow, the beauty spot about which so many poets have written. Everywhere there were warm receptions.

Just before I got to Peking, a huge Soviet exhibition had been opened there. A vast building had been constructed especially for it by the Soviets. This was rather garish with golden spires and the like. This building and its courtyards were full of Soviet goods of all kind-small and big. Machinery was specially displayed. Huge agricultural machinery, tractors, earth movers and the like. Also many kinds of auto mobiles, small cars, big cars, trucks, etc. I must say that the exhibition was very impressive' showing what the Soviets were manufacturing: Vast crowds went to see it. In fact, during the first week about a million people saw it and there were enormous crowds waiting to enter. Even when we went there, it was so crowded that it was not easy to move about. This whole exhibition building was prepared from start to finish in rather record time of about a year. Having done all this, the Soviet Government made a grand gesture and presented the building and all it contained to the Chinese Government.

In the Five Year Plan the Soviets have agreed to put up 141 major enterprises in China. Many of their technicians have come or will come. But they were not

evident. Chairman Mao told me that they lacked technicians and they had to go to the Soviet for help. They trained their own men and went away and there were no political or other strings attached.

There are so many things that I could write to you about China, but I cannot continue now. The other countries I visited, in Indo-China¹¹¹, were very different. Laos was a sleepy depressing place. Cambodia was somewhat better and the King is an active, fairly clever and a popular person, because he led the struggle against the French and also actually led his army against some Vietminh invaders. Nevertheless, the position in Cambodia is not an easy one. The fact is that independence having been more or less obtained, the social problems are immediately coming up and the King does not appear to be competent to deal with them. At the same time he is a little afraid of some prominent leaders who would help in solving these problems and who are suspected of republicanism. '

Saigon was a mess and nobody knew what was going to happen and even within the Government there were rival factions. There were private armies. The Prime Minister had fallen out with the Generals and Emperor Bao Dai of course continues to live in the south of France. The whole thing was fantastic, the French and the Americans exercising their influence often in contrary directions. The Americans were obvious in Laos and Cambodia also. At Saigon I was driven from the airport and through the city at a speed of fifty miles an hour, presumably for security reasons. Even corners were taken at that speed, with the occupants of the car rolling about in it.

Hanoi had changed hands just five days before I arrived there and the Vietminh were in possession.¹¹² Ho Chi Minh had not made his official entry, but he came down to see me. The city had a queer rather fearful look. The streets had been cleared, people sat on their thresholds, looking rather glum. But there were many Vietminh flags in the shops and houses. Ho Chi Minh produced an instant impression upon me, which was good. He is one of the most likeable men I have come across. He gives one the impression of

¹¹¹ See post, pp. 93- 105.

¹¹² On 11 October 1954.

integrity, goodwill and peace. His Foreign Minister and Vice Premier, Pham Dong, also struck me favourably.

Not only in Hanoi but in the other states of Indo-China some of the communist or near-communist leaders I met were obviously superior in character and ability to the others who seemed to have no clear aim and who were unable even to cooperate with each other. There is no doubt that if there was an election now in Vietnam, there would be a tremendous majority in favour of Ho Chi Minh. The Americans think that with various kinds of aid they might change this in the course of the next year or two. I doubt it. The Americans have not yet learnt the art of winning over people and think in terms of money which does not go far.

You will forgive me for this typewritten letter. But this was what I could manage tonight and I did not wish to delay writing to you. Early tomorrow morning I am going to Darjeeling with Dr Roy¹¹³ to open a Mountaineering Institute there. The Chief Director of Training will be Tenzing.¹¹⁴ From Darjeeling' I shall go to Delhi.

My return to India has been clouded by the fact of the death of Rafi Ahmed Kidwai. This is a heavy blow for me. You did not know him well. But he was outstanding both in our struggle for freedom and in our Government, His recent achievement in largely solving our food problem has been remarkable. He was throughout a man of the people, with intimate contacts with the people all over India and with very strong commonsense. No one who went to him for help, and large numbers went to him, ever came back without some kind of assistance. He did this at the cost of himself and his family is in a state of poverty with a broken down house in a village to live in.

Yours,
Jawahar

¹¹³ B.C. Roy, Chief Minister of West Bengal.

¹¹⁴ Tenzing Norgay.

Collective Security in South East Asia¹¹⁵

No question has arisen, so far as I am aware, of any special non-aggression pacts between China and the South East Asian countries. Nothing of this kind was even mentioned to me in China. So far as we are concerned in India, we do not propose to have any such pacts with any country. Of course, even joint declarations based on the Five Principles are declarations of non-aggression. That is good enough.

2. A collective non-aggression pact would be still more undesirable.

3. The establishment of friendly relations with China on the basis of the Five Principles would definitely tend to weaken the danger of internal communism.

4. The question of large Chinese communities abroad has been repeatedly discussed with the Chinese leaders and they have accepted the principle that the Chinese abroad should either (a) become nationals of the country they are in and have no constitutional relations with China, or (b) should remain nationals of China and not interfere with the internal politics of the country they are in. The Chinese leaders are, however; reluctant to lay down a general principle applying to all countries because of its possible effect on the Formosan situation. Therefore, they propose to deal with each country separately, notably Burma and Indonesia. When U Nu goes to China, this matter will be discussed and presumably settled. So also with Indonesia separately.

5. Pakistan's attitude and recent events in Pakistan have, I think, very definitely weakened not only Pakistan but American position in South East Asia. It almost appears that where the United States goes with its military aid, it creates new problems and weakens that country internally. I have no doubt whatever that if the Indonesian Government joined them in a pact or accepted some kind of military aid from the US, they would have to face grave internal difficulties. Instead of getting security, they will have further insecurity. I don't think there is any reasonable chance of the Indonesian Government doing this.

6. As for the Afro-Asian Conference, I have already expressed my opinion that there should be a general invitation to all free Asian or African countries. This

¹¹⁵ Note to the Commonwealth Secretary, 7 November 1954. JN Papers. NMML.

would include China as well as Japan and Siam and Turkey. As regards the Indo-China States, the matter will have to be considered carefully.

7. You may convey my views to our Ambassador in Djakarta.¹¹⁶

8. It is my intention, as soon as I have some little time, to send a note on my visit to China to the Indonesian Prime Minister.

Page 72

Impressions of the Visit¹¹⁷

Question: During the last session of Parliament, before your visit to China, two questions were raised, one of Chinese population overseas, and the question of international communism. After your talks with the Chinese leaders do you feel reassured on these two questions, without going into the question of guarantees etc.?

Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as the question of Chinese overseas is concerned, that is not our problem in India, they are there in Indonesia, in Siam and the rest. Well, I was told in Delhi and later, what their general policy with regard to that was.¹¹⁸ Further they said that in this matter they propose to deal with the people directly. They appealed to the Prime Minister of Burma with regards to the Chinese there and to the Prime Minister of Indonesia also. They propose to deal with them in this way ; not in some kind of a vague manner, for conditions differ in different places. And as for international communism etc, I presume what you mean is about aggression or...

Q: About *sub rosa* activities.

JN: Well, you know those Five Principles the Panch Shila. It is definitely stated that we do not want external or internal interference. The internal interference naturally refers to any kind of help given to others in national affairs. So far as the statement is concerned, it is there. So far as acting up to the statement is concerned, there is nothing to be said except to wait and watch. One can really

¹¹⁶ B.F.H.B. Tyabji.

¹¹⁷ Press conference, New Delhi, 13 November 1954. From the Press Information Bureau. Extracts. For the rest of the press conference See post, pp. 100-103.

¹¹⁸ See ante, pp. 18-19.

judge all these things in the general approach by a country. If the approach of one country is friendly, it normally follows there is nothing to be done. If it is not, then things are different. I am convinced that China, entirely for its own sake, wants peace, wants time to develop its country and thinks in terms of at least three or four five year plans - fifteen or twenty years' time to lay the foundations of a socialist state. So all this question of aggression, internal or external, has to be seen in that context, of their not desiring to get entangled.

Q: What-about the broadcast of K.I. Singh from Peking ? Or about the ex-Thai Minister?

JN: I do not know anything about the Thai Minister. About Dr K.I. Singh, well, this case was mentioned by me not as affecting us here but as a general thing. I was told that political asylum had been given to him in the normal way and nothing more. There is no further argument about it, and I do not think Dr K.I. Singh will function in future.

Q: Do you believe that this word coexistence is meant as an antidote to prevent a third world war?

JN: Antidote or a preventive to the third world war; that little statement brings in so many ideas and things, you can't deal with it. It is surely a simple proposition, exceedingly simple. Either you coexist or you co-destroy. There is no third way out of it. Is it not so ? I prefer the former. I have not the least, the faintest fear of China or any country. I want to assure you gentlemen that if you think that the policy of India is governed by fear of anybody, you are entirely mistaken. We may be conceited people in this, that we are not afraid of anybody, either the communists, or international communism or any other country. That is all right. But I recognise that other countries are afraid. I want other countries not to be afraid because fear is a bad thing, is a bad companion, it perverts one's thinking, one's functioning. Therefore, I am anxious that whether it is China or any other country, it should not do anything which is likely to make other countries afraid in Asia or elsewhere.

Q: What do you mean by saying that K.I. Singh would not function in the future ?

JN: I did not say that. I don't think K.I. Singh has been functioning against his own country in the past. I don't know what he will do in the future....

Q: You said that you were anxious that neither China nor any other country should do anything that would create fear. Did you express this opinion in Peking ?

JN: Yes. I did....

Q: It was reported after your return from China that two concrete results of your visit to China had been that China has accepted that Nepal was in the sphere of influence of India, and that China will start its diplomatic relations with Nepal.

JN: I am sorry, but many statements that have appeared in the press since my return from China, i.e., about my visit etc. have been very far from accurate. Sometimes they may have had some grain of truth. So far as Nepal is concerned, it is a well known fact and it is needless for me to state it. It is contained in our treaties and in our other agreements with Nepal that we have special position in Nepal-not interfering with their independence, but not looking with favour anybody else's interfering with their independence either. You will remember that in the past i.e., before India became independent, well, Nepal was not independent in any reality. It was very much under the British Government not internally I mean, but in regard to external matters. When we became independent, we went much further in recognizing the independence of Nepal than the British Government had done. India's special position in regard to foreign affairs in Nepal was recognised and that has been an admitted fact. As for diplomatic relations between Nepal and China, that is a matter which the Nepalese Government no doubt will deal with in its own way.

Q: Does China recognise this position-India's special position regarding Nepal?

JN: I did not ask them to recognize anything. I don't want anybody's assurance or guarantee of my position. I am quite happy about it....

Q: You might have discussed with the Chinese leaders their attitude towards SEATO. Do you propose to do anything to coordinate their attitude and your attitude?

JN: There was no discussion about SEATO, there might have been just a reference here and there. There was a little reference to Asia because it dealt with Asia also and among the powers are no doubt some Asian countries, but many Asian countries have nothing to do with it. Therefore, I refer to it as the

Manila Treaty and not as SEATO. There is no point in discussing it with them. Our attitude in regard to the Manila Treaty had been clearly stated by me in the Parliament¹¹⁹ and elsewhere and I presume you all know what that attitude is.

Q: According to a news item in an American magazine issued by the Associated Press of America you made an offer in Peking that you would use your good offices with the British Government for the return of Hong Kong to China.

JN: I may mention that throughout our talks-I don't know for how many hours-Hong Kong was never mentioned, not even casually. But it might interest you perhaps, I hope, when I say, that I casually asked them once "What about Macao?" The answer was, "It is like your Goa".

Q: Did the question of China's possible participation in the Afro-Asian Conference come up during your talks?

JN: Not in that way. I was asked, "What is this Afro-Asian Conference? Is it going to be held?" And I told them that the general principle had been accepted but we did not discuss it in detail, and that we were likely to go to Djakarta to discuss this matter further....

Q: Is it correct that China was very keen to establish normal diplomatic relations with all the countries in the world?

JN: That is the impression that I got quite clearly that they will be happy. Perhaps they will have relations with every country including the countries which are opposed to them.

Q: Would it be correct that in your discussions at Peking on the question of Formosa you advised tolerance and patience? I presume Formosa was discussed.

JN: Yes, it was discussed in the sense that, as you know, Formosa or Taiwan was very much talked about there. There was a considerable feeling or excitement on this issue. And to say that it was discussed, perhaps it is not quite correct. But I listened to their viewpoint about it, not so much about Formosa as such, but rather about the nearby islands. There are many islands near the Chinese coast and many of them are at present occupied by the

¹¹⁹ See Selected Works, (second series), Vol. 26, pp. 318-332.

Formosan troops.¹²⁰ And they pointed out to me how dangerous it was for them. Those islands on their coastline were a menace to them. They bombard, they carry out aerial flights and throw bombs sometimes from the air. Also they pointed out how all their coastal shipping was very severely interfered with, not only theirs but of others also. In fact, they gave me a statement giving the names of the ships and the deaths. It was a long statement and I should say that ninety per cent of the ships mentioned there were British ships.

Q: It has been asserted in some quarters that China maintains a very huge standing army of about ten million. And the very size of the army creates misapprehensions in the minds of some people. Is it your opinion that China has such a huge army?

JN: I know from the same facts as you have that China has a large army. I cannot say what numbers they are. But I did not discuss their army with them at all. I have no doubt that it is a big army and probably it includes a big militia merged in it. I do not know the figures. It is a very big one undoubtedly....

Q: Could you, Sir, give your own impression as to what the Chinese Government thinks about the twelve million Chinese abroad, whether they will accept them as their own nationals or not?

JN: I thought that this had been stated that their broad policy was, it was told, that the Chinese overseas should either elect to remain Chinese nationals; if so, they should not interfere with the internal affairs of the country they are in, or should become the nationals of the country of residence and then they have nothing to do with the Chinese Government. They wanted to deal with the question with each country separately....

Q: You said we could learn also from China, could you particularize the way in which you are thinking?

JN: They have got, as I say, the problem of industrialization; they have got the problem of land. We have dealt with in a different way the problem of land, but we have also put an end in India to what might be called the big land estate

¹²⁰ There are two sets of islands, namely, the Formosa group, consisting of thirteen islands and the Pescadore (Penghu) group, consisting of sixty-four islands. Out of these about thirty islands were under Nationalist occupation.

system, the zamindari system. We are now dealing with the second phase of this, that is of further distribution, of limitation, of ceilings in land. I do not know the details of the Chinese system. I did not go into any village; I cannot say anything about villages but I would personally imagine that the conditions in our villages, an average village, are much better than the average village in China. But then conditions vary in villages. There are so many things there which are very interesting; how they are dealing with various problems, industrial or other. One can learn from them as we can learn from other countries too...

Well, I would better stop. There are one or two matters which I will explain to you. One thing is that in spite of many irritating and rather dangerous tendencies, there is no doubt that world tension has decreased greatly and in people's minds there is less fear and danger of war. Now, this may be due to many reasons, but certainly, I think, one of these reasons was the Geneva Agreement and its consequences, that is, there is a feeling that although the problems are very difficult, they can be solved without recourse to war and that is a very healthy feeling.

There is one other small matter. I referred to conditions in China and India about public criticism. In China that does not exist in India there is an abundance of this. That is my impression. It is healthy, but I must say that sometimes the way the press or some papers behave is not only strange but has been most objectionable....

Q: Can you give us an idea as to the extent of Russian influence on China?

JN: How can I tell you that? There is no doubt about it that the Chinese are relying on Russia for their technological advancement. There are a considerable number of Russians or Soviet technicians helping them. In fact, in their Five Year Plan, I think, they have (the Soviet) agreed to put up some major enterprises in China in the course of the five years. As soon as the Soviet technicians come, the Chinese technicians are attached to them to learn from them. As soon as the Chinese learn, the Soviet people go away. I saw there an entirely new plant built there by the Soviets,¹²¹ at a fairly rapid speed,

¹²¹ On 24 October 1954, Nehru spent two hours at the new Soviet-built Anshan Iron and Steel Works—a giant metallurgical complex of some forty plants.

I believe, in the course of a year or 14 months, and it is a fine plant. I am not an expert, but other people have said that it is a fine plant....

Page 78

Implications of China Visit¹²²

During my visit to China, I had a number of talks with the Chinese leaders.¹²³ I had long talks with Premier Chou En-lai separately. I also had joint talks with Chairman Mao Tse-tung and his principal colleagues, viz., Vice Chairman Chu Teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the Peoples' Congress, Liu Shaochi, Premier Chou En-lai, Vice Chairman of the Standing Committee, Sung Ching-ling (Madame Sun Yat-sen), Vice Premier Chen Yen and the Chinese Ambassador in India. On our side in these joint talks, we had our Secretary General, N.R. Pillai, and our Ambassador in Peking, N. Raghavan. We both had interpreters with us.

2. I met separately the principal Ministers dealing with economic and financial policy and the Five Year Plan. Also Ministers dealing with land problem and flood control.

3. All these talks were through interpreters. Chairman Mao and most of his colleagues did not understand English at all. Premier Chou En-lai understood English a little and occasionally said a word or two in English, but his knowledge of English was limited. Madame Sun Yat-sen, of course, knew English well and I had a separate direct talk with her also.

4. I met large numbers of other leading personalities including the Dalai Lama, the Panchen Lama and scientists, medical men, engineers, people connected with cultural affairs, some representatives of nationalities, educationists, actors and actresses. My talks with these groups were brief and usually took place in big receptions.

¹²² Note 14 November 1954. , JN Collection. Also available in File No. 25(6)/54-PMS, and G. Parthasarathi (ed.), Jawaharlal Nehru: Letters to Chief Ministers 1947-1964, Vol. 4, pp. 76-89.

¹²³ In a covering note to the Commonwealth Secretary and the Foreign Secretary on 13 November, Nehru wrote that he had glanced through the notes of conversations in China and found that "they were not always quite correct. However, they give a fair idea of what we said to each other."

5. Our talks covered a large range of subjects. I was interested in the finances and economic implications of the Five Year Plan. I do not, however, propose to deal here with these talks regarding financial and economic matters as it was not possible for me to get a full grasp of these rather complicated subjects. I was promised a full note on these matters which I have not yet received. I might mention here that the Chinese budget for this year amounted to about: Revenue - 4,500 million US dollars, and expenditure over 5,000 million US dollars. There was thus a deficit of 500 million US dollars. I was told that during the two previous years there had been considerable surpluses and the present deficit was covered by them. The chief sources of income were the turn-over tax and profits from State undertakings. Income from land was inconsiderable. It should be remembered that China is very much a unitary and centralized ~State, so that the budget was for the whole of China.

6. My discussions about flood control and cultural matters were also interesting.

7. The real discussions were with Premier Chou En-lai and Chairman Mao and party. Although we talked about a large variety of subjects, I shall refer here only to some principal points that arose in the course of these discussions.

8. Chairman Mao referred to the age old association as well as to the new friendship between China and India. Both countries were struggling for peace. They had more or less common experiences in recent history and both countries needed peace to reconstruct their economies as both were industrially backward. The Chairman considered that India was industrially somewhat more advanced. But both countries were in this respect backward and had large populations. Industrial development had to be achieved quickly in both. Given peace, it might take China about four five year plans, i.e., twenty years or so, to become an industrial country with foundations laid for a socialist economy. China, therefore, was anxious for peace. But some countries, notably USA, were obstructing this process. USA was occupying, or helping in the occupation, not only of Formosa, but many islands very near the Chinese mainland. There was bombardment of the Chinese mainland from these islands and air raids were frequently carried out. During the past two years, there had been airdropping in the Chinese mainland not only of groups

of men, but also of wireless transmitters and other equipment. Many of such groups had been rounded up and caught. Most of them consisted of Chinese Kuomintang agents, but there were some Americans also among them.

9. China was not a threat to any country and wished to live in peace with all other countries. But the USA did not permit her to do so and even brought pressure to bear upon England, France, and other countries to prevent them from cooperating with China.

10. The question of Formosa or the other islands occupied by Formosan troops was not discussed by me. But it was made clear to me that great importance was attached by the Chinese Government to this issue of Taiwan and, even more so, to the islands of the mainland, and the interference with normal coastal trade and attacks on the mainland.

11. Some reference was made to the Manila Treaty and Chairman Mao pointed out that this Treaty- was the result of the American reaction to the Geneva Agreement. The American Government did not like that Agreement and wanted to come in the way of peaceful settlements.

12. Reference was also made to the Five Principles which had been included in the joint declarations issued by India and China, and Burma and China. It was agreed that if these principles were agreed to by other countries and acted upon by all of them, this would go a long way in removing tensions and fears.

13. I agreed to this and pointed out that there was no doubt that there was a certain amount of fear in the minds of the smaller nations in Asia or China. That fear might have no basis, but the fact remained that there was that fear. Some of these countries were perhaps also afraid of India. It was essential, therefore, that this fear and suspicion should be removed. In the past both the Chinese and Indian peoples had spread out to countries in South East Asia and there were considerable populations of overseas Chinese and overseas Indians.

14. Chairman Mao agreed that these fears must be removed and nothing should be done which might cause apprehension to these countries.

15. In this connection reference was made, especially, to the Chinese overseas and to the question of their nationality. I was assured, what I had been told previously, that the Chinese Government wanted to settle this question in cooperation with the countries concerned. There were some difficulties in

dealing with it as a whole. They proposed, therefore, to deal with it separately for each country. The Prime Minister of Burma, U Nu, would be visiting China soon and they would discuss this with Indonesia. Their general approach was that the Chinese abroad should choose their nationality, that is, whether they would continue as Chinese nationals or become nationals of the country they lived in. There should be no dual nationality. It seemed to me that while this point was quite clear in the minds of the Chinese leaders, they had some apprehensions lest any step that they might take might be to the advantage of the Formosa Government. Hence this caution in approach and the separate approaches.

16. The Chinese leaders repeatedly assured me that they did not want war and that they were prepared to cooperate with every country and have diplomatic relations with it, even though that country was opposed to them. They mentioned, in this connection, particularly, Thailand and the Philippines which, they pointed out, were completely under the influence of the USA. This itself was evidence of the Chinese desire to live at peace with other countries. These countries, I was told, accused China of thinking in terms of aggression, but did not respond to the Chinese offer to establish improved relations. China was prepared to issue joint statements on the basis of the Five Principles with other countries. This would rule out aggression as well as internal interference.

17. Reference was made by me especially to this internal interference through local communist parties. I was assured that China did not wish to interfere in any way with local affairs.

18. Chairman Mao dealt at some length with the past two World Wars and their revolutionary consequences. He pointed out that China had no atom bombs or any equipment of the latest type. But the US and the USSR had both.

Ultimately, it was the people, who would count and who would be the deciding factors. He pointed out that the experience of both the World Wars was that the countries who started the war were defeated and those who were on the defence won. Another consequence was revolutions in some countries and the freedom of some colonial countries. Thus, if unfortunately another world war took place, disastrous as it might be, it would lead to the defeat of the aggressors and possibly other revolutionary changes might take place. He was

not afraid of a war if it came, but he did not want it because of its disastrous consequences to the world and because it would come in the way of developing their country.

19. I was not fully in agreement with Chairman Mao's analysis, but I entirely agreed with him that war must be avoided and every step which might lead to war should also therefore be avoided.

20. My talks with Premier Chou En-lai covered larger ground. He referred also to the United States policy which came in the way of peace and created tense situations in the Far East. "Why", he asked, "was America so aggressive and what was her motive in carrying on this aggressive activities in the Far East?" I replied that I did not think that the American people wanted war but undoubtedly they were afraid of communist aggression and wanted to take action to protect their interests. Premier Chou did not quite agree with me and said that America's policy was an expansionist policy. He referred to the military aid given to Pakistan which had nothing to fear from China or the Soviet Union. America, according to him, wanted to bully weaker nations and rule the world.

21. I pointed out to Premier Chou that this was exactly what some countries in the West said about Soviet imperialism and communism endangering the peace of Europe and the world. They said also that communists did not want war because they thought they could get everything without war, that is, by infiltration and other tactics.

22. Premier Chou said that this was absurd. China had already made a declaration of Five Principles, and revolution could not be imported from outside. He referred to the Kuomintang forces on the Burmese borders and said that China would have been justified in attacking them as they were creating trouble on the Chinese side. But the Chinese Government realized the difficulties of the Government of Burma and wanted to be friendly to them. Therefore, they desisted from any activity against the Kuomintang troops there.

23. I referred to Chinese maps which still showed portions of Burma and even of India as if they were within Chinese territory. So far as India was concerned, I added, we were not much concerned about this matter because our

boundaries were quite clear and were not a matter for argument. But many people took advantage of these old maps and argued that China had an aggressive intent, or else why continue to use these maps. In Burma also this caused apprehension.

24. Premier Chou replied that these maps were old ones and China had not done any surveying to draw new maps. Their boundaries even with Mongolia and the Soviet Union were still not clearly demarcated and there were discrepancies. I pointed out that this might be so. So far as India was concerned, I repeated, there was no doubt about our boundaries and I was not worried about them. But I wondered how China would feel if a part of Tibet had been shown as part of India in our maps.

25. I referred also to the case of K.I. Singh, a Nepalese national, who had rebelled against his Government and who, according to reports, had been given encouragement in China. This kind of thing created apprehensions in the minds of Asian countries. Premier Chou replied that K.I. Singh crossed into Chinese territory with some other men in possession of rifles and ammunition. According to international custom, China disarmed them and gave them asylum. Nothing more was done. He referred in this connection to the intention of the Dalai Lama at one time to go to India. The Indian Ambassador had told the Chinese Government then that if the Dalai Lama came to India and sought asylum, they could not refuse this and they would treat him with courtesy but would not encourage any political activities on his part. As a matter of fact, the Dalai Lama did not go to India but some of his relatives did go there and had been given asylum. The Chinese Government did not mind this. In K.I. Singh's case, the Chinese Government had given him asylum and he would not be allowed to take part in any political activity against his country.

26. Premier Chou asked me questions about Nepal and various other countries. He referred to his invitation to the Indonesian Prime Minister to come to China. The Indonesian Prime Minister had expressed the wish that Premier Chou should first go to Indonesia. This was not possible for some time as he was very busy with important work, more especially as he had been absent for a long time in Geneva and elsewhere. Premier Chou was particularly interested in foreign influences at work in various countries of Asia, more especially

American influences. He referred especially to pressure brought upon them to join the so-called South East Asia Defence Organisation. He referred to Thailand also and said that they were anxious to have normal relations with it. 27. Premier Chou also asked me about my visit to Indo-China and the position there.

28. Premier Chou referred to Korea. He was anxious that something should be done to settle the Korean problem. He thought that a conference should be held soon to consider this and that the old Geneva Conference should be enlarged for this purpose by adding neutral Asian countries.

29. I said that I agreed that we must pursue methods to arrive at a settlement in Korea and a conference for this purpose would be necessary. But such a conference should be held at the right time when some ideas about a settlement were clearer. Merely to have a conference without such ideas might lead again to a deadlock. Meanwhile, it was important that we should not allow the situation in Korea to deteriorate.

30. We discussed India-China relations and the exchange of technical personnel, books, periodicals, etc. Also an agreement about air services. It was agreed that there should be a reciprocal arrangement for an Indian air service at a Chinese port, probably Canton. This matter was to be discussed further through diplomatic channels.

31. I referred to certain difficulties of pilgrims going to Tibet. Premier Chou agreed to look into this matter and to remove such difficulties. He also agreed to the supply of silk cocoons to Kashmir and suggested our sending an expert to select the varieties.

32. He informed me about the Chinese desire to have diplomatic relations with Nepal. I told him that the Nepalese Government had kept us informed of this. The King of Nepal had been ill and had gone to Switzerland for treatment. On his return, they would no doubt take up this matter. So far as we were concerned, we would welcome friendly relations between Nepal and China.

33. I gave him a brief outline of recent Nepalese history and how previously Nepal was far from independent, that is, before India became independent. There was no interference in internal matters, but otherwise the United Kingdom was the suzerain power. Independent India had accepted the full

independence of Nepal and had not claimed some of the rights that Britain had exercised. But the two countries had agreed that their foreign policies should be coordinated. It was clear that India had a special position in Nepal and it became necessary, therefore, for their foreign policies to be in line with each other. India did not 'approve of foreign intervention in Nepal in any way. As for Nepal and China, it was desirable that they should settle such problems as existed in regard to Tibet. The question of diplomatic representation could probably be dealt with by the Chinese Ambassador in Delhi also being accredited to Kathmandu. I pointed out that Nepal was passing through grave internal difficulties and we wanted to help her to get over them and not add to these difficulties. .

34. Premier Chou asked me about the Afro-Asian Conference. I told him that we had agreed on the principle of it but, had not decided the details and that we were likely to meet soon at Djakarta to consider this matter. Premier Chou welcomed the idea and it was evident from his talk with me that he would like China to be invited to it.

35. I have given a brief summary of our talks. These talks both with Chairman Mao and Premier Chou were frank and friendly. We did not discuss the theories or ideology underlying our respective political and economic structures. We knew that they were different and yet there was much in common in the work of both the countries and many of our problems were similar. We... ..his desire for cooperation with the French and even to be associated with the French Union, provided his country had complete independence. He mentioned the relationship of India with the Commonwealth and asked me for further particulars about it. It was evident that Vietminh was well organized and disciplined.

49. South Vietnam produced a completely opposite effect on me. The whole place seemed to be at sixes and sevens with hardly any dominant authority. The Prime Minister and his General were opposed to each other. There were three private armies of some kind of semi-religious sects. Foreign representatives apparently also pulled in different directions. It was generally estimated that if there was a vote now, ninety per cent or more of the

population would vote for Vietminh. What would happen a year or two later, one could not say.

50. Laos also appeared to be a sleepy and rather depressing place. There was a good deal of French influence there still and the International Commission was facing rather difficult problems.

51. Cambodia was somewhat different. It could be considered more or less independent although there were one or two issues still to be settled with the French. The International Commission had completed the greater part of its labours and the Joint Commission of the two parties¹²⁴ had finished its work. The young King¹²⁵ is popular and is a bright and agreeable person. But it was said that he was in the hands of palace clique. Some of his high placed officers told me that unless the King got the support of some prominent leaders who stood for far reaching political and economic reforms, the future would not be happy.

52. Premier Chou En-lai asked me as to whether we were going to recognize these Indo-China States. I told him that for all practical purposes we were dealing with them, either through the International Commission or otherwise as if we had recognized them. We intended sending Consuls General to them. For the present, we did not intend going any further because of our delicate position as Chairman of the three International Commissions.

53. Since my talk with Premier Chou En-lai, I passed through Cambodia and I felt that the case of Cambodian was somewhat different from the others and we might perhaps go a little further in our relations with that State. We are considering this matter now.

Page 87

China's Desire for Peaceful Coexistence¹²⁶

¹²⁴ See post, p. 101.

¹²⁵ . King Norodom Sihanouk.

¹²⁶ Interview to Norman Cliff, BBC, New Delhi, 19 November 1954. From The Hindu, 20 November 1954. Extracts.

Norman Cliff wanted Nehru to give his reactions to the warm welcome he received in China.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Mr Cliff. I had a very cordial welcome which, from the popular side, was very spontaneous and I was naturally very much impressed by it. Even the weather cooperated and we had lovely weather in Peking in October when Premier Chou En-Jai told that they wanted to be very hospitable to the guests. So they did and provided a cold wave when the Russians came and warmer weather when we came. But he was sorry that he could not provide a London for Mr Attlee.

Cliff wanted to know whether it was possible for India to emulate the discipline and enthusiasm of the Chinese in nation-building activities without resorting to regimentation.

JN: I think so, certainly, but not exactly the same type. It may be, we have seen in our country in the past, during Gandhiji's time, tremendous enthusiasm apart from our struggle, in nation-building activities, and we see even now, more especially in the rural areas, a great deal of enthusiasm and cooperation. It is difficult to compare and it may be that in China it is much more. But we certainly hope to increase the enthusiasm of our people and go ahead with these activities.

Cliff wanted to know whether it was possible without regimentation.

JN: Well, it is certainly possible. To what degree, is a matter for guessing. We may not be able to do it to the same extent as the Chinese but we prefer to do it our own way.

Cliff said that he felt that Nehru during his talks with the Chinese leaders expressed his viewpoints without trying to harmonize incompatible theories to reach agreement on particular problems and it was said that Nehru had opened windows overlooking Asia for his hosts, while they opened peepholes on the Russian side. About Nehru's declaration in a press conference¹²⁷ that India was not afraid of any other country whereas other countries were afraid, Cliff wanted to know on what was India's fearlessness based.

JN: May I say that when I said that I was not referring to powerful countries but rather to countries in Asia. I was not referring to other outside countries

¹²⁷ See ante, p. 73.

either. It is rather a long question to answer. First of all, we have been mentally conditioned by Gandhiji and that is important: 1 think secondly, even our geographical situation is such that it preserves us. Thirdly, we think we are not so weak as to internally or externally meet any danger if it comes, but we don't invite it by taking any steps to that end....

Page 90

Consequences of Visit to China¹²⁸

It is a little difficult to make an appraisal of the political consequences of my visit to China or to measure its effect on India's relations with China. Normally the political test is some pact or treaty or agreement or some guarantee asked for and given. Apart from these, the consequences, however great they might be, are imponderable. They can be seen and felt though it may be difficult to state them precisely.

I did not go to China as a casual tourist or visitor, nor did I go there to discuss the terms of any agreement, or ask for or given any guarantee. During the long talks I had with the leaders of the Chinese Government, at no stage was any reference made by either party to any pact or agreement. Those talks dealt with a large variety of subjects in which either of us or both were interested. Both of us knew well the differences in political or economic structure of our respective Governments and countries and we did not argue about these matters. Proceeding on that basis, we found a large measure of agreement in our approach to different questions and many problems, both internal and external, which were common to us. We discussed these frankly and without inhibitions or reservations. We found that such differences as existed in our political or economic structures need not come in the way of our cooperation in many fields and, more specially, in our working for peace in Asia and the world. Indeed, the basis of our talks was the preservation of peace, because we were both firmly of opinion that peace was essential in order to

¹²⁸ Statement in the Lok Sabha, 22 November 1954. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. VI, Part I, 1954, cols. 343-348.

enable us to build up our respective countries, apart from its beneficial aspects in the world at large.

We envisaged peace not as a negative avoidance of war, but as something positive and healing, bringing in its train freedom from fear and suspicion and a measure of confidence, enabling progressive cooperation.

I did not go to China as a stranger to its past or present. For many years past, I had made some study of its history and great culture and paid particular attention to recent developments. And yet, the reading of books and the study of statistics do not always bring in their train an understanding and awareness of the larger meaning of events. I had hoped that some such closer understanding will come to me by a personal visit and by meeting those who were responsible for the new China. I think I can say that my visit was successful in this respect, as I hope and believe that Premier Chou En-lai's visit to India some months ago, brief as it was, gave him some clearer picture of our country and its hopes and urges.

The visit of Premier Chou En-lai to India and my visit in return opened up for both of us and, I think, our respective countries vast vistas of history as well as the present period of revolutionary change in Asia in its various forms. Although this past was our background and gave us the proper perspective, it was the present that absorbed our attention and the future that we were seeking to build.

I saw in China, as I hope Premier Chou En-lai sensed somewhat in India, the process of history in the making. I found China not only a country big in size but great in spirit, full of confidence in itself and determined to march ahead. The great changes that had come there during recent years had undoubtedly made a tremendous difference to the vast population of that country. Perhaps the greatest change of all was in the social sphere and yet, I also found that the people had their deep roots in the past and were not cut off from their great cultural inheritance which had been their pride. I found also a deep and widespread feeling of friendship for India and her people which itself was not an outcome of the present only, though the present had much to do with it, but had far-reaching roots.

All these matters are to me imponderables about which people may have differing opinions. But sometimes, the imponderables of history and current events are more important than factual data. I had a sense in China, as I often have in India, of the vast changes that were coming over this Asian continent of ours, which had upset the old balances and were searching for a new equilibrium. Unless this overwhelming fact is recognised, and unless it is fully appreciated that there can be no reversal of these historic processes, there will be no understanding of what is taking place in various parts of Asia. Perhaps some of the difficulties of the present day world are due to a lack of understanding of this great development in human history.

The mere fact of a closer understanding between India and China is a factor of vital importance not only to these two countries but to others also. Therefore, the visit of Premier Chou En-lai to India and my visit to China assumed a significance of some historic importance.

Apart from conflicts which exist in many parts of the world, the major difficulty appears to be the prevalence of fear and the reactions to that all-pervading fear. The two great groups of nations which have been ranged against each other for several years suspect each other of aggressive designs. Each charges the other with evil intentions and with preparations for external aggression or internal subversion. Every act of one country or one group which is aimed at the other, leads to a counter act. Thus tension grows and the vicious circle continues.

We discussed this matter in Peking, as we had done previously in New Delhi, and we agreed that everything should be done to remove this fear and apprehension from men's minds, so as to produce an atmosphere which is more helpful in the consideration and solution of problems. The leaders of China assured me that they were anxious to do this and I have no doubt that they meant what they said, because the circumstances that exist today demand such a course of action even from the point of view of national interest. The Five Principles or the Panch Shila as I would like to call them, to which we agreed some months ago, appear to me to offer a firm basis for friendly intercourse between nations.

It has seemed to me that the people of every country desire peace and would like to be friendly with other countries, but circumstances come in the way of normal contacts and understanding and leads to deep distrust of each other. I feel that the removal of all these barriers to contact and understanding should go some way to remove this distrust. This understanding of each other has happened to some extent between India and China, and therefore, it has to be welcomed in the larger context also. It has been a step towards peace in Asia and even in the world. My visit to China might by itself have had no great importance. But, in the context of things today, it fitted in with a gradual change in the world situation and therefore, it was helpful. Hon. Members will remember the crises through which we have passed even during this year-in March and September-when war on a big scale appeared to be near. Fortunately those crises were passed without disaster and, in this matter, I should like to pay a tribute to the part played by the President of the United States of America in the avoidance of war.¹²⁹ The Geneva Conference marked a turning point in postwar history. Unfortunately, the Manila Treaty came somewhat in the way of that new atmosphere which Geneva had started. Nevertheless, there have been many indications in recent months of this improved world atmosphere for which credit must go to all the Great Powers. Briefly put, I would say that the political consequences of my visit to China were a deeper understanding between India and China and what they stand for and what they work for, and a knowledge that there is much in common in the tasks that confronts them, and it is desirable for them to cooperate in as large a measure as possible. India, as she is situated geographically and politically, can be of some service in interpreting some countries to others and thus helping to remove misunderstandings. Probably my visit also helped a little in easing the existing tensions in Indo-China and in South East Asia. As such, it helped in the larger and vital problems of world peace.

¹²⁹ In March the Vietminh invaded Laos and war intensified in the Indo-China region. In September the attack on Quemoy and Amoy islands started triggering off a long drawn out battle between China and Taiwan. On both occasions it was anticipated that the USA would join in and enlarge the scale and scope of war, but at crucial junctures Eisenhower followed a policy of restraint

