

Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru

Series 2, Volume 59

March 26 – April 14, 1960

People's Republic of China

153. To Lok Sabha Secretariat: Denial of Press Report¹

Two or three days ago I received a notice from the Lok Sabha Secretariat in which a Member of Parliament had asked for a statement to be made by me under Rule 197 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business. This referred to an article that had appeared in the Amrita Bazar Patrika of Calcutta on March 29th, 1960,² making an allegation that I had made some statement at a meeting of Chief Ministers of States. I ventured to submit to Mr. Speaker that the allegations contained in this article were completely untrue and without foundation. At that time I thought that it was not necessary to make a particular statement about this baseless allegation.

2. I have now received another notice of the same kind on the same subject. Also, notice of a Short Notice Question on the same subject.

3. On reconsideration of this matter and as there appears to be some genuine misunderstanding in the minds of some Members of Parliament, I

¹ Note to the Lok Sabha Secretariat, 2 April 1960.

² P.G. Deb, Ganatantra Parishad, Lok Sabha MP from Angul, Orissa, gave a calling attention notice on 31 March 1960 about this article in the Amrita Bazar Patrika on 28 March. See Appendix 8.

think it would be better for me to make this brief statement on this subject. I would prefer to make this brief statement to answering a Short Notice Question.

4. I should like to make this statement as early as possible. I am leaving Delhi for two days tomorrow. If it is convenient to Mr Speaker, I should like to make this statement in the Lok Sabha on Tuesday the 5th April. In the event of the 5th April being a holiday, I shall make it on the 6th April.

5. I enclose a copy of the statement I propose to make.³

154. To Khushwaqt Rai and other MPs: Conditions for Chou En-Lai's Visit⁴

April 4, 1960

Dear Shri Khushwaqt Rai,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 4th April with which you have sent me another letter of the same date⁵ signed by some members of the Opposition Parties in the Lok Sabha.⁶

The questions you have referred to in your letter have been discussed repeatedly in the Lok Sabha. Indeed there was a discussion even after it

³ For Nehru's statement in the Lok Sabha on 6 April 1960, see item 155.

⁴ Letter to Rai, PSP, Lok Sabha MP from Kheri, UP, and other Opposition MPs. Copied to SG and FS. The text of this letter was also published in *The Hindu* on 7 April 1960.

⁵ For Khushwaqt Singh's and other MPs' letter of 4 April 1960 published in *The Hindu* of 6 April, see Appendix 18.

⁶ The draft of the letter, prepared by the Opposition MPs barring the Communists, was approved at a meeting on 2 April, attended by N.G. Goray (PSP), A.B. Vajpayee (Jan Sangh), Shakuntala Masani (Swatantra Party), Sivaraj (Republican), P.K. Deo (Ganatantra Parishad), and B.R. Singh (Socialist) among others. See *The Hindu*, 3 April 1960.

was stated by me that I had invited the Prime Minister of China to visit India. I had made the position of the Government quite clear on that occasion. There has been no change in the views of the Government since then.

I had made it clear that at no time had I said that unless certain pre-conditions were satisfied, I would not invite the Chinese Prime Minister. I certainly thought and still think that such pre-conditions as I had mentioned previously would facilitate talks. Otherwise there was too big a gap between the two positions.

It has always been our policy, before Independence and subsequently, that we should not refuse to meet and discuss matters with representatives of other Governments, even though we do not agree with them at all. Whether such a meeting leads to any substantial or good results or not is another matter.

I shall naturally keep Parliament informed of any talks that I may have with the Prime Minister of China.

You refer to the reception that might be given to the Prime Minister of China when he visits our country. You are no doubt aware that there are rules and conventions governing the visit of Heads of Governments and Prime Ministers as our guests to India. Apart from these, there are certain well known conventions and courtesies which are given to distinguished guests, regardless of our difference of views. It would be extraordinary, improper and not in keeping with India's cultural traditions, for us not to abide by those rules and conventions and refrain from giving every courtesy to a distinguished guest.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

155. In the Lok Sabha: Article in Amrita Bazar Patrika⁷

Shri P.G. Deb: Sir, on a point of procedure. When this matter is being brought up, I would like to ask whether the hon. Prime Minister is going to make a statement regarding the very same article which came out in the Amrita Bazar Patrika on 28th March, 1960⁸ about which I gave a calling attention notice on the 31st of March.

Mr. Speaker: So, he does not want the statement now? All calling attention notices are for the purpose of getting a statement from the Prime Minister. Now, does he not want me to call on the Prime Minister to make that statement?

Shri P.G. Deb: I did not get any reply whether it was rejected or accepted.

Mr. Speaker: The procedure is this. Whenever the hon. Ministers want they intimate to me that they want to make a statement and I give them permission. After all, calling attention notices or things of that kind are only for the purpose of making the Ministers to make a statement on the floor of the House. They accept some notices and they do not accept some. But I prefer the opportunity being given to the Ministers themselves to make a statement in as liberal a manner as possible to avoid this process. That will be the procedure normally.

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

⁷ Intervention in the Lok Sabha, 6 April 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol XLII, cols 9831-9832.

⁸ See Appendix 8.

My attention has been drawn to an article that appeared in the Amrita Bazar Patrika of Calcutta on March 28, 1960. This article referred to a meeting of Chief Ministers of States held in Delhi⁹ at which I am alleged to have made some statement in regard to our problems relating to our frontier with the Chinese State.

The allegations made in this issue of the Amrita Bazar Patrika are completely untrue and without the least foundation. I regret that such baseless statements injurious to the national cause should be made in a responsible newspaper.

156. To S. Dutt: Programme for Chou En-Lai's Visit¹⁰

Now that we have received the list of the people coming with Premier Chou En-lai, we should draw up some provisional programme for him.¹¹ I think that the programme thus far should be the Delhi programme only. We may indicate to our Ambassador that we are not including any visits outside Delhi for the present so as not to reduce the time for talks, etc. But if Premier Chou En-lai so wishes, he can easily go, say, to Agra or any other place nearby. Perhaps, it would be as well to have a visit to Agra about the middle of his stay here for some kind of a break. I cannot think of any other suitable place nearby. There is no point in taking him to the usual community development centres.

2. In Delhi he can visit some of our scientific institutions. He will go for sight-seeing to the Qutab and to Red Fort also.

⁹ On 20 March after the NDC meeting. Amrita Bazar Patrika reported it on 28 March, The Hindu on 22 March; most others did not report it.

¹⁰ Note to the FS, 8 April 1960. S. Dutt Papers, NMML. Also available in JN Collection.

¹¹ A 31-member delegation led by Chou En-lai, included Chen Yi, Vice Premier of the State Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs, and was accompanied by seven pressmen.

3. There is a new defence science institute which I am going to visit in a few days' time,¹² but I doubt if it would be suitable to take him there.

4. There will be the usual banquet given by me at Rashtrapati Bhavan and a lunch by the President. I think it would be a good thing if a lunch by the Vice- President, preferably at the Vice-President's house, is included. You can ask the Vice-President about it. He may come to lunch one day at my house in continuation of our talks. These talks will presumably be held at my house or at Rashtrapati Bhavan. If necessity arises, we may have them in the External Affairs Ministry.

5. Some such tentative broad programme might be fixed up and communicated. When we got a reply from our Ambassador, this can be finalised.

6. Parliament will be sitting in those days, but I do not think any Parliamentary function should be organised for him. He will naturally call on the President and the Vice-President. Among the Ministers who might meet him would be the Home Minister, the Finance Minister and the Defence Minister.

157. In the Lok Sabha: Question of Privilege¹³

Mr. Speaker: Shri Vajpayee¹⁴ perhaps, wanted to say something.

¹² It is not clear which institute he has in mind. A number of laboratories and establishments were being started around this time. For a complete list, see the website [http:// www.drdo.gov.in/drdo/English/index.jsp?pg=genesis.jsp](http://www.drdo.gov.in/drdo/English/index.jsp?pg=genesis.jsp), accessed on 22 July 2014.

¹³ Interventions by Nehru, 8 April 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XLII, cols 10376-10380.

¹⁴ Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Jan Sangh, Lok Sabha MP from Balrampur, UP.

Shri Vajpayee: Sir, may I know your reactions to my letter of this morning with regard to the publication of a news item relating to the Chinese reply to the Indian note of 12th February?¹⁵ It has been reported in the Press that the Government of India has received a reply; and the contents of the reply have also appeared in the Press. I feel that before the publication of the contents of the reported reply, this House should have been informed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister.

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

Sir, I should like to be clear on this subject of what is sometimes referred to as a privilege of this House. I am not aware of any such privilege that I should control the Press as to what they should print or not print when they get it...

Shri Vajpayee: The External Affairs Ministry should be controlled and not the Press.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: And the External Affairs Ministry even, to what measure it should be controlled as to what it should give to the Press and what it should not. I think it is a novel proposition of which I have not been aware in any country. But that is another matter. I want to be clear on this matter which is referred to again and again, to my knowledge, without any justification in parliamentary practice in any country. In fact, it would become almost impossible for Parliament to function if I am supposed to tell them of all military moves, all diplomatic moves from day

¹⁵ For GOI's note of 12 February 1960, see White Paper III, pp. 85-98; and for the China Government's reply to it on 3 April 1960, see White Paper IV, pp. 8-16.

to day. That is not parliamentary government, so far as I know. But that is by the way.

We have been trying to keep the House fully informed of these developments. Sometimes, it so happens that newspapers get some information and they publish it—not because we give it to them. We do not want to encourage publication in newspapers before we have decided that it should be published. A reply has come from the Chinese Government and we were waiting to find out the exact date of publication by them and by us and then I shall place it before the House possibly—I do not know—in the next two or three days. We are not responsible for a newspaper publishing it or the substance of it. (Interruptions) (An Hon. Member: It has leaked out) Maybe. I do not think that it leaked out. The newspaper concerned has correspondents abroad too and those correspondents get it from other sources also.

Shri Vajpayee: When will this be laid on the Table of the House?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: For the information of the House, I should like to place it before the House as soon as possible—may be, in two or three days, perhaps, on Monday. I shall not be here but I shall instruct my colleague, the Deputy Minister, to lay it on the Table of the House on Monday.

I may add that the note which is a fairly long one is really a resume of what has been said in the past. There is nothing new in it except the repetition of what they have said. Well, presumably, if I may use the word it is to put their case as a whole, together, again.

Shri Hem Barua: The language is very polite, it seems?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is referring to politeness.

Shri Hem Barua: It is said about the note that the language is very polite. That is what the newspaper reporters say.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The language is, and ought to be, always polite When Governments deal with each other and when guests come they should also be treated politely ... (Interruptions)

Shri Hem Barua: Nobody says that guests should not be treated politely.

Mr. Speaker: Now, one point has been raised. So far as this matter is concerned, I had noted here—"not a matter for a privilege motion." But I was informed that the Prime Minister wanted to make a statement. Otherwise, I would not have called him.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I appreciate that, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Let me make my position clear. With respect to these matters, I would like the hon. Members to know what exactly I am going to allow and not to allow. It is for the hon. Minister to find out, and to decide for himself, whether a particular document ought to be placed on the Table of the House or not. If he makes up his mind that it ought to be placed here, the hon. Members expect that this House must be the first to get information before it is given to the Press. But it is for the hon. Minister to decide whether it is a matter which is so important that the information ought to be given first to the House or whether it is not of such importance and might be given out to the Press. Today, I understood him to say that somehow it had leaked out. In that case, every hon. Member is entitled to ask how it has leaked out. If, on the other hand, he feels that it is not a matter which ought to be kept secret, there is absolutely no such question of leakage. If, the hon. Minister feels, on the other hand, that it is a matter of importance and the House ought to be taken into confidence first, before it goes out, every

step ought to be taken to see that the outside world does not give information of this matter before the paper is laid on the Table of the House. It is for the Minister to decide.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: As I understand you, Sir, the whole matter is left to the discretion of the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am quite satisfied with it.

Shri Vajpayee: May I submit that I did not want this question to be the form of breach of privilege I only wanted to draw your attention.

Mr. Speaker: I can only add this to avoid any misunderstanding in the future. When the hon. Minister gives information to the Press or allows the information to the Press or allows the information to be given to the Press he ought not to say that he wanted to place it on the Table of the House first.

If he wanted to give it to the Press, let him say so. If, on the other hand, he wanted to keep it a secret, the House is always entitled to ask how it has leaked out before it was given to the House. That is the only point.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I beg of you to say that there are many matters which are not exactly secret but publicity is given to them at a time considered the right time? Normally, if you place anything before the House, it is obvious that it is not right to issue it to the Press previously. But if the Press gets it—not from us and so there is no question of leakage—surely, the Ministries concerned are not responsible for the activities of the Press. Obviously, it is a matter not of privilege but pure courtesy even that it should be placed before the House before it is sent to the Press. But sometimes it so happens—apart from the papers—that

we have Press Conferences and there are questions and answers. Something is said and an answer has to be given. That is not a matter of discourtesy to anybody that an answer is given. Can it be said that every answer should be given here before it is given in the Press Conference?

158. To Lok Sabha Secretariat: Boundary Dispute¹⁶

I would submit to Mr. Speaker that it will not be desirable for me to make a statement at this stage about the recent letter from the Chinese Government regarding our boundary disputes. The Prime Minister of China is coming here within a week's time and a full discussion about this note in Parliament will, I think, not be desirable. I might add that the letter of the Prime Minister of China is a repetition of what has been said by the Chinese Government previously to which we have given adequate replies. The fact that he has repeated his arguments does not raise any fresh issue which has not been answered by us. Our case has been fully stated already in the House on previous occasions.

I might add that I have to go out of Delhi on the 14th April morning. I shall return only on the 17th afternoon.

(c) Tibet

159. To S. Dutt: Education for Tibetan Refugees¹⁷

I agree generally with what you have written in your note.

¹⁶ Note, 12 April 1960.

¹⁷ Note to FS, 28 March 1960. File No. 29(78) BST/59, MEA.

2. I agree also that we must take some steps for the education of the children. To some extent, some effort should be made to teach adults also, at least the language of the place. I realise that it is difficult to do much in the way of education when they are in temporary camps. Even so, teachers could be arranged in these temporary camps. That is a step to which we should give some priority.

3. You might have some kind of an answer sent to Mrs Bedi.¹⁸

160. In the Lok Sabha: Non-Tibetan Refugees from Tibet¹⁹

Question:²⁰ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 29 on the 16th November, 1959 and state:

- (a) Whether the investigation conducted regarding the identity and antecedents of the 40 non-Tibetans found amongst the refugees from Tibet has been completed; and
(b) if so, the result there of?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b). Yes; about fifty persons have been identified as of Chinese origin.

Shri Ram Krishan Gupta: May I know whether any restrictions have been placed upon their movement; if so, the nature of those restrictions?

¹⁸ Freda Bedi, a social worker.

¹⁹ Oral answers to questions, 31 March 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XLI, cols 8841-8845.

²⁰ By Congress MPs Ram Krishan Gupta, A.M. Tariq and Bhakt Darshan.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, the first obvious restriction was that they were kept more or less in custody to know what they are. At present all these Tibetan refugees have been kept in camps, they do not normally wander about all over India. Some of these Chinese people are in Calcutta, I understand, but they have to keep in touch with us or we have to keep in touch with them. It is intended, so far as this particular lot is concerned, to gradually send them out of India.

Translation begins:

Shri A.M. Tariq: I want to know about these people who have been caught and questioned—does the Government think that some of them represent Kuomintang Government and are their spies?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is such a matter that it is not proper for me to answer these questions. Many things were revealed, but now if I answer one or two parts, then it will not be good.

Shri Bhakt Darshan: Sir, have their objectives in coming with the Tibetans been investigated?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This is the same question. Now different people have different objectives.

Shri Braj Raj Singh:²¹ Have these Chinese been separated from the Tibetan refugees; and if they have been separated, where have they been kept? And as the Prime Minister has said that there is a plan to send these out of India, I want to know when they are going to be sent.

²¹ See fn 37 in this section.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not sure but I think they are kept in the same area separately. One, some of these, as I said, had run away and were caught, I do not mean to say that they were arrested but it became known that they had come to Calcutta, and the Government kept a watch on them as to what they have been there. Now when will they be sent I cannot say, no specific date has been fixed but when appropriate arrangements are made and they can be sent conveniently, they will be sent.

Dr Ram Subhag Singh:²² Did these 50 Chinese come to India via Tibet, and if yes, was any notice taken of them at the first check post or not?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I could not understand properly.

Translation ends]

Subhag Singh: May I know whether all these 50 Chinese entered India from Tibet; if so, whether they were first notice at the first Indian check-post or not?

[Translation begins:

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They came like other Tibetan refugees in groups, and they came in different groups, in the same way, on the same route. Later when checking was done it was found that they were not Tibetans, and then enquiries were made.

Shri A.M. Tariq: I want to know whether the Government is aware that many people who are not Tibetan but since they resemble Tibetans, they mix with Tibetan refugees. And if it is correct what action the Government has taken in this regard?

²² See fn 38 in this section.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as facial resemblance is concerned, so many people live on the borders of India who resemble them, and such people are especially found in Kashmir.

Translation ends]

Shri Brajeswar Prasad :²³ May I know whether these Chinese want to go back to China or not?

[Translation begins:

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, there will be different opinions but it is obvious that wherever they have come from they do not want to go there.

Translation ends]

Shri Hem Barua: In view of this particular incident and in view of the fact that Tibetan refugees or refugees from Tibet are pouring in almost every day, particularly at Misamari, may I know whether the Government have adopted any stringent measures to screen them off?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There have always been measures to screen the refugees. Originally when they came in very large numbers this had to be done, and subsequently it was done. Now the numbers are not so many; they do come, struggle in, and they are screened.

Shri Brajeswar Prasad: It is the policy of the Government of India to send back these Chinese against their wishes?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am afraid, I cannot give a very definite answer, because if they do not carry out our directions it is open to us to send them at least outside India —where I do not know. We cannot have people coming in here and insisting on staying here.

²³ Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Gaya, Bihar.

Shri Ram Krishan Gupta: The hon. Prime Minister just now stated that these refugees had been kept in camps. May I know whether these non-Tibetan refugees have been kept with Tibetan refugees or separately?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have already answered that.

[Translation begins:

Shri Bhakt Darshan: Sir, I want to know whether there has been any correspondence with the Chinese Government about sending these Chinese back to China; if yes, what reply has been received from the Chinese Government?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir. We are interested in this, that they should go out of India; where they go is their choice.

Translation ends]

161. In the Lok Sabha: Education²⁴

TIBETAN REFUGEES EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

Shri D.C. Sharma:²⁵ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that a Tibetan Refugee Educational Institution has been set up at Mussoorie recently;
- (b) whether any assistance has been asked from the Central Government;
- (c) if so, the extent and nature of the same; and
- (d) the nature of subjects to be taught?

²⁴ Written answers to questions, 4 April 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XLII, cols 9562-9563.

²⁵ Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Gurdaspur, Punjab.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) to (d). A school for young Tibetan refugees has been started at Mussoori at the instance of His Holiness the Dalai Lama with the assistance of some relief organisations working in India. The number of Tibetan students in the school at present is 50 but it is hoped to increase the number to 300.

The subjects which are being taught in the school are as follows:

- (i) Tibetan language
- (ii) History of Tibet
- (iii) Religious knowledge
- (iv) English language
- (v) Geography
- (vi) Indian history
- (vii) Mathematics
- (viii) Elementary science

At the time of the formation of the school, the Government of India had been requested to meet the travelling allowance of the teachers and students selected from the various centres and worksites and sent to Mussoorie. This was agreed to. As His Holiness the Dalai Lama is moving his residence to Dharamsala, a request has been received from his representative in Delhi for assistance (1) in finding an alternative site in or near Dharamsala for the school and (2) to meet the cost of transportation of students and the school equipment.

Another request has also been received from the Principal of the Tibetan Refugee School for financial assistance for the running of the school and towards feeding the children. The matter is under consideration of the Government.

162. In the Lok Sabha: Tibetan Refugees in NEFA²⁶

Shrimati Manjula Devi:²⁷ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 188 on the 17th February, 1960 regarding Government's scheme to settle 1,000 families of Tibetan refugees on land at Bhaluckpung in N.E.F.A. and state?

(a) how far is the land at Bhaluckpung from the Chinese-occupied Indian territory; and

(b) whether this area falls within the demarcated land as shown in Chinese map?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Bhaluckpung is about 12 days march from the nearest point on the Indo- Chinese border. It is in fact on the edge of the Assam Plains and is not far from Missamari.

(b) The place is only just within the area claimed by the Chinese in their maps.

163. To P. N. Rajabhoj: Don't Go to the Tibet Conference²⁸

7th April, 1960

My dear Rajabhoj,

I have your letter of the 6th April. I do not think it will be advisable for you or for any Congress member to participate in the Afro-Asian Conference on Tibet.²⁹

²⁶ Written answers to questions, 4 April 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XLII, cols 9561-9562.

²⁷ Congress, Lok Sabha MP from Gopalpara, Assam.

²⁸ Letter to Rajabhoj, Congress, Rajya Sabha MP from Bombay. JN Supplementary Papers, NMML.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru

164. To Walter Nash: Contribution from New Zealand³⁰

April 12, 1960

My dear Prime Minister,

I have received from your High Commissioner³¹ your message regarding the decision of your Government to contribute a sum of £20,000 towards the cost of resettlement of Tibetan refugees in India. Thank you very much for it. My colleagues and I greatly appreciate your Government's offer of such generous financial assistance for the rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees, for whom we have accepted responsibility. Their number has now gone up to some 15,000. Their reception, accommodation and feeding have imposed a rather heavy strain on our exchequer but we are even more concerned about their future rehabilitation. There is very little hope of any appreciable number of them either going back to their country or finding homes in other countries. We are now engaged in drawing up schemes to rehabilitate them. The problem of rehabilitating these persons, who do not know our language and are not familiar with the ways of life in our country, will present particular difficulty and any scheme is bound to be extremely costly. It will involve training them for occupations and setting up small industries for them. Our intention is to utilise this very generous offer in implementing some such rehabilitation schemes. As Soon as details have been worked out we shall let your High Commissioner know.

²⁹ Held in New Delhi on 9-11 April 1960.

³⁰ Letter to the Prime Minister of New Zealand.

³¹ R.L.G. Challis, Charge d' Affaires, and Acting High Commissioner, at this time.

May I also thank you for the kind thoughts which you have expressed in your message in regard to the help we have been able to render to these distressed people.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
[Jawaharlal Nehru]

165. To S. Dutt: Education for Tibetan Refugees³²

I enclose a letter I have just received from the Dalai Lama. This refers to the education of Tibetan children.

As I think I wrote to you some little time ago, I feel that we have not been doing as much as we ought to for this education. Next to food etc., I think this is more important than anything else.

I do not know what your ideas are about the moneys received from the Australian and the New Zealand Governments. In any event, we should take early steps in the matter. We can discuss this.

166. In the Rajya Sabha: Foreign Exchange for the Dalai Lama³³

FOREIGN EXCHANGE SOUGHT BY THE DALAI LAMA

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Dalai Lama or any other person deputed on his behalf applied for foreign exchange;

³² Note, 12 April 1960.

³³ Oral answers to questions, 13 April 1960. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXIX, cols 685-688.

(b) if so, what is the amount applied for and the purpose thereof; and (c) how much amount has actually been sanctioned?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon) :- (a) Yes Sir, persons deputed by the Dalai Lama did apply. (b) and (c). Three persons were granted foreign exchange worth Rs. 3,000 to proceed to Manila to receive the 1959 Ramon Magsaysay Award for community leadership awarded to the Dalai Lama. Similarly three persons were granted Rs. 22,5000 for proceeding to the United States of America for presenting an appeal to the United Nations on behalf of the Dalai Lama.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Before I ask the question, may I draw the attention of the hon. Prime Minister to one Mr. D.K. Sen, styling himself as the confidential adviser to the Dalai Lama who stated in London on March 14 that about £ 37,500 worth of gold had already been sold to pay the expenses of their three-men delegation to the U.N.³⁴ He also revealed that much of It was going to be paid as fees to American lawyers to put their case to the United Nations. May I know why Government has sanctioned foreign exchange in this case when clearly the Dalai Lama is putting up a case contrary to the position taken by India in the United Nations Organisation?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know anything about Mr. Sen who is referred to or Sardar Sen's statement. It is not in conformity with my information. As for the broad question why we gave some foreign exchange amounting to Rs. 22,000 odd, we felt that not to do so would be coming in the way of something which the Dalai lama was anxious to

³⁴ Reported in The Statesman, 16 March 1960. Sirdar D.K. Sen, barrister and the author of The Indian States, and their Status, Rights and Obligations (London: Sweet and Maxwell Ltd, 1930) and Indian Studies in International Law and Diplomacy: the Position of Indians in South Africa (Calcutta: Indian Law Publications Ltd., 1950) among others. Sundry details about him are available in Lois Lang-Sims, The Presence of Tibet (London: The Crescent Press, 1963).

do and we did not wish to obstruct him in carrying out his wishes in this matter, although that wish was not in conformity with our position.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: The proposition has nothing emotional or sentimental about it. In this case, here is a person enjoying the asylum or the hospitality of this country and he was putting a case contrary to the position taken by the host country in the United Nations Organisation, and for this the foreign exchange of India was being expended in order that the other case which is not in Conformity with the position taken by India could be put up. Sir, I would like to have some legal or other arguments in favour of the position taken by the Government in this matter, apart from sentiments.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We can hardly have any legal argument over this question. It was considered as we have often considered such questions and given facilities for the propagation of views which are entirely opposed to ours. That is our broad approach to public questions. We gave this opportunity and though we were not in favour of this matter being taken to the United Nations, we felt that our preventing this by not issuing foreign exchange would probably not be right, in view of our broad policy.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Did you ask the Dalai Lama or those people who made the representation on his behalf, to make a statement before the Government of India, when asking for this foreign exchange, whether they had any amounts in certain financial institutions or banks in the U.S.A. or Britain or any other country where from the foreign exchange could be drawn?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know nothing about it.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: There was an inward remittance of Rs. 47,350/- to the Dalai Lama's account because of the Ramon Magsaysay Award and we have given him only Rs. 25, 000/-.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: That is not the point. The point I raised was...

Mr. Chairman: she says money that they received for the Ramon Magsaysay Award comes to more, being Rs.47,000 odd whereas we have granted them only Rs. 22,000/-.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Rs. 25,000/-, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: So we have some extra still left.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: No, Sir that is not the point. It seems they would make it look as if we are making money out of this deal. Not at all. What I want to know is this. Normally when an application for foreign exchange is made, the person is asked to file certain statements. May I know from the Government whether the Dalai Lama or those who were representing him were asked by the Government or the Finance Ministry to file a statement, specially with regard to the point that I have made, namely, whether they had any account abroad, prior to taking the decision as to whether the sanction should be given, apart from sentiments?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not remember what kind of statement was asked for.

Shri Jaswant Singh:³⁵ Sir, we in such matters are liberal, because we give foreign exchange to political parties also whose views and ideals are opposed to ours. So I do not see any harm in a case like this where the

³⁵ Independent, Rajya Sabha MP from Rajasthan.

Dalai Lama seeks redress in another place if we had given him some foreign exchange.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Is the hon. Member giving the answer?

Shri Rajendra Pratap Singh:³⁶ I would like to have an answer from the Prime Minister to the question whether it is not a fact that the Communist Party of India had been given foreign exchange for going abroad, to propagate their views?

Shri Bhupesh Gupta: Then tomorrow I will file an application, if you like. But the...

Mr. Chairman: Next question.

167. In the Rajya Sabha: Tibetan Refugees in Delhi³⁷

Shri P.N. Rajabhoj: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a large number of Tibetan refugees are begging in Delhi; and

(b) if so, what action Government are taking in the matter of rehabilitating these persons?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b). Some 100 Tibetan refugees were camping outside Mori Gate Delhi. It was believed that they earned their livelihood by taking recourse to begging. It is understood that they have now gone to

³⁶ PSP, Rajya Sabha MP from Bihar.

³⁷ Written answers to questions, 13 April 1960. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXIX cols, 714-715.

various places with more congenial climate, such as Simla Hills, Dharamsala and Rawalsar.

APPENDIX

8. NDC Meeting³⁸ [Refer to item 155]

Something ominous happened on the periphery of the recent Delhi meeting of the National Development Council. It did not happen in the Vigyan Bhavan where the Council was meeting officially. It happened at 7, Jantar Mantar Road, the headquarters of the All-India Congress Committee. Taking advantage of the presence in Delhi of the Chief Ministers of various States, the Congress President Shri Sanjiva Reddy, called a meeting at 7, Jantar Mantar Road where Prime Minister Nehru was present. As was to be expected, the Prime Minister spoke and there was no discussion. It happened during that speech.

Quite a few of the Chief Ministers present came out of the meeting with the uneasy impression that the Prime Minister was of the opinion that there was no alternative to parting with the 100-mile Aksai Chin Road and the territory east of it some 8,000 square miles (It should be recalled in this connection that the Prime Minister has studiously avoided the question in Parliament in spite of repeated challenges from opposition benches and also from one or two of his own party members). Maybe India might retain some voice in the co- administration of the road. The advantages of such a compromise would be numerous, reportedly according to him:

1. India would gain China's eternal friendship.
2. The entire China-India frontier would be officially recognised by China for the first time since Chiang Kai-shek started the map-making firm in Peking which was duly appropriated by Chou En-Lai.
3. China is much deeper in the Indian territory as it is. It will be forced to withdraw upto Aksai Chin Road or at least within two miles along its 100-mile length.

³⁸ Krishnalal Shridharani, "Beginning of the End" in Amrita Bazar Patrika, 28 March 1960, p.6.

4. And how could we resist China anyway. Those who are shouting the loudest will be farthest from the front when and if the war starts. And do they know the cost of an uneasy frontier? More than 500 crores per year. What would happen to our Third Five-Year Plan?

What Price Eternal Friendship?

Some of the Chief Ministers caught the drift of the Prime Minister's talk and must have felt that he was preparing the ground for what many an Indian would call The Great Surrender. They were, therefore, unhappy that there was no attempt on his part to elicit opinion of the Chief Ministers who were present. For, at least two to three of them would have liked to politely tell him that they would not be able to sell the idea either to the peoples or the Legislatures of their respective States.

Now let us examine, one by one, the four advantages hinted at:

1. Eternal Friendship. How can we be sure that the bhoodan of the Aksai Chin spur will win as China's eternal friendship? To win China's eternal friendship, (a) India became the first to diplomatically recognise Mao and to ditch Chiang who had played no small part in supporting India's claim to independence; (b) Year in and year out India supported the Peking claims on the United Nations at the cost of antagonising the greatest giver of economic aid to the world in general and to India in particular; (c) India acquiesced in the Chinese rape of Tibet twice; (d) India foisted Chou En- lai on an unwilling Asia at Bandung. The Chinese must have a different system of mathematics. That eternal friendship lasted just about five years! Thus the Chinese span of eternity is five years. Are purchasing that five- year long eternity by making bhoodan of the Aksai Chin spur and that too without the permission of Vinoba Bhave or Jai Prakash Narayan—the professional bhoodanis?

2. Recognition of the MacMahon Line. If the MacMahon Line is ours, as we claim it, would Mr.Chou En-lai's recognition thereof be a great concession on China's part? Would not the Pakistanis be justified, then in asking for the Shrinagar Valley promising us that they would recognize that the Taj Mahal belongs to India?

3. Chinese withdrawal. Would the Chinese be justified in illegally staying on in a part of our territory simply because they agree to vacate another part of our territory?

4. Loud Mouths and Expenditure. When the war starts, all the loud mouths will be well behind the fighting front, those on the opposition benches as well as those on the Treasury Benches, including the P.M. and D.M. So this taunt is a pure Australian boomerang. So far as expenditure is concerned, it can be merely slightly and not greatly less if we have an understanding with China at the cost of Aksai Chin. "we can never again neglect the border areas" seems to be the private refrain of all the Ministers including the P.M.

The Supreme Court Monkeywrench

From all accounts it appears that of all the assembled Chief Ministers, Prime Minister paid the greatest attention to Dr. B. C. Roy of West Bengal. Apart from their especially intimate personal relations, there was another concern. The monkeywrench thrown in by the Supreme Court in connection with the transfer to Pakistan of a portion of Berubari and Cooch-Bihar enclaves was weighing heavily on the Prime Minister's mind. The Supreme Court has ordained that a Constitutional Amendment is necessary to implement the Nehru- Noon Agreement on the subject. West Bengal's concurrence is necessary to avoid further complications. Dr. B. C. Roy was, therefore, invited to an intimate dinner by the P.M. The P.M. solicitude for Dr. Roy was indicative of his desire to settle with Pakistan. But it was more indicative of the realisation that the Supreme Court opinion has made his talk with Chou En-lai much more difficult. Since time and again Prime Minister has declared in Parliament that Indian Himalayan frontier is firm and defined. Parliament is a party to that contention and it has committed itself. Any modification of that frontier would require a Constitutional Amendment. Some legal luminaries under the inspiration of some partisan ministers have started to argue that Aksai Chin is in Kashmir and that the state of Jammu and Kashmir has a Special position in the Constitution. However, the more sober

Constitutional opinion does not see a way out of a Constitutional Amendment when and if the evil day of surrender comes.

Election As Referendum

Mr. Nehru is obviously aware of the difficulties. Even if he agrees to part with 8,000 square miles in Aksai Chin, perhaps in bargain for Tibetan territory lying between Sikkim and Bhutan and straightening the MacMahon Line at a point where India had given up the watershed principle in order to give monastery to Tibet, it is beginning of the end. The actual demarcation would take a long time. The Constitutional Amendment Bill would take further time. Meanwhile, general elections could be upon Nehru and the country. The Prime Minister seems to be anxious to avoid a referendum on the subject but he would be thus incurring a referendum in the form of general elections, for the opposition parties would make the deal with China the central electoral.

Our China policy is of such grave moment that any true democrat at the helm of affairs would seek the verdict of the people by fresh elections. No doubt Mr. Nehru is still the most popular person in the country but the question is whether the policy he intends to pursue is popular with the people. And since the issue is crucial, people must have a chance to pronounce their verdict.

In other words, the crucial question being debated today in Parliament lobby, on the streets of the nation's capital is this: How far can Mr. Nehru get away with it? There are three mutually cancelling responses.

A. Mr. Nehru can get away with the Bhodan of Aksai Chin. He is such a darling of the people that he can get away with anything, including murder as the English idiom goes, although he is incapable of committing a murder.

B. Mr. Nehru is shrewd, and so he will never go beyond what the public will allow him.

C. This will be the Waterloo of "N" (he once had his stationery printed with the Napoleonic "N") if he appeases Chou En-lai.

The reader is naturally free to take his choice.

Shrinking Specialism

At one stage during the deliberations of the National Development Council, the Prime Minister is reported to have remarked with irritation, in substance: "I do not understand our rich people. Everything is open to the private sector, barring two fields. And yet they are critical."

This is the type of outburst that confirms the trend indicating about-face from socialism. It is likely to disturb the little gingers strewn over the Congress and the P.S.P. parties, and overlaying the Communist Party. But many signs now point to the trend of lip-service to Socialism for election purposes. A huge chunk of resources is reserved for the Private Sector in the Third Plan. Oil, even Russian oil, is to have the benefit of private enterprise. Steel is being opened further and further to private sector. A pragmatic approach to State Trading in Foodgrains, indicating second thoughts on the subject, is being advocated. Cooperative farming is all but forgotten. The 51-per cent minimum for Indian capital for any venture inviting foreign investment is being waived. The P.M. 's attacks on big interests are becoming less frequent.

But India merely reflects a world-trend. There is growing disillusionment about Socialism as a solution of poverty. There is growing faith in regulated private enterprise. After the first flush of radicalism, people are realizing that it is better to have well-being at the price of inequality rather than to have equality at the price of poverty. To hunt wealth is not to capture Commonwealth. There can never be good wages or good employment for any length of time without good profits.

Mr. Nehru might have another motive. He stole the wind out of the sails of the Praja Socialist Party by showing that the Congress too is socialist. He might be trying to steal the wind out of the sails of the Swatantra Party by showing that the Congress too is conservative.