

Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru

Series II, Volume 67

February 15- March 31, 1961

Bhutan

103. In the Lok Sabha: Roads to Bhutan¹

P.C. Borooah: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) how many link-roads are proposed to be constructed in Bhutan with Indian aid; and
- (b) what is the cost of the scheme?

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

(a) It is proposed to construct the under mentioned 5 roads: -

- i. Jaigaon to Paro;
- ii. Darranga to Tashigang;
- iii. Sarbhang to Wangdiphodrang;
- iv. Hathisar to Tongsa;
- v. Timphu to Tashigang

(b) The estimated cost is Rs. 15 crores which would be borne by the Government of India.

¹ Written answers, 8 March 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol 51, 28 February-13 March 1961, pp. 3597-3598.

246. In the Lok Sabha: China-Bhutan Border²

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:³

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Chinese Government have approached Bhutan Government directly for settling China-Bhutan border dispute;
- (b) whether the Bhutan Government have informed the Government of India about it; and
- (c) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Sadath Ali Khan):

- (a) Apart from what has been reported in the newspapers Government have no other information;
- (b) No;
- (c) In accordance with the request of the Bhutan Government the Government of India have taken up the question of the border between Bhutan and China with the Chinese Government. Notes exchanged with the Chinese authorities have since been published in the White Papers.

Raghunath Singh: May I know the areas of Bhutan which are claimed by China and the reasons for their claim by China?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, all these numerous documents that have been placed before the house from time to time deal inter alia with this particular matter also. How can I in answer to a supplementary give the Chinese reasons, which I consider to have no force at all? It is true, as hon. Members will find in the latest rather big volume that has been placed, that on several

² Oral answers to questions, 15 February 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. L, 14-27 February 1961, cols 69-70.

³ Question by Congress MPs Hem Raj and two others; Jan Sangh MP Assar; Ganatantra Parishad MP P.K. Deo and Independent Raghunath Singh.

occasions we mentioned that we wanted to discuss the Chinese claim on some Bhutan territory, to show them how erroneous it was, but the Chinese Government or their representatives were not prepared to discuss the Bhutan matter as one or two other matters. But again and again this was repeated to them that this is our concern. In fact, not only would it have been our concern, but the Bhutan National Assembly had specially asked the Government of India to deal with this matter with the Chinese Government and we informed them of this.⁴

Hem Barua: May I know whether it is a fact that China has of late refused to recognise India's traditional relations with Bhutan and Sikkim and they have said that China is ready to recognise only "proper relations"? If so, may I know what they mean by this extra emphasis on the word "proper", which they have themselves inserted?

Speaker: He has answered it.

Jawaharlal Nehru: How can I answer, Sir, what the Chinese Government or their representatives may mean by a word they use?

Speaker: The hon. Minister has said he was willing to negotiate on behalf of Bhutan but the others are not prepared to negotiate with the Indian Government.

Tyagi: In case the Bhutan Government requested the Government of India to come to their rescue to defend their territory, if there is any showdown, may I know if the Government of India will readily render help for their defence?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The position is, as I have stated in this House previously,

⁴ See SWJN/SS/62/ Appendices 49 and 66.

that we have undertaken full responsibility for the defence of Bhutan in case of any aggression. How we do it, what we do, is a matter for consideration by our experts. But what we have said is, any aggression on Bhutan will be considered as aggression on India.

China

247. In the Lok Sabha: Visit of Indians to China⁵

Pangarkar:⁶ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state the number of Indians who have been issued passports to visit China during the last three months?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): The number of Indians who were granted passports for China or endorsements for China during the last three months (November, 1960 to January, 1961) is one hundred and thirty-one (131).

248. In the Lok Sabha: Indian Traders⁷

J.B.S. Bisht:⁸ Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Chinese authorities in Western Tibet during the last trading season declined to allow Indian traders to take their pack animals loaded with goods to India across the Shipki la Pass on Himachal Pradesh-Tibet border;

(b) the quantum of loss suffered by Indian traders as a result of Chinese action; and

(c) whether anything has been done to give them some relief?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) to (c). According to information available with Government, local authorities

⁵ Written answers to questions, 15 February 1961, Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. L, 14-27 February 1961, cols 96-97.

⁶ N.K. Pangarkar, Congress.

⁷ Written answers to questions, 15 February 1961, Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. L, 14-27 February 1961, col. 123.

⁸ Congress.

in Western Tibet have banned the export of livestock as beasts of burden. However, the Indian traders did not bring to the notice of Government or the Indian Trade Agent for Western Tibet that they were not permitted to take their pack animals loaded with goods to India across the Shipkila Pass in Himachal Pradesh. No enquiries about the quantum of loss suffered by them were, therefore, made.

249. In the Lok Sabha: China-Burma Border⁹

Mafida Ahmed:¹⁰ Sir, under Rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

The map attached to the Sino-Burmese Border Treaty and Government's reactions thereto.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, this question relates, I take it, to this map which is attached to the recent treaty between Burma and China. It affects a certain corner of India, the North- Eastern corner, which impinges on Burma and which a little further up touches China. Three countries are involved in it. What kind of treaty two independent countries like Burma and China may make between themselves about their boundary is their concern. But where that touches our interests, naturally, it becomes our concern also.

There has been no argument about our border there, in so far as Burma is concerned. First of all our northern border has been defined, as we have often said, by natural boundaries which have been accepted by tradition, custom and practice. Our boundary runs along the high Himalayan

⁹ Calling Attention, 15 February 1961, Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. L, 14-27 February 1961, cols 148-153.

¹⁰ Congress.

watershed which naturally separates the Tibetan plateau from the Indian sub-continent. In the Eastern sector, this traditional boundary of India was confirmed in 1914. That is what is known as the McMahon Line. When surveys were conducted in the implementation of the McMahon line agreement it was established as early as 1918 that the alignment met the Burma-India boundaries at a point near Talu pass: coordinates I need not mention here.

Successive Governments of India and Burma have accepted this location of the tri-junction and not as had been erroneously assumed to be five miles farther south near Diphu Pass. As early as 1957, it was noticed by the Government of India that in certain communications and published statements made by or on behalf of the Chinese Government references were made to suggest that the Chinese Government considered that the tri-junction lay not at the Talu pass but at the Diphu pass. We drew the attention of the Burmese Government to the error and the Burmese Government confirmed that the northern boundaries of India and Burma meet near the Talu pass a few miles north of the Diphu pass.

A joint committee of Burma and China met in pursuance of the agreement signed between the two countries and they conducted some surveys. As a precaution to ensure that this committee did not commit the earlier error and take any decision bilaterally in respect of the tri-junction with India, the Government of India in an informal note presented to the Burmese Government in August 1960 recalled the previous correspondence and specified the exact coordinates of the tri-junction, so that no decision was taken which might have an adverse effect on the boundaries and territories of India.

The Boundary Treaty was signed on the 1st of October 1960 between Burma and China. In this no definite coordinates of the tri-junction had been mentioned. Thus in the treaty itself there is no mention of all this.

We were informed by the Prime Minister of Burma that the Chinese Government did not agree that the tri-junction lay near Talu pass, but reaffirmed that it should lie near the Diphu pass. It appears that ultimately

the representatives of the Burmese and Chinese Governments agreed not to describe the precise location of the tri-junction in the treaty and left the point vague.

The House will recall that Premier U Nu in his speech before the Burmese Parliament, delivered on the 5th December 1960, suggested that the actual tri- junction could not be determined until the boundary question between India and China was settled and therefore had been purposely left undetermined. It was, however, explained by him that the Burmese and Chinese Governments had to indicate the tri-junction in the maps attached to the Treaty and for the purpose of the maps Diphu pass was taken as the meeting point between the western extremity of the Burmese-Chinese boundary and the eastern extremity of India-China boundary.

Premier U Nu, in his speech, added that should the agreed boundary between China and India meet the Burmese boundary not at the Diphu Bass, but at some other point, not only will the specific geographical location of that point have to be entered into the treaty but the map also will naturally have to be altered. The Burmese Government argued that because of the difference of views as regards the exact location of the tri-junction, the agreement which had been reached on all other points could not remain unsigned and the Burmese Government were obliged to accept the Chinese contention as far as the cartographic delineation was concerned. We appreciate that the exact location has not been specified but this vague mention and the fact that the treaty map showed the line as starting from Diphu Pass five miles south of the water shed is likely to have prejudicial effect on 75 square miles of Indian territory. The Government of India, therefore, in notes presented to the Chinese and the Burmese Governments at the end of December, 1960,¹¹ made clear once again the exact coordinates of the tri-junction stating that the traditional boundary running along the Himalayan watershed passed through the point near Talu Pass and not the Diphu Pass which had been shown as the western extremity in

¹¹ See Appendix 4.

the maps attached to the treaty. The Government of India could not recognise the erroneous depiction of the tri-junction since it has an adverse implication on the territorial integrity of India.

Tyagi: Who has got physical possession of that area? I want to know, are we in physical possession of that area which has been shown in that map or we have left it as it is. I can well understand attempts made by the Minister of External Affairs to safeguard that area. May I know if we are actually in physical possession of that area or not?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is rather difficult to answer that question, because the area is highly mountainous. Nobody is apparently sitting there. They may come and go. It is not an area where anybody holds physical possession.

Tyagi: Seeing to the danger, have we taken precautions to see that we are not deprived of that area ultimately? Have we taken any precautions to safeguard that area?

Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as we are concerned, we are in possession.

Tyagi: That is all I want.

Jawaharlal Nehru: If we send any orders, they are received there.

Braj Raj Singh: The country is entitled to know clearly whether the area which has been shown there is in our possession.

Speaker: That is what he said.

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is within our administrative area. It is as much in our possession as any other. As I pointed out, possession does not take effect from day to day. It is obviously in our possession.

Hem Barua: In view of the fact that the map attached to the treaty shows a dig in to the extent of five miles into the McMahon line, may I know whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the pithy statement of U Nu, the Burmese Prime Minister, that before the signing of the treaty, it was asked of the Government of India to clarify its position, but the Government of India, on this issue, was silent. Why it is that the Government of India chose silence to be the better part of wisdom and valour at that particular moment?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know to what the hon. Member is referring.

Speaker: He says that the Prime Minister was asked about this and the Prime Minister was silent.

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is what I am saying. I do not understand the statement because a number of communications have gone. I had myself personally talked to U Nu about this question. How silence comes into the picture, I do not know, and at what stage.

Hem Barua: May I know whether a protest was made by the Government of India after the treaty was signed? It is after that that U Nu came with that pithy statement. (Interruption).

Speaker: Order, order.

D. C. Sharma: On a point of order, Sir, it has not been the custom with this House to permit Members to ask supplementary questions on Calling Attention statements. That has not been the practice.

Speaker: Order, order.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry, I have just given the dates. We have been continuously drawing attention to this matter. In August last, four months before the treaty was signed, we drew the attention, again, of the Burmese

Government.¹² Before the treaty was signed, we discussed it with them and after, of course, also.

250. In the Rajya Sabha: Harassment of Embassy Staff in Peking¹³

Dahyabhai V. Patel: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Indian Ambassador and his staff in Peking are being subjected to constant harassment and humiliation;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Chinese chauffeur of the Indian Embassy and the cook were recently arrested, and if so, for what reasons and whether they were put to trial and what was the result thereof;

(c) whether the Indian personal assistant of the Ambassador in Peking was subjected to flogging in public and if so, for what offence, and whether he was allowed a fair trial, and what was the nature of alleged offence against him; and

(d) what action Government have taken in the matter?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

(a) This is not a fact. But it is true that the Indian Mission in Peking has noticed in recent months an unsympathetic attitude towards its functioning.

(b) No information has reached us about the cook, but the Chinese chauffeur of the Indian Embassy and a clerk, both of whom are Chinese nationals, were removed from the service with the Indian Embassy, presumably under instructions of the Chinese Government. The Government of India have no present knowledge of their whereabouts or the reasons for their removal.

¹² See SWJN/SS/62/item 326.

¹³ Oral Answers to Questions, 16 February 1961, Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. 32, Nos 1-12, 14 February-2 March 1961, cols 155-157.

(c) This is not true, but it is true that the Personal Assistant was subjected to insulting and unseemly behaviour, without justification, by Chinese officials.

(d) In so far as the chauffeur and the clerk are concerned, as they were Chinese nationals, no formal protest has been made, but informally the attention of the Chinese Government has been drawn to the embarrassment and inconvenience caused by their sudden removal. In regard to the Personal Assistant of the Ambassador, strong protests have been lodged with the Chinese Government.

Dahyabhai V. Patel: What is the result of the protest?

Jawaharlal Nehru: A reply which was considered unsatisfactory.

Jaswant Singh: The hon. Prime Minister said in reply that some adverse attitude is being taken up by the Chinese Government in regard to our officials. I would like to know what the nature of that attitude is, what kind of adverse attitude they are taking up against our officials of the Diplomatic Mission.

Jawaharlal Nehru: If the hon. member had followed the answer, it says that there is nothing precise that we can say, but there is unsympathetic attitude. I do not know how to describe an unsympathetic attitude. It may be a look, it may be a gesture, it may be a tone of voice which can hardly be reproduced except through mechanical methods.

Jaswant Singh: I take it that by gestures and by various other adverse methods they are showing an unsympathetic attitude?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have answered that question.

A.N. Bose: In regard to answer (c), what was exactly the nature of the unseemly behaviour which was meted out to the personal Assistant to the Ambassador?

Jawaharlal Nehru: If I could go into this matter of detail, it was some incident that happened in a railway train where at the invitation of the Chinese Government a number of diplomats were taken round to show some places. On their way back this Personal Assistant got into trouble. He was charged, as we found, quite unjustifiably. There was no beating as it is said but abusive language in general and some shouting. So we objected to all this and the matter is still proceeding.

Dahyabhai V. Patel: Was the abusive language directed personally to the personal Assistant to the Indian Ambassador or to Indians in general?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Broadly speaking, it was to the individual, the Personal Assistant. I do not know all the Chinese epithets which they might have used.

N.M. Lingam: May I know if any assurances have been given by the Chinese Government that such indignities will not be repeated on our personnel?

Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir. They have denied having done so.

251. In the Rajya Sabha: Demarcation of China-Pakistan Borders¹⁴

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:¹⁵

(a) whether Government have seen the news item published in the Indian Press on January 16, 1961, attributing a statement made by the Pakistan Foreign Minister Mr Manzoor Qadir to the effect that China had accepted in principle Pakistan's request to have the Sino-Pakistan borders demarcated; and

¹⁴ Oral Answers to Questions, 16 February 1961, Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. 32, Nos 1-13, 14 February - 2 March 1961, cols 162-163.

¹⁵ Question by PSP MP Niranjana Singh and Independent Jaswant Singh.

(b) if so, whether this agreement includes the demarcation on the Azad Kashmir's border also?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) There is no boundary common to China and Pakistan. The reference, however, in the Foreign Minister's statement is presumably to that part of the boundary of the state of Jammu and Kashmir which is at present under occupation of Pakistan.

Niranjan Singh: May I know what progress has been made after this declaration, whether there is any talk between the two Governments?

Lakshmi Menon: Sir, the Government of India through their High Commission at Karachi have approached the Pakistan Government to seek clarification of the statement made by the member of the Pakistan Government and the significance of that statement.

Jaswant Singh: I would like to know whether we have made any reference to China also, as to why they are discussing this matter with Pakistan?

Deputy Chairman: Was there any reference made to China?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Reference being made to China about this particular matter?

Jaswant Singh: In regard to this particular matter.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Their attention was drawn to it but hon. Members will understand that Pakistan's views about this matter are very different from hon. Member's views. No doubt, we are asking them for an explanation; we do it we record our protest against the thing but their views basically are

different. They view the whole question of Kashmir in different ways as hon. Members realise.

Faridul Haq Ansari: The hon. Minister has just said that our High Commission has been asked to seek clarification on this point from the Pakistan Government. May I know whether that clarification has been received by the Government of India?

Lakshmi Menon: No, Sir.

252. To Tan Yun-Shan: Border Report and Letters from China¹⁶

February 19, 1961

My dear Professor Tan Yun-Shan,

Thank you for your letter of the 16th February.¹⁷ It is said that the meeting of Indian and Chinese officials in regard to the border problems has not yielded any helpful results. I am having a copy of the report sent to you.

I read with interest the two letters that you have received from China.¹⁸ Thank you also for your pamphlet.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru

¹⁶Letter to the Director of the Cheena-Bhavana, Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan; copied to Subimal Dutt.

¹⁷ Appendix II.

¹⁸ Appendices 1 and 5.

253. In the Lok Sabha: China-Pakistan Border Agreement¹⁹

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:²⁰

- (a) whether it is a fact that Pakistan's proposal for border settlement of occupied area of Jammu and Kashmir State has been accepted in principle by China as expressed by Pakistan Minister of External Affairs at Peshawar;
- (b) if so, whether it is in accordance with the MacMahon line; and
- (c) if not, the action taken by the Government of India in this regard?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Sadath Ali Khan): (a) to (c) Government have seen press reports attributed to President and Foreign Minister of Pakistan and have sought clarification in the matter from the Government of Pakistan. As the reported statements pertain to areas of Jammu and Kashmir State only, which is illegally occupied by Pakistan, it has no relevancy to the so called "McMahon line" which governs the eastern sector of our border line.

Raghunath Singh: As the matter of occupied Kashmir is pending in UNO, may I know whether Pakistan has the right to negotiate about the occupied territory with China?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): According to us, they have no right.

[Translation begins:

¹⁹ Oral Answers to Questions, 20 February 1961, Lok Sabha Debates. Vol 50, 14-27 February 1961, cols 795-801.

²⁰ Question by Congress MPs Raghunath Singh and eighteen others; PSP MPs Khushwaqt Rai, Nath Pai; Mahagujarat Janata Parishad MP M.B. Thakore; RSP MP Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri; Jan Sangh MP Assar; Ganatantra Parishad MPs P.K. Deo and Supakar; Forward Bloc (Marxist) MP Aurobindo Ghosal and Independents Ram Garib and Prakash Vir Shastri.

A.M. Tariq: As the Parliamentary Secretary mentioned just now that Government of Pakistan is having talks with China, I want to know whether the Prime Minister made that statement at the time we were having talks with China, then it is our responsibility to get reasons from China; so I want to know whether reasons have been sought from China.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, we have asked China.

A.M. Tariq: I want to know whether the Prime Minister is investigating the notice that claims of Azad Kashmir; that they will take help from China and others to free Azad Kashmir and whether investigations are being carried out.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not seen it but it is possible that some officer there made such a statement as such irresponsible statements are often made there.

Translation ends]

Tyagi: As reported in the press, have the Chinese occupied a further chunk of Indian Territory in this sector since the time the matter was entrusted to negotiation between the two official teams?

Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir. Not at all, not any part, any bit. The main Chinese advances took place in 1959, not since then.

Ram Subhag Singh: Throughout the course of the discussion with the Indian officials, the Chinese official team declined to discuss anything pertaining to the boundary of Jammu and Kashmir beyond the Karakoram Range. May I know whether this indicates that the statement given by Mr Qadir is full of meaning and that China has entered into some sort of agreement with Pakistan?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I think the answer that has been given is quite adequate. It answers all these questions. I cannot know what secret parleys or other things may have taken place, but I do not think there is anything beyond these vague statements made on behalf of Pakistan by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, and, to some extent, by the President. I do not think anything has happened beyond those statements, but I cannot obviously answer on behalf of Pakistan or on behalf of China.

Nath Pai: There is a complaint of the Government of India lying with the United Nations against Pakistan's aggression in Kashmir. Now, Pakistan is trying to present a fait accompli by reaching an agreement with another aggressor against India. In the light of this, will this effort to sidetrack the authority of the United Nations by Pakistan be brought to the notice of the Security Council?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not quite sure that that is worthwhile or desirable in the circumstances. We have informed Pakistan about it; in fact, we have asked them for an explanation. For us to run to the Security Council every time Pakistan says something that we object to may not be desirable. We sometimes do go up there. I am not clear in my mind, but we shall consider this matter.

Ranga: How is it that we have not sent any protest to China on coming to know about these developments? We were told that we sent a note to Pakistan. Why is it we have not done the same thing so far as China is concerned, especially when the Chinese officials refused to discuss that side of the question?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Considering that we are protesting to China all along the line, merely telling them or asking them about this is not clear to me. We are protesting about their whole attitude in regard to this. These were speeches made by high authorities in Pakistan. So, we asked them.

Ranga: Till now the dispute had been only between China and India and Pakistan was not brought into the picture at all. When for the first time the Chinese officials refuse to discuss this question with our representatives, is it not time for the Government to lodge a protest against this?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We may lodge a protest, but what I am venturing to suggest is this. This question of the territory west of Karakorum did not arise in our discussions with the Chinese officials, not directly; indirectly, the whole border has been considered. Therefore, it did not arise precisely then. The hon. Member will see that we have clarified the whole boundary. Although we have clarified that in the report of the officials, we may consider what further steps we should take in this matter.

[Translation begins:

Vibhuti Mishra: I want to know whether our Prime Minister has got to know from diplomatic sources whether China and Pakistan have reached an agreement or are talks still underway.

Jawaharlal Nehru: An agreement is farfetched, I think they are yet to embark upon talks.

Translation ends]

Joachim Alva: We addressed a communication to the Pakistan Government in this regard. Have we got a reply? Or, do we know from our diplomatic channels whether a reply is on the way?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We have received no reply, but in the public press, as far as I remember, President Ayub Khan has stated somewhere in a speech, I think in Dacca, that they have every right to deal, with any country they like and discuss their border.

[Translation begins:

Prakashveer Shastri: May I know whether the Government of India has

demanded from its Commissioner there that he meet the Pakistan Government and get information on the content of the China-Pakistan talks. Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, this is what has been done. Regarding that, we have spoken to the Pakistan High Commissioner here and there we have asked our High Commissioner to find out.

Translation ends]

Hem Barua: In relation to the McMahon Line, regarding which a treaty has been signed with China by Burma, the Prime Minister of Burma has said that that frontier would be settled when India settled her problem with China. May I know whether Pakistan has said anything of that sort or not? The President of Pakistan has said that he wants to enter into an agreement with China, and China has also agreed to that indirectly by refusing to discuss the problem with us as evidenced in the official report.

Speaker: What is the question?

Hem Barua: I want to know whether this has been brought to the notice of the President of Pakistan that unless we enter into an agreement with China and settle our dispute, Pakistan has no right to make any statement or enter into any agreement with China.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is completely confused. This has nothing to do with the McMahon line. This is a thousand miles away from the McMahon line.

Hem Barua: I brought about an analogy only. About the McMahon Line the Prime Minister of Burma has said that this frontier would be settled when India settles her frontier with China. I know where the McMahon line lies.

Speaker: He ought not to make a speech.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have given a day or two ago a full reply to this particular point, of this tri-corner where Burma's, India's and China's frontiers come together. I cannot go into every question in a supplementary reply. My reply is quite clear. The hon. Member may refer to it.

Hem Barua: I am completely misunderstood, and I want your protection, Sir.

Jawaharlal Nehru: May I say one thing? Just now I said in reply to a question that we had protested to Pakistan through their High Commissioner here. The correct position is that our High Commissioner to Pakistan has met the Foreign Secretary there and protested.

Hem Barua: My contention is this. U Nu had the courtesy and the grace to say that the frontier about which Burma had entered into an agreement with China would be settled when India settled her frontier with China. My question is whether that arises or not here.

Speaker: The Question Hour is over.

254. For Sabavala: Nehru's Statement in Parliament²¹

Please reply to this letter as follows:

Dear Mr Sabavala,

The Prime Minister has received your letter of February 20th. Some of the facts or assumptions that you have mentioned in your letter are not correct. Apparently you misunderstood the Prime Minister's statement in

²¹ Note to Kesho Ram, 21 February 1961.

Parliament.²² The Chinese have not moved further in Ladakh or occupied any more Indian territory there since their major movements which probably ended in the late summer of 1959. What the Prime Minister stated was that their maps are varied and in the latest map they claim more territory. Actually they have not occupied anymore and, in fact, cannot do so easily because there would be conflict.

Their treaty with Burma is the culmination of their talks which had gone on for some years previously. The treaty itself does not affect or infringe our territory at all. But it is true that the Chinese have attached a map to it which is not correct, according to our viewpoint, in regard to a corner in North East India. The Burmese Government pointed out at the time of the signing of the treaty and subsequently in Parliament that they were not bound by this map; so far as the frontier of India and China was concerned, that was for them to settle.

As for the air violations, it is by no means clear that these were committed by the Chinese, more especially at the North East border.

Yours sincerely,
[Jawaharlal Nehru]

255. In the Lok Sabha: Danger of Chinese Attack²³

Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Khushwaqt Rai on the following subject:

"The gathering of troops by the Chinese in Tibet just near the border of Bhutan and Sikkim and the northern border of India, conscription of thousands of men from prisons and monasteries, continuous pouring of Chinese troops equipped with anti-aircraft guns into the Loka area and

²² See item I, here pp. 12 to 17. See also items 249 and 256.

²³ Motion, 22 February 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, vol. 50, 14-27 February 1961, pp. 1361-1362.

building of roads and laying a railway line from Lhasa to Lanchow by working day and night. Due to all these activities grave danger of military attack on Bhutan and Sikkim, with whom we have entered into special defence pacts, and on the border of India, has arisen. To consider this."

The hon. Member has produced The Hindustan Times of today in which an article entitled "China Prepares for Fight" has appeared.²⁴ What is the position?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): The Hindustan Times sources of information are much greater than mine!

Speaker: Anyhow, it is alarming.

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not only alarming but it is largely untrue. So far as we are concerned, I cannot, of course, definitely say what is happening inside Tibet here and there, but we have absolutely no report of this kind. And so far as we are concerned, our borders are well protected.

Khushwaqt Rai:²⁵ This report comes from Darjeeling and, as such, Government must have some information.

Jawaharlal Nehru: How can we have any information on something which perhaps does not exist at all?

Hem Barua: Whenever there is any report of this kind in the newspapers, involving the security of the country, will the Prime Minister take the trouble of contradicting it, or enlightening the public and the House about such reports?

²⁴ Appendix 25.

²⁵ PSP.

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is obvious that here is an Adjournment Motion and the hon. Member has put a question, and here I am, making a statement. What greater publicity can we give? As a matter of fact, it so happened that in the last few days the Maharaja of Bhutan has been here, his Prime Minister has been here; the Maharaja of Sikkim and the Maharajkumar and his Dewan had been here. None of these persons knew anything about it. I do not know how the correspondent of that paper got to know it in Darjeeling.

Speaker: I do not give my consent to this Adjournment Motion.

256. In the Rajya Sabha: China-Burma Border²⁶

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:²⁷

(a) whether it is a fact that in the map prepared by China and Burma for the settlement of their dispute over the boundaries, an eight mile wide strip of land belonging to India has been claimed by China as her own; and

(b) if the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, whether any talks were held in this connection with the Prime Minister of Burma when he recently came to Delhi?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

(a) So far as the text of the Treaty is concerned, there is nothing prejudicial in it to India. But in the map attached to the Treaty, the tri-junction of Burma, India and China is shown approximately five miles South of its actual traditional location. The Government of India have pointed out clearly that we do not accept this map.

(b) Yes; this matter was referred to in the talks between the Prime Minister and the Burmese Prime Minister during his visit to India in November,

²⁶ Written Answers to Questions, 27 February 1961. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. 32, Nos 1-13, 14 February-2 March 1961, pp. 1171-1172.

²⁷ Question by Congress MPs Ram Sahai and J.H. Joshi.

1960.²⁸ The Burmese Prime Minister stated that his Government had not accepted the map attached to the Treaty. The Sino-Indian boundary was a matter which should be decided by those two countries and should not be affected by the Burmese Treaty.

257. In the Lok Sabha: China-Nepal Border²⁹

Raghunath Singh: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether China and Nepal have reached an agreement regarding border areas; and
- (b) if so, whether the Indian border is affected in any way by the new agreement?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Sadath Ali Khan): (a) and (b). According to the Press Communique issued by the Nepal Government, an agreement satisfactory from the point of view of the two Governments has been reached. We do not have the details of the agreed definition of the Sino-Nepalese border. So far as known, there is nothing prejudicial to our territory.

Tyagi: Have Government made it quite sure that our borders have not been affected by this settlement and that it is not prejudicial to our interests?

Speaker: That is what he said.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): That is what we have said.

[Translation begins:

²⁸ See SWJN/SS/64/pp. 94, 350 and 351.

²⁹ Oral Answers to Questions, 28 February 1961, Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. 51, 28 February - 13 March 1961, pp. 2021-2022.

Raghunath Singh: If there has been an agreement in the course of China-Nepal border talks, what impact does it have on the Indian borders?

Jawaharlal Nehru: If the hon. Member had listened carefully to the response then he would have got an answer to his question.

Translation ends]

Tyagi: Was the Government of India taken into consultation at any stage during these negotiations for we are responsible to defend the borders of Nepal? Were we at any stage consulted in regard to this matter?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know how far it is proper for confidential consultations between two countries, especially in such cases, to be publicised; but rather earlier-not at the time of the immediate talks-there have been frequent talks between us and the Nepal Government about these matters.

258. In the Lok Sabha: Tibet at the UN³⁰

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:³¹

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the statement made by the Dalai Lama, published on the 10th March, 1961³² in newspapers, asking the Members of the U.N.O. to support the vacation of China from Tibet-a question which is to be discussed in the World Body on a resolution jointly sponsored by some member nations; and

(b) if so, the reaction of the Government of India in this matter?

³⁰ Oral Answers, 24 March 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. 52, Second Series, 14-27 March 1961, pp. 6989-6991.

³¹ Question by PSP MP Hem Barua and Congress MPs P. C. Borooah and Maimoona Sultan.

³² Appendix 40.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (J.N. Hazarika):

(a) The Government have seen the reported statement of the Dalai Lama.

(b) The Government of India's attitude, to the proposed resolution will be decided as and when the question comes up again before the U.N. General Assembly.

Hem Barua: May I know whether, Government consider this occupation of Tibet by China as a normal extension of the Chinese administrative jurisdiction to that area or as a conquest of Tibet by China? If it is the latter, why is it that Government have not been able to make up its mind as yet?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): Government has all along considered that Tibet was in the past an autonomous part of the Chinese State. It was a part of it. It had autonomy, but internationally speaking it is part of the Chinese State. That is the basic position. At some periods that autonomous part even had the right and exercised that right to make treaties. Nevertheless, it was a part of the larger Chinese State. From that the various policies of the Government of India flow in relation to this matter.

Hem Barua: May I draw the attention of the hon. Prime Minister to his Glimpses of World History where he writes categorically that Tibet is independent? And may I know what are the specific grounds for the hon. the Prime Minister to withdraw from that position?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know to what part of my book the hon. Member is referring.

Hem Barua: To page 842.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is referring to my book which is dealing

chiefly with other matters, not with Tibet. I do not know in what connection it came up; and if I have made any such remark there it was due to absence of full knowledge.

H. N. Mukerjee: I recall that when the Dalai Lama was given asylum in this country, he had given an assurance to Government that as long as he was on Indian soil he would not take part in propaganda of a political sort. May I know if this kind of statement issued from Indian soil is not contradictory to that understanding, particularly in view of the fact that this might lead to an unnecessary acerbation of this business?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The kind of assurance we asked for was that India should not be made a base for activities outside. But it is rather difficult to draw a line between making a statement about one's views and making it a base for activities. On the whole, in these matters we take a fairly liberal line.

259. To Subimal Dutt: B.M. Kaul's Proposals about Bara Hoti³³

Two or three days ago, Lt. Gen. B.M. Kaul came to see me and discussed this very subject with me. He showed me the maps and gave me the necessary information about the proposal now made. I agreed to the proposals for the despatch of armed troops to the vicinity of the Bara Hoti area as suggested.

2. His idea was that he should take some civilians with him who could be sent on to the Bara Hoti plateau even before the regular civil revenue party came from the UP. I have no objection to this. It will be better, however, to expedite the despatch of the UP civilian party so that they could get there soon after the armed platoon reaches there.

³³ Note, 25 March 1961, to the FS.

3. I agree, therefore, to the proposals made.

206. In the Lok Sabha: World Peace Council Session in Delhi³⁴

Mahavir Tyagi: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government are aware of the fact that the World Peace Council is having its session in Delhi from March 24th to 28th, 1961;
- (b) how many visas have been issued to the representatives of various countries; and
- (c) what is the number of delegates from the Communist China?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Sadath Ali Khan):

- (a) Yes.
- (b) 210 visas have been issued to persons coming from 47 countries, including 2 visas granted to persons whose nationality is not determined.
- (c) 20

Tyagi: As reported in the press, was any understanding arrived at between the Prime Minister and Pandit Sundar Lal, the promoter of this conference, to the effect that Sino-Indian border dispute shall not be a subject of discussion in this conference?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): No, Sir, there could be no question of any understanding of this kind. I have no clear recollection, but so far as I remember, I had told Mr Sundar Lal that this Peace Council was an organisation which, in its desire to work for peace, often indulged in warlike declarations and it did not help much and, therefore, while we did not wish to come in their way, we could not help

³⁴ Oral Answers and Short Notice Questions, 27 March 1961, Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. 52, Second Series, 14 March-27 March 1961, pp. 7241-7252.

them in any way.³⁵ And in the course of my talk I had broadly mentioned, I think, this question of our border troubles and said, here was a test about the views of the Peace Council-something like that. I cannot remember what happened, but I think probably it was he who might have said that, "Oh, this kind of thing will not be considered." There is no question of agreement by me. So far as I am concerned, they could certainly consider it-they should consider it in the right way, not in the wrong way.

Tyagi: Is it true that Government gave any help to this organisation?

Jawaharlal Nehru: No help of any kind has been given.

Ansar Harvani:³⁶ Is it not a fact that hundreds of our countrymen had accepted the invitation of the Peace Council in the past and the visas had been issued for the return visits of those people?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know about hundreds, but some people, and some Members of Parliament even, have attended this conference in other countries in the past.

Goray:³⁷ In yesterday's Times of India Mr Sundar Lal has been quoted like this: "Mr Sundar Lal claimed that there was a tacit understanding between the sponsors of the session and the Government of India"-he is referring to it-"that the border issue would not be raised at the conference. He did not explain the reasons for the tacit understanding, nor did he say at whose initiative it has been arrived at". So he makes a specific allegation, or rather a specific point that there has been an understanding.

Speaker: What is the point of the hon. Member?

Goray: My point is, if no such understanding was there, and if the leader of

³⁵ See SWJN/SS/62/item 313 and SWJN/SS/63/ Appendices 13 (a) & (b).

³⁶ Congress.

³⁷ N.G Goray, PSP.

the Indian team made such an allegation, should we not refute it and see that such allegations are not allowed to be made, because they create a misunderstanding throughout the country.

Speaker: The hon. Member wants to know whether it is true or false.

Jawaharlal Nehru: As a matter of fact, I had not seen this report to which he refers. But last night I got a letter from Mr Sundar Lal. He was thinking that this would be reported and he wanted to explain to me that it might create a wrong impression. I read it last night and passed it on. But absolutely, he himself said that "I quite agree you gave no understanding." There can be no question of an understanding on any issue between me and him.

Nath Pai:³⁸ Will the Prime Minister tell us if there is a revaluation and reassessment on the part of the Government of India regarding this Peace Council, because the Prime Minister told Parliament this about the Peace Council: "There is an organisation that calls itself the All-India Peace Council. What kind of peace it wants and talks about is not clear.³⁹ I am deeply shocked"-this is the Prime Minister-"that any person calling himself an Indian should degrade and defame his own country in this manner." We want to know if there has been any change, because earlier, when the Council wanted to hold its session, we think the Government of India had not been very enthusiastic about it. So we want to know whether since then there has been any reappraisal and therefore permission was granted to hold the session here.

Jawaharlal Nehru: There has been no basic change in the Government of India's attitude towards this organisation. The organisation has quite a number of distinguished persons whom normally we would welcome when

³⁸ PSP.

³⁹ Nehru made this statement in the Rajya Sabha on 17 August 1960. See SWJN/SS/62/item 261, here, p. 414.

they came to India. But I believe there has been some rather not basic, but nevertheless, some change in the activities of the Peace Conference or Council, as it is called. Some of its very, what I consider, objectionable features have been dropped off. But, as I said, basically there is no great change. Our attitude in regard to this matter is, we do not wish, as far as possible, to exercise our right of preventing the freedom of coming into India. We allow people to go there. We do not associate ourselves with these organizations in any way, either by help or otherwise. But it is only rarely that we want to come in the way of an organisation meeting in India, especially a committee or a small council.

Asoka Mehta: I hope that the Prime Minister's attention has been drawn to the behaviour of the Chinese representatives at this gathering the other day when the Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs was speaking, and I also hope that his attention has been drawn to the statements made by the Chinese representatives that the overwhelming majority of the people of India were in favour of whatever they stood for. In view of these facts, I would like to know from the Prime Minister as to what the purpose was in having this conference here and in allowing 20 delegates from China to come and participate in a manner which is likely to be very provocative to the country?

Jawaharlal Nehru: My attention has been drawn, though I do not know the details of those statements made by the Chinese in this conference;⁴⁰ but, I have broadly, gathered that they made some statements of the kind that

⁴⁰ The Chinese delegation walked out of a cultural function to celebrate Tagore's centenary when Humayun Kabir, Chairman of the function, mentioned that much like Tagore's love for Japan did not deter him from criticizing Japan's invasion of Manchuria, the poet would have regretted the suppression of Tibet's personality by China. Before walking out, the leader of the delegation said that while most Indians wanted a settlement with China, there were some who sought to delay the solution and thus inherit the "seeds of British imperialism." See *The Statesman*, 25 March 1961, p. 1.

the hon. Member has mentioned.

Goray: They staged a walkout and made a statement to the Press.

Jawaharlal Nehru: But I do not know what this has got to do with the conference being held here. Naturally, I think that the statements made on behalf of the Chinese people here, who attended this conference, were very objectionable.

Hem Barua: May I submit, Sir...

Jawaharlal Nehru: May I submit that I am speaking now? This has nothing to do with the holding of the conference. But the problem which comes before us is—we cannot see what future incidents might be, but—whether we should be very strict in preventing conferences of organisations with which we do not agree being held here or not. That is the basic question. We have allowed conferences of various types—we do not agree with them—to be held here, and broadly, we should like to adhere to that. Of course, we do not associate ourselves, but once we start the practice of preventing meetings of this type to be held, it is difficult to draw the line; and on the whole, we would rather draw the line such as to allow people to come here rather than to prevent them from coming here. Of course, the line has to be drawn somewhere. But, so far as this particular incident is concerned about what the Chinese delegates to this conference said, it is clear that it was a very objectionable attitude to take up for those people who have come here.

Asoka Mehta: Did the Prime Minister expect that the Chinese representatives would behave in any other manner than the one that they have shown here? Knowing that they were likely to behave in that manner, I do not know why they have been permitted to come to India to insult our country in our own capital city.

Jawaharlal Nehru: In any case, I did not know how many Chinese were coming or whether any Chinese were coming.

Asoka Mehta: But you said, 20.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I know now.

Asoka Mehta: But when the visas were issued, surely, you must have known.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I know, but the Prime Minister does not issue visas.

Asoka Mehta: We are talking about the Government.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Government have liberalised their policy of issuing visas for all-I am not talking about the Chinese-for Americans, for the French, for the Germans and for everybody, and because there have been complaints often expressed in this House about delays in issuing of visas, we have liberalised them. And the general rule is that unless we have something special about an individual, concerned, we allow the visas to be issued. I do not know how many Chinese were coming in this conference or council. It is only lately that I have heard that 20 people have come. Certainly, the hon. Member would be right in thinking that the visa-issuing authority knew about it, because they issued the visas.

Hem Barua: May I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that this Chinese delegation attending the Peace Conference in session at Delhi today is carrying on Mr Chou En-lai's campaign of slander and calumny against India to the very heart of our country, and when they had characterised Indians as inheritors of British imperialism, and when they had tried to "glamorize" the reasonableness of our neighbours, Nepal and Burma, in order to isolate India? I want to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to these things. I also want to know from the Prime Minister what steps Government propose to take to check all these things, because Mr Chou En-lai's campaign of slander and calumny is brought to the heart of

this country?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is more or less a repetition in somewhat more forcible language, of what other hon. Members have said, which I have answered.

Hem Barua: I have said certain specific things, and I have pointed out that they characterised Indians as inheritors of British imperialism, and at the same time, they have "glamourised" the reasonableness of our neighbours, Nepal and Burma, in order to isolate us.

Speaker: Once again, it means this, that the conference must not have been allowed to be held here, and he wants to know what the Prime Minister has to say on this. (Interruptions). I understand the hon. Member to say once again that the conference ought not to have been allowed to be held here, and the conference is something like giving an opportunity to the Chinese to carry on their adverse propoganda in the heart of this country. What answer does he expect from the Prime Minister? Having allowed it, what is the answer that can be given now?

Hem Barua: May I submit that our concern is this? So long as the propoganda of slander and calumny against this country was confined to the frontiers of China. Mr Chou En-lai used the television and the Press to condemn us. Now, we have allowed representatives of China to do Mr Chou En-lai's job in the capital city of this country. And that is my quarrel with the Prime Minister.

Vajpayee: In view of the fact that the Indian Peace Council has adopted an anti-national attitude on the question of Chinese occupation of Indian territory, and the Chinese delegates have exploited the situation to vilify India, may I know whether Government have taken any steps to post the foreign delegates with all the facts in regard to the Sino-Indian boundary dispute?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Post with what?

Vajpayee: May I know whether the foreign delegates have been posted with full facts in regard to the Sino-Indian boundary dispute?

Ranga: Supply copies of your report?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Facts? I think the hon. Member means that we should post them with facts. I think the persons who make these allegations against India, to which the hon. Member Shri Hem Barua referred, are so fully acquainted with the facts that they would not require more facts, but there are other reasons, whatever they might be....

Speaker: He means the other foreign delegates.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know whether they have carried on special propaganda amongst the Members of the Peace Council, but we have provided some of them with the recent publications on this subject.

Acharya Kripalani: The tragic part of it is that the Indians who were participating in this conference did not say anything when things were said against India and in favour of Chinese aggression; and the most tragic part of it is that chief inviters and those who were present at the conference were Congressmen.

Tyagi: There were no Congressmen.

C.D. Pande:⁴¹ They are not Congressmen. They are fellow-travellers.

Acharya Kripalani: Most of them are Congressmen.

⁴¹ Congress.

Asoka Mehta: Diwan Chaman Lall is there; is he a fellow-traveller?

Acharya Kripalani: For instance, there is Diwan Chaman Lall; then, there is Mrs. Nehru.

The Minister of Railways (Jagjivan Ram): There are no Congressmen in it.

Acharya Kripalani: May I say that the Prime Minister had said on a remark that I had made on a previous occasion, when we were talking of the espionage, that he would not like Indians to be members of the associations that are connected with foreign countries? If that is so, would he not advise Congressmen to refrain from being associated with these organisations?

Tyagi: But where are the Congressmen?

Ranga:⁴² May I know how many out of these two hundred odd delegates who have come here to this conference have hailed from the Communist countries?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know. I shall find out. I have not got the records here.

Speaker: He has not got the records here.

Ranga: Is it not the duty of the External Affairs Ministry which is responsible for issuing these visas to have that information ready with themselves even for their own information?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not accept that statement, that because a question might be asked in a supplementary or on an adjournment motion which comes unexpectedly, we should have all the information ready.

⁴² N.G Ranga, Congress.

Ranga: Even otherwise, is it not the duty of the External Affairs Ministry to have that information ready?

Speaker: They have information, but not now.

Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir, as a matter of fact, I have got it even now. But I do not accept this demand that I should have it all the time on any unexpected matter.

Ranga: Why do we have the External Affairs Ministry? Only to go on sleeping there?

Speaker: He cannot carry all the information with him.

S.A. Dange: As one of the participants in the Peace Conference that met in Delhi, I wish to strongly deny the innuendoes that are conveyed through some of the questions put by hon. Members.

Vajpayee: What is this clarification? Is he speaking on behalf of the Peace Council?

Speaker: I will proceed to the next question.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not wish that anyone Member should feel that I am reluctant to give information. In fact, I have got a list here of the 48 countries to whom visas have been issued. As regards the number of delegates from each country, if I may, I shall read out....

Speaker: Not necessary. They only wanted to know the number from the Communist countries.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot distinguish them, unless I take each of them separately. There are 48 countries.

Chintamani Panigrahi: Are they all Communist?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Not at all.

An Hon. Member: The majority of them are.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I will just read out the names of the countries: Czechoslovakia, Israel, Ceylon, Belgium, Spain, Sudan, Austria, Vietnam, Cyprus, Italy, Poland, Mongolia, East Germany, Mexico, Lebanon, Tunisia, America, Bulgaria, France, Iran, Russia, UAR, Jordan, Rumania, Japan, Sweden, Congo, Burma, Venezuela, Philippines, Peru, Iraq, Indonesia, Hungary, Finland, Denmark, Brazil, Argentina, West Germany, Albania, Laos, Mali, Guinea, China, North Korea, Greece, Chile and others.

Nath Pai: I want to ask one question.

Speaker: I allowed him already.

Nath Pai: When the adjournment motion was referred to, you said you would permit questions. I have personally one question to ask.

Speaker: Yes.

Nath Pai: Whereas not disagreeing with the Prime Minister in his eagerness to uphold the traditions of hospitality of our country, may I ask a very simple question? This Peace Council has every dispute under the sun on its agenda. Is the fact of its refusal to discuss the dispute that concerns this country most vitally a measure of its having discarded and shed off some of its unpleasant features, to which he referred just now? He said that the Peace Council gradually has shed off some of its unpleasant and less appealing features. Is the refusal to discuss the most important issue for the host country a measure of its improved and better behaviour?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not quite understand the question. I cannot give answers for the Peace Council, as to what it seeks to do or does not seek to do. What I wish to make clear is that any kind of impression from the reported statement of Shri Sunderlal that there was some kind of understanding as to what they should discuss is completely wrong. There is no question of my coming to an understanding with them (Interruptions).⁴³

261. In the Rajya Sabha: Indian Peace Council⁴⁴

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:⁴⁵

- (a) whether his attention has been drawn to the newspaper report published in the Delhi Edition of the Times of India, dated the 26th March, 1961, of a Press conference in which Pandit Sunder Lal, President of the Indian Peace Council, stated that the Chinese aggression on India's northern borders was not being discussed at the World Peace Council Conference because of an understanding between him and the Prime Minister; and
- (b) if so, what is the actual position in this regard and whether there was any such understanding?

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

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) No such understanding was arrived at.

B.K.P. Sinha: May I know whether after the reports of the Peace Conference had appeared in the newspapers the Prime Minister received a letter from

⁴³ See also item 261.

⁴⁴ Statement, 30 March 1961. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. 33, Nos 1-4, 27-30 March 1961, pp. 352-356.

⁴⁵ Question by Congress MPs B.K.P. Sinha and Nawab Singh Chauhan; Swatantra Party MP Dahyabhai V. Patel.

Pandit Sunder Lal in this respect and, if so, can the Prime Minister place that letter on the Table of the House or give an indication to this House of the contents or a summary of this letter?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I did receive a letter even before I saw anything in the Press, that is to say, the day before the newspapers announced this fact. I knew nothing about this incident-I forget, I think I was not in Delhi or something- but I received a letter from Pandit Sunder Lal stating that something had happened and that it had been stated that there had been an understanding, and he tried to explain that he did not mean exactly that a regular understanding was reached but this was his understanding of the understanding reached, that he had written a letter to me, and so on-slightly complicated-but he tried to explain what points were likely to appear in the Press the next day. I did not deal with it any further till I saw the newspaper account the next day. I hardly think it will be worthwhile for me to put a letter of that type here to add to the papers of the Rajya Sabha.

Maheswar Naik: It is reported that some time back the Government of India refused permission to hold a meeting of the Indian Peace Council here in India. May I know whether on this occasion also they wanted to have the permission of the Government of India? If so, may I know why the permission was given to hold that meeting here knowing full well that the Council consists of members mainly of pro-Chinese inclinations?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is almost a difficult matter for us to determine when to give permission to outside organisations and when not to. On the whole the tendency in recent periods has been to be lenient in this matter. Such conferences are held often by various organisations which lean, as the hon. Member said, this side or that side. On the whole we permit them to come, but whenever we are asked permission, we say that we will examine the credentials of the persons before giving visas. We do not issue visas en bloc. Even in this visa there has been far greater laxity or leniency than previously, and when this matter came up, I remember I received a letter

from an eminent scientist in the United Kingdom about this matter saying that it was proposed that the Peace Council would meet in New Delhi and "would you have any objection?", and I replied to him that the Council which was supposed to be a relatively small body, could meet here but before issuing passport we would examine the credentials of the people who were coming. That was how permission was given and this was allowed to meet.

Maheswar Naik: May I know whether the attention of the Prime Minister has been drawn to some Press reports that the Chinese delegation here in India are still engaging themselves in anti-Indian propaganda while addressing other meetings also?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not seen any particular Press report to this effect.

Faridul Haq Ansari: Is the hon. Prime Minister aware that the Chinese delegation in the Peace Council meeting as much as in other meetings describe India as inheritors of British imperialism?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I did see that report in the newspapers.

Bhupesh Gupta: May I know whether it is not a fact that this Peace Council meeting which was held here was attended by such prominent persons as Mr D.N. Pritt, Mr Jenett Stevenson, Madame Clark, Mr Konder, Mr Ronchett, Mr Alavi and others from various countries? May I know whether it is not a fact that the resolutions that have been passed by the Peace Council broadly conform to the policy pursued by the Government of India in the matter of world peace?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is difficult for me to answer that question. I have not carefully read the resolutions, but my own impression is that the resolutions do not wholly conform to it, partly of course they naturally conform but partly they do not. As for the eminent persons whose names the hon.

Member has read, I have no doubt the information is correct. They must have come here.

Jaswant Singh: This Peace Conference passed several resolutions, and when some of the delegates wanted to include on the agenda the issue of the Indo-China border dispute, the Chinese delegations opposed it very vehemently, and in this opposition the Indian delegation came to their rescue and amongst them are Congress Members of Parliament particularly. I would like to know whether this fact has come to the notice of the Prime Minister and what he has to say on the matter.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Government had no representatives or observers at this Conference. We have to rely therefore on what appears in the Press. The hon. Member has probably seen some Press reports; I have also seen some. I do not know what happened exactly, but may I add that the incidents which probably the hon. Members have in mind took place not at the meeting of the Peace Conference but at a meeting at which many members of the Peace Conference were present which was supposed to be a Rabindranath Centenary Celebration meeting to which one of our Ministers was invited because he is connected with the Centenary Celebration-Mr Humayun Kabir-and it was on that occasion that Mr Humayun Kabir said something and the Chinese delegates not only took exception to it but indulged in rather offensive language.

Jaswant Singh: My question did not relate to the incident which the hon. Prime Minister related. My question related to the actual Peace Council meeting where some Western delegates wanted to touch on the subject of the Indo-China border dispute also when they were discussing Goa and Congo and so many other things which the Chinese delegates vehemently opposed, and their stand was supported by Indian delegates, some of them being Congress M.Ps. That was my question.

Chairman: We recognise only M.P.s. Not this or that.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no information except what has appeared in the Press. I do not know who opposed it. In the Press, so far as I know, it is stated that some representatives-I think from the United Kingdom--enquired as to why this Sino-Indian question was not put up, and it was stated in reply that it was not desirable to put it up, this should be settled by the parties concerned. This is what I read in the papers. Who was concerned or was not concerned, this, that and the other I do not know.⁴⁶

⁴⁶See also item 260.

APPENDICES

1. China Commission for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries to Tan Yun-Shan: Strengthening India-China Cultural Ties⁴⁷

[Refer to item 252]

Dear Prof. Tan Yun-Shan,

Your letter dated the 18th of January addressed to Prime Minister Chou En-lai has been seen by him. Prime Minister Chou gives extreme importance to suggestions forwarded by you for strengthening Sino-Indian Friendship and Cultural Interchange between these two countries. He specially recommends our Commission to consider them sincerely and do the needful. We now beg to communicate to you our preliminary views as under: -

(1) We consider very good the suggestions made by you for celebrating the 100th birthday of Tagore. We shall forward these proposals as well as the question of inviting a delegation of the Visva-Bharati University, led by its Vice- Chancellor Mr. Das to visit China and attend the Tagore Centenary Celebration Meetings, to the department concerned of the Tagore Centenary Celebration Preparatory Committee, to be established soon, for their consideration.

(2) As regards founding an "Institute of Indology" or an "Academy of Indian Studies" in Peking, we may inform you that conditions at present are not yet mature. We keep it for careful future consideration.

Henceforward we sincerely wish to have your continuous support and co-operation in our mission for Sino-Indian Cultural Interchange. Let us once again convey to you our heartfelt regards for your sincere efforts in promoting friendship between the peoples of China and India for Cultural Interchange between these two countries.

With regards and Salutations!

⁴⁷ Letter, initialed at the end by Tan Yun-Shan 16 February 1961. Asterisked footnote at the end of the letter as follows: "Translated from Chinese into English by Sri Amitendranath Tagore and Sri Narayan Chandra Sen of Cheena-Bhavana."

(Sealed)

People's Republic of China

Commission for Cultural Relations with
Foreign Countries

3.9.1960.

3. NEFA Slaves⁴⁸

[Refer to item 74]

Slavery in the NEFA is a heritage from the past when inter-village and inter-tribal feuds were very common. People became slaves for a number of reasons. They were captured in war; they were purchased; they were used to repay a debt. Many were born slaves. Sometimes a man became a slave because he had committed a serious offence against the community and could not afford the fine demanded.

2. The slaves are, however, by and large, treated as members of the household and are themselves quite often unwilling to leave the shelter and security of their masters to lead an independent life. In many homes, they come to be accepted as members of the family after a period of years. The owner provides them with food, clothing and shelter. He arranges their marriage. In some areas, a slave is allowed to keep a part of the earnings.

3. The Government of India is a contracting party to the Slavery Convention of 1926. Its provisions were applied to NEFA in 1938. It was agreed that positive steps should be taken as soon as possible to bring about progressively the disappearance of slavery in every form. Our Constitution does not permit slavery. Government have been exerting all efforts to eradicate this evil. Where necessary compensation in cash has

⁴⁸ Statement made by Lakshmi Menon on behalf of Nehru to a Calling Attention Motion by A.B. Vajpayee, 21 December 1960. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. XLIX, 12-23 December 1960, pp. 6753-6756.

been paid to liberate slaves from their masters. During the current year, a sum of Rs. 25,000 has been provided for this purpose. The Political Officers are authorised to pay up to Rs. 500 for the emancipation of the individual slave.

4. During 1950 and 1959, some 160 slaves have been liberated through Government efforts. There are a few hundred more slaves left in NEFA.

5. During a Conference of the senior officers of the NEFA Administration in October 1960, decision was taken to take even more energetic steps for the liberation of the small number of slaves still left in NEFA. Some of the ways suggested were:

(a) A slave who becomes a Government employee should be encouraged to put aside his savings regularly and himself pay for his liberation;

(b) when a slave escapes, no efforts should be made by the Government to restore him to his owner;

(c) when a slave is involved in a customary case, the local authorities should see that the customary decision does not strengthen the owner's hold over the slave;

(d) when a slave-owner is involved in a customary case for which he has to pay fines, the possibility of compelling him to liberate slaves in lieu should be exploited;

(e) when a slave-owner becomes eligible for relief from Government, it should be given on the condition that he will free one or more slaves;

(f) in border areas refugees bringing slaves should be denied asylum unless they set them free;

(g) no one who is a slave-owner should be given any form of paid Government employment; and

(h) no one born after 15th August 1947, should, under any circumstances, be accepted as a slave nor should the transfer of ownership of slaves after that date accepted as legal.

6. Efforts are being made to eradicate slavery from the NEFA as soon as possible. The situation is not serious nor has the Government met with failure in ending slavery as has been stated in the adjournment motion. The

process has necessarily to be slow, for it would only add to the problem if a slave is freed, without at the same time providing for his (and in many cases his masters) rehabilitation suitably.

7. The need to accelerate the process has, however, been fully realised, specially in view of developments across the border, as it would be clear from decisions recently taken in Shillong (as summed up above).

4. From GOI to China: Boundary Troubles⁴⁹

[Refer to item 249]

The Government of India present their compliments to the Government of the People's Republic of China, and with reference to the text and the maps attached to the Burmese-Chinese Boundary Treaty of 1st October, 1960 which were recently presented to the Parliament of the Union of Burma, have the honour to bring to the attention of the Government of the People's Republic of China the following facts pertaining to the western extremity of the Burma-China boundary where it meets the eastern extremity of the India-China boundary.

2. Although Article 5 of the Treaty does not specify the exact location of the western extremity of the Sino-Burmese boundary, in the map attached to the Treaty the boundary is shown as ending at the Diphu L'ka Pass. The traditional boundary of India west of the Sino-Burmese boundary follows the watershed between D-chu in India and Lat-te in the Tibet region of China; and the tri-junction of India, Burma and China is five miles north of the Diphu L'ka Pass, and not at the Diphu L'ka Pass itself. The coordinates of the tri-junction are approximately longitude 97° 23' east and latitude 28° 13' north. The fact that the traditional boundary running along the Himalayan watershed passes through this point has in the past been accepted by the Governments of Burma and China and it has for many years been shown correctly on official maps published in India.

3. The Government of India recognise that the text of the Treaty has left the exact location of this point unspecified. The Government of India are

⁴⁹Note, 30 December 1960. White Paper V, p. 20.

however obliged to point out that the extremity of the boundary between the two countries has been shown on the maps attached to the Treaty in an erroneous manner. As the location of the tri-junction at the Diphu L'ka Pass has an adverse implication on the territorial integrity of India, the Government of India wish to make clear to the Government of the People's Republic of China that they would be unable to recognise this map insofar as it prejudicially affects Indian territory.

The Government of India take this opportunity to renew to the Government of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.

5. China Commission for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries to Tan Yun-Shan: Preparations for Celebrating Tagore Centenary in China⁵⁰

[Refer to item 252]

Dear Prof. Tan Yun-Shan,

We have received your letter of 12th December and have taken note of it. Your letter describing elaborately about the preparation of Tagore Centenary Celebration throughout India and at Visva-Bharati University will be of great help to us as a reference for the celebration of Tagore Centenary in our country (next year). We convey our thanks to you for this. As regards some concrete suggestions made by you for the celebration of Tagore Centenary in our country, we will forward these to Tagore Centenary Celebration Preparatory Committee which is to be established very shortly. We always treasure the long traditional friendship between China and India. We have great regard for Tagore's struggle against imperialism and for

⁵⁰ Letter, initialed at the end by Tan Yun-Shan, 16 February 1961. Asterisked footnote at the end of the letter as follows: "Translated from Original Chinese into English by Sri Narayan Chandra Sen of Cheena-Bhavana."

national freedom and his efforts for the promotion of Sino-Indian friendship. Hence, at the time of celebrating the 100th birthday of Tagore, there will be some commemorial activities and bringing out translations of some of his classic works. As to the question of founding an "Institute of Indology" or an "Academy of Indian Studies", it will receive our utmost consideration in proper time as conditions at present are not yet mature.

We express our heartfelt admiration for your contribution to the cause of Sino-Indian Studies and Cultural Interchange between these two countries. We also believe that your efforts will go on promoting the cause of friendship between the peoples of China and India.

With regards and Salutations!

Commission for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries

7-1-1961

11. From Tan Yun-Shan: Border Officials' Report⁵¹

[Refer to item 252]

Santiniketan
West Bengal, India

16-2-1961

Revered Panditji,

It was really depressing to read the newspapers regarding the Report of Indian and Chinese Officials on the border problem.⁵² Something might be again wrong on the other side of the Himalayas [sic].

Can I in any way offer my humble service in this matter as my dedication and devotion to you?

Kindly permit me to enclose a copy of two letters from the Commission

⁵¹ Letter from the Director of the Cheena-Bhavana, Viswa-Bharati, MEA, File No. 17(11)-EAD/61, pp. 6-8/corr.

⁵² See SWJN/SS/66/Supplement.

for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, People's Republic of China,
addressed to me⁵³ along with a new pamphlet for your gracious perusal and
instructions.

With profound admiration and devotion,

Most Sincerely yours,
Tan Yun-Shan

⁵³ See Appendices 1 and 5.

25. China's War Plans⁵⁴

[Refer to item 255]

China Prepares For Fight On Sikkim

Darjeeling, Feb. 21- The Chinese authorities in Tibet appear to be preparing to battle with India over the border states of Sikkim and Bhutan, according to reports reaching here.

India is trying to consolidate her interests there.

A reliable source who was in Lhasa just over a week ago said the Chinese authorities there were assiduously courting all Bhutanese and Sikkimese nationals. They were also organising an intensive series of study courses for teaching military officers the Bhutanese, Sikkimese, Nepali, Hindi and English languages.

New reports confirm the recent information of intense Chinese military activity along Tibet's southern border with Bhutan and India. Tens of thousands of men have been conscripted from prisons and monasteries.

They are being used to push ahead with a road from Lhasa through Gyamda to Pemako. A large airfield and military base is being established there right on the Indian border just east of Bhutan and north of Dibrugarh.

Troops equipped with anti-aircraft guns are pouring into the Loka area south of Lhasa. At least another 15,000 recently joined a force of 10,000 already in the Ari area.

Garrisons for them cannot be built quickly enough, and monasteries are being ruthlessly requisitioned as barracks.

As the road supply routes are vulnerable to attacks by Tibetan guerillas, the Chinese are also driving ahead in strictest secrecy with the railway from Lhasa to Lanchow. No propaganda is attending this ambitious project.

This in itself is suspicious. Night and day the truck is being driven ahead.

⁵⁴ Reproduced from The Hindustan Times, 22 February 1961, p. 1.

The railway is expected to be completed within a few months. It will run from Lanchow through Karmoo, Nagchuka Dham and Medogonkar to Lhasa.

In the midst of this ruthless drive for more Himalayan territory the Chinese authorities in Tibet continue to send hundreds of lorries of grain to China.

Yet there are famine conditions throughout Tibet. That they scrape the bottom of the barrel there shows how desperate the situation in China itself must be.

In these circumstances Bhutan-with its small population, large stocks of grain and high productivity in the paddy fields and its vulnerable political position vis-a-vis both China and India-must seem an irresistible attraction to the rulers in Peking.

But India remains slightly ahead in her attempts to gain influence there.-
By arrangement with the Daily Telegraph, London.

40. The Dalai Lama: Chinese hold on Tibet⁵⁵

[Refer to item 258]

Support for Tibet's Case in U.N. Dalai Lama's Appeal to India

The Dalai Lama on Thursday appealed to the members of the UN to make the Chinese end their aggression in Tibet.

In a statement issued on the occasion of the second anniversary of the reassertion of Tibetan independence on March 10, 1959, he said that shortly the question of Tibet would come up for discussion in the plenary session of the U.N. Assembly, reports PTI.

The Dalai Lama said that any measures short of complete Chinese withdrawal from Tibet would be of little avail.

He expressed his gratitude to the Federation of Malaya, Thailand, Ireland

⁵⁵ Statement reproduced from The Statesman, 10 March 1961, p. 11.

and El Salvador for sponsoring Tibet's case in the U.N. and appealed to India, "our great neighbour which has given refuge to the thousands of us," to lend its powerful support to their cause.

The Dalai Lama said the world had been rightly concerned by the recent murders in the Congo, "I would, however, ask the world not to forget that thousands of Tibetans have been and are being killed for the only reason that they refuse to accept foreign domination."

He added: "On March 10, 1959 the Tibetan people reasserted their independence after suffering almost nine years of foreign domination. Foreign rule, alas, still continues in Tibet but I know, and I am proud to know, that the spirit of our people remains uncrushed and their resolve to fight on till independence is regained unshaken. I know that the struggle, which began a few years ago, is still being waged in Tibet against the invader and the oppressor, who masquerades under the name and guise of 'liberator.' I can confidently assert that the civilised world is, every day, becoming more and more aware of those, who, in the name of liberation, are crushing the freedom of defenseless neighbours."

Jurists' Report

The world, he said, had been made aware of the terrible happenings in Tibet by the two "illuminating" reports of the International Commission of Jurists. These reports had pointed out that the Chinese had, ruthlessly, trampled on the elementary human rights of the Tibetan people, that thousands of them had been killed for the only reason that they asserted their right to live in the manner they desired to do, following their cultural and religious heritage.

"The reports have further pointed out that the Chinese have been guilty of genocide by reason of their killing many Tibetans with the intent to destroy the Tibetan religion and by deporting thousands of children to China."

The statement, which was issued in Delhi by the representative of the Dalai Lama on his behalf, said that the situation in Tibet had worsened as was clear from the "steady and unceasing" flow of refugees from Tibet.

The Dalai Lama appealed to the people of Tibet to keep up their spirits and their resolve to regain their independence. "On my part", he said, "I need hardly say I am far from happy to be away from my country and my beloved and brave people." I want to tell them their hopes and their agony." To his countrymen in India, Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim, he said that a heavy responsibility devolved on all of them to prepare themselves "for the day when we can return to our country and build a happier and greater independent Tibet."

Draft Constitution

The Dalai Lama said he was preparing a draft of the constitutional and economic structure which he visualized for his country. He said he would eventually place it before the representatives of the Tibetan people in India and the neighbouring countries for their consideration.

He said that during the Chinese occupation, before he was compelled to leave Tibet, the Kashag and he had made efforts to introduce land and other reforms in Tibet, but their efforts were blocked by the Chinese.

The Dalai Lama added: "The Communists are today forcing what they call reforms down the throats of our people. I have given careful consideration to these so-called reforms and I have come to the conclusion that at the end of the reforms the Tibetan people will be reduced to the state of mental and economic serfdom. Such reforms are not in consonance with the Charter of the U.N. nor with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The reforms that I visualize must, while preserving intellectual, moral and religious freedom, bring about an equitable distribution of the wealth of the country."

The Dalai Lama said that if Tibet were to be made a rich, strong and vigorous nation, the special privileges and the large estates enjoyed, whether by monasteries or aristocratic families, would have to go. The governmental structure would also have to be reformed so that people were more intimately associated with it.