

## Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru

*Series II, Volume 68*

*April 1 – May 15, 1961*

### **88. To B. P. Chaliha: Visit to Tawang<sup>1</sup>**

April 24, 1961

My dear Chaliha,

I have tentatively agreed to visit Tawang near our frontier with Tibet. The main purpose of my doing so is to see the road construction work. I intend to go on the 19th May from Delhi arriving at Gauhati about 12 noon and proceeding almost immediately by helicopter to Tawang. I shall spend the afternoon and night there and next morning I shall return to Bomdila by road and from Bomdila by helicopter. I can go to Shillong direct or stop at Gauhati. If I go to Shillong direct, I shall spend the night there and return the next day, possibly by helicopter to Gauhati and thence to Delhi.

I am sorry I cannot travel about Assam then. But if you think it necessary, I could spend a few extra hours at Gauhati on my way back to enable me to meet you and your colleagues.

Yours sincerely,  
Jawaharlal Nehru

### **89. To Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit: Chandola's Talks with Phizo<sup>2</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter to the Chief Minister of Assam. PMO, File No. 8/176/61-PMP, Sl.No. 3-A. Also available in the JN Collection.

24 April 1961

Nan dear,

I have just received your letter of April 22nd, sending me some papers about Chandola's<sup>3</sup> talks with Phizo.<sup>4</sup> These raise difficult questions. We shall give thought to them and then I shall write to you.

I am thinking of going to Assam for a couple of days about the middle of May. That will enable me to have talks with the Governor there, Shrinagesh.

Love  
Jawahar

## **Sikkim and Bhutan**

### **148. In the Lok Sabha: The Defence of Sikkim<sup>5</sup>**

Question:<sup>6</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that Sikkim Government have requested the Central Government to allow them to raise a separate para military force for the defence of Sikkim; and
- (b) if so, nature of action taken in this regard?

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

(a) The Sikkim Government have suggested their association with the defence

---

<sup>2</sup> Letter to the High Commissioner in London. NMML, Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit Papers, Subjects File No. 61.

<sup>3</sup> Harish Chandola, journalist; worked with The Hindustan Times, The Times of India, and The Indian Express.

<sup>4</sup> A. Z. Phizo.

<sup>5</sup> Oral Answers, 19 April 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. LIV, 11-21 April 1961, cols 12341-12344.

<sup>6</sup> By Jan Sangh MP P.R. Assar, and Congress MPs Ram Krishan Gupta, D.C. Sharma, Bishwa Nath Roy, Ajit Singh Sarhadi and Hem Raj.

of Sikkim through the formation of a Sikkim militia.

(b) This matter is under the consideration of the Government.

[P.R.] Assar: May I know when a decision will be taken?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): When it has been fully considered.

Ajit Singh Sarhadi: May I know whether this militia will be commanded by the Indian officers? Has this point been decided?

Jawaharlal Nehru: At present there is no Sikkim militia. If it is a question of who is to command it, obviously the only possible commander can be an Indian trained officer. Who else? I do not think the Sikkimese have any trained people.

D.C. Sharma: May I know if adequate arrangements for the defence of Sikkim exist at present?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We think the arrangements are quite adequate.

Braj Raj Singh:<sup>7</sup> How is it that the need or occasion arose for the raising of such a paramilitary force when it is the direct responsibility of the Government of India to defend Sikkim?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The militia or a kind of home guards suggested is just any home guards in the various parts of India. They are not up to the standard of the army, of course. The suggestion was made. That is why we are considering it. They do not take the place of the army.

---

<sup>7</sup> Socialist Party, from Firozabad, UP.

Hem Barua:<sup>8</sup> May I know whether the Chinese refusal to acknowledge India's special relations with the Himalayan States of Sikkim and Bhutan is one of the reasons for Sikkim to organise a militia of her own in order to meet any emergent situation?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think so. It has nothing to do with it. It is only a proposal.

[Translation begins:

Prakash Vir Shastri:<sup>9</sup> I want to know that like Sikkim, the Bhutan Government has also requested the Indian Government for Bhutan's defence; if yes, has the Government of India made any special arrangements about Bhutan's defence?

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of a request because this is well known and everybody accepts it that Bhutan's defence is our responsibility.

Translation ends]

[Mahavir] Tyagi:<sup>10</sup> The defence of Sikkim is the responsibility of the Government of India, and this militia as suggested in this question, is also proposed to be raised for the defence of Sikkim. So, if it is allowed to be independent of the defence forces of India, there will be two defence forces defending Sikkim. May I, therefore, know whether the Prime Minister will see to it that this force, if raised, acts under the control of the Defence Ministry?

Jawaharlal Nehru: That is obvious, Sir. Nobody can raise it or train it or officer it or control it, except our army people, if it is decided, but we have not decided about the nature of it. The idea is, as I hinted, that it should be in the nature of some kind of home guard.

---

<sup>8</sup> PSP, from Gauhati, Assam.

<sup>9</sup> See fn 429 in this section.

<sup>10</sup> Congress, from Dehra Dun, UP.

[Mahavir] Tyagi: Because it is for the defence of Sikkim. If it is for any other purpose, I can understand, but it is for the defence of Sikkim.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not framed the question. I have only to answer it. If I had been asked to frame, I would not have used "militia" for instance; I would not have used many words.

Bishwanath Roy: May I know if the proposed militia for Sikkim would have any connection with the auxiliary force in India?

Jawaharlal Nehru: What is the auxiliary force to which the hon. Member refers?

Speaker: He thinks there is an auxiliary force here.

Bishwanath Roy: Just as we have got military trained personnel in India...

Speaker: The question is not understandable. Next question.

#### **149. In the Lok Sabha: Jalpaiguri-Bhutan Road<sup>11</sup>**

N.R. Ghosh:<sup>12</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether there is an old route connecting the district of Jalpaiguri, West Bengal with Bhutan passing through the Chumurchi Tea Estate of Jalpaiguri;
- (b) whether it is a fact that some time ago, the Bhutan Government wanted to make this route suitable for vehicular traffic and requested Government to improve and widen the portion of this route which falls within the district of Jalpaiguri; and
- (c) if so, what steps have been taken in this direction?

---

<sup>11</sup> Oral Answers, 27 April 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. LV, 22 April - 5 May 1961, cols 14063-14064.

<sup>12</sup> Congress, from Cooch Behar, West Bengal.

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

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) The request was referred to the Government of West Bengal in whose jurisdiction the road lies. They agreed to improve the road and to construct a permanent bridge suitable for vehicular traffic across the river Daina near Chengmari. Financial aid from the Government of India for these works is being considered under the Third Five Year Plan.

N.R. Ghosh: May I know whether Government have got any programme to improve the large number of trade routes, bridle-paths and foot-paths which connect Bhutan with Jalpaiguri because there is a good volume of business between Bhutan and West Bengal?

Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): I do not know about the various small routes, but some principal roads are being constructed between Bhutan and India, on the Bengal side as well as on the Assam side; they will be the main arteries of traffic.

N.R. Ghosh: I am referring to the large number of foot-paths and bridle-paths connecting Jalpaiguri and Bhutan, because Jalpaiguri is just on the border of Bhutan, and there is a good volume of business between Jalpaiguri and Bhutan.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have said that I do not know about the foot-paths. As to what is being done, I can enquire.

[Translation begins:

Bhakt Darshan:<sup>13</sup> Is it a fact that to connect Bhutan with India, a project to construct two or three roads between West Bengal and Assam has been going

---

<sup>13</sup> See fn 434 in this section.

on for several years now and work has not been completed? May I know why this work is not progressing and whether it will pick up speed? As far as I know this work is very slow.

Jawaharlal Nehru: No, I have just replied to this. Not several years but it is being discussed for the last one and a half or two years. One major road, which goes to the capital, has progressed fast and has been built in less time than was allotted to it. I think it should be completed by September and reach the capital. Arrangements are being made for other roads also.

Translation ends]

### 300. In the Lok Sabha: Survey of External Affairs<sup>14</sup>

Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am always grateful to hon. Members in this House. When subjects relating to our foreign policy come up here, I benefit by their advice and their criticisms even though I might not always perhaps agree with them. More specially, it is always a pleasure to listen to the hon. member Acharya Kripalani even though sometimes he repeats almost textually what he has said before and not paying much regard to changing conditions or the world situation. It is almost pleasing to listen to him because there is a touch of romance about what he says, and reality, the hard facts of this world of ours, are often ignored.

Now, Sir, to begin with, may I deal with one point he raised, because that is a personal matter? He suggested that perhaps there is too great a burden on me and I should attach some Minister or senior Minister to the Ministry of External Affairs to share that burden. Now, as the hon. Member himself knows, I am a very modest person and any criticism of me is always welcome. I certainly cannot judge of it myself; others are better judges of my virtues or my failings. As a matter of fact, so far as all these major matters are concerned in our foreign policy, they have not only come up before this House again and again during the last dozen years, but apart from that, they are constantly under review by various very important committees of the Cabinet and the Cabinet itself, and I take it that the matters are too important for them to be dealt with without the full consideration of the. If not the Cabinet, there are two committees of the Cabinet. One is the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet and the other, in matters of this kind like the sending of troops to Congo, is the Defence Committee of the Cabinet, both consisting of senior members of the Government. Apart from formal meetings of these committees, informal consultations are fairly frequent. So I do endeavour to share that burden because it is a heavy burden and involves very important policies.

---

<sup>14</sup> Reply to the debate on the budget demands for grants for the MEA, 3 April 1961, Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. LIII, 28 March-10 April 1961, cols 8897-8927.

But, apart from my own failings etc., I should like to say something in justification of all those large numbers of people—thousands of them—who work in the External Affairs Ministry in our different missions abroad. Of course, they have grown greatly, and they go on growing because the independent countries go on growing although we are not represented in every one of them. We have to spread our representation much more. We cannot ignore, for instance, the new countries in Africa. It is of importance that we should be represented there. And, we have, unfortunately, in the past many years, not been properly represented in South America although the countries of South America are important. We are gradually trying to fill those gaps. But, apart from the extent of our work that our External Affairs Ministry does—the extent need not carry us very far—as hon. Members would no doubt agree, much depends on the quality of the work. I think I can say with considerable assurance that, broadly speaking, the quality of the work of our Ambassadors and others abroad is of a high order as compared to any foreign service of any country including some of the oldest foreign service in the world. It is not only very senior members of the service but the next in rank, if I may say so, have also proved to be efficient and persons who, wherever they go, command respect and attention. Naturally, I cannot speak of thousands of people, putting them on the same level. There are persons who do not come up to that degree. But I think it may be said that our Foreign Service is respected by all the Foreign Services in the world, and wherever they are situated, they are consulted by others representing other countries, and their advice carries weight.

There is one matter which also deserves consideration. Frequently, when some particularly difficult service is required, Indians are sought after, usually, the Indian representatives of our Foreign Service are sought after and selected. This is a matter which certainly has some significance and some meaning. Why should these various countries, big or small, and the United Nations, try to get Indians to perform very responsible and difficult tasks? Because, they are considered, I take it, of a high order, their intelligence, their application, their understanding of world events. That has happened repeatedly in the past, and it goes on happening. In fact, sometimes we are put to some difficulty because

we cannot always spare them. Yet, it is our desire to serve the larger cause wherever we feel that they can be of good service.

Then again, it is said, as if it was an admitted fact, that somehow we have failed in regard to countries who are our neighbours. Our neighbours are Pakistan, Afghanistan, Nepal, Ceylon, Malaya and Burma; these are the nearest neighbours. Acharya Kripalani, I think, was under the impression that we sent our best people to Europe or America and our second-rate people to these other countries, who are our neighbours. Well, I should like to disabuse him of this view because, in our own list, these neighbouring countries are given the first place. Of course, there are some countries which should inevitably have the first place, like the United States of America, like the Soviet Union, like the United Kingdom, because they occupy a position in world affairs which is of great importance. So, we keep this in mind in choosing persons to these countries. In the Soviet Union we have one of our senior-most men for many years, Shri K.P.S. Menon, who has done very good work. He is retiring after a very good record of distinguished service. We are sending to take his place one of our senior-most and most respected persons in the Foreign Service, Shri Subimal Dutt. It is not an easy matter for us to spare him from here, but we felt that the work in the Soviet Union is of such importance that we must send one of our best. That applies to the United States or to the United Kingdom also. But, apart from these, we have always tried, and we always try, to send our leading and most distinguished Ambassadors to the neighbouring countries, more especially to Pakistan, Burma, China and to other countries round about. Our Ambassador to China<sup>15</sup> has played a good part. Perhaps there was a hint that our representation in China might not have been up to standard. I should like to say that our Ambassador in China is one of the persons whose work and whose general advice we respect very highly. He is working in a very difficult position in China and, as the House can very well appreciate, he is performing that task with great ability and forbearance.

So far as some of our younger people in the Foreign Service are concerned, the

---

<sup>15</sup> G Parthasarathi.

House has had some occasion to see their work. It does not often come up before the public but we have seen their work in the Indian and Chinese officials report. In regard to these our troubles with China, they had occasion to judge the quality of their work. So I would like this House to appreciate that. It is not only our opinion, but it is a general opinion among those people who come in contact with them, that is, the foreign service of other countries and the foreign missions in other countries and here who hold our Foreign Office and its Ambassadors and others in the highest regard.

I just mentioned Nepal. Before I venture to say something which is not in full agreement with Acharya Kripalani, I should like to express my agreement with him in regard to what he said about the report of a hunger strike undertaken by Shri B.P. Koirala who was till lately the Prime Minister of Nepal.<sup>16</sup> When this change-over in Nepal took place, I expressed my broad regret at the democratic structure having been changed. But apart from expressing my regret, naturally it was not up to us to go to interfere in any way with what was happening in Nepal. It is not a matter of our liking something or disliking it. It is for the people of Nepal to decide what they should do or what they should not do. So, there has been strong criticism sometimes in the Nepalese press and sometimes that criticism has been completely besides the mark and without the least foundation. Take for instance a statement that was reported to have been made, namely, that some kind of a secret understanding had taken place between India and Nepal, that Shri Koirala had brought about that secret understanding which was completely untrue. It was so untrue that nobody had ever mentioned it. There has been no mention or thought of it and it was practically also quite out of the question. He could not possibly think of it. We do not desire that type of thing. So, many of these things have happened but we have not interfered in the slightest in Nepal. The kind of works that we are doing in Nepal which are developmental works we have carried on and propose to carry on in the normal way. But it is obvious that when news about the

---

<sup>16</sup> B.P. Koirala was detained on 15 December 1960 when his Government was dismissed by Mahendra (see also SWJN/SS/65/items 232-236) and had been on a fast from 25 March 1961, see *The Hindu*, 1 April 1961, p.7 col. 2.

hunger-strike of a person like Shri B.P. Koirala and his fast deteriorating health comes to people in India, they are troubled by it. They are distressed by it. They are distressed for the larger reasons that wherever such a thing occurs we would be distressed and for some personal reasons also, personal in the sense that Shri Koirala was a comrade of ours in our own Indian struggle for independence. Naturally, we do feel that. We have been distressed about this matter because apart from rumours appearing in the newspapers there has been no Nepalese official intimation about, it. When representatives of the Nepal Government were asked about it, they neither confirmed it nor denied it. It was not a very satisfactory reply specially when such positive statement is made in the press and elsewhere. We have been distressed about it. Just as I was speaking here news came to me this afternoon that sometime today Shri B.P. Koirala broke his fast and took some fruit juice and, I think, some milk.<sup>17</sup> I do not know the conditions, how and in what way this was done and what other things happened. But there it is.

Another fact I should like to mention is that one of the present Ministers of the Nepal government had openly stated that interviews would be allowed to the Members of the family of Shri B .P. Koirala. On the other hand, I learn that his own wife was not given the permission to interview him. I hope that the Government of Nepal will appreciate that our interest in such matters is not interference in their internal affairs but an inevitable feeling that we have about the people who have played an important part in public life and who have been associated with us in the past. And, whatever else may be done or may not be done, normal amenities and facilities should not be denied to opponents of the present regime.

Again, in Nepal, I would say, coming back to Ambassadors, one of our senior most Ambassadors has been sent there. Before him also we sent an outstanding person so that we have always treated Nepal as a very important post for our foreign service. And that applies, to some extent, to Burma also

---

<sup>17</sup> The National Herald reported on 5 April 1961 (p. 1 col. 7) quoting Tulsi Giri, the Home Minister of Nepal, that Koirala had ended his fast on 3 April.

and to round-about countries.

Day before yesterday when I ventured to place these Demands before the House I said something. I begged the House to consider these questions relating to foreign affairs in their broad context. It is easy of course, and sometimes necessary, to separate an item and examine it in greater detail. Nevertheless, they are all inter-connected, inter-linked, and you cannot really exercise a full judgment about any particular matters isolated from the rest. And therefore I ventured to suggest that this dynamic in the concept of history in making in the world should be kept before us. Because, history is always in the making. But perhaps the pace is much swifter today. Life is faster today. People rush about, conferences seem to be held every few days, international conferences. And as a consequence of the technological development in the world, the speed of international events also has been made much faster. Also, the fact that somewhere in the background looms the atomic and the hydrogen bombs has also made people think more swiftly, more rapidly and attempt from time to time to grapple with these problems that have arisen. There are so many new things, new type of things. Whether it is the hydrogen bomb or nuclear warfare, whether it is the great changes that have come about after the Second World War including the emergence of China, whether it is the new things that we are seeing every day, the emergence of Africa, the African people and the tremendous problems that have arisen, all these are major historical events. It is not a question of liking or disliking them, just as it is not a question of your liking or disliking an earthquake or a hurricane. There it is. One deals with the hurricane or the earthquake in the best manner possible. There is no question of liking or disliking it. Some you may like, or some you may dislike. We like the emergence of the African people. We do not like everything that is happening in Africa, and the conflicts within Africa, apart from those imposed upon it.

It was in this context that we decided, after much thought, after a great deal of thought, to send our armed forces to the Congo. It seemed to us that a grave crisis had arisen not only in the Congo but in the whole United Nations and its future. And it so happened that it was given to us, to some extent, to deal with

this crisis, to ease it or to make it worse. Not that we are the only country which could have done it; but the fact of the matter was that, obviously, European countries or American countries as a whole could not do it; because, the intrusion of European forces or American forces would have not been welcomed. First of all, the intrusion of any great power forces would not have been welcomed anywhere, secondly, countries which are normally associated in military alliances are not welcomed, because they give rise to counter-forces coming into, so that by a process of exclusion, or call it what you will, it fell to us to take a step. We were invited to do so, and if we did not take it up, there was grave danger of the whole of the United Nations structure in the Congo not functioning, or even collapsing, at a time when oddly enough, the United Nations was being attacked from both directions, that is, the so-called two major military blocs, both of them, were attacking the United Nations for entirely different reasons, of course. And we decided, therefore, to do something which we had not done previously in this way. And it was a serious decision, serious not only for us but serious, one might say, even in the brief history of the United Nations.

May I say here that I agree with Acharya Kripalani that our sending troops to the Congo was different in quality? The nature of the thing is different from our sending them to the Gaza strip or to Indo-China or elsewhere; they were different, except for the fact that we sent them, some troops in Indo-China, to help the International Commission there and to serve as test-teams to find out what was happening, or in the Gaza strip, to help in observing the cease-fire line between Israel and the United Arab Republic. This is of a different kind, and admittedly so. That was why it caused us so much worry and difficulty to decide. But we came to the conclusion entirely from the wider point of view, not merely from a narrow point of view of India, but from a wider point of view, that it was our duty to undertake this responsibility, more especially because we had associated ourselves just a little before with the resolution passed by the Security Council in regard to the Congo—I think it was passed on the 21st February or so. Having done that, it seemed rather craven-hearted for us, for narrower reasons or just for fear of the consequences, not to shoulder that

responsibility, apart from the other reasons that I have mentioned, such as the consequences on the United Nations, and so, we shouldered it. Having shouldered it, before we decided to do so fully, we made clear the pre-conditions on which we were sending these troops to the Congo. I do not exactly remember all of them, but broadly speaking, they were as follows: First of all, we wanted to be assured that the United Nations was going to consider the Security Council resolution seriously and to implement it, and not, as previously, to leave it largely unimplemented or with doubts raised about its meaning. This has happened previously, and I think many of the difficulties in the Congo have been due to the fact that previous resolutions of the Security Council were not given effect to. But we did not want that to happen, and we were assured that certainly it was meant for implementation.

Secondly, we said that we did not want our Forces to come into conflict with the Forces of any other member-country of the United Nations. Obviously, we were not going to fight other countries there. They could be used, if fighting was necessary, because the main purpose was the establishment of law and order and a Government of the Congolese, a properly elected Government of the Congolese. Therefore, they might have to be used between factional fights in the Congo to bring about a measure of security and law and order, otherwise not. We added certainly that as regards the people who were there apparently as mercenaries from abroad, chiefly from Belgium, some from other countries, who were supporting some of the factions in the Congo, notably in Katanga province, to some extent in Leopoldville and in Kasai also, if it was essential, if it was necessary, our people will have to fight them, if these mercenaries continued functioning there.

The very first part of the resolution of the Security Council was that the Belgian Forces there should be withdrawn. And that still remains the crux of the Congolese problem. When that is done fully, I have not the shadow of a doubt that the rest would be easier of solution. The only solution can be not the impression of any power, even the United Nations, but the taking charge by the Congolese themselves of the Government and being in full control. The United Nations would come in to give help, economic help, food, medicine and that

kind of thing. That is what one aims at. We do not want our people to remain there a day longer than is necessary.

So we decided to send them. Part of them have arrived there and some of them are on their way.<sup>18</sup> Even after sending them—this decision to send them—other difficulties have arisen and they are constantly, daily, arising. It is not very easy even to keep pace with changing events there. Every day we get a sheaf of telegrams from the Congo and from the United Nations about this matter and we send replies. It is a difficult matter and not without risks, but nevertheless, I am quite sure that we did the right thing. One cannot run away from risks, if one feels that that is one's duty to undertake.

Then about the various governments in the Congo, an hon. Member opposite asked why we had not recognised the successor government to Mr Lumumba's Government, that is, the Gizenga Government.<sup>19</sup> As the House knows we have not officially recognised any government there. We did not recognise at any time, any government except right at the beginning when to some extent we did recognise the Government which was represented by Mr Kasavubu<sup>20</sup> as President and Mr Lumumba<sup>21</sup> as Prime Minister. That was a Government under the Constitution and the President had limited powers and Mr Lumumba had power of a head of Government. After that, nobody has had those full powers, because Mr Lumumba was eliminated first; that is, long before his death, he was eliminated from government and put in prison chiefly by Mr Mobutu<sup>22</sup> who

---

<sup>18</sup> India supplied one complete brigade group for service in the Congo. They left in batches by air and sea between 14 March and 12 April 1961, totalling 6000 under the command of Major General K.A.S. Raja. It was the largest single contingent in the UN Command. See Indian Armed Forces Year Book 1960-61, pp, 895-896; and B. Chakravorty, *The Congo Operation 1960-63*, edited by S.N. Prasad (Delhi: The Controller of Publications, 1976).

<sup>19</sup> Government of Antoine Gizenga, his short-lived government at Stanleyville was recognized by 21 African, Asian and East European countries.

<sup>20</sup> Joseph Kasavubu; first president of Congo, 1960-65.

<sup>21</sup> Patrice Lumumba; first prime minister of Congo, June-September 1960, killed on 12 February 1961.

<sup>22</sup> Mobutu Sese Seko, original name Joseph Mobutu; secretary of state for national defence, Congo.

came in, not under any constitution or law but a coup d'etat, and who was later, more or less supported by Mr Kasavubu.

Now, one may say Mr Kasavubu was a part of the Lumumba Government because he was an elected President; but under their own Constitution that part cannot become the whole. The President cannot become Prime Minister and all the government with all the powers of the full government. But as a matter of fact, he has been functioning more or less as a complete government, and he was encouraged to do so by the fact that in September or October when he went to the United Nations, he was taken into the General Assembly of the UN which was, I think, rather unfortunate, partly because he did not have those full powers and secondly because, because of that the very delicate balance in the Congo was rather upset, and some of those gentlemen there like Mr Tshombe, Mr Mobutu and others threw their weight about and practically started opposing the UN much more than they had previously done. I have little doubt that they were encouraged to do so by Mr Kasavubu being taken in into the General Assembly of the UN and also because they have been functioning very much under Belgian advisers—apart from Belgian officers and other forces under Belgian political advisers. And one may presume that their activities against the UN were due to Belgian advice to act against the UN. So we have had a very peculiar situation. That is about Mr Kasavubu.

Now about Mr Gizenga. When Mr Lumumba was first kept in prison, he was not functioning for many months. Then he escaped and was caught and ultimately, as the House knows, he was brutally murdered. To consider that in the strictly legal sense somebody has succeeded him as the legal successor government for the whole of Congo is rather stretching the law. I do not mean to suggest that we should function in these matters under some very strict legal code because conditions are very odd there and one cannot be quite rigid. But one must be guided either legally or morally or both possibly. I feel that as a matter of fact when the Congo was divided up into 3 or 4 major provinces or parts, the authority of one part did not extend to the other. But, further, we felt that it would be more helpful if we did not attach ourselves to one particular group or party there even though we may have sympathy with that group, than if we did

attach ourselves in this way. Anyhow, these are the reasons and I think they still hold and we feel that, ultimately, only the Parliament there can organise a government, can fix a Government. That was what I suggested when I went to the U.N.

It would have some kind of legal or constitutional basis and the U.N. would be justified in supporting it fully. As it is, nobody has any constitutional basis there. I have suggested that if the U.N. supports one party, it is inevitably supporting a faction and throwing its weight in favour of it. That has been our difficulty about these matters, because U.S. is in a peculiar position. The Security Council passed a Resolution six weeks ago which we naturally supported and because of which we have really sent our forces there. That Resolution was passed not by the Security Council at the instance of its members but at the instance of a large number of other countries who are not in the Security Council. Some, of course, who formally moved it, were there; but many others were outside who were consulted. We were outside the Security Council and we were consulted. The resolution was sponsored by the U.A.R. and two other countries, Liberia and Ceylon. But, really, there were a dozen other countries who were consulted before it was put in. That Resolution was passed.

Among various things in that Resolution there was a part, the very first part, about Belgian withdrawal, about dealing with the Congolese Army, which is a very peculiar Army, hardly with any discipline or control and which has done what it chose. The idea was that it should be disciplined and controlled, and, if necessary, disarmed.

There were several other matters. One was an investigation into Lumumba's murder. It is very important. Now, some of the authorities at present in the Congo, like the authorities of Katanga and Leopoldville are charged by some people with being accessories to this murder. To charge them, to have an investigation and yet to recognise them as functioning authorities brings about a certain confusion, obviously.

These very authorities have recently, in the last 2 weeks or so, been openly declaring something very near war with the U.N. So, we have this peculiar position with the United Nation's policies as covered by the Security Council's

Resolution. But, at the same time, the United Nations, is, to some extent, recognising and encouraging the very people who are opposing it and opposing this Resolution.

In the nature of things one cannot have two contradictory policies which cut off each other. That has been the difficulty of the U.N. But that is not so much the fault, perhaps, of some official or other. The U.N. itself reflects the conflicts in the world. That is the difficulty. Some of these conflicts are sometimes resolved, sometimes they are not resolved. So, they affect the action. That is the difficulty. We are quite convinced of the steps to be taken by the UN. Firstly, there must be the withdrawal of Belgian mercenaries. They are not being sent by the Government, so far I know, but they have come to Mr Tshombe and the other gentlemen there. They spread their net fairly wide. They recruit them from Belgium and from France.... (An Hon. Member: From South Africa) and, to some extent, from South Africa even. So, if that is done the whole problem becomes simpler. There should be some kind of disciplining, of the Congolese Army and then they should proceed with the investigation of the murder of Lumumba. These are the most important things.

We are in some, I would not say, "apprehension"; but nevertheless difficulties come up every day. Here are our forces going; some have gone by air and some by sea. Only day before yesterday I think they sailed. We sent what we call an integrated unit with all arms. That is, if you separate one part, the rest is unbalanced. It is a balanced unit; we do not want unbalanced units to go there. But apart from that, here is a ship going and normally it would have gone to that port of Matadi. Meanwhile, the Matadi port is occupied by Mr Mobutu's henchmen after driving out some Sudanese troops functioning under the UN. It is of urgent importance not only for ourselves but for the UN functioning there that this port through which supplies come, should be occupied and fully controlled by UN. I hope it will be—very soon.

Again the same difficulty arises by contradictory policies being followed and pressure being exercised in the UN in this matter. Naturally, a good deal of responsibility attaches to the major powers in the UN because it is not a question of merely a boot here and there but of throwing their weight in the

furtherance and in the implementation of a certain policy.

In this connection, I may mention something which is rather distressing and that is the campaign against Mr Rajeshwar Dayal<sup>23</sup> -against his continuance in the Congo. We are not anxious to send our best men there for them to remain there indefinitely. But in the context of things as they are Mr Rajeshwar Dayal's removal from there would mean, inevitably, shall I say, a new balance being created there against the implementation of the Security Council resolution which of course will affect the situation very much. Therefore, we are entirely opposed to this in the present context or in the near future. And it may have some effect on our maintaining our forces there. If we feel that they are not being properly utilised as we intended them to be, then it is for us to consider what to do and I hope that it will not happen.

So, Congo is a very big matter today in the World affairs; in itself it is big because it affects the future of the UN and because it affects the whole of Africa, and naturally all the newly independent and other countries of Africa. As you have just heard among other people who are functioning there, there appears to be South Africans too and we can well imagine what kind of spirit they bring to that adventure.

Now, there has been Laos where it would appear that the possibility of some kind of agreement and cease-fire has become greater. It is a pity that these questions are often considered under the shadow of threats, whether it is the threat of the SEATO conference sitting there, or the threat of some other opposite party, because as soon as threats come in, prestige comes in and the policy of each country becomes much more rigid.

Fortunately, however, there is some hope of, I shall not say entire, but some kind of, cease-fire coming about some time. Maybe the International Commission may meet probably first in Delhi and then they will have to go to Laos, very soon after. Where that international conference will meet, we do not know yet. So, there it is among two of the major problems affecting Asia, Africa and the world.

---

<sup>23</sup> U.N. Special Representative in the Congo.

A great deal has been said by Acharya Kripalani about China and he has pointed out again with much force what he has done previously in almost identical language. I do not know; I am sorry that what I said on the previous occasions, endeavouring to explain to him what had happened and how he had reacted to it, unfortunately has had no effect on him. Therefore, probably what I might say today will equally have no effect on him, because as I said, the hon. Member is a person of a romantic temperament and rather averse to examining the facts of life as they are.

Acharya Kripalani:<sup>24</sup> I thought that change of heart was more romantic!

Jawaharlal Nehru: He mentioned the words "change of heart." I have not said anything about change of heart. What I said was something very much different. I said that the broad policy we have pursued, including very much the result of this Officials' Report,<sup>25</sup> this investigation, etc., has brought out the basic facts so clearly that I thought that even the Chinese Government would be affected by them, not suddenly but gradually. Governments are not affected suddenly, but gradually it may affect even their rigid mind, when they feel how strong is India's case in this matter. That is what I said. That by itself will not affect them, but other accompanying factors, our own attitude to this whole matter, the way they have realised that we cannot be pushed this way or that way, how we have adhered strongly to the position we have taken up which is continuing, which is not a thing which they can look upon with any measure of contentment.

Acharya Kripalani: This view of things—is it not very romantic that nations will change their policy by these things?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Nations change their policies because of pressures and there

---

<sup>24</sup> J.B. Kripalani, PSP.

<sup>25</sup> See SWJN/SS/66 Supplement.

are many kinds of pressures.

Rajendra Singh:<sup>26</sup> Pressures of logic or facts?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry I did not hear the interruption. Every nation changes its policy because of the logic of circumstances, facts and pressures. Acharya Kripalani thinks that the only pressure worth considering is the pressure of war. Short of war, I do not know what the middle stage is, which the hon. Member may have in mind. The normal policy for a country or a Government to adopt even in the most serious circumstances is not to jump into war, but to avoid war and also prepare for it, if necessity comes. That is the only policy, and meanwhile one has to try all other means, all other pressures. And, in the modern world or in any world there are pressures of various kinds. Does the hon. Member realise the pressure on the Chinese Government which is being constantly exercised by the facts, by India's attitude supported as it is by all these facts? The House must realise that while it may be completely clear to think about the facts, those facts were not clear to many people outside India. Even people who are entirely opposed to the Chinese Government—let us take the United States of America; they are entirely opposed to them, they are not friends of them—when asked did not give a clear reply. That is not because of our not explaining to them. Governments do not function in that way. They do not get their facts from others. They get their facts themselves. They have got vast establishments to find out. We have got a historical section here. They have got armies of historians and others constantly pouring over these matters. They come to a judgment themselves, not because of our publicity or anything like that. That does not count very much. I was merely pointing out that a country like the United States was a little chary; they will not be chary anymore because of this marshalling of evidence that has been done on our part. People have said that somehow we have become isolated, that China has isolated us. I do not understand this. I suppose they have come to a border

---

<sup>26</sup> PSP.

treaty with Burma or possibly a treaty with Nepal which has not been finalised yet. It is because of this, I suppose, that they think they have isolated us. I do not understand this. We are not isolated. I cannot speak of Nepal, there is a new dispensation. But in Burma there is no question of isolation or any question of any lessening of the close contacts that we have with Burma. If I may say so, when we were asked when we were consulted at an early stage about their dealings with China, we told them to go ahead and get a good border settlement if they could. We told them that they should not just to please us not take it or not accept it. Of course, we told them not to do anything which would affect our interests. That is a different matter. But our advice to them was to get a good settlement if they could. We do not complain at all about what the Burmese Government has done. We do not complain about Nepal either-I do not quite know what the facts are and therefore, I Cannot say much about the future.

But it is wrong to imagine that we have become weaker in these areas, our neighbouring areas, because of something that is happening there, which is happening in China. There are of course big facts. The mere fact that China being there is a fact which none of these countries can ignore, and nothing that we can say can eliminate Chinese presence in a big way. That is a different matter. That is what I venture to suggest to Acharya Kripalani that these are certain facts, certain developments, and one of the major developments of the post-war period has been these changes in China, in Africa etc., which have a powerful effect upon the world situation and which affect us in some ways more particularly.

I ventured, I think, to give some "data" in the last session of Parliament about what steps we had taken in regard to our border from 1950 onwards, because it was imagined that we had been completely ignorant or impervious to what was happening and we had done nothing at all till they had occupied a good part of our territory in the north-east of India. But I ventured to give some "dates" as to what we had done. It may be said, of course, perhaps, that we did not do enough. That is a different matter. It is a question of judgment, balancing of things, but the fact of our cognisance of this possible danger is there. We

concentrated more particularly on our NEFA border which we considered more easily capable of being threatened.

Hem Barua:<sup>27</sup> In spite of Longju?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Longju has no importance, if I may say so with all respect; excepting a certain psychological and sentimental value, Longju...

Hem Barua: I would request the Prime Minister not to say like that. In respect of Ladakh he said that not a blade of grass grew there.<sup>28</sup> The Prime Minister was very sad when Mr Chou En-lai quoted that statement of our Prime Minister against him.

Jawaharlal Nehru: If the hon. Member asks me a question, I have to answer it. What I said about Ladakh was from another point of view. I said that these territories are so high up that they are hardly inhabited, there is no communication, there are hardly any trees or any blade of grass. It does not lessen the Chinese guilt in coming in. It is a fact that from the point of view of the action we might take or not Longju, as I repeatedly said, is a matter of, perhaps, I think 2 ½ sq. miles, a village, a little part of the village this side and a part of it on that side, it is annoying that it should be there. But it is a different matter. In the larger scheme of things, it has no importance to them or to us. One must not lose the perspective. Ladakh stands on a completely different footing.

Hem Barua: In Longju we had our troops. But they were pushed out.

[Interruption]

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am very sorry I cannot argue this out. We have to look at

---

<sup>27</sup> PSP.

<sup>28</sup> See SWJN/SS/52/item 89, p. 186.

these things in some perspective. It is right that we had a small platoon there, which was driven out forcibly by the Chinese. It was highly objectionable. There is no doubt about that. But I am merely looking at it from the broad perspective of events. If it is a question of Longju it can be settled in no time. In fact, when Mr Chou En-lai came here, we did not talk of Longju, but we broadly referred about that part of the area and he said that, in the circumstances he would accept the McMahon line. His point was not that of accepting or no; accepting the McMahon line, but this particular village was on the other side of the McMahon line. It was on that side of the McMahon line. That is another matter.

Hem Barua: It is three miles inside the McMahon line.

Jawaharlal Nehru: This has no importance whatever. We must not lose ourselves in these petty things. But Ladakh has vast importance, both in regard to extent of the area and other consequences that may come from the Chinese occupation.

Anyhow, from 1910<sup>29</sup> onwards we took steps to strengthen our position in NEFA, and very successful steps as subsequent events have shown. It is much more difficult to take those steps, although we took some steps in the Ladakh side too. They were not adequate, not enough, and when the Tibetan rising came two years ago, they crept in from various directions. That story or whatever it is given in the correspondence, White Paper and the rest. Excepting that particular bit, the Aksai Chin road in the north, which took place a little later, apart from that, the rest took place after the Tibetan rising two years ago. So, my point is—I am not putting forward this as an excuse—that we had in mind all the time, ever since the Chinese came to Tibet, that the whole frontier position has changed and we have to take steps in regard to it and very extraordinarily difficult steps are involved in this. Even from 1950 we have been building roads, mostly, again, on the NEFA side, because we attached more

---

<sup>29</sup> Presumably 1950, as stated in the next paragraph and given the expression "our position", which he may not have used if he was referring to the British strengthening their position in the area following the Chinese government's advance into Lhasa in 1910.

importance to it as being more threatened, and especially checkpoints. We built some roads in the Ladakh side too. In the main, whatever roads we have built in the Ladakh side, they are all controlled by one road, and that is the road which goes from Jammu to Srinagar in the valley, and the tunnel. That is a bottleneck. If that is not there then all the roads in Ladakh do not count because you cannot reach them. Therefore all this business of building the Banihal tunnel, improving the road there and the next road from beyond Sonamarg to Baltal—all these were preliminaries. We did think of that in building that road to Leh for the last few years. May be, we could have done it quicker and sooner. Things were hastened by the Tibetan rebellion and what followed. But there it is. Since then, during this last year or a little more than a year, we have hastened our road programme and have achieved very considerable results in that. It is going much faster than normally any PWD establishment of the Government functions. This has made a great difference both from our defensive point of view and from other points of view. Again, I repeat, as I want to be quite frank with this House, that we have considered this matter. Acharya Kripalani talked about ten years. It was not clear to me in what connection and whether he was referring to the past ten years or the future. But the fact is that we do not propose to take any adventurist action not for any psychological reasons but for strictly practical and military reasons. At the same time we must be prepared for every kind of action and we are preparing ourselves for that. It is no good shouting, following which one might come under certain circumstances....

Hem Barua: We have the report; they have the territory-

Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is here to interpret everything. But I would say, as some hon. Member pointed out, that hon. Members might perhaps keep in mind whether what they say here helps our people or the opposite party.

Hem Barua: That applies to your remarks.

Rajendra Singh: That applies more to that side.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I say so because the Government is accused of having a defeatist mentality. Again, I would beg to submit that much that is said or something that is said here is more defeatist than anything can be. I have no defeatist mentality. I can assure them that I am quite confident. If you want me to march an army across the Himalayas and seize that territory, I consider that not a very wise or sensible proposition to make. If that is not there then the alternatives have to be considered. Those alternatives having been considered we are taking certain action. I am preparing for the future apart from building up, which is a very important thing, in the eyes of the world, of other countries in Asia, Europe, America etc., a certain momentum of feeling of knowledge in regard to this matter. It is no small matter that the Chinese Government has to face a certain criticism from these other countries—I am not talking about the countries which are opposed to China, but other countries in Asia—which they do not like at all. Their prestige suffers. They accuse us, India, of imperialist ambitions and what not. That very charge is being made against them. We do not go about shouting these things because we are conditioned and built differently. Other countries, many countries in Asia, are throwing that at them. It seems to me that that is the only proper course to follow from the point of view of India's dignity, prestige, maintenance of our strength and building it up more. Every step that we take we have to measure the consequences. After all, a Government and a Parliament have to think and function with a measure of responsibility.

I entirely agree with what, I think, the hon. Member, Shri Kasliwal,<sup>30</sup> said, namely, that the Officials' Report is not just an exercise in some scholarly thesis. It is scholarly, of course.

An hon. Member: Shri Sharma said that.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> N.C. Kasliwal, Congress.

<sup>31</sup> D. C. Sharma, Congress, referred to another member's comment that the Officials' Report was an academic thesis, and said that it was a highly prejudiced mind. He continued: "It [the

Jawaharlal Nehru: Maybe, Shri Sharma. But it is scholarly, of course, and it has to be commended for scholarship. It is not a speech delivered to support a case but it is a scholarly thesis objectively put. Therefore it has all the more value. But because of all that it is a challenge to the world and more particularly to the Chinese Government.

Acharya Kripalani referred to "the rings of spies" surrounding us and wanted to give full information.<sup>32</sup> Well, I mentioned previously that there are three countries involved. In this particular matter, if I go a little further back, there would be half the countries represented here involved...

Acharya Kripalani: Let us know their names.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Not directly or indirectly—and some very important countries—it is not in small ways or big ways. It is difficult always to get evidence. If we have full evidence, we take action. But this kind of thing one has to judge in the context in which it has occurred.

One thing I would like to say. An Ambassador is a very important person, of course. But many things happen without the least knowledge of Ambassadors. That I got to know some years ago, not today, many years ago, when this happened—the big agencies in fact, it is deliberately done that the Ambassadors should not know. And many of these so-called information agencies, information services are not even under the direction of the Ambassador; they are directed from the headquarters of the home country. It is an extraordinary state of

---

Report] has proved our case to the very hilt. I think every word in that report, every sentence in that report is a challenge which we have given because we know that our case on account of this very report stands proved legally, judicially, administratively and psychologically. It stands proved on account of tradition and history. I am afraid that an hon. Member of this House should have said that this report is a scholarly report, a scholarly thesis, and that it should have been equated with a kind of Ph. D. thesis or something like that." See Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. LIII, 3 April 1961, cols 8883-8887.

<sup>32</sup> For Kripalani's interventions, see Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. LIII, 3 April 1961, cols 8761-8763. See also SWJN/SS/66/item 127.

affairs.

Of course, every country tries to gather knowledge. Some do it by rather clever methods, some by rather crude methods. That is the main difference. Some information may be harmful, some may not be. One has to keep all these factors in mind. And we felt that no useful purpose would be served for us to put all the details of this matter before the House or the public. Because, it so happens that our relations with those countries are very friendly and then it had no particular direct relation with that, although it was undesirable obviously, and that is why we took action.

I think hon. Member opposite wanted to know of the conditions of service of our armed forces in the Congo. I have already mentioned about this, First of all we wanted them to function in terms of this resolution of the Security Council. Secondly, they are not to fight the forces of any other member-country of the United Nations excepting the Congo itself. Thirdly, they were not to be used against any popular movement in the Congo. Fourthly, they were to function under their own officers as a unit. That is to say, they had to function, of course, under the general command of the General commanding there, the broad command, but otherwise they were not to be dispersed in small packets, thereby losing their identity.

Acharya Kripalani: There is no General Commander, so far as I know.

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is.

Acharya Kripalani: Not a military man as a General Commander, so far as I know.

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is a military man. I am not quite sure of the name but I have an idea that he is an Irish General.<sup>33</sup> He is there. But our unit will

---

<sup>33</sup> General Sean McKeown, Chief of Staff of the Irish Army, was made the Supreme Commander of the UN Force in Congo in January 1961. See Rajeshwar Dayal, Mission for Hammarskjold, The Congo Crisis (Delhi: Oxford University Press 1976), p.23.

function under the Indian Brigadier who is in command.

Then, the hon. Member said something about a Military Staff Committee of the U.N. Well, that may sit in the U.N. I do not know what functions it exercises in the Congo. But the Military Adviser to the Secretary-General about the Congo was another Indian officer, Brigadier Rikhye.<sup>34</sup>

Indrajit Gupta:<sup>35</sup> Have we signed an agreement, according to article 43 of the Charter, an agreement between us and the U.N. defining the terms on which our troops were being sent there?

Jawaharlal Nehru: No, we have signed no agreement; but we have exchanged letters and telegrams.

Indrajit Gupta: Unfortunately, the Charter says something else.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I shall now deal with one or two small matters. Acharya Kripalani referred to Berubari as an undoubted injury to a human problem. But I would like to say what I have said previously that in the balance of things, it was a good decision for India and for the Indian people, and this House has decided by a very large majority in its favour, but that apart, an identical position arose in the west, in the agreement between Pakistan and India on the western border. It happens that practically the same number of people were affected, and came away; Indian nationals were affected; some Pakistani nationals were affected. The only difference was in the reaction of the people. In the Punjab, they celebrated this by illuminations and the rest, on both sides of the Punjab, that was the reaction of the people. Some people had to come away, naturally, they came away, and we provided for them; some others had to go away to Pakistan. But the point was that they celebrated it with great eclat; and the Governor and the Chief Minister went from our Punjab to their

---

<sup>34</sup> Inderjit Rikhye.

<sup>35</sup> CPI.

Punjab, and their Governor came over this way, and all that, because it was advantageous to both.<sup>36</sup> You cannot measure things. There, in the eastern border disputes, there were a very large number of people whose future was in doubt as to whether they might ultimately have to be transferred to Pakistan. It was assured to them that this matter was settled in our favour; their number was far larger than this number involved on the other side, so that to call this a deep injury is not quite correct.

Acharya Kripalani: If I remember aright, you yourself said that the human problem had not been properly taken into consideration, and I repeated your words.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I did say so; that is true; I had said that; I did not know at that time how many individuals or human beings would be involved in it; I was not perfectly sure; the fact of the matter is that I do not yet, in spite of the enquiries that I have sought to make, because the matter depends on where the line will be drawn, but the maximum number we know more or less.

I shall touch upon one or two minor things, before I finish. The hon.

Member Shri Ram Sewak Yadava<sup>37</sup> seemed to have said, I am told, that I went to the United Nations last year because the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom decided to go, and that, he said, proves that our policy follows, and is linked with, that of the United Kingdom. Well, he had forgotten; he may be thinking as well that my going there might be partly due to the fact that the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union went there too; so, from that one might draw the impression that our policy is linked with that of the Soviet Union. In fact, there was quite a good crowd of Prime Ministers and Presidents present there at the United Nations; there were the representatives of a large number of African countries, the President of the United Arab Republic, the President of Indonesia and so many other countries...

---

<sup>36</sup> See SWJN/SS/65/items 185-207.

<sup>37</sup> Socialist Party.

The Minister of Transport and Communications (P. Subbarayan): Of Yugoslavia also.

Jawaharlal Nehru: .... and the Yugoslav President and so on, apart from smaller fry like Prime Ministers. But, instead of judging by this, it would be more helpful to him, I suggest, if he sought to find out exactly what happened there when we were there, and how far my policy or our policy was linked with that of any other; it was certainly linked because our effort is always to link it up with that of other countries; one does not function by oneself in the United Nations.<sup>38</sup> Finally, some reference was made by some Member, probably the same Member, to the large funds spent on the Queen's visit here.

Speaker: Is it part of External Affairs?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It was mentioned. That is why I am referring to it. It is partly External Affairs.

I do not yet know how much was spent because it was spent all over Indi in different parts. But I do know broadly-and I can assure the House-that this idea that vast sums were spent is grossly incorrect and exaggerated.

An hon. Member: How much was spent?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Two things get mixed up. They are putting all the money spent on our Republic Day as if it was spent on the Queen's visit.<sup>39</sup> (An hon. Member: Apart from that). As the House knows, the Republic Day function is a very big function. It is growing in importance, in its power to attract crowds tremendously and we have to consider every year what to do with the crowds. We have to widen our roads and strengthen our barricades and what not. So all that was independently of the Queen's visit, except in so far as this that when

---

<sup>38</sup> For Nehru's interventions in the UN General Assembly and his interactions with others in New York, see SWJN/SS/63/items 213-226.

<sup>39</sup> See also SWJN/SS/66/items 263-277.

the Queen was visiting here—we had found some difficulty in dealing with the crowds when President Eisenhower came—we did not want that difficulty to occur again.

It may surprise you and hon. Members to learn that at many places like Calcutta the amount spent on the visit of Mr Khrushchev and Mr Bulganin was far greater than that on the visit of the Queen.

S.M. Banerjee:<sup>40</sup> That is no consolation.

Jawaharlal Nehru: All this is not spent on illuminations. It is due to the fact that when vast crowd come, special arrangements have to be made, roads have to be broadened and all kinds of arrangements have to be made. It is inevitable. It has nothing to do with the visit of any particular person.

If I may go back to what I had said day before yesterday about these matters being considered from the point of view of the dynamics of this changing world and not merely from odd little bits of it separated. I would really recommend to Acharya Kripalani to try to find out exactly what India's position is in the world at large. It seems to be higher than it is in the minds of some Members opposite. Perhaps that might give them an insight into the facts governing present-day history, because India's position is quite extraordinarily high and respected, and this is considered as a sign by people who do not rush about shouting to all, of wisdom, forbearance and strength.

Acharya Kripalani: The Prime Minister has answered all my points, but I will remind him that he has not touched on one point that I raised. I do not want him to answer me now but to take it into consideration as to how far the executive can send armies outside India, decide the question of peace and war and transfer of national territory. I had said that in their own interest, the executive should restrain itself from doing these things. I do not want him to answer me just now but to think over the matter whether the executive should

---

<sup>40</sup> Independent.

be given such powers.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I shall just say two words-not at any length. So far as transfer of territory is concerned, the question does not arise, because it was decided that only Parliament could do it. In fact, an amendment of the Constitution is required. So the question does not arise. Nothing more can be done than that.

As regards the question of sending forces abroad, there is no doubt that in law or in constitution the executive can do so. There is no doubt about that, whether it is desirable for the executive to do so or whether we should have some constitutional barrier or not is another matter. I do not think it would be right to do that. You authorise the Government-the Constitution authorises it, and facts and circumstances authorise it perhaps-to declare war even, which is the most serious thing that any government can ever do. Now here in the present case, you send some forces in agreement with the United Nations. That is far easier and far simpler than declaring war. And, I do not think it would be right. Of course, even in this case, long before we sent them, that is, when we decided to do so, we came to the House and informed the House. If the House wanted not to send them it was open to it to say so. It cannot be done overnight-this kind of thing. But, I think, looking not at the present but to the future, that it would not be a good thing to put some kind of constitutional barrier to this being done, even in the case of an emergency.

## China

### **309. For the Speaker: Chinese Delegates to the World Peace Council<sup>41</sup>**

I would submit to Mr Speaker that the matters referred to in the Calling Attention notice and the Short Notice question do not deserve a special statement in the House. They have already been mentioned in the course of questions and supplementaries and I have dealt with them. Nothing more can be said except in regard to the suggestion that the Indian Government has not allowed Chinese delegates of the World Peace Council to stay longer in India. This is not correct. What happened was that after the incident in Vigyan Bhavan,<sup>42</sup> External Affairs Ministry enquired from the organisers of the Peace Council how long the Chinese delegates intended to stay in Delhi. In the reply received, it was stated that they would leaving as soon as arrangements for their return could be made as the Council meeting was over. Thereafter no further steps were taken.

### **310. In the Rajya Sabha: Chou En-lai's Speeches<sup>43</sup>**

Nawab Singh Chauhan:<sup>44</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) how far the news item published in the newspapers to the effect that the Chinese Government have published a collection of the speeches delivered by Prime Minister Chou En-lai during his tour of India, Burma, Nepal and Cambodia last year, in which, and in the map appended to which, India has been shown under imperialist domination and Bhutan

---

<sup>41</sup> Note, 1 April 1961, to the Director (c).

<sup>42</sup> The Chinese delegation walked out of a cultural function on 25 March 1961, see SWJN/SS/67/item 260.

<sup>43</sup> Oral Answers, 20 April 1961. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXIV, Nos 1-7, 19-27 April 1961, cols 153-155.

<sup>44</sup> Congress.

has been shown as aligned with the socialist countries like China, is correct; and

(b) whether Government have sent a protest note to the Chinese Government in this connection?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon) (a) and (b). The speeches of the Chinese Prime Minister and the map are contained in a pamphlet entitled "Victory of the Five Principles", a limited number of copies of which have come to our notice recently. The pamphlet is stated to have been printed in the People's Republic of China but was not to our knowledge being distributed officially. It was not considered worthy of serious notice as Government of India's policy of non-alignment and the position of Bhutan are well-known to require clarification or reiteration.

[Translation begins:

Nawab Singh Chauhan: That is alright, but does the Government know that its copies—as has been accepted that they have been printed in China— are being publicised clandestinely in India? What is the policy of the Government for stopping the publicity of these copies?

Translation ends]

Lakshmi Menon: Sir, we have already pointed out that the Ministry of Finance has issued instructions to Collectors of Customs and others to seize such copies, whenever they are found.

Jaswant Singh: If a foreign country sees a pamphlet derogatory to the integrity of any country, is it not necessary that it should be contradicted? In this case, Sir, China, in regard to Sikkim or Bhutan, says that it does not belong to India, and we keep quiet. Is it not likely to create some misunderstanding, Sir?

Jawaharlal Nehru: This has been contradicted many times in this House and outside—this allegation of China. How does the hon. Member think that this has

remained uncontradicted? This particular pamphlet by itself is not contradicted, but these allegations have been contradicted many times.

Jaswant Singh:<sup>45</sup> This pamphlet is an official pamphlet issued by the Government of China.

Chairman:<sup>46</sup> It is not official. That is what the answer says.

Rajendra Pratap Sinha:<sup>47</sup> If it is not official will the Prime Minister draw the attention of the Government of China that such publications are being published from China?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think that would serve any particular purpose. It is rather undignified for us, in a matter like this, to go up to China, when we know that very often they are deliberately doing something which we disapprove of again and again. Why should we give publicity and attach so much importance to it, to this pamphlet? The fact remains that that allegation has been contradicted.

Rajendra Pratap Sinha: In the case of Nepal, Sir, there were publications issued by a number of agencies. Is it not a fact that the Government of India drew the attention of the Government of Nepal to such publications? If that is so, why does the Government consider it unnecessary to do that in the case of China?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, Sir, I can hardly enter into any argument on this question. It is a question of judgment as to what, in a particular set of circumstances, is desirable or not in consonance with our dignity.

Rajendra Pratap Sinha: Will the Government place that pamphlet in the Library

---

<sup>45</sup> Independent.

<sup>46</sup> Sarvepalli Rashakrishnan.

<sup>47</sup> PSP.

so that we can have a look at it?

Chairman: I do not know where the pamphlet is. Next question.

**311. In the Rajya Sabha: Maps in Communist States<sup>48</sup>**

Maheswar Naik:<sup>49</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that in the recent maps issued by all the countries of Communist bloc in Asia and East Europe some 50,000 sq. miles of the Indian territory in the Himalayan regions have been shown as included inside the Chinese boundaries; and

(b) if so, whether Government have taken up the matter with these countries?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon): (a) and (b). We have come across only a few such maps from Eastern European and Asian countries and in those cases due diplomatic representations have been made by us.

Maheswar Naik: May I know whether there has been any effect of the correspondence with these countries?

Lakshmi Menon: Yes, Sir. There is some effect. We have received some type of assurance from East Germany and Hanoi that these maps are not intended to be published and distributed. From other countries we have not received any reply.

Maheswar Naik: Have these countries which have given an assurance withdrawn

---

<sup>48</sup> Oral Answers, 20 April 1961. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXIV, Nos 1-7, 19-27 April 1961, cols 164-168.

<sup>49</sup> Congress.

their maps or even corrected their maps?

Lakshmi Menon: They have withdrawn their maps and they will not print them again.

N. Sri Rama Reddy:<sup>50</sup> May I know the area of Indian territory included in these maps?

Lakshmi Menon: Aksai Chin area, Bhutan and North Eastern Frontier.

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not an identical thing. They only think they are similar but the delineation is wrong. As between themselves they are varying.

Jaswant Singh:<sup>51</sup> Every now and then such maps are being issued by Communist countries. Every time the claim of China increases on our territory, these maps are issued by those countries including Russia. I would like to know whether my reply particularly from Russia has been received.

Lakshmi Menon: No, Sir.

Jaswant Singh: Do they not reply to our representations or what is the position?

Lakshmi Menon: The position is that we have not received any reply from the Soviet Government.

H.N. Kunzru:<sup>52</sup> Have you reminded them recently of the letter sent by you originally?

---

<sup>50</sup> Congress.

<sup>51</sup> Independent.

<sup>52</sup> Independent.

Chairman:<sup>53</sup> When no replies are received, reminders have been sent.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Sir, we have reminded them from time to time. Atlases are not issued annually. They remain for some years. Apart from that it is the normal attitude which many of these countries have taken up that "we are publishing or we publish and we shall correct it when necessity arises." What I mean is that the mere act of correction becomes for them a political step taken, and they are somewhat reluctant to take an active political step. In the more recent maps they have shown something—for instance, it is a fixed line, now they have shown it as undulated or uncertain or some such marks. I think we have followed this practice of drawing their attention to this and protesting against it, but apart from reminding them from time to time there has been little else that we could do, and we have not thought it desirable to do so because we realise the difficulties in this matter for them suddenly to withdraw a large number of maps which they have printed and change them on an issue of this kind.

H.N. Kunzru: Have we any reason to suppose that when the next edition of the maps is published, Russia will make the corrections desired by India?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know. How can I say?

Jaswant Singh: During the last four or five years a series of maps have been issued, and every time in the Communist countries including Russia they have formed a line based on the increased claims of China. This being the position, does not Government consider this matter serious enough?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not quite understood the question.

Chairman: For a number of years these maps are issued and they are incorrect. Don't you think it is sufficiently serious to draw their attention that some

---

<sup>53</sup> Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan.

changes should be made? That is his question.

Jaswant Singh: Not only that, but the incorrectness increases with the increased claims of China.

Chairman: Correct maps are being issued by us.

Jaswant Singh: That does not meet my point.

Faridul Haq Ansari:<sup>54</sup> In view of the statement that the hon. Prime Minister has made, may I take it that these countries are reluctant to correct the maps?

Jawaharlal Nehru: If they do not correct them, presumably they show some reluctance, and the reason for the reluctance is obvious, that the act of correcting a map which they have issued itself becomes a major political act. In the circumstances as they are we have sent them our maps and we have drawn their attention to the incorrect maps. We have sent them these long official reports, the reports of the Indian and Chinese officials about the border and all that. We have drawn their attention, but it becomes a major issue for them to do something of that type, because just as we protest, other people protest the other way.

H.N. Kunzru: Did they consult India before issuing their maps since they knew that there were differences on this point between India and China?

Jawaharlal Nehru: When the maps were issued, the differences in these matters had not come to the fore as they had done in the last two years. Anyhow there were no consultations, and normally if we draw our maps, we do not go about consulting other countries. We get maps of other countries probably and decide for ourselves what is the right map.

---

<sup>54</sup> PSP.

H.N. Kunzru: Does this mean that the Chinese map is the right map?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I should imagine that they based their original maps before this dispute came in on the original maps of China.

M.S. Gurupadaswamy:<sup>55</sup> The Prime Minister just now said that the correction of these maps may mean taking a political step. May I know whether the Prime Minister is aware that the publication of such maps by those countries itself constitutes a political step?

Chairman: The publication of incorrect maps is itself a political step as the correction of those maps will constitute another political step. That is what he says. Next question.

### **312. In the Lok Sabha: Sealing of the Bhutan-Tibet Border<sup>56</sup>**

Question:<sup>57</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Bhutan is sealing her border with Tibet?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Sadath Ali Khan): The reference is presumably to the entry of Tibetan refugees. The Government of Bhutan may desire to prevent further influx of refugees into Bhutan, as they are finding it difficult to settle those refugees who are already in Bhutan. So far as the Government of India are concerned, there has been no change in our attitude towards the grant of asylum to Tibetan refugees.

P.C. Borooah: May I know whether Government has decided to screen Tibetan

---

<sup>55</sup> Congress.

<sup>56</sup> Oral Answers, 24 April 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. LV, 22 April- 5 May 1961, cols 13304-13307.

<sup>57</sup> By P.C. Borooah and five others, four Congress and one Socialist.

refugees crossing the border to determine whether they are genuine refugees coming to India? If so, what is the screening method envisaged?

Sadath Ali Khan: Strict screening is being done of fresh arrivals.

Ram Subhag Singh:<sup>58</sup> May I know the number of refugees who came via Bhutan—I mean the Tibetan refugees who have been received by the Government of India and who came via Bhutan?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think I would be able to give the number of those who came from Bhutan. But, broadly speaking, the total number of who have come to India is about 30,000.

[Mahavir] Tyagi:<sup>59</sup> Are the Government sure that among these Tibetan refugees there are no fifth columnists—of Chinese communists? Is there any method by which they could judge whether a refugee is a genuine refugee or not?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Attempts are made to screen them fairly thoroughly. But, if, in spite of this, there is failure to discover such persons—it may so happen—it cannot be absolutely guaranteed. But, one tries one's best to do it.

Harish Chandra Mathur:<sup>60</sup> What is the present inflow of refugees during these months? Has it decreased or increased; how does it stand?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think there has been any marked change. The inflow continues to be on a relatively small scale.

Yadav Narayan Jadhav:<sup>61</sup> May I know whether it is a fact that the Bhutan Government had expressed that they have not got any proper machinery to screen these refugees? What steps are being taken by our Government to

---

<sup>58</sup> Congress.

<sup>59</sup> Congress.

<sup>60</sup> Congress.

<sup>61</sup> PSP.

screen them?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We screen them when they come to India.

Yadav Narayan Jadhav: What about Bhutan saying that they have not got the proper machinery?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know whether they do or do not. But, we screen them when they come to India, but although as they enter Bhutan, as far as I know.

Ram Subhag Singh: Now that the Tibet-Bhutan border has been finally sealed, may I know whether suitable steps have been taken by the Government of Bhutan, in consultation with the Government of India to dispose of the produce which they wish to sell in Tibet and also to make the supply, they wish to get from the Tibetan side?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not hear the last part of the hon. Member's question, Suitable steps for what?

Ram Subhag Singh: The agricultural and other produce which they wish to dispose of in the Tibetan markets and also to get the supply which they wish to get from the Tibetan side.

Speaker:<sup>62</sup> What steps have Government taken?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think there is very much trade between Bhutan and there, at the present moment. It is rather standstill. I do not think they have taken any particular steps. That is the position. That is, naturally, rather injurious to the interests of the traders in the border. That is true. But, on the

---

<sup>62</sup> M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar.

whole, the Bhutan Government has preferred not to encourage this trade.

Yadav Narayan Jadhav: May I know whether the Bhutan Government has promised these agriculturists of the border land that the Bhutan Government will purchase the surplus of corn? What sort of help is our Government extending in this respect?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the Bhutan Government has informed their agriculturists. We have not been called upon to give them any help in this respect. We are helping them in many other ways.

### **313. In the Rajya Sabha: Restriction on Indian Diplomats in Lhasa<sup>63</sup>**

Maheswar Naik:<sup>64</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the reports to the effect that restrictions on the movements of Indian diplomats and their families in Lhasa have been further tightened and they are now virtually under house arrest, is correct;
- (b) whether it is a fact that the Indians in Lhasa military prisons, whose number nearly a thousand, are being subjected to inhuman tortures; and
- (c) if so, what action is being taken by Government in the matter?

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

- (a) While the restrictions on the movement of our personnel of the Consulate General and Trade Agencies outside the urban limits and their functioning in Tibet continue, there has been no further tightening of such measures recently.
- (b) The Government is not aware of this.
- (c) As will be observed from various Notes published in the series of White

---

<sup>63</sup> Written Answers, 1 May 1961. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXIV, Nos 8-13, 28 April - 5 May 1961, col. 1373.

<sup>64</sup> Congress.

Papers on Sino-Indian relations, we have been repeatedly urging the Chinese Government to remove the difficulties experienced by our Missions and our nationals in Tibet.

### **314. In the Rajya Sabha: Chinese Activities in Bhutan and Sikkim<sup>65</sup>**

N. Sri Rama Reddy:<sup>66</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Chinese have started leaflet war in Bhutan and Sikkim, spreading panic and inciting people against the Indians there?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon): Our enquiries do not confirm any such leaflet war in Bhutan and Sikkim.

N. Sri Rama Reddy: May I know, Sir, if any other type of spying or anti- Indian activities are being carried on by the Chinese in these border States of Sikkim and Bhutan?

Lakshmi Menon: Sir, if any such activities are carried on, suitable action will be taken by the Government.

N. Sri Rama Reddy: May I know if it is a fact that one of the Chinese soldiers was captured by our Army in Sikkim recently, when he was trying to do some spying?

Lakshmi Menon: Sir, it is true that we did capture a Chinese in Sikkim.

---

<sup>65</sup> Oral Answers, 4 May 1961, Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXIV, 28 April- 5 May 1961, cols 1948-1950.

<sup>66</sup> Congress.

Chairman:<sup>67</sup> The Prime Minister will answer it.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Sir, the first part of the question is correct; the second is doubtful that is to say, a Chinese soldier was captured there. As it appears, he deliberately came to be captured, but whether he was doing espionage work or not, it is very doubtful. In fact, Sir, it is not likely to be true, because he came and gave himself up practically. If I may say so, a spy does not normally do this kind of thing.

Savitry Devi Nigam:<sup>68</sup> Is it a fact that he is one of the Tibetan refugees who wanted to cross the border and come in, and people has just by mistake taken him to be a spy or something like that?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think so. I think he is a Chinese, not a Tibetan.

Jaswant Singh:<sup>69</sup> Sir, the Deputy Minister has said that if any such anti- Indian activities or propaganda are carried on, suitable action will be taken by the Government. Action will be taken by which Government, Sir? By the Indian Government or the Government of Sikkim and Bhutan?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Such action, I presume, will normally be taken by the Government of Sikkim. Bhutan is a separate Government, of course. Because there is no apparatus for the Indian Government to function in Bhutan, it has to be taken by the Government of Bhutan and Bhutan only. Nobody else can do it. 'In Sikkim also it is the Government of Sikkim which will do it. Of course, there are our representatives, political officers or others in Sikkim who can draw the attention of the Sikkim Government to these things, but actual steps will be taken by the Government of Sikkim.

---

<sup>67</sup> Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan.

<sup>68</sup> Congress.

<sup>69</sup> Independent.

### **315. In the Rajya Sabha: Sabotage in Jammu and Kashmir<sup>70</sup>**

Nawab Singh Chauhan:<sup>71</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Press report to the effect that the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir told the Kashmir Legislature on the 25th of March, 1961, that as a result of the activities of Pakistani and Chinese saboteurs, 24 persons lost their lives and other losses were suffered between January, 1959 and December, 1960, is correct; and
- (b) if so, what is the total number of incidents of sabotaging which occurred during the same period and who were responsible for those incidents?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon): (a) and (b). The hon. Member presumably refers to the statement by the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir made on the 26th February, 1961.

According to our information the total number of sabotage incidents— such as bomb explosions unexploded materials planted by saboteurs and the recovery of explosives from the dead or alive saboteurs— is 188. Ten persons lost their lives in these incidents. All of them involved Pakistani nationals.

There has been no incident involving Chinese saboteurs. However, in October, 1959 the Chinese soldiers fired on our patrol party in the Chang Shen-mo valley and killed 10 persons. The figures announced by the Kashmir Premier seem to include this incident and the ten casualties as the result of the activities of Chinese saboteurs, but the Chinese soldiers can hardly be described as saboteurs.

[Translation begins:

Nawab Singh Chauhan: Have some of these saboteurs been arrested? If yes,

---

<sup>70</sup> Oral Answers, 4 May 1961, Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXIV, Nos 8-13, 28 April- 5 May 1961, cols 1959-1963.

<sup>71</sup> Congress.

then how many of them have been arrested? And how many of them have been killed?

Translation ends]

Lakshmi Menon: In 1959 the number of incidents by Pakistanis is 90, and incidents by Chinese 1. The number of persons killed or injured in incidents committed by Pakistanis is 6 killed and 8 injured and in the incident committed by the Chinese 10 killed. In 1960 there were 98 incidents by Pakistanis in which 4 persons were killed and 19 injured.

Jawaharlal Nehru: May I also add that there is a possibility of our mixing up the sabotage incidents that the Pakistanis commit and the Chinese incident? The Chinese incident, of course, is an entirely different thing. It may be called worse than sabotage; whatever it is, it is not sabotage. The House knows very well how one of our police patrols came into conflict with the Chinese there and there was shooting on either side.<sup>72</sup> That is a thing apart but what is important really is that these incidents—sabotage incidents—go on occurring in Kashmir, committed by people who come from Pakistan. This is a continuous thing. Every week we get reports of one, two or three happenings and it is a very serious matter, this kind of thing going on. They have not fortunately done any very grievous injury but small injuries are taking place but it is the atmosphere that produces that and the people who send them to do this—that is very important and deplorable.

Faridul Haq Ansari:<sup>73</sup> May I know, Sir, whether the Kashmir Government has taken any steps to prevent such occurrences there?

---

<sup>72</sup> See Nehru's letter of 27 October 1959 on this matter to V. K. Krishna Menon, SWJN/SS/53/item 174, and other correspondence in the section on China in the same volume; see also Government of India's Note to the Chinese Government, 4 November 1959, from the White Paper II, reproduced as appendix 9 in SWJN/SS/54.

<sup>73</sup> PSP.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Kashmir Government has captured and arrested some of the people. But some of them themselves suffered and the saboteur himself suffered from the explosion of the bomb placed by him. When they have been captured, they have made their confession as to how they came and who sent them, etc.

Jaswant Singh:<sup>74</sup> In regard to this threat of sabotage from Pakistan, have you left the matter altogether to the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, or is the Central Government here also trying to help the Kashmir Government in order to meet the threat of the saboteurs from Pakistan?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Central Government is there to assist them in every way. We have got our Army there, apart from everything else. Obviously it is for their assistance but individual acts of sabotage will obviously be done in a secret manner. They are not done publicly. Somebody at midnight places something near a culvert or under a bridge. He is either captured sometimes or is not. Anyhow, the Army is there to protect and to prevent this kind of thing happening, wherever they can.

Jaswant Singh: Did you bring it to the notice of the Pakistan Government that these serious things were happening there as a matter of everyday occurrence?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It has been brought to the notice of the Pakistan Government on several occasions, I think.

Maheswar Naik:<sup>75</sup> May I know, Sir, whether the Government have taken care to see that these saboteurs are not working inside our own territory? The Prime Minister says that some people are coming from Pakistan off and on. My intention is to know whether those people are staying inside in order to commit

---

<sup>74</sup> Independent.

<sup>75</sup> Congress.

sabotage.

Jawaharlal Nehru: They do not take our permission to do it.

## Tibet

### 316. In the Lok Sabha: Aid for Tibetan Refugees<sup>76</sup>

P.C. Borooh: <sup>77</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) the quantity of food and medical supplies received so far separately from CARE, the unofficial American Relief Organisation, for Tibetan refugees; and
- (b) how much of such relief is expected from that organisation during the forthcoming year?

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

(a) The value of food and medical supplies received from CARE (Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere Inc.) for Tibetan refugees so far has been Rs 44,17,500 and Rs 19,475, respectively.

(b) This organisation has a future programme for distribution of 14,270 maunds of rice during the first half of 1961 of the total value of Rs 8,33,625 and of tools and equipment of the value of Rs 13,000.

P.C. Borooh: May I know how many Tibetan refugees are being fed and given medical aid through the aid received from CARE and whether this aid is being intensified proportionately with the increase in the influx of Tibetan here?

---

<sup>76</sup> Oral Answers, 6 April 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. LIII, 28 March-10 April 1961, cols 9579-9581.

<sup>77</sup> Congress, from Sibsagar, Assam.

Sadath Ali Khan: I require notice to give the number of refugees who are being fed and looked after.

P.C. Borooah: May I know through which agencies this aid has been distributed?

Sadath Ali Khan: The assistance given to Tibetan refugees by various voluntary organisations is channelled through the Central Relief Committee for Tibetan refugees, which co-ordinates the work of receipt and distribution of all gift supplies among the Tibetan refugees in various places in India.

Sadhan Gupta:<sup>78</sup> Some years ago when the Soviet trade unions sent some relief to be distributed through the All India Trade Union Congress, it was decided that relief should be distributed through Government and not through private agencies. May I know whether any similar procedure will be adopted in this case also?

Sadath Ali Khan: I cannot say; I have just said all this aid is channeled through a particular association and that is the present position.

B.K. Gaikwad:<sup>79</sup> May I know how much our Government have spent on Tibetan refugees?

Sadath Ali Khan: The expenditure incurred by the Government of India from May 1959 till the end of 31st March, 1960 was roughly Rs 47 lakhs and voluntary non-official organisations spent almost an equivalent amount for the relief of Tibetan refugees in India. The figures for the financial year ending 31st March, 1961 are not available, though the initial expenditure by Government is about Rs 55 lakhs.

---

<sup>78</sup> CPI.

<sup>79</sup> SCF.

### **317. In the Lok Sabha: Tibetan Leaders in Darjeeling<sup>80</sup>**

D.C. Sharma:<sup>81</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether any representations have been received from various Tibetan institutions, monasteries and representatives of Tibetan refugees in Darjeeling and Kalimpong requesting to withdraw orders prohibiting three Tibetan leaders from entering Darjeeling district; and
- (b) if so, the action taken thereon?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b). Yes, three Tibetans were asked to remove themselves from the Darjeeling district as it was stated that they had caused disaffection among Tibetan refugees. As representations were received in regard to this matter, it was given further consideration. In the event of their giving assurance of good behaviour, they may be allowed to return.

### **318. In the Lok Sabha: Tibetan Refugees from Bhutan<sup>82</sup>**

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

- (a) whether four hundred more Tibetan refugees have lately arrived in Darjeeling from Bhutan; and
- (b) if so, what is the total number of such refugees in that district now?

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

- (a) 358 Tibetan refugees reached Darjeeling between 23rd February and 17th

---

<sup>80</sup> Written Answers, 6 April 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol, LIII, 28 March -10 April 1961, col. 9615.

<sup>81</sup> Congress.

<sup>82</sup> Written Answers, 11 April 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. LIV, 11 April- 21 April 1961, col, 10475.

March, 1961.

(b) Total number of Tibetan refugees in Darjeeling district was 4343 till the 3rd April, 1961.

### **319. Talks with the Dalai Lama<sup>83</sup>**

The Prime Minister received His Holiness the Dalai Lama at P.M.'s House on Sunday the 16th of April last, and the talks lasted for over 90 minutes. The Secretary General was present.<sup>84</sup> Having thanked P.M. for inviting him to Delhi, the Dalai Lama said that he had come to the conclusion that the only hope of preservation of Tibetan culture and religion now lies in those Tibetans especially children who have come to India. The object of his visit to Delhi, therefore, was to discuss with the Prime Minister the various important problems dealing with the rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees with special reference to the drawing up a suitable programme for the education of young people, both boys and girls below 16 years in age.

The Dalai Lama added that as for the rest, broadly speaking, only two schemes have so far been finalised which cater for the rehabilitation of refugees as agriculturists. One of these was being implemented in Mysore and the other in NEFA. The Prime Minister said that he wanted the Tibetans to grow up as an .integrated community with due safeguards for the maintenance of their tradition, culture and religion. He added that in order to make a proper assessment of the problem of rehabilitation, it was necessary to consider it in two or more parts. He was himself specially interested in the education of the young people, and this, therefore, must assume topmost priority. The Prime Minister wanted to make it clear that the Government of India had the responsibility to provide education to every Tibetan child of school-going age. The programme of education did not include just primary education, but also

---

<sup>83</sup> On 16 April 1961. Record dated 17 April 1961, prepared by K.L. Mehta, Joint Secretary. MEA, File No. 2/31-EAD/61-TRC.

<sup>84</sup> R. K. Nehru, Secretary General at the MEA.

secondary education, and for those who would benefit from it, University education. He had no doubt that the future of the Tibetans in India depended on the quality of education given to them, and it would be entirely artificial to lay down an upper limit in regard to the number of young people to be educated. The Prime Minister emphasised that the education should be good, with due regard to the traditional background of Tibetans, and at the same time modern. It was important to realise that whereas separate schools will be provided for primary education, and also at the secondary stage, the syllabus would have to be designed in such a way as to enable the students to join Indian polytechnics, and those likely to benefit from it also Indian Universities. We could not obviously provide separate polytechnics and separate Universities for Tibetan children only. Indeed having completed their secondary stage, it would not even be right for the Tibetan children to remain cut off from the rest of India. The Prime Minister added that arrangements to provide religious instruction to Tibetan boys even at the University stage could be made separately, if the Dalai Lama so wished. It must be understood, however, that the educational programme for Tibetans should be drawn up to ensure development of the Tibetan children along the lines of their genius, and also to ensure that the actual education given was fully modern in the sense that it equipped the boys and girls to join Indian Universities and Polytechnics in due course.

The Dalai Lama said that he was in full agreement with the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister. He added that there were 3000 Tibetan refugee children below the age of 16 in India at the moment. Arrangements have so far been made to provide education to only some 500 amongst them. He added that the help of the State Governments concerned such as Mysore, U.P. and Punjab would be necessary in running the schools, but at the same time it was essential that there should be a common approach in running all the Tibetan schools irrespective of where they happened to be situated.

After some discussion and after taking note of the fact that the Nursery School at Dharamsala is now running on the whole, satisfactorily, and that the U.K. "Save the Children Fund" Project, recently discussed in Delhi by Lady Alexandra

Metcalfe<sup>85</sup> is to be started shortly, the Prime Minister felt that the entire question of drawing up of a programme of education for Tibetan children including the opening of schools, the drawing of syllabus, the production of text books and other such details, should be made the responsibility of a Committee to be set up in New Delhi. The membership of the Committee would consist of a representative each from the Ministries of External Affairs and Education, and representative of the Dalai Lama. To these, representatives of the State Governments concerned, viz. Mysore, U.P., Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, NEFA and J&K would be invited as may be necessary from time to time. This Committee will make policy, have a wide discretion, and take necessary steps to ensure that the decisions of the Government of India in such matters as the opening of schools, the training of teachers are being carried out according to the approved programme. The Committee will have a Special Officer on a whole-time basis as its Secretary. This officer will go round looking after the schools, liaising with the Dalai Lama, and the State Governments concerned, and generally to assist the Committee in seeing that the decisions are being carried out.

The Dalai Lama expressed himself wholly willing to give his fullest co-operation to the Committee and to nominate his representative on it. The Prime Minister directed me to call on the Education Minister to inform him with the list of discussion that had taken place and also to seek his advice in regard to the constitution of the proposed Committee. The Prime Minister emphasised that this policy Committee will consider the problem as a whole. The Committee will also consider that what to do with Tibetan refugees in the age group of 16- 20 to which the Dalai Lama made a special reference. It might for example be possible to train them as technicians while others may be found jobs in factories and elsewhere.

In this connection, a reference was made to the Dalai Lama's offer to make available a sum of Rs 20 lakhs for being spent on the education of Tibetan refugees during the next 4 years. The Prime Minister asked the Dalai Lama to

---

<sup>85</sup> (1904-1995); daughter of UN. Curzon, Governor-General of India, 1900- 1905.

consider whether he should not create a trust fund for the education of Tibetan refugees and generally towards the rehabilitation of these people. This would ensure that the funds are properly invested, and incidentally, this would also mean that the profits would be free from income-tax. The Dalai Lama promised to consider this advice and added that as soon as this 4-year period was over, he hoped to earmark the profits of a pipe making factory in Bihar, which he has already started in Bihar, in co-operation with Indian businessmen and on the advice of an expert from Chicago.<sup>86</sup>

The Dalai Lama expressed his heartfelt thanks to the Prime Minister for his views on the education of Tibetan refugees and expressed himself in whole-hearted agreement with the P.M.'s views. The Prime Minister then touched upon the question of settlement of refugees, who would not be covered by the education programme. He said that we should go ahead with the settlement of 3,000 refugees in Mysore, and when this has been completed take up with the Mysore Government the question of settling another 2,000 if not more refugees in the forest areas nearby.

The Prime Minister gave his approval to the suggestion that a few more schemes on the lines of the Bhalukpong Scheme<sup>87</sup> should be drawn up and implemented in other parts of NEFA. Similarly, we should re-double our efforts in settling refugees in Ladakh away from the border.

A reference was made to a recent suggestion from the Sikkim Durbar that they would rehabilitate 1,000 to 1,500 as agriculturists and tea-growers in Western Sikkim. The Prime Minister enquired whether the promised scheme had been received from Sikkim.

The Prime Minister approved the suggestion that efforts should be made with the Government of Bhutan to settle refugees already in Bhutan and necessary financial and administrative help given to the Government of Bhutan.

---

<sup>86</sup> See reference to the pipe making factory in the Rajya Sabha, item 325.

<sup>87</sup> A forest settlement for 500 Tibetan refugees about 40 miles from Tezpur. See Story of the Tibetan Refugees (New Delhi: Central Relief Committee, n.d.), pp. 53-54. This publication is available in the NMML, J.B. Kripalani Papers II Instalment, File No. 110.

(Shrimati Rukmini Devi<sup>88</sup> told me some time ago that the Government of Madras would like to help in the task of rehabilitating Tibetan refugees. Enquiries may be made from that Government whether they are in a position to make land available for the settlement of Tibetan refugees.)<sup>89</sup>

Finally the Dalai Lama made a reference to the old and the infirm who do not depend on anyone and who should be looked after. The Prime Minister felt that statistics of such people should be obtained and steps taken urgently to provide a home for them. This should be progressed further in consultation with the Dalai Lama.

The Prime Minister concluded by saying that it would greatly help in the understanding and solution of the question of rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees if the entire number, viz. 28,000 to 30,000 now in India are divided in various categories to determine how many amongst them would be absorbed in schools, in handicraft centres, as agriculturists, as workers on our road programme (and for how long) etc. The lamas amongst the 28,000 to 30,000 refugees number 5,000. The Dalai Lama said that of them 1,700 are already being looked after by Government. I mentioned that the required information under various head was available and that this would be further checked up and brought up- to-date in consultation with the Dalai Lama.

Separately the Prime Minister told me that he was dissatisfied with the progress achieved in implementing the programme of education for Tibetan children. He added that he attached the utmost importance to this question and wanted it to be known that the education to be given must be of good quality.<sup>90</sup>

K.L. Mehta

17.4.61

---

<sup>88</sup> Rukmini Devi Arundale, nominated MP to Rajya Sabha.

<sup>89</sup> This paragraph within brackets seems to be an intervention by K. L. Mehta.

<sup>90</sup> This last paragraph seems to be an aside by Nehru to K. L. Mehta. See also item 322.

### 320. To K. Kamaraj: Settling Tibetans<sup>91</sup>

April 19, 1961

My dear Kamaraj,

Rukmini Devi, MP, has told our Deputy Minister, Lakshmi Menon, that the Madras Government is willing to take charge of some Tibetan families in the same way as Mysore has done. I shall be glad if you will kindly let me know of your willingness to do so.

The Mysore Government has given us a fairly large tract of land near Coorg to settle Tibetan families for agricultural purposes. This is at 3000 feet altitude and is a forest area. We have thus far sent 1000 persons there and it is intended to bring this number up to 3000. Later it may be increased even to 5000. The idea is to have a regular colony of Tibetans so that they can live their own communal life there and, at the same time, have schools, etc., for their training.

We should be glad to settle some of them in some part of Madras State if you are agreeable to this. But two factors have to be borne in mind. One is that the climate should not be too warm. Thus, the location will have to be somewhere in the foothills. Secondly, there is no point in sending too few families. There must be enough to form a community. We think that the minimum number is about 1000, that is, about 200 or 250 families. Sending a smaller number will not be advisable as they will be too few to build up any kind of community life of their own.

If, therefore, you can find suitable land for about a thousand persons to do agricultural work, etc., we shall be happy to avail ourselves of your offer. The costs of settlement, etc., of these people will naturally be borne by the Government of India. But we shall have to function with the help of the Madras Government. That is the arrangement arrived at with Mysore.

Yours sincerely,  
Jawaharlal Nehru

---

<sup>91</sup> Letter to the Chief Minister of Madras, copied to Subimal Dutt and to K. L. Mehta, JS (MEA).

### **321. In the Lok Sabha: Khampa Refugees in Ladakh<sup>92</sup>**

P.C. Borooah:<sup>93</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether some more Khampa refugees have recently crossed into Ladakh;
- (b) if so, how many have entered since the beginning of this year; and
- (c) whether they have been properly sheltered?

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

(a) and (b). 67 Khampa refugees entered Ladakh direct from Tibet during this year till 4th April, 1961.

(c) The J & K Government have been requested to formulate a scheme for the rehabilitation of these refugees including those who arrived earlier in Ladakh.

### **322. To K.N. Katju: Settling Tibetans<sup>94</sup>**

April 24, 1961

My dear Kailas Nath,

I came back from Bhopal today rather tired, but I am glad I went there. Thank you for all you did.

There was one matter I wanted to talk to you about, but forgot to do so.

The Dalai Lama was here for a number of days discussing with us the question

---

<sup>92</sup> Written Answers, 24 April 1961. Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. LV, 22 April- 5 May 1961, cols 13348-13349.

<sup>93</sup> Congress.

<sup>94</sup> Letter to the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh.

of rehabilitating the Tibetan refugees in India.<sup>95</sup> There is no chance, as far as one can see, of their being able to return, to Tibet. I am particularly interested in the boys and girls receiving good education. Probably in the future these Tibetans who are now in India will be the only real Tibetans left.

We are making special arrangements for the education of those boys and girls. So far as the Lamas are concerned, they are being settled in two or three places near monasteries and the like.

The Dalai Lama has been anxious to have agricultural colonies of Tibetans. With the help of the Mysore Government, we have got a good place on the uplands near Coorg, about 3,000 feet high, for such a colony of 3,000 persons. Over a thousand have moved there already; others will go as soon as arrangements have been made. Possibly we might be able to increase this number to 5,000 in Mysore. I think this is likely to be a good colony.

But this does not exhaust the Tibetan agriculturists, and something more has to be done for them in the shape of colonies. The Dalai Lama particularly mentioned to me the possibility of some of them going to Madhya Pradesh. I told him that I would enquire

I want to know from you if there is any possibility of this.

It has to be remembered, however that they cannot be settled anywhere and everywhere. They cannot stand the great heat of our plains. They must, therefore, go to a place at a fair altitude where the heat is not very great.

Mysore has suited them more or less because it is 3,000 feet high. Also it is no good sending very small numbers of them anywhere. The minimum number for some kind of a community life in a colony would be about 250 families, making a total of approximately 1,000 persons.

I should like to know if you think this is at all feasible anywhere in Madhya Pradesh where these two conditions can be satisfied. So far as the expenditure on such a project is concerned, that will be set entirely by the Central Government.

Yours affectionately,

---

<sup>95</sup> See item319.

**323. In the Lok Sabha: Manasarovar Pilgrims<sup>96</sup>**

[Translation begins:

Bhakt Darshan:<sup>97</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state in reply to the starred question No. 781:

- ( a) What is the result of the correspondence with the Chinese Government for removing difficulties in the way of and grant of more facilities to Indian pilgrims going to Kailash and Manasarovar; and
- (b) For this year's pilgrimage season, what special arrangements are being made for Indian pilgrims?

Translation ends]

Sadath Ali Khan:<sup>98</sup> I shall read it in English also.

(a) The Chinese Government have not replied to our representations about grant of facilities of Indian pilgrims as envisaged by the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954.

(b) The Indian Trade Agent, Gartok, will render all possible assistance on being approached by pilgrims.

[Translation begins:

Bhakt Darshan: Sir, how far it is true that the Chinese Government is giving permission to Indian pilgrims to go through only one pass, and that too on their own responsibility; and is it not against the 1954 Agreement? If yes, what steps are being taken about it?

Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): Yes, it is true

---

<sup>96</sup> Congress.

<sup>97</sup> See fn 112 in this section.

<sup>98</sup> Congress, and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister.

that the Chinese Government has told us that it would be better if people use one route. Now, it can be said that they had earlier decided that several routes could have been used, and now they say this; and how it does not match with that. But obviously, it may mean that if other routes are used, there might be safety issues; and this might be the result of some internal inconveniences.

Bhakt Darshan: Sir, if this is the situation, I would like to know what the advice of the Indian Government is to Indian pilgrims and what arrangements are being made for them?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The advice of the Indian Government is that as far as possible, take the route suggested by the Chinese Government. And if they want to go by some other route they can do so on their own responsibility.

M.S. Aney:<sup>99</sup> Parliamentary Secretary, Sir, has said in his reply that no reply has come from the Chinese Government. I want to know on which date the letter was dispatched from here. How much time has gone by since?

Jawaharlal Nehru: This has been written several times. I do not have the dates with me at the moment.

Translation ends]

[K.R.] Achar:<sup>100</sup> There were paper reports recently that there are disturbing circumstances there and, therefore, those who go there must make their own security arrangements. May I know whether Government will be able to do anything in the matter?

Jawaharlal Nehru: They must make arrangements for security for themselves in those regions.

[Translation begins:

---

<sup>99</sup> See fn 115 in this section.

<sup>100</sup> Congress.

D. N. Tiwary:<sup>101</sup> Does the Government have any information that Indians who have gone through routes, other than the prescribed ones by China, have encountered any danger; and if so, what kind of danger? What kind of problems have they faced?

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no specific information about it. There are general rumours.

Bhakt Darshan: Sir, whatever information has so far been received in this connection has come from the local authorities of Tibet. Since it is a very important subject, will there be an attempt to solve it by writing to the highest authority of China-the Prime Minister of China?

Translation ends]

Mr. Deputy Speaker:<sup>102</sup> It is a suggestion.

[Translation begins:

Raja Mahendra Pratap.<sup>103</sup> This issue comes up every now and then. This means we have not been able to get the Chinese Government to make any proper arrangement. I am trying to go to Peking. Is it possible for us to arrive at an agreement with China on a big scale so that these small Issues get resolved forever?

Deputy Speaker: This is a matter of opinion, it may be possible for you, but may not be for others.

Translation ends]

Brajeshwar Prasad:<sup>104</sup> Is the route indicated by the Chinese the shortest or the longest route to Manasarovar?

---

<sup>101</sup> See fn 118 in this section.

<sup>102</sup> Hukam Singh.

<sup>103</sup> See fn 121 in this section.

<sup>104</sup> Congress.

Jawaharlal Nehru: That depends where you start measuring from.

### **324. In the Rajya Sabha: Dalai Lama Seeking Support<sup>105</sup>**

Nawab Singh Chauhan:<sup>106</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether his attention has been invited to the statement made by the Dalai Lama on the 10th March, 1961, in which he has appealed to India and other members of the Commonwealth for lending their full support in the United Nations to the cause of liberating Tibet from Chinese aggressors;<sup>107</sup> and
- (b) if so, whether Government have received any formal appeal from the Dalai Lama in this regard?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) The Government have seen the reported statement of the Dalai Lama.
- (b) The Dalai Lama addressed a letter to the Prime Minister urging such support.

[Translation begins:

Nawab Singh Chauhan: Has any action been taken on this letter?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Dalai Lama Saheb had come here a few days ago and we had a talk with him.<sup>108</sup> Our policies have been explained to him.

Translation ends]

---

<sup>105</sup> Oral Answers, 25 April 1961. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXIV, Nos 1-7, 19-27 April 1961, pp. 617-621.

<sup>106</sup> Congress.

<sup>107</sup> For the Dalai Lama's statement, see SWJN/SS/67/item 258 & Appendix 40.

<sup>108</sup> See item 319.

Jaswant Singh: Is it a fact that the Government of India are embarrassed in giving support to Tibet because of the commitments they have made in the past?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Government of India is normally not embarrassed. It has to deal with questions which involve difficult decisions. Being embarrassed does not help in decisions. As a matter of fact so far as this resolution in the U.N. is concerned, it is not being taken up during this session of the U.N.

A.D. Mani:<sup>109</sup> In view of the intense feeling in the country about this matter, would Government consider telling the Dalai Lama that the moral sympathies of the country are with him in the liberation of Tibet?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Our own policy of accepting Tibetan refugees to come here in considerable numbers, in looking after them, in trying to give education to their young people and training, etc., is a more effective testimony of our moral sympathy than a few words said here and there.

Bhupesh Gupta:<sup>110</sup> If the letter is along the lines of the question, then it is assumed that Tibet has to be liberated and aggression has been committed against Tibet. May I know if such a thing had been written in the letter by the Dalai Lama to the Prime Minister which takes Tibet as a separate country- from what the Government of India says, whether it was pointed out to the Dalai Lama that the view of the Government of India in this matter was not what was made out in such a letter and that the Government of India held Tibet as an autonomous region of the Peoples' Republic of China?

Jawaharlal Nehru: In this matter the Government of India's view is not fully the same as that of the Dalai Lama nor is it the same as the hon. Member's opposite.

---

<sup>109</sup> Independent.

<sup>110</sup> CPI.

Bhupesh Gupta: My view is the same as the Prime Minister's view. I supported Panchsheel. I still stand by it. (Interruption). The hon. friends there never supported it. They never supported it, they never understood it. May I know whether it is right for the Dalai Lama to write such a letter and get it published in the Press saying that steps will be taken in the United Nations to get the aggression vacated, and so on, and spread the impression that the Government of India is in sympathy with such things? I am talking of the specific move.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Dalai Lama, when he came here more than two years ago, was told that he was a very welcome guest and all that, but we would not like him to use the soil of India for any active agitation. In determining these things of course it is rather not very easy always. By and large, the Dalai Lama has been careful not to indulge in any such activity as might be considered by us undesirable. We have not come in the way, however, of his occasionally expressing his views about these matters.

Bhupesh Gupta: Is the Prime Minister aware that certain foreign exchange was sanctioned by the Ministry of Finance to facilitate this kind of petition being made or application whatever it is, on behalf of the Dalai Lama at the United Nations, that is describing the position of Tibet as it is here in this question? May I know whether this kind of sanctioning foreign exchange, when we are advising the Dalai Lama not to do so, is in consonance with the policy of the Government when Government does not favour such a kind of thing being made from the soil of India?

Jawaharlal Nehru: That foreign exchange was sanctioned at the request of the External Affairs Ministry by the Finance Ministry, that is the External Affairs Ministry was fully responsible for that because we thought that we should not come in his way of doing this. It is sometimes a little difficult to draw the line as to what we should prohibit and what we should permit. We thought that in this matter we should draw the line so as to allow him to send some of his

representatives to the United Nations.

Faridul Haq Ansari:<sup>111</sup> When the question of this resolution on Tibet in the U.N. General Assembly was raised here, the hon. Prime Minister was good enough to say that the Indian support to the resolution depended on the language of the resolution moved there. May I know whether the Government of India has resiled from that position?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry I have not quite understood this question.

Chairman: The attitude of the Government of India will be decided on the way in which the resolution in the United Nations Assembly is couched.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Actually the Government of India has always decided on the text of the resolution which comes up. It is not decided in the air.

Jaswant Singh: The Prime Minister stated a little while ago on this question that the fact that we are giving asylum to the Tibetans to such a large extent and are looking after them shows that our sympathies are there. On the other hand the Tibetans as a nation are being exterminated by China and we are sitting quiet. How do these things tally?

Bhupesh Gupta: That is the language he would like to pass on.

Chairman: Nothing to know hereafter. Next question.

### **325. In the Rajya Sabha: The Dalai Lama's Investments in India<sup>112</sup>**

---

<sup>111</sup> PSP.

<sup>112</sup> Oral Answers, 1 May 1961. Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. XXXIV, 28April- 5 May 1961, cols 1307-1311.

R.P.N. Sinha:<sup>113</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Dalai Lama's investments in business in India have been made in consultation with Government; and
- (b) if so, what is the extent of these investments?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

- (a) No, Sir.
- (b) The Government understands that the Dalai Lama has invested some money in a Cast Iron Spun Pipe factory but have no knowledge of the extent of the investment.

R.P.N. Sinha: Are Government aware that some unscrupulous persons in the country have been trying to exploit the Dalai Lama financially? If so, do they propose to give him correct advice in the matter?

Jawaharlal Nehru: It is quite possible that unscrupulous people will try to take advantage of any position like that. But I have no particular knowledge of any particular set of unscrupulous persons doing that. The Government have given him general advice suggesting that he should invest his savings or whatever he has in reliable undertakings. That is all the Government has done. But, as has been said, the Dalai Lama has started a cast iron pipe concern for producing cast iron pipes somewhere in the Hazaribagh district in Bihar and he has invested some money in it.<sup>114</sup>

Bhupesh Gupta:<sup>115</sup> In the event of foreigners investing money in our country for starting factories, the general rule is that the Government should see that 51 per cent, of the equity shares is held by Indians. May I know whether in this particular case this rule has been observed and if there has been any

---

<sup>113</sup> Rajeshwar Prasad Narain Sinha, Congress.

<sup>114</sup> See item 319.

<sup>115</sup> CPI.

agreement between the Dalai Lama and the Government that no profits earned here on account of his investment would be allowed to be remitted either to the sterling or the dollar area?

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no agreement of any kind nor is it considered necessary in this case. It appears, so far as we know, that debentures have been taken on behalf of the Tibetan refugees. The rest of the money has been thrown open for public subscription in India and we have been informed that all profits would be used for the Tibetan refugees in India.

Bhupesh Gupta: The hon. Prime Minister has said that these shares have been taken on behalf of the Tibetan refugees. As far as we know, the Company Law does not allow shares being taken in this manner; they have to be taken in certain names.

H.N. Kuzru:<sup>116</sup> Debentures.

Chairman:<sup>117</sup> Debentures.

Diwan Chaman Lall:<sup>118</sup> Debentures, not shares.

Bhupesh Gupta: You have to name the Tibetan refugees. Somebody buys the debentures also. This is the law. Evidently the Ministry has no proper information. May I know, Sir whether in this particular case, these debentures or shares, as the case may be, have been taken in the name of the Dalai Lama or in certain other names and if they have been taken in the names of a large number of people, whether it has occurred to the Government that it might be a method of income-tax avoidance or evasion?

---

<sup>116</sup> Independent.

<sup>117</sup> Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan.

<sup>118</sup> Congress.

Manubhai Shah:<sup>119</sup> All the assumptions of the hon. Member are incorrect. Firstly, this is a normal private sector project under the Industries Act and licensing has been done in the normal way. The Dalai Lama and his friends are owning a portion of this concern, the rest is being thrown open to Indian participation and the stipulation is that as far as possible, for ten years, the capital belonging to the foreign parties namely the Dalai Lama and his associates, would not be repatriable.

Bhupesh Gupta: Now, Sir, we have got a little business answer. Let me proceed. Now, the hon. Minister said that there had been some stipulation, that for ten years to come the capital would not be allowed to be taken out of the country. May I know, Sir, whether there is any such agreement which covers remittances of profit and interest from this country to any country in the sterling area or in the dollar area?

Chairman: The Prime Minister has answered the question and said that it would be used in the interests of the refugees. That is what he said.

Bhupesh Gupta: I know the Prime Minister has his good at heart. The question is relating to the agreement. I would like to know because the Government Industrial Policy Resolution provides such things, and under the Industrial Development Regulations they have such powers, whether any agreement has been arrived at that the remittances of the profits earned will not be allowed, under the stipulation, to be shipped out of the country to the sterling or the dollar area, the stipulation I am talking about.

Manubhai Shah: As far as this country's Industrial Policy Resolution is concerned, there are no restrictions on repatriation of dividends or profits or interest held by any foreigner.

---

<sup>119</sup> Minister of State for Commerce and Industry.

A.D. Mani:<sup>120</sup> Would the Government be able to give an idea of the total value of these investments?

Manubhai Shah: About Rs 40 lakhs.

M.H. Samuel:<sup>121</sup> I just wanted to know what is the authorised capital of this firm, how much was the issued capital, and out of the issued capital how much the Dalai Lama and his Tibetan refugees have taken:

Manubhai Shah: Its authorised capital is Rs 1 crore. The issued capital and the paid-up capital in the first instance will be Rs 40 lakhs, and the share of the Dalai Lama and his brothers and associates will be about Rs. 15 lakhs. The earning of profits will depend upon the profitability of the enterprise when it goes into production.

Bhupesh Gupta: Now, Sir, he said that the authorised capital was Rs 1 crore. May I know, Sir, in, the matter of sanctioning the capital issues and in respect of flotation of Rs 1 crore, whether considerations of priority were taken into account, and whether it involved any foreign exchange expenditure and if so what?

Manubhai Shah: Sir, this is a very high-priority industry because it helps to utilise the pig iron of the country into making pipes, which have a great export potential. Therefore, all these angles have been looked into.

Bhupesh Gupta: What about foreign exchange?

Manubhai Shah: Foreign exchange is covered by the foreign investments of the Dalai Lama.

---

<sup>120</sup> Independent.

<sup>121</sup> Congress.

### 326. In the Lok Sabha: Nehru-Dalai Lama Talks<sup>122</sup>

Question: <sup>123</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Dalai Lama visited New Delhi on the 15th April, this year for having some discussions with him; and
- (b) if so, what were the subjects discussed?

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

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Arrangements for the education of the Tibetan Refugee children in particular and the problems of rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees in general.

Maimoona Sultan: May I know, Sir, if there has been any precedent in history or any other country which granted asylum to political refugees on the conditions that they do not engage themselves in political activities? If not, may I know, what are the reasons that influenced the Government to make this departure from this international practice?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): I do not know if the hon. Member is referring to some general principle in these matters or she wants me to quote instances. It is the normal practice that when asylum is granted, it is done so subject to any condition that the country may think it necessary. The condition is that the soil of their country should not be used for any purposes opposed to them, which might get the country into trouble. It is a normal practice.

---

<sup>122</sup> Written Answers, 2 May 1961, Lok Sabha Debates, Second Series, Vol. LV, 22 April- 5. May 1961, co Is 14819-14821.

<sup>123</sup> By Maimoona Sultan, Congress, and two others, both Congress.

Ranga:<sup>124</sup> Does it mean that we have imposed any conditions on the Dalai Lama and if so, what are those conditions?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We informed the Dalai Lama when he first came here and subsequently that we would not like him to use the soil of India to carry on any operations in regard to Tibet. We just left him to his discretion to function and broadly speaking he has functioned in that way. Occasionally, of course, it is rather difficult always in regard to borderline cases. Sometimes something might have been done by him, which he would have been wiser if he had not done. But broadly speaking, he has been good enough to abide by these. I would not call conditions, but certain matters which we expect him to do when he is here.

Ranga: Am I to understand that the Dalai Lama is not in any way prevented from carrying on his correspondence with the United Nations and other nations also, without indulging-as he has not been indulging-in any offensive activities either against India or in any violent activities against any other nation.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The question is whether he can carry on correspondence. He can carry on correspondence with any person or organisation.

Speaker. All these are not relevant to the question that has been tabled, viz., what are the subjects that have been discussed.

Braj Raj Singh:<sup>125</sup> May I know whether the question of investment of funds by the Dalai Lama in Indian business was also considered at these talks?

Speaker: He wants to know whether the matter of his investing funds in India was one of the matters discussed.

---

<sup>124</sup> N.G Ranga, elected Congress; shifted to Swatantra in June 1959.

<sup>125</sup> Socialist Party.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Discussed here? No, Sir. There was nothing to discuss about it. The information we had, we had previously. It might have been mentioned previously. There is not much to discuss about it. We discussed, as I stated, chiefly Tibetan children's education and the rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees here.

Maimoona Sultan: In view of the fact that economic assistance has been given to political refugees by the international organisation, say, to Arab refugees, may I know if government of India propose to seek economic assistance from the UN or other agencies for the rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees and if not, what are the reasons for not doing so?

Speaker: It does not arise out of this question. The hon. Member wanted to know the subjects discussed and the hon. Prime Minister said broadly two questions were discussed—the education of Tibetan children and one other matter.

Hem Barua:<sup>126</sup> May I know whether the attention of the Prime Minister is drawn to a statement made by the Dalai Lama and the purpose of it is that he left the Prime Minister a much wiser man, that he became a much wiser man after he left the Prime Minister? If that is so, on what point was he wised up?

Speaker: The hon. Member will refer to the newspaper man.<sup>127</sup>

### **327. To K. N. Katju: Settling Tibetan Refugees<sup>128</sup>**

---

<sup>126</sup> PSP.

<sup>127</sup> On discussions on the Dalai Lama's investments, see item 325; on his seeking outside support, see item 324; on Nehru's talks with the Dalai Lama, see item 319.

<sup>128</sup> Letter to the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh.

May 5, 1961

My dear Kailas Nath,

Your letter of the 3rd May about the rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees in Madhya Pradesh. I am glad to learn that, there are suitable areas from the climatic point of view where these people can be settled. I shall await your further letter.

But one thing I should like to make clear. We cannot accommodate these people in small groups cut off from each other. The whole purpose is that a large group should live together and have some kind of a community life of their own, In Mysore the number is 3,000 and we intend increasing this to 5,000. That is why I wrote to you that the minimum number living together should be about one thousand or 250 families.<sup>129</sup>

Yours affectionately,  
[Jawaharlal Nehru]

**13. (b) From K. D. Malaviya: Oil Deals in France and Italy<sup>130</sup>**

**[Refer to items 229-230]**

May 9, 1961

My dear Jawaharlalji,

As I told you in the Cabinet Meeting, the French Institutes, which are a combine of Government and private companies, had discussed with us the contract drilling arrangements for oil. A few points remain to be settled. They are willing to offer us the credit to be paid back in 9 years. We will try to increase the payment time.

Subject to your approval, I propose to go to Paris with Khera, L.K Jha and one or two others in the first week of June to settle this matter of French assistance for contract drilling in Jaisalmer area and elsewhere. I propose to stay in Paris for 3 - 4 days and then, on my way back, I would like to take this opportunity of staying in Rome to finalise the Italian deal also. Their teams returned to India recently and are preparing their final offers. I believe that my going there, on my return from France, might have a psychological effect in expediting the deal. The Italian leader, Mattei will also feel satisfied by my going there. The two visits of France and Italy might take 12 or 13 days in all. I shall surely be back on 15th of June.

Yours affectionately,  
Keshava Deva Malaviya

**14. From C. B. Gupta: Swarup Rani Nehru Hospital<sup>131</sup>**

**[Refer to item 397]**

---

<sup>130</sup> Letter from the Minister of Mines and Oil. PMO, File No. 17(463)/61-63-PMS, Vol. I, Sr. No.3-A.

<sup>131</sup> From the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh. JNMF, KNM Hospital Papers, Vol. II.

Lucknow April 14, 1961

My dear Panditji,

This is in continuation of para 2 of my letter No. 1120, dated February 4, 1961, regarding the Moti Lal Nehru College & Hospital to be started at Allahabad.<sup>132</sup>

The new Hospital building will, for the present, accommodate 200 beds, but ultimately is designed to be expanded to have 700 beds. Since the College & Hospital are two separate entities, it is proposed that the Hospital may be named as "Smt. Swarup Rani Nehru Hospital" after the name of your revered mother. The old Hospital with 78 beds already known as the Moti Lal Nehru Hospital inside the town is being retained in view of its popularity and will continue to retain this name. I hope this proposal will receive your approval.

With respects,

Yours sincerely,

C.B. Gupta

---

<sup>132</sup> See earlier correspondence in SWJN/SS/66/items 161-162 and Appendix 49; SWJN/SS/61/item 228.