

## Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru

Series II

*Volume 70*

*July 1 – August 20, 1961*

### Nepal

#### **369. To Jayaprakash Narayan: B.P. Koirala, Disarmament<sup>1</sup>**

July 5, 1961

My dear Jayaprakash,

Your letter of July 4.<sup>2</sup> We have heard from our Ambassador in Kathmandu.<sup>3</sup>

He says that to the best of his information, B.P. Koirala is keeping fairly good health. I am, however, pursuing this matter further.

If you wish to study the papers that we have in regard to disarmament, we shall gladly help you. We have also got the Pugwash Conference papers which are voluminous. When you come to Delhi you can discuss this disarmament question with those people in our Ministry who are specially dealing with it.

I am not quite sure if it will be feasible to send many papers to you to Mussoorie. I am, however, enquiring.

I rather doubt if the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi is going to agree to the payment of a fairly considerable sum of money to the War Resisters International.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter; address: Central Institute, Radha Bhavan, Mussoorie.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix 12.

<sup>3</sup> Harishwar Dayal.

<sup>4</sup> A Press Report suggested that the Gandhi Peace Foundation, a sister organisation of the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi, would join the War Resisters International in forming an

Yours affectionately,  
[Jawaharlal Nehru]

### **370. To Mahendra Bir Bikram Shah: Indo-Nepal Relations<sup>5</sup>**

July 7, 1961

My dear friend,

Thank you for your letter of the 27th June 1961 which reached me through our Ambassador in Nepal on the 1st July. I was happy to receive it because Nepal is often in my mind and it is our basic belief and policy to have close and friendly relations with Nepal and her people.

Towards the end of last year, I received a letter, dated 16th December 1960,<sup>6</sup> from Your Majesty, in which you informed me of the changes that had taken place in Nepal. To this letter I sent a reply on the 23rd January 1961.<sup>7</sup> That reply was a long one and I expressed my views in a frank and friendly manner. It was a letter which I could only write to a friend who would expect frankness from me; it was also a letter which I could only write in regard to matters about which I felt deeply and because of my earnest interest in Nepal's present and future. In that letter, therefore, I ventured to bare my mind to Your Majesty. It had been my good fortune to have the friendship of your revered father and, because of that friendship, he was pleased to discuss matters with me in all frankness. I spoke to him also in those days frankly and without hesitation. It was because of these old personal and friendly contacts that I ventured to write to you in the same

---

international peace brigade. See *The Hindustan Times*, 30 June 1961, p. 6. See also appendix 13, fn 36.

<sup>5</sup> Letter to the King of Nepal.

<sup>6</sup> See SWJN/SS/65/Appendix 42.

<sup>7</sup> See SWJN/SS/66/item 288.

manner as I used to write to your revered father.

The views I expressed in that letter of mine were not casual views, but were the natural outcome of years of thought and experience. I have had, in the fairly long life that I have lived, a variety of experiences of a somewhat unusual kind, and I have come in contact, not only with great men, notably our leader Mahatma Gandhi, but also with great events and developments in my own country and in the world. It is these events that have conditioned and fashioned me, and my work in India, during all these long years, has been governed by this past thinking and conditioning. Naturally, in a changing world, one has to adapt oneself to new conditions and, to that extent, I am trying to adapt myself. But, basically, my thinking has not changed much and the ideals I then held for my own country or for the world, have not changed much. It has been a matter of no little satisfaction to me that the ideals we have held forth in India have been progressively appreciated in many countries and the voice of India, as representing those ideals, is listened to with a measure of respect by many countries, not only in Asia and Africa, but also in Europe and America.

We are passing through a revolutionary period in the world's history and no man can foretell what the future might bring. In spite of a deep and widespread desire for peace all over the world, preparations for a mighty war continue to be made. The situation in the world is a tense one and it almost seems that some evil fate is pursuing mankind, in spite of the great advances that humanity has made. In such a state of affairs, it becomes all the more necessary to have some basic principles and not to be pushed about by momentary gusts of wind.

Your Majesty has referred in your letter to a previous letter I wrote to you many years ago, on July 17, 1955. In that letter, I had made certain suggestions about the development of a democratic structure in Nepal. These suggestions were based on a widespread and effective system of panchayats elected by adult franchise, and indirect elections by these panchayats to a national Parliament. Conditions change and new forces come into play. It is difficult to be positive about these matters, but I still

think that what I had suggested then was worthy of consideration, even though many of my colleagues in India possibly might not agree with it. In any event, India has adopted a different method and has worked it with a considerable measure of success. But my previous suggestion was essentially based on a very effective panchayat system with wide powers. Merely to have truncated panchayats with ineffective powers would be a travesty of that system. I mention this because, in a neighbour country of ours, some kind of panchayats have been established, but they have no powers and they are not properly elected. In India, at present, in spite of our direct elections to Parliament and the supreme authority of that Parliament, we are introducing what we call Panchayati Raj. We are giving groups of panchayats a great deal of authority as well as resources. This is a revolutionary change that is taking place here, which I think will change the face of rural India. Power is being transferred and decentralized and our development works, education, etc, are being transferred to this Panchayati Raj.

I mention this to indicate what my conception of panchayats is. I do not attach any importance, if I may say so, with all respect, to the type of panchayats established in Pakistan. The essential thing is the transfer of power and authority. It is only this that makes people responsible, self-reliant and capable of growth. Whether we have direct elections or indirect elections at the last stage, the basic approach remains the same and that is, the opportunity to the people to exercise power and learn from it. In the world of today, there is no other way which can promise stability and progress.

Your Majesty is quite right in saying that Nepal differs at present from India in lacking certain conditions of democracy at this stage. It is also true that in India we have to deal with a vast population which is as backward as the people of Nepal. However, a substantial number of people here are trained and these people can form the framework of a democratic state and a progressively industrialized economy. But the masses of the people remain socially backward. We decided to take the risk and put our faith in them, and

I am glad to say that our faith was justified.

Your Majesty refers in your letter to India granting political asylum to some Nepali nationals, and further, to an organised movement in India against a friendly country like Nepal. It is perfectly true that it has long been our practice, based on our Constitution, to grant political asylum and freedom of expression and peaceful organisation. But I am surprised to read in your letter that Your Majesty has received reports that a movement secretly or openly directed against Nepal is being organised in India, that volunteers are being trained at various centres with the connivance of Indian local authorities and that anti-national Nepalese elements in India are on the look out for arms. I am not aware of this and I believe that my sources of information are good.

As Your Majesty knows, there are no restrictions on movement of persons between India and Nepal. We have made it clear to our State and local authorities not to permit any activity which is opposed to our laws or which has anything to do directly or indirectly with violence; only such peaceful activities as are in conformity with our laws can be permitted. My inquiries and information show that the reports that Your Majesty has received are incorrect.

We know that some members of the Nepali Congress have sometimes met each other in India and have issued policy statements criticising the present political set-up in Nepal and advocating early restoration of parliamentary institutions. We have not, according to our laws, prevented this type of peaceful agitation. We also know about the activities of some Nepalese leaders and the All India Gurkha League in Darjeeling and other areas, who have been advocating active support to the King and the present political set-up in Nepal. We have not come in their way either, or interfered with them in any way.

It is true that sometimes pamphlets are issued which may be objectionable. It is indeed a frequent occurrence in India for pamphlets in the strongest language to be issued against our own Government in India. Unless they offend against our laws, we take no action against them.

I can assure Your Majesty that it has not been and is not our desire in any way to interfere in the internal affairs of Nepal, and we will not permit any activities from Indian soil which are against our laws and institutions. These laws permit a great deal of freedom of expression in the press and we have to put up with much which we actively dislike.

Your Majesty has asked me about the proposed conference at Belgrade. As you must know, certain discussions at ambassadorial level have been taking place in Cairo in regard to the countries that are to be invited to this conference. Probably these discussions will end soon and we shall see the final picture as it emerges. Our approach has been that we should be liberal in issuing invitations to this conference. It is likely that I shall attend this conference, but I do not wish to decide finally till I know the decisions at the Cairo talks.

There is one matter which I would like to mention to Your Majesty on a purely personal level. This is about Shri B.P. Koirala's health. I have received many enquiries from his friends and relatives in India who have naturally been anxious about it.<sup>8</sup> This is not a political matter, but one of humanitarian approach. I am sure that, regardless of political differences, requisite facilities will be given to B.P. Koirala to safeguard his health and, if necessity arises, his own doctors might be allowed to visit him and examine him.

We are glad to have your new Ambassador, Shri Marapatap,<sup>9</sup> here. I am sure, with your new Ambassador and our Ambassador in Kathmandu,<sup>10</sup> the close and friendly relations between our two countries will continue to grow.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

---

<sup>8</sup> See item 369; appendix 13; SWJN/SS/69/ items 371-372.

<sup>9</sup> Marapatap Thapa.

<sup>10</sup> Harishwar Dayal.

## China

### **371. To Sunder Lal: The India-China Friendship Association<sup>11</sup>**

July 12, 1961

My dear Sunderlalji

Your letter of the 5th July about the India-China Friendship Association.<sup>12</sup>

I have consulted my Ministry. They have drawn my attention to the fact that as a matter of general principle we do not finance in any way or give any grant-in-aid to the various Friendship Associations that have grown up here. In fact, questions were asked in Parliament about these. It was as a very special case that we decided to give grants to the India-China Friendship Association in 1955-56 and for three years subsequently. Even normally it would not be feasible for us to continue to make the India-China Friendship Association an exception to our general rule. This becomes much more difficult because of the deterioration in the relations between India and China and we would not be able to justify this in any way before Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Jawaharlal Nehru]

### **372. To MEA Officials: Mahendra Pratap's Visit to Taiwan<sup>13</sup>**

Raja Mahendra Pratap, MP, came to see me today after his visit to Japan, Taiwan, Hongkong and Singapore. He has left notes with me about these visits. I am sending these to you as they may perhaps interest you.

2. I do not take Raja Mahendra Pratap very seriously. What Marshal Chiang

---

<sup>11</sup> Letter.

<sup>12</sup> Appendix 15.

<sup>13</sup> Note, 24 July 1961, to SG, FS, CS MEA.

Kai Shek is reported to have said to him is rather interesting.<sup>14</sup>

3. There is one sentence in his report which deserves attention. He says about his visit to Rangoon that he found a general complaint that the Indian Government representatives are too proud to meet poor Indians. They live high lives enjoying parties, etc.

4. The Raja also complains of drinking going on at our Embassies, Legations, etc., and quotes an Indian merchant who said that he would not come to India again because the Customs here made it hell for him.

5. I am also sending you some photographs and pamphlets which he left with me.

### **373. To R.K. Nehru: Talks with Chou En-lai<sup>15</sup>**

I have read your note as well as the record of the talks which you had with Premier Chou En-lai and the Chinese Foreign Minister Chen Yi.

2. In the main, these talks do not throw much light on the situation. It is true that what has been said about Bhutan and Sikkim is helpful; and what they said about Kashmir is, to a small extent, and rather negatively, in our favour. But, in so far as the main subjects are concerned, which have led to our disputes and conflicts, no helpful suggestions have been made, except one at the end, when Chou En-lai is reported to have said that he will examine the officials' report and that this should be followed up through diplomatic channels. I get the impression from these talks that the Chinese Government remains where it is, but, at the same time, has perhaps weakened a little.

3. The main arguments which Chou En-lai and Chen Yi have raised, have

---

<sup>14</sup> Mahendra Pratap's paraphrase of what Chiang Kai Shek told him: "I was told that several thousand agents were working in China to bring about fall of red regime. Taiwan still has two hundred and fifty thousand strong army. They are fully supported by U.S.A. They have diplomatic relations with many states." MEA, File No. 1105(21)-SD/ 61, pp. 6-7/corr.

<sup>15</sup> Note, 29 July 1961, to the Secretary General, MEA.



little to do with the problem, although they may affect Chinese thinking. There is a great deal said about our treatment of the Dalai Lama, and our criticism of the Chinese attitude in Parliament, press, etc.

4. There is a reference to my having criticised the recent Russian statement about increasing their armed forces. The only statement I made in answer to a query from the press was that I am pained, that is, I am pained at this drift towards more and more armament.

5. The statement about Arthur Lall<sup>16</sup> saying something about the Defence Minister is absurd on the face of it. I hope that Arthur Lall has been asked about it. The whole passage relating to this matter should be sent to Arthur Lall for his explanation.

6. Great stress laid on our using the word "aggression" is understandable, but is, nevertheless, beside the point. Our case is that Chinese have occupied our territory. If that is true, then it is aggression. Whether it is true or not can only be considered now on the basis of the officials' report.

7. We just come back to that report and I think we shall have to proceed in the future on that basis. As Chou En-lai has said that he is going to examine this report, I think that we should proceed on this basis somewhat later and perhaps communicate with him through our diplomatic channels. We shall consider this matter later.

8. I think that the Defence Minister<sup>17</sup> should see these reports of conversations.

### **374. In the Lok Sabha: Report of Chinese and Indian Officials<sup>18</sup>**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Ambassador to Austria.

<sup>17</sup> V. K. Krishna Menon.

<sup>18</sup> Written answers, 10 August 1961. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Vol. LVI, Second Series, 7-19 August 1961, col. 1159.

(a) whether Government have considered the report of the Chinese and Indian Officials on border talks;<sup>20</sup> and

(b) if so, the action taken in the matter?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

(a) and (b). Yes, Government have given careful consideration to these reports. Since these reports were received there have been discussions in Parliament also. Government cannot indicate exactly the further steps they may take in this matter. The reports have, in the opinion of Government, established the correctness of the case put forward on behalf of India. They would continue to press this on the Government of the People's Republic of China and thus endeavour to get the People's Republic of China to agree to the facts as contained in these reports. When these facts are accepted, a peaceful solution would be possible. In any event, Government will continue to be prepared for all eventualities.

### **375. In the Lok Sabha: China-Pakistan Border Agreement<sup>21</sup>**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 157 on the 20th February, 1961 and state:<sup>22</sup>

(a) whether Government have considered the suggestion to raise in the Security Council the Pakistan move to hold border negotiations with China; and

(b) if so, the result thereof?<sup>23</sup>

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

---

<sup>19</sup> By Ganatantra Parishad MP P.G Deb and Congress MP Shree Narayan Das and four others.

<sup>20</sup> See SWJN/SS/66 Supplement.

<sup>21</sup> Oral answers, 16 August 1961, *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. LVI, 7-19 August 1961, cols 2248-2251.

<sup>22</sup> By Congress MP Ram Kishan Gupta and two others and Jan Sangh MP Balraj Madhok.

<sup>23</sup> See also SWJN/SS/67/item 253.

Khan): (a) and (b). Government have no present intention of raising this matter in the Security Council.

Ram Krishan Gupta: In reply to a previous question it was stated that we have sought clarification from the Pakistan Government and our High Commissioner has met their officials. May I know whether any clarification has been received from them so far?

Sadath Ali Khan: Yes, they stated that the policy of the Pakistan Government was well known to us and, therefore, they regretted that they could not clarify the situation.

[Translation begins:

Pandit D.N. Tiwari: May I know to which area the China and Pakistan talks refer to and whether any part of India is involved and how much?

Sadath Ali Khan: They want to discuss the illegally occupied area of Jammu and Kashmir. But, there is no common border shared by China and Pakistan.

Translation ends]

Hem Barua: In view of the fact that the border under dispute with China has been conclusively established by the official teams in favour of the Indian claim, may I know whether China except advancing the preposterous theory of actuality, has been able to adduce any other argument in favour of her claim? If not, may I know whether we have protested directly to China over this issue?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): The hon. Member puts questions which are not quite easy to grasp.

Hem Barua: May I repeat it?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Then there is a certain risk of it becoming even more complicated.

Hem Barua: I will simplify it.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Things are quite clear. The hon. Member's opinion is not held by the Chinese Government nor by the Pakistan Government. He may be completely justified in his opinion but it is not held by those two Governments. According to us, Pakistan and China have no common border. The only commonness comes in because of certain area of Jammu and Kashmir State which is occupied by the Pakistan authorities. This question, therefore, arises on that thing, namely, the border of that area with China. To the west of the Karakoram Pass there is a certain area. On the other side is China, not Tibet. It is not Tibet but the Chinese territory of Sinkiang that comes there. There has been some argument or some difference of opinion between the Chinese Government as shown in its maps and our maps as to where exactly that is. There is some slight difference. When we put this to the Pakistan Government they said that they had no obligation to us to give any clarification. That was their territory, according to them, and therefore they proposed to deal with it, delimit or whatever it is, with the Chinese Government.<sup>24</sup> So far as we know, apart from the statements on the part of the Pakistan Government nothing further has been done in this matter. That is to say—we are not sure and I am saying this subject to confirmation—there has been no great response from the Chinese side in regard to this matter.

Speaker: Shri Hem Barua. The hon. Member ought not to lose himself in the flourish of language.

---

<sup>24</sup> Nehru clarified the Pakistani argument once again, on 18 August 1961, in the Rajya Sabha. See Oral answers, *Rajya Sabha Debates*, Vol. 35. Nos 1-10, 14-28 August 1961, pp. 649-650.

Hem Barua: No, sir. I shall be very simple in my language. In view of the fact that the hon. Prime Minister said on another occasion that we have clarified our position so far as the border is concerned when the official teams met and discussed over this matter, may I know whether this clarification of the border embraces this particular portion of territory also which is under illegal occupation of Pakistan at present?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Inferentially; it does not do so directly. It was not taken up directly so far as I can remember with the Chinese authorities; but if the principle that we laid down is accepted, that would apply there too.

Ram Subhag Singh: In view of the fact that Pakistan has not given any clarification to our query and also as they say that it is their area, what will be our position in regard to the cease-fire line if Pakistan enters into any agreement in regard to the border demarcation with China?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think the cease-fire line has anything to do with this matter. It would be improper for Pakistan to enter into any agreement on border demarcation. But this border is very far from the cease-fire line and it has nothing to do with that. But, firstly, Pakistan has not done this and I do not know if they will do it or if both parties will agree; secondly, if they do it on that particular part of the border, it is not quite clear whether, apart from our registering our protest with them and may be in the United Nations, there is much else that we can do about that.

Hem Barua: In view of the fact that the hon. Prime Minister said on another occasion that we have lodged a protest with Pakistan after the Pakistan President and the Foreign Affairs Minister made a statement to what effect, may I know whether we have lodged a protest with China about this or not?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes Sir, we have.

## Tibet

### **379. To MEA Officials: Dalai Lama's Tour<sup>25</sup>**

I attach a letter from The Dalai Lama. In this he suggests a grand tour of a large number of countries. When he had previously mentioned this matter to me, I got the impression that he wanted to go to some neighbouring Buddhist countries. His proposal, however, covers other countries also. This can only be a propagandist tour. I do not fancy this extended tour although I would not have minded his going to some of the Buddhist countries nearby.

2. He says that he does not wish to impose the burden of expenditure on our Government or the other countries. But, as a matter of fact, this is going to fall on us so far as foreign exchange is concerned. We are at present very rigid about any expenditure in foreign exchange.

### **380. In the Lok Sabha: Settling Tibetan Refugees in Mysore State<sup>26</sup>**

Chintamani Panigrahi:<sup>27</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

- (a) the total number of Tibetan refugees who have so far been settled in Mysore State;
- (b) the acreage of agricultural land which has been allotted to a Tibetan refugee family there;
- (c) the amount of financial assistance given to them besides agricultural lands; and
- (d) whether there is a proposal to settle more Tibetan refugees in

---

<sup>25</sup> Note, 3 August 1961, to R K. Nehru, the SG, and M.J. Desai, the FS.

<sup>26</sup> Written answers, 7 August 1961. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Vol. LVI, Second Series, 7-19 August 1961, cols 157-158.

<sup>27</sup> Congress MP from Puri, Orissa.

### Mysore and in Kodai Kanal Hills?

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

(a) About 2,100 Tibetan refugees have so far been sent to Mysore State for permanent settlement on land in Periyapatna taluk.

(b) Agricultural land to the extent of 5 acres per family is being allotted by the Mysore Government.

(c) No financial assistance in cash is given for resettlement. However, the Tibetan refugees are given free of cost agricultural implements, seeds, seedlings, manures and work animals.

(d) It is proposed to settle a total number of 3,000 Tibetans refugees under the Periyapatna settlement scheme of Mysore. We do not have any proposal regarding the settlement of Tibetan refugees in Kodai Kanal Hills.<sup>28</sup>

### **381. In the Lok Sabha: Tibetan Refugees<sup>29</sup>**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:<sup>30</sup>

(a) whether tightening of checks in Tibetan border has resulted in decreasing influx of Tibetan refugees into India;

(b) the number of Tibetan refugees who came to India during each of the months from March to July 1961 and through each of the passes and how do their numbers compare with the Tibetan refugees who

---

<sup>28</sup> To a similar question about settling Tibetan refugees in Orissa, Nehru replied that 3000 acres had been offered by the Orissa Government and that the site would be chosen after the rains; as for Madhya Pradesh, 1000 Tibetans were to be settled in its Shahdol District. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Vol. LVI, Second Series, 7-19 August 1961, pp. 158-159.

Orissa had in fact offered the 3000 acres for 3000 persons, see SWJN/SS/69/item 368; see also SWJN/SS/68/section External Affairs, subsection Tibet.

<sup>29</sup> Oral answers, 10 August 1961. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Vol. LVI, Second Series, 7-19 August 1961, cols 1121-1128.

<sup>30</sup> By Congress MP Shree Narayan Das and ten others; CPI MP Muhammed Elias; Socialist MP Ram Subhag Singh; Gantantra Parishad MP P.G Deb and Janata Party MP Arjun Singh Bhadauria.

came during the corresponding period last year;

(c) the details of the steps taken to rehabilitate them in various parts of the country;

(d) whether any instances have come to the notice of Government where Chinese spies also entered India in the garb of refugees; and

(e) if so, the steps taken in this regard?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Lakshmi Menon):

(a) to (c). A statement is placed on the Table of the House. (See Appendix I, annexure No.63).

(d) and (e). We have come across a few Tibetans whose bona fides as refugees could not be established. Adequate measures have been taken and continue to be taken to deal with such cases.

Shree Narayan Das: May I know the extent to which the Government of India has accepted the responsibility of rehabilitating these refugees? What is the total expenditure that is expected to be incurred on this matter?

Lakshmi Menon: The whole thing is given in the statement—the extent to which refugees have been settled.

Shree Narayan Das: I wanted to know whether the Government of India have accepted all the responsibility, or whether any international aid is being sought by the Dalai Lama or the Government of India for this purpose.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): The responsibility is entirely taken by the Government of India, but as a matter of fact, the Dalai Lama has, to some extent, shared it occasionally. We have also received contributions from abroad for this purpose, rather, from some Governments abroad. They are being used for specific purposes like the establishment of a school or something like that.

D.C. Sharma: From the statement I find that the influx of Tibetan refugees



is a continuing process. Even during this year we have received 2,880 persons. I find that arrangements have been made for them in some States of India. May I know if it has been taken into account that the places in which they are going to be settled will be able to accommodate the ever increasing or the ever continuing influx of refugees because this does not seem to be coming to an end in any way?

Lakshmi Menon: We are exploring the possibilities of settling them in different States, and from the statement it is obvious that the States have come forward with allotment of land etc. Since the influx is getting less and less, we think we will be able to find ways and means of settling them.

Ram Krishan Gupta: The hon. Prime Minister stated that contributions have been received from some foreign countries. May I know the names of those countries?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Government of Australia and the Government of New Zealand. As far as I can remember, these two have given some sums of money. Switzerland has actually taken away some of the young boys and girls for training them there.

Ram Subhag Singh: From the statement it appears that the influx of refugees in Jammu and Kashmir area has increased. May I know the causes for this.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot give any precise answer to that. I do not know if they are included in this figure, but a number of Ladakhi Muslims and others were held up there. They would not allow them to come because of the dispute as to whether they were nationals of India.

Ram Subhag Singh: I am not referring to them. They are only about 120 or so. In the statement I find 412 refugees came in 1960 to the State of

Jammu and Kashmir, whereas in 1960 their number is 1,590. That is why I want to know whether the pressure of the Chinese on western Tibet side has increased, or it is due to some other reason that they are coming.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot give any precise reason for this. It may be because of local pressures.

[Translation begins:

Raghunath Singh: About three to four days before, the newspapers reported that Tibetan refugees had arrived in large numbers to Leh. Is this true?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I don't know. Though it is tough to come from Tibet to Leh.

Translation ends]

Nath Pai: Has the interrogation of these refugees revealed what makes them leave their homeland whether it is the continuance of disturbed conditions in Tibet or persecution or some other reason?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Obviously they leave Tibet because they find it difficult to live their ordinary lives because of pressures on them and circumstances, and they think they can better themselves elsewhere. Interrogation does take place, but the broad facts are fairly well known.

[Translation begins:

A.M. Tariq: I want to know from the Prime Minister if he has received information that some political groups of this country go to the refugees and demoralise them and also spread animosity between India and her neighbouring countries. If this is correct, have measures been taken to prevent these political groups from going to the refugees?

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no specific information with me as of this moment of any political group doing this on a large scale. Yes, it is possible that at the individual level this is being done. Doing so is inappropriate and they should be stopped.

Translation ends]

Muhammed Elias: What is the total amount that is spent for the rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees till now and what is the programme of Government spending for future rehabilitation of these refugees in our country?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry I cannot give the financial figures. Naturally it is a fairly large sum. It is indeterminate, if I may say so, as we take additional liabilities as more people come.

Our first object is to lay stress on children's education and their proper upbringing. I may mention that there are some foreign agencies who are helping in this work of educating them. A school or some establishment is run in Simla by some children's society in England. There is some other help given by CARE organisation. So, the first thing is children's schools, etc. The other thing is to find work for those who can work. One of the difficulties that comes in is the very large proportion of Lamas, people who are called incarnate Lamas, who normally do not work in this normal way. There are some monasteries, etc. which have been expanded for them.

When we send these people to the States, we want to send them in adequate numbers so that they can form a community among themselves, usually for agricultural purposes. The minimum number, we think, is about 500 families or 400 or something like that. In Mysore we have sent 3,000; we may add to it and give them land. In Orissa, I think we are sending 3,000, I think....

Chintamoni Panigrahi: 3,000 acres.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not talking of acres; I am talking of human beings.<sup>31</sup>  
In Madhya Pradesh also, we are trying to find out. We do not want to send them in small numbers. They get lost.

[Translation begins:

Bhakt Darshan: Sir, has it come to the notice of the Government that the fate of refugees from Western Tibet who came to India a year back, especially in areas of Garhwal and Almora, has not been decided and they are still in transit camps? Their condition is not good and neither are the arrangements there. Will a decision be taken on them at the earliest, to settle them and to provide them employment?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I can't say for any particular camp, but its true that there are many for whom no arrangements in particular have been made. Arrangements have been made for feeding them, but very little has been done to settle them. Efforts are underway.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I don't understand why our fellow brothers are disappointed that people from outside are coming here. Let people come from Tibet or Pakistan or Lanka [Ceylon]. We should welcome them. But I want to ask whether any arrangements are being made to cleanse their minds and inject good thoughts in them, so that they work with us. Is there such a provision?

Jawaharlal Nehru: This is a slightly serious matter. For the past few days, honourable member has been trying to cleanse our minds, but it has had no effect.

Vibhuti Mishra: Has the Prime Minister spoken to other countries about

---

<sup>31</sup> Although acres, not human beings, were mentioned in his correspondence with Biju Patnaik, the Chief Minister of Orissa, see SWJN/SS/69/item 368.

settling these Tibetan refugees there?

Jawaharlal Nehru: No. As I said, some have gone to Switzerland. They are very few in number. I don't remember-perhaps ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty youth have gone. Their parents too have gone. They have been taken there as it was felt that the climate there comes close to that of the mountainous region. Besides them, we have neither tried to send them to other countries, nor do I believe it is appropriate. A few go. Few have gone to America to study, arrangements have been made for them. We can't send them in large numbers, as other than the language, they have very little in common and hence will be unable to adjust.

Translation ends]

Kalika Singh: May I know if a world refugee fund has been created by U.K. and certain other western countries and from that fund a substantial amount has been received for rehabilitating these Tibetan refugees and that has been one of the causes of the influx of poor Tibetan families?

Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir; we have not brought this matter up before the World Refugee Organisation.

Speaker: Nobody has been sent to Madras; why should Shri Tangamani put a question now?

Tangamani: There is a proposal to that effect, Sir.

Chintamani Panigrahi: May I know whether the Dalai Lama has spent any amount from his treasures which he brought and if so what is that amount? Has he expressed his desire to settle permanently in India and if so, I want to know whether land has been allotted to him?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not got the figures as to how much he spent but he

has met some educational expenses for the monks and others. As to how much money he realised from what he brought with him, I do not remember at the moment.

Yadav Narayan Jadhav: May I know whether the help received from abroad or given from internal sources is being properly utilised and distributed properly? My information is that there is dissatisfaction among the refugees.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member's information is completely wrong.

### **382. To M.J. Desai: Tibetans in Bhutan<sup>32</sup>**

I told you on the telephone today of what Miss Freda Bedi<sup>33</sup> said to me about these Tibetans in Bhutan. She gave me a rather alarming account of their condition. More particularly, she mentioned that young Tibetan boys and girls were spirited away.

2. It would appear that anyhow these Tibetan refugees in Bhutan are in a bad way. It is true that we cannot have them here in India because we have not yet made adequate arrangements for ten thousand other Tibetan refugees. But I think something should be done about them. The Dalai Lama of course should send some people to look after them. Can we, with the permission of the Bhutan Government, also send some competent man to help them?

3. I have read your draft letter to the Dalai Lama. I think that you might, after stating that we cannot have these refugees in India now for the reasons given by you, say that if and when this is possible in the future, we may be prepared to do so. But in present circumstances, we are unable to bring them to India. It is, therefore, desirable that they should be rehabilitated in Bhutan. We are prepared to help in this process insofar as

---

<sup>32</sup> Note, 10 August 1961, to the Foreign Secretary.

<sup>33</sup> Social worker. See SWJN/SS/61/item 283; SWJN/SS/59/item 159; SWJN/SS/58/item 212 and SWJN/SS/55/item 173.

we can.

4. I do not think you need say anything in your letter about the desire of the Bhutan authorities that these Tibetan refugees should be naturalised in Bhutan and become part of Bhutan. This is just what the Dalai Lama does not want. It may be, of course, that if they stay there for some time, gradually they will begin to adapt themselves. But at present we need not raise this question.