

Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru

Series II, Volume 71

August 21 – October 14, 1961

Page 301

And then we had a meeting, unusual there, to call a public meeting, in a big hall about 2,500 persons, not in the stadium which is a very big, huge stadium, but in a big hall and all the diplomats were present and others and I read, the only time there I had prepared my speech in script, I read it out.¹ I do not know if the speech appeared here. In what form? It came in the radio too? You mean to say you could listen to it? Anyhow that speech created some impression there, not by virtue of the speech but this combination of my delivering it in that particular place, of the Kremlin, that speech in that audience, that combination, the diplomats and others were rather impressed too.

Well, then we came away. I mean to say I cannot go into our detailed talks. I have given you a broad idea. One thing there was no doubt about it, that Mr Khrushchev and the Russian officials, at his instance no doubt, went all out to be friendly, even when I was criticizing them; naturally even when I criticize them I criticize them in a friendly way, although I lay stress on my points, but I did so in a friendly way. Suppose I criticize them about the nuclear tests. I had referred to them as leaders in the peace movement, I said you doing it comes as a greater shock because you have been so much committed to peace and people look to you and so on and so forth. Anyhow they were definitely friendly, rather went out of their way.

¹ See item 295.

Then in Moscow I went to see there an exhibition, an enormous exhibition.² Some of you might have seen that enormous place, the permanent exhibition. It used to be an agricultural exhibition; it is industrial, cultural, everything, a huge area. I went one night to the famous Bolshoi theatre, ballet.

Then I went to Tashkent. I went to Tashkent because Mr Khrushchev specially wanted me to go to Tashkent to see the progress made there. I have been there about six years ago. So I went to Tashkent and felt a little more at home there even than in Moscow. Little things count. They were friendly people. As soon as I arrived there, I shouted out to them Salaam Alekum. They were pleased with this greeting. The President of the Uzbek Republic, Uzbekistan, is a lady, a Muslim lady, Nasiruddinowa, a very able and efficient woman with all facts and figures about her Republic at her fingers' end. Alimov³ is the Chairman of the Council of Ministers. He is the Prime Minister there, she is the President. That is the difference. I visited all their big collective farms, of cotton which they say produce various records in cotton production and the Chairman of that farm was an oldish, tough Tajik farmer, not a city man I mean to say village man. So, very big farms, I forget now, but several thousand acres, I forget how much it was. Then I visited the Oriental Institute there.⁴ They are teaching there many languages, Hindi, Urdu, Tamil, what not. They gave me some books. Have you seen the books I sent you? Various editions, an album, their productions of these in their Tajik language and a number of other books which I have passed on to our National Library⁵ and books about Amir Khusro. Amir Khusro came from that area originally, his family. And one thing I was surprised to learn that in the schools in Tashkent in Tajikistan teaching is done in Tajik language and in Russian both. Everybody learns Russian. Russian is partly a medium and the Tajik language is partly a

² Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy.

³ Arif Alimov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic.

⁴ The Tashkent State Institute of Oriental Studies.

⁵ See item 241.

medium too. Anyhow, what surprised me was that they were teaching, now in their schools, the *Baburnama* and Babur's verses, poetry. I did not know Babur had done much poetry. I did not know it, his ghazals, and all this were read now in the schools of Tajikistan because the Tajik language is more or less Turkish, I mean to say it is a Turkish language; it is not Turkish, it is a Turkish language. Babur came from that area so they consider him as one of their own persons. And they are very pleased when I told them of Amir Khusro here, his riddles, his songs, which are still popular here; so they were pleased. These little intimate touches bring people nearer to one another; there was a feeling of oneness.

Well, finally this was the first time I came back by the Soviet airline from Moscow to Tashkent and Tashkent to Delhi. Now, Tashkent to Delhi is exactly two hours and 40 minutes. It is on their airline, it is a very fast airline of course, jet line, but it was surprising to fly over other places, which one had heard of in one's childhood as remote, inaccessible places, Khotan and Kashgar and what not—travellers' tales—which is about an hour's flight from Delhi or an hour and a half. [...] Tibet-India border in Ladakh, one of the disputed points we hold, we actually saw it there in this valley although we were flying high. So all this gave us rather somewhat intimate knowledge of that area than we had before and so I came back.

[Translation: Let me tell you one thing generally. There is one difficulty. Elections are going to be held in West Germany in a few days-I don't know the exact date.] There are going to be elections and because of these elections these people [...] Chancellor Adenauer, talks much more, well, I do not know how to choose the word, but strongly, almost arrogantly if you like, bad speech he has delivered, bad in the sense of creating [sic], Mr Khrushchev, if he gets irritated, he can say much that in a strong language that you can imagine and so there is a possibility after these elections of a slight turn for the better. Because every one of these countries now recognizes that they have to come together and solve this German [problem], if not solve it, at least to solve the present aspect of it. Probably some such thing will happen, they will come together and the United States

and the United Kingdom came to this conclusion some time ago. But Chancellor Adenauer and General De Gaulle struck out to come strongly line "No." Although as Khrushchev pointed out to me that if there is a nuclear war everybody will suffer terribly. He said the Soviet Union will suffer but it will survive, it is too big to disappear; but Germany, England and France will disappear from the face of the earth, he says. America might survive a little also, it is too big; but what will happen to these countries, they cannot. They all realize that of course and I think that it is difficult to say but on the whole there is a certain easing in people's minds, in my mind, maybe I, I do not [sic] situation is a pretty dangerous one because every little thing may excite and may create incidents. But nevertheless I think that war will be avoided.

General

87. In the Lok Sabha: Expedition to Annapurna⁶

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:⁷

- a. whether it is a fact that the base camp of the Indian Team, which has been successful in climbing Annapurna Peak, was looted.
- b. if so, the circumstances in which this happened;
- c. whether it is a fact that porters in the area refused to work for the team; and
- d. if so, the reasons therefor?

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

- a. and b. The base camp was looted by the Manang villagers on the 21st April, 1961, while all members of the expedition were in the higher camps. These villagers have been in the habit of harassing mountaineering expeditions with the object of extorting money.

⁶ Written answer, 5 September 1961. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. 58, 4-8 September 1961, cols 7039-7040. Nehru was not in Delhi when this answer was given.

⁷ Question by Shree Narayan Das, Congress.

c. and d. The villagers refused to provide porters unless Rs 2,000 was paid by the expedition. However, on the intervention of our Ambassador,⁸ the Government of Nepal deputed some troops to the area together with sherpas who ferried loads to the next stage where porters were available.⁹

88. To Kesho Ram: Ladakh Buddhist Vihara in Delhi¹⁰

I had a talk with Shri Kushak Bakula¹¹ today about the Ladakh Buddhist Rest House which we have built in Delhi.

2. I think that broadly we should agree to any matter about which he feels strongly. Thus, so far as the name is concerned, we might agree to call it "Ladakh Buddhists Vihar". He wants the name to be Ladakh Buddhists Rest House and Vihara. I think that is too long a name. His wishes are met by the name I have suggested above.

3. As for the committee, we can add one or two Ladakh representatives in addition to Shri Kushak Bakula to represent the Ladakh Buddhist society. Possibly one or two of them may be almost permanent residents here. It would be desirable to have a permanent resident who can look after the Vihara. We may call him Manager or some such name. He need not necessarily be the Secretary of the Committee, though I have no objection to some person from Ladakh being Secretary if he is adequately educated in English.

4. I told him that it would be better to have some charge, though very small, for staying in the Vihara. It is not so much to make money, but to ensure proper management. Any Lama or such like person sent by Shri Kushak

⁸ Harishwar Dayal.

⁹ For correspondence at time of occurrence, see SWJN/SS/68/item 36.

¹⁰ Minute, 13 September 1961, to the PPS. PMO, File No. 2(314)/59-67-PMS, Minute No. 158. Also available in the JN Collection.

¹¹ Minister of State for Ladakh Affairs and Trade Agencies, Jammu and Kashmir, 1957-1962.

Bakula may stay there without payment on his recommendation. But others should be charged some small daily fee. This should not exceed one rupee a day and may possibly be even less.

5. These are the principal points discussed by me. You might have a further discussion with him and settle things finally.

6. Shri Kushak Bakula also spoke to me about some scholarships for boys in Leh. I think he mentioned the number as ten. He also said something about a school for the Tibetan refugees there. I don't think there need by any difficulty about these two matters. So far as the Tibetan refugees are concerned, we are making arrangements for their education wherever they are and we should do that in Ladakh also. So also about scholarships that is suggested.

Pondicherry

206. To M.J. Desai: Pondicherry Council Members Satisfied¹²

It would interest you to know that some Members of the Council of Pondicherry saw me at Madurai. They expressed their satisfaction at the new turn of events there which, according to them, was due to the instructions we had sent to the Administrator. The Administrator was now cooperating fully with them. Mr Goubert¹³ was also at Madurai, but I did not have a chance of talking to him separately. I was told, however, that he was also more or less satisfied.

¹² Note, 5 October 1961, to the Foreign Secretary.

¹³ Edouard Goubert, leader of the Congress Party in Pondicherry and Councillor for Finance, Labour and Industries.

Bhutan

207. To Jigme Dorji Wangchuk: Indar Jeet Bahadur Singh as Political Officer¹⁴

September 25, 1961

Your Highness,

I write to inform Your Highness that Shri Indar Jeet Bahadur Singh, M.A. (Oxon); B.Litt. (Oxon); Bar-at-Law (Middle Temple) is being appointed as Political Officer in Sikkim. He will also be in charge of our relations with the Government of Bhutan.

Born in 1914, and educated at Trinidad and England, Shri Bahadur Singh joined the Indian Foreign Service in 1949 and has served in Indian Missions in China, Japan, Korea and the U.S.A., as well as in the Ministry of External Affairs. He was appointed as Commissioner for India in East Africa in December 1958 and will be going to Sikkim directly from Nairobi. He is expected to arrive at Gangtok on the 22nd October, 1961.

Shri Bahadur Singh is an officer in whom the Government of India have the fullest confidence. We trust that Your Highness will always find in him a worthy friend and well-wisher.

With my greetings and best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

External Affairs

Page 596

In the Rajya Sabha: the International Situation

For the rest I merely wish to say something about the situation in Africa. In Africa the main trouble spots are the Congo, Algeria, Tunisia, Bizerta, etc. And there is also Angola. These are the major spots. There are others too.

¹⁴ Letter to the Maharaja of Bhutan.

Of course, there is South-West Africa, there is the Union of South Africa's continuing policy of apartheid, and they are trying to affect other parts of Africa with it. For instance, in Angola it is said that the South African government is lending its help to some extent to the Portuguese authorities. Also there is a sense of fellow feeling, I believe, to some extent between the South African Government and the Central African Federation or rather the white governing elements there. So you see in Africa this tremendous upsurge being met by the old vested interests in the shape of some governments and chiefly white settlers trying to stop the march of the Africans forward, and as we have seen, in the Congo a very difficult situation is being created. The most painful thing, of course, today in a sense, perhaps in the whole world, is what is happening in Angola and the way the Portuguese Government is dealing with the situation there with primitive savagery and barbarity. Many accounts do not come but some accounts do come, accounts chiefly of missionaries. Reading them it is a little difficult to remain calm and peaceful because it is a record of absolute primitive barbarity. It is shocking in the extreme that such things can occur. All one can hope is that the people of Angola will be able to meet this, as I believe they are meeting it and meeting it with a measure of success.

The terrible part of it is that the Portuguese authorities, apart from committing large scale genocide, are particularly interested in liquidating, killing if you like, every educated African they can find in Angola. In a population of many millions, there are not many but tens of thousands of educated people— I am not talking of very high-class education but moderately educated—so that the Angolans may not have any leadership left. That is the idea.

It is a ghastly thing and it does little credit to other nations, especially the big nations that such a thing should occur and they cannot check it or stop it. There is the United Nations, there are the other great countries and there is Portugal still sitting in the Councils of the NATO group of nations. Only one member of the NATO—I think it is Norway—has had the courage to say publicly that they will have nothing to do with Portugal in the shape of any

help and that it should not be in the NATO. Of course we cannot expect that other countries will send armies to Angola to fight the Portuguese but the least that any country can do is to express its strong disapproval of what is happening there and to desist from even indirectly helping the Portuguese Government in this nefarious business. I am afraid some countries have not done so and I regret to say that the United Kingdom is one of those countries, which indirectly have associated themselves with the Portuguese, and, if not directly approved of what is happening, apparently have made it clear that they can survive without much damage to their own esteem. I think it is very unfortunate that any civilised country in the wide world should take up an attitude or take up a very legalistic attitude in regard to what is happening in Angola.

In regard to Algeria, we have repeatedly hoped for or looked for some settlement between the Algerian Nationalist Movement and the French Government. They seemed to have come near it and yet again drifted away. There can be no doubt, nobody can doubt, not even the authorities in France, that Algeria is bound to be free and the continuation of this struggle merely means needless suffering all round. In Tunisia, what happened in Bizerta also indicates how even a vanishing imperialism strikes back and strikes back very roughly and very cruelly. Altogether, the atmosphere of the world is so full of violence that it is becoming increasingly difficult to consider problems in a peaceful, quiet and logical way. So much in regard to foreign problems.

As the House knows, in about a week's time, I am going to attend a Conference at Belgrade, a Conference of countries that are described as non-aligned. I hope that this Conference will be able to throw its weight, such as it has, on the side of peace in Europe because one of the main questions to be considered is the question of war and peace at present as well as the other questions like anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-racialism and the like. Also I hope that it will do some good. It is not merely a question of denouncing things. It is very easy to denounce things and condemn them. It is much more difficult to take some steps, which help

to improve a situation, and I hope that some such step may be taken by them and that we shall not merely talk in terms of denunciation of what we dislike. Even here in our country and in the Parliament we have every right to express our opinions forcefully but we have always to think as to what steps or what word will help peace and what will merely aggravate a difficult situation.

In India, we have our three problems now, which are our companions all the time. They are the two border problems, if you like, the Pakistan border and the Tibet-China border with India and there is Goa. Of course, they are entirely different problems, specially the Goa problem. I believe that conditions are ripening even in regard to Goa for an advance being made. It is difficult for me to say anything definite because I am not sure myself as to what might be done in the whole context of things, what is happening to the Portuguese colonies abroad and to Portugal itself because in regard to Portugal one must remember that it is not a question of their introducing some special type of Government in their colonies—of course they have introduced it—but in Portugal itself, the method of Government is tyrannical and there is no freedom or civil liberty for even the Portuguese, what is happening there today will produce new situations in Goa requiring a new approach and we are watching them carefully.

In regard to Pakistan, we have had recently quite a good deal of speeches and declarations from responsible people in Pakistan in regard to India, in regard to Kashmir and these speeches and declarations have rather pained me—no doubt it must have pained others too—more especially in the context in which they came. I do not wish to enter into any argument here or at any other time. So far as the question of Kashmir is concerned, our position has been perfectly clear and it remains clear and if anyone in Pakistan thinks that complaining to other countries or trying to rouse other countries or attempting to bully our people will force us into some kind of decision, if they think so, then they have totally misunderstood what India stands for and how India reacts to these tactics. Our position in Kashmir is completely clear. Apart from all the 10 or 12 years of history, the basic facts

remain, that Kashmir was invaded by raiders coming through Pakistan and that the Pakistani Army followed them, that Kashmir joined legally the Indian Union. These are basic facts. When the U.N. Commission¹⁵ came here, they had accepted these facts. There is no doubt about it. Having accepted them, they made certain proposals. Even in those proposals, which we accepted, the first step was that Pakistan should withdraw from the Kashmir territory. They have never done so in the least. So, I cannot understand how anyone in Pakistan, least of all responsible leaders, can go on harping back on this issue. We have shown the greatest tolerance, the greatest patience, because according to us, the whole of Kashmir must be freed of any illegal control as part of it is under Pakistani control. That is our right. But we have also said that we are not going to take any military measures to push out the Pakistan army or the controlling apparatus from that area. It is our right and we are prepared to consider that when the time comes, in a peaceful way. That is going pretty far, as the House will appreciate, when we say that we are not going to take any military steps in that area which is occupied by Pakistan. That, as I said, is a policy which exhibits a great deal of patience and tolerance on our side. As for talk of plebiscite, etc. we have had repeated general elections there. We have a kind of responsible government going on there. We have development plans functioning and changing the face of Kashmir. And on the other side, which they have occupied, there is backwardness everywhere. Not only in that part, but also in the whole of Pakistan, there is no question of any elections or anything of that type. For them to recommend a process in Kashmir, which they have themselves discarded completely, does seem to me rather odd. Anyhow, that is the position and we are not going to be pushed out or harried by this kind of tactics that some people are employing in Pakistan. So far as the Indo-China—not Indo-China, that is confusing, because there are countries in Indo-China—I mean so far as the Sino-Indian border is concerned, or the Tibet-Indian border, there is not very much to report.

¹⁵ United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan.

Ever since our officials and the Chinese Government officials conducted the official examination of facts and those big volumes came out,¹⁶ it appears to us, and I should imagine, to any impartial reader, that the Chinese case had little substance, while our case was established beyond any possibility of doubt. We felt that this having been done, it was a step forward certainly and it should affect Chinese thinking in this matter, because we are not thinking, as far as possible, to try to settle this question by a war, and a very difficult war, in the high Himalayas. Apart from our aversion to war and apart from the world situation which would be affected by any such thing, we wanted to settle this, even if it took time, by peaceful methods without, of course, giving up our own rights, our own position. The official document that came out very largely supported what we had said and established our case and I thought that the Chinese Government would be affected by this and might change their attitude. It is difficult for me to say whether they are affected or not. Externally they are not. But I cannot conceive of their having read this and not having felt that their position is a weak one. When recently our Secretary-General in the External Affairs Ministry¹⁷ went to represent us in Mongolia at the fortieth anniversary of their freedom,¹⁸ a freedom, I might remind the House, which they obtained from China forty years ago, I asked our Secretary-General—it was a normal thing to do—to pass through Peking when coming back to India. He could have come back through Moscow, but he went through Moscow, which is a longer way and this is a shorter way through Peking. And it was right not only that he should pay courtesy visits to the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister,¹⁹ not merely

¹⁶ Reproduced in SWJN/SS/66 Supplement.

¹⁷ R.K. Nehru.

¹⁸ See SWJN/SS/69/item 8.

¹⁹ Chou En-lai and Chen Yi. respectively.

Other

Page 713

339. In the Lok Sabha: Ram Subhag Singh's Visit to Ladakh²⁰

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:²¹

(a) whether Government have received report from Dr Ram Subhag Singh, M.P.,²² on his visit to Ladakh at their instance; and

(b) if so, the main features of the report?

The Prime Minister and Minister of external Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The report touches on various aspects of a tour of Ladakh undertaken by Shri Ram Subhag Singh, in July last, including climate, religion, education, agriculture, afforestation, our army, and the political consciousness of the local people, etc.

37. From Le Corbusier: Door of Assembly Building²³

[Refer to item 253]

25 Rue de Sevres,

Paris-6

25 September 1961

Dear Mr Nehru,

Sub: Enamel painted door of the Assembly building at Chandigarh [...]

I had tried to gather information at Chandigarh concerning the symbolic

²⁰ Written answer, 23 August 1961. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. 57, 21 August - 1 September 1961, cols 4233-4234.

²¹ Question by Premjibhai Ranchhoddas Assar, Jan Sangh.

²² Congress.

²³ Letter, translation from the French (not recorded by whom), from the Architectural Adviser to the Government of Punjab, Capital Project. PMO, File No. 7(118)/56-66- PMS, (Vol.I), Sr. No. 111-A, excerpts only available at NMML.

signs which it could be useful to have represented on this door. I obtained little information and, generally, of signs exclusively dating from a hundred or a thousand years ago. Finally it seemed to me better for this Parliament to have signs of our actuality and it is you, Mr Nehru, who knows them and who can express them. A mass of signs is not required but only some of those concerning the ethics, the social and the politics of the present times. A few words coming from you with, eventually, a drawing of these signs (which already exist or perhaps do not yet exist) would be sufficient.

I think the world is becoming, through lack of imagination, quite mad. Everything is opened before us: a programme for peace supplies to feed the factories throughout the world and gorge even the insatiable gluttons who would enjoy starting a war to "make big money".

Believe me, dear Mr Nehru,

Yours most sincerely,

Le Corbusier