

## Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru

*Series 2,*

*Volume 74*

*February 6, 1962*

### **(b) China**

#### **242. Talk with U Nu<sup>1</sup>**

I had a talk today with Prime Minister U Nu. He himself initiated it. He said that when he was in Peking, he had talks with Premier Chou En-lai<sup>2</sup> and more especially the Foreign Minister and Deputy Prime Minister, Chen Yi.<sup>3</sup> Chen Yi seemed to be earnest and anxious to have a settlement with India by negotiation. He said, however, that it was difficult for China to take a move because of India's attitude towards China and their advocating that China should vacate large areas of territory before any negotiations could take place.

U Nu said that the Chinese Government was friendly to Burma and they had reached a good settlement with them. In fact, China had been occupying some Burmese territory, but they had vacated when this was suggested to them.

U Nu asked me if we could take some steps leading to negotiations. He seemed to think that the Chinese Government would be more reasonable now if we took the lead. Chou En-lai had stated that he had been to India twice and suggested that I should go to Peking. U Nu asked me if it would be possible for me to go there.

I told him that we would be glad to have negotiations. Obviously we do not want to go to war with China. The only way to settle this question was

---

<sup>1</sup> Record, 13 January 1962, Varanasi, signed by Nehru, forwarded to R.K. Nehru, the Secretary-General, MEA, and M.J. Desai, the Foreign Secretary.

<sup>2</sup> Prime Minister of China.

<sup>3</sup> U Nu visited China, 11 to 14 October 1961.

either by negotiation or by arbitration. But negotiations could only take place if there was some helpful approach made by the Chinese Government. Merely talking vaguely about negotiations was not helpful. Certainly, in the circumstances existing, I could not go to Peking. This would be resented greatly by our people, as they did our Secretary General's going to Peking on his way back from Mongolia which did not produce any helpful result.<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile, there had been intense anti-Indian propaganda by the Chinese Prime Minister and the Chinese Government approaches to Pakistan which were obviously based on hostility to India.

Thus the situation was not such that we could make proposals for negotiations with the Chinese Government leaving things as they are at present. We need not insist on their physical withdrawal from all our areas occupied by them but an indication of their withdrawal would open the door to negotiations. Otherwise our representatives for negotiations will merely repeat what they have said and the Chinese will also repeat their story and nothing will be done.

I gave U Nu a brief account of the last meeting with Chou En-lai in Delhi and the reports of the Indian and Chinese Government officials.<sup>5</sup> We could proceed on the basis of those reports. Again, unless something was clearly said by the Chinese, a meeting would merely result in repetition of arguments. Thus, some step had to be taken by the Chinese.

I told U Nu that if he so wished, he could convey this to the Chinese Prime Minister or the Deputy Prime Minister.

### **243. In New Delhi: China<sup>6</sup>**

---

<sup>4</sup> In July 1961, see SWJN/SS/69/item 8, p. 52.

<sup>5</sup> For records of meetings between Nehru and Chou En-lai, see SWJN/SS/60; for reports of officials, see SWJN/SS/66/Supplement.

<sup>6</sup> Speech, 21 January 1962, at Ramlila Grounds. Report in *The Hindu*, 22 January 1962, p. 1.

## Vacation of Chinese Aggression

Force will be used if Peaceful Methods do not Succeed

New Delhi, January 21 - Prime Minister Nehru today declared that India was determined to get Chinese aggression on her soil vacated by peaceful methods, but if it became necessary to use force to achieve this, she would do so.

Mr Nehru, who was addressing a mammoth public meeting here, described as "childish" the demand of certain parties that India should immediately march her armies against China to throw her out from Indian soil.

The Prime Minister said it had been repeatedly made clear that without full preparation, it would be folly to use armed force to get that kind of aggression vacated. "When we use armed force, we should do so with the idea of winning and not losing. Anyone who suggests that we should at once be jumping into the fray without adequate preparation is indulging in irresponsible talk."

The Prime Minister said, "Our critics shout at us and ask us why we have not thrown out the Chinese from areas under their occupation on Indian soil.

Mr Nehru added: "It has been repeatedly said by us that we will get this aggression by the Chinese vacated. We have to prepare for it. We are building roads in the mountain regions bordering on China and making other preparations. It is a difficult question."

"We will make every effort to solve this problem through peaceful methods because it is not a joke to fight with a big country in mountainous regions. But our determination is firm that after making full preparations, we will solve this problem. We will try to do so peacefully, but if this does not succeed, and, it is necessary to use force, we will use force." (Cheers).

The Prime Minister said: "How can there be two opinions on this matter? It may be that the Communist Party of India has a different opinion because it talks with two voices. Some members of this party support China while others say that both India and China had made mistakes and this problem

should be settled peacefully by agreement."

Mr Nehru added: "Yes, we are prepared to have an agreement through peaceful means provided it is a just agreement."

The Prime Minister warned the people against communal parties like the Jan Sangh, the Hindu Mahasabha and the RSS and said that their communal approach could harm India immensely.

#### Danger of Separatism

"Our entire history teaches us that only that King or Emperor was able to build up a great empire and achieve progress in India who encouraged unifying forces and kept the people together as a united body. Any King or Emperor who followed the narrow policy of separatism and dividing people on the basis of religion or caste failed miserably."

The Prime Minister said that separatist approach was against the very grain of India's basic culture of tolerance and unity of all peoples professing different religions and viewpoints. That had been amply demonstrated by Asoka and Akbar, who had made India a united and prosperous land. As against that, Aurangzeb, a brilliant man, began the process of weakening and breaking up the Mughal Empire by following separatist and narrow policies.

"I will, therefore, warn you against the communal approach. This approach can ruin India. You should beware of the communal parties and not support them at the coming elections. All this talk of Hindu Rashtra is against the grain of Indian nationalism and weakens it. The communal approach must not be given any quarter."

In a reference to Goa, Mr Nehru said that it would be wrong to make Goa an election issue. All parties in India, except a few people, wanted action to be taken to end Portuguese colonialism in Goa. The action taken in Goa against the Portuguese was a national issue and everybody supported the action.

Turning to critics in America and Britain of India's action in Goa, Mr Nehru said: "These critics were stating that while they had been full of praise for India's policy of non-alignment and solving problems through

peaceful methods, India's action in Goa had dimmed the picture in their minds of this good policy of India."

Mr Nehru said that political parties in India which opposed India's foreign policy should know that even critics in America and Britain of India's action were saying that they greatly admired India's policy. Those critics prefaced their criticism of India's action by praising India's policy and then saying that they had got a jolt because action had been taken in Goa.

Mr Nehru said that some people and newspapers in America and Britain were opposed to India's action. The way those critics were expressing their resentment and criticism against India was worth noting. The critics were saying: "We had a lofty picture in our hearts and minds of India's foreign policy. But by taking action in Goa, you have not lived upto this picture. You did not remain non-violent in regard to Goa. You did not turn out to be as big and great as we had thought you were."

The Prime Minister said that even these American and British critics had acknowledged that they held a very high opinion of India's foreign policy. But there were parties in India which found nothing good in India's foreign policy.

"I say that our foreign policy has helped India and enhanced her status and respect in the rest of the world.

Mr Nehru said that the critics in America and Britain, who were angry that India had not stuck to non-violence in regard to Goa, were hardly the people to talk of non-violence. Gandhiji could have done so, but when people in America and Europe talked of non-violence, he could not understand it. I cannot understand how these people, who themselves do not believe in non-violence, can tell us that we should have remained non-violent in Goa."

The Prime Minister said that the real thing was that India was not wedded to non-violence completely. If they were so, then there was no point in her maintaining her defence forces, the Army, the Navy and the Air Force.

#### **244. For M.J. Desai: Airdrop Going Astray<sup>7</sup>**

The incident mentioned in the enclosed telegram<sup>8</sup> deserves full enquiry. It is very odd that our supplies should be dropped on a Chinese post even though that post might be in our territory. Please get full report from Defence about it.

#### **(c) Nepal**

#### **245. For M.J. Desai: Tulsi Giri's Objectionable Statements<sup>9</sup>**

You told me today that a protest has been made to the Nepalese Government about the various charges made against India.<sup>10</sup> I presume a copy of your note will be sent to me.

I think that the attitude of Shri Tulsi Giri and the statements made by him have been highly objectionable and we must protest in the strongest manner against them both here with their Ambassador<sup>11</sup> and with the Nepal Government through our Ambassador in Kathmandu.<sup>12</sup> You might give quotations of some of the statements made by Shri Tulsi Giri.<sup>13</sup> I

---

<sup>7</sup> Note, 26 January 1962, for the Foreign Secretary.

<sup>8</sup> No. CCB-1156.

<sup>9</sup> Note, 26 January 1962, for the Foreign Secretary.

<sup>10</sup> According to the *Indian Express* of 29 January 1962, Tulsi Giri, Nepal's Home and Foreign Minister, alleged on 26 January that anti-national Nepalese elements were training themselves in India and were carrying out destructive acts within Nepal; and said, "how can the use of Indian soil by some dacoits and goondas to carry on destructive acts within Nepal, despite Prime Minister Nehru's repeated assurance that the Indian soil would not be permitted to be so used, be called friendly?" Since the middle of December 1961 there had been armed uprisings at a number of places in Nepal.

<sup>11</sup> Narapratap Thapa.

<sup>12</sup> Harishwar Dayal.

<sup>13</sup> Tulsi Giri said, among other things, that "he was surprised that, while Prime Minister Nehru saw no difference between US military invasion of Cuba and permission to carry out an attack on Cuba by Cubans from US territory, he (Mr Nehru) was not preventing similar action against Nepal by anti-national Nepalese." About the Kathmandu-Lhasa Road

suggest that our Ambassador in Kathmandu might see the King<sup>14</sup> about this matter.

#### **246. To Harishwar Dayal: Anti-India Agitation in Nepal<sup>15</sup>**

Your telegram 27 dated 30th January. Foreign Secretary<sup>16</sup> is unfortunately unwell. But I have [had] a talk with him.

2. King's attitude is not at all satisfactory. But you have expressed yourself in fairly strong language. It is evident that people in Nepal are being incited against India. This could not happen without King's approval.<sup>17</sup> I have just heard that an effigy of mine together with other effigies was taken out in procession at Panauti and burnt.<sup>18</sup> I do not mind this, but obviously it creates anger in India.

3. All this is completely without any foundation. We have not given slightest help to any of the Nepalese leaders here or encouraged them in any way. Subarna Shamshere has stated that he has nothing to do with attack on King. He added, however, that dissatisfaction against present regime is growing.

---

project, Tulsi Giri said that "in the same manner as India did not like this northern road, the Chinese might not have liked the southern road." India was engaged in a 900- mile road project in Nepal in cooperation with the USA and Nepal. *Indian Express*, 29 January 1962.

<sup>14</sup> Mahendra.

<sup>15</sup> Telegram, 31 January 1962, to the Ambassador to Nepal.

<sup>16</sup> M.J. Desai.

<sup>17</sup> A demonstration, sponsored by the municipal committees of the Kathmandu valley, was held in front of the Indian Embassy on the night of 26 January. Demonstrators came in a fleet of cars and buses; shouted anti-Indian slogans, including "Death to Nehru;" and delivered a memorandum to the Embassy demanding extradition of King Mahendra's political opponents living in India. *The Times (London)*, 27 January 1962.

<sup>18</sup> *The Statesman* of 1 February 1962, quoting a Nepalese press report, said that effigies of Nehru, Subarna Shamshere and Bharat Shamsher, leader of the Opposition in Nepal's dissolved Parliament, were burnt on a river bank at Panauti, east of Kathmandu.

4. Our Parliament is meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> March. King can come here in the second week of March and I shall gladly meet him even though I am likely to be very busy then.