

## **Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru**

*Series 2, Volume 75*

*June 1- July 31, 1960*

### **Page 21-22**

Ludovic Kennedy: Logically it would be impossible to defend the British being in Hong Kong, according to your line of argument.

Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, from that point of view perhaps you are right.

Ludovic Kennedy: How would you actually define the word "colonialism", Mr Nehru, yourself?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Well colonialism is possession of another territory, and with definite economic consequences. The political are obvious, but certain economic consequences, economic exploitation of that territory for the advantage of the metropolitan country, that is the nineteenth century type of colonialism which grew up. To some extent and in some places the exploitation part is less now, but the essence of it is that it is governed for the sake of the metropolitan country.

Ludovic Kennedy: Would you say that the Russian occupation of Hungary was colonialism?

Jawaharlal Nehru: No. It is not. It may be desirable or undesirable from your point of view. You may say the Soviet has exercised considerable influence on the Government of Hungary, but it is not colonialism of that type.

Ludovic Kennedy: Would you say that the Chinese occupation of Tibet was colonialism?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I think the Chinese occupation of Tibet has done a lot of

harm to Tibet and its people; that's one thing. But using the word in that sense it may be used if you like but historically, there's a long history behind it. But that is quibbling with words; I don't wish to quibble. I do think that Tibet, even when it has been a part of the Chinese Empire, has been an autonomous part, and they have taken away the autonomy of Tibet; and in spite of their promise not to do so. And made it practically not only a colony, but in some ways worse than a colony.

Ludovic Kennedy: Could I turn now to China. How seriously do you regard the present Chinese infiltration along your northern border?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We consider it very serious, both in the present and for the future, because China and India are neighbouring countries, with a frontier of 2000 miles, and if we are hostile to each other it's a bad inheritance—to spend all our resources in protecting our frontiers; that is the long-term view. In the short term it's also bad and serious because we think we are completely in the right, and the Chinese insist on their being completely in the right.

Ludovic Kennedy: Would it not strengthen your defensive position enormously if you could sink your differences with Pakistan to form a common defensive position along the northern border?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Well it would help, positively and negatively. The mere fact that our relations with Pakistan are not too good, and some armies are employed on our borders, itself lessens our strength. Positively I don't think it would make very much difference, because that would mean, I suppose, their helping us in defending India but the Chinese threat is to both.

Ludovic Kennedy: Isn't one of the dangers though of non-alignment that if and when it comes to a test of strength with China, India may find herself quite alone?

Jawaharlal Nehru: We'd rather be absolutely alone. In fact non-alignment in such a case is a greater help to us than otherwise, because alignment itself

brings the danger nearer; we have to face the danger immediately, while non-alignment means that we do not invite the danger. And by alignment, apart from having to change our policy completely as it is—and that could be an upsetting feature—there are other things, I think. What could we get out of it, except some arms; we could get some arms of course, but we'd rather get them by paying for it, than be bound up in a military block.

Ludovic Kennedy: I'd like to finish, Mr Nehru, by asking one or two general questions. You're sending a very strong team to the coming disarmament talks in Geneva. Now do you have any particular reason for regarding these talks as being any more fruitful than the other ones?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I don't think I can furnish you a reason, but I have a certain hunch that they will be ultimately more fruitful, simply because of my faith in human nature and reasonableness.

Ludovic Kennedy: How do you regard Britain's proposed entry into the Common Market? Even if there are Commonwealth safeguards—will this make Britain more European minded and less Commonwealth minded than before?

**(d) China**

**251. In the Lok Sabha: Chinese Incursions<sup>1</sup>**

Question:<sup>2</sup> Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether there have been any further Chinese incursions into Indian territory after the last statement made in Parliament; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b). No further Chinese incursions into Indian territory after the last statement made in Parliament have come to Government's notice except one case of a Chinese border patrol 12 miles from the Chinese check post on the Chip Chap River about which we had protested to the Chinese on 31<sup>st</sup> October, 1961. We have lodged a protest in this case and asked the Chinese authorities to issue strict instructions directing that no patrols should be sent out into Indian territory.

P.G. Deb: I would just like to know whether the Chinese have re-captured Longju outpost.

Jawaharlal Nehru: No. There has been no question of capture or re-capture of Longju.

Braj Raj Singh:<sup>3</sup> The point is this. The Prime Minister said in the last session of Parliament that the Government of India have vacated possession of Longju. The point is whether the Chinese have taken possession of it or not, or is it in nobody's possession.

---

<sup>1</sup> Oral answers, 13 March 1962. *Lok Sabha Debates*, Second Series, Vol. LXI, 12 March-26 March 1962, cols 50-60.

<sup>2</sup> By Ganatantra Parishad MP P.G. Deb, three Congress MPs, and one PSP MP.

<sup>3</sup> Socialist Party

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Government of India have not vacated possession of it. The hon. Member has taken....

Braj Raj Singh: I am sorry, the Government have not taken possession of it.

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Government have not taken possession of it. So far as I know, I am not quite sure, it has not been taken possession of by us. The Chinese retired about three or four miles from it. I presume that that situation still continues.

P.G. Deb: If the Chinese have not recaptured the area, is it then a no-man's land?

Speaker:<sup>4</sup> Shri Nath Pai.<sup>5</sup>

Nath Pai: Mr Speaker, this is the first time that a session of the House opens without our being told about fresh Chinese incursions. We welcome it. May I know, is it the result of the fact that the Chinese have occupied all that they claimed in their maps or whether it is perhaps the result of the new policy of the Government of India to stand firm by our rights?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The Chinese have not occupied all the lands they claimed in their maps even in Ladakh or the Northern sector. In the east, they have not done anything at all. There were very large areas which they claimed in NEFA and roundabout and it has not been occupied by them at all—no part of it at all. There has been no major change. What occasionally happens is, as it has happened in the western sector, their patrol has come. Patrols pass. Our patrols also pass that way. They have passed under protest. There are protests from both sides about this.

Perhaps, if you, Sir, would permit me to go beyond this question, in a connected matter about which I understand you have received notice of two adjournment motions, I might deal with that. In an alleged interview with

---

<sup>4</sup> M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar

<sup>5</sup> PSP.

the *Washington Post*,<sup>6</sup> evidently, the writer<sup>7</sup> of that interview did not quite understand me. He asked me something about leasing of land. I said the same thing that has been published in the correspondence that about a year and a half ago I made a temporary proposal so that we may discuss the matter further, that they should retire from a large area which they had covered and we should retire from any area which we may have covered according to them and that further I stated then that so far as this route is concerned, it may continue to be used by the Chinese because it is an old route for certain purposes, pending our discussions. That was what I said then. I told what I said a year and a half back which the Chinese had not accepted. This, somehow, was misunderstood by him perhaps.

Hem Barua:<sup>8</sup> On a point of order, Sir, the Prime Minister is pleased to say that we are prepared to retire from areas which we might have occupied. So long, we have been told in this House that we have not occupied any territory and that it is the Chinese who have occupied our territory in Ladakh. Now, may I know how this particular statement of our Prime Minister as a matter of clarification goes hand in hand with the national policy so far adopted by our Government?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I am merely stating what I said a year and a half ago. We suggested a principle to them that they should retire from any area which they claimed, they said we had occupied. In actual fact, this applied to a large area which they had occupied as it applied to two or three villages in the Demchok area in northern Ladakh which they claimed as theirs, quite apart from the present incursions not originally theirs; they said we have occupied. Without going into the question as to who was correct or wrong, we said, you withdraw from that area and we will withdraw from this—ours is a very small area of two villages—and then we sit down to discuss this

---

<sup>6</sup> Published on 25 February 1962

<sup>7</sup> Warren Unna, *Washington Post* correspondent for Asia, based in New Delhi. See item 237.

<sup>8</sup> PSP.

matter. It was a preliminary step which would open out discussion of these questions.

Nath Pai: As you were pleased to allow him to answer my adjournment motions, may I ask him...

Speaker: Yes. There is no point of order.

Nath Pai: We are glad to have your clarification. May be you are misquoted. *The Washington Post* quoted you as saying that the Government of India would be willing to give a lease which is a very different thing, Mr Speaker, from allowing somebody to use. We would like to know whether the Prime Minister really meant it or he was unfortunately misquoted.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think that the word "lease" was used at all by me.

I think he mentioned it, and he asked, "Would you be prepared to give it on lease?" That is why he has got mixed up. In answer to that, I reminded him again of what I said a year and a half ago that I would allow them, pending talks, to use that road because the road was considered to be of importance to them or whatever it was, but that would be subject to what would be decided when we discussed matters.

Nath Pai: During the past eight days, the Chinese have been using their propaganda machinery to tell the world that the firm stand of the Government of India was only an election stunt and that as soon as the elections would be over, the Government of India would give up their present position and come to what they call a reasonable stand, thereby indicating that the Government of India would abdicate their present position. May we know what the position of the Government of India is on this? May we know whether there is no reversal of our policy as indicated; and whether our policy remains what the President indicated in his Address yesterday?

P.G. Deb: I would like to put the question in this form. May we know

whether the Prime Minister is thinking of giving away the road constructed by China in the Aksai Chin area on condition that they vacate our territory?

Jawaharlal Nehru: As I have pointed out, I repeated what I said or offered to the Chinese a year and a half ago. It is there in the correspondence. The hon. Member can see that. I was not telling him of any fresh offer that we had made or that we were going to make. It was in a historical sense that I mentioned these matters, and that too, for the time being, so that it might make it easier for us to talk; we said that we would be prepared to talk and discuss all these matters, if they vacated that aggression, and they may continue the use of that road till we decided further about it, and use of that road too for civil purposes.

Hem Barua: May I know whether the attention of Government has been drawn to a statement made by Mr Jayaprakash Narayan<sup>9</sup> to the effect that the India-China border dispute should be referred for arbitration, and if so, what the Prime Minister's reaction to this suggestion is?

Speaker: An hon. Member or any politician may make any statement.

S.M. Banerjee:<sup>10</sup> Last time, we got a reply.

Speaker: I am not going to ask the Prime Minister to go on refuting it or accepting it here.

An Hon. Member: But that is a suggestion from a great man.

Speaker: Great men may say many things.

Ram Subhag Singh:<sup>11</sup> May I know whether the statement made to the representative of the *Washington Post* still stands, and it is the firm opinion of the Government of India that that road is of considerable importance to the Chinese, and therefore, they can continue to use that.

---

<sup>9</sup> Sarvodaya leader and a member of the PSP.

<sup>10</sup> Independent

<sup>11</sup> Congress



Speaker: The hon. Member wants to know whether that offer is still open.

Jawaharlal Nehru: I was telling him what happened a year and a half ago. It was rejected by the Chinese authorities then. The question of its standing now or not does not arise; nothing stands to be rejected, it is over. But I cannot say in what form the matter may come up, again, possibly; I cannot definitely say that, but there is no proposal from us to that effect now, because when it was made, it was rejected. And if I may mention again, that suggestion was for a temporary period, to open the door to discussions; after that, it would depend upon what, if any, arrangement was arrived at.

I mentioned to you the failing of the Indian people. One was this lack of unity, lack of a proper concept of nationalism and their tendency to go off into factions, religious factions or others. The other has been, lately—by lately, I mean for some hundreds of years—they have been cut off from the march of the world's progress. Originally, Indians used to go abroad, travel abroad, take the message of India to other countries, get the other messages back; they have travelled all over India, they have left great monuments in Java, in Indo- China; their books and their language, that is, their sacred language, Sanskrit, has affected the languages of other countries. And they went to China, Japan, Mongolia, Tibet of course, Afghanistan and countries of Western Asia, apart from, in ancient times, Rome and Greece. So, they were adventurous people in search of knowledge and carrying their own message to other people. Then comes the period in history when we become, for reasons I cannot make out, all closed in; a closed society, not caring or daring to go abroad and, therefore, quite out of touch with what was happening abroad. Thus, we become, as I said, a closed society. Now, a closed society does not make progress, it becomes a static society, it does not change, and a society which does not change is doomed to decay because everything changes in this world, except, perhaps, some high principles, but everything else changes, and if we do not keep pace with the change, we fall back. That is what happened to India. While Europe or some countries in Europe were experimenting with science and its offspring, technology, we were absorbed in our own thoughts, in our own repetition of old laws and did not care at all to experiment in this way, to find out the truths about the physical world. Europe experimented with science and got to know

**237. To The Washington Post<sup>12</sup>**

New Delhi, Feb.24 - The following is a condensation of Warren Unna's interview with Indian Premier Jawaharlal Nehru here today:

Warren Unna: There is talk here of a possible new meeting between you and Chou En-lai, that Burma's Premier U Nu suggested to you that it be held in Rangoon, and that Communist China has shown some interest of late by holding back in its personal criticism of you and by not accepting Pakistan's overtures to settle a joint border with China which would involve a part of disputed Kashmir. Are you interested?

Jawaharlal Nehru: U Nu did not suggest such a meeting to me. But so far as I am concerned one would not want to neglect any chance to bring about a peaceful settlement.

Warren Unna: There is talk that India at one time offered China a 999- year lease to use her road through Ladakh to get from Tibet into Sinkiang in exchange for general recognition of India's McMahon line border and Indian sovereignty over the 12,000 square miles of Chinese occupied territory in Ladakh. Is this offer still open?

Jawaharlal Nehru: About 1959, pending a solution, we suggested that they should withdraw from behind our frontier and we were prepared to withdraw to their suggested front, leaving the middle area a kind of no-man's land. We suggested that afterwards they could go on using the road. Nine hundred and ninety years is a very long time. Nobody has talked about the offer recently but it certainly is in a sense still open because it would have meant their withdrawing from a large chunk of territory and involving only one village of our own.

---

<sup>12</sup> Interview to Warren Unna, The Washington Post correspondent in India, 24 February 1962. The Washington Post, 25 February 1962, p. A14. "Question" and "Answer" in the text have been replaced with "Warren Unna" and "Jawaharlal Nehru."

Warren Unna: Do you have any trick up your sleeve which might prevent the usual East-West impasse in the forthcoming disarmament conference in Geneva?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The only thing that encourages me is a feeling that there is a stronger realisation everywhere that something has to be done. I can't catch hold of it. I feel sure that Khrushchev, for various reasons, is anxious to have disarmament and peace. How far he will go on, that I don't know. But he certainly is eager to have a peaceful settlement.

Warren Unna: What about the hitch over inspections?

Jawaharlal Nehru: Khrushchev has said repeatedly, "you can have as much inspection as you like". But he told me when I saw him in Moscow "I will not have inspection alone without disarmament" because he felt it would be used for espionage. It is apparently a vital matter for the Russians not to disclose the sites where they are likely to have installation.

### **Timing Question**

Warren Unna: What about the timing question-do you start disarming before you inspect to see if you really are carrying it through?

Jawaharlal Nehru: If there are men of goodwill and desiring the same objective I am sure the question of timing can be solved. But if they are suspicious of each other... the UN principle that the two should proceed simultaneously and at no time should this process give an advantage to the other party that is a good principle.

Warren Unna: Has your experience with troops in the UN's Congo pacification convinced you that future brushfire conflicts must be put down with a UN force staffed by soldiers from non-aligned countries?

Jawaharlal Nehru: There is much talk about disarmament, but logically you must consider that a supranational authority must exist. In that sense whether it is non-aligned or other, some authority has to be there.

Warren Unna: Some people have wondered whether America's difficulty in neither endorsing a strongman government in Latin America is not comparable to your own in Nepal. Is this so?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I don't think it is comparable. We were sorry to see a setback to democracy (when King Mahendra dissolved his cabinet in December, 1960 and imprisoned his country's leading politicians). But for the rest, we did nothing. The King's father was much more friendly toward us.

### **Stabilizing Elements**

We have pointed out to the present King that there are two stabilising elements—the King and the Nepalese Congress Party—and so long as they stayed together things would improve. The two coming into conflict created instability. We didn't wish any radical means to be taken. But we did wish slow progress would be made. The movements inside Nepal became a little more active lately and the King accused us. We've told them we have not encouraged them. Our position throughout is not to interfere.

Warren Unna: Will you be meeting with the King shortly, as has been rumoured, to smooth out these differences?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I don't know yet if he will come. Our treaty says that in regard to foreign affairs and defense we consult each other. We were a little surprised at the agreement they had come to with China about building a new road. We had not known anything about it.

Warren Unna: Has the road gone ahead and, if not, would its going ahead be a point of your discussion with the King?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I don't think anything has been done about it yet. It might be refereed to.

Warren Unna: I am told that India has some thoughts that Communist North Viet-Nam might become another Yugoslavia independent from

Communist China just as Yugoslavia is from the Soviet Union. Is this true?

Jawaharlal Nehru: I don't know. But the past hundreds of years have been ones of conflict against China as a whole. A while ago the Health Minister from North Viet-Nam was here and asked me how many Chinese we had in India. I said about 20 to 30,000. I suppose, mostly in Calcutta, a drop in the bucket, with our population. He said (here Nehru smiled) "You are lucky you've got so few." It showed their mental bent. The Vietnamese may be Communists, some of them, but mostly they are nationalists with a Communist bent and the nationalism is against too much Chinese intrusion.

Warren Unna: you gave us a warning about China coming into North Korea if we crossed the Yalu River. Are you warning us now about our military buildup in South Viet-Nam?

Jawaharlal Nehru: In Korea we had been told that they would come in. We passed it on..

As for the American military in South Viet-Nam, you can't deal with these matters in a purely military way unless there is some political urge behind it. There is no doubt that in South Viet-Nam, the rural areas especially, there are a considerable number of people opposed to (President Ngo Dinh) Diem. They may get help from North Viet-Nam but essentially it is local trouble.

Southeast Asia

Warren Unna: India and the US have shown a mutual concern about the affairs in Southeast Asia, particularly Laos and Viet-Nam. Is India's policy one of containing China from Southeast Asia?

Jawaharlal Nehru: The basis of the Geneva meeting in 1954 was that this area should be left to develop by itself and if one party interfered from outside the other was bound to and it would become a cockpit. It didn't quite develop. We thought it would. We still think the policy laid down before on the Geneva basis is sound.

Warren Unna: President Kennedy has made known his views that it would be better for all concerned if the Kashmir problem could be set aside and both India and Pakistan get about the business which concern them most Economic development. How possible is this today?

Jawaharlal Nehru: For four or five years it had been more or less frozen. The year before last when I went to Pakistan for the signing of the Indus Canal Waters issue. That was a big step in advance and really that settlement was by far more important than the territorial issue (of Kashmir) I had asked President Ayub to come here for a return visit. But unfortunately a few months after coming back the Pakistan press and certain government members there started attacking us over some routine speech which a deputy Minister here had made merely restating the facts...

After our operation in Goa we felt they might have thought: it was a super opportunity when we had been criticized by the West to raise this (Kashmir issue before the UN Security Council). Two months ago, when the Pakistan Minister of Education and (Nehru smiled) Kashmir affairs was here I repeated my invitation to President Ayub and he told me he would convey it. Then President Ayub made a statement not directly to me that he had not received a formal invitation and that there was no point unless we had more or less agreed as to what was to be said. I recently had our High Commissioner to Pakistan repeat the invitation. I have not heard. I quite agreed with President Kennedy that it will help nobody by having a bitter debate about it at this stage.

Asked About Menon

Warren Unna: In America as you are aware Krishna Menon has become somewhat of a dirty word. He speaks for your foreign affairs in the UN he is your Defense Minister he has built up a new sector of defense industries here and he is your longtime personal friend. Now he is running for reelection with open Communist Party endorsement and your heavy backing... How can we better understand Mr Menon's position?

Jawaharlal Nehru: In India as a whole we (Nehru's Congress Party) are opposing two main parties the Communist and the Jan Sangh (a conservative party which preaches separate Hindu and Moslem communization). In Delhi the Communists decided to help some of our (Congress Party) candidates here because the others were Jan Sangh. This sort of thing has received a great deal of public attention particularly in North Bombay (Menon's reelection district). But in Bombay itself some of our main opposition are Communists. The Communists as a whole in India are likely to do worse than they did before. It is I suppose silly for me to prophesize five days in advance of the returns. But I don't think they are likely to prosper.

Warren Unna: What about the speculation that after the election your government either through cabinet shift or an increased speedup of your socialistic development will be turning "Leftist?"

Jawaharlal Nehru: The more Rightist elements have challenged us and because they have it has brought out some of the more Leftist elements in the Congress (Party) more that before. But broadly speaking, our policy is represented in the Five Year Plan we wish to implement. The approach in India has been rather to bring together than to have this fierce conflict. Our approach has been to go some distance toward our goal in a friendly way. We would rather go a little slowly than increase these internal conflicts.



### **238. For the International Students' Association<sup>13</sup>**

I send my good wishes to the International Students' Association and wish it success in the work it is doing. That work must necessarily be of creating greater understanding among young people of all countries, greater tolerance and a desire to learn from others.

I do believe that nationalism, properly understood, is essential because it gives roots to an individual and a country. Without such roots one is apt to float about and have no anchorage. But nationalism is not by itself enough. The world becomes more compact and every country lives practically on the threshold of other countries because of the great increase in the means of communication. Therefore, the only future for this world can be for us to grow out of the limiting features of nationalism and to have understanding and tolerance of others.

It is a good thing now that students go to various countries and thus broaden their outlook. We have welcomed students from other countries, and more especially those of Asia and Africa. Sometimes they may have to face some difficulties here. We should try to help overcome these difficulties because we have ourselves grown up largely in a closed society in the past. We have to broaden our horizon and learn from others. But the fact of meeting people from other countries is important and we should encourage it.

---

<sup>13</sup> Message, 25 February 1962

## 239. The *Borba* Interview<sup>14</sup>

General Election

Nehru Satisfied with Results

New Delhi, March 3.

Prime Minister Nehru has described the general election just concluded in India as "satisfactory".

In an interview with the official Yugoslav newspaper *Borba* published in Belgrade, last night, Mr Nehru said that the losses suffered by the Congress in some States would not affect its basic policy.

### Page 677

A similar attempt was made against Dr Shankar Dayal Sharma, Education Minister, but it did not succeed. In Vindhya Pradesh Deputy Minister Dashrath Jain, the only Jain who supported Dr Katju, has been defeated along with his associates in Chhattarpur district. Shri Lalaram Bajpai along with all other candidates has been defeated in Tikamgarh district. Tikamgarh is the only place in the State which I visited after my return from Delhi in connection with a college function. On a casual enquiry the Collector told me that the Jains were opposed to the local Congress candidate. Shahdol was a Congress stronghold but only Minister Shambhunath Shukla and one other candidate have survived.

The fact is that every district in Madhya Pradesh has its own tragic tale and what is urgently necessary in the interest of the Congress organisation is the suspension of the PCC President and an impartial enquiry. If this is

---

<sup>14</sup> Report in *The Hindu*, 4 March 1962, p. 1. Dusan Simic, the *Borba* correspondent met Nehru on 1 March 1962, Engagement Diary entry.

done, I am sure, shocking facts will be revealed. I know that the PCC President has his own supporters in Delhi and only you can grant justice to this State. You acted boldly in Uttar Pradesh and that State has been saved. The people of Madhya Pradesh are unsophisticated and love you dearly. Have you not noticed the excellent results of the places visited by you during your election-tour in this State?

My suggestion may be considered as mere postmortem examination, but it is not so. If no enquiry is held it will adversely affect the future administrative set-up in Madhya Pradesh. Those who have been elected on Congress ticket are seething with discontent because they have survived against heavy odds. They will not accept a Chief Minister who has been associated with the PCC group. I am giving below a break-up of the Congress strength region wise as it stands now:

| <u>Region</u>   | <u>PCC Group</u> | <u>Anti-PCC Group</u> | <u>Unattached</u> |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Mahakoshal      | 22               | 54                    | 10                |
| Madhya Bharat   | 15               | 15                    | 3                 |
| Vindhya Pradesh | 0                | 12                    | 6                 |
| Bhopal          | 0                | 5                     | 0                 |
| Total           | 37               | 86                    | 19                |

Thus it is evident that thanks to better showing made by Mahakoshal the Anti-PCC group or the so called Ministerialist group has much better strength. But it has never been a united group. It can be broken up as follows into personal groups: -