

the dustbin by sudden freaks of anger and take away what we have given by the right hand. Seven times we have moved it in the forum of the United Nations. It does not matter if the resolution that is moved may be thrown to the wolves. But seven times we have moved in the United Nations that China be admitted. I say, China is still considered an untouchable in the U.N.O. Would you not feel it as a nation if you are the masters of this land and if you are not admitted to the club of the United Nations? If you are not admitted would you not feel it? There are rules of the club and if you are admitted to the club you are bound by the rules. To keep the Chinese out of it is an injustice and the sooner this is mended the better it is. Here we stand and sponsor a resolution that Nations but with the left hand we China be admitted to the United Nations but with the left hand we say that the Tibetan issue be taken up.

I was looking at the map of the world for El Salvador. I have nothing to say against El Salvador. El Salvador I could not locate in the map though I took the aid of my esteemed friend Dr. Ram Subhag Singh. I could not find El Salvador on the map. But in the year in 1950 or so, a year after Red China declared independence. El Salvador moved that Tibet be discussed. I do not know anything about what His Highness the Jam Saheb said. I hope the hon. Prime Minister will say about it. But be assured that even though I am a practising Roman Catholic, I say that the record of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches in China has not been altogether creditable. They have been pedlars. They have been the casinos. They have run even insurance company and what not—these missionaries. This is the way China was treated and that is how they became rebellious against everything. If they are coming down to our borders and if they are showing their strength we shall take it calmly and firmly. We have been

213 LSD.—6.

the followers of Mahatma Gandhi. We have been brought up during the last 50 years in the spirit of non-violence. I have seen the effect of that spirit of non-violence in the Chanceries of Europe and in the Capitals of Europe where people honour you for your foreign policy. If you are going to throw your foreign policy in the dustbin we shall not be honoured.

And what is it that Kingsley Martin say?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Joachim Alva: I want to take three or four minutes more. It is very important.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Two minutes.

Shri Joachim Alva: Sir Kingsley Martin, Editor of the *New Statesman and Nation*, who visited Bhutan and Sikkim barely two years ago, wrote a long article on Tibet. If anybody wants I will hand over a copy of it to him. I bought a dozen copies of the *New Statesman*. Do you know what he said at the end of that article?

"They are fools indeed, whether in this country, America or in India who would be glad to see Nehru compelled to abandon Indian neutralism and come forth as a champion in the cold war."

These are the last lines in his article.

What do the Egyptians say? Al Ghamouria, the Government organ at Cairo, whose Editor had come to India recently, in its issue of April 20th says:

"China must respect the right of India to accept (Tibetan) refugees and India should prevent the Dalai Lama from making any statements insulting to China.... India is the biggest country following a policy of positive neutrality. Nothing will force her to change her position. It is better for China to win her than

[Shri Joachim Alva]

to push her into a bloc she does not wish to be in... India and China are neighbours and should live like good neighbours."

Lots of advices have come to us. Our Army has moved on. They know their business. After all, you and I cannot take arms. We may talk as much as we like. We have entrusted the defence of our country to our Defence Forces. The major business of our defence forces is to help the civil authority in distress and also to guard our frontiers and they are doing their job. But, the time will come when we will have to sit around a Table and discuss what is the effect. Remember, we in India are also disturbed that the Chinese have not said a word about Kashmir. Marshal Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev, when they were in Kashmir, made an unequivocal declaration that Kashmir belongs to India. We have not heard anything from the Chinese. If we are the friends of the Chinese, let us tell them that we expect the Chinese, like the Russians to say that Kashmir belongs to us. If they have been nibbling Ladakh little by little, let us not forget that we are the inheritors of power from the British. What did the British do in Tibet? My hon. friend His Highness the Maharaja could not..... (*The time bell rings*) Only two more lines, Sir.

What did the British do in Tibet, just in this century?

"We killed several thousands of the brave ill-armed men; and as the story of the fighting is not always pleasant reading, I think it right, before describing the punitive side of the expedition, to make it quite clear that military operations were unavoidable—that we were drawn into the vortex of war against our will by the folly and obstinacy of the Tibetans."

This is by Mr. Candler in his book, *Unveiling of Lhasa*. He participated

in the Young husband Expedition into Lhasa. He also described his horror at the squalor, the dirt and the cruelty that the British found in Tibet. No doubt, he says, the Lamas employed "spiritual terrorism" to maintain their system of rule and justified it by their own dread of an age of materialism and reason.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must resume his seat now.

Shri Joachim Alva: One more sentence.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order; I have rung the bell three times. Shri Hem Barua.

Shri Joachim Alva: With these few words, I oppose the motion that the matter be referred to the United Nations General Assembly.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, this Resolution purports to refer the Tibetan issue to the United Nations and I welcome this Resolution wholeheartedly.

In the context of this, the question that is naturally asked is, under what provision we refer this Tibetan issue to the U.N.O. A very wide issue is involved in it. We find there is a flagrant violation of the human rights enunciated in the Universal Declaration adopted by the U.N.O. on the 10th December, 1948. The basic human rights constitute the Bible of the civilised world. China, by adopting the law of the jungle subjugating the people of Tibet to a reign of blood and terror, has not only violated the fundamental principles of the Declaration, but has also outraged the conscience of the civilised world. At the same time, I feel there is a violation of the Bandung spirit, a spirit that tried to create an atmosphere of mutual goodwill and understanding among the nations of the world and a spirit that has been so carefully nurtured by our Prime Minister into a positive philosophy.

There are 30 articles in the Declaration. I do not want to analyse each one of them against the background of the Chinese action in Tibet. But, I take a particular article of it, that is article 3 which says:

"Everybody has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

Events today under Chinese authority in Tibet of murder and naked barbarism in that country only prove it to the hilt that this very human right is soaked in blood and that is the blood of innocent people in that small country. I can substantiate what I have said elaborately from the report of the International Commission of Jurists that was recently published in Geneva. I can just tell you that there is unabashed gangsterism stalking the land from one end to the other. And with the invasion of the country by Chinese forces, the debacle is complete. Tibet today appears to me to be vast slaughter-house.

I would just refer you to the press conference at Mussoorie on the 20th June 1959, where a question was asked by a journalist in the following terms:

"An Indian report filed with the International Commission of Jurist; says that 65,000 Tibetans have been killed in fighting with Chinese occupation forces since 1956. Is that correct?"

And the Dalai Lama said:

"The number of Tibetans killed in fighting the Chinese occupation forces since 1956 is actually more than the Indian report."

This shows that more than 65,000 people were killed in Tibet since 1956.

It is on this specific issue, namely the violation, the naked violation of the human rights enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the UNO that we can bring

this matter before them or refer the Tibetan issue to the UNO and thus justify the moral heights that we have attained today in the eyes of the world.

It is not that alone; there is a *prima facie* case of genocide against China. There are positive instances to prove that there has been indiscriminate air attack on the innocent people not actually engaged in hostilities.

Now, may I draw your attention to the fact that the contracting parties to the genocide convention of 1948 undertook to prevent and punish genocide, a crime against the law of nations? This makes it obligatory on all the nations who participated in that convention that whenever there is a case of genocide in the world, they should bring it to the notice of the parent organisation, that is, the United Nations Organisation. A moral responsibility devolves on India as well, which was a party to that convention. When there is a clear case of genocide in Tibet, it devolves on us to bring this to the notice of the UNO.

In this connection, I would just like to quote the appeal made by the International Commission of Jurists, which says:

"The Commission, therefore, earnestly hopes that this matter will be taken up by the United Nations. For, what at the moment appears to be attempted genocide may become the full act of genocide."

There can be another argument also, and this is very often advanced. People say that this is an internal problem of China, and we should not have anything to do with it. *The People's Daily* of China also claims it; that also claims sovereign rights over Tibet. It says:

"The People's Republic of China enjoys full sovereignty over the Tibetan region....there

[Shri Hem Barua]

can be no doubt whatever about this, and no interference by any foreign country or by the United Nations under whatever pretext or in whatever form will be tolerated"

This claim to sovereign rights is an anachronism, it is historically untenable, and it does not have any historical foundation whatsoever

During centuries of relation between China and Tibet, whether relations of peace or of war, no Chinese Government have ever claimed the right to sovereignty over Tibet. That is also a fact. Now, the very fact that China was forced to enter into an agreement with Tibet shows that Tibet was independent, it shows positively that China did not enjoy sovereign rights over Tibet.

The preamble of the agreement states

"The Central People's Government appointed representatives with full powers to conduct talks on a friendly basis with the delegates with full powers of the local Government of Tibet"

The very words of the preamble prove that it is an agreement not between a paramount country and a subordinate country but between two sovereign States.

After the Second World War started, after the Far Eastern debacle in 1943, China wanted to establish means of communication through Tibet, but Tibet denied those rights to China and maintained her autonomy or rather independence.

I want to quote a despatch sent by the Head of the Far Eastern Department of the British Foreign Office to the Counsellor of the American Embassy in London. That was on 7th August 1942. It says

"In fact, the Tibetans not only claim to be but actually are an independent people, and they have in recent years fought successfully to maintain this freedom against Chinese attempts at domination"

I can justify it by reference to Shri Nehru's book *Glimpses of World History*. There he says about China

"So China lost Manchuria and much else, and Japan continued to threaten the rest of the country. Tibet was independent"

This is on page 842 of that book.

The sovereign right of China over Tibet and the subsequent agreement of 1951 were effected under the threat of bayonets and bullets. Therefore, it cannot be an internal problem of China alone. It is an international problem. I feel that China has to be contained because of the recent border incidents. There is some design on their part. I know there is a booklet by Mao Tse-Tung where he says that there should be a Federation of the Mongoloid people who are on the periphery of China, people who live on this periphery of the Himalayas all belong to the Mongoloid group of people. There is a pointed reference made by Chou En-Lai when he said in April last that there are 'undetermined frontiers with our southern neighbours'. At the same time, they have not yet ratified the agreement under which the MacMahon Line was drawn up in 1914.

All these facts show that they have certain designs here. I would say that there was recently at the Inter-Parliamentary Union's Conference in Warsaw a reference by a Russian representative, Govkin, in which he said positively that the fault lay with India and did not lie with China.

These are the things. We have to view the entire problem in the context of these developments. When we view the entire problem in the context of these developments, we feel that liberty is butchered, freedom is slaughtered—Tibet is a vast slaughterhouse, as I have already said—and all sense of human values are sacrificed at the altar of expansionism, and

there is a threat to the security and solidarity of our borders as well.

All these things call for a ready reference of the Tibetan issue to the UNO and such action will be justified.

Shri Brajeswar Prasad (Gaya) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, The Government of India can neither raise the question of Tibet nor support it if it is raised by someone else in the United Nations Organisation. The agreement between China and Tibet has no validity in the eyes of international law, because Tibet is not an international personality.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara) It is an independent country.

Shri Brajeswar Prasad: We have also endorsed this position by saying that Tibet is an integral part of China and that China's sovereignty exists over Tibet.

The division between North Korea and South Korea was recognised by the United Nations Organisation. Tibetan autonomy, on the other hand, has never been recognised by either the United Nations Organisations or the League of Nations or by any other international organisation. Tibet can become independent if Russia and America invade China. As long as this condition is not fulfilled, Tibet can never become free.

Therefore, it is futile to raise the question of Tibet in the United Nations Organisation. An anti-Communist front cannot be formed by raising the question of Tibet in the United Nations Organisation. Any new anti-Communist front, if formed, will go the way of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis. Russia and America have started embracing each other. Any conflict between India and China will jeopardise the interests of the black and the coloured races in gene-

ral, and of India and China in particular more of India than of China, because China has become a nuclear power. Any conflict between India and China will facilitate a political settlement between Russia and America on terms advantageous to the latter. Similarly, any collaboration between India and America will lead to the same result.

If we antagonise China on the question of Tibet, Russia will support Pakistan on the question of Kashmir. Let us try to liberate Kashmir first before we talk of Tibet. For Heaven's sake stop talking about Tibet. The threat of the establishment of the Karachi-Peking-Moscow axis looms large on the horizon. Russia is with China on the question of Tibet. Let there be no mistake about it. There are people who think that Russia is giving only routine support to China on the question of Tibet. I differ from this view. It will be a political blunder of the gravest magnitude to antagonise China at this hour when the threat of a political settlement between Russia and America leading to the establishment of white hegemony over the black and coloured races looms large on the horizon.

The central problem of international politics is not that of a conflict either between Russia and America or between communism and democracy. It is one of conflict between the black and coloured races on the one side and the white races on the other. The menace of white hegemony can be liquidated by the integration of Russia with the Afro-Asian land mass. Russia can be integrated with the Afro-Asian land mass if India and China are integrated into one political unit. The alternative to the integration of India and China into one political unit is the division of the world either between Russia and America or between Russia and China.

An Hon Member: In case of integration who will be the Prime Minister?

Shri Ferose Gandhi (Rai Bareilly):
Raja Mahendra Pratap.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Sovereign nation States have become obsolete. The status quo cannot be maintained by any strategem whatsoever. I do not give my support to the cult of self-determination. It led to the outbreak of the Second World War (*Interruptions*). The Second World War was fought at the altar of Polish independence. Where is Poland now? And, was the independence of Poland worth the price paid? Poland led to the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki

An Hon Member: What about Tibet?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: One thing leads to another. A war between India and China may be the result of our championing the cause of Tibetan autonomy. A war between India and China may lead to the outbreak of a nuclear war on a global scale.

President Wilson championed the cause of self-determination. The result was the outbreak of the Second World War. We also championed the cause of self-determination. The result was the vivisection of India.

17 hrs.

Military security is not possible in a world of sovereign Nation States. India, China, Russia, America, England, France and Germany feel threatened by one another. All nation States are enemies of one another by virtue of the imperatives of power politics, in a world of anarchy. There are no permanent friend or enemies. All big nation States are gangsters and small nation States are just like prostitutes. They either go with the highest bidder... (*Interruptions*) or are liquidated by force of arms. A full-fledged settlement between India, China and Russia will facilitate the achievement of the goal of (*Interruptions*) a world government which is

the only solution of the problems of insecurity.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Aurangabad): On a point of order, Sir. Issues of high international importance are being discussed and the manner in which the hon. speaker is speaking is most reprehensible... (*Interruptions*.)

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am sorry that my friend has not been able to follow me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has finished his speech, I suppose.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Let me have a few minutes more, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I have called the Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, The Resolution moved by the hon. Member appears to be a fairly simple one, simply worded. But as the course of this debate has shown, behind that Resolution lie high international issues and big problems with big consequences. Now, I suppose everyone in this House has a feeling of the deepest sympathy at the sufferings of the Tibetan people. There is no doubt about that. As everyone knows, we have given refuge and asylum not only to the Dalai Lama but to nearly 13,000 others. In fact we have given refuge to everyone who came. I cannot remember the case of a single person whom we denied refuge in this case, in regard to Tibet. That itself was evidence of our feelings in this matter.

But feeling apart, our sympathy for the Tibetans apart, what exactly should we do about it? What exactly should we do even, let us say, to give expression to those feelings of sympathy? Some hon. Members have delivered rather brave speeches as to the evil deeds perpetrated by other countries. It is easy enough to talk about them and it is easy enough to

find many faults in the ways the countries behave. But, if a country like India has to function, we have to function in a mature way, in a considered way, in a way which at least promises some kind of results. It is absolutely—I should say respectfully—pointless for us to make brave gestures and it is worse than pointless if these brave gestures react and rebound on us and injure us or injure the cause which we seek to promote.

So far as this question of Tibet is concerned, we may look at it from many points of view—historical, cultural and other contacts with India, China, etc. It is a long and chequered history and one need not go into it. When a country has had a long and chequered history, it supplies enough material for any party to support any claim. The Chinese claim that Tibet was subject to their sovereignty or suzerainty—I do not know what word they use—for hundreds of years. The Tibetans claim that they were independent for many periods except when they were forced into some kind of subservience. Now, really this may be interesting to the historical students, but it does not help us. It is a fact, of course, that for a period of 40 years or so, for all practical purposes, ever since the Manchu Dynasty fell or a little after that, Tibet was practically independent; even so not hundred per cent, even so China never gave up her claim. But in effect it was independent.

As I said, it does not help us very much. Of course, if this question arose in the International Court of Justice at the Hague—of course, it will not; such questions do not arise there because national States do not take them there and China, anyhow, has nothing to do with the International Court of Justice at the Hague—they might consider all these questions.

The two or three main considerations are that internationally considered, Tibet has not been considered

as an independent country. It has been considered an autonomous country but under the suzerainty or sovereignty of China. That was the case before India became independent, with the United Kingdom, with Russia—not only the Soviet Union but the Czarist Russia previous to that—and these were the main countries concerned. The rest of the world did not pay the slightest attention to Tibet except that it was some kind of a land of mystery.

That being so, when India became independent and we inherited more or less the position as it was in British days, both the advantages and the disadvantages of it, well, for a moment we carried on. We did not like many things there—I mean to say the extra-territorial privileges that we have there which certainly were relics of British Imperialism in Tibet. We did not like that particularly, but we were too busy for the first year or two to interfere with anything.

Then came this Chinese incursion or invasion into Tibet. At no time had we denied Chinese overlordship of Tibet, you might call it what you like. That has been the position all along. Even in recent years we have not denied it. Even after independence, even before the People's Government of China came there we had not denied it. In fact, we had somewhat functioned as if we accepted it.

Now, when this came we had to face a difficult situation in law, and constitutionally speaking we could not say anything because of the position we had accepted and the world had accepted. Nevertheless, we were rather pained and upset at the way things were happening, armies marching, and what appeared to be a forcible conquest and occupation of Tibet. We sent some notes in those days, some one or two notes politely worded, expressing the hope that this question would be peacefully solved. I am afraid, the replies we got from the Chinese Government were not equally politely worded at that time. I am speaking from memory...

An Hon. Member: That is a fact.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is a fact. I am talking about the sequence of events; that I am speaking from memory.

Then, a country, El Salvador, a member of the United Nations sponsored some kind of a motion on Tibet in the United Nations. It was a motion for the inclusion of the item on the agenda of the General Assembly and with it was a draft resolution condemning, what they called, the unprovoked aggression in Tibet and suggesting the appointment of a committee to study the appropriate measures to be taken.

Now, there was some discussion on this question of the inclusion of the item on the agenda. The representative of India, and I believe the representative in this particular case was the Jamsaheb of Nawanagar, pleaded that this matter might be settled peacefully and it would be better not to take it up in this way. He added, I believe, that we had received some assurances from the Chinese Government that they wanted to settle it peacefully by negotiation, and therefore the inclusion of this item on the agenda be adjourned. This suggestion was supported by the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Australia, Soviet Union, and for its own reasons no doubt, even by what might be called Kuomintang China in Formosa. The item was postponed. The postponement was agreed to.

On what basis did the Jamsaheb say that we had received assurances from the Chinese Government? I am sorry I have not got the exact papers with me, but so far as I can remember, we had received a message from the Chinese Government in answer to our representations and to our requests to the effect that they wanted to settle it by negotiation and in a peaceful way. In fact, I think they

had stopped the march of their army somewhere near the eastern borders of Tibet.

Also, some representatives of the Tibetan Government sent by the Dalai Lama were to proceed to Peking to discuss this matter. In those days, until quite recently, the easiest and simplest way for a person going from Lhasa to Peking was via India. It was much more difficult to go via the Gobi desert and all that. In fact, even after the People's Government of China came into power, on several occasions they sent their representatives or their other people via India to Tibet. It was simpler: from Calcutta right up to Gangtok in Sikkim and through Nathu La onwards. The Tibetan representatives, on their way to Peking, came to Delhi. It was more or less natural. Also, I suppose, they wanted to consult us. This happened ten years ago, and I have no very clear recollection of the sequence of events. I know they remained in Delhi for rather a long time; why exactly it was not clear to me. Anyhow they did. It was this sequence of events that led us to make that suggestion in the United Nations, and the matter was not discussed.

Afterwards, as a matter of fact, there was no proper negotiation with the team that the Tibetans sent. Long before they reached Peking, the other developments took place in Tibet. I think the Chinese army started marching again and the Dalai Lama and his representatives came to an agreement with them. Maybe, of course, the agreement might have been under compulsion of events, under pressure, but it was an agreement signed on behalf of the Dalai Lama, etc.

May I say this in this connection? The hon. Member Shri Vajpayee stated that the Dalai Lama came to the 17-point agreement with China because of certain assurances that I gave him and further that this was after the Chinese Prime Minister's

visit to India. He has got these things rather mixed up. There was no question of my giving any assurance, and the Chinese Prime Minister had not come to India and I had not gone to China. I had not met the Chinese Prime Minister at the time of this so-called 17-point agreement between the People's Republic of China and the Dalai Lama's Government, whatever it was. So, the question of any assurances from us does not come in at all. The only thing that we accepted was—based on the message received from the Chinese Government—what the Jamshep said in the United Nations Security Council, namely, that the Chinese said they wanted a peaceful settlement of this question and on the basis of that, it was not considered.

After that, there was this 17 point agreement in which some stress was laid on the autonomy of Tibet. Again it would be wrong to say that this stress on autonomy was included there because of our pressure and our desire. Certainly, it was our desire undoubtedly but when the agreement was concluded we were not there, we were not asked to express our opinion. It was between the Chinese Government and the Tibetans. So it is not correct to say that they had given us an assurance which they broke later.

What happened was that, several years afterwards, when Premier Chou En-lai came here, we had talks about Tibet and the Dalai Lama too was here at that time. The talks I believe were really initiated by Premier Chou En-lai and he wanted to explain to me—he did explain—what their position was in regard to Tibet, not because he was answering some charge made by me or because he thought that it was incumbent on him to do so, but because he felt—I take it—that we had friendly relations and he had to try to convince me of China's position and case.

He began by telling me that Tibet had always been a part of the Chinese State, 'always' meaning for hundreds and hundreds of years. Occasionally

when China was weak, that sovereignty was not exercised properly, but he said Tibet had always been a part of Chinese State. That was his case. He further added but Tibet is not China proper. It is part of the Chinese State. It is not the Hun people there. Chinese are the Hun people, but these are the Mongols, Manchus, Tibetans, etc. Tibet, he said, is not a province of China. It is an autonomous region of the Chinese State and we want to respect that autonomy. That is what he told me. In fact, he went on to say that some people imagined that we want to thrust communism on Tibet. That is absurd, because the Tibetans socially speaking, are so backward that communism is very far from the Tibetan state of affairs now. But he said, certainly it is a very backward State and we want to make them progress socially, economically, etc.

Even then that is, three years ago, some trouble had started internally in Tibet or rather on the eastern border of Tibet particularly in an area which was not in Tibet proper, but it was Tibetan really in population—the Kham area which was on the eastern border of Tibet but inhabited by Tibetans. The portion had been incorporated in China a little while ago I forget when—not now anyway, but previous to all this. The Tibetans there, the Khampas, did not take kindly to certain Chinese measures, because although the Chinese Government left Tibet proper more or less untouched in the sense of any so-called land reforms or any other reforms politically they held Tibet firmly. But they did not interfere—that is what Premier Chou En-lai told me. "We do not wish to interfere, let them gradually develop themselves." But in this eastern part which was considered a part of China—they treated it as a part of China—this ultimately led to the Khampa rebellion there, a kind of guerilla rebellion, which had already lasted for a fair time a year or more, when Premier Chou En-lai came here three years ago. We did not discuss that. But he referred to it and said we do not wish,

[Sri Jawaharlal Nehru]

to interfere with the Tibetans, with their internal structure, internal autonomy, social custom, religion or anything; but we would not, of course, tolerate rebellion and foreign interference etc. Well, I do not know what he meant or thought when he said foreign interference or imperialist interference, but I find that they had some kind of a kink in their minds, not so much, I think, of India having anything to do with it, but of foreign countries, United Kingdom or America somehow making incursions into Tibet, because they had got those countries in their mind. They have not quite realised that the United Kingdom has absolutely no interest in Tibet since they left India. They just cannot reach it. They have no means, no representative there, they have nobody there even to give them any news. And, to my knowledge, neither has the United States, in fact. The only representative in Tibet of any other country is that of India, the Consul-General, probably the Soviet Union also, possibly also Mongolia. But what I meant to say was there were no Europeans or Americans. Anyhow this is what he told me the rebellion is going on. So, we had this talk and you may call it what you like. But it was more an explanation to me. It was not some kind of an assurance extracted by me from Premier Chou En-lai. I say this because people might say oh, you did this because of that guarantee given to you. It was not a guarantee in that sense. It was certainly something which, when I heard, pleased me, about the autonomy of Tibet etc. But I have no business to call him to account saying "you guaranteed and you are not doing it", in that sense, though I must say that I was pained when, because of other developments, the structure of the autonomy broke down completely.

Well, this internal revolt in Tibet gradually spread month after month, year after year. It spread slowly from the east westwards. And I have personally little doubt that the great majority of Tibetans, even though they

did not during this period participate in it, sympathised with it; I have no doubt about it. And that is for obvious reasons, not on any high grounds but for the simple reason that the Tibetans, like others, have a strong nationalist sense, and they resented those whom they considered outsiders coming in and upsetting their life and all the structure in which they lived. So, this spread and then other things happened.

One need not go into the detailed history but the trouble in Lhasa itself, partly of course, I think, may have been caused by various activities of the Chinese governors. Where a ruler, an outsider, an alien ruler has to deal with the population which is not friendly, well, the relationship can well be imagined. It is not a healthy relationship. The ruler is afraid, the people are afraid, both of each other. And when fear governs the relations of two parties, it is likely to lead to bad results. In fact, wherever a country is a subject country, that is an unhealthy relationship. Well, that led to this upheaval in Tibet and the Dalai Lama's flight from Lhasa, coming to India and so on and so forth. After that I have no accurate news of what has happened.

I think we may broadly say that there has been strong military pressure on several parts of Tibet and the Tibetans enjoy far from autonomy under the military government there. It may be that the stories that we hear about happenings inside Tibet are exaggerated, because most of the stories inevitably come from refugees, and refugees, however good they may be, having suffered themselves, are apt to give rather a coloured picture, and the picture is not of what they have seen or what they have heard. So, it goes on increasing. So, it may be that the stories are exaggerated. But as a responsible person I cannot repeat those stories till I have some kind of a proof. But whether they are exaggerated or not there can be little doubt that a great deal has happened in Tibet which is deplorable and that the people of Tibet have suffered much.

and that it can certainly not be said that it is a happy family living together.

17.36 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Previously when this matter came up before this House I said that our approach to these problems was governed by two or three factors. Among these I mentioned two—our sympathy for the Tibetan people and our desire to maintain friendly relations with China. Now that may appear to be something contradictory and it does in the present context slightly contradict each other. That is the difficulty of the situation. But that does not get away from our basic approach which is governed by these two factors. The third factor, of course, is and always will be the integrity of India and the freedom of India. It is our first duty to protect that.

Why do I say that? Because I want to repeat that any step that we may take now cannot be taken in a huff, if I may say so, because we are angry and we do something regardless of the consequences of that step. We work not only in the present but for the future—for the distant future. I have always thought that it is important, even essential if you like, that these two countries of Asia, India and China, should have friendly and as far as possible co-operative relations. It is a remarkable fact of history—and I do not think you will find it duplicated elsewhere at any time—that during these two thousand years of relationship between India and China they have not had any kind of military conflict. It has been a cultural relationship. It has been to some extent a trade relationship. It has been a religious association. Throughout these long periods, they were not passive countries. They were active, positive countries. They went in those days, not like the later days in India when we did become a passive, inert country, tied down by caste and do not cross the seas and do not touch this man and do not see that man—that type of country we developed—our

people went on adventures. They went all over the south eastern seas. They established colonies. They established, not imperialist colonies, but independent colonies. In fact the effect of India all over the south eastern region was tremendous. You see it today. So also was the effect of China there. So these two great big powerful countries were constantly meeting and yet there was no conflict. It is a remarkable fact of history. Certainly nowhere in Europe will you find such a thing or, for the matter of that, in Asia.

Now it seemed to me that in the future it would be a tragedy not only for India, and possibly for China, but for Asia and the world if we develop some kind of permanent hostility. Naturally friendship does not exist if you are weak and if you are looked down upon as a weak country. Friendship cannot exist between the weak and the strong, between a country that is trying to bully and the other who accepts to be bullied. Whether it is an individual or a group or a country that does not happen. It is only when people are more or less equal, when people respect each other that they are friends. So also nations. But subject to that we did work for the friendship of India and China. May I say that in spite of all that has happened and is happening today, that is still our objective and we shall continue to work for it. That does not mean that we should surrender in anything that we consider right or that we should hand over bits of territory of India to China to please them. That is not the way to be friends with anybody or to maintain our dignity or self-respect. But, in the long run, it is of importance for these two great countries, whatever their internal structures and policies might be, to be friends.

I know that, sometimes, it is difficult to feel friendly when one hears things that irritate, that anger, when we see that our people have not been treated even courteously, when we receive communications from the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Chinese Government, which are singularly lacking in even ordinary politeness. All that is irritating. But, then, it is easy enough for any one to get angry and irritated. It is necessary for people who hold responsible positions not to allow themselves to be irritated, certainly to maintain the dignity of the country and the continuity of our policy too.

Many people charge us "What about your famous Panch Sheel, where are those five principles, dead and gone and buried or cremated?" Call it whatever you like. That indicates a completely wrong approach to this question. What is Panch Sheel? Panch Sheel or the five principles,—they did not become principles because they were embodied in a treaty between India and China—they stand by themselves, principles of international relationship which we hold to be correct and we shall hold to them even if all the world says 'no' to them. Of course, it is obvious that if the other party does not agree to them, that relationship does not subsist. The principles remain true all the same. When people are wise enough, they come back to them. Therefore there is no question of Panch Sheel failing. It may be, if you like, the question of India failing or China failing. But, the principles remain. This is the outlook.

If you will permit me to go slightly outside the purview of this Resolution, we have to face certain difficult situations on our borders and elsewhere the treatment accorded to our people in Tibet by the Chinese authorities. I may inform the House that the first thing that I do every morning is to open a bunch of telegrams, a pretty big bunch. I should imagine that in every bunch there are at least five or six dealing with this affair either from Peking or Lhasa or Gyantse or Yatung, just the latest happenings, the

latest developments. Of course, the telegrams we get from Gyantse, Yatung and Lhasa cannot tell us about the happenings in Tibet, because they have no communication with the rest of Tibet. They can only see more or less round about the Consulate or the Trade agency and tell us what are the happenings today. There are petty problems arising. Almost every morning, usually, at least, I start the day not in a too pleasant mood, because of these messages. I try to overcome that. I am getting accustomed to some extent to do that.

We have got to deal with these difficult problems these border incidents. If anyone asks me, as they sometimes do, what do the border incidents indicate frankly, I do not know what might be in the minds of the other party whether it is just local aggressiveness, or just to show us our place, if I may use a colloquial phrase, so that we may not get uppish or whether it is something deeper. I do not know.

I might inform the House that only last evening we received a fairly long reply from the Chinese Government. That is a reply to the protest I had sent a few days ago about these incidents on the North East Frontier border. It is a fairly long reply. It will, naturally, require very careful consideration. But, broadly speaking, the reply is a repudiation of our charge that they had come on our territory, that they had started firing on our patrol there and charging us with having come on their territory and having opened fire on them; that is, complete conflict in the facts, reversal of the facts here.

An Hon. Member: Reversal of the MacMahon Line

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Of course, we shall examine that reply carefully because it is a long and more or less argued note, with lots of places mentioned and other things. And we shall send them a reply fairly soon, that is, in the next two or three days.

May I also repeat what I said here that before this House rises in this session, I hope to place a White Paper before the House containing correspondence between the Chinese Government and our Government ever since the treaty between India and China in regard to Tibet, that is, during the last five years, so that the House may have the background of what has been happening?

Now, all this is there. We have, on the one hand, naturally to protect our borders. And when I say that, I want to hold myself and somewhat restrain my powerful reactions so as not to go too far, in, let us say, military measures and the like, because, when nations get excited and all their prestige is involved, then, step by step, they are driven often in wrong directions. So we try, at any rate, to balance in the sense of a firm policy where we think we are in the right, nevertheless, with always a door open to accommodation, a door open to a settlement, wherever this is possible.

Broadly speaking, in regard to this border, that is, the border incidents, as I have just mentioned, they say that we have committed aggression. Now, it is a question of fact, whether this village or that village or this little strip of territory is on their side or on our side. Normally, wherever these are relatively petty disputes, well, it does seem to me rather absurd for two great countries or two small countries immediately to rush at each other's throat and to decide whether

two miles of territory are on this side or on that side, and especially, two miles of territory in the high mountains, where nobody lives. But where national prestige and dignity is involved it is not the two miles of territory, it is the nation's dignity and self-respect that become involved in it. And, therefore, this happens. But I do not wish, in so far as I can, to press the issue so far that there is no escape for either country because their national dignities, are involved, except a recourse to arms. That is not, I hope

Dr Ram Subhag Singh: What is the boundary, according to the latest report? What is the boundary which they have indicated according to the latest reply that we have received from them?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How can I say that without a large map, all kinds of little things about villages and all that? The present dispute about that matter is relatively a small matter whether it may be two miles this side or that side is not a very big thing, but I do not know what their map is, here, there and elsewhere. So far as I am concerned, I have often stated how our frontier from the Burma border right up to the Bhutan border is the MacMahon Line, we hold by that.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): Do they

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Please allow me to continue. Please do not attach too much importance to what appears in the newspapers. I speak with a little greater authority on this subject.

That is the MacMahon line, and we hold by it, and we think it is highly objectionable, highly improper for the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Chinese Government to go on issuing maps colouring half of the North Eastern Frontier Agency, one-third of Assam and one-third of Bhutan as if they belong to China. That is really an affront. I can understand something happening for a little while, and some mistake, but a continuing thing, to be told year after year for ten years that 'Oh, well, we shall look into it when we have leisure' is not a good enough answer. That is so.

But having accepted broadly the MacMahon line, I am prepared to discuss any interpretation of the MacMahon line, minor interpretation here and there,—that is a different matter—not these big chunks but the minor interpretation whether this hill is there or this little bit is on that side or this side, on the facts, on the maps, on the evidence available. That I am prepared to discuss with the Chinese Government. I am prepared to have any kind of conciliatory, mediatory process to consider this. I am prepared to have arbitration of any authority agreed to by the two parties about those minor rectifications, where they are challenged by them or by us, whichever the case may be. That is a different matter. I say this because I do not take up that kind of narrow attitude that whatever I say is right and whatever the other person says is wrong. But the broad MacMahon Line has to be accepted and so far as we are concerned, it is there and we accept it.

The position about Ladakh is somewhat different. The MacMahon Line does not go there. That is governed by ancient treaties over a hundred years old between the then ruler of Kashmir, Maharaja Gulab Singh, who was a feudatory of the Sikh ruler of the Punjab at the time—this was in the thirties of the 19th century—on the one side, there was the treaty of 1842 and on the other side, the ruler of Lhasa and the representative of the Emperor of China, which resulted in Ladakh being recognised as a part of Kashmir State.

Now, nobody has challenged that. Nobody challenges it now. But the actual boundary of Ladakh with Tibet was not very carefully defined. It was defined to some extent by British officers who went there. But I rather doubt if they did any careful survey. They marked the line. It has been marked all along in our maps. They did it. As people do not live there, by and large, it does not make any difference. It did not make any difference. At that time, nobody cared about it.

Now, the question arose. We are prepared to sit down and discuss those minor things. But discuss it on what terms? First, treaties, existing maps etc. Secondly, usage, what has been the usage all these years. Thirdly, geography. By geography, I mean physical features like water-sheds, ridge of a mountain, not a bit of plain divided up. Those are convenient features for international boundaries.

I have gone out of my way to refer to these various matters in connection with this Resolution which deals with a simpler issue. Coming back to this particular Resolution, quite apart from the sympathy which the hon. Member and some other hon. Members feel for the Tibetans, if we take an action, it should be justifiable in law and in constitution and we should hope for some results, some results which will help us to achieve the objective aimed at.

Looking at it from the point of view of justification, the United Nations may come into the picture for two reasons. One is, violation of human rights and the other, aggression. Now, violation of human rights applies to those who have accepted the Charter of the United Nations, in other words, those members of the United Nations who have accepted the Charter. Strictly speaking, you cannot apply the Charter to people who have not accepted the Charter, who have not been allowed to come into the United Nations.

Secondly, if you talk about aggression, aggression is by one sovereign independent State on another. As I told you, in so far as world affairs are concerned, Tibet has not been acknowledged as an independent State for a considerable time, even long before this happened—much less after. Therefore, it is difficult to justify aggression.

Now, you may say that these may be rather legal pleas. But I am merely pointing out a constitutional aspect of and the difficulties and the procedures involved.

Then, I come to a certain practical aspect. And that is what good will it achieve? Suppose we get over the legal quibbles and legal difficulties. It may lead to a debate in the General Assembly or the Security Council wherever it is taken up, a debate which will be an acrimonious debate, an angry debate, a debate which will be after the fashion of cold war. Having had the debate what then will the promoters of that debate and that motion do? Nothing more. They will return home. After having brought matters to a higher temperature, fever heat, they will go home. They have done their duty because they can do nothing else.

Obviously, nobody is going to send an army to Tibet or China. If that was not done in the case of Hungary which is in the heart of Europe and which is more allied to European nations, it is fantastic to think they will move in that way in Tibet. Obviously not. So, all that will happen is an expression of strong opinion by some other countries denying it and the matter being raised to the level of cold war—brought into the domain of cold war—and probably producing reactions on the Chinese Government which are more adverse to Tibet and the Tibetan people than even now. So, the ultimate result is no relief to the Tibetan people but something the reverse of it.

The question, both from the constitutional and the legal point of view, is not clear. In fact, persons who have

examined it think that it is difficult to bring it there. And, from the practical point of view also there is no good result. Then, what exactly is the purpose of taking that subject, except maybe to satisfy some kind of urge to show sympathy or to show that we are angry. I can understand that urge certainly. But we must not allow the urge to take the reins into its hands and take us away with it to unknown regions and dangerous regions. Therefore, I am unable to accept this resolution and I would suggest to the House also not to accept it.

श्री बाबनेवी (बलरामपुर) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध में सदन में जो कुछ भी कहा गया है उसे मैं ने गौर से देखा है। जिन सदस्यों ने उसका समर्थन किया है मैं उन्हें धन्यवाद देता हूँ लेकिन जिन्होंने उसका विरोध किया है उनको धन्यवाद देते हुए मैं मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि मैं उनके दृष्टिकोण को ठीक तरीके से समझ नहीं सका।

तिब्बत की समस्या हमारे सामने है। पहली बार जब तिब्बत का बहन सशुक्त राष्ट्र सभ में उठा तो जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है हमारे प्रतिनिधि ने उस समय यह भाषा प्रकट की थी कि तिब्बत की समस्या शान्ति के साथ चीन के द्वारा वार्ता से हल हो जायेगी लेकिन पिछले नौ साल का इतिहास इस बात का प्रमाण है कि तिब्बत की समस्या को शांति से हल करने का कोई प्रयत्न नहीं किया गया। चीन ने तिब्बत में बल प्रयोग किया। चीन ने तिब्बत के स्वतंत्र अस्तित्व को मिटाने की कोशिश की और अपने पिछले भाषण में ने कहा था कि आज प्रश्न केवल तिब्बत की स्वायत्तता का वा स्वतंत्रता का नहीं है बल्कि प्रश्न यह है कि क्या तिब्बत एक प्रयुक्त देश के नाते, अपनी सम्पूर्ण गिश्तेजताओं को साथ जीवित रहेगा। यदि भारत सरकार की यह भाषा कि तिब्बत का प्रश्न शांति से हल होगा पूरी हो जाती तो भारत को और इस सदन को बड़ी प्रसन्नता होती। लेकिन अभी तक के जो आसार विज्ञाप्यी