

**Resolution re: BHADRA 12, 1951 (SAKA)**

*Reference of 6494,  
the Tibet Issue  
to the U.N.O.*

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): It can be taken up on Monday.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On Monday it can be taken up.

have already been taken up and 1 hour and 32 minutes are left for its further discussion today.

Shri Braj Raj Singh may continue his speech.

But there is one thing that I might say in the beginning. There is such a large number of hon. Members who have expressed their desire to speak that the time they take should be limited to the minimum. I think ten minutes each might be enough.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Sir you promised that the time would be extended by say, one hour.

That is within the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will look into it if I have given any promise. But even then the time-limit would be ten minutes

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): There are some amendments of which notice has been given.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry that I forgot them. But the reason for that was that they were all beyond the scope of this Resolution. Shri P. K. Deo's amendment says that for the word 'refer' substitute 're-open'. That would not be covered. Then he says that after the words 'Tibetan issue' add the words 'and refer the Chinese aggressive in roads to India'. That would be out of order as it is beyond the scope of this Resolution. We cannot refer to a friendly country in such a manner. Then there is Shri Shree Narayan Das' amendment. That also refers to certain matters that ought not to be brought in this Resolution. I will give them an opportunity to speak and I think that is all that they want.

Dr. Gehekar (Yeotmal): My amendment is also there.

15.34 hrs.

#### COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

##### FORTY-NINTH REPORT

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Janjgir): Sir, I beg to move that this House agrees with the Forty-ninth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 2nd September, 1959

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Forty-ninth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 2nd September, 1959."

The motion was adopted

15.35 hrs.

#### RESOLUTION RE: REFERENCE OF THE TIBET ISSUE TO THE UNO— contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion of the Resolution moved by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee on the 21st August, 1959 regarding reference of Tibet issue to the UNO.

Out of 2 hours allotted for the discussion of the Resolution, 26 minutes

213 LSD—7.

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Time could be extended a little, say, by another half-an-hour or an hour, if you like.

**Shri P. K. Deo:** At least by one hour.

**Dr. Gohokar:** My amendment is there. I think it is perfectly in order.

**An Hon. Member:** There are other amendments also.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Which amendment.

**Dr. Gohokar:** The one in my name. It is in list No. 3.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Kalika Singh's amendment is there. That is very argumentative and it touches...

**Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh):** Taken as a whole it is in order.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have seen it. It says:

"This House is of opinion that Tibet is an integral part of China, and as such, it is within the domestic jurisdiction of the People's Republic of China to solve the Tibetan tangle in the best possible manner. Failure of China to solve the tangle may result into mass genocide and breach of international peace which may attract the provisions of U.N. Charter for intervention....."

I do not think it would be advisable to discuss all these things here or bring them up here thus. Shri Gohokar's amendment.....

**Shri Radha Raman (Chandni Chowk):** My amendment is there in list No. 2.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Gohokar's amendment says, for the words 'refer the Tibetan issue to the United Nation', substitute 'support the Tibetan issue if brought in the United Nations Organisation.' That is in order.

**Shri Radha Raman:** My amendment is in list No. 2. It is amendment No. 4.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Radha Raman's amendment says, for the original Resolution, substitute—

"This House approves of all the steps which Central Government has taken so far in respect of the Tibetan issue and is further of opinion that suitable steps such as would lead to a Conference of Bandung Powers at an early date be taken to consider and resolve this question in the larger interest of Asia and maintenance of peace in it'.

Things like convening of Bandung Conference and others cannot be covered by this Resolution.

**श्री ब्रजराज सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) :**  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रस्ताव पर जब से बहस शुरू हुई है उसके बीच में भारत की राजधानी में महामहिम दलाई लामा पधारे हैं और मैं उनका स्वागत करता हूँ ।

तिब्बत में जो घटनायें घटी हैं उन से हर देशवामी का, जिसकी जड़ें इस देश में हैं, चिन्तित होना स्वाभाविक है । यह बात दूसरी है कि इस देश में पैदा होने के बाद कुछ लोग ऐसा महसूस करते हैं कि उनकी जड़ें इस देश में नहीं हैं और वे भले ही इस सब घटनाचक्र में चिन्तित न हों । तिब्बत में न सिर्फ नरहत्यायें हुई हैं बल्कि एक तरह से हम कह सकते हैं कि उसकी आजादी की ही हत्या कर दी गई है । जब तिब्बत की आजादी की हत्या का प्रश्न उठता है तो हमें कुछ थोड़ा सा पीछे की ओर जाना पड़ता है ।

सन १९५० में भी उस तरह का एक प्रश्न उठा था और तब भी संयुक्त राष्ट्र संगठन में तिब्बत का प्रश्न उठाया गया था भारत द्वारा नहीं बल्कि किसी अन्य राष्ट्र द्वारा । उसके बाद यह आशा व्यक्त की गई कि यह प्रश्न

क्षात्पूर्वक रूप से हल हो जायगा। इस तरह से उसको हल करने का कुछ प्रयत्न किया गया और मालूम पड़ा कि इस दिशा में कुछ प्रगति भी हुई है। लेकिन जिन तरह से वह हल होना चाहिये था वह उस तरह से उभर नहीं हो सका और लगता है कि अब भी सम्भवतः वह होने वाला नहीं है। उसमें एक प्रारम्भिक गलती हुई है और वह यह कि जब हम ने यह माना कि हिन्दुस्तान की प्रभुसत्ता तिब्बत पर नहीं रही हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद होने के बाद, उस वक्त यह नहीं माना कि चीन की प्रभुसत्ता भी तिब्बत पर नहीं है। आज भी अगर लोग इस तरह की बात कहें कि तिब्बत चीन का एक हिस्सा है तो वह दिखाता है कि हम यह मान लेते हैं कि चीन की जो आक्रमणवादी प्रवृत्ति है उसको हम स्वीकार करते हैं, या उसका हम समर्थन करते हैं। आखिर कोई भी राष्ट्र हो चाहे वह आज की चीन की पीपल्स गवर्नमेंट जो कही जाती है, जनतन्त्री सरकार जो कही जाती है वह हो तथा उसने जो उत्तराधिकार इम्पीरियलिस्ट गवर्नमेंट से, साम्राज्यवादी सरकार से पाये हैं, उन अधिकारों की रक्षा के लिये यदि वह यह कहे कि क्योंकि तिब्बत पर पिछली सरकार की प्रभुसत्ता रही है, चाहे आप यह कहें कि पिछले बादशाहों की रही है, उनका वह कैसे त्याग कर सकती है, तो यह भी सोचने वाली बात है। लेकिन दलील के लिये यह मान भी लिया जाय कि चीन की जो पहली सरकार थी उसकी प्रभुसत्ता तिब्बत पर रही है, तो भी यह कहना पड़ेगा कि चीन के जन सरकार बनने के बाद उसकी यह मान लेना चाहिये था कि क्योंकि तिब्बत की संस्कृति उससे अलग है, तिब्बत की भाषा उससे अलग है, तिब्बत का रहन सहन उससे अलग है, तिब्बत की राष्ट्रीयता उससे अलग है, इसलिये अगर तिब्बत आजाद होना चाहता है, तो आजाद रह सकता है। उसे कहना चाहिये था कि हम उस पर अपनी प्रभुसत्ता को नहीं बनाये हैं। मैं भारत सरकार के उस

कदम का स्वागत करता हूँ जो उसने तिब्बत पर से अपनी प्रभुसत्ता हटाकर उठाया। लेकिन उसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार को उस वक्त यह कहना चाहिये था कि किस तरह से हम अपनी प्रभुसत्ता को हटा रहे हैं उसी तरह से चीन की सरकार को कहना चाहिये कि तुम भी अपनी प्रभुसत्ता को हटा लो।

अब उसी गलती के कुछ नतीजे चल रहे हैं। नतीजे के तौर पर उस गलती को हम सुधार नहीं पा रहे हैं। लेकिन जो प्रस्ताव हमारे सम्मुख हैं उस प्रस्ताव से मुन्न लगता है कि यह समस्या हल होने वाली नहीं है। मैं यह इसलिये नहीं कहता हूँ कि चूंकि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि क्योंकि चीन मयुक्त राष्ट्र संगठन का सदस्य नहीं है, इसलिये इस तिब्बत के बवाल को बहा उठाया नहीं जा सकता है या ले जाया नहीं जा सकता है और एक पक्षीय बात कैसे की जा सकती है। इस प्रश्न का बहा ले जाने के बारे में मेरे मित्र श्री बाजपेयी ने कुछ दलीलें दी थी और कहा था कि उत्तरी कोरिया का प्रश्न बहा उठाया गया था और इस तरह से दूसरे प्रश्न भी बहा उठाये जा चुके हैं। वह कोई ऐसी दलील नहीं है जो महत्व की दलील हो। लेकिन मैं दूसरे ही आधार पर यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रश्न को मयुक्त राष्ट्र संगठन में हम ले जायें तो जो मयुक्त राष्ट्र सभ का वर्तमान स्वरूप है, उसमें कुछ होने वाला नहीं है, मयुक्त राष्ट्र कुछ करने वाला नहीं है या सम्भवतः कुछ कर नहीं सकता है। काश्मीर का प्रश्न बहा पड़ा है। साथ ही साथ यह भी एक बात है कि जिस तरह से हम एक विश्व की सरकार चाहते हैं जिस तरह से हम विश्व का एक संगठन चाहते हैं क्या उस तरह का संगठन मयुक्त राष्ट्र बन सकता है? मयुक्त राष्ट्र संगठन विश्व के दो सड़ने वाले गुटों का एक संगठन बन गया है जहाँ पर हर प्रश्न पर इस पहलू से विचार किया जाता है कि आखिर यह जो बात सार्थक

## [श्री ब्रज राज सिंह]

एही है यहाँ पर वह किस गुट की बात है, दुनिया के कौन से राष्ट्र को फायदा पहुंचाने वाली बात है। कौन से राष्ट्र को खिलवाफ जाने वाली बात है भले ही इस बक्त हमें लगता हो कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र में जाने से दुनिया के बहुत से राष्ट्र ऐसे हो सकते हैं जो तिब्बत के प्रश्न पर हमारे साथ हों, लेकिन हो सकता है कि जिस तरह से दुनिया की राजनीति चल रही है, उसमें वह धीरे भी उलझ जाये। हम देख रहे हैं कि राष्ट्रपति आइज़नहावर और श्री निकिता ख्रुश्चेव की मुलाकात होने वाली है, हो सकता है कि उसमें फिर इस तरह की कोशिश की जाये कि दुनिया को अपने अपने प्रभाव क्षेत्र में बांटा जाये, इस तरह से बांटा जाये कि दुनिया के जो दो बड़े आर्मेंट्स हैं, वो बड़े शेर हैं, वे मिल जाये और जो कमजोर ताकतें हैं, शक्तिहीन राष्ट्र हैं, उनको फिर हड़पने की कोशिश करे। लेकिन अगर इनकी मुलाकात से दुनिया में शान्ति स्थापित करने में योग मिल सके तो उमका स्वागत करना होगा। इसका कारण यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिक चाहते हैं कि दुनिया में शान्ति बनी रहे और यदि लड़ाई होती है तो उससे विनाश होता है, शान्ति से ही दुनिया का निर्माण हो सकता है। हिन्दुस्तान एक गरीब मुल्क है, पिछड़ा हुआ मुल्क है, अविकसित मुल्क है और इसलिये उसका भला इसी में है कि लड़ाई न हो। लेकिन हमारे चाहने मात्र से, हमारी ऐसी इच्छा होने मात्र से यह चीज होनी संभव नहीं मासूम देती है। उसके लिए शक्ति चाहिए जोकि आज हमारे पास नहीं है। इसलिये हम क्या करें, यह सोचने वाली बात हो जाती है। इस वास्ते दोनों नेताओं में जो मुलाकात होने जा रही है उसके फलस्वरूप अगर शक्तिहीन राष्ट्रों को हड़पने की कोशिश की जाती है या यह संकामें ठीक निकलती हैं तब फिर इस तरह का प्रश्न संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठाने से कोई फायदा नहीं होता है और जिस तरह से काश्मीर का प्रश्न उलझा पड़ा है उसी तरह

से यह प्रश्न भी उलझ सकता है।

समस्या का हल क्या है? मैं मानता हूँ कि बड़ा विकट समस्या पैदा हो गई है। एक राष्ट्र के नष्ट होने का प्रश्न है। मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि ६५-७० हजार आदिमियों को कत्ल कर दिया गया है। वहाँ पर लाखों चीनियों को बसाने की कोशिश की जा रही है। एक नये तरह के साम्राज्यवाद को लादने की कोशिश की जा रही है। यह एक भयंकर प्रकार का साम्राज्यवाद है। अब तक तो लोग विदेशों से आकर किसी देश पर अपना राज्य कायम करते थे, वहाँ पर शोषण करते थे लेकिन अब एक नये प्रकार का साम्राज्य यह है कि अपनी देश के नागरिकों को ले जा कर दूसरे देश में बसा दो और जनतंत्र की दुहाई कर, यह कह कर कि वहाँ की जनता का बहुमत यह चाहता है कि चीन के साथ उस देश का हमेशा के लिये सम्बन्ध रहे, जनता की भावनाओं को दबाया जाये। चीनी नागरिकों को तिब्बत में बसाया जा रहा है और जो तिब्बती जनता है, जो वहाँ की हमेशा से रहने वाली जनता है, उस जनता को आउट-नम्बर किया जा रहा है, उमको अल्पमत में परिणत करने की कोशिश की जा रही है और यह कोशिश की जा रही है कि चीन वासियों का वहाँ पर बहुमत हो जाये। इस तरह की कोशिश होने से मैं मानता हूँ कि एक बहुत ही विकट प्रश्न उठ खड़ा होता है।

15.46 hrs.

## [SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ उसको हल नहीं कर सकेगा। ऐसी सूरत में क्या किया जाये।

हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार इस विषय में कुछ सक्रिय कदम उठाये, इतना ही काफी नहीं है। इसका कारण यह है कि आज चीन यू० एन० ओ० का सदस्य नहीं है और इस वास्ते हम इस प्रश्न को वहाँ नहीं उठा सकते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार

चीन को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में जगह दिलवाने की, उसको उसका सदस्य बनवाने की कोशिश कर रही है और मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। हमें मानना होगा कि कोई भी सरकार हो, उसका कोई भी कलर हो, उसका कुछ भी कारेक्टर हो, किसी प्रकार का भी चरित्र हो, अगर उस सरकार का अपने देश पर कब्जा है, तो उस सरकार को मान्यता मिलनी ही चाहिये। इस आधार पर हम चीन को मान्यता दिलवाना चाहते हैं। लेकिन इसी के साथ साथ हमें यह भी देखना होगा कि तिब्बत का जो प्रश्न है वह न सिर्फ तिब्बत की नैशनलिटी के नष्ट होने का प्रश्न बन गया है, न सिर्फ उसकी राष्ट्रीयता खत्म होने का प्रश्न बन गया है बल्कि हमारी अपनी भी राष्ट्रीयता को बचाने का प्रश्न आज हमारे सामने उपस्थित हो गया है, हमारी अपनी सुरक्षा का प्रश्न भी बन गया है। तिब्बत में चीन के घुसने के बाद हम देखते हैं कि मैकमेहन जो लाइन है उसके बारे में बार बार यह कहा जा रहा है कि यह ऐसी रेखा नहीं है जिस पर हमारी सीमा बनती है। हमारी सीमा पर ही नहीं, हमारे अपने क्षेत्र में घुस कर आज चीन कोशिश कर रहा है कि वह टेरेटरी पर, हमारे क्षेत्र पर कब्जा कर ले। अब यह प्रश्न ऐसा हो गया है जो केवल तिब्बत की राष्ट्रीयता की रक्षा का ही नहीं बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान की अपनी रक्षा का भी बन गया है। तिब्बत में घाने के बाद हमारी अपनी जो बफर लाइन है, भूटान, सिक्किम, नेपाल और लद्दाख इत्यादि की, उस सब पर खतरा छा गया है, खतरा भा चुका है और वह खतरा हिन्दुस्तान पर भी पड़ा है। ऐसी सुरत में हमें क्या करना चाहिये? हमें दुनिया में ऐसे राष्ट्रों का संगठन करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये जो कभी सड़ाई न चाहते हों। मैं मानता हूँ कि वे कमजोर राष्ट्र होंगे। जिस तरह से कुछ सम्प्टीड्यूट कोशिश करती गई है कि बॉइंग पावर्स की कॉन्फ्रेंस हो, या साउथ ईस्ट एशिया के

देशों की हो या मध्य एशिया की कोशिश जो कि सड़ाई नहीं चाहती है, उनकी हो, या जो किसी गुट में नहीं रहना चाहती, उनकी हो, जो यह चाहती है कि दुनिया में कमजोर राष्ट्र भी रहें। उनको इकट्ठा करके दुनिया में एक इस तरह का जनमत तैयार किया जाए कि जो यह समझे कि तिब्बत में जो कुछ हुआ है वह न सिर्फ किसी मुल्क की राष्ट्रीयता को हनन करने का प्रश्न है बल्कि मानवता को ही खत्म करने की वह एक कोशिश है। इस तरह से हम कोशिश करें दुनिया में एक जनमत बनाने की। अगर किसी तरह से संयुक्त राष्ट्र प्रसेम्बली में जाने से यह प्रश्न हल हो सकता तो हम सोचते इस प्रश्न को वहाँ भेजना चाहिये या नहीं और सम्भवतः मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता। लेकिन आज दुनिया की जो परिस्थिति है उसे देखते हुए मैं सोचता हूँ कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र प्रसेम्बली में जाने से सम्भवतः यह समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती। इसलिये हमें दुनिया में एक प्रबल जनमत कायम करना चाहिये, दुनिया के अधिक से अधिक राष्ट्रों को अपने साथ लाना चाहिये, इस प्रश्न पर कि तिब्बत में जो कुछ हुआ है वह गलत हुआ है। तिब्बत की राष्ट्रीयता की रक्षा के लिये हमें दुनिया के जो भी दूसरे कमजोर राष्ट्र हैं, या मजबूत राष्ट्र भी हैं कि इकट्ठा हो सकते हैं, उन को इकट्ठा करना चाहिये और इस बात के लिये चीन को मजबूर करना चाहिये कि उसने तिब्बत में जो कुछ किया है उससे उसे हटना पड़ेगा, तिब्बत में जो अन्याय उसने किया है उससे उस को पीछे हटना पड़ेगा और चीन की राष्ट्रीयता को मंजूर करना पड़ेगा। अब समझा गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिक बार बार यह कहें हालांकि अब तक चीन का तिब्बत एक इंटीगरल पार्ट रहा है, लेकिन तिब्बत में अब वह कायम नहीं रह सकता है। तिब्बत एक स्वतन्त्र राष्ट्र है और हम चीन से यह आशा करते हैं कि जब वह यह मानना है कि अगर कोई भी देश स्वतन्त्र रहना

[श्री बच राज सिंह]

चाहता है, किसी देश का कोई हिस्सा स्वतन्त्र रहना चाहता है तो उसे इस तरह से रहने का अधिकार है तो वह तिब्बत की स्वतन्त्रता को भी मागेगा क्योंकि जिस देश को इन्हीं-रिश्तितम उत्तराधिकार में मिला है उन्होंने उस को उसमें प्राजाप्य करने की कोशिश की है।

चीन के बारे में कहा जाता है, उस के कानों में कहा जाता है कि वह दुनिया में शान्ति चाहते हैं, लेकिन जो इस बारे में चीन का कदम है वह उससे उल्टा ले जाने वाला कदम है, वह ऐसा कदम है जिससे दुनिया में शान्ति फल सकती है। अगर चीन बाकई दुनिया में शान्ति चाहता है तो हम यह माशा करेंगे कि वह अपने कदम को वापस लेगा। तिब्बत में या दूसरी तरफ हिन्दुस्तान में जो कदम उठाने उठाया है, उसे वापस ले क्योंकि उससे चीन और हिन्दुस्तान की दोस्ती, जिसे कि हिन्दुस्तान का हर नागरिक चाहता है, खत्म हो सकती है। हमारे देश के लोग चीन की दोस्ती की कद्र करते हैं, लेकिन चीन से दोस्ती हम उसे अपने सिर पर बिठा कर नहीं कर सकते हैं। हम चीन से दोस्ती बराबरी के लिहाज से कर सकते हैं। इसलिये मैं माशा करता हूँ कि चीन अपने कदमों को वापस लेगा और मागे कोई ऐसा कदम नहीं उठायेगा जिससे दुनिया की शान्ति के भंग होने का खन्देसा हो।

Shri P. K. Deo: I wholeheartedly support the resolution which has been so ably moved by my hon. friend Shri Vajpayee on this Tibetan issue. The whole purpose of my tabling the amendment was this, that I thought that the Tibetan question was already

pending consideration in the United Nations, and so, there would be no question of referring the issue to them; the appropriate thing would be to reopen the Tibetan question in the United Nations forum.

On the 13th November, 1950, we learnt from an announcement from Lake Success that the question of Chinese aggression and invasion on Tibet had been referred to the United Nations by the then Tibetan Government. Formally, it was raised in the Steering Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations by Mr. Castro, the representative of El Salvador. He very correctly pointed out that under article 1, Paragraph 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, the United Nations must maintain international peace and security, even though Tibet was not a member of the United Nations, because the U.N.O. must not only maintain peace among the member-States, but the main obligation of the U.N.O was to maintain international peace throughout the world.

It was only on the firm assurance of India that the Tibetan question could be peacefully solved and that Tibetan autonomy would be safely safeguarded by peaceful negotiations, that this adjournment was done on this Tibetan question; and there has been no final decision on the Tibetan question; there has been no *res judicata*. It has been pending consideration since then, and it could be reopened at any time by any member of the UN General Assembly.

While taking part in the discussion, India's representative, the Jamsahel of Nawanager had said that :

"The Chinese forces have ceased to advance after the fall of Chamdo, that is, 490 kilometers from Lhasa. Indian Government

are certain that the Tibetan question could be settled by peaceful means and such a settlement can safeguard the autonomy which Tibet has enjoyed for several decades, while maintaining its historical association with China "

He further said

"My delegation considers that the best way of attaining that objective would be to abandon for the time being the idea of including the question in the agenda of the General Assembly "

'Sir, I would request you to mark the words for the time being' The whole question was shelved for the time being From the recent occurrences, you will notice how disillusioned the Jamsaheb was at that time when he suggested such a measure The Chinese forces did not stop at Chamdo, they forcibly occupied Tibet, they massed their troops along the Indian border and invaded and occupied certain portions of the Indian territory

Sir Tibet is of considerable strategic importance to India The Thirteenth Dalai Lama declared the complete independence of Tibet, just as Nepal broke away all sorts of allegiance with China for all time Tibet is an autonomous government, and has never permitted—any interference in its internal administration by the Chinese Further, in the Second World War Tibet did not compromise by throwing her forces on the side of China So you can very well see that Tibet has all along maintained an independent status so far as her internal administration is concerned

In 1950, it was on the assurance of India that even the USA voted for the adjournment of the Tibetan question Mr Gross of the USA at that time pointed out that he had voted for the adjournment motion on the fact that "the Government of India most directly concerned in the subject

matter and whose territory borders on Tibet hoped that the Tibetan question could be peacefully and honourably settled "

I beg to submit that in 1950 the Tibetan question was not rejected, it was simply adjourned

Lately, we find that the Chinese dragon has been spreading its fangs from the roof of the world on India. It was possible because of the latitude that we have shown to the Chinese for so long, and because of our traditional good behaviour towards our neighbours

I most respectfully submit that it was on the initiative of India that the Tibetan question was shelved, and it is now the sacred duty of India to reopen the Tibetan question in the United Nations especially when the Chinese have not only crossed and penetrated into Indian territory but have thrown a challenge to India's integrity and sovereignty

The Sino Tibetan agreement of 1951 which was possible because of the goodwill of our Government, and which recognised Tibetan autonomy under Chinese suzerainty has been thrown to the winds and Tibetan autonomy and Chinese suzerainty have not been reconciled by peaceful means

The people of Tibet have been denied the fundamental rights of liberty and security of life We have seen that freedom to live and freedom of movement have been denied to the Tibetan people Freedom of worship and religion has been completely violated Thousands have been butchered, and thousands have been put to torturously cruel methods and forced labour There is an organised and planned attempt to annihilate the personality and the individuality of Tibet and to completely wipe it out from the map of the world

I most respectfully submit that all that has been done in Tibet amounts

[Shri P. K. Deo]

to genocide which has been resorted to by the Chinese on the helpless, the unarmed and the peace-loving Tibetan people; and this has surpassed even the outrages of Hitler in the Belsen camp

It was on the initiative of India, Cuba and Panama that a resolution on genocide was passed. India has been championing such cases all along. It was on India's initiative that the resolution on genocide was passed. It said that genocide is a matter of international concern as it is a crime against humanity. The convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide was passed by 55 votes to 0. That was passed just one day prior to the Universal Declaration of the Human Rights by the United Nations. These two conventions were passed without a single note of dissent from any member. So, you can very well imagine what an amount of goodwill from the whole world was there behind those two conventions or resolutions.

Now, what is genocide? It is said in that resolution that genocide, according to that convention, means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, namely (i) killing members of the group, (ii) causing serious bodily and mental harm, etc. It provided that the crime should be punished, and the trial should be by an international tribunal.

I most respectfully submit that the misdeeds of China are clearly proved, that China has committed genocide and should stand trial by an international tribunal and should be punished. By 'China', I mean the People's Republic of China, regarding whose admission into the United Nations, we have been advocating so much. Further, China has denied the Tibetans the right of self-determination.

In this connection, I may draw your attention to the famous resolution on the right of self-determination. As I had pointed out previously, this time also, India along with six powers initiated the resolution in the U.N.O. on the right of self-determination which clearly suggested the appointment of a commission which at the request of any ten members of the UNO would examine any situation resulting from alleged denial or inadequate realisation of the right of self-determination. In this case, India was the prime mover behind the resolution.

In the case of Tibet, we have found that the right of self-determination has been denied to the Tibetans, genocide has been committed on Tibet, and the integrity of Tibet has been violated. The aggressive attitude of the Chinese has proved that imperialism is not the monopoly of European countries. It can spread even to Asia and it can be used to suppress and to victimise weaker nations.

16 hrs

Tibet has completely unmasked China as a wolf in sheep's clothing. Communist imperialism is worse than western imperialism, because they claim themselves as the liberators of the down-trodden countries. We have seen what 'liberation' has meant to the Tibetans recently. India has no political axe to grind, but in view of the historical role that India has played for the right cause and in view of the manner in which India has championed the cause of the down-trodden, dependent and weak countries, it is just right that India should rise to the occasion and reopen the Tibetan question in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In the case of Morocco, Algeria, Indonesia and in the Anglo-French action against Egypt, India has all along sided with the weaker nations.



nations which have been subjected to the imperialism of aggressive bigger powers. Even the stand taken by the United Nations in the case of Korea has clearly proved.....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Deputy-Speaker had said in the very beginning that there are a large number of Members who wish to speak. So if any one Member speaks beyond the time-limit, it will curtail the opportunity of others.

Shri P. K. Deo: I will not speak beyond the time-limit. I will just take five minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: By my watch, he has already taken 12 minutes.

Shri P. K. Deo: Let me have three minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: I hope he will conclude within that time.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): On a point of order. Of course, I do not want to disturb the hon. Member who is on his legs.

Shri P. K. Deo: He is taking up my time.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan: I am apologising for raising the point of order. Can we have the debate in a manner which spoil our friendship with other nations?

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): What is the point of order? There is no point of order.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan: According to our rules, we should not in our debates offend friendly countries.

Mr. Chairman: Here mention is made of relations of Tibet with China and in that connection, it was said that the Government of India had sided with the weaker nations. As far as that goes, anything relating to Tibet can come in. But the only thing is that the time-limit should be adhered to.

Shri P. K. Deo: If you examine the stand India took in the case of Korea, you will find that India approved of the enforcement of collective measures against armed attack on the Republic of Korea by North Korea.

I submit that India has always played that historical role. In this connection, I would crave the indulgence of the Prime Minister to repeat a few words from his famous speech on 3rd November 1948 in the United Nations. This is what our beloved Prime Minister said then:

"It was an astonishing thing that any country could still venture to cling to that doctrine of colonialism, whether by direct or indirect rule. After all that happened there, there will be not mere objection to that situation but an active struggle against any and every form of colonialism in any part of the world".

I request the Prime Minister to remember these famous words he spoke there and act accordingly.

On the 5th June, 1959, the International Commission of Jurists.....

Mr. Chairman: If he goes on quoting like this, there is no time available.

Shri P. K. Deo: This is the last one.

Shri Kalika Singh: This is Chinese attitude!

Shri P. K. Deo: On the 5th of June, 1959, the International Committee of Jurists at Geneva have clearly stated after going into the evidence that deliberate violations of the fundamental human rights have taken place and there has been a *prima facie* case that the Chinese have made an attempt to destroy the national, racial and religious activities of a group, by killing the members of the group and by causing serious bodily harm to the members of the group.

In these circumstances, I do not think that there can be a better case.

[Shri P. K. Deo]

and a better cause for India to raise in the United Nations and for the United Nations to intervene and act.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Shree Narayan Das. I think those who have tabled amendments should be given a chance first. Shri Shree Narayan Das.

Dr. Gobokar: Sir, my amendment has been allowed.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Shree Narayan Das.

Dr. Gobokar: Sir, I beg to move.

In the resolution,—

for the words "refer the Tibetan issue to the United Nations"

substitute "support the Tibetan issue if brought in the United Nations Organisation." (6)

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : सभापति महोदय, जिस प्रस्ताव के बारे में अभी विचार हो रहा है, उस का जो विषय है वह बड़ा ही महत्वपूर्ण है। तिब्बत में हाल में जो घटनाएँ घटी हैं और जिस तरह की रिपोर्टें हमारे पास आ रही हैं, उन से मैं समझता हूँ कि जा भी स्वदेश से प्रेम रखने वाले लोग हैं, स्वतंत्रता से प्रेम रखने वाले लोग हैं, व दुःखी हैं। तिब्बत के साथ चीन की सरकार का कंसा भी सम्बन्ध रहा हो, जिस तरीके से उस ने वहाँ काम शुरू किया है, वह दुःख का विषय है। तिब्बत कोई स्वतंत्र देश रहा हो, ऐसा कोई प्रमाण हमारे सामने नहीं है। यह मानी हुई बात है और इतिहास से भी यही प्रकट होता है कि बराबर तिब्बत चीन की प्रभुसत्ता मानता रहा है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह बात गलत है।

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : यह मेरा ब्याज है, हो सकता है कि गलत हो। फिर भी यह बात सब जानते हैं कि प्रभुसत्ता के बावजूद

भी तिब्बत अपने सभी मामलों में स्वतंत्र था। जैसा एक माननीय सदस्य अभी कह रहे थे कि तिब्बत एक स्वतंत्र देश था तो क्या कारण था कि इतने दिनों से संयुक्त राष्ट्र तब कर्त्तव्य है, तिब्बत एक स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र के रूप में संयुक्त राष्ट्र का सदस्य नहीं हुआ यह जिस बें काब अपने मामले को भारत के जरिबे मेजना चाहता है। जबकि ६० राष्ट्र उस में शामिल हैं तो तिब्बत एक स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र के रूप में उस बें क्यों सम्मिलित नहीं है। इसलिये यह एक विवादास्पद प्रश्न है कि तिब्बत एक स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र है या नहीं है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह विवाद खुद चीन का बनाया हुआ है।

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : आज हम प्रश्न को तय करने का मौका नहीं है और तय करने का अधिकार भी इस मसद् को नहीं है। इस में हर एक सदस्य को स्वतंत्रता है कि जो कुछ भी सामान उसके पास हो, चाहे वह ऐतिहासिक हो चाहे किसी और प्रकार का हो, उस का महेंजर रख कर अपने विचार प्रकट करे। जहाँ तक मैं ने अपने अध्ययन से मसला है, जब से संयुक्त राष्ट्र मव कायम हुआ है और उस के पहले भी लॉग आफ नेशन्स कायम थी, उस में भी मैं न देखा कि तिब्बत कभी स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र के रूप में वहाँ पर नहीं था। न उसने लॉग आफ नेशन्स में भाग लिया और न संयुक्त राष्ट्र मव में किसी रूप में भाग लिया। जो भी माननीय सदस्य यहाँ मौजूद हैं व स्पष्ट रूप से यह जानत हैं, इसलिये मेरे ब्याज से यह विवादास्पद विषय है, लेकिन फिर भी

एक माननीय सदस्य : इंडिया या सीप आफ नेशन्स में ?

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : आज हम इसे मानने के लिये तैयार हैं कि जिस तरह की कार्रवाइयाँ तिब्बत में हो रही हैं, उन से काफ़ी की जनता को बहुत ही कष्ट है, दुःख है और

हवारी तमाम सहानुभूति उस के साथ है। तिब्बत में रहने वाले जो लोग हैं, अपने देश के अन्दर उन के जो अधिकार हैं, उन अधिकारों को वे प्राप्त करें। और उन अधिकारों को प्राप्त करने के लिये जो भी आन्दोलन के शरने उस आन्दोलन के साथ भले ही हम क्रियात्मक रूप से सहायक न हो सकें, लेकिन हमारा पूरी सहानुभूति उन के साथ है।

साथ ही माय यहां के एक सदस्य की हैनियत में मैं समझता हू कि चीन ने जो क्व अस्त्यार किया है, जबकि तिब्बत के ऊपर चीन का प्रभुसत्ता है, उस प्रभुसत्ता के रहने हुए भी उन्होंने तिब्बत के साथ जो आघ्राहवा किया है, जो इकरारनामा किया है। उन्होंने उस इकरारनामे के विरुद्ध काम किया है। इस लिये आज जा विषय है वह न केवल भारत के लिये वर्तन मैं समझता हू कि स्वतंत्रता स प्रेम रखने वाले जिनने भी दश दुनिया में हैं, उन सब के लिये यह दुख का बात है।

अब मवान यह है कि तिब्बत के इश्यू का, जिनमें हम चाहते हैं कि भारत सरकार मयुक्त राष्ट्र में ले जाये वह मवान क्या है। इश्यू यह है कि एक स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र ने हमने स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र का दबा दिया ता बात दूसरी थी। लेकिन जहां तक प्रभुसत्ता का सल्लुका है गलत या सही, हम ने चीन की प्रभुसत्ता का कोई रूप में मान लिया है। जो इकरारनामा हान में भारत ने चीन के साथ किया है, वह व्यापार का इकरारनामा हमारे सामने है, उन में हम ने कबुल किया है कि तिब्बत जो है वह चीन का एक भाग है तिब्बत एक स्वतंत्र देश नहीं है। सब हम ने तिब्बत को चीन का एक भाग मान लिया तब फिर यह सवाल उठाना कि साहब, तिब्बत जो है वह चीन का अक्ष नहीं है, एक गलत बात होगी। लेकिन तिब्बत का जो एक रीजन है, जिसे अधिकार प्राप्त थे, उस के अधिकारों पर आघात हुआ है, वह मैं मानता हूँ। अब लिये सब सवाल यह है कि इस इश्यू

को मयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में ले जाया जाये तो इश्यू क्या होगा? अगर वह है कि चीन सरकार ने जो इकरारनामा तिब्बत के साथ किया है उस के विरुद्ध काम किया है ता एक इश्यू तो यह हो सकता है, दूसरा इश्यू यह है कि तिब्बत में जो घटना घटी है उस से दुनिया का शांति में खलल पड़ने वाला है। मयुक्त राष्ट्र मय के बहुत में उद्देश्य हैं, जिन में से एक उद्देश्य यह भी है कि अगर मयुक्त राष्ट्र यह मनझे कि किसी देश में या दुनिया के किसी भाग में हम तरह कि घटना घटी है जिन से दुनिया में लडाई फैलने की सम्भावना है, ता उस का मैं वह अपनी बहस में ले सकता हूँ। इन लिये मैं यह सम्झाना चाहता हूँ—इस प्रश्न पर विवाद करने का जो मौका मिला है वह बहुत अच्छा मौका है—कि इस मामले का मयुक्त राष्ट्र मय में किस प्रकार से लाया जा सकता है। यह चीज मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रही है। इस प्रस्ताव से माफ नहीं मान्य पड़ता है कि हम का मयुक्त राष्ट्र मय के किस भाग में ले जाया जाये। आया इमे मिस्को रेटी कौमिल में ले जाया जाय या युनाइटेड नेशन्स जनरल असेम्बली के अजडे में इन्क्यूड कराने की कागिश की जाय। जहां तक मरा खयाल है यह इश्यू विवादास्पद है अभी जा इस का कानूना पढ़ने है, चीन के मकामले तिब्बत की जो स्थिति है वह ठीक में माफ नहीं हुई है। इस लिये इंग बान में जल्द बाजी करने की कोई खास आवश्यकता मुझे नहीं मालम पड़ता है। जहां तक हिन्दुस्तान का प्रश्न है कि वह इस तिब्बत के प्रश्न का मयुक्त राष्ट्र में उठाय ता मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्रश्न का। इस दृष्टिकाम में देवा जाता चाहिये। और जैसा कि अभी माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान जा कालनाज हूँ उपलिवेश हूँ, उन उपलिवेशों की स्वतंत्रता के लिये बराबर में लडना आया है और वह बान सही भी है कि जब से हिन्दुस्तान स्वतंत्र हुआ है तब से हमने उन कालोनीज के हक में आवाज बुलन्द की है जो कि किन्हीं दूसरे देशों के अधीन हैं। उन कालोनीज के हक

**[श्री श्री नारायण दास]**

की बात हमने रक्की है लेकिन सवाल तो यह है कि तिब्बत कोई चीन की कालीनी नहीं है और अगर तिब्बत को चीन की कालोनी की स्थिति प्राप्त हुई होती तो आज हिन्दुस्तान के लिये दरवाजा खुला हुआ था कि हम तिब्बत का मामला संयुक्त राष्ट्र सब के सामने ले जाते लेकिन तिब्बत चीन का उपनिवेश नहीं है. . . .

**श्री प्र० के० देव :** अब भारत जिस प्रकार से दक्षिण अफ्रीका में भारतीयों के साथ जो गभेद की नीति बर्ती जाती है और उनके साथ बुरा बर्ताव किया जाता है और हालांकि वह दक्षिण अफ्रीका का इन्टरनल और इमेस्टिक मामला है लेकिन उसकी संयुक्त राष्ट्र में ले गया जैसे ही तिब्बत के मामले को भी ले जा सकता है ।

**श्री श्रीनारायण दास :** मैं ने कहा कि बहुत से ऐसे देश हैं कि जहां पर किसी दूसरे स्वतंत्र देश का अधिकांश है और इस सम्बन्ध में यह सवाल उठता है कि प्रायः तिब्बत चीन का उपनिवेश है कि नहीं और चूंकि वह चीन का उपनिवेश नहीं है तो उस हालत में हमें यह विचार करना होगा कि इस सवाल को संयुक्त राष्ट्र में उठाया जाय कि नहीं बहरहाल मैं समझता हू कि इस सवाल पर भी अभी विचार करने की जरूरत है कि हिन्दुस्तान को इस मामले में पडना चाहिये कि नहीं ।

जहां तक मेरे निजी मत का सम्बन्ध है मैं यह स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हू कि हमारी सहानुभूति तिब्बत की जनता के साथ पूरी है और उनके साथ चीन की सरकार ने जो व्यवहार किया है मैं उसका समर्थन कर सकता । अब पूरी पूरी जानकारी हमें नहीं है कि तिब्बत में क्या स्थिति हुई है और किस स्थिति में चीन की सरकार ने वहां यह कार्यवाही की या वहां की जनता न क्या किया इसके ठोक ठोक जानकारी हमें नहीं है .

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** आप वहां स्वयं जा कर देखिये ।

**श्री श्रीनारायण दास :** वहां की जनता की बलपूर्वक दवाने की कोशिश की गई है और हो सकता है कि इस सिलसिले में माननीय सदस्य ने जिक्र किया हो कि बहुत से भारतीय वहां पर मारे गये लेकिन इतना स्पष्ट है कि वहां के जो धर्माध्यक्ष हैं और जो तिब्बती सरकार के प्रमुख हैं वह माननीय दलाई लामा हमारे देश में आगये हैं और मैं हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को इसके लिये बधाई देना चाहता हू कि बावजूद इसके कि हमारे और चीन के जो मैत्री सम्बन्ध हैं उनमें दलाई लामा को भारत द्वारा शरण देने से धक्का पहुंचा है तो भी भारत सरकार ने उनका भारत में स्वागत किया । अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में एक राष्ट्र को दूसरे राष्ट्र के एक धर्माध्यक्ष के साथ बर्ताव रखना चाहिये इस बात को मद्देनजर रख कर उनको हमने अपने देश में रहने की सुविधा प्रदान की है और हम इसके लिये भारत सरकार को बधाई देते हैं । दलाई लामा के साथ जो और बहुत से तिब्बती शरणार्थी हमारे देश में आ गये हैं उनका रहने की और अन्य सुविधायें दे कर भारत सरकार ने जनता के मन के भूताविक काम किया है बावजूद इसके कि हमने सिर्फ गलतफहमी से या किसी बजह से चीन के साथ कुछ बिगाड सा कर लिया है । लेकिन फिर भी हम उचित और सही पथ से विचलित नहीं हुए और हम ने अपने कर्तव्य को निभाया और एक स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र के धर्माध्यक्ष हमारे देश में आये और उन्हें हमने अपने देश में रहने का मौका दिया और अन्य भी आवश्यक सुविधायें प्रदान कीं । मैं समझता हू कि ऐसा कर के हमने बहुत अच्छा काम किया है लेकिन इन सब चीजों के होते हुए भी हम चाहते हैं कि तिब्बत की जो स्थिति है उसकी कुछ क्षामवीन की जाये और उस सम्बन्ध में कुछ जानकारी हासिल की जाये कि तिब्बत की जनता की क्या हालत है और तिब्बत की जनता क्या चाहती है इस बात की भी कुछ क्षामवीन की जाये । केवल अन्तर संयुक्त राष्ट्र

में ही इस तिब्बत के प्रश्न को ले जाने से इस समस्या का समाधान सम्भव हो सकता था जो हम समझते हैं कि उस हालत में हिन्दुस्तान को कुछ सोचने विचारने की जरूरत नहीं थी और बह जल्दी से जल्दी यह तिब्बत का मामला संयुक्त राष्ट्र में रख सकता था लेकिन बात ऐसी नहीं है और क्या केवल संयुक्त राष्ट्र में यह प्रश्न ले जाने से तिब्बती जनता का जो प्रश्न है उसका कोई हल होने वाला है और अगर हल होने वाला नहीं है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान को पूरी गम्भीरता से इस पर विचार करना चाहिये, कानूनी दृष्टि से इस पर विचार करना चाहिये और फायदे की दृष्टि से इस पर विचार करना चाहिये। जल्दबाजी में आ कर या किसी तरह की भावना से प्रेरित हो कर इस तरह का प्रश्न उठाना मैं समझता हूँ कि अभी उचित नहीं है और समयानुकूल नहीं है। इसलिये कानूनी दृष्टि में बह्विध की स्थिति की दृष्टि से और चूंकि यह एशिया का प्रश्न है और एशिया के और भी स्वतंत्र देश हैं और खास कर मैं ने अपने सभोवन में जिन कि मैं भूच नहीं कर सका उसको भी ध्यान में रखते हुए और यह कि हिन्दुस्तान ने इस बात में अग्रिम भाग लिया है और एशिया में सम्मिलित जब कभी कोई प्रश्न आये तो यह उचित होगा कि एशिया के जो दूसरे स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र हैं उनमें आपस में विचार विमर्श हो और इस बात का जानने का प्रयत्न किया जाये कि आखिर उनकी भावना क्या है और उनका खयाल क्या है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके लिये डिप्लोमैटिक स्तर पर कोशिश करना चाहिये और मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के सरकार और खास कर के हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय इस बात की जरूर कोशिश में होंगे कि इसको पीसकुनी और शान्तिमय तरीके से हल किया जाये और यदि ऐसा हो सके तो वह अच्छा ही होगा। यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में जा कर और वहाँ पर इस को ले कर सच्ची बहस खिड़ने से इस समस्या का समाधान होने वाला नहीं है। इसलिये तिब्बत की जो समस्या है उसका

समाधान करने के लिये शान्तिमय उपायों द्वारा और विशेष कर एशिया के जो अन्य स्वतंत्र देश हैं उनमें आपस में इन सम्बन्ध में विचार-विमर्श करा जाये और यह देखा जाये कि हिन्दुस्तान को इस बारे में आगे कदम बढ़ाने चाहिये कि नहीं। जल्दबाजी में कोई कदम उठा लेना उचित नहीं होगा और इसलिये अभी मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ।

Dr. Gohokar: Mr. Chairman, Sir, so far as the resolution moved by Shri Vajpayee and the amendment that has been allowed by you are concerned, I do not think that Shri Vajpayee will be against my amendment. Because his main object in moving this resolution is to get this issue discussed in the United Nations General Assembly. So, whether Government wants to take this issue by themselves or not, when it comes up in the United Nations, I wish the Government should support this issue in the Assembly.

We have to look at this issue from quite a different point of view, because so many facts have come out now. The Dalai Lama is present in our country and he has explained so many facts. If you remember, in his statement of June 20th, he said that the 1951 agreement which was signed between Tibet and China was signed under duress and was signed at the point of the bayonet. The Tibetan representatives were compelled to sign it and they were threatened to sign it if they did not sign it the Tibetan territory would be violated. Again, the seal which they used on this agreement was not a real seal. It was a fabricated one. So we have to look at this agreement from all these different points of view. The very fact that China thought it necessary to conclude an agreement with Tibet shows that China herself recognized the political position of Tibet. So, the agreement which was concluded in 1951, as has been shown by the Dalai Lama, was under duress and at the point of the bayonet. So, I feel

[Dr. Gobokar]

that the agreement cannot stand any more

Our Government which concluded an agreement in 1954 did not know all these facts. We took the 1951 agreement between Tibet and China to be true and at its face value we concluded the 1954 agreement. When we now know from the Dalai Lama that the 1951 agreement was under duress, we must look at our 1954 agreement from this point of view also. We have to review all our past positions taking into consideration these new facts. If the agreements of 1951 and 1954 do not stand and if we go to the historical background, then we find that as far back as 1906 when an Anglo-Chinese convention was held in Peking. In 1906 in this convention, the Chinese Government withdrew the suzerain right over Tibet and gave all those rights to the British Government who were then the rulers in India. This shows that China did not claim any sovereignty even in 1906. They only transferred the suzerain rights. They did not have the sovereign rights even in 1906. Whether any nation is existing or not, the test that could be applied to see whether it exists or not is the *de jure* and *de facto* aspects. Whatever *de jure* rights China had, were transferred in 1906. If we look to the position of the Government of Tibet, we find that it was generally self-governing. Or at the most, if somebody says some other power had suzerain rights over it, I might even say that it was autonomous to some extent, but we find that after 1906, China was never in possession of this Tibetan territory. So, the Chinese claim that they held some sort of claim over Tibet is wrong. I feel that from 1906 at least, Chinese cannot claim any sovereignty or suzerainty over Tibet.

It was from this convention of 1906 that India claimed some sort of concessions over Tibet. Even India did not claim any sovereignty, only certain concessions were given. You will

find that a treaty between India and Tibet was ratified in 1914, when China was never consulted. If China had any claims over Tibet, China would have been consulted then. But this never happened. This also shows that China did not object to the 1914 ratification, which was about the McMahon line.

With the Dalai Lama's statement, everything is clear. We must review our relations with Tibet in the light of these circumstances. In my amendment to the resolution of Shri Vajpayee, I have requested the Government to support this issue in the U.N. Assembly. Our Government, I learn, feel that it will be a sort of interference in the internal affairs of China. But I feel quite differently, because if we take all these facts and our relations and China's relations with Tibet from 1906, it is a question of Chinese intervention in the internal affairs of Tibet since 1951 and not otherwise. So when this issue is brought before the United Nations Assembly, I want our Government to support this issue.

If we do not take this issue to the U.N. Assembly, I am sure some other country, which is a member of the U.N., will surely bring this issue. Another point which I want to stress here is that we have been supporting China's membership in the U.N.O. I feel in the present circumstances, we must review the situation, because up till now we were friendly with China, but now our relations have been strained. So, we must look at this from a different point of view. It is said that if we take this issue and make China a member in the U.N.O. then China will act with some responsibility. But I feel that it is generally not so. We have found that in the case of South Africa, Russia and France also, though they are members of the U.N.O., they have not acted many times in accordance with the spirit of the U.N. Charter. So, I feel that even if China becomes a

member in the U.N., it will be of no use to us. I think with the position she will get in the U.N., she will try to wield her influence and carry propaganda against democratic countries. So, I feel that we should not any more champion this cause. With these words, I request the Government to support the Tibetan issue, if it comes before the United Nations General Assembly in the coming session.

16.30 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara). I oppose the motion moved by my esteemed friend, Shri Vajpayee, with so many emotion and passion, though with sincerity. We are in a very crucial stage in the history of the world and right in our own land we have been conquered by almost many countries of the world—the British, the French, the Dutch, the Portuguese the Moghuls, the Japanese and now even perhaps the Chinese may be threatening to invade our territory. China and India have been friends down the centuries. Chinese have come down here as travellers and I have heard from Chinese that they have read the stories of Chinese travellers about our great past. But the speech delivered by my hon. friend, His Highness, if it were to be implemented—unfortunately he is not in his seat—if, unfortunately, whatever he said is implemented, we shall make a bonfire of our friendship with China and we shall throw India into danger and every line of our frontiers will be in extreme danger. Today we had very reactionary speeches in this House. Just when the China lobby is being eliminated in the Congress of the United States of America, unwittingly a Chinese lobby is being built up in this very House. That we shall resolutely oppose. We shall also resolutely oppose if ever China were to touch an inch of our territory.

An Hon. Member: They have already done it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Joachim Alva: The Prime Minister has stated that the Mac-Mohan line is by usage, by historical precedents and by agreement our border line. And we shall fight for that border line, whether it is the Chinese, the Russians, or the British, or the Americans. We shall not agree to have an inch of foreign domination in our land. We shall live and die for our country and only when we die shall we preserve our hard-won freedom. This Parliament shall fall to pieces if our freedom is gone. Gone are the days when we went to jail and when going to jail was an easy thing, or not so difficult. Now it is a very difficult thing to keep our freedom going, and the world has become so small. And yet His Highness, the Maharaja, whose adherents are partners in our administration of Orissa, makes a written speech on that question which is reactionary and which, if accepted, our border will crumble down to bits.

I ask my Chinese friends: are they prepared to invade India? I am sure in their heart of hearts they do not want to invade India. I ask my own people are you prepared to go for a war with China? There are lobbies, whispers, suspicions and mistrust and so it is time that we take a full view, of the great policy enunciated by our Prime Minister, a policy which has been born down the ages for 2,000 years. We have tolerated every kind of man, whether they are Britishers or other foreigners. But if there is any incursion we will be up against it. As I said, I am also one of those who will not allow an inch of our land to be taken by any country.

But we must take note of another factor and that factor is that the Chinese people are also very inscrutable people. During the last two years I have been to London and Moscow. I have visited all the borders like the German-Polish border and the Turkish-Soviet border so much so when I met Mr Gromyko.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

the Foreign Minister and Mr. Adnan Mendaras, the Turkish Prime Minister, they said they do not generally permit others to speak about the rival countries: "we allow you to talk of Turkey" "we allow you to talk about Russia", because they felt that I was hailing from the land of the great Mahatma who brought peoples together.

When General Ayub Khan was here yesterday the whole event was overshadowed, though it was a historical event. When he came here I was the only Indian M.P. who was at the Palam airport. I went there as a journalist. And I may tell you frankly that General Ayub Khan is a different type of man, a man of few words, a man who nobly said: "forget and forgive" in one line

Are you going to war against the Chinese? What is China? Let us have a background of China. There was Manchu China and Sun Yat Sen's China. Then came the Red China. Then came the untouchable China that you know. Lastly came the rebellious China. You know what was Manchu China and Sun Yat Sen's China. Manchu China was exploited by the nations of Europe in a manner that the Chinese were worse than dogs. A few millionaires of ours in Bombay, made money when the Opium War was waged. Have you any idea as to how many rich men became richer in Bombay and are still millionaires in their mansions because they made money out of the Opium War when the Western powers thrust opium on the helpless Chinese? The Chinese were treated as dogs, were worse than Indians and worse than what we were under the British. Let us not forget that background. They are gallant and inscrutable race.

Through the kindness.... (Inter-ruption), I am explaining their background. I am coming now.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At least some time.....

Shri Joachim Alva: Through the kindness of.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At least sometimes at certain intervals he should look towards the Chair also.

Shri Joachim Alva: I shall not look towards anybody else.

Through the kindness of an esteemed ambassador of ours, Dr. Khosla, one of India's most popular ambassadors abroad, I had a long chat with one of America's ablest ambassadors, Mr. Leslie Johnson, in Prague sitting down at two o'clock in the morning in October, 1957. Mr. Leslie Johnson and Mr. Wang, the Secretaries-General of the American and Chinese Delegation respectively at the Geneva Conference carried on negotiations for the release of American prisoners. After hearing Mr. Leslie Johnson, who is now U.S.A. Ambassador in Thailand, I do not understand why the Chinese threw away the chance of releasing just five or six American prisoners. The Americans, as I heard from Mr. Johnson—I do not think I am giving away any secret—were ready to go for a second stage and the second stage might have ended in the recognition of China by the United States. But lo, the Chinese built an iron wall and said, "We shall not release these five or six prisoners". For the sake of five or six prisoners, world tension had been kept up. When I heard the story from the mouth of Mr. Leslie Johnson as early as two o'clock in the morning in Prague, I wondered where India came, why India did not interfere and brought the Chinese and the Americans together and got those five prisoners released. That was human consideration.

But today we do not need pedlars. We do not need intermediaries to bring China and us together. Today we have to talk it round the table. If you want to go to arms, by all means go to arms, though we have never been. But we are not going to throw our precious liberty into



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 Jamsaheb 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

[Shr. 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 गिरोहताओं 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

## [श्री बाजपेयी]

बैते हैं उनसे इस बात की आशा नहीं है कि वापस की बार्ता द्वारा अब इसको हल किया जा सकता है, और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो अपने भाषण में इस तरह की कोई आशा प्रकट नहीं की है। हमने दलाई लामा को और उनके साथियों को भारत में स्थान दिया, बहुत अच्छा काम किया और सब इसका स्वागत करते हैं। किन्तु क्या दलाई-लामा को भाष्य देने के साथ ही तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में भारत का कर्तव्य पूरा हो जाता है? क्या दलाईलामा और उनके साथी कभी सम्मान के साथ तिब्बत वापस लौट सकेंगे? क्या तिब्बत को आटोनामी जिसकी चीन ने गारंटी दी थी फिर से वापस पा सकेंगे? क्या तिब्बत अपने अस्तित्व की रक्षा कर सकेंगे? इन प्रश्नों का कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया गया।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि उनकी नीति चीन के साथ मित्रता रखने की है उनकी इस नीति से सारा देश सहमत है। चीन से क्या हम पाकिस्तान से भी मित्रता चाहते हैं। दुनिया के सारे देशों से दोस्ती चाहते हैं, किन्तु सवाल यह है, उस मित्रता का आधार क्या होगा? किस कीमत पर वह दोस्ती की जाएगी? हम फ्रांस से दोस्ती चाहते हैं मगर इसलिए हम अल्जीरिया की आजादी का समर्थन करने से इन्कार नहीं कर सकते। हम पुर्तगाल की भी दोस्ती चाहते हैं मगर इसके लिए हम गोष्ठा की स्वतंत्रता की मांग को बन्द नहीं कर सकते। हम दक्षिण अफ्रीका से भी मित्रता चाहते हैं, मगर इस कारण हमने दक्षिण अफ्रीका के गैर श्वेतों का सवाल संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठाने से मना नहीं कर दिया। हर साल हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में अफ्रीका में भारतीयों का प्रश्न उठाते हैं। हर साल दक्षिण अफ्रीका संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के निर्णय को नहीं मानता, मगर हम इस प्रश्न को उठाते हैं क्योंकि हम समझते हैं कि बिना के जनमत

को जामत करने के प्रस्ताव इन सवालों को हल करने का और कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं है।

मैं ने जब तिब्बत के प्रश्न को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में ले जाने का प्रस्ताव किया तो मेरा उद्देश्य स्पष्ट था कि हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में विश्वास करते हैं इसलिए हमें तिब्बत के सवाल का वहां ले जाना चाहिए। और तिब्बत की शिकायत के धीरिच्य मैं भी हम विश्वास करते हैं इसलिए भी हमें तिब्बत के सवाल को वहां ले जाना चाहिए।

अब तिब्बत के सवाल को वहां ले जाने से फायदा होगा या नहीं होगा? मैं समझता हूँ कि इसका निर्णय अगर हम न करें और तिब्बत के सर्वोच्च नेता श्री दलाई लामा के फैसले के अनुसार चलें तो मैं समझता हूँ वह ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। तिब्बत का भला किस में है, क्या श्री दलाई लामा से अधिक और कोई इस बात का फैसला कर सकता है? और उन श्री दलाई लामा ने ३० अगस्त को अपील की है दुनिया की सभी सिबिलाइज्ड नेशन्स के नाम, जिनमें भारत भी आता है, कि तिब्बत के सवाल को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में ले जाना चाहिए। प्रधान मंत्री जी अब मेरे प्रस्ताव को मानने से इन्कार करते हैं तो वह श्री दलाई लामा की अपील को मानने से भी इन्कार करते हैं। अगर श्री दलाई लामा समझते हैं कि तिब्बत की समस्या को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में ले जाने से कुछ लाभ होगा तो मैं समझता हूँ कि भारत को उस प्रश्न को उठाना चाहिए। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह भी स्पष्ट नहीं किया कि अगर और कोई देश तिब्बत के सवाल को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में लाएगा तो उस समय हमारी नीति क्या होगी। हम दुनिया के और किसी देश को यह सवाल लाने से नहीं रोक सकते। क्या हम उस समय यह कहेंगे कि यह सवाल नहीं लाया जाना चाहिए? इस सम्बन्ध में हमें हमारा जो प्रतिनिधि संबन्ध



जनरल असेम्बली में भाग लेने जा रहा है उसको स्पष्ट निर्देश देना चाहिए। मुझे प्य होता है कि हमारे प्रतिनिधि मंडल के जो नेता जनरल असेम्बली में भाग लेने जा रहे हैं वे वहाँ भारत की भावनाओं का सही प्रतिनिधित्व कर सकेंगे। एक बार पहले भी वह हंगरी के सवाल पर भारत की जनता की भावनाओं को सही रूप से प्रकट नहीं कर सके थे। प्रधान मंत्री कुछ कहते थे और हमारे प्रतिनिधि मंडल के नेता कुछ कहते थे। मुझे डर है तिब्बत के सवाल पर यह इतिहास न पुहराया जाए। इसलिए अगर भारत सरकार स्वयं तिब्बत के प्रश्न को नहीं उठाती है, तो जैसा कि कांग्रेस के सदस्य डा० गोहोकर ने संशोधन रखा है, अगर कोई और देश इस प्रश्न को उठाता है तो भारत को उसका समर्थन करना चाहिए। पिछली बार हमने समर्थन नहीं किया इसलिए दुनिया का कोई भी देश भागे नहीं बढ़ा। आखिर तिब्बत में हमारी सबसे अधिक रुचि है, हम तिब्बत से सबसे अधिक सहानुभूति रखते हैं, तिब्बत हमारा पड़ोसी देश है।

एक माननीय सदस्य. क्यांगकाई लोक क्यों नहीं उठाते इस प्रश्न को ?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. This is not the first time that the hon. Member is moving his motion. He has moved his motion and spoken on it. If any explanation has to be given to what has arisen out of the speeches that have been made for or against, he can do so by explaining a few points. He cannot make a second speech as the one which he made at the time of moving the motion.

Shri Vajpayee: I am only explaining a few points.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is not doing that. He has reopened the whole thing.

श्री वाजपेयी : मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर तिब्बत के सवाल को किसी और देश ने उठाया तो भारत की नीति क्या होगी ?

218 L.S.D.—9.

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस के सदस्य ने जो संशोधन रखा है उस के सम्बन्ध में सरकार का क्या मत है ? वह मेरा संशोधन नहीं है। श्री प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उस सम्बन्ध में सरकार के दृष्टिकोण का कोई स्पष्टीकरण नहीं किया है।

तिब्बत के सवाल पर व्यावहारिक कठिनाइयाँ हैं यह ठीक है लेकिन संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में ले जाने के बलावा तिब्बत की समस्या का और कोई हल दिखायी नहीं देता। वहाँ गरमागरम भाषण होंगे यह ठीक है। लेकिन अगर हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में विश्वास करते हैं और चीन संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में जाना चाहता है तो फिर विश्व के जनमत का चीन पर जरूर कुछ प्रभाव होना चाहिए। अब भारत के सामने एक ही रास्ता है कि हम विश्व की धारणा को अपील करें, हम विश्व की चेतना को जगाएँ। तिब्बत में होने वाले मानव अधिकारों के हनन के प्रति विश्व के जनमत को जाग्रत करें। और यदि कम्युनिस्ट चीन पर उसका असर नहीं होता तो हमें यह तो संतोष होगा कि हमने अपना कर्तव्य पालन किया। हम जानना चाहते हैं कि भारत सरकार की तिब्बत के प्रति नीति क्या है ? क्या हाथ पर हाथ रखे रहने की नीति है ? क्या अनिश्चय की नीति है, असहायता की नीति है ? आखिर तिब्बत की समस्या को शान्तिपूर्वक हल करने के लिए हम कौनसा कदम उठा रहे हैं ? मैंने निवेदन किया कि दलाई लामा को जगह देने मात्र से तिब्बत की समस्या हल नहीं होती।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। अभी भारत ने फैसला किया है कि हम चीन को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में लाने के प्रस्ताव को इस बार फिर से उठावेंगे। पिछले सात सालों से हम इस प्रश्न को उठा रहे हैं। लेकिन क्या भाज की परिस्थिति में इस प्रस्ताव को हम उठाएँ इस बात की प्रावश्यकता है। चीन संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में जाना चाहे, अगर जो कुछ हो रहा है हमारे और चीन के बीच

[ श्री बाजरेयी ]

में, क्या उसको देखते हुए हमें पहल करना चाहिए चीन को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में अर्थात् देने की? मैं समझता हूँ कि समय आ गया है कि भारत सरकार संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में चीन को प्रवेश दिलाने के प्रस्ताव को वाप कर दे। अगर दुनिया का कोई भी देश उस सवाल को उठाए तो हम उसका समर्थन कर दें। यदि हम तिब्बत के सवाल को उठाने को तैयार नहीं तो फिर चीन जो कुछ हमारे साथ कर रहा है उसको देखते हुए चीन को संयुक्त राष्ट्र में प्रवेश दिलाने के लिए पहल क्यों करें। भाबिए, जैसा मैं ने कहा, चीन से मित्रता का यह धर्म नहीं है कि वह सार्ते भारत जाए और हम उनके चरणों को चूमते जाएं। मित्रता धात्म सम्मान के आधार पर हो सकती है। चीन आक्रमणकारी है, चीन हमारी सीमा पर प्रवेश करने आया है। हमारे दरवाजे लटका रहे हैं। और प्रधान मंत्री जी कहते हैं हम सीमा के सम्बन्ध में बात करने को तैयार नहीं हैं। मैं समझता हूँ हमें अब चीन के सवाल को उठाना नहीं चाहिए। और मैं इस सदन से अपील करूंगा कि वह मेरे प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करे और यह सिद्ध करे कि शायद कुछ अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कठिनाइयों से भारत सरकार तिब्बत के सवाल को जले ही न उठा सके, अगर भारत की जनता की भावनाएँ तिब्बत की जनता के साथ हैं, बर्बाई सामा के साथ हैं और इसका एक ही रास्ता है कि हम इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करें।

18 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: There is an amendment moved to this motion.

Shri Gohokar: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

The Amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that Government should refer the Tibetan issue to the United Nations".

The motion was negatived

18.01 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: SESSION OF LOK SABHA AT HYDERABAD OR BANGALORE

श्री प्रकाश और शशी (गुड़गांव): अध्यक्ष महोदय, धनी इस सदन में विश्व की एकता के सम्बन्ध में चर्चा हो रही थी। परन्तु मैं एक वह प्रस्ताव उपस्थित करने आ रहा हूँ, जिस में भारत की एकता निहित है। मेरे प्रस्ताव के शब्द ये हैं—

इस सभा की यह राय है कि लोक-सभा का अधिवेशन प्रतिवर्ष दक्षिण भारत में हैदराबाद में अथवा बंगलौर में होना चाहिए।

यह प्रस्ताव न केवल मेरी भावनाओं का प्रतिनिधित्व करता है, बल्कि वह भारतवर्ष के एक बहुत बड़े उस भूभाग की भावनाओं का प्रतिनिधित्व भी करता है, जिस को दक्षिण भारत कह कर पुकारा जाता है। वह मेरा सौभाग्य है कि उत्तर भारत का निवासी होते हुए मैं अपने दक्षिण भारत के भाइयों की भावनाओं का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए इस प्रस्ताव को इस सदन में उपस्थित कर रहा हूँ। दूसरे फिर एक सचब ऐसा था कि जिस समय दिल्ली भारतवर्ष के मध्य में मानी जाती थी। वह समय वह था जब कि भारतवर्ष का विभाजन नहीं हुआ था और उस की सीमा ब्रह्मदेश-बर्मा-तक थी। पाकिस्तान भी उस वक्त भारतवर्ष में सम्मिलित था। लेकिन आज बर्मा भारत से पृथक हो गया है और पाकिस्तान बनने के बाद भारत के उत्तर का एक बहुत बड़ा भाग भी हम से पृथक हो गया है। इसलिए अब इस सचब को स्वीकार नहीं किया जा सकता है कि दिल्ली