Chapter II

Tibetan Refugees, Emerging Issues and Question of Resettlement

Tibet popularly known outside as the ‘Land of Lamas’, the style of life in Tibet belonged to a hoary past which despite big revolutionary advances in science and technology in outside world could not even touch the fringe of Tibetan Society. The mystery associated with this unknown land was better expressed in another epithet for Tibet ‘The Forbidden Land’. Till the Chinese occupation in 1951, Tibet remained one of the little known and inaccessible land-locked countries of the world and for all practical purpose, cast off from the rest of the world.

The Chinese ‘occupation’ of Tibet suddenly catapulted the land and its people into a wider world of international politics, modern civilization. And also a determined Chinese campaign to ‘transform’ the tradition bound, outdated and fossilized character of the Tibetan social order by introducing large-scale ‘reforms’ threw it into a lot of turmoil. In early 1959 the political events took another turn, there was outbreak against the Chinese authorities, which was of course quickly suppressed. The Dalai Lama, the spiritual and political head of Tibet made a dramatic escape and took asylum in India. He was followed by thousands of his followers who were tied to the Dalai Lama by a strong traditional tie.

There are diverse, complex and politically sensitive interpretations to the political event, which led to the Dalai Lama and, thousands of his country-men to flee Tibet. Before going directly to the causes of their flight to neighbouring countries, it is important to understand some important geographical aspects of Tibet.
Tibet: A Geographical Setting

Tibet is situated at the very heart of Asia, bordering India, Nepal and Myanmar in the South, China in the east; and East Turkestan in the North. This Tibetan highlands extended over an area of 750,000 sq. miles or 2.5 million sq. km., this region lies for the most part above 10,000 feet within its largely desolate highland plains lived the 6 million Tibetans people. With a culture and way of life totally different from that of the peoples of the neighbouring countries, Tibetan have developed a unique and rich culture and spiritual traditions, a distinct language and a large body of literature and exquisite works of art. The Tibetan highlands include the present province of Qinghai and Tibet proper.

The Tibetan highlands can be divided into four major regions bounded on the North by the Kunlun and Nan Shan mountain systems, on the South by the Himalayas, and on the East by the longitudinal ranges of Western Szechwan. The four broad regions are: the Qinghai plateau, the Qinghai-Sikiang Canyon country, the Changtang plateau of northern Tibet, and the great valley of Southern Tibet. Figure 2.1 shows the physical division of Tibet Highlands.

The great valley of Southern Tibet extends for more than 10,000 miles between the trans-Himalayas and the Himalayas. It is occupied by the upper Indus river in the West and the upper Bramaputra river in the East. In this trench, situated at 12,000 feet above sea level, concentrated the population and economy of Tibet. In the valley, the chief cities of Tibet Lhasa, Shigatse, Gyantse and most of the meager agricultural and animal husbandry are located. Its great elevation and enriching mountains conditioned the climate of Tibet. The high altitudes and rarefied air

2 The population of Tibet varied from sources and no authentic census are available.
3 Shabab. No.1, p. 319.
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combine with intense isolation and strong radiation produce sharp contrasts
temperature between night and day and between the dry winters and the
moist summers. And also the high, nearly parallel ranges in the Southern
Tibet operate as an effective rain barrier.

**People**

Tibetans can be divided into different population groups viz., Khampa,
Amdo and Bodpo. This is basically a geo-demographic division. Though there
are no appreciable racial differences among these population groups, but there
are some remarkable cultural differences among them, which have also formed
some stereotypes on the eastern border, along both sides of the Sino-Tibetan
frontiers, there are the war like people known as Khampas. On the North-East
region, adjoining China Amdo are living. The Amdo people are reputed to be
very clever businessmen and traders. More than the people of other regions
the Amdos have had a close contact with the Chinese and there has been a
strong impingement of the Chinese cultural upon them. In the central regions,
which includes the capital region of Lhasa, live the Bodpo people. The Bodpos
proliferate even to the regions further west and are reputed to pick up cultural
sophistication in Tibet.

Tibetans make up the largest ethnic group in Tibetan highlands,
although the Chinese influx since the middle 1950s has undoubtedly
reduced the Tibetan component in the total population. According to the
1982 census, out of the total Tibetan population of 38,85,500 in the
People's Republic of China, 9,45,000 are Sichuun; 7,50,500 in Qinghai,
3,05,000 in Gansu; and 95,000 in Yunan\(^4\). If the Dalai Lama's figures are

---

correct, at present there are six million Tibetans and seven million Chinese in Tibet. With the increasing population transfer, the Chinese majority in Tibet will be even greater.\(^5\)

Tibet's geography has exercised considerable influence on the evolution of her peculiar polity and unique culture. Her relative isolation from countries around her, surrounded on all sides by mountainous ranges but with sufficient culture contacts with neighbouring civilizations, ensured an independent cultural development up to 1950s. However, her geo-strategic location tended to periodically invite foreign interference in her antiquated political system in pre-modern times and more frequently in our times, leading to the current communist takeover.

**Historical Highlight**

A survey of the Tibetan history, which has a bearing on Sind-Tibetan relations, will be imperative for a clear understanding of the Tibetan refugees problem. In the absence of any systematic history of Tibet it is not easy to recall the historical events of the country in any proper and uniform sequences. The Tibetan, like men elsewhere, have their myths to explain the creation.

During the 7th century AD we came to the reign of a king who was one of the most famous, if not the most famous, in all the Tibetan annals. His name was Song-Tsen-Gampo. He was once a conqueror, a law giver, and a religious reformer. His armies attacked the neighbouring countries; they overran and conquered Western China and upper Burma. It was during the reign of Song-Tsen-Gampo that Buddhism gained a firm hold. He took a wife to a daughter of the emperor of China, as well as a princess of Nepal, and it seems to have been largely through the influence of these

\(^5\) Ibid., p. 342.
two queens that the king himself adopted Buddhism and established it in the country. He built the Potala palace at Lhasa.

Another great Tibetan King was Song De-Tsen who according to the Chinese histories conquered much of the western China and extended Tibetan rule over India as far as the Bay of Bengal, which was known as the Tibetan Sea. During his reign the Tantrick Buddhist, Padma Samdhava, from Udyayana in North-Western India, visited Tibet, where he suppressed demons and founded the first large monastery, the monastery of Samye. Thus, we find the original Buddhism of Tibet, known as the Red Hat Sect. Padma Samdhava, often also known as Lo-Pen Rimpo-Che, ‘the Precious Teacher’ was its saint.

To put the history brief, we came towards the close of the 13th century where, the great Kublai Khan, the first Mongol emperor of China, visited to his court the high priest of the large Tibetan monastery of Sakya. The high priest converted the emperor to Buddhism, and received in return the sovereignty of Tibet. Thus, began in Tibet the rule of priest-kings. This first installment of it, however, lasted for only seventy full years, from 1270 to 1345 AD

In 1358 Tsong-Ka-Pa was born in the North-Eastern Tibet, ‘the Man from Land of Onions’. He inaugurated a movement by which the priesthood was forbidden to marry or to drink wine. Monastic discipline was tightened up. His disciples were known as the Yellow Hats, to distinguish them from the Red Hats of the existing priesthood. Tsong-Ka-Pa’s successor was Gan-den Truppa. After the latter death in 1474, his spirit was held to have passed into an infant born about the same time, and this child become his successor. He, too, died, and was reincarnated in the same manner. His successor, SONAM GYATSO, converted a large part of Mongolia to the faith. From the Mongol chieftain Altan Khan he received the little of Dalai Lama Vajradhara, ‘The All Embracing Lama the holder
of thunder-bolt'. Thus it was that the name Dalai Lama originated. The Dalai Lama was held in turn by each head of the Yellow Church.

During the reign of the 7th Dalai Lama the Chinese were able to increase their influence in Tibet, and a subsequent invasion by Gurkhas augmented it still further. In 1760 the ruler of Gurkha succeeded in establishing his power throughout Nepal. And twelve years later these Gurkhas captured Shigatse, the large town half a mile from Tashi Lhum-po. The Chinese Government dispatched an army composed partly of Chinese and partly of Tibetans which drove out the Gurkhas, pursued them into Nepal, and overwhelming defeated them within a few miles of their capital. By this feat the Chinese influence over Tibet was for a time greatly strengthened by the presence of the Ambans in Lhasa, 1792. The British power had then become paramount in Bengal, and was going throughout India, and so the Chinese took the precaution of closing Tibet to the Europeans.

The 13th Dalai Lama, Thupten Gyatso (1875-1933) had unfortunate reign to start with China. Britain had setup her protectorate over Sikkim and secured the opening of trade mart in Tibet, at Yatung in the Chumbi Valley 1893. Russia, several of whose Mongol nationalities (Kalmuks, Buriats) were Buddhists, had an influential advocate with the Dalai Lama, the Lama Dorjieff. Britain tried to restore the balance, and decided on war and occupied Lhasa 1904. Russia’s attention was absorbed by her war with Japan. A treaty was signed and recognized China’s suzerainty over Tibet, but opened up Tibet with Great Britain.

China set about reorganizing and modernizing Tibet in order to assert her position. There was armed intervention in Kham. Britain aid was brought by Tibet, but could do nothing. The Chinese army advanced on Lhasa and the Dalai Lama fled to India in 1910. But revolution broke out in China, and with it a period of anarchy. The Chinese army had to with
drew from Tibet, and the Dalai Lama went back to Lhasa. He proclaimed himself freed from the tied of vassalage and looked upon himself as sovereign. But China declared that Tibet formed part of China. The Sino-British treaty of 1914, provided for the division of Tibet into two parts: central Tibet from Laddakh to Chamdo, under the Dalai Lama’s administration, with a Chinese representative accompanied by a small escort, at Lhasa; and the eastern part, Kham, under the Chinese administration, with the Dalai Lama control over monasteries. The Chinese of course never ratified this treaty.

China regained powers under the communist rule in 1949, they set out about controlling Tibet effectively. They swiftly occupied the country and on May 23, 1951. A 17-point agreement was signed between the Central Peoples’Government of China and the Tibetan religious Government at Peking. The most important point was that of incorporating Tibet in the People’s Republic as an ethnic minority enjoying internal autonomy, maintaining the privileges of the Dalai Lama, and the Panchen Lama, and respecting religious tradition. From July 1951, events took a swift pace and the Dalai Lama returned with his whole court to Lhasa.

In circumstances that are not wholly clear, an armed revolt broke out in 1956 owing much to the Khampas, proud warriors who had many times before resisted China. And afterwards, the Lhasa uprising of 10 March 1959, the Dalai Lama fled to India with his cabinet, soon followed by thousands of Tibetans.

On 30 March 1959, the government of India granted asylum to the Dalai Lama, who was officially welcomed at Tezpur in Assam. In an anticipation of the day when repatriation would be possible the Dalai Lama maintains a government in Dharmasala, Himachal Pradesh in India. This administration “exists only as a non-political and private organization devoted mainly to the cultural development, rehabilitation and general
welfare of Tibetans refugees” and also serves as a consultant to the government of India in the execution of its Tibetan refugee policy.  

**Genesis and Causes of Tibetans Flight**

The Tibetan question is too controversial that even an innocent attempt that seeks to unearth the causes for the post - 1958 displacement became problematic. For such an attempt touches in directly one of the nerve-centres of the Sino-Tibetan controversy: Why did the Tibetans ‘serfs’ escape from the Chinese liberation?  

It is necessary to understand briefly the various reasons for the fight and the political context in which over 80,000 Tibetans mostly commoners escaped to the neighbouring South Asian countries generally between 1959 and 1962.

There are many studies, which sought to document the cases of genocides in Tibet that led to the mass exodus in 1959. Perhaps the well-known studies are the two reports by the International Commission of Jurists. The reports based on interviews with select groups of refugees in India, documented several cases of religious persecution, torture, forced sterilization, destruction of families and so on. To quote a report on genocides in Tibet, “The evidence established four principal facts in relation to genocide: a), that the Chinese will not permit adherence to and practice of Buddhism in Tibet; b), that they have systematically set out to eradicate this religious belief in Tibet; c), that in pursuit of this design they have killed religious figures because their religious belief and practice was
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6 'Tibetans in Exile, 1959-80', Compiled, Edited and Published by The Information Office of His Holiness The Dalai Lama, Central Tibetan Secretariat, Dharamsala, India. 1981. pp. x, xiii - xv  
an encouragement and example to others; and d), that they have forcibly transferred large numbers of Tibetan children to a Chinese materialist environment in order to prevent them from having a religious upbringing".

If what the international lawyers reported were true, their findings might have applied to Inner Tibet less in the case of Outer Tibet. In the analysis of the causes and character of 1959 revolt, following which most of the forced migration took place, it clearly emerges that one of the principal causes may be traced to the Chinese policy towards Tibet. The annexation of Tibet with China and the consequent rapid inroad of the aggressive ideology into body-politics brought in their wake a stream of Tibetan fleeing their country. It may be justifiably surmised that the Chinese, who had been pursuing a cautious policy of 'reform' among the Tibetans with the ulterior aims of subverting the latter traditional type of life-style, economic structure and socio-political institutions heightened the tempo of class war and communization as part of the aggressive trend which reached its acme in the years immediately after the cultural revolution was ushered in as the main plank of the Chinese communist party programme. It was this ideological aggressiveness by the Chinese in Tibet that triggered off active Tibetan resistance to them. However, it is clear that Chinese crusade was launched against feudalism and theocracy. It becomes an ideological conflict between monks and nobility against communism and Chinese rule. It is clear that Chinese reform and change directly attacked high priests, nobles and landlords, i.e., the upper strata of society. No doubt, for these groups there was every threat of their life, property and security of status, a majority of them left Tibet for the places where they could find their lives and interest more safe and protected.10

9 Ibid., p. 3.
Norbu\textsuperscript{11} traced the principal causes of the Tibetan Revolt of 1959 and consequently provided the political context of violence and flight to the differentiated Chinese policies towards Inner and Outer Tibet in the 1950s. The British officials referred to ‘Inner Tibet’, what the Tibetans call Amdo and Kham, most part of which were already incorporated into the Chinese provinces (Sichuan, Yunan, Gansu and Qinghai) before 1951. And ‘Outer Tibet’ included Central, Southern and Western Tibet and some parts of Kham which were under the effective control of the Tibetan government in Lhasa at the time of the communist take over. This part of Tibet is what PRC call the Tibet Autonomous Region today; Kham and Amdo are excluded from the Chinese conception of Tibet. The 17-Points Agreement 1951 applied to only outer Tibet.

Under the Communist leadership they formulated and persuade two radically different policies: radical communist policy measures in Inner Tibet and non-Communist liberal ones in Outer Tibet. In other words, the communist leaders treated, for all practical purposes Kham and Amdo more or less exactly like China proper in term of general policy implementation such as ideological campaign, land reforms much excluding the Outer Tibet. This then led to the first wave of displacement and forced migration from Inner to Outer Tibet during the mid-1950s and by 1959 into South Asia.\textsuperscript{12}

One of the central assumptions for this argument is that the population both in Inner and Outer Tibet, despite minor regional variations, constituted an identifiable ethnic group, sharing all the fundamental features of common society. It was wrong on the part of the Chinese leaders to base their policy towards Inner Tibet on a legalistic fiction rather than on social facts. For Tibet, whether Inner or Outer, still it is a relatively homogenous culture. This means that Inner Tibet was where

\textsuperscript{11} Dawa Norbu, 1979, “The 1959 Tibetan Rebellion”, \textit{China Quarterly}, No. 77, pp. 78-84
the 'revolution' was postponed until 1959 for political reasons. This also explains the predominant role played by the Khampas in the 1959 Revolt. Once the Tibetan revolted the Chinese authorities showed no mercy in repressing them.\textsuperscript{13}

Another important specific reason was that numerous Tibetan had heard about the atrocities committed by the Chinese in Lhasa such as tortures and humiliations in public for anyone unwilling to embrace Chinese communism. The third reason was that the Chinese authorities were obstructing endogamous marriages among the Tibetans who are forced to take a bride or a groom from the Chinese. This measure, they explained, was aimed at destroying their race of which Tibetans are so proud of. The fourth reason was that the news of their leader Dalai Lama's escape. The fifth reason was the confiscation of property from the propertied classes. Moreover, the Chinese had planned the take over in such a way that the communities and families were split among themselves. The children were used to spy upon their parents, wife upon the husband. Thus, concluded, Palakshappa, the occupation of Tibet by the Chinese had created a sense of insecurity and this insecurity in their daily life was at the bottom of the Tibetan migration.

According to the Dalai Lama, the Tibetan refugees who followed him, have not come from any single class, they really represent the entire Tibetan people. Among them are the Lamas of great eminence, learned and respected scholars, about five thousand monks, quite a few government officials, merchants and soldiers, and a large number of poor and ordinary peasant. The streams of refugees continued pouring for months and in a small trickle for some years after 1959, till after Sino-India War in 1962, when the border was completely sealed off. Commenting on above, and given the reasons for

\textsuperscript{12} Norbu, No.7, p. 80

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
decision to flee, Saklani\textsuperscript{14}, "an overwhelming majority of these refugees hardly had any correct knowledge of the situation inside the country, India; they were simply spurred on to take the fateful decision of escaping from their own land by the news of the Dalai Lama’s escape. They left their country in a state of utter confusion, they were either panicky and feet insecure or were the ardent followers of their God-King".

Spatial Distribution of Tibetan Refugees in India

Having discussed the reasons why the Tibetan refugees moved across the borders to the South Asian countries, it is now imperative to examine the direction, scale and area of movement and concentration of the Tibetan refugees in India. This will place the Indian experience into the South Asian perspective. The Dalai Lama fled with some one hundred members of his government and household to India. He has followed by more than 85,000 Tibetans fleeing from the southern borders of Tibet into India and Nepal and later also into the semi-autonomous regions of Sikkim and Bhutan.\textsuperscript{15} Refugees remained in the border areas until effort to move and resettle them into other parts of the country. Indian government provided relief to the thousands of Tibetans who crossed the border for their entire requirement like food, shelter and medical-care.

Large proportion of Tibetan refugees came from the areas bordering India, Nepal and Bhutan and from the central region (U-Tsang, Lhasa) of Tibet. These were the areas from where it was relatively easy to escape or where there were disturbances due to Chinese occupation forces. Comparatively, very few called flee from the interior parts of Tibet, unless at the critical period or time they happened to be away in the southern

\textsuperscript{14} Saklani, No.10, pp. 38-39.
\textsuperscript{15} G.A.(xiv), Doc.A/4234, 29 September 1959.
villages on business or pilgrimage. It may be noted in this connection that Lhasa always had a large itinerant population of traders and pilgrims.\textsuperscript{16}

In India Tibetan refugees are covered under the Foreigner's Act, the right of the refugees to reside in India is governed by government decrees or statutes about alien population. The Tibetan refugees are given residence permits as well as travel documents.\textsuperscript{17}

\section*{Movements}

Responsibility for the Tibetan refugees were, at first, placed in the Ministry of External Affairs. Forewarned of the imminent arrival of large number of refugees, the Ministry had set up transit camps one at Misamari in Assam, and at Buxa in West Bengal, each with an Indian government in charge. Three hundreds bamboo huts were hastily constructed, and food, clothing, and medical supplies were rushed in, often from great distance. The refugees in the camps were provided with rations, clothing, cooking utensils, as well as medical care. Serious cases were sent to hospitals in nearby town. Within a few weeks 6,000 persons had arrived at Misamari and 1,000 at Buxa, most of them via Bhutan and Sikkim. The government of India made an attempt to avoid an accumulation of large number of refugee in the camps and made frequent dispersal of refugee to other areas. Even then at one point, the population of Misamari was over 7,000 people. Between May and June 1959 the camps handled a total of 15,000 Tibetan refugees.\textsuperscript{18}

Misamari wound up its operation in July 1960, and refugees were dispersed to the Himalayan colder region, including some 4,000 to Sikkim where most were absorbed, temporarily on road works. The elderly Lamas

\textsuperscript{16} Saklani, No.10, pp. 38-39
\textsuperscript{17} None of the South Asian Countries-including India-are signatory to any International Conventions on Refugees
\textsuperscript{18}
numbering about 700 were settled in Dalhousie and a residential academy was set up at Buxa in West Bengal where over 1,200 junior Lamas were able to pursue their theological studies. The Central Relief Committee of India (CRC-1), and several voluntary agencies set up a handicraft training and production centres which trained some 500 Tibetan youths in various trade. A small transit camps at the border was retained to accommodate the steady trickle of refugees still making their way out of their homeland despite the fact that the border was sealed from the other side.

The Tibetan refugee movements within India were largely influenced by the government policies for the care of Tibetan refugees. There are physical factors like, climate, higher latitude and availability of work, which influenced their movements. India’s policy towards Tibetan’s resettlements was also largely affected by her relationship with China.

In order to understand the refugee movements in India we started with the policy of host country. India’s policy on Tibetan refugees involved delicate weighting of factors. For many years, in the interest of both harmonious foreign relations and smooth internal development, the government of India handled the Tibetan refugees cautiously. While attempting to maintain the cultural autonomy of the Tibetan people, it nonetheless sought to avoid large concentration of unsettled refugees, which might attract attention. It also refrained from officially seeking help from the international community, and sought to retain control over the use made on the very considerable assistance offered by local and overseas voluntary agencies and their personnel. It did not seek UNHCR assistance, and in the General Assembly, it abstained from voting on both in 1959 and 1961 resolutions concerning the treatment of the Tibetan people by the People’s Republic of China. During this period, policy was based on the
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18 Tibetans in Exile, 1959-1980, No. 6, p.2
hope that matters could be arranged diplomatically so that the Tibetan refugees in India might return to their motherland.

In 1962 there was an exchange of hostilities between India and Chinese over the border issue, and Indian policies in the United Nations over Tibet were changed thereafter. At the 20th Session of the General Assembly in 1965 India joined the forty-three nations which supported the General Assembly resolution concerning Tibetans.

The government of India decided in 1962, a permanent solution for refugees settlement which would permit them to settle in large, relatively isolated communities, and this would allow them to preserve the identity of the two thousand-year old culture of the Tibetan peoples. The Tibetan refugees were move to the resettlement areas in batches during different period of time, when the settlement plans are ready for them. These lands are allotted for this purpose in different states of India. In these settlement areas the refugees were supplied rations and wages for work on land development and other infrastructural works till the land yielded the first crop. They were also provided transportation expenses from their camps to the district headquarters and then to the settlement sites. Mention may be made here that the real picture of the spatial movement would be come clearer when we discuss the resettlement pattern in India towards the end of this chapter.

Tibetan Refugee Population

The statistics for the Tibetan refugees population can be obtained from the foreigner's Registration offices of the Government of India. Moreover, the Central Tibetan Administration, Dharmsala and the Bureau of the Dalai Lama, New Delhi, and the local Tibetan settlement offices furnished information on the Tibetan refugees. But the information
available is not sufficient for research purposes, as their tabulations and data are meant to serve only recording refugees in the host countries.

When the Dalai Lama was forced to leave Tibet in 1959, around 85,000 refugees were able to follow at that time and seek refuge primarily in India, Nepal and Bhutan. According to another sources, in 1976, the

Table 2.1 Country/Area and Population of Tibetan, 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>68748</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arunachal Pradesh</td>
<td>6247</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhandara, Maharashtra</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bir Area</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcutta, Bombay</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandragiri, Orissa</td>
<td>3690</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie, Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darjeeling</td>
<td>4475</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehradun and Mussourie</td>
<td>11369</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi and Chandigarh</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharamshala, H.P.</td>
<td>3591</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaya and Varanasi</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalim Pong</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulu Valley</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladakh</td>
<td>4177</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainpat, MP</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipore, Karnataka</td>
<td>17077</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikkim</td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimla</td>
<td>3140</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>3275</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Japan</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>8673</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>82546</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Tibetan refugees were 82,546 in number as in Table 2.1; they are spreading in India, Bhutan, Nepal and also in Europe, Switzerland, United States of America.

**Table 2.2 Population of Tibetan Refugee Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>South India</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered Communities</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Central India</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered Communities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered Communities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered Communities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>North East India</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered Communities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>West Bengal and Sikkim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered Communities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ladakh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered Communities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Tibetans Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>4634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,25,777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total population figures in S.A. have been compiled from IDP Survey, the office of His Holiness the Dalai Lama and Department of Home Records. The populating figures for Tibetans abroad have been taken from the recorded of the Department of Information and International Relation. Until a population Census is...
undertaken, the CTA assume the total population of the Tibetan Refugees Community to be 130,000. Sources: Integrated Development Plan-III, p.5.

The total Tibetan refugees’ population for 1994 was given as 125,777 as in table 2.2. the table gave the refugees by region-wise. They can also be grouped as settlement communities and the scattered communities. The above table gave that almost 70,000 Tibetan refugees live in the settlements; the remaining 50,000 lived in the scattered communities in India and Nepal. In addition there are 4634 Tibetan refugees who live outside South Asia, such as Canada, Britain, United States, etc. They were in these countries under selective immigration arrangement made with the Dalai Lama’s administration.

The United States’ Committee for Refugees gave the world refugees figure for 1998 in which the Tibetan refugees’ constitute 110,000 peoples and new arrivals as 3,100 peoples.

The above data showed an increased in refugee movements towards South Asia. This significant increase over refugees’ population were due to the following major reasons, (I) A continuing streams of refugees, following His Holiness the Dalai Lama’s flight until the Chinese policies cut off the ability of the people to flee Tibet, (ii) Birth in the community, and (iii) A renewal stream of refugees after the liberalization of Chinese policy beginning in 1980s made to travel to India legally feasible and escape a realistic possibility.

The opening of India-Tibet border in 1980, and changes in China’s policy after more than 20 years, allowed Tibetans to make pilgrimage and visit their families in exile have resulted in a steady flow of Tibetans into India and Nepal. These refugees who flee Tibet are, 1) Due to a strong belief that they can do more from outside for Tibet’s freedom, ii) To escapee religious persecution

---

20 Ibid., p. 2.
21 Source: WWW.Refugees.org Country Report”.
as they can practice their religion freely in exiles, iii) So that their children can get education since little education is provided in Tibet, and iv) To escape political persecutions for having expressed views or engaged in actions, which they believe subject them the risk for imprisonment, torture or even execution.

According to Tibetan Refugee Community Integrated Development Plan-II, 1995-2000, from 1986-1993 over 15,000 Tibetans have sought asylum in India, increasing the refugees population by over 10 percent. As mentioned the new arrivals for 1998 from Tibet was 3,100 refugees. Almost two-thirds of these new refugees have been children and young.

Table 2.3 New Tibetan Refugees in India and Nepal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total No. of Persons</th>
<th>No. Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3281</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3395</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3774</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4477</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18667</td>
<td>3582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 Anand Kumar, Ibid., p.126
people under the age of 25 years. This rapid movement of young refugees' population has caused strains to the already fragile settlement economy and infrastructure. Since, (i) the amount of land to support the community has not increased proportionally; (ii) employment opportunities in the settlements are severely limited; (iii) additional housing facilities to sustain the new population are absent; and (iv) infrastructure such as sanitation, health, education and similar facilities has not developed proportionately.\(^{25}\)

Table 2.4 New Refugee from 1989-1993 By Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-25</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>5,079</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-59</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>3,208</td>
<td>11,227</td>
<td>8,021</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Refugee Community: Integrated Development Plan-11, 1995-20000, ibid., Table No.2.3, p.43

According to the report available the population composition of the new refugees arrival increases with monks and nuns in recent years. Almost 45 percent of all newly arrived refugees in the five years between

\(^{25}\) Ibid.
1989 to 1993 have been monks and nuns. Table 2.3 showed new refugees from 1989-1993. In fact the monastic population has more than doubled since 1980. Monastic institutions have few economy resources to support this increasing population. Many of the monasteries are located in the settlements this compounds stress on the economies that are already poor in land and other resources.

The continued stream of new refugees has compelled the Central Tibetan Administration (CTA) to construct building to provide temporary shelter for them. In three years, (as Table shows), 1990-1993, 2757 or nearly half of all refugees who have come from Tibet, have been between 14 and 25 years old. A further 854 have been 13 years or younger. Over a third or 1/3 of the new refugees in the past three years have been monks and nuns fleeing religious persecution.

The most common methods of escape used by the refugees are walking and trekking through the high mountain passes across the Himalayas in Nepal. They usually arrive in Kathmandu, Nepal and from there they travel to Dharamsala, Himachal Pradesh, in India via Delhi. The majority of the new refugee population comes with nothing apart from a few personal belonging. Many suffer from mental and physical impairments. These were the results of tortures and imprisonment by the Chinese security forces or from health problem both physical, mental, or poor diet in Tibet, the rigours of a long and arduous escape from Tibet, and the drastic changes in climatic conditions and food habits. They seldom have education or skills that they can use to support themselves. Inspite of significant progress in developing reception facilities for new refugees over the past two years, the ever increasing numbers cannot meet the needs of this increased flow of new refugees in Kathmandu, Delhi and Dharamsala
Settlement Pattern

The contemporary spatial pattern of Tibetan refugees migration and settlements within India could be understood when about 85,000 Tibetans refugees in 1959 crossed to South Asian countries, including the Dalai Lama. The refugees arrived and their number increases and resettled refugees have evolved gradually, so also have resettlements. The principles that guides resettlement in its initial phases have yielded to the realities of resettlement logistics, and this evolution has been mirrored in the changing distribution of the refugee population.

Because of the state-control organized settlements, the spatial distribution of refugees in most settlements were in a pocket of concentrations in different states of India. The government has managed to place about 50 percent of Tibetan in organized settlement, whose total Tibetan refugees’ population in India for 1994 was 108,400.

In India Tibetan refugees are living in various places. The areas of concentration are in the rehabilitation settlements that evolved and developed over the years through various programmes. The following states, which an important refugee resettlements in India are as follows. They are:-

In the South Region: Karnataka
The Central region: Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Maharashtra.
Northern Region: Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir.
Eastern Region: Sikkim and West Bengal.
North-Eastern Region: Arunachal Pradesh.

More than 50,000 refugees lived in scattered communities in 1994. These scattered communities spread all over India. Many of those who live outside the settlements do so because of better livelihood and employment.
opportunities. Private trading and services are by far the most important occupations of the scattered communities, accounting almost three-quarters of total employment there.

The spatial pattern of the Tibetan refugees as shown in figure 2.2 in India resulted from the cumulative affect of regionally selective policy of initial migration and an imbalance pattern of the secondary migration. Changes in the pattern of primary migration, inter-state migration and population distributions could be analyzed with reference to the factors that attract refugees to specific regions.

The distribution of the refugee’s population at any given time is the result of two types of locational choices. The choices of an initial resettlement are usually made not by the refugees themselves, but by the circumstances that brings the refugees to the places/areas or by the relevant voluntary agencies. From the migrant standpoint, the first stage in resettlement takes place within a highly constrained context. But the secondary migration or the second and the optional stage of resettlement, may be considered a standard case of inter regional migration, because choices are instrumental in the decision to leave the resettlement for new location. These proposition are relevant for the pattern of Tibetan refugees distribution in India, which come clearly when the discussed about their resettlement question. In addition, refugees have become increasingly dependent on public assistance, one would expect their locational choices also to reflect the availability and level of assistance.

For the Tibetan refugees psychological and physical cohesion of the extended family and possibly takes precedence over purely materialistic concerns. Socio-cultural factors should be all the more significant, as the
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traumatic circumstances of refugees’ flight and resettlement have re-enforced their reliance on the support of families and communities.\textsuperscript{26}

Differences in population densities at any to given time may be viewed as the cumulative result of the primary and secondary migration. Because neither of these components of refugee population has been uniform across the years of resettlement, however, each should be the object of cross-sectional analysis. But lack of data for Tibetan refugees constrained in study any of these aspects.

\textbf{Resettlement Questions}

In a review of the refugees situation in Africa, Rogge, (1977) observed that whilst refugees may be held in transit camps, repatriated, or dispersed in rural areas, transfer to planned settlements is often the preferred solution. To these he added the refugees onward migration to an urban area, an increasingly attractive option for many refugees themselves (Rogge, 1986)\textsuperscript{27}. The UNHCR report noted that 1960-63 marked the quest for permanent solution to the Tibetan refugees’ problem in South Asia.\textsuperscript{28}

When the Tibetan refugees comes to India, one of the urgent need was a long-term rehabilitation programme that would bring all the refugees into homogenous Tibetan communities, large enough to allow them to

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{26} Jacqueline Desbarat, 1985, “Indo-Chinese Resettlement in the United States”, \textit{Annals Association of American Geographers}, 75, p.528
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perpetuate their national identity. And to secure food, shelter, medical care, education, means of livelihood and to develop economically self-supporting communities during their period of exile.

The influx of the Tibetan refugees in India was sudden and most of the refugees have abruptly left their country in state of panic and confusion. There was an atmosphere of deprivation and defeatism, the bulk of the refugee population suffered from both emotional and physical exhaustion. Not only the human dimensions that the organizers of the relief operation had to grapple which complicated the situation.

The problem of relief organization was further complicated by the limitations imposed upon the government of India by its own diplomatic position on the Tibetan issue. India had consented to the Chinese claim of suzerainty over Tibet years before the Tibetan refugee influx took place and had not subsequently changed that position, though India condemned the Chinese violation of human rights in Tibet and their failure to live up to the promises of regional autonomy of the Tibetan. India gave asylum to the Tibetan and the Dalai Lama, on ‘humanitarian grounds’ and it was explicitly stated that “he was free to carry on his religious activities in India”, but neither the Dalai Lama nor the Tibetans could carry on political activities from the Indian soil (Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru’s statement in Parliament on April 20, 1959). This ambivalent diplomatic position set a curb on the government of India in regard for the relief and rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees. Additionally the Indian economy being at the time in a critical state, her resources were severely overstretched in order to meet such a serious and unforeseen contingency. Non-official relief organizations were thus the only alternative. In this situation the Central Relief Committee (CRC-I) for the Tibetan refugees was set up in India.
An ideal solution in India for the Tibetan refugees, who had been farmers or herders in Tibet, would have been in agriculture. The Dalai Lama was very concerned over the fate of many who were employed in road construction work. In addition to these difficulties, almost all the Tibetans, accustomed to the cold, high-altitude conditions of the Himalayas, suffered severe physical effects from the Indian climate, and became extremely susceptible to tuberculosis. There were also special problems such as those of the 2000 children who were either orphans or unable to accompany their parents to the rugged road construction camps, and of the more than 3,000 aged and infirm who could never expected to become fully self-sufficient.

Efforts were made to ensure the well-being of Tibetan refugees which would enable them to be more or less self-sufficient during their period of exile. The government of India has made three approaches to this objective. The most effective means was resettlement in agriculture, horticulture, or animal husbandry. Two alternate solutions - establishment of centers for training refugees in the production and sale of Tibetan India crafts, and the creation of small industries to be run and operated by Tibetan-were also proposed. During 1960-65 development of five major agricultural settlements in India and several small ones in Sikkim and Bhutan, was initiated. Although handicraft workshops sprang up spontaneously in many settlements, and the Government of India itself opened a small center in 1959, these alternative approaches were not tried extensively until after 1965.

In the earlier stages, the uncertainties about the future of the Tibetan refugees and the indefinite position of Tibetan leaderships itself were the factors mainly ad-hocism of the rehabilitation programmes. The political events were too fresh and the resultant problems too delicate to allow taking a firm policy decisions. However, hopes for their ultimate
repatriation ebbed out very soon. On the contrary, the Sino-Indian political relations started worsening in which the Indian attitude towards the Tibetan refugees became one of the important causative factors. The Chinese aggression against India in 1962 almost ended any such hopes as were nursed about the quick return of the refugees to their homeland.

The stated reasons above, the misery and hard life of the Tibetan refugees working on construction projects made the Dalai Lama to urge the Government of India for better modes of rehabilitation for the Tibetan refugees in India. The government of India responded by asking the various state governments to find land for the settlement of the Tibetan refugees. The state governments of Mysore, Orissa, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh favourably responded to this request. Thus, started the phase of rehabilitation of the refugees in the agricultural and industrial settlements. The process began around 1961 and subsequently a clearly formulated organizational pattern took shape.

The responsible of planning and implementation of the various measures to provide relief and rehabilitation to the Tibetan refugees were taken up by three agencies: (1) the government of India/State governments; (2) The Tibetan (Dalai Lama's) Administration- Home and Rehabilitation office, and (3) Central Relief Committee-(I) as the authorized chain for the flow of all voluntary as well as international assistance including help from foreign governments. The Tibetan administration, apart from running some direct programmes from its own resources, has been recognized as the advisory body through which Indian governments and voluntary agencies process their proposals. Its function is more than that of a liaison body, or an advisory body. It normally designates the need areas and groups to which assistance should be given. It actively lands its hands in determining the modes and quanta of relief.
The Dalai Lama in his Autobiography, 'My Land and My People', 1987 expressed his resolution: "In the face of this destruction of my people and all that they live for, I devote myself in exile to the only courses of action left to me: to remained the world, through the United Nations, and now through this book, of what has happened and is happening in Tibet; to care for Tibetans who have escaped with me to freedom; and to plan for the future". He added: "It is for this kind of work, and to maintain a small nucleus of government, that the gold dust and silver bars which I deposited in Sikkim in 1950 have been so useful. But they were not nearly enough for all the work that my government and I want to do and ought to do for our refugees and for the future of Tibet. For me and for all the refugees, the pursuit of our religion remains just as important as the struggle to make our way materially in a unfamiliar world".29

In pursuance of this aim, the Dalai Lama’s Administration set up an organization known as the Home and Rehabilitation Office. Its main function has been to work for rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees in India, Nepal and Bhutan and generally to look after the welfare of all Tibetans in exile. Besides, others also compiled information on refugees situation for use by the government of India, the Tibetan Administration and the private donor agencies.

The Central Relief Committee-(I) was the main accredited agency for mobilization of all voluntary aids from India and abroad, including those from governmental and semi-governmental sources. This committee played a significant role in various projects until it has shrunk over, it role, especially after the heavy influx of the Bangladesh refugees in 1971. Which created another emergent problem before the government of India.

29 Howorth, ed., 1962, 'My Land and My People': The Autobiography of his Holiness Dalai Lama, New Delhi: Asia Publishing House, pp. 201-2; 204-45
In addition, individual Tibetan refugees as well as some of their welfare agencies are also receiving some direct help both in cash and kind from voluntary welfare agencies as well as individuals. But the quantum of such help is difficult to ascertain.

In addition to various economic programmes, a large complex of educational and welfare institutions also grew over the years. The government of India, almost throughout and wholly, shared the main burden for providing formal education to the Tibetans, from elementary to graduate and post-graduate stages. However, sacred education, which is an important academics activity with the Tibetans, is conducted mainly by the Tibetan Administration. The followers of different sects also support the monastic establishments where such education is available. Initially the monks received free cereals from the Government of India for many years. The arrangement was later progressively cut down and finally discontinued. Both economic stringency and a general attitudinal change in the émigré Tibetan community. These have, as it seems driven home a strong realization of the value of self-reliance other welfare institutions, such as old-age homes, crèches and residential institutions for the children of poor families and orphans, are also being run by the Tibetan community with voluntary support from India and abroad. These institutions constitute a unique feature in the life of the Tibetans because, back home they had no welfare or humanitarian institutions of these types.

Survey of the Tibetan Settlements in Exile (India)

According to the information available there are 54 refugee settlements established in India, Nepal and Bhutan since 1959. It comprised of 26 agricultural, 17 agro-industrial and 11 handicraft-based
settlements. They are established with the assistance of the governments of India, Nepal, Bhutan, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), foreign donor agencies and the work, faith and tenacity of the Tibetan refugees themselves.

These settlements differ greatly in location and circumstances. While certain remote settlements in Ladakh (an area in Jammu and Kashmir state bordering Tibet) and North Nepal closely resemble Tibet in terms of climate and life style, less than 5 percent of the refugees lived under such conditions. A majority of the settlements are in reclaimed forest and in dry, hot, forbidding climates which are the antithesis of the Tibetan environment.

Agricultural Settlements

During 1960-63 the groundwork was laid for the development of five major agricultural settlements in India and several smaller ones in Sikkim and Bhutan. The Government of the state of Mysore (now Karnataka) was the first to reply affirmative to the Central Government’s request for land on which to settle Tibetan refugees in India. An agreement was reached between the state and Central Governments, in consultation with representatives of the Dalai Lama, to settle 3,000 refugees on 3,000 acre of tracts of land.

Later in 1961 land was located and settlement begun at two other sites in the heavily forested areas of the North-East Frontier Agency – Changlang and Tezu. The government of India has also been the major source of relief to refugees in Sikkim and Bhutan. Two settlements were established in 1963 for the settlement of 1,060 refugees, with funds made available by the Indian Government.

---
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Another important settlement came up in Bomdila in 1961 in NEFA, now Arunachal Pradesh, close to the Indo-Tibetan border. In 1963 land was made available at Mainpat in Madhya Pradesh, at Chandragiri, and nearby Mahendragarh in Orissa, each a settlement of 2,500 refugees.

Following the border hostilities between India and the Chinese People's Republic in 1962, India change her policy that led to the representation of 12 major overseas voluntary agencies on the Advisory Committee of the CRC-(I), which had been set up in 1959 to coordinate the limited assistance from abroad and to act as the agent for distributing government and voluntary agency. While the Government of India retained control of the general handling of activities within it territory, the voluntary agencies could now determine the uses to which their contributions were put.33

Some of the salient features of the rehabilitation and development programmes were through agricultural resettlements. After necessary arrangements were made for agricultural settlements, the refugees were transferred to the permanent sites. In this way approximately more than sixty percent of the refugees have been rehabilitate in different parts of India through agricultural, agro-industrial and multi-purpose societies. In some of the settlements cooperative farming were carried along with other joint production activities.

In the agricultural settlements, five areas of land were originally given to every family of five members. For convenient, a system of artificial family groups of five persons (whether relative or not) was used for the distribution of land and houses. Gradually the people themselves sorted out their families and made changes in the decision of land and housing accordingly. The initial settlers were paid for the work of clearing

lands, digging wells, and constructing houses. During the first five years, the Government of India and the UNHCR provided rations to settlers. A housing unit for a family of five consists of 300 to 500 square feet divided into or three rooms, and a plot of land for a Kitchen-garden. During the last four decades many Tibetan agricultural settlements came up. Most of them are located in the states forwarded with the offer of land for the rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees. They are Arunachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Orissa, Himachal Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Sikkim and Jammu and Kashmir.

**Dairy-cum-Farming Settlement**

There are some other settlements, which are of the dairy-cum-farming character. A few settlements are working as multi-purpose cooperative societies and, with the help of the host country and various voluntary agencies, are gradually trying to become self-supporting units.

The Government of India’s role in the above direction cannot be ignored. The over-stretched land resources of the country not withstanding, in 1962 the Government of India decided to find land to rehabilitate most of the refugees on land settlements. The refugees were shifted to the settlement areas as when land was allotted for the purpose in many Indian states.

Each settlement was administered by a committee consisting the representatives of the Dalai Lama, local officials of the concerned state government as well as the representatives of the settlers. The settlement committees functioned as managing boards, laying down the policies, plan, rules and regulations. The Executive Officer of each settlement was responsible for the day-to-day administration. In all these settlements the nature of production varies from one to another, depending on the
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33 Holborn, No. 28, p.725.
occupational background and aptitude of the settlers. Thus, if agricultural has been given priority in some, mixed farming has been introduced in others. Apart from dairy, poultry and piggery have also been promoted in some of the settlements.

Some of the agricultural settlements have introduced joint farming, while at others each family has been allotted a separate plot. House for accommodation along with Kitchen garden and other welfare aids and services, such as schools, health centres, crèches, home for the aged etc., has been provided in many of these settlements. The refugees' communities in these settlements have built monasteries and other community institutions. The settlers gave a Tibetan names and styles to their settlements, localities, institutions and organizations. This reflects the strong patriotic spirit. The major agricultural settlements have developed into full-fledged communities, looking after all the needs and requirement of the families and individuals.

Apart from these, production-cum-training centres were set up in various part of India such as in Sikkim, Darjeeling, Dharamsala, Simla, Dalhousie, Dehra Dun etc. Later, industrial productive activities were started both on cooperative and company-ownership basis under various schemes of self-employment. Though the government of India and other statutory bodies have aided these programmes through land grants, capital grants, and training input, a great deal of voluntary effort of the Tibetans has also gone into the promotion of these industrial rehabilitation activities.

Another significant development was the formation of the Tibetan Industrial Rehabilitation Societies, started with a view to rehabilitate Tibetan refugees in various agro-industrial projects and programmes with the help and support of the voluntary agencies all over the world. These
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projects took programmes, which suited the aptitudes of the Tibetans, such as woolen mills, tea plantation, limestone quarry, lime-kiln, fabric glass, carpet weaving etc. The main idea was to explore the extent to which the voluntary effort could be mobilized to rehabilitate the Tibetan refugees without dependence on the government. It is noteworthy that only those TIRS ventures have succeeded in which industrial activities were made ancillary to agricultural, which provided the main base.

In another sphere the multi-purpose agro-industrial projects are important for Tibetan settlements. Mentioned may be made of the Tibetan Nehru Memorial Foundation of Dondupung (or Phondupung) settlement based at Clement Town, Dehradun, U.P. The refugees were settled through gainful employment in a number of crafts, such as carpet weaving, noodle making, wool-pinning, tent making, tailoring etc. This foundation also runs an agricultural farm comprising 40 acres of land, which has become more or less a mechanized farm. The refugees attached to this foundation are provided with houses; and a large majority of them came under the self-employed category.

A few multi-purpose agro-industrial societies comprising roughly a total of ten thousand refugees have been registered mainly for the purpose of getting loan or other financial help from the government or voluntary organizations. It has been observed that the multi-purpose societies are becoming the concentrations of the different Tibetan regional groups.

The Dalai Lama himself has created a Trust, with an effort towards rehabilitation, invested a good sum of money in it. The trust has set up two factories which also help to provide employment to some of the Tibetan refugees.

An important and successful area of refugee rehabilitation has been the setting up of the typical Tibetan handicraft centres. The cottage
industry includes manufacturing woollen mates and carpet. The traditional crafts like metal work, clay modeling, hand-made paper, manufacturing, carpet weaving and making religious painted scrolls were kept alive in the above centres.

The Tibetan handicraft centres are located in Darjeeling and Kalimpong, (West Bengal, Dalhousie, Dharamshala, Simla and Paprola, (Himachal Pradesh), Clement Town and Rajpur (District Dehradun, UP.) and Gangtok, (Sikkim). In this way also a few thousand Tibetan refugees have been rehabilitated.

The Tibetan refugees, both men and women in very large numbers have taken to independent hawking trade and business. They have shown remarkable enterprise in the way in which they have almost monopolised trade in woollen products of various popular types. They have shown a commendable degree of business acumen in this regard and penetrated into almost every nook and corner of India.

The preservation of the Tibetan civilization, its religion and cultural heritage is what the Dalai Lama and the refugee group articulate as the main purpose of their flight from Tibet. They are making valiant efforts at religious reconstruction. It will be pertinent to reiterate them briefly here, when the refugees come to India in early sixties, a makeshift monastic institution was set up at Buxa, in West Bengal where 1200 junior Lamas were reassembled to continue their sacred education. Since then there has been lot of progress. In this regard an effort of the Indian Government and the Dalai Lama’s administration along with various relief agencies help to a large extent in smooth rehabilitation of a massive completely disrupted and impoverished refugees population as the reconstruction of their economic and social life in the host country.
Scattered Communities

According to the data available, 1994, there are 51,715 refugees living outside the settlements who seek better economic and other opportunities. According to the same sources, 9845 of them are unsettled refugees who arrived during 1959 to 1979.\textsuperscript{35} Due to resource constraints and sometimes due to remoteness of their location, they have not been provided adequate amenities of housing and means of earning a livelihood, and often live in a very poor conditions and have only precarious sources of income. Being scattered they often do not belong to a viable Tibetan community in which they can preserve their language and culture and give their children a Tibetan education.

There are 64 scattered communities in India and Nepal. The majority of population in the scattered communities are employed in service or trading including sweater selling. Handicrafts (especially carpets) and manual labour are other important occupations for many in the scattered communities. In contrast to the settlements, agriculture and animal husbandry only generate a small percentage of employment.

Welfare Institutions

Another important components of Tibetan refugees are the various refugee institutions. The most prominent is the care for the children. The Dalai Lama expressing his concern for refugee children wrote in his Autobiography (1982), “The Children have been a special anxiety to me. There are over five thousand of them under eighteen (as on 1961 or so). It is even harder for children than for adults to be uprooted and taken
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suddenly to entirely different environment, and many of them died, in an early days, from the change of food and climate”. Emphasizing their importance for future struggle for Survival of the Tibetan civilization, he stated “so, in the next generation, the five thousand children in India may be very important people, a nucleus to preserve the heritage of peaceful religion tradition and culture which is being wiped out in Tibet”. The magnanimous Dalai Lama fully realized and offered to take them (the children) all under his protection.

On March 3rd, 1960, the first Tibetan school with 50 student in Mussourie was opened. In the subsequent years the number of children—many of them orphans, increased with continuing influx of refugees, and the education problem become more acute. In May 1961, with the Dalai Lama’s initiative and the government of India support, a committee was formed and establish to Tibetan school society, an autonomous body under the Ministry of Education of the Indian Government. Its main aim was to provide the children, the knowledge of their culture, history and traditions and to introduce them to modern educational system. In 1979, the Tibetan school society was renamed as the Central Tibetan School Administration, (CTSA).

There are various welfare schemes for orphan, old people, infirm, traditional Tibetan medicines, and residential located in important refugee settlements. These are set up with the help of the Government of India and assistance from international charities, which the detail account we cannot give as it is beyond our present study.

In our description so far, it is evident that towards the realization of the aim of refugee relief and rehabilitation a large ground has been already covered, in some respects at least, the Tibetan refugees could consider that

---

they are being taken care in host country. However, considering the vast magnitude of the problem, much of the task still remains to be completed.

Role of the UNHCR and Other Agencies

In recognition of the UNHCR's services and the need for enlargement of his duties and areas of supervision, it was then that the General Assembly had passed a resolution authorizing the High Commissioner, "in respect of refugees who do not come within the competence of the United Nations to use his good offices in the transmission of contributions designed to provide assistance to these refugees". 37 It was the representative from Nationalist China who first welcomed the High Commissioner's reference to the refugees from Tibet. Estimating the number between 12,000 and 18,000, he stated that all were in urgent need of assistance and added that we had the right to bring this matter to the attention of subsequent sessions. 38

As mentioned, by 1961, the refugees had been dispersed to various organized locations for settlement. The urgent requirement of the refugees was relief in terms of food, clothing and medical cares. Cash of foreign non-Governmental organization and voluntary agencies apart from generous local contributions and donations came forward with immediate relief aid. Some were well known international organizations, others were specifically devoted to Tibetan refugees aid. Certainly, the UNHCR was not in one of other groups. P.N. Kaul, Deputy Secretary for Tibetan Refugees in the Ministry of External Affairs in 1961 has, in his book briefly touched on the problem mentioned and underscores the magnitude.

in his admittance that “the settlement of Tibetan refugee in India was not too easy a task”. The Government of India, however, “tackled the job with sympathy”.

A number of voluntary agencies, which assisted refugees, however posed a problem in that each wanted to help in its own measure according to its dislikes and dislikes. Therefore, a coordinating agency was formed in the central Relief Committee, India (CRC (1), which Shri. J.B. Kripalani was the first Chairman.

These agencies, working through CRC (1), rendered valuable services through their support of government programme financially and in kind. In addition, some had developed programmes for training Tibetans overseas for occupations that they could pursue upon their return to refugee committees in the host countries.

Several agencies in India and from overseas assisted the government by providing farm equipment and animals, vocational training, school and clinics, and help in financing self-help projects and in providing child care. Most of the aid took the form of food distributed by various agencies which were members of the CRC-(I). Besides the Indian Government bearing the expanses of settlement, sources of relief aid mentioned in the 1961 report was traced to some 14 organizations and governments. These included the following; American emergency committee for Tibetan refugee (AECIR); Catholic Relief Service (CRS), Church World Service (CWS); Committee on Relief and Gift Supplies (CORAGS); Cooperation for American Relief Everywhere (CARE); Council of YMCA of India and Ceylon Refugee Section; Dr. Thomas Dooley Foundation, California, USA; Government of South Vietnam; Indian Red Cross Society (IRC); Jumar Chamber International, US (JCI); National Catholic Welfare Conference (NEWC); National Christian Council (NCC); Save the Children Fund, U.K. (SCF); Service Civil International (SCI). This

---

list, however, neither seeks to indicate comprehensive assistance given though the years nor the total work moved. Besides, as noted by Wood Cook, some organizations chose to ignore the CRC (1) channel and operated independently.

In India, the first indication of UNHCR involved for the Tibetan refugees, besides “closely following the problem”, has discussed at the 11th session of the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner in April 1963.40

The first tentative acceptance of the idea that the UNHCR could aid in the settlement of Tibetan refugees in India, Bhutan and Sikkim was expressed during the visit for the High Commissioner Mr. Schnyder to India in July 1963. On the invitation of the Indian Government, the High Commissioner sent his direction of operations to India in November 1963, and again in September 1964 in order to assess the situation, and to plan for the allocation of funds coming from the sale of “All Star Festival”. It was agreed that sale of the record in India would begin on UN Day, 24 October 1964.41 Because of continued tension over the Chinese-Indian border, the Indian Government preferred, however, not to have an official representative of the UNHCR based in India at that time. At the end of 1967 the High Commissioner, on request, again sent a representative to India and to Nepal to re-evaluate the position of Tibetans. The refugees, many of them in India for a decade and their hopes of returning to Tibet had become all but extinct, they now accepted the need for well established settlements, but this required notably viable schemes but also considerable resources. An important development was that the Indian Government’s earlier guarded acceptance of assistance from international sources had

now changed to one of positive welcome, provided still this assistance did not provoke undue diplomatic comment.

On 1 February 1969 after discussion with the High Commissioner and the Government of India, a Branch Office was officially opened in Delhi. It was thought that the UNHCR programme in India would be required for at least two or three years before the problem of the Tibetan refugees could be permanently resolved.

In 1970, the role of the UNHCR assumed new importance as attempts were made to consolidate and speed up the permanent settlement of Tibetan refugees. Projects from previous years were carried forward in the fields of agricultural settlements, housing for the aged, and for the Buxa lamas, and for the improvement of medical facilities. From the $300,000 allocated in 1970 the UNHCR provided a total of $20,000 for vocational training for young Tibetans, particularly in the fields of agriculture, cooperative management and simple book keeping and accounting.42

In 1970, Mr. Jamieson, after his third mission to India, reports the needs for which UNHCR assistance was required had been identified and a substantial programme of assistance drawn up. Although the work toward Tibetan rehabilitation was no mean complete, and the task of affording legal protection to the refugees in such matters as naturalization, ownership of property, and the rights and obligations of citizenship still thought out, the work of UNHCR in India was suspended after Bangladesh independence in 1971, when misunderstanding between the Government of India and UNHCR arose due to the latter non-response to India request for help.

42 Holborn, No. 28, p. 738.
Issues and Consequences

A related issue of interest to geographers is the question of the extent to which refugees represent a burden on their host country. Referring to influxes of refugees in the early 1980s, across the Thai Kampuchean border, and the Horn of Africa, Johnston (1982) commented that 'large-scale refugee movements place intolerable burdens on the governments of recipient states'. As discussed in the beginning of this chapter, the resettlement of the Tibetan refugee in India, the burden of resettling the refugees heavily falls on the government of India. Not only in terms of lands, but foods, clothing, shelter medical services and others needs are provided by the Government of India. Large sums of money were spent on settling the refugee in various part of India.

Another important issue is the large-scale presence of Tibetan refugees in India affected the formulation of India’s foreign policy, which involved a delicate weighing of factors. For many years, in the interest of both harmonious foreign relations and smooth internal development, the government of India handled the refugee issues cautiously, which we shall discuss in chapter 4.

The impact of refugees on the host country India can be gauged from identifying the relationship between the refugees and the host population. As stated, one of the motive forces behind the forced migration of Tibetans was the fear that their cultural identity and religious institutions were in danger of disappearance under the Chinese rule. Most Indian sympathized with this. But the creation of separate settlements for Tibetan in fact meant maintaining a cultural boundary from the host

---
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society. This in turn means that the integration between the refugees and the host population is limited to economic transactions in the market.

The refugee settlements have positive economic benefit to many member of host population. Local people are engaged as agricultural labourers, new jobs, more business opportunities. School and hospitals are open to host population. But the impact is not uniform across the entire host society, which the elites see the phenomena of Tibetan success differently. This is particularly true in the Himalayan states. The Ladakhi intellectual resents the fact that the Tibetan refugee controls six important monastic institutions in Ladakh priests and also those Tibetan refugees in the area have not learned Ladakhi. This kind of development and thinking resulting from the Tibetan settlements in the sensitive Himalayan region is not conducive for our security reason.

In the another bordering areas of Tibet, a host intellectual observation of the refugees can be heard. A Nepali intellectual strongly objects to the Tibetan journalists’ remark that Nepali language and culture have invaded Tibetan tongues and homes in Darjeeling and Sikkim. Dr. T.K. Subha attacks the Indian government policy, which grants cultural autonomy to Tibetan refugees, and passionately predicts that Tibetan refugees determination to preserve their culture and their resistance to learn local languages will endanger conflict with host population. This was actually an intricate case of political intrigue in which the Dalai Lama’s elder brother Gyalo Thondup and a foreign agency were involved in Bhutan, Tibetan refugees in Bhutan were used as scapegoats. It was, in fact, not a case of refugee-host conflict.
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There are scholars who observed the underlying tension between the refugees and host elites, even though actual cases of host-refugee conflicts have been rare in India. Stobdan sees two reasons for the host refugee tension in the Himalayan region. They are, (1) the prosperity of the Tibetan refugees and the subsequent economic disparity between the native Himalayan population and the Tibetans (2) the perpetuation of the Tibetan cultural and religious chauvinism in the Himalayan region. This seems particularly true in Bhutan, Northern Nepal and Ladakh.47

When surveying the relationship between host-refugees there appears to be variation in host-refugee tensions. The Himalayan regions seem to be witnessed more tension than in the Indian plains. This may be explained as Tibetan refugees in the Himalayan states share a number of racial, linguistic, religious and cultural commonalities with most of the host populations except the Nepalis. Such commonalities make the chances of more politically ambitious among the refugees somewhat more 'realistic' to involve themselves in local politics, which is acutely resented by the indigenous middle-level elites as politically threatening. The centuries of traditional Tibetan cultural dominance in the CIS-Himalayan regions seems to lend credence to the native Himalayan elites fears and threat perceptions from the refugees.48

In the South India, there are virtual absent of fears and threat perceptions. T.C. Palakshappa has observed: "I did not notice any sense of inferiority or constraints when seeing the Tibetan's dealing with the Indians it was feel a competition between equals’ there are no resentment that have ever aired or articulated by South Indian intellectuals towards the refugees. In fact Palakshappa concludes that the various side benefits that the host population have received from the Tibetan Settlement “have gone

a long way in developing more positive Indian attitude towards the Tibetans. In the North Indian plain too, no host refugee conflict appears apparent. According to Saklani, who did extensive field survey found that 76.92 percent of Indian attitude towards the Tibetan refugees was positive while 85 percent of Tibetan attitude towards the Indians was positive.  

Conclusion

Since coming into exile in 1959 the preservation of the Tibetan way of life, with its unique culture, religion and national identity, has been the chief goal of the refugee community. The rehabilitation of the refugees in the various settlements in India has played a critical role in preserving the Tibetan way of life so that it can be reestablished when Tibet becomes independent once again.

48 Norbu, No.7, p.88.
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