APPENDICES

APPENDIX-A

NOTES EXchanged BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF INDIA AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA CONCERNING THE ADVANCE OF CHINESE ARMY UNITS INTO TIBET

a. Indian Note, 26 October 1950

We have seen with great regret the report in the newspapers of an official statement made in Peiking to the effect that 'People's Army units have been ordered to advance into Tibet.

We have received no intimation of this from your Ambassador here or from our Ambassador in Peiking.

We have been repeatedly assured of a desire by the Chinese Government to settle the Tibetan problem by peaceful means and negotiations. In an interview which India's Ambassador had recently with (China's) Vice Foreign Minister, the latter, while reiterating the resolve of the Chinese Government to 'liberate' Tibet had expressed a continued desire to do so by peaceful means.

We have informed the Chinese Government through our Ambassador of the decision of the Tibetan delegation to proceed to Peiking immediately to start negotiations. This delegation actually left Delhi yesterday. In view of these facts the decision to order the advance of China's troops into Tibet appears to us most surprising and regrettable.
We realize there has been a delay in the Tibetan delegation proceeding to Peiking. This delay was caused in the first instance by an inability to obtain visas for Hongkong for which the delegation is in no way responsible. Subsequently the delegation came back to Delhi because of the wish of the Chinese Government that preliminary negotiations should first be conducted in Delhi with the Chinese Ambassador. Owing to the lack of knowledge on the part of the Tibetan delegation of dealing with other countries and the necessity of obtaining instructions from their Government who in turn had to consult their Assemblies, certain further delay took place.

The Government of India do not believe that any foreign influence hostile to China have been responsible for the delay in the delegation's departure.

Now that the invasion of Tibet has been ordered by the Chinese Government, peaceful negotiations can hardly be synchronized with it and there naturally will be fear on the part of Tibetans that negotiations will be under duress. In the present context of world events, invasion by Chinese troops of Tibet cannot but be regarded as deplorable and in the considered judgement of the Government of India, not in the interest of China or peace.
The Government of India can only express their deep regret that in spite of friendly disinterested advice repeatedly tendered by them the Chinese Government should have decided to seek solution of the problem of their relations with Tibet by force instead of by the slower and more enduring method of peaceful approach.

b. Chinese Reply, 30 October 1950

The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China would like to make it clear:

Tibet is an integral part of Chinese territory. The problem of Tibet is entirely the domestic problem of China. The Chinese People's Liberation Army must enter Tibet, liberate the Tibetan people and defend the frontiers of China. This is the resolved policy of the Central People's Government.

The Central People's Government has repeatedly expressed hope that the problem of Tibet may be solved by peaceful negotiations and it welcomes, therefore, the delegation of local authorities of Tibet to come to Peiking at an early date to proceed with peaceful negotiations.
Yet the Tibetan delegation, under outside instigation, has intentionally delayed the date of its departure for Peiking. The Central People's Government, however, had not abandoned its desire to proceed with peaceful negotiations.

But regardless of whether the local authorities of Tibet wish to proceed with peace negotiations and whatever the results may be achieved by negotiations, the problem of Tibet is a domestic problem of the People's Republic of China and no foreign interference shall be tolerated. The particular problem of Tibet and the problem of the participation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations are two entirely unrelated problems.

Therefore with regard to the viewpoint of the Government of India on what it regards as deplorable, the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China cannot consider it as having been affected by foreign influences hostile to China in Tibet and hence express its deep regret.

c. Second Indian Note, 31 October 1950

India's Ambassador at Peiking has transmitted to the Government of India a Note handed to him by the Vice-Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China on 30 October. The Government of India have read with amazement the statement in the last paragraph of the Chinese
Government's reply that the Government of India's representation to them was affected by foreign influence hostile to China and categorically repudiate it.

At no time has any foreign influence been brought to bear upon India in regard to Tibet. In this, as in other matters, the Government of India's policy has been entirely independent and directed solely towards the peaceful settlement of international disputes and avoidance of anything calculated to increase the present deplorable tensions of the world.

The Government of China are equally mistaken in thinking the Tibetan delegations departure for Peiking was delayed by outside instigation. In previous communications, the Government of India have explained at some length the reasons why the Tibetan delegation could not proceed to Peiking earlier. They are convinced there has been no possibility of foreign instigation.

It is with no desire to interfere or gain advantage that the Government of India have sought earnestly that a settlement of the Tibetan problem should be effected by peaceful negotiations adjusting the legitimate Tibetan claim to autonomy within the framework of Chinese suzerainty. Tibetan autonomy is a fact which, judging from reports they have received from other sources, the Chinese Government were themselves willing to recognize and foster.
The Government of India's repeated suggestion that Chinese suzerainty (over Tibet) and Tibetan autonomy should be reconciled by peaceful negotiations was not, as the Chinese Government seem, to suggest, unwarranted interference in China's internal affairs, but well-meant advice by a friendly Government which has a natural interest in the solution of problems concerning its neighbours by peaceful methods.

Wedded as they are to ways of peace, the Government of India had been gratified to learn that the Chinese Government were also desirous to effect a settlement in Tibet through peaceful negotiations. Because of this the Government of India advised the Tibetan Government to send their delegation to Peiking, and were glad that this advice was accepted in the interchange of communications which had taken place between the Government of India and the Government of China, and the former had received repeated assurances that peaceful settlement was aimed at.

In the circumstances, the surprise of the Government of India was all the greater when they learned that military operations had been undertaken by the Chinese Government against peaceful people. There has been no allegation that there had been any provocation, or any report as to non-peaceful methods on the part of the Tibetans. Hence there was no justification whatever for
such military operations against them. Such a stop, involving an attempt to impose a decision by force, could not possibly be reconciled with a peaceful settlement. In view of these developments the Government of India are no longer in a position to advice the Tibetan delegation to proceed to Peiking unless the Chinese Government think it fit to order their troops to halt their advance into Tibet and thus give a chance for peaceful negotiations.

Every step that the Government of India have taken in recent months has been to check the drift to war all over the world. In so doing they often have been misunderstood and criticized, but they adhered to their policy regardless of the displeasure of great nations. They cannot help thinking that military operations by the Chinese Government against Tibet have greatly added to the tensions of the world and to the drift towards general war, which they are sure the Government of China also wish to avoid.

The Government of India have repeatedly made it clear that they have no political or territorial ambitions as to Tibet and do not seek any naval privileged position for themselves or for their nationals in Tibet. At the same time, they pointed out, certain rights have grown out of usage and agreements which are natural between neighbours with close cultural and commercial relations.
The relations have found expression in the presence of an agent of the Government of India in Lhasa, the existence of trade agencies at Gyantse and Yatung and the maintenance of post and telegraph offices at the trade route up to Gyantse for over forty years. The Government of India are anxious that these establishments, which are to the mutual interest of India and Tibet and do not detract in any way from Chinese suzerainty over Tibet, should continue. The personnel at the Lhasa mission and the Agencies at Gyantse and Yatung accordingly, have been instructed to stay at their posts.

It has been the basic policy of the Government of India to work for friendly relations between India and China, both countries recognizing each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity and mutual interests.

Recent development in Tibet have affected these friendly relations and the interests of peace all over the world; this the Government of India deeply regret.

In conclusion, the Government of India can only express their earnest hope that the Chinese Government will still prefer the method of peaceful negotiation and settlement to a solution under duress and by force.
Chinese Reply, 16 November 1950

On 1 November 1950, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China received from His Excellency Ambassador Panikkar a communication from the Government of the Republic of India on the problem of Tibet.

The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, in its past communications with the Government of the Republic of India on the problem of Tibet, has repeatedly made it clear that Tibet is an integral part of Chinese territory and the problem of Tibet is entirely a domestic problem of China. The Chinese People's Liberation Army must enter Tibet, liberate the Tibetan people and defend the frontiers of China. This is the firm policy of the Chinese Government. According to the provisions of the Common Programme adopted by the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, the relative autonomy granted by the Chinese Government to national minorities inside the country is an autonomy within the confines of Chinese sovereignty.

This point was recognized by the India Government in the aide memoire to the Chinese Government dated 28 August this year (1950). However, when the Chinese Government actually exercised its sovereign rights, and began to
liberate the tibetan people and drive out foreign forces and influences to ensure that the Tibetan people will be free from aggression and will realize regional autonomy and religious freedom the Indian Government attempted to influence and obstruct the exercise of its sovereign rights in Tibet by the Chinese Government. This cannot but make the Chinese Government greatly surprised.

The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China sincerely hopes that the Chinese People's Liberation Army may enter Tibet peacefully to perform the sacred task of liberating the Tibetan people and defending the frontiers of China. It has therefore long since welcomed the delegation of the local authorities of Tibet which has remained in India to come to peking at an early date to proceed with peace negotiations. Yet the said delegation, obviously as a result of continued outside obstruction, has delayed its departure of peking. Further, taking advantage of the delay of negotiations, the local authorities of Tibet have deployed strong armed forces at Changtu, in Sikiang Province, in the interior of China, in an attempt to prevent the Chinese People's Liberation Army from liberating Tibet.
On 31 August 1950, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs informed the Indian Government through Ambassador Panikkar that the Chinese People's Liberation Army was going to take action soon in West Sikiang according to set plans, and expressed the hope that the Indian Government would assist the delegation of the local authorities of Tibet so that it might arrive in Peking in mid-September to begin peace negotiations.

In mid-October, Chinese Ambassador Yuan again informed the Indian Government of this. Yet still owing to outside instigation, the delegation of the local authorities of Tibet fabricated various pretexts and remained in India.

Although the Chinese Government has not given up its desire of settling the problem of Tibet peacefully, it can no longer continue to put off the set plan of the Chinese People's Liberation Army to proceed to Tibet. And the liberation of Changtu further proved that through the instrument of Tibetan troops, foreign forces and influences were obstructing the peaceful settlement of the problem of Tibet. But regardless of whether the local authorities of Tibet wish to proceed with peace negotiations, and regardless of whatever results may be achieved by negotiations no foreign intervention will be permitted. The entry into Tibet of the Chinese People's Liberation Army and the liberation of the Tibetan people are also decided.
In showing its friendship with the Government of the Republic of India, and in an understanding of the desire of the Indian Government to see the problem of Tibet settled peacefully, the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has kept the Indian Government informed of its efforts in this direction. What the Chinese Government cannot but deeply regret is that the Indian Government in disregard of the facts, has regarded a domestic problem of the Chinese Government -- the exercise of its sovereign rights in Tibet -- as an international dispute calculated to increase the present deplorable tensions in the world.

The Government of the Republic of India has repeatedly expressed its desire of development, of Sino-Indian friendship on the basis of mutual respect for territory. Sovereignty, equality and mutual benefit and of preventing the world from going to war. The entry into Tibet of the Chinese People's Liberation Army is exactly aimed at the protection of the integrity of the territory and the sovereignty of China. And it is on these questions that all those countries who desire to respect the territory and the sovereignty of China should first of all indicate their real attitude towards China.
In the meantime, we consider that what is now threatening the independent of nations and world peace is precisely the forces of those imperialist aggressors. For the sake of the maintenance of national independence and the defence of world peace, it is necessary to resist the forces of these imperialist aggressors. The entry into Tibet of the Chinese People's Liberation Army is thus an important measure to maintain Chinese independence, the prevent the imperialist aggressors from dragging the world towards war, and to defend world peace.

The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China welcomes the renewed declaration of the Indian Government that it has no political or territorial ambitions in China's Tibet and that it does not seek any new privileged position. As long as our two sides adhere strictly to the principle, of mutual respect for territory, sovereignty, equality, and mutual benefit, we are convinced that the friendship between China and India should be developed in a normal way, and that problems relating to Sino-Indian diplomatic, commercial and cultural relations with respect to Tibet may be solved properly and to our mutual benefit through normal diplomatic channels.
APPENDIX-B

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CHINESE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT AND THE TIBETAN GOVERNMENT

23 May 1951

1. The Tibetan people shall unite and drive out imperialist aggressive forces from Tibet so that the Tibetan people shall return to the big family of the motherland -- the People's Republic of China.

2. The Local government of Tibet shall actively assist the People's Liberation Army to enter Tibet and consolidate the national defence.

3. In accordance with the policy towards nationalities laid down in the Common Programme of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, the Tibetan People have the right of exercising regional autonomy under the unified leadership of the Central People's Government.

4. The Central authorities will not alter the existing political system in Tibet. The central authorities also will not alter the established status, functions and powers of the Dalai Lama. Officials of various ranks shall hold office as usual.
5. The established status, functions and powers of the Panchen Ngoerhtehni (Lama) shall be maintained.

6. By the established status, functions and powers of the Dalai Lama and of the Panchen Ngoerhtehni are meant the status, functions and powers of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama and of the ninth Panchen Ngoerhtehni when they were in friendly and amicable relations with each other.

7. The policy of freedom of religious belief laid down in the Common Programme of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference shall be carried out. The religious beliefs, customs and habits of the Tibetan people shall be respected, and Lama monasteries shall be protected. The central authorities will not effect a change in the income of the monasteries.

8. Tibetan troops shall be reorganized step by step into the People's Liberation Army and become a part of the national defence forces of the People's Republic of China.

9. The spoken and written language and school education of the Tibetan nationality shall be developed step by step in accordance with the actual conditions in Tibet.
10. Tibetan agriculture, livestock-raising, industry and commerce shall be developed step by step, and the people's livelihood shall be improved step by step in accordance with the actual conditions in Tibet.

11. In matters related to various reforms in Tibet, there will be no compulsion on the part of the central authorities. The local government of Tibet should carry out reforms of its own accord, and when the people raise demands for reform, they shall be solved by means of consultation with the leading personnel of Tibet.

12. In so far as former pro-imperialist and pro-Kuomintang officials resolutely sever relations with imperialism and the Kuomintang and do the engage in sabotage or resistance, they may continue to hold office irrespective of their past.

13. The People's Liberation Army entering Tibet shall abide by all the above mentioned policies and shall also be fair in all buying and selling and shall not arbitrarily take a needle or thread from the people.

14. The Central People's Government shall have the centralized handling of all external affairs of the area of Tibet and there will be peaceful co-
existence with neighbouring countries and the establishment and development of fair commercial and trading relations with them on the basis of equality, mutual benefit and mutual respect for territory and sovereignty.

15. In order to ensure the implementation of its agreement, the Central People's Government shall set up a Military and Administrative Committee and a Military Area Headquarters in Tibet and -- apart from the personnel sent there by the Central People's Government -- shall absorb as many local Tibetan personnel as possible to take part in the work. Local Tibetan personnel taking part in the Military and Administrative Committee may include patriotic elements from the local government of Tibet, various districts and various principal monasteries; the name-list shall be set forth after consultation between the representatives designated by the Central People's Government and various quarters concerned, and shall be submitted to the Central People's Government for appointment.

16. Funds needed by the Military and Administrative Committee, the Military Area Headquarters and the People's Liberation Army entering Tibet shall be
provided by the Central People's Government. The Local Government of Tibet should assist the People's Liberation Army in the purchase and transport of food, fodder and other daily necessities.

17. Signed and sealed by delegates of the Central People's Government with full powers;

Chief Delegate : Liwei-han;
Delegate : Chang Ching-wu; Chang Kuohua; Sun Chih-yuan

Delegates with full powers of the local government of Tibet:-

Chief Delegate : Kaloon Ngabou Ngawang Jigme;
Delegates : Dizasak Khemey Sona Wangdi; Khentrung Thuptan Tenthar; Khenchung Thuptan Lehmum; Rimsi Samashi Sampocy Tenzin Thundup
APPENDIX-C

JOINT STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTERS OF INDIA AND CHINA
(28 JUNE 1954)

His Excellency Chou En-lai, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China, came to Delhi at the invitation of His Excellency Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the Republic of India. He stayed here for three days. During this period the two prime Ministers discussed many matters of common concern to India and China. In particular they discussed the prospects of peace in South-East Asia and the developments that had taken place at the Geneva Conference in regard to Indo-China. The situation in Indo-China was of vital importance to the peace of Asia and the world and the Prime Ministers were anxious that the efforts that were being made at Geneva should succeed. They noted with satisfaction that some progress had been made in the talks at Geneva in regard to an armistice. They earnestly hoped that these efforts will meet with success in the near future and that they would result in a political settlement of the problems of that area.

The talks between the Prime Ministers aimed at helping, in such ways as were possible, the efforts at peaceful settlement that were being made in Geneva and elsewhere. Their main purpose was to arrive at a clearer
understanding of each other's point of view in order to help in the maintenance of peace, both in co-operation with each other and with other countries.

Recently India and China have come to an agreement in which they have laid down certain principles which should guide the relations between the two countries. These principles are: (1) Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty; (2) Non-aggression; (3) Non-interference in each other's internal affairs; (4) Equality and mutual benefit; and (5) Peaceful co-existence.

The Prime Ministers reaffirmed these principles and felt that they should be applied in their relations with other countries in Asia as well as in other parts of the world. If these principles are applied not only between various countries but also in international relations generally, they would form a solid foundation for peace and security and the fears and apprehensions that exist today would give place to a feeling of confidence.

The Prime Ministers recognized that different social and political systems exist in various parts of Asia and the world. If, however, the above mentioned principles are accepted and acted upon and there is no interference by any one country with another, these differences should not come in the way of peace or create conflicts. With the assurance
of territorial integrity and sovereignty of each country and of non-aggression, there would be peaceful co-existence and friendly relations between the countries concerned. This would lessen the tensions that exist in the world today and help in creating a climate of peace.

In particular, the Prime Ministers hoped that these principles would be applied to the solution of the problems in Indo-China where the political settlement should aim at the creation of free, democratic, unified and independent states, which should not be used for aggressive purpose or be subjected to foreign intervention. This will lead to a growth of self-confidence in these countries as well as to friendly relations between them and their neighbours. The adoption of the principles referred to above will also help in creating an area of peace which, as circumstances permit, can be enlarged, thus lessening the chances of war and strengthening the cause of peace all over the world.

The Prime Ministers expressed their confidence in the friendship between India and China which would help the cause of world peace and the peaceful development of their respective countries as well as other countries of Asia.
The conversations were held with a view to help in bringing about a greater understanding of the problems of Asia and to further a peaceful and co-operative effort, in common with other countries of the world, in solving these and like problems.

The Prime Ministers agreed that their respective countries should maintain close contacts so that there should continue to be full understanding between them. The appreciated greatly the present opportunity of meeting together and having a full exchange of ideas leading to clearer understanding and co-operation in the cause of peace.
Agreement between the Republic of India and the People's of China on Trade and Intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India.

The Government of the Republic of India and the Central Peoples Government of the People's Republic of China:

Being desirous of promoting trade and cultural intercourse between Tibet Region of China and of facilitating pilgrimage and travel by the people of China and India.

Have resolved to enter into the present Agreement based on the following principles:

1. mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;

2. mutual non-aggression;

3. mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs;

4. equality and mutual benefit; and

5. peaceful co-existence,

and for this purpose have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries
The Government of the Republic of India, H.E. Nedyan Raghavan, Ambassador Extra-ordinary and Plenipotentiary of India accredited to the People's Republic of China, the Central People's Republic of China, the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, H.E. Chang Han-fu, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government, who, having examined each other's credentials and finding them in good and due form, have greed upon the following:—

**Article I**

The High Contracting Parties mutually agree to establish Trade Agencies:

1. The Government of India agrees that the Government of China may establish Trade Agencies at New Delhi, Calcutta and Kalimpong.

2. The Government of China agrees that the Government of India may establish Trade Agencies at Yatung, Gyantse and Gartok.

The Trade Agencies of both parties shall be accorded the same status and same treatment. The Trade Agents of both parties shall enjoy freedom from arrest while exercising their functions, and shall enjoy in respect of themselves, their wives and children who are dependent on them for their livelihood, freedom from search.
The Trade Agencies of both parties shall enjoy the privileges and immunities for couriers, mail-bags and communication in code.

Article II

The High Contracting Parties agree that traders of both countries known to be custodarily and specifically engaged in trade between the Tibet region of China and India may trade at the following places:

1. The Government of China agrees to specify (1) Yatung, (2) Gyantse and (3) Phari, as markets for trade. The Government of India agrees that trade may be carried on in India, including places like (1) Kalimpong, (2) Siliguri and (3) Calcutta, according to customary practice.

2. The Government of China agrees to specify (1) Gartook, (2) Pulanchung (Taklakot), (3) Gyanima-Khargo, (4) Gyanima-Chakra, (5) Ramur, (6) Dongbra, (7) Puling-Sumdo, (8) Nabna, (9) Shangtse and (10) Tashingong as markets for trade; the Government of India agrees that in future when in accordance with the development and need of trade between the Ari District of Tibet Region of China and India, it has become necessary to specify markets for trade in the
corresponding district in India adjacent to the Ari District of Tibet Region of China, it will be prepared to consider on the basis of equality and reciprocity to do so.

Article III

The High Contracting parties agree that pilgrimage by religious believers of the two countries shall be carried on in accordance with the following provisions:

1. Pilgrims from India of Lamaist, Hindu and Buddhist faiths may visit Kang Rimpoché (Kailash) and Mavam Tso (Manasarowar) in Tibet Region of China in accordance with custom.

2. Pilgrims from Tibet Region of China of Lamaist and Buddhist faiths may visit Banaras, Saranath, Gaya and Senchi in India in accordance with custom.

3. Pilgrims customarily visiting Lhasa may continue to do so in accordance with custom.
Article IV

Traders and pilgrims of both countries may travel by the following passes and route:

1. Shipki La Pass,
2. Mana Pass,
3. Niti Pass,
4. Kungri Bingri Pass
5. Darma Pass, and
6. Lipu Lekh Pass

Also the customary route leading to Tashigong along with valley of Shangatsangpu (Indus River) may continue to be traversed in accordance with custom.

Article V

For travelling across the border, the High Contracting Parties agree that diplomatic personnel, officials and nationals of the two countries shall hold passports issued by their own respective countries and visaed by the other party except as provided in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this Article.

1. Traders of both countries known to be customarily and specifically engaged in trade between Tibet Region of China and India, their wives and children who are dependent on them for
livelihood and their attendants will be allowed entry for purposes of trade into India or Tibet Region of China, as the case may be, in accordance with custom on the production of certificates duly issued by the local Government of their own country or by its duly authorized agents and examined by the border check posts of the other party.

2. Inhabitants of the border districts of the two countries who cross border to carry on petty trade or to visit friends and relatives may proceed to the border districts of the other Party as they have customarily done heretofore and need not be restricted to the passes and routes specified in Article IV above and shall not be required to hold passports, visas or permits.

3. Porters and mule-team drivers of the two countries who cross border to perform necessary transportation services need not hold passports issued by their own country, but shall only hold certificates good for a definite period of time (3 months, half a year or one year) duly issued by the local Government of their own country or
by its duly authorized agents and produce them for registration at the border check post of the other party.

4. Pilgrims of both countries need not carry documents of certification but shall register at the border check post of the other party and receive a permit for pilgrimage.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the foregoing paragraph of this Article, either Government may refuse entry to any particular person.

6. Persons who enter the territory of the other Party in accordance with the foregoing paragraphs of this Article may stay within its territory only after complying with the procedures specified by the other party.

Article VI

The present Agreement shall come into effect upon ratification by both Governments and shall remain in force for eight (8) years. Extension of the present agreement may be negotiated by the two parties if either party requests for it six (6) months prior to the expiry of the Agreement and the request is agreed to by the other party.
Done in duplicate in peking on the twenty ninth day of April 1954 in the Hindi, Chinese and English languages, all texts being equally valid.


Plenipotentiary of the Central People's Governments, People's Republic of China (Chang Han-fu).
APPENDIX-D

NEHRU'S STATEMENT

Excerpt from a statement by the Prime Minister of India in the Lok Sabha on 27th April 1959

I have made several statements in the House in regard to the developments in Tibet. The last statement was made on 3 April in which I informed the House that the Dalai Lama had entered the territory of the Indian Union with a large entourage. I should like to bring this information up-to-date and to place such additional facts as we have before the House.

A few days ago the Dalai Lama and his party reached Mussoorie where the Government had made arrangements for their stay. I have had occasion to visit Mussoorie since then and have had a long talk with the Dalai Lama.

In the course of the last few days reports have reached us that considerable numbers of Tibetans, numbering some thousands, have recently crossed into the Kamang Frontier Division of the N.E.F.A., and some hundreds have also entered the territory of Bhutan. They sought asylum and we have agreed to this. Such of them as carried arms were disarmed. We do not know the exact number yet. Temporary arrangements are being made in a camp for their
maintenance until they can be dispersed in accordance with their wishes and the necessities governing such cases. We could not leave these refugees to their own resources. Apart from the humanitarian considerations involved there was also the law and order problem to be considered. We are grateful to the Government of Assam for their help and cooperation in this matter.

So far as the Dalai Lama and his party are concerned we had to take adequate measures on the grounds of security and also to protect them from the large numbers of newspaper correspondents, both Indian and foreign, who in their anxiety to obtain first-hand information in regard to a matter of world importance, were likely to harass and almost overwhelm the Dalai Lama and his party. While we were anxious to give protection to the Dalai Lama and his party, we were agreeable to giving these newspapermen suitable opportunities. A senior officer of the external Affairs Ministry was therefore deputed to proceed to Tezpur in advance to deal with the press representatives and photographers who had assembled in that small town of Assam. This officer made the necessary administrative arrangements to met as far as possible the wishes of the newspapermen to see the Dalai Lama and to photograph him. Soon after entering India and Dalai Lama indicated his wish to make a statement. We were later informed that this
statement would be released at Tezpur. Our officer made arrangements for the distribution of the translation of the statement to the newspaper correspondents.

In view of certain irresponsible charges made I should like to make it clear that the Dalai Lama was entirely responsible for this statement as well as the subsequent briefer statement that was made by him for Mussoorie (on 22 April). Our officers had nothing to do with the drafting or preparation of these statements.

I need not tell the House that the Dalai Lama entered India entirely of his own violation. At no time had we suggested that he should come to India. We had naturally given thought to the possibility of his seeking asylum in India and when such a request came we readily granted it. His entry with a large party in a remote corner of our country created special problems of transport, organization and security. We deputed an officer to meet the Dalai Lama and his party at Bondilla and to escort them to Mussoorie. The particular officer was selected because he had served as Consul-General in Lhasa and therefore was to some extent known to the Dalai Lama and his officials. The selection of Mussoorie for the Dalai Lama's stay was not finalized till his own wishes were ascertained in the matter and he agreed to it. There was no desire on our part to put any undue
restrictions on him, but in the special circumstances certain arrangements had necessarily to be made to prevent any mishap. It should be remembered that the various events in Tibet culminating in the Dalai Lama's departure from Lhasa and entry into India had created a tremendous interest among the people of India and in the world press. After his arrival in Mussoorie steps were taken to prevent the Dalai Lama from being harassed by crowds of people trying to see him as well as by newspapermen. Apart from this no restrictions about movement were placed on him. He has been told that he and his party can move about Mussoorie according to their wishes. It should be remembered that the Dalai Lama has recently not only had a long, strenuous and dangerous journey but has also had harrowing experiences which must affect the nerves of even the hardest person. He is only just twenty-four years of age.

These are some bare facts, but behind these facts lie serious developments which may have far-reaching consequences. A tragedy has been and is being enacted in Tibet. Passions have been let loose, charges made and language used which cannot but worsen the situation and our relations with our northern neighbour. I am sure that the House will agree with me that in considering matters of such high import we should exercise restraint and wisdom
and use language which is moderate and precise. In these
days of the coldwar there has been tendency to use
unrestrained language and often to make wild charges
without any justification. We have fortunately kept out of
the coldwar and I hope that on this as on any other
occasion we shall not use the language of the cold war.
This matter is too serious to be dealt with it a trivial or
excited way. I would therefore appeal to the press and the
public to exercise restraint in language. I regret that
occasionally there have been lapses from this or our side.
In particular I regret that grave discourtesy was shown
some days ago to the picture of the Head of the Chinese
State, Chairman Mao Tse-tung. This was done by a small
group of irresponsible people in Bombay. In the excitement
of the moment we cannot allow ourselves to be swept into
wrong courses.

It is not for me to make any similar appeal to the
leaders, the press and the people of China. All I can say
is that I have been greatly distressed at the tone of the
comments and the charges made against India by responsible
people in China. They have used the language of the cold
war regardless of truth and propriety. This is peculiarly
distressing in a great nation with thousand of years of
culture behind it noted for its restrained and polite
behaviour. The charges made against India are so fantastic
that I find it difficult to deal with them. There is the charge of our keeping the Dalai Lama under duress. The Chinese authorities should surely know how we function in this country and what our laws and constitution are. Even if we were so inclined we could not keep the Dalai Lama under some kind of detention against his will and there can be no question of our wishing to do so. We can gain nothing by it except a burden of difficult problems. In any event this matter can be easily cleared. It is open to the Dalai Lama at any time to go back to Tibet or wherever he wants to as the Panchen Lama has made himself responsible specially for some strange statements I have stated that we would welcome him to come to India and meet the Dalai Lama himself. should he choose to do so every courtesy will be extended to him. I have further said that the Chinese Ambassador or any other emissary of the Chinese Government can come to India for this purpose and meet the Dalai Lama. There is no barrier for anyone to come peacefully to India and, whether we agree with him or not, we shall treat him with the courtesy due to a guest.

Another and even stranger allegation has been about 'Indian expansionists' who, it is alleged, are the inheritors of the British tradition of imperialism and expansion. It is perfectly true that British policy was one of expansion into Tibet and that they carried this out by
force of arms early in this century. That was in our opinion an unjustified and cruel adventure which brought much harm to the Tibetans. As a result of that, the then British Government in India established certain extra-territorial rights in Tibet. When India became independent we inherited some of these rights. Being entirely opposed to any such extra-territorial rights in another country we did not wish to retain them. But in the early days after independence and partition our hands were full, as this House well knows, and we had to face very difficult situations in our own country we ignored, if I may say so, Tibet. Not being able to find a suitable person to act as our representative at Lhasa we allowed for some time the existing British representative to continue at Lhasa. Later one Indian took his place. Soon after the Chinese armies entered Tibet the question of these extra-territorial rights was raised and we readily agreed to give them up. We would have given them up anyhow whatever developments might have taken place in Tibet. We withdrew our army detachments from some places in Tibet and handed over the Indian postal and telegraph installations and rest houses. We laid down the five principles of Panchasheel and placed our relationship with the Tibet region on a new footing. What we were anxious about was to preserve the traditional connection between India and Tibet in regard to the pilgrim
traffic and trade. Our action in this matter and whatever we have done subsequently in regard to Tibet is proof enough of our policy and that India had no political or ulterior ambitions in Tibet. Indeed even from the narrowest practical point of view any other policy would have been wrong and futile. Ever since then we have endeavoured not only to act up to the agreement we made but to cultivate the friendship of the Chinese State and people.

It is therefore a matter of deepest regret and surprise to us that charges should be made which are both unbecoming and entirely void of substance. We have conveyed this deep feeling of regret to the Chinese Government, more especially at the speeches delivered recently in the current session of the National People's Congress in Peking.

I stated some time ago that our broad policy was governed by three factors (1) preservation of the security and the integrity of India; (2) our desire to maintain friendly relations with China; and (3) our deep sympathy for the people of Tibet. That policy we shall continue to follow because we think that the correct policy not only for the present but even more so for the future. It would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia, India and China, which have been peaceful neighbours for ages past,
should develop feelings of hostility against each other. We for our part will follow this policy, but we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries which are so important from the wider point of view of peace in Asia and the world. The five principles have laid down inter-alia mutual respect for each other. Such mutual respect is gravely impaired if unfounded charges are made and the language of the cold war used.

I have already made it clear previously that the charge that Kalimpong was a centre of the Tibetan rebellion is wholly unjustified. We have a large number of people of Tibetan stock living in India as Indian nationals. We have also some Tibetan emigres in India. All of them deeply respect the Dalai Lama. Some of them have been exceedingly unhappy at the developments in Tibet. Some no doubt have anti-chinese sentiments. We have made it clear to them that they will not be permitted to carry on any subversive activities from India, and I should like to say that by and large they have acted in accordance with the direction of the Indian Government. I cannot obviously say that someone has not done something secretly, but to imagine or say that a small group of persons sitting in Kalimpong organised a major upheaval in Tibet seems to me to make a large draft of imagination and to slur over obvious facts.
The Khampa revolt started in an area of China proper adjoining Tibet more than three years ago. Is Kalimpong supposed to be responsible for that? This revolt gradually spread and no doubt created a powerful impression on the minds of large numbers of Tibetans who had kept away from the revolt. Fears and apprehensions about their future gripped their minds and a nationalist upsurge swayed their feelings. Their fears may have been unjustified, but surely they cannot be denied. Such feelings can only be dealt with adequately by gentler methods than warfare.

When Premier Chou en-lai came here two or three years ago he was good enough to discuss Tibet with me at considerable length. We had a frank and full talk. He told me that while Tibet had long been a part of the Chinese State, they did not consider Tibet as a province of China. The people were different from the people of China proper. Just as in the other autonomous regions of the Chinese State the people were different even though they formed part of the State. Therefore, they considered Tibet an autonomous region which would enjoy autonomy. He told me further that it was absurd for anyone to imagine that China was going to force communism on Tibet. Communism could not be enforced in this way on a very backward country and they had no wish to do so even though they would like reforms to come in progressively. Even these reforms they proposed to postpone for a considerable time.
About that time the Dalai Lama was also here and I had long talks with him then. I told him of Premier Chou En-lai's friendly approach and of his assurance that he would respect the autonomy of Tibet. I suggested to him that he should accept these assurances in good faith and co-operate in maintaining that autonomy and bringing about certain reforms in Tibet. The Dalai Lama agreed that his country, though according to him advanced spiritually, was very backward socially and economically and reforms were needed.

It is not for us to say how far these friendly intentions and approaches materialized. The circumstances were undoubtedly difficult. On the one side there was a dynamic, rapidly moving society. On the other a static unchanging society fearful of what might be done to it in the name of reform. The distance between the two was great and there appeared to be hardly any meeting point. Meanwhile change in some from inevitably came to Tibet. Communications developed rapidly and the long isolation of Tibet was partly broken through. Though physical barriers were progressively removed, mental and emotional barriers increased. Apparently the attempt to cross these mental and emotional barriers was either not made or did not succeed.
To say that a number of 'upper strata reactionaries' in Tibet were solely responsible for this appears to be an extraordinary simplification of a complicated situation. Even according to the accounts received through Chinese sources in revolt in Tibet was of considerable magnitude and the basis of it must have been the strong feeling of nationalism which affects not only the upper class people but others also. No doubt vested interests joined it and sought to profit by it. The attempt to explain the situation by the use of rather worn-out words, phrases and slogans is seldom helpful.

When news of these unhappy developments came to India there was immediately a strong and widespread reaction. The Government did not bring about this reaction. Nor was this reaction essentially political. It was largely one of sympathy based on sentiment and humanitarian reasons and also on a certain feeling of kinship with the Tibetan people derived from long-established religious and cultural contacts. It was an instinctive reaction. It is true that some people in India sought to profit by it by turning it in an undesirable direction. But the fact of that reaction of the India people was there. If that was the reaction were one may well imagine the reaction among the Tibetans themselves. Probably this reaction is shared in other Buddhist countries of Asia. When there are such strong
feelings, which are essentially not political, they cannot be dealt with by political, they cannot be dealt with by political methods alone much less by military methods. We have no desire whatever to interfere in Tibet. We have every desire to maintain the friendship between India and China; but at the same time we have every sympathy for the people of Tibet and we are greatly distressed at their hapless plight. We hope still that the authorities of China in their wisdom will not use their great strength against the Tibetan but will win them to friendly co-operation in accordance with the assurances they have themselves given about the autonomy of the Tibet region. Above all we hope that the present fighting and killing will cease.