

planning unit. Whatever money you are going to allot in the remaining two years of the fourth plan and in the fifth plan for the backward regions, you should separately allot so much money for each backward district and that district development authority will be authorised to utilise that money.

Of course, the Planning Commission have taken certain steps for removal of regional imbalances. They have appointed committees and the reports of the committees are there. You should de-license the backward regions in respect of industries so that they can be started in the backward areas. Then, it is said there is black money to the extent of Rs. 3000 or 4000 crores. Give them five years' time to go to the backward areas and invest their black money there for turning it into white money and in the process develop the 223 backward districts. My suggestion may not appear radical to some, but I think this can be considered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before taking up the Half-an-Hour discussion I want to make one point very clear. The fixation of more time for this motion will go to the Business Advisory Committee. So far as the day for further discussion of this motion is concerned, that will be decided by the Government.

17.30 hrs.

#### HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION NORMALISATION OF RELATIONS WITH CHINA

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Mr. Chairman, just a few days before, in reply to one of my questions, Shri Surendra Pal Singh replied that our Ambassador in Warsaw had a courtesy meeting with his Chinese counterpart there. I would have been happy if it had been described as "a courteous meeting of exchange of good will between Indian and Chinese Ambassadors".

It is good news that our *charge d' affairs* in Peking, Shri Brijesh Mishra, had a good chat with the Chinese officials in Peking on the 15th August celebrations in our mission there. It came over the radio and I say it is a good sign. Though it will be disappointing to us that China has blocked the entry of Bangladesh into UNO, I think we need not be too much disappointed because we have given the opportunity to Shri Bhutto to play the diplomatic game on us with the help of China. For instance, if we had agreed to make peace with Pakistan, after

the recognition of Bangladesh perhaps Shri Bhutto would not have got an opportunity to play China on Bangladesh.

I want to caution the Government that some kind of a new pattern of new politics is developing. At least, Shri Bhutto is trying to develop a new politics of Pindi-Peking-Tehran axis. And I believe Government know the Shah of Iran has shown a certain gesture to Peking. I think our Foreign Ministry has taken note of that.

Recently, a very radical political step has been taken by the Big Powers. The border line of the international politics of alignment and non-alignment is almost missing. I think a completely new pattern is developing in international diplomatic relations after the meeting of Mr. Nixon with Mr. Mao Tse Tung and Mr. Brezhnev.

The Hon. Minister should also take note of the fact that there is radical change in the inside politics of China. After the Cultural Revolution of China we noticed a certain tendency. That tendency is gradually changing to a new pattern of diplomacy. China is trying to normalise its relations with other powers from whom it tried to withdraw. Another significant factor is that some kind of metamorphosis is going on inside China. The tussle between the civil wing and the military wing of the Communist Party is coming to an end. With the liquidation of Lia Piao, the civil wing is more or less in control to decide the fate of China. That is a very significant event in regard to Chinese politics and Chinese point of view on international relations. We already notice certain changes, at least in their attitude towards Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos and her approach to Japan.

I should also like to draw your attention to the fact that China's attitude towards India is also changing. In 1967, 1968 and in 1969 perhaps, we remember almost every day, China was encouraging Naxalites over Peking Radio and China was thinking—some news appeared in their official paper—that Indian States were going to disintegrate. They were giving all kinds of inspiration to Naxalites to go ahead. But they have now changed their attitude. Not only they have stopped that, not only they are not supporting Naxalites, but certain radical changes have taken place in the Sub-continent...

AN HON. MEMBER: What about their support to Pakistan? (Interrupted.)

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** What I was going to say is that we certainly find China has noticed that Naxalite problem has completely changed there is no hope for the Naxalites, and the China's attitude towards Naxalites and the forces of disintegration has also changed. China has noticed that all their help to Nagas, and Mizos has also failed ; that the batches of Nagas and Mizos they had trained have been caught by India. Then, China has noticed that with the annihilation of Pakistani rule over Bangladesh, there is a radical change in regard to the possibility of poking their nose in the Indian sub-continent. Apart from that, we have noticed a certain low-key attitude of China during the conflict between India and Pakistan in relation to Bangladesh.

I mention all this because China wanted to have a certain point or political base to enter into the politics of Indian sub-continent. The things have changed. China is now being obliged to make a thorough change, if I may not use the word "thorough" change but a certain change is already indicated in the attitude of China towards India.

I want to quote Han Suyin's interview, in November 1971, from a Chinese papers in which she has made a very significant statement after meeting one of the close associates of Chou En-lai. It says :

"China desires India to be strong and at peace. . ."

"The official insistently remarked the sub-continent should be kept clear of big power influence and the aim of "imperialist powers" to shower mistrust and provoke clashes between India and China...."

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** This is Unstarred Question No. 634 on which you have raised a half-an-hour discussion. The Question was put by Shri S. M. Banerjee and Shri R. S. Pandey. The Minister's reply is, "India is still awaiting China's response to her earlier move in this regard."

Now, you are giving your own impressions as to what is China doing.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) :** This is a very profound analysis that he is making.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** I know that there is a group of politicians in India. Whenever there is any alignment or good

gesture to other than one axis, that creates trouble with them. We understand their politics. I understand Mr. Indrajit Gupta also quite well. And further, the Report says :

"He hopes that 'India will see her way clear of the control of her own destiny....'

"China desires that India should remain united and independent. It is not in the interest of any one except imperialism, open or disguised, that India should break up."

This is a statement which is very important. I mention this because there are certain indications of change in China's attitude towards India.

There is another point about the axis of rivalry. That China has also radically changed. That was mainly with India. After 1962, the axis has changed. This axis is no longer there. This is not the axis of rivalry between Delhi-Peking but now it is between Peking-Moscow. We should realise its significance. It is good and I appreciate the Government that they are not over-playing the Indo-Soviet Peace Treaty. Rather, our Government is emphasizing the politics of non-alignment and the politics of self-reliance. This is absolutely necessary. It is absolutely necessary for our future relations with China. If you really want to develop a base of peace in the sub-continent, it is essential that we disentangle ourselves from all international bloc alignments. It is essential that we try to develop good neighbourly relations with China. In fact China is now afraid of a weaker India. But China will appreciate a stronger India. A weaker India may play the role of a second fiddle to some big power. About the new axis, the new axis of rivalry between Peking and Moscow may affect India to go on the side against China. Therefore, China will prefer a stronger India and not a weaker India. The political situation has changed.

Now it is the time that India should try to take initiative in normalising relations with China. Ours is not the position of 1962. After 1965 and 1971, the image of India in the international world and also at home has undergone a change. Therefore, we can talk with China from the point of strength and from the point of self confidence and not with any sense of inferiority complex.

You were now talking about the actual

line of control in Kashmir. This can be an indirect communication to China to settle our border dispute with her.

I conclude by saying that, for the future, for ensuring a real, socialist base, for socio-economic development of India, it is absolutely essential that the Indian sub-continent should be made a base of peace. That peace is possible if we can normalise our relations with China and develop good neighbourly relations with them. That is why I have raised this discussion.

**SHRI P. NARASIMHA REDDY (Chittoor) :** I would like to know from the Minister of External Affairs whether any efforts or any moves have been initiated by third countries to bring about a better relationship or a thaw in the relationship between India and China. We have reports that Mrs. Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon, during her visit, was instrumental to bringing about a message or some sort of a move with a view to breaking the immobility or the deadlock in the relations between India and China on account of the border dispute. I want to know whether there is any such move or any efforts have been made at the initiative of this country and if so, what are the efforts that we are making to normalise our relationship with China, to resume our diplomatic relations with China.

**SHRI DASARATHA DEB (Tripura East) :** We had hostilities with China owing to border dispute. But now, for the last ten years, there has been a lull in the border. It appears that the Government of the Peoples Republic of China have already indicated their eagerness to normalise relations with India. In view of this changed situation, I do not see any reason why it should not be possible for India and China to normalise their relations. I also want to know what specific steps are being taken by the Government of India to establish full diplomatic relations with China and also trade relations. My another point is this. Every one of us knows that imperialist America is the number one enemy of the socialist China. If President Nixon could go to Peking to talk to the leaders of China to improve their relationship, what stands in the way of the Government of India to take the initiative to normalise the relations with China ?

**PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hansipur) :** As a part of the process of normalisation of relations with China, our Govern-

ment has been sending some feelers and one of them, I believe, is an invitation conveyed to the Chinese Government to take part in the Third International Asian Trade Fair to be held in Delhi. May I know China's response to this?

**श्री कूलचन्द्र वर्मा (उज्जैन) :** सभापति महोदय, मैं मन्त्री महोदय से प्रश्न पूछने के पहले यह उम्मीद करूंगा कि वह मंरे प्रश्नों का गोल गोल उत्तर न दें। आज से दस वर्ष पूर्व, सन् 1962 में इसी माननीय सदन में हमने सर्वसम्मति से एक प्रतिज्ञा की थी।

सभापति महोदय : आप सवाल पूछिये।

**श्री कूलचन्द्र वर्मा :** मैं सवाल ही पूछ रहा हूँ।

**बिबेश मन्त्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) :** उनका सवाल भी गोल है इसलिये जवाब भी गोल होगा।

**श्री कूलचन्द्र वर्मा :** हमने प्रतिज्ञा की थी कि जब तक चीन ने जो भूमि दबा कर रख ली है उसको हम वापस नहीं छोड़ा लेंगे तब तक हम चीन से बातों नहीं करेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज भी उस स्थिति में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है। लेकिन समाचार-पत्रों और हमारे दूतावासों के माध्यम से शिखर वार्ता की बात चल रही है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे कौन से कारण विद्यमान हो गये जिनके कारण सरकार प्रेमलाप को आतुर दिखाई पड़ती है ? यह जो सरकारी दख है कि चीन से बात की जाय, मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि इसके पीछे कोई विदेशी शक्तियों का दबाव है। कृपया इसको स्पष्ट करें।

**श्री स्वर्ण सिंह :** एक तो श्री समर गुह का ही दबाव है। (अव्यवधान)

**श्री कूलचन्द्र वर्मा :** इसके बाद मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आज भी चीन के पास हमारी 90 हजार वर्ग मील भूमि है जिसको वह दबाये बैठा है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से इसका स्पष्ट उत्तर चाहता हूँ कि अब तक हमने चीन से उस भूमि को प्राप्त नहीं किया तो इसके क्या कारण हैं, और भविष्य में उस भूमि को वापस लेने में कितना समय लगेगा ?

**THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH):** I have listened with a great deal of interest to the expression of different points of view and different emphasis that has been laid on this question.

Shri Samar Guha appears to have talked with a great deal of insight into the intentions of the People's Republic of China. I am not sure whether China has changed or not, but, there is definitely a change in Mr. Samar Guha. It is a welcome change, whatever may be the background and the reasons for this change.

We should continuously go on assessing the situation. There is no fixed position and if the international situation changes, then we should also be prepared to our attitudes and our approach to the changing situation. That is the essence of any foreign policy and we should take note of the changes and take appropriate steps in order to keep pace with these changes.

So far as the broad policy of the Government of India is concerned, we have always been of the view that the people of India and the people of China are great people and they are neighbours—geography has placed them together—and whatever may be the differences or disputes between the two countries, I cannot see any escape from the ultimate emergence of a situation where the people of India and the people of China would live in peace and as good neighbours.

In the meantime, we have always been of the view that relations between India and China should improve. There is no doubt that relations between the two countries deteriorated very much; there was an armed conflict between the two countries. After that also, the general attitude of China has not been one of expressing any friendly feeling or friendship towards India. In fact, we have noticed, as Mr. Samar Guha mentioned, their support to certain disruptive elements in India. There is also their general propaganda line of trying to project a picture of India as a disintegrating India, highlighting our troubles either on the labour front or on the front of industrial production or food production; this, unfortunately, has been the attitude of China. At one time Mr. Samar Guha used to summarise all these things in an admirable manner and he used to urge us to take a more militant attitude towards China. We had, however, resisted that temptation and always

took an attitude which we thought was in our best interests.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** If I am a realist, am I wrong? If I find changes, I also change.

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** When the praise comes, take it in good spirit. Don't feel rattled when you are praised. While keeping our objective to do everything possible to improve relations, our main effort has been not to do anything which unnecessarily exacerbates relations between India and China. But, at the same time, we have to take a realistic view of the situation as it is today.

I have made several public statements. I have made statements on the floor of the House expressing our desire, our willingness, our readiness, to improve relations with China. Unfortunately, unless Mr. Samar Guha has some inside information, we have not received a good response. Our attitude still continues to be to do everything to improve relations, to remove misunderstanding. But, the latest propaganda blast which China has undertaken in several respects is not a very good development and I do not see any noticeable change in their attitude towards India and their attitude of highlighting our difficulties, and their trying to paint a picture which shows India in unfavourable stance still continues.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) :** What is your opinion about their vetoing Bangladesh's admission in the United Nations?

**SHRI SWARAN SINGH :** On the question of Bangladesh, the entire House knows the attitude of the Chinese representatives. We know what their attitude was when the situation in Bangladesh was developing and also when the Pakistani attack came on us. And also, their attitude in the U. N. O. These are all facts, known to every one. Surely, even if you give a most charitable interpretation, you cannot say that they were unbiased in this respect. Their attitude was tilted in favour of Pakistan, and, unfortunately, in favour of a military regime, Yahya Khan regime, which had unleashed that terror and violence against the people of Bangladesh.

Even today, our neighbour Bangla Desh is recognised by four out of the five permanent members of the Security Council. Over 80 members of the United Nations have already recognised Bangla Desh, which means that the majority of the membership of the United Nations has recognised Bangla Desh. But still

the Chinese attitude in the United Nations appears to be to block the entry of Bangla Desh. It is all the more, I should say, tragic that a country like the People's Republic of China, whose own entry to the United Nations had been blocked by others is now adopting an attitude against the majority view of the UN members and threatening to exercise the exceptional right which permanent members of the Security Council have, to veto her entry into the United Nations. The power of veto is a power which is very sparingly exercised when issues of peace and war are involved. To keep a country of 75 million out and to threaten the use of veto is certainly not a very encouraging feature; which holds out great possibilities of normalisation of relations; in the attitude of China in relation to the countries of the Indian sub-continent.

I am not quite sure whether President Bhutto is making their attitude more strong or whether it is the Chinese attitude which perhaps is encouraging Mr. Bhutto again to adopt an attitude which, according to our assessment does not appear to be in the best interests even of Pakistan or of President Bhutto. But this is a fact which we cannot ignore and we cannot explain it away and we cannot wish it away by any argument. Whatever may be various axes, whether it is friendly between Peking and other countries or an unfriendly attitude between Peking and third countries, we should carefully assess our own position and our own attitude. We were hoping that relations with China would improve, and to be quite frank, I had a feeling that they were moving though very slowly towards improvement, before the situation in Bangla Desh developed. We should take a realistic view, with the Chinese attitude in relation to the events in Bangla Desh, in relation to the movement of about ten million refugees from Bangla Desh into India, in relation to the Pakistani attack on us, in relation to their general assessment of what was happening in this sub-continent where human rights of millions of people were actually trampled under the military pressure and military atrocities; the Chinese attitude was not such as could be by any imagination be regarded as impartial. In fact, it was heavily weighted in favour of the military regime which was crushing the urges of the people of Bangla Desh for their own independence and for the preservation of their human rights.

This attitude again caused a setback to the slow process of improvement that was

taking shape before the events of Bangla Desh took the shape which they did.

18 hrs.

I am not yet clear as to whether there has been a clear reversal or a change or even a softening of the attitude in this respect. Whereas our ultimate objective is clear, still we cannot improve the relations unless there is a response from the other side. As they say, you cannot achieve such a thing by unilaterally pressing your viewpoint. After all, there have to be two to strengthen friendship as also there are to be two if there is going to be trouble. Notwithstanding our willingness to improve relations, at the present moment, I do not see any clear response from the Chinese side.

What should we do in this situation? We should not do anything which unnecessarily exacerbates relations. At the same time, we cannot continue to go on repeating this thing without a proper response. So we must as a mature nation watch the situation and should carefully see as to how things are emerging. We have to safeguard our interests; we have to safeguard the basic interests of peace in this sub-continent, of our relations with Bangla Desh and with Pakistan in this neighbourhood, and it is only in the light of this that we can take further steps to normalise relations.

With your permission, I would like to answer very briefly the three questions put. To the first by Shri Reddy, my reply is that there has been no effort made by any third country to take any initiative for bringing about improvement of relations between India and China. Our approach in this respect has always been that whenever the relations between these two great countries, India and China, being neighbours, being large countries, improve, they will improve only by bilateral effort and any friendly association or friendly move by a third country is not likely to yield any useful result.

The question of sending an ambassador or raising the diplomatic representation to ambassadorial level is only a question of raising the level of representation. We have got a resident mission in Peking and Chinese got a resident mission in Delhi. Either country on any occasion can notify the other that it has decided to upgrade the level of representation. No wide or important principle is involved in this. If we find that by upgrading the level of representation our contacts there can be established at a higher level to some useful

(Shri Shivaram Singh)

purpose, we will not hesitate to do so. As I said, there is no question of any wide principle involved one way or the other in this respect.

I have already answered one question asked by Shri Deb. The other is about trade relations. We are prepared to have economic relations with China. If they are prepared to buy anything, we are prepared to sell it to them. If we require something from China, we are prepared to purchase from them. Political differences need not come in the way of economic relations.

Another question asked was about our invitation to them for their participation in the Trade Fair. We did extend an invitation to them, that they should participate in the Trade Fair being organised. We have not so far got any response from them.

I am glad the CPI (M) member has quoted the example of President Nixon's flight to Peking. As you know, we have always welcomed the relaxation of tension in

any part of the world, between any two adversaries. We have also to remember that behind President Nixon's flight was a long period of informal contacts and most of the understandings, according to our information, had been achieved even before President Nixon went to Peking, as a result of several contacts, about which the whole world now knows, that were established at a fairly high level between China and the USA.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : America followed it up after sending a ping pong team to China. We did not follow that way.

Then, I think the Jan Sangh Member's question does not call for any reply because he did not put any question as such to me.

12.06 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, August 17, 1972 (Sraavan 26, 1894 (Saka).*