

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

were here he would have the right to withdraw it, but he is in jail. Should he not have that right?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What can I do?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I want your ruling on this.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no point of order. I shall put the resolution to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"This House is of opinion that large-scale employment of Contract Labour is detrimental to the interest of the workers and the nation and recommends to Government that steps should be taken to abolish the system as a whole forthwith."

*The Resolution was negatived.*

—

15.32 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: SITUATION IN VIET NAM

**Dr. Ranen Sen** (Calcutta East): I beg to move:—

"This House is of opinion that the recent bombing of North Viet Nam territories by USA military forces is a threat to peace and freedom in South East Asia and calls upon the Government of India to take steps to mobilise word opinion to stop US intervention in Indo-China."

The Minister of External Affairs, I am sorry to say, is not here....

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour and Employment (Shri R. K. Malviya): I am here.

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** My hon. friend is only the Deputy Labour Minister.

**Shri Khadilkar** (Khed): It does not add to the dignity of the House that even though three Ministers should be there in the External Affairs Ministry, none of them is present here now.

**Shri Badrudduja** (Murshidabad): Time and again, we had been pointing this out, but Government do not seem to have taken any notice of this.

**Shri Rane** (Buldana): 1 hour and 20 minutes had remained for the earlier resolution, but it had actually taken less time.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee** (Kanpur): Our External Affairs Minister is doing nothing either externally or internally. I do not know why he should not be here now.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Every word that is uttered will be conveyed to him.

**Some hon. Members:** He should be present here in the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He will be coming. I have sent for him.

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** Anyway, the Deputy Labour Minister cannot represent the External Affairs Minister.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He will be coming. Let us go on with the business meanwhile.

15.33 hrs.

[SHRI SONAVANE in the Chair]

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** My resolution relates to a very dangerous situation arising out of the bombing of North Viet Name territory by the American forces. The end of World War II saw two important events, firstly the emergence of the socialist power in the world embracing one-third of humanity, and secondly the emergence of the national liberation movement that shook the very foundation of imperialism and colonialism. The world imperialist

Powers did not accept the situation, particularly the American imperialism did not accept the emergence of these two powers, namely the socialist powers and national liberation forces. So, immediately after the Second World War, the American imperialist authorities tried to forge military alliance systems throughout the world. Today, this has taken a gruesome proportion.

**Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana):** Why is my hon. friend repeatedly calling the American authorities as the American imperial authorities? Where is imperialism? My hon. friend should not cast aspersions on a person or Power that is not here to answer back.

**Shri Khadiolkar:** That is a very strange position.

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** I may be allowed to speak.

The American imperialist powers did not accept the situation and they started forging military alliances throughout the world.

The Viet Nameese people fought for their independence during the last one century first against the Chinese Mandarins, then against the French, then against the Japanese, and again against the French colonial power.

**An hon. Member:** And now against the Chinese.

**Dr. Ranen Sen** What happened when the French imperialist forces were routed at the battle of Dien Bien Phu? In the year 1954, an agreement was arrived at at Geneva between fourteen Powers to end hostilities in the Indo-Chinese territory. But before this Geneva Agreement was concluded, the American Government wanted to help the French power and they stepped into the shoes of the French colonialists and they tried to subvert the agreements that were arrived at at Geneva in the year 1954. These are all historical facts.

Let us see what some of the important provisions of the Geneva Agreement were. One was that the division of Viet Nam into two territories was a provisional one; the second was that within two years after the Geneva Agreement, that is, in July, 1956, both these territories would have an election for national unification under a joint commission consisting of members from these two territories and under the supervision of the International Control and Supervisory Commission. The third important point in that agreement was that there would be no military station, and no naval or aircraft station and no military build-up in any of the territories of Viet Nam, either in the south or in the north. But it was at the behest of the American colonial Power that the Government that was set up in South Viet Nam started subverting all those clauses of the agreement. And let us see what happened.

In 1953, Mr. Nixon, on behalf of the American Government stated that America wanted a crescent system starting from Korea and touching all the littoral islands and ending in Indo-China. Then again, there was a brochure written by Gen. Navarre who was in charge of the French forces in 1953-54 in which he wrote that the American Government proposed an 'Operation Vulture' on the Indo-Chinese territory, to which the French Government also had agreed. So, the position was that the French colonial vultures left, but the other vulture started ravaging the Indo-Chinese territory.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** Can he not use decent terminology?

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** It is called 'Operation Vulture'. It is in the document.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** Americans are not vultures.

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** What happened? A military alliance known as SEATO was forged in South East Asia. In August 1959, our late Prime Minister

[Dr. Ranen Sen]

called it a very dangerous and very unwise military alliance that threatened the whole security of South East Asia. What happened? A puppet regime was formed in South Vietnam. It was a puppet regime as evidenced by the fact that every week almost there is a coup there and nobody knows what is happening in regard to the ruling power. The Government of South Vietnam at the instance of the American Government started violating all the agreements. In 1956, there should have been a general election for national unification. That was flouted. South Vietnam became a lease of the Pentagon.

I will give some figures in 1954. The American military personnel in South Vietnam numbered only 200. In 1964, it is 25,000. There are 169 airfields in South Vietnam, big and small; 11 naval bases, big and small, in South Vietnam waters. From Sept. 1954 to March 1964, the US illegally introduced more than 2,000 shipment of military equipments and weapons. In 1955-64, 284 military delegations including top officers visited South Vietnam. The Defence Secretary himself visited 14 times. Not only that. It has become a colony of America.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** How is it illegal?

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** Because the Geneva agreements had stipulated that there should be no foreign military bases or naval bases or foreign military personnel there.

Then South Vietnam became a prison house of the South Vietnamese people. You will be astonished to learn that after 1954, 900 jails have been built, 3.7 lakh people have been jailed, 1.6 lakh people murdered, 6.8 lakh disabled, 16,000 women tortured or raped, 8,000 children detained and 30 lakh people herded into concentration camps.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** Where does he get these figures from?

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** These have been culled from international literature, mainly from Soviet literature.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** Communist sources.

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** They are the greatest friends of India, I mean the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries.

The war went on. It was waged by the South Vietnamese people against American military occupation and their puppet regime. I will quote a British journalist, David Hutton, who had said that it has no independence at all.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** On a point of order. Are we constitutionally competent to discuss the domestic and internal affairs of a foreign country and a foreign power?

**Mr. Chairman:** I think the House is entitled to express an opinion. The Resolution is an expression of opinion.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** I accept your ruling.

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** He writes:

"South Vietnam has no independence at all. How can a country be independent when its entire army is financed by a foreign power? The very idea is an absurdity. How can a country be independent when more than 80 per cent of its imports are paid for not by its own exports but by the treasury in Washington? Far from being independent, South Vietnam today is one of the most dependent countries of the World".

This is from an English journal.

Therefore, the fight going on there is a freedom battle waged by the South Vietnamese people against American military intervention and

against the despotic government, puppet government in South Vietnam. The situation is getting difficult every-day for the American interventionists. This is apparent from what the *New York Times* noted on February 11, 1965, after the American bombing for the second time. The editorial points out:

"In South Vietnam those who profit by the American presence want the USA to stay. Those who feel frustrated by American power, nationalists, communists, Buddhists, probably the majority of the peasantry who simply wish to be left alone and want the American to go".

Even now there is a gradual realisation in America that this intervention is against the interests of America. Therefore, out of this desperation, because the whole South Vietnam people have risen against the puppet regime and against the American intervention, in order to make a case that outsiders are helping the South Vietnam people, in order to carry the war to the north and throughout Indo-China—because they have started bombing in Laos also—this bombing takes place in North Vietnam territory.

My resolution specifically states that it has become a danger to peace and security in South East Asia including security of India.

I want to remind the House of what the late Prime Minister had stated about the SEATO treaty. I have stated very categorically and forcefully that the first task of India, which has a heritage of fight against imperialism—our peace policy is known; we want that peace should be restored there and the American forces must quit South Vietnam—is to see this achieved and new Geneva type conference held in which a fresh probe into the situation is undertaken, a fresh analysis of the situation made by the conference. If India takes up this position and tries to rouse public

opinion against the American intervention, a Geneva type conference will take place very soon and that will lead not only to peace and freedom in South East Asia but also peace and security in India, free from foreign intervention.

With these words, I commend my Resolution.

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"This House is of opinion that the recent bombing of North Vietnam territories by USA military forces is a threat to peace and freedom in South East Asia and calls upon the Government of India to take steps to mobilise world opinion to stop US intervention in Indo-China".

One hour has been allotted for this.

**Shri Khadilkar:** I would request an extension of time at the beginning, because apart from the Government's opinion, this House's opinion will have a good effect in the outside world. This is an important matter. So, at the beginning I would request for a little extension of time.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I move that the time be extended by two hours.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):** I second the proposal.

**Mr. Chairman:** There is another important resolution. We shall conclude the discussion on this resolution by 4.55, so that the other resolution might be allowed to be moved.

How much time will the Minister take to reply?

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh):** Fifteen to 20 minutes.

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** I will take five minutes to reply.

**Mr. Chairman:** There are six or seven members anxious to speak. If we restrict ourselves to strictly ten minutes each, I think we can accommodate them.

**Shri Solanki (Kaira):** I am here to oppose in toto this resolution moved by my hon. friend

When he was moving the resolution, one of my colleagues raised the question whether we can discuss the affairs of a foreign country. It is rather unfortunate that we ourselves have no policy on South-east Asia. The whole problem that is facing us and the world today, and South-east Asia in particular, is the problem of Chinese expansionism versus the democracies, and the only democracy in Asia, and the biggest democracy in the world, that is affected is India.

When I am talking on the subject, I have nothing to do with America. I am only concerned with my country and the security of my country. I feel that the events that have taken place in South-east Asia have a direct effect on the policies of our country, on the defence of our country. I would say that if we are not awakened in good time, events will take place as those which took place in Tibet at the time of the earlier Chinese expansion, when many senior Members of this House warned the Government and requested to contain Chinese expansionism. My hon. friend was talking of the second world war and of colonialism. I would say that there would be a third world war in the near future if we do not contain Chinese expansionism. Talking of colonialism and imperialism, I must say that China is no less imperialistic, no less colonialistic and no less brutally communist than any other country even more. China today threatens not only India, but the whole of Asia. Looking at the map of Asia, looking at the events which have taken place, looking at the inactivity of our Government, I feel that only three countries might be left out of this war—Australia, Japan and ourselves. And a day might come when the war might also verge on the borders of India because China will not leave India out of its sphere of influence. This is the sphere of

influence that China has created in South-east Asia. China regards South-east Asia as its backyard, and China wants no interference from anybody in her backyard

We should understand that China swallowed Korea and Tibet, that the Vietnamese territories were also influenced by China, that Malaya was in total war against communism, and lastly that India only recently was invaded and our borders are still occupied by the Chinese. In all these events we have done nothing.

The objective of China is very clear—expansionism, Chinese hegemony over the South-east Asian countries, including India. They want to impose the communist way of life on other countries. In the situation that is facing us today, a new factor has arisen, namely the expansionism of Indonesia. Indonesia is a small dragon breathing fire on the neck of Malaya and many other countries. This is the way the two nations, China and Indonesia, have come up against the whole South-east Asia.

Therefore, the question of policy which arises is whether we are able to resist this power. If we do not want to resist, do we agree to this expansionism of China, do we submit to the will of China? This is the question that is facing us today—not the question of American intervention or the intervention of anybody else. What are we going to do? Obviously, so far we have done nothing.

My hon. friend suggests a Geneva type conference. Somebody else suggested a parallel to the Colombo proposals. We know what has happened to the Colombo proposals. We know what has been the result of the Geneva conference. There are other people who say that through non-alignment and an approach of peaceful co-existence we can appeal to these nations, but this is only talk

at the conference table. We want to talk about peace and non-alignment sitting in Delhi. We do not care what is happening in Saigon.

Only last year I was in South Vietnam. I toured the entire country for a fortnight with other members of the delegation which left India for South Vietnam. The situation that we witnessed there was not a happy one, and they have passed through more dangers within the last one year. Today that country faces much more danger of direct Chinese aggression that last year.

When China was expanding its territorial ambitions, America came and put a stop to it on the borders of South Vietnam. The British contained Indonesian expansion in Malaysia. These two nations have filled the vacuum created in the territories of Asia. Because we were not able to do the same, other countries had to come to their help. The job which should have been done by Asian countries is being performed by European powers and my friend calls them colonial and imperialistic.

Of course, this is another way. If direct aggression on India is not possible, through the backdoor of South-east Asia they can enter India and other territories of Asia. We do not want to play any active part, in South Vietnam we met several people who said, "We do not like the Americans but we do not like the Chinese, either but the Americans today are helping us to safeguard us from the dangers of the communist way of life." They are not worried about nationalism, they are worried about their way of life.

In contrast, North Vietnam is a living hell where people like slaves.

**Dr. Ramen Sen:** Have you been there?

**Shri Solanki:** Indian officers have reported these things, those of the Control Commission. It is that living

hell that the South Vietnamese do not want. South Vietnamese prefer freedom, they would prefer death to entering into the sort of coalition that my hon. friend suggests, union with North Vietnam. The two parts cannot unite because their way of living and way of thinking are different. It is not a matter of forcing them to unite. It is a matter of life and death for the South Vietnamese.

In this matter, the British and Americans have helped. They want Australia, Formosa, India, Ceylon, Burma, any power that is willing, to come to their help. They would accept that help. But is India ready to go with her resources and help South Vietnam? India could not prevent even the aggression on Tibet. We sat here and we discussed at the conference table and we said it was unfortunate. That is all we can do. We cannot even extend our support to Sikkim, Nepal and Bhutan, not to talk of going to the help of South-east Asia. Therefore, for our inactivity, for our incapacity, we are blaming the Americans for creating the situation. The situation was not created by the Americans. It was created long before by the Chinese expansion, and this situation now is coming to an end. With the present action of the USA, the Vietcongs cannot hold out any longer and the day will come when the Vietcongs will themselves come to the conference table. As it is, they only understand the language of force, and I think they do not understand this talkie-talkie or the conference table, non-alignment, etc. and only force can contain them.

16 hrs.

Now, the Americans are giving them hell and they realise that their end is near and hence this talk of cease fire and so on. The whole move is on. In South Vietnam the infiltration was so much, as we observed there, that it is so difficult for an ordinary man to go for his daily work in South Vietnam. If a farmer goes

[Shri Solanki]

to his field, he is shot down. If an ordinary labourer goes just 10 miles out of Saigon, he is not safe. His women and children are not safe. That is the way of terrorism indulged in by the Vietcongs in South Vietnam, by the Vietcong guerillas, but this will now come to an end.

That is why I feel that if we cannot extend help to South Vietnam, we should not prevent others from giving them help. It is a question whether we can do it. If we can do it, let us do it. If we cannot do it, let us not talk about it. That is all that I wish to say.

**Shri Khadilkar:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, it so happened that I was just reading James Ruston's report in the *New York Times* wherein he has put it that the first casualty in every shooting war is common sense and the second is open and free discussion. I thought that those friends from the Swatantra party who are not in the war would show some common sense at least and maintain the freedom of discussion, because this is a democracy.

What is happening in South Vietnam today is of much concern to us. Our policy unfortunately is daily growing more and more anaemic and passive, because the results of the present conflict in South Vietnam will ultimately decide the fate of the south-east Asian countries. In such a situation, if we take a very narrow view of things and are guided by considerations of certain alignments in the world conflicts, as my young friend who just now argued, then, it will ultimately have an adverse effect on us as well.

About what is happening in South Vietnam today, even in America, there are two opinions. Walter Lippman the well known correspondent and columnist, has expressed very categorically that there is no possibility of any military solution in South

Vietnam and that the only solution is a political solution. Even now, I was reading in the *New Statesman* an American report. There, there is a clear cleavage; on the one side, there is a certain military section egging on for war and on the other side a little mature section in the administration having second thoughts regarding the situation in South Vietnam. Do you know, Sir, that in South Vietnam, every day, a very authoritative document says, America is spending a million and a half dollars? (*Interruption*). A lot of American troops are pinned down there. This war is fought, as I said, in the name of democracy. Man who know better have come to the conclusion that in South-east Asia two forces are struggling: one is communism and the other is the local nationalism. But it is the imperial powers, the super-powers, in the world who are penetrating there under the pretext of giving protection; they are the greatest enemies to stability and national freedom in South-east Asia. It must be clearly understood.

**An hon. Member:** What about China?

**Shri Khadilkar:** I am coming to that. You must understand better; please have a little more reading about political affairs. (*Interruption*). China: the question is, how to contain China? Can you do it by the SEATO type of alliance and by sending military equipment and American jets to North Vietnam to crush it?

**An hon. Member:** We can.

**Shri Khadilkar:** It is foolish adventure and American mature opinion does not also advocate it. There is a volume of opinion that new forces since the last world war settlement have come up and one of the forces is China. There are other new nations. Unless the western big powers are prepared to recognise and come to terms, I do not think there is any possibility of any settlement

in South Vietnam, and ultimately the Americans will meet their fate; I am predicting it, because the Americans themselves are predicting it; fate is awaiting them, as they have suffered after the Chinese came to the Yalu river and McCarthur was disgraced in the Korean war. They are facing that phase today.

As I said, our Government today is taking an attitude which is most passive. I am surprised; whatever our quarrel with China, are we going to give a latitude for a foreign power, however big and however friendly, to penetrate in this area and establish its hegemony? That is the question and India, as a self-respecting independent republic, must keep in mind that question. Therefore, my suggestion is this. It is not a question of any meeting. There was a suggestion that Kosygin and Johnson should meet, but that suggestion was dropped next day; a statement was issued stating that a Geneva-type conference should be convened, but there is now no more thought about it; there is no further action. Ne Win was here. I would like to know what he said about his country's attitude to south-east Asia and particularly to Vietnam. The French Prime Minister was here. I know what he said in other countries. But what did he tell the Government of India? He did not approve entirely our attitude, though he supported a Geneva type of conference.

What I feel is, now the time has come when India should not look passively on and advise or say *Mantras* of peace. An active lead is called for. Call for a Far-eastern Conference including China, America, Soviet Union, India and Japan and if such a conference is visualised and active lead is taken, then alone perhaps peace could be restored and a political solution of the South Vietnamese situation or crisis could be in sight. When I say this, it is helping the Americans to get out of the ditch into which they have fallen just now in South Vietnam. You know in

South Vietnam, every morning you find a new Government, and a latest one has come up even this morning. The new Government would also like to have a political settlement. So, even the South Vietnamese are really tired of war. They want peace and if you are going to impose war, today if not tomorrow, certainly events will happen in a few days' time when there will be a revolt in South Vietnam against the foreign intervention. That eventuality is there. If we are to avoid the US disaster in South Vietnam, firstly, we as an Asian power, in our own right, must have a sphere of influence in south-east Asia and all these regions, keeping in the background whatever has happened regarding the Chinese conflicts with us. That conflict will be resolved one day. What Shri Jayaprakash Narayan said in the Sapru House is that you do not visualise China as a permanent enemy; that posture would be wrong and India should not take up that posture, and Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is no lover of communism.

I would just plead that the time has come when India should take the lead in south-east Asia in this struggle. If the local struggling national forces are given full freedom, I am certain in their own right they would be creating a bulwark against the expansion of China. No American arms can stop that expansion. In such a situation, I would appeal in this way. Two things are called for: firstly, the world situation has altered completely; there is no possibility of any conference deciding anything. Europe is divided. In Africa, new nations have come up. In south-east Asia, there is a conflagration. In such a situation, India should recognise the new forces that have come up. At Teheran, Stalin and Roosevelt thought of the world and some spheres of influence were decided upon. These spheres of influence and the established order of the world based on that view are not going to last long, because there is a new challenge. It is not simply the chal-

[Shri Khadilkar]

lence of the atom bomb of China. It is the challenge of the new forces that have come up. Recognise these forces; come to terms with them and accommodate them. Then alone India would be able to play her role.

Secondly, Japan is coming up. Canvass opinion in the world for a peaceful settlement and take a leading part in the calling of a conference for Far-East settlement. After Tehran, such a conference would bring about peace in South-East Asia, and strengthen democracy in these countries. Assure the South-East Asian people, who are agitated, that in their struggle for freedom, India, the Indian people and the Indian Parliament stand by them.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya):** Sir, I do not agree with the view that there is conflict between nationalism and communism in South-East Asia. Two forces are in operation on the stage of international politics. China represents the centrifugal forces. Russia and America on the other hand represent the centripetal forces. China stands for the transformation of the bipolar world into a multipolar world. Russia and America on the other hand stand for the transformation of the bipolar world into one world.

The recent bombing of North Vietnam by America is the first step that has been taken for the purpose of liquidating the threat of Chinese expansionism in South-East Asia in general and in South Vietnam in particular. If a war breaks out between China and America, the result would be the division of China into two spheres of influence, Russian and American. A war between China and America can never lead to the outbreak of a thermo-nuclear world war. The establishment of the thermo-nuclear stalemate, the emergence of China as a nuclear power, the growing possibility of all States becoming nuclear powers in the near future and the threat of the establishment of

Chinese hegemony over the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands rule out the possibility of the outbreak of a war between Russia and America.

The Geneva conference can lead either to the establishment of a Sino-American *entente* or to the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet Pact or to the coming together of Russia, China and America or to the withdrawal of both Russia and America from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands. India would have to join the Soviet bloc if a Sino-American *entente* is established. India would be divided into two spheres of influence—Chinese and Russian—if the Sino-Soviet Pact is Resurrected. India would be divided into three spheres of influence—Chinese, Russian and American—if Russia, China and America come together. India would be divided into two spheres of influence—Chinese and Pan Islamic, if both Russia and America withdraw from South-East Asia.

**Mr. Chairman:** I request the hon. Member to confine himself to the resolution before the House. The other things he can put forward at the time of the budget discussion.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I am arguing within the limits of the resolution. These are the consequences that are bound to follow if the Geneva conference is held.

The condition precedent to the transformation of the bipolar world into one world, i.e., the achievement of the goal of world disarmament, is the division of China into two spheres of influence, Russian and American.

The objective of the Geneva conference on the other hand is the break-up of the bipolar world into a multipolar one. The concept of the Geneva conference is the antithesis of the concept of Russo-American *entente*. A meeting of President Johnson and Mr. Kosygin on the Yalta pattern should be held to solve the problems

of the Afro-Asian Sector of the Rim-lands in general and of South-East Asia in particular.

श्रीः बड़े : (खारगोन) : माननीय सभा-पति महोदय, चाइना के लिए जो यह रिजोल्यूशन रानेन सेन साहब लाए तो उस पर मुझे कोई आश्चर्य नहीं हुआ। लेकिन श्री खाडिलकर ने जो अपने भाषण में कहा उससे मुझे धक्का लगा कि ये किधर जा रहे हैं। हिन्दी में एक कहावत है कि :

घर में नहीं दाने और अम्मा चली भुंजाने एक अम्मा दाने भुंजाने जा रही थी। लोगों ने उससे पूछा कि तेरे घर में तो दाने नहीं हैं, तू भुंजाने क्या जा रही है। वही बात मैं खाडिलकर साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि तुम पर तो चीन ने हमला किया था, तुम उसकी मदद क्यों करना चाहते हो। मुझे लगता है कि वे आधे शाणे हैं। पेशवा के साढ़े तीन शाणे होते थे। जो कलम बहादुर और तलवार बहादुर दोनों होता था उसको पूरा शाणा कहा जाता जाता था, पर जो केवल कलम बहादुर होता था उसको आधा शाणा कहा जाता था।

मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि शत्रु का शत्रु अपना मित्र है। वही बात कौटिल्य ने अपने अर्थ शास्त्र में कही है। यदि आज अमरीका चीन का शत्रु है, तो हमें उसको अपना मित्र म.नना चाहिए तभी हमको फायदा होगा अन्यथा नहीं।

इस समय वियतनाम में दो पाड़े लड़ रहे हैं और जो कम्पाउंड है वह नष्ट हो रहा है। एक तरफ चीन है दूसरी तरफ अमरीका है। अब चीन इंडियन ओशन में आना चाहता है इधर से वह इंडिया को एनसरकिल करना चाहता है। उसने पाकिस्तान को मित्र बना लिया है, बर्मा में भी उसका प्रभाव है, लंका को भी उसने अपने पाकेट में रखा हुआ है, अब वह इंडियन ओशन में आना चाहता है। इसलिए अमरीका ने उसको रोका है क्योंकि अमरीका जानता है कि इधर अग्र चीन

बड़ा तो वह इंडियन ओशन में आ जाएगा क्योंकि वियतनाम इंडियन ओशन का दरवाजा है। इसी लिए अमरीका ने हमला कर दिया है। वे होशियार लोग हैं व्यर्थ में अपनी शक्ति नष्ट नहीं करेंगे।

आप देखें कि यह रिजोल्यूशन इस वक्त क्यों आता है। इसका कारण यह है कि चीन थक गया है। रूस उसकी मदद करेगा या नहीं इसमें शंका है। और चीन विश्व युद्ध में घुसना नहीं चाहता। इसी लिए हिन्दुस्तान में यह प्रस्ताव लाया जा रहा है और जेनेवा कानफरेंस की बात कही जा रही है और खाडिलकर साहब का भाषण हो रहा है। इस सब का कारण यही है कि चीन थक गया है और उसको मदद करने के लिए यह किया जा रहा है।

इस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान को पैसिव नहीं ऐक्टिव होना चाहिए। खाडिलकर साहब कहते हैं कि हमारा शासन ऐक्टिव नहीं पैसिव है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि इस समय जब कि चीन अमरीका से भिड़ा हुआ है तो हम लड़ाख में अपनी सेना भेजें या नेफा में अपनी सेना भेजें या लाहाखियों को भड़कावें और इस प्रकार दोनों ओर से चाइना को पिसर में लें। मेरा तो विचार है कि इस वक्त हमको चीन की मदद की बात भी नहीं सोचनी चाहिए। चीन ने हम पर हमला किया था। हमको तो उस चीन को इस वक्त पिसर में लेना चाहिए जिसने हमारे जवानों का खून बहाया और जिसने हमारे जवानों की माताओं की गोदियां खाली कीं। इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करना तो देशद्रोह के समान है। उनका समर्थन नहीं करना चाहिए। जाहिर है कि देश-द्रोही आदमी ही चीन का समर्थन करते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इंडोनेशिया और वियतनाम यह इंडियन ओशन में आने के दरवाजे हैं और आज अमरीका वहां पर अग्र चीन को रोक रहा है तो वह हमारे लिए स्वागत की चीज होनी चाहिए और हमें उसको रोकने

[श्रं वड़े]

दना चाहिए नहीं तो चीन इंडियन प्रोशन में आ जाएगा और इस तरह से इंडिया को दूर सकल कर लेगा। इस वक्त जैसी परिस्थिति है उसमें हमें अमरीका को चीन को रोकने देना चाहिए। हमें जो भी चीन का शत्रु हो उसे अपना मित्र समझना चाहिये। चूंकि चीन का शत्रु इस समय अमरीका है इस वास्ते अमरीका हमारा मित्र है। राजनीति का यह तकाजा है कि हम इस वक्त चुप बैठें, बाकी जैसी भी परिस्थिति आयेगी उसके अनुसार हम अपने को एडजस्ट कर लेंगे और देशहित की खातिर जरूरत पड़ने पर अपनी पालिसी में चेंज भी कर सकते हैं। आज की परिस्थिति ऐसी है कि चीन को जैसे भी हो आइसोलेट करके कमजोर किया जाय क्योंकि इस तरह से उसके दिक हो जाने पर हम अपनी खोई हुई जमीन वापस लेने के लिए उस से निबट सकते हैं। इसलिए इस समय हमें कोई भी इधर या उधर की तरफ जाने का कदम नहीं उठाना चाहिए लेकिन यह जरूर कहना चाहिए कि वहां से अमरीका और चीन दोनों ही चले जायें और विएटनाम को खुला रखें।

सभापति महोदय, हमारे देश में एक बीमारी पैदा हो गई है और यहां पर वह लैफटिस्ट और राइटिस्ट चाइना की बात पैदा हो गई है। कांग्रेस में धीरे धीरे ऐसे आदमी घुस रहे हैं जो कि चीन का समर्थन करते हैं और देश में इस तरह से चाइना लौबी का निर्माण हो गया है। अब पता नहीं इस अजगर रूपी चीन ने कितने व्यक्ति अपने पेट में निगल लिये होंगे? चीन सारे एशिया पर अपना प्रभुत्व और इम्पायर उमाना चाहता है और वह कहां तक बढ़ सकता है भगवान जाने। इस वास्ते इस समय अमरीका जो उसको इंडियन प्रोशन में आने से रोक रहा है वह हमारे हित में ही है। हमें उसको रोकने देना चाहिए और हमें उसमें कोई

हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहिए। इसलिए यह जो प्रस्ताव लाया गया है मैं उसका जोरदार विरोध करता हूं। अगर कुछ कहना ही हो तो बस यही कहा जाय कि दोनों ही, चीन व रूस वहां से निकल। बाकी जो वहां पर अमरीका और चीन के बीच लड़ाई चल रही है न तो हमें उसका समर्थन करना चाहिए और न ही उसका विरोध करना चाहिए। दोनों पाड़े लड़ रहे हैं, अच्छा है उन्हें लड़ने दिया जाय। इस तरह दोनों व क हो जायेंगे। चीन तो व क हो ही जायगा और यह हमारे हित में ही होगा। यह भी पालिटिक्स है कि यदि शत्रु वीक होता है तो अपनी ताकत बढ़ती है और इसलिए अगर शत्रु आज अमरीका द्वारा मारा जा रहा है तो उसे मरने दीजिये और इधर अपनी ताकत बढ़ाते चलिये। इन्हीं सब कारणों से मैं यह जो प्रस्ताव लाया गया है उसका विरोध करता हूं।

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Sir, I am surprised to find this resolution is being discussed on the floor of this House. If this resolution had been discussed in the Parliament of North Vietnam or in the Parliament of Indonesia there would have been some justification for it. But I do not think that there is any justification for discussing a resolution of this type in the Indian Parliament.

I would like to give my reasons for it. In the first place, India is committed to the policy of non-alignment, and when you believe in the policy of non-alignment you cannot say that the Americans are to blame here and some other powers are to blame there. I think we have to keep ourselves away from these involvements in those troubles and we should try to keep away from them. It is our policy that cautions us to do so.

In the second place, I do feel for the people of Vietnam, whether they belong to North Vietnam or South Vietnam. I think they are undergoing a great deal of suffering.

though I believe that the sufferings of the people of South Vietnam are much greater than the suffering of the people of North Vietnam. But it cannot be denied that if America has gone to North Vietnam, America has its reasons to do so, though I do not justify altogether their bombing. The American fleet was attacked, the American army had been attacked. It is a retaliatory action, though I do not approve of any retaliatory action. But the fact of the matter is this that if America has taken any reprisals it is a kind of counter offensive, and though I do not approve either of what North Vietnam has done or South Vietnam has done, I think it would be very dangerous for us to take sides either on the side of North Vietnam or on the side of South Vietnam.

Again, to say that America is the enemy of peace and freedom anywhere is a travesty of fact. There are only two colonial powers at this time in the whole of this world, whatever anybody may say. One is the colonial power of Portuguese against which we fought and the other is the colonial power of China against which we are fighting. I may tell you that the colonial power of China is like an elephant while the colonial power of Portugal was like a small cat. It is a very big, huge, mammoth power and we are out to fight it.

From where are we getting the help or aid for fighting this colossus, this imperial colonial power to whose head has gone the newly acquired power? We are fighting with the help of the United Kingdom, we are fighting with the help of U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. And, to blame those persons who are helping you and to play the game of that person who is against you, I think, is neither commonsense, nor politics, nor expediency, nor statesmanship.

Therefore, I think that the only thing which India can do is this. India should beware of the power of China. Mr. Chairman, I have got a paper here. I wish Shri Khadiilkar was here. He would have liked me to quote from this paper. I am quoting from the

*New Statesman* dated 12th February, 1965, and not from what Walter Lippman has written. I do not want to read the whole of it as my time is limited. What this paper writes I want our Foreign Ministry to pay heed to. What he writes is this. He says that China first wants to swallow Vietnam, after that it will be the turn of Thailand, then it will be the turn of Laos, then Cambodia will be snuffed out, then Malaysia will be attacked from the north, then it will come to the eastern flanks of Burma and then to the plains of India. I do not want to read the whole article. I wish my friends to read this article. But I do want the people of India to heed one sentence which has been written here which is this:

"The road to New Delhi lies through Saigon".

I would like to impress upon my people that they should watch their own frontiers. They should watch the developments which are taking place. They should also take the warning of the *New Statesman* which says that what happens to Saigon is going to have a great deal of effect on us. It is China which is at the back of all this war. It is China which is doing all this mischief. Nobody can deny it. Therefore, I would say that the matter of North Vietnam and South Vietnam should be taken to the Security Council. There it should be discussed, whether the Vietcong who are fighting a guerilla's war, fighting the South Vietnamese people are under the influence of North Vietnam or China or they are a self-sufficient, self-reliant and self-contained body. I think that is the only solution to this problem. There cannot be any Geneva-type conference because even if you call such a summit conference, China would not come to that conference, and if China does not come to that conference it would be meaningless. Therefore, what India can do is to try to expose the tactics of China, which is keeping alive its fight in North Viet Nam, in South Viet Nam,

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

in Indonesia and other places. This question should be taken to the Security Council and in that India should take the lead. So that, even if the war is not stopped, people know the truth, the bare truth, the honest truth about the involvement of China in the whole struggle which is going on in South Viet Nam. To talk about U.S.A. or U.K. is besides the context. I think the only context in which we can talk about the war is the context of China which is indirectly and directly promoting this kind of warfare.

**Mr. Chairman:** I want to call the hon. Minister at 4.35 p.m. I have got only five minutes at my disposal.

**Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana):** Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the time you have given me. The second world war ended in a bi-polar world. In the U.N.O. there were five powers, Russia, U.S.A., U.K., France and China. China was mere formality and France was mere courtesy; U.K. was in the pocket of U.S.A. and against this was Russia. If these five powers had been allowed to rule the world, in their own ways, war would have been the inevitable result. The third world war would have been the inevitable result of historical forces. For the last two thousand years, wherever the world was divided into two, two rigid polar forces, war was the inevitable result.

The third world war was avoided by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru with his non-alignment and co-existence. If for the last fifteen years the world has been at peace, it is all due to this great man, if it could be due to an individual in the modern world. Because of him India rose to its present position and has become a great power. It is simply a damn lie to say that at any time Russia, America or China could over-run the plains of India. It is simply impossible. There is such a thing as reactive nationalism which will see to it that no power in the world can crush us, disgrace us or demoralise us. It is an impossibility. It is a modern truth that the American forces, however great, cannot defeat China on its mainland. China, how-

ever great in population, however rigid in its political structure, cannot fight us on the mainland of India. Similarly, U.K. cannot fight Tibetans on the plateau. These are the three great historical truths or facts. So, it is no use saying that China will do this or that; China can do nothing, so far as the independence of India is concerned. It is one thing to fight on the Himalayan crevices, it is another thing to fight a great country on its plains. Our people are organised, our people are determined to guard their freedom. That is the position of India today. India is a great power and it will not submit to any outside power, however great that power may be.

At the same time, I will say another thing. While India was growing into a power, there arose another fourth power, and that is China. The Chinese were lying prostrate for centuries. Then they rose, consolidated and became a great power.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** What is our number? Four and a half?

**Shri K. C. Sharma:** We are a great power. We have to be proud of our race and country. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru pleaded for its recognition and for its membership of the U.N.O. If it would have been accepted, there would have been no invasion against India. A huge country, squeezed into a tight corner, cannot but run amuck. So, the solution lies in that China should be recognised, that it should be a member of the U.N.O. If we are worth anything, we should mobilise our forces. I plead for the conscription; I plead for the most modern armaments; I plead for the Rationalisation of our industries. It is not time to say: let things go as they go. It is time to create things in every form of our activity, be it war, be it military, be it industry, be it agriculture. It is time for forcing our people to rise. And we are a great power and we will rise. Nobody, be it China, be it America, can bring it to submission. That is an impossible thing. With

China in U.N.O., India risen to power and prestige, Vietnam will be left to solve its own problem.

**Shri Dinesh Singh:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I must first of all apologise to you for not being here . . .

श्री यशपाल सिंह (हरियाणा) : कभी कभी अपनी भाषा भी बोल लीजिए । कभी कभी अपनी जुबान भी याद कर लीजिए ।

**Mr. Chairman:** Let us not insist upon that.

**An hon. Member:** He is speaking on foreign affairs.

**Shri Dinesh Singh:** . . . . . when the debate started.

Sir, the House is rightly exercised over the situation in Indo-China. We are aware that the situation is grave—very grave, in fact—and we can all only hope that the situation will improve because otherwise, if it escalates into any kind of greater conflict, it may involve us all into a war whose limits we cannot yet fully fathom.

Dr. Ranen Sen, in his opening remarks, gave some background of the Geneva Conference which brought about a solution to the war that was going on in Vietnam. The Geneva Agreement of 1954 envisaged consultations, in 1955, between the authorities of North Vietnam and South Vietnam, leading to a nation-wide elections in 1956. Unfortunately, this has not been possible with the result that we have not been able to move any nearer the unification which was the main aim of the Geneva Conference.

Now, from time to time, there have been disagreements between the two parties there and matters have been referred to the International Control Commission. We have always tried in the Commission and India particularly has made an effort to see that we give as clear an indication as possible of what is happening there without taking any sides.

Dr. Ranen Sen had again mentioned the question of our special report on

this subject. It is true that both sides had complained to the Commission about the infringement of the Geneva Agreement and we had in our report made it quite clear that there had been infringement on both sides. In fact, Commission had gone into the details of the charges made and had said that the military support that South Vietnam is receiving from the United States is of such a substantial nature that it basically alters the position there and Commission also gave our views on certain points brought to our notice by South Vietnam where there had been infringement on the Geneva Agreement by North Vietnam. Now, the situation had been going on in this manner for over 10 years. From time to time it became worse; from time to time it receded into the background, but by and large there has always been this conflict.

This conflict has suddenly come to the forefront again with what happened around 7th February, leading subsequently to the bombings by the American planes of certain areas in North Viet Nam. As the House is aware, Government made a statement on the 8th February on this subject, and if I may read a small portion from it, it is said there that:

“For the sake of peace in Asia and the world, a war in Viet Nam must be avoided.”

It went on to say:

“The Government of India consider that as the first step there should be an immediate suspension of all provocative action in South Viet Nam as well as in North Viet Nam by all sides involved in the Viet Nam situation, and nothing should be done to aggravate the situation.”

**Shri Bade:** Suspension of action by both?

**Shri Dinesh Singh:** Yes, of course. How can you have only one side in a conflict?

**Shri Bade:** That is what our friend wants.

**Shri Dinesh Singh:** So, we had made this clear statement.

Then, on the same day, that is, on the 8th February, the Prime Minister, speaking at a function, appealed to both President Johnson and Prime Minister Kosygin. If I may again quote from what the Prime Minister had said, he had appealed to both of them 'to do all they can to ensure that peace is not disturbed'. Here, again, we took a positive action in this matter.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan):** We understand that the President of the U.S.A. has sent a recent message to our Prime Minister. Has it got any reference to Viet Nam?

**Shri Dinesh Singh:** I shall deal with it later.

**16.42 hrs.**

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Then, the question did not rest here. We informed our Missions in the countries that are concerned with the situation in Viet Nam to take up with the respective Governments to which they are accredited and to bring to their notice the serious situation that was developing in this area and also to request them to use every influence they have to try to stop the fighting there and to see that it did not escalate any further.

We had also suggested that perhaps the solution lay in having a conference in which all the countries that had been represented in the Geneva Conference in 1962 could take part, so that we could discuss this matter in all its entirety and find a peaceful solution.

I am happy to say that we have received the support of a large number of countries in our proposal to convene a Geneva type conference on the 1962 pattern. There has been to some

extent a certain lessening of tension in this respect, and although the conflict goes on, there is no serious event that has taken place in the last few days. Then, again, the Foreign Minister had made a statement to this House on the 19th February, and here again, if I may quote from what he had said,

"We consider that as a first step there should be an immediate suspension of all provocative actions in Viet Nam by all sides involved in this situation and that nothing should be done to aggravate the situation. What is necessary is for the principal Powers concerned to get together in search for a peaceful solution for the Viet Nam problem."

So, the House will see that we have not only made statements here and in Parliament but that we had also taken positive steps in the capitals of the interested countries to see that a peaceful solution was found to this very difficult problem.

Some hon. Members had raised the question of our discussions with Gen. Ne Win and the French Prime Minister. Of course, when they were here, we took the opportunity to discuss this matter with them and we found that we were, by and large, in agreement with them also; they also felt that there should be an effort at a political solution to this problem.

Shri Khadilkar in his speech referred to a larger Asian conference instead of the Geneva type conference that we have had. If I may refer him to the Geneva conference he will notice that the 1962 Geneva conference on Laos was already an enlargement of the Geneva Conference of 1954. We have been talking about the Geneva conference of 1962 which will take into account all the interested countries. If a few more countries wish to come, we could consider it at that time. The point is that we do not want that the matter should be delayed. If we were to take up the general question of invitation to countries, it may lead to certain conflicts and difficulties which might delay the issue. Our effort is

to have a conference as soon as possible so that the situation is brought under control and that there is no further deterioration. But if a few more countries who might be interested in this wish to come, we could certainly consider that issue at that time.

Another hon. Member had referred to the question of bringing this before the Security Council. As you know, all the members who were present at the Geneva conference are not represented in the Security Council, not even in the U.N. As such, to take up this matter before the Security Council may not be as fruitful as having a Geneva type conference where all of them will be directly represented.

During the debate, the general question of China was brought in in regard to Vietnam. We are fully aware of the Chinese danger, of the desire of China to expand, in South East Asia, in South Asia and in other parts of the world. Chinese expansion, to our mind, cannot be contained by limited military action. It is something we shall have to meet by political solutions; there can be no purely military solutions to these problems.

Therefore, we shall have to consider this in a larger issue. To leave China and U.S.A. to fight it out in Vietnam is not a solution. It is perhaps easy to say, 'the two giants are fighting. Why should we get in the way?' Do they realise that when giants fight, may be some flies will be squeezed in between? May be in this fight, it may go out of control and the whole world may get involved in it. Therefore, it is our duty as a peace-loving country to take interest in this matter, to try to find a peaceful solution. It is our hope that a Geneva type conference will be possible and that we shall be able to meet to find a peaceful solution.

I may add that the resolution that Dr. Ranen Sen has brought before the House is really largely met by the action we have taken. I do not know whether he would still wish to press it. But may I read from a statement

the Foreign Minister had made in the other place yesterday and which hon. Members may have seen in the newspapers? He had said:

"As an Asian country of this region, we can only view the serious developments in Vietnam with grave concern. We would like to see the people of Vietnam enjoy their freedom and independence without any interference from outside from any quarter whatsoever. We hope that all powers who are interested in the freedom and independence of Vietnam will make sincere efforts to find a political solution in Vietnam and will arrest the present situation, which is a danger to world peace, from deteriorating any further. To this end, the parties concerned should get together in a conference and try to solve the problem peacefully".

I hope this will be possible.

**Dr. Ranen Sen:** The only point I want to make is this, that our Government is trying to have a peaceful solution of this conflict that is going on, but while doing so it should not put on a par the South Vietnamese people and the American Government.

I have read the International Control Commission's report also, and by and large this can be said that the Geneva Agreement has been violated by South Vietnam, though it is also true that there was violation of some of the provisions by North Vietnam, but they came much later. I have got the 1956 and later reports also. Therefore, I want to emphasise that the people of South Vietnam are trying to fight against the American occupation. So, they should not be dealt with on a par. When the Algerians were fighting for freedom, our Government sympathised with them. They should do the same here.

However, after hearing Shri Dinesh Singh and speech of Shri Swaran Singh yesterday, I think there has been a little improvement in the

[Dr. Ranen Sen]

position of the Government of India than taken a few days earlier. Therefore, I do not press the resolution, and I withdraw it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw the resolution?

**Hon. Members:** Yes.

*The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.*

16.53 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: UPLIFT OF  
SCHEDULED CASTES

श्री बाल्मीकी (खुर्जा) :

मा भ्राता भ्रातरं द्विषन् मा स्वसारमुता  
स्वसा ।

सम्यञ्चः सव्रता भूत्वा वाचं वदत  
भद्रया ॥

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब हमारे देश का मस्तिष्क बाहरी और भीतरी समस्याओं से चिन्तित है, दबा हुआ है, ऐसे समय में एक चिन्ता और जो मेरे इस संकल्प के विषय में है, वह भी मैं आपके सामने रखूँ तो कोई झूठा नहीं लगता है। यह बात आवश्यक है कि सारे संसार में प्रेम और सद्भावना उत्पन्न हो। इस लिये इस अर्थात् वेद के मंत्र में आदेश दिया गया है कि 'भाई भाई में द्वेष न हो, बहन बहन में किसी प्रकार की घृणा न हो और सब एक मत हो कर, एक व्रति होकर समान दृष्टि से मीठे वचन बोलें'। लेकिन संसार में या देश के अन्दर सत्तापूर्ण लिप्सा बढ़ती हुई दिखाई देती है, चाहे वह देशों की हो चाहे वह यहां मानवों की हो। ऐसे समय में जब कि देश के अन्दर भाषायी भेद उभरे हों, भाषायी झगड़े उभरे हों, जो कुछ भी इधर हुआ है वह आपके सामने है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : पहले आप अपना संकल्प सदन के सामने रख दीजिये।

श्री बाल्मीकी : मेरा जो संकल्प है वह इस प्रकार है :

“इस सभा की यह राय है कि तीन पंच वर्षीय योजनाओं के बाद भी अनुसूचित जातियों के सामाजिक, आर्थिक तथा शैक्षिक विकास के कार्य में कोई उल्लेखनीय प्रगति नहीं हुई है और, इस लिये, यह सभा भारत सरकार से आग्रह करती है कि वह इस सम्बन्ध में अब तक हुई प्रगति का मूल्यांकन करने और अनुसूचित जातियों के कल्याण, विशेषकर सरकारी नौकरियों में उन के लिये पदोन्नतियों तथा स्थान रक्षित करने, भूमि दिये जाने, आदि सम्बन्धी उपायों का सुझाव देने के लिए एक उच्च शक्ति प्राप्त आयोग नियुक्त करे।”

मैं अपने इस संकल्प को पेश करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। यह बात अवश्य है कि जब हम अपनी दशा का जिक्र इस सदन में करते हैं तो आज भी हमें अस्पृश्यता की जो विभीषिका है देश के अन्दर उस और जाना होगा। यह बात ठीक है कि अस्पृश्यता निवारण का जो कार्य है वह एक मानवीय कार्य है, लेकिन जिस गति से वह हमारे इस देश के अन्दर चल रहा है उस से हम अभी सन्तुष्ट नहीं हैं। आज भी आप देखें कि जो चीजें और जिस प्रकार के जुल्म और सितम हमारे लोगों पर हो रहे हैं उस के पीछे एक ही कारण है अस्पृश्यता का। यह ठीक है कि इस के लिये सरकारी आधार पर और दूसरे तरीके से प्रयत्न चलते हैं, लेकिन उन प्रयत्नों में कोई जीवन या कोई उस प्रकार की प्रगति नहीं