

recommendations contained in the Twentieth, Twenty-second and Twenty-eighth Reports of the Department-Related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Information and Technology.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Report of the Justice Mukherjee Commission of enquiry regarding alleged disappearance of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री कलराज मिश्र) : 17 मई, 2006 को सभा पटल पर रखे गए नेताजी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस के कथित रूप से गायब होने से संबंधित न्यायमूर्ति मुखर्जी जांच आयोग के प्रतिवेदन पर अब डा. वरुण मुखर्जी चर्चा आरंभ करेंगे।

DR. BARUN MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Hon. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you that after a long wait; this very important issue has been taken up for discussion. Sir, we are at the critical juncture of a momentous decision making process, the outcome of which will have a great impact on our history of freedom movement. If this decision is biased and motivated the truth will be buried and history will be distorted. The future generation will not forgive us for that. It is exactly the same that is happening today in respect of the Report of Justice Mukherjee Commission of Enquiry regarding the alleged disappearance of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose.

After more than five years of laborious inquiry in India and abroad, critically examining hundreds of witnesses and deponents and minutely scrutinising a large number of files and documents, Justice Mukherjee, has come to some startling conclusions like:

1. Netaji did not die in the plane crash, as alleged; and
2. The ashes in the Renkoji Temple of Japan were not of Netaji's.

Unfortunately, the Congress led Government is still inclined to stick to its earlier preconceived biased stand and has summarily rejected the aforesaid findings of the Mukherjee Commission without assigning any reason therefor. It appears, whether an attempt is being made to hide the truth.

I may cite another glaring example in this respect. Only yesterday i.e., 23rd August, I received a written answer from the hon. Home Minister in response to my question:

Whether Government are providing any maintenance allowance or other financial assistance to the Renkoji Temple in Japan where the so-called ashes of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose are kept;

If so, from which date or year this allowance is being paid and what amount of money is paid per month or year; and

What is the total amount of money paid so far?

Sir, the hon. Minister did not deny this financial assistance. But, simply replied, 'Facts are being ascertained.' Such a reply, Sir, is a shocking surprise to me. In view of this, let us try to ascertain some facts. As it is known to all, Justice Mukherjee Commission of Inquiry is the third one. The first inquiry Committee was set up in 1956, under the Chairmanship of Shah Nawaz Khan, when Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister. People could not accept the Japanese and British Report of Netaji's alleged death in a plane crash at Taihoku on 18th August, 1945. Hence, immediately, after Independence, people started demanding an inquiry to know what exactly happened to their most respectable leader, Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, after his mysterious disappearance in August, 1945. When the then Government was not agreeing to respond to the people's demand, people themselves took initiative to form a non-official Inquiry Committee, headed by the famous international jurist, Dr. Radha Vinod Pal. In view of this public move and pressure, the Government, at last, constituted an Inquiry Committee under the Chairmanship of Shah Nawaz Khan, after nine years of Independence. This Shah Nawaz Committee of 1956 hurriedly completed the inquiry and submitted its Report that Netaji had died in the alleged plane crash. But the third member of this Committee, Suresh Chandra Bose, elder brother of Subhas Chandra Bose, submitted his dissenting note saying that there was no such plane crash. But the Government accepted the majority view of Netaji's alleged death.

Obviously, the public reaction was critical against the Shah Nawaz Committee Report, highlighting its many discrepancies. Hence, there was a demand for another inquiry which the Government conceded to after a long 14 years. At that time, the Government was also headed by Congress with Indira Gandhi as Prime Minister. The very fact that the same Congress

Government constituted the second inquiry Commission, headed by Justice Khosla in 1970. ...Clearly indicated that the Government was convinced of the discrepancies of the first Committee, which was negated by the formation of the second enquiry commission. The Khosla Commission submitted its report in 1974 with the same findings that Netaji died in the alleged plane crash. This report was, again, challenged by many experts, knowledgeable men with valid arguments and facts. This opposing version was collaborated by no less a person than Late Shri Morarji Desai, the then Prime Minister of India. He made a statement on the Floor of Parliament on August 28, 1978, "Reasonable doubts have been cast and the correctness of the conclusion reached on the two report on various important contradictions in the testimony of witnesses have been noticed. Some further contemporary official documentary records have also become available; in the light of those doubts and contradictions and those records the Government finds it difficult that earlier conclusions are decisive."

A question has been raised by the hon. Home Minister in his reply to the Lok Sabha on 7th August, 2006, "Why had the then Prime Minister, Morarji Desai, not constituted another inquiry which he could have done without difficulty"? It should be remembered in this respect that Morarji Desai had to leave his office shortly after his aforesaid statement. Perhaps, he did not get enough time to constitute another inquiry commission. Nevertheless, peoples' demand for fresh inquiry to find out the truth continued unabated. Meanwhile, two other relevant incidents strengthened the peoples' demand. Firstly, the Calcutta High Court directed the Government of India for a vigorous inquiry in accordance with law, if necessary, by appointing a Commission of Inquiry for the purpose of bringing an end to this controversy. Secondly, a Motion was adopted on 24th December, 1998 by the West Bengal Legislative Assembly wherein a demand had been made for a fresh inquiry into the matter to remove the mystery regarding the whereabouts of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose.

Moreover, the then Central Government was of the opinion that it was necessary to appoint a Commission of Inquiry for the purpose of making an in-depth inquiry into a definite matter of public importance, namely, the disappearance of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose in 1945.

In the backdrop of all these facts, incidents and public findings, the one-man Justice Mukherjee Commission of Inquiry was appointed on May

14, 1999. The NDA Government was then at the Centre. Thereafter, Justice Mukherjee Commission, after an exhaustive inquiry, submitted its report on 8th November, 2005 with some startling new findings, as stated before.

While reacting to this Report, consisting of a total number of 671 pages in three volumes, the Government have simply, in one sentence, stated in their 'Action Taken Report' (ATR), "Have not agreed with the findings that -- (a) Netaji did not die in the plane crash; and (b) the ashes in the Renkoji Temple were not of Netaji."

But, Sir, why? Why have the Government grossly rejected the Commission's findings without assigning any reasons or arguments in support of their action? Is it the rational way of exploring historical facts of great national interest? I am sorry to say that this shows the Government's casual approach to the issue, their predetermined, biased attitude, along with their utter neglect, lack of interest and disrespect for the great son of India, whom Gandhiji once acclaimed as 'the patriot of patriots'. Apparently, it seems that the Government is not prepared to accept the fact that the decades long myth of Netaji's death in plane crash, which the Congress and its Government have so long maintained with motherly affection, has now been exploded. The hon. Minister of Home Affairs has said in his recent reply on August 7, 2006 in the Lok Sabha, "In matters of such inquiries, the oral evidence given by the witnesses, and, more so, the eye witnesses, is equally more reliable than any documentary evidence." But, Sir, is it a rational approach? If we go through the proceedings of the Commission, we will find a lot of oral evidences where the deponents have or are reported to have said many fantastic stories like 'Netaji is spending his days here and there secretly, roaming as a *sadhu* in hilly areas, seen as an Army Officer in China', and so on. Are we to believe all these stories? In contrast to this, Justice Mukherjee took the position of rejecting all such hearsays and beliefs without having any supporting documents. Circumstantial evidence was more important. In this respect, we may refer to pages 47-48 of Volume I of Justice Mukherjee Commission's Report where he dealt with statements given by hon. Shri Pranab Mukherjee, Shri K. Natwar Singh and Dr. Yashimi who treated Netaji for his injuries. Justice Mukherjee explained that their statements were only based on beliefs and two earlier inquiry reports etc., whereas the doctor's statement had many contradictions. (*Time-bell*). Sir, I am raising this issue as a ...(*Interruptions*)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री कलराज मिश्र) : इसीलिए ज्यादा समय दिया है। 15 मिनट से ज्यादा हो गए हैं।

DR. BARUN MUKHERJEE: Sir, a little more time may be granted. But, on the other hand, Justice Mukherjee, in search of documents, has discovered one pertinent fact which disproves the myth of plane crash. The fact is this that the Government of Taiwan and the Taipei City Government admitted before the Chairman of the Commission that they had no document as proof of the fact that there was any plane accident at the mentioned time.

Justice Mukherjee Commission further stated in its Report, Volume I, Page 53, that "Shri Tarakeswar Pal, the learned senior counsel, appearing for the Government of India, fairly submitted that there were glaring discrepancies in the adduced evidence regarding the accident as also the date and time of death, news of death, death certificate and cremation of Netaji." We may quote further from the Mukherjee Commission's Report, Volume I, Pages 59-60, "From the records made available to this Commission, it is seen that after August 23, 1945 when the news of Netaji's death was broadcast, and prior to the appointment of the Shah Nawaz Committee by the Government of India on April 5, 1956, quite a number of inquiries were held at the behest of the British and the American intelligence authorities to ascertain the truth.

Reports of those inquiries indicate that they based their findings relying solely upon the oral testimony of some witnesses without caring to search for the relevant records of Taihoku Airport, the Army Hospital, Taipei Municipal Bureau of Health and Hygiene and Taipei City Crematorium to test the veracity of their assertion, and, in case no such record was found, to incorporate that fact in their respective reports."

Question has been raised by hon. Shri Shivraj Patilji - "Enough time was available for it, that is Mukherjee Commission, to get the necessary documents. Nearly more than four years were at its disposal. Why were the documents not got from the previous Government?" True, adequate documents were not available from the NDA Government, neither those were available from the UPA Government, after 2004. If we carefully go through the Mukherjee Commission's Report, we will find enough evidence as to how the Commission was denied many, many important files and documents as were asked for. It was reported, either they were destroyed or not available.

Sir, I would like to say a few more words about hon. Shivraj Patilji's reply dated 7th August, 2006, in the Lok Sabha. We are sorry to note that he has referred to Netaji's famous INA, the Indian National Army, as his 'Force of Independence' which is not correct

Secondly, he has raised the question whether we are respecting Netaji by keeping this dispute alive, or, whether we are disrespecting other great leaders. This is not a matter of respecting or disrespecting. The basic idea is to search the truth following the path of history. If we fail to do that, the new generation will not forgive us. Were we not interested to know how the last end of Sri Chaitanya came? Did we not have the interest to know the last days of Sri Sankaracharyaji? It is natural, and it is logical to search the truth. It is not logical to maintain that the so-called ashes kept at Renkoji temple in Japan are of Netaji, when that has not been proved. Who knows whether those pieces of burnt bones were of an animal or others?

The famous film director, Shri Shyam Benegal is sitting here. He made his remarkable film, "Bose - the forgotten hero", in which he has not included this so-called plane crash. I would appeal to the good sense of the hon. Members of the Congress Party and the UPA Government to assess once more with an unbiased mind this great issue of national importance and accept the much-awaited logical findings of the Mukherjee Commission. If the Government fails to do it, I am afraid, the people will be inclined to believe that the Congress party has not yet come out of the chapter of their old traditional opposition to Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, as was evident during the thirties of the last Century, particularly, during the Tripuri Congress episode of 1939. Merely by putting statues and portraits in the Parliament or elsewhere will not do the needful. It is necessary to pay all due respect to this great son and revolutionary leader of the country in proper historical perspective.

I am thankful that Shri Shivraj Patilji has acknowledged Netaji Subhash as the pioneer of national planning in India, mention of which was not made in Nehruji's 'Discovery of India'. Incidentally, inquiry should be made as to why and how the book on "Planning & Subhash Chandra" by Madhu Dandavate, Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission was suddenly withdrawn from the market. In conclusion, we demand that :

- (i) the ATR of the Government, be scrapped;
- (ii) Mukherjee Commission findings be accepted;
- (iii) the Japanese Government be immediately informed that the Government of India has nothing to do with the so-called ashes of

Netaji kept at the Renkoji Temple; and (iv) all financial assistance to Renkoji Temple be stopped immediately.

For ascertaining what happened to Netaji since his disappearance in August 1945, we are prepared to accept the recommendation of the Mukherjee Commission that "the Central Government can proceed on the basis that he is dead but did not die in the plane crash, as alleged."

We would like to know it for the sake of truth and history, which are, obviously having a lot of political significance.

But, at the same time, we clearly say that Netaji's selfless sacrifice and patriotism, his ideals and political philosophy, his struggle against imperialism, his ceaseless fight for the freedom of the country, his novel idea of socialistic reconstruction of the country are still very important and relevant for the country. That is why, we urge upon the people to "Rebuild India in Netaji's way". Thank you, Sir.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL): We would like to know, in what fashion, we can respect Subhash Chandra Boseji's memory. If whatever we have done is not sufficient, we would also like to know from the hon. Members what else is required to be done.

DR. BARUN MUKHERJEE: We request you to at least accept this historical truth. With a free and open mind, once more, you can go into all the records of the Mukherjee Commission's findings: There was no plane crash and the question of his death in a plane crash does not arise, and the ashes kept at Renkoji Temple were not of Netaji. For the sake of history, for the sake of next generation, we should accept it. Sir, it will not go against you. ...*(Interruptions)*... But due to absence of many of the documents, it is true that the Mukherjee Commission could not say what happened to him afterwards. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: It is your view that we are not respecting Subhash Chandra Bose's memory. ...*(Interruptions)*...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसमाध्यक्ष जी, मैं आपका बहुत आभारी हूँ कि आपने इस महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर मुझे अपने विचार रखने का समय दिया है। सबसे पहले मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि यह एक महत्वपूर्ण विषय है, इसके लिए समय-सीमा बहुत कम निर्धारित की गई है और इसमें यह आग्रह नहीं होना चाहिए कि कोई बात रखने से छूट जाए। मेरी दृष्टि से यह केवल कोई राजनैतिक प्रश्न नहीं है, बल्कि यह देश के इतिहास से संबंधित, देश की स्वाधीनता के इतिहास से संबंधित प्रश्न है और देश के इतिहास में कोई किसी तरह का अंतराल न रहे, गैप न रहे, इसकी दृष्टि से महत्वपूर्ण है। श्री वरुण जी ने जो बताया, उसमें से बहुत सी

बातों को मैं दोहाऊंगा नहीं, लेकिन यह सच है कि 1978 में तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री श्री मोरार जी देसाई ने, उस समय मैं भी संसद में सदस्य था, यह बात स्वीकार की थी कि इन दोनों, शाहनवाज कमेटी और जस्टिस खोसला कमीशन के बाद कुछ ऐसे तथ्य सामने आए हैं, जिनके आधार पर यह मानना उचित नहीं लगता कि नेताजी का देहांत किसी प्लेन क्रेश में हुआ। जहाँ तक मुझे याद पड़ता है, उनका इस प्रकार कहना था - "Shri Morarji Desai, the then Prime Minister of India, during the course of his reply to the discussion on August 28, 1978, had stated that while the majority report of the Shahnawaz Committee and the Khosla Commission had held the report of Netaji's death as true, but, in view of the reasonable doubts being cast on the correctness of the conclusions of the two reports and because various important contradictions in the testimony of witnesses were found and some further contemporary official documentary records have become available, the Government found it difficult to accept that the earlier conclusions were decisive. Thus, doubts on the veracity of these two reports existed, according to me, even in 1978". गृह मंत्री जी, हम यह चाहेंगे कि ये डाक्यूमेंट्स कहीं न कहीं सरकार के प्रदर्शन में होंगे।

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Why did you not yourself give those documents?...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: That is not the question. क्वेश्चन यह है कि वे हैं या नहीं। हमारी सरकार ने दिए या नहीं दिए, आप ने दिए या नहीं दिए, उससे क्या फर्क पड़ता है।

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Two or three years were available to you. If they were...*(Interruption)*...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : आप यह कहना चाहते हैं कि वे नहीं हैं।

SHRI SHIVRAJ PATIL: If they were available, they should have been given.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : आप स्पष्ट कहिए कि वे नहीं हैं।

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, we were asking for the number of the files and the nature of documents; but nothing was given. They themselves were not in a position to give those documents. They could not do that in two years' time, and they are asking us, 'why you didn't do it'?

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : मैंने यह नहीं कहा कि 'why did you not do it?' मैंने तो कहा कि वे होने चाहिए। मैंने बहुत साफ बात कही है कि वे होने चाहिए और वे कहाँ हैं। अगर मान लीजिए हमारी सरकार ने नहीं दिए, मगर वे डाक्यूमेंट्स हैं। प्रधान मंत्री श्री

मोरारजी भाई ने वक्तव्य दिया है, सदन में वक्तव्य दिया है, कहीं बाहर प्रेस कांफ्रेंस में नहीं दिया है। तो कुछ न कुछ चीज जरूर होगी और जहां तक मैं समझता हूं, वह चीज कहीं न कहीं अवश्य होगी, जो कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को पढ़ने से पता लगता है कि एक मंत्रालय से दूसरे मंत्रालय में, फिर तीसरे मंत्रालय में गए और कुछ डाक्यूमेंट्स के बारे में रिपोर्ट कहती है कि उनको बतलाया गया कि ये उपलब्ध नहीं हैं, डेस्ट्रॉय हो गए हैं। कब डेस्ट्रॉय हुए? किसके आदेश से डेस्ट्रॉय हुए? श्रीमती गांधी के जमाने में डेस्ट्रॉय हुए, उसके बाद हुए, मोरारजी भाई के जमाने में हुए, कब हुए? सवाल यह है कि अगर वे डेस्ट्रॉय हो गए हैं तो कोई तो रिकार्ड होना चाहिए। किसके आदेश से डेस्ट्रॉय हुए हैं, वह तो होना चाहिए।

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Why did you not do it?

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : इसीलिए मेरा कहना है कि इस बात की गंभीरता से जांच होनी चाहिए कि वे डाक्यूमेंट्स जो इतने महत्वपूर्ण थे, जिनके आधार पर 1978 में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा, वे अगर आज उपलब्ध नहीं हैं तो उसके बारे में कोई निर्णय होना चाहिए। प्रश्न यह नहीं है कि किस सरकार ने किया या किस ने नहीं किया। अगर किसी सरकार ने कुछ समझकर उनको डेस्ट्रॉय किया तो कुछ आदेश होंगे कि इनको हमें डेस्ट्रॉय करना है। वे आदेश आप कमीशन को दिखा दें, बात खत्म हो जाती है। अगर वे आदेश भी नहीं है तो फिर यह देखना पड़ेगा कि वे कागज़ कहां गए?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, we don't want the country to be misled. I am asking, was the Commission in a position to tell us what kind of documents Shri Morarji Desai was referring to? Could he give us the numbers? Could he give us the name of the document?

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: How could he give that?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: He did not. And, you expect us to find out that document about which no information has been given! If they were available, you could have done that.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : सम्माननीय गृह मंत्री जी, कमीशन को क्या पता।

DR. BARUN MUKHERJEE: There are many references in the report. It has taken so much time. ...*(Interruptions)*...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री कलराज मिश्र) : गृह मंत्री जी, आप जब उत्तर देंगे तो अपना विस्तृत उत्तर दे दीजिएगा।

श्री शिवराज वी० पाटिल : यह बार-बार जो बोला जा रहा है तो इससे पूरी कंट्री मिसलीड होती है।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : कुछ फाइलों के नम्बर भी कमीशन ने दिए थे, वे भी नहीं मिल रहे होंगे।

श्री शिवराज वी० पाटिल : कुछ नहीं, इस बात को मैं पूछ रहा हूं।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : सर, इस बारे में कमीशन को क्या पता होगा, क्योंकि मोरारजी भाई ने ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री कलराज मिश्र): डा० साहब, यह बात हो गई, अब आगे बढ़ें।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : इसको गंभीरता से लीजिए। मोरारजी भाई ने किसी आधार पर कहा होगा।

श्री शिवराज वी० पाटिल : हमें क्या मालूम।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : हमें भी क्या मालूम। यही तो जांच करनी है, इस जांच में आपको सहयोग करना चाहिए। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि इसको गहराई से देखना चाहिए क्योंकि यह केवल इसी कमीशन के सामने ही नहीं, बल्कि जिस डिस्सेंट रिपोर्ट का इन्होंने जिक्र किया है, उसमें भी यह बात आई है नेता जी के संबंध में कि उनका देहांत उस एयर क्रैश में हुआ, सुरेश बोस विस्वास नहीं करते थे, जो डाकूमेंट्स उनके सामने थे, उनके बेसिस पर।

और मुझे बहुत अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि सरकार ने इस डिसेंशिएंट रिपोर्ट को नहीं छपवाया था, तब भी नहीं छपवाया था और आज भी नहीं छपवाते हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि अगर आप इसे छपवा देंगे तो इससे लोगों को एक बहुत ही ऐतिहासिक जानकारी मिलेगी, क्योंकि उन्होंने यह कहा है कि नेता जी इस एअर क्रैश में नहीं मरे। उन्होंने जिन राधा विनोद पाल का उल्लेख किया, उन राधा विनोद पाल का पत्र इस डिसेंशिएंट रिपोर्ट में रखा हुआ है, जिसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि

"In any case, I feel that the whole thing demands a thorough investigation. Statements by individuals made here and there will not convince me as to the truth of the story given out. I have reasons to doubt its correctness."

यह मोरार जी से उन्होंने पहले भी कहा है और उनका यह जो पत्र है, यह फरवरी 1953 का है। इसका अर्थ यह है कि उस समय भी रीज़नेबल डाउट्स थे कि शाहनवाज कमेटी के द्वारा यह जो बात कही जा रही है, सत्य नहीं है। इस पुस्तक में उन्होंने बहुत स्पष्ट रूप से यह उल्लेख किया है, अगर आप इसके पृष्ठ 5, 6 एवं 7 को देखेंगे कि नेता जी का मानस क्या था और 1944 के नवम्बर में वह क्या सोच रहे थे -

"Netaji foresaw that the Japanese nation would have to surrender and that was only a question of time as the main object of his life was to continue his struggle for the liberation of India and as he could not do the same in those countries in the East where he was then working as they would come under the occupation of the victorious British and American Forces, and as for the same purpose and for the same reason, he could not continue his work also in Japan. He considered Russia to be a convenient and suitable country for his next future activity."

अगर आप नेता जी की बाकी तमाम गतिविधियों को देखेंगे, उन्होंने रूस से संबंध यह स्थापित किया था, पहले भी वह रूस जा चुके थे और उस समय की तमाम ऐतिहासिक चीजों को देखने से यह पता लगता है, साथ ही इस डिसेंशिअंट रिपोर्ट से यह पता लगता है कि उनकी यह मान्यता थी और वह इस बात को जानते थे कि अगर जापान हार जाएगा, जैसी कि परिस्थिति आ रही थी, तो नेता जी का क्या होगा, उन्हें कहां जाना होगा। अगर वह उसी क्षेत्र में रहेंगे और वहां पर ही सरेंडर होगा तो वॉर क्रिमिनल होने के नाते निश्चित रूप से उनके साथ जो कुछ होना होगा, वह होगा, इसलिए उन्होंने सोचा कि किसी ऐसे स्थान पर जाना चाहिए जिसके खिलाफ उनकी लड़ाई नहीं थी। वे लोग रशिया से नहीं लड़ रहे थे, उनके साथ उनके पुराने संबंध भी थे, इसलिए उनके दिमाग में एक बात थी कि वह रूस जाएं, ऐसा इस डिसेंशिअंट रिपोर्ट में लिखा है। उस समय की तत्कालीन एवं अन्य बहुत सी पुस्तकें हैं, उनमें भी ऐसा ही लिखा है। यह एक Hugh Toye की पुस्तक "Subhash Chandra Bose - The Springing Tiger" है, इसके अध्ययन से भी यह पता लगता है कि नेता जी का रूस के साथ क्या संबंध था। इसी घटना के बाद पेज 143 पर यह बताते हुए वह कहते हैं कि

"Before he left Tokyo, Bose asked to be allowed to approach Soviet Russia. He believed that the alliance between Russia and the West would not outlast the war in Europe. He had already lectured INA officers on this and that Russia might, therefore, be willing to sponsor him next."

इस तरह से यह जो सारे तथ्य सामने आ रहे हैं और जो तथ्य मौजूद हैं, यह इस कमिशन से पहले भी थे और यह इस बात को इंडिकेट करते हैं कि अगर नेता जी का लक्ष्य, जैसी वहां की परिस्थिति बन रही थी, उसमें हार का आधा तो उनका अगला मोर्चा रूस से लगेगा। कोई भी ऐसा व्यक्ति जो देश की आजादी के लिए लड़ रहा है और आखिर तक लड़ना चाहता है, वह कभी भी इस तरह से सरेंडर नहीं करेगा, जिसमें उसको मर जाना पड़े और उसका सारा जो आन्दोलन है, सारा संघर्ष है, रैवोल्यूशन है, वह सब समाप्त हो जाए। इसलिए वह सब बातों को सोच कर रखते थे, वह बुद्धिमान व्यक्ति थे, देश के बड़े नेता थे। एक बात यह समझ में आती है कि नेता जी का देहांत अगर उस दुर्घटना में नहीं हुआ तो फिर वह कहां-कहां पर जा सकते हैं। उस दुर्घटना में उनका देहांत नहीं हुआ, इस बात के बहुत बड़े प्रमाण आपकी इस रिपोर्ट से मिलते हैं। पहली बात तो यह है कि 18 अगस्त 1945 को उस स्थान पर कोई भी एअर क्रेश ही नहीं हुआ। जो रिपोर्ट इस बात को साफ-साफ कहती है, मैं उसे उद्धृत कर सकता हूं। जिस व्यक्ति को नेता जी ने नाम पर दफनाया गया या जिसका क्रिनेशन हुआ, वह आर्मी का एक सिपाही था और यह बात इससे बिल्कुल स्पष्ट है। केवल यही नहीं यह बात हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को भी मालूम थी। ब्रिटिश कॉन्सुलेट TamSui Formosa ने 10 जुलाई, 1956 को लंदन में अपने फॉरेन ऑफिस को लिखा है ...।

"Dear Department - जिन्होंने अपने फॉरेन ऑफिस को लंदन में लिखा है - Reference my telegram 76 of June 27, 1956, to you about Subhas Chandra Bose. We enclose herewith a translated copy of a self-explanatory letter from the Governor of Formosa, dated the 4th July, together with a police report on Bose's death and cremation. Also a copy of the extract in the

cremation register in respect of Ichiro Okara, believed to have been the name used for Subhas Chandra Bose. It will be seen that most of the witnesses the Indian authorities requested us to obtain evidence from have either died, disappeared, or nothing, etc., etc. We have also certified, Governor seal and signature, six copies of the translation of the letter, report and cremation certificate together with two copies, in the original Chinese, have been forwarded to Chancellery at New Delhi for transmission to the Indian authorities if you see no objection."

और यह कॉपी हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को मिली और उस समय खोसला कमीशन काम कर रहा था। अब आप यह देखें, इसमें बहुत साफ यह कहते हैं कि यह जो सज्जन गए हैं उनका नाम Formosan language में उसको लिया और कहा कि यह जो सज्जन हैं इसका नाम है Ichiro Okara और उसकी पूरी डिटेल इस रिपोर्ट के अंदर मौजूद है। वे साफ-साफ कहते हैं कि यह आदमी जो मरा और उसका जो क्रिमेशन का सर्टिफिकेट है उस सब की डिटेल इसके अंदर मौजूद है, मैं वह खोजकर आपको दे सकता हूँ, उसकी कोई दिक्कत नहीं है। वे कहते हैं कि Taipei City Health and Hygiene Bureau certificate है:- "Certification of Death: Date of death - 21st August, 1945". Not 18th August, 1945. Seal of the Doctor, etc. "Name - Okara Ichiro ('Okara' literally means, I was told, big warehouse of food, and 'Ichiro' means eldest son). Sex - male. Birth - borne in 33rd year, April 9th (In Japanese language, it was Ming, etc., etc. Occupation - Taiwan Gunshilepu Dikugun Shoktaku. He was the obedient officer of the Taiwan Military Government. Cause of Death - suicide, poison, by sickness, killed or natural death. Nature of sickness - heart attack. Time of sickness - 17th August, 1945. Time of death - August 19th, 4 p.m."

और यह जो उन्होंने एक पूरी लिस्ट दी है कि कौन एक्सिडेंट कब हुआ, वह भी बड़ी इंटरेस्टिंग लिस्ट है जिसमें उस तारीख को किसी एक्सिडेंट का जिक्र ही नहीं है। वे कहते हैं कि उस दिन तो कोई एयरक्रैश हुआ ही नहीं। जिन सज्जन का लिखा गया है यह भी इस रिपोर्ट के पेज -294 पर है, in the Municipality for Cremation, Sl.No.2641 और वही Name of disease - heart failure वही नाम, Date of death - 19th. Date of Permission - 21st. Date of cremation - 22nd. और यहां भी जो लिस्ट उन्होंने दी है On this date, that is, between 21st and 22nd जब उन्होंने क्रिमेशन दी है, तब केवल एक आर्मी पर्सोनल उस दिन क्रिमेट हुआ है and that was he. इसके पहले जो 19th और 21st की डेट है उसमें तो एक आर्मी पर्सोनल भी क्रिमेट नहीं हुआ और उसके पहले भी केवल एक क्रिमेट हुआ है वह 17th से पहले का है। तो 18 अगस्त, 1945 को कोई एविडेंस नहीं है कि जो इस बात को बताए कि वहां कोई एयरक्रैश हुआ था और उसमें नेता जी का देहांत हो गया। एविडेंस यह कही जाती है और बार-बार यह कहा जा रहा है कि सबसे पहले तो मुझे यह कहना होगा कि मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ कि जब मैं सारी बातों को देख रहा था कि तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने जबकि शाहनवाज कमेटी चल रही है, लेकिन उन्होंने एक

जजमेंट दे दिया कि "death of Netaji is a settled fact". उस पर अब कोई बहस नहीं हो सकती। तो यह एक बात सामने आई कि यह कैसे उनको पता लग गया, जबकि कमेटी तो काम कर रही है, उसके काम करने के दौरान उन्होंने कह दिया। शाहनवाज खान उस समय कांग्रेस के सदस्य थे, सांसद भी रहे हैं। इसलिए यह एक बात सामने आई कि शुरु से यह बात लोगों के दिमाग में डाली गई कि नेता जी का देहांत 18 अगस्त, 1945 को हो गया और यह settled fact है और इस पर बहस करने की जरूरत नहीं है। फिर कमेटी की जो रिपोर्ट आई, उसके बारे में सुरेश बोस, जो उस कमेटी के सदस्य थे, वह नेता जी के नियरेस्ट संबंधी थे, उन्होंने बहुत संदेह पैदा किए, राधा विनोद पाल जी ने संदेह पैदा किए। मुझे खोसला साहब के बारे में कुछ कहना नहीं है। जैसे ही वह उस रिपोर्ट से खाली हुए, वह श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की बायोग्राफी लिखने में मशगूल हो गए। ये कुछ ऐसी चीजें लगती हैं, वह न फारमूसा जाने के लिए तैयार हुए और न अन्य चीजों के लिए तैयार हुए। वहां भी प्रो० समर गुहा की वजह से कुछ चीजों की जानकारी मिली, उसमें उनका कोई वह भी नहीं था और वह वहां बात भी नहीं करना चाहते थे। जो कुछ इतिहास से पता लगता है, डाक्युमेंट्स से पता लगता है, जो एविडेंसज सामने आई हैं, उनसे पता लगता है। वह भी इसी जल्दी में थे कि किसी तरह से इसको कह दो कि नेताजी का देहांत हो गया। मोरारजी ने उसके बाद फिर संदेह पैदा किया और अब इस कमीशन ने तो बहुत साफ-साफ यह कहा है कि नेताजी का देहांत वहां नहीं हुआ, इसका कोई एविडेंस नहीं मिलता है। अब फिर से संदेह पैदा हो जाता है, एक कमेटी और एक कमीशन ने पहले मना किया है, फिर संदेह पैदा हुआ और अब जो कमीशन है इसने साफ-साफ कहा है कि नेताजी का देहांत नहीं हुआ, इसलिए यह एक उलझन वाली बात आ गई है। अगर उस दिन नेता जी का एयर क्रेश हुआ ही नहीं, नेताजी का देहांत हुआ ही नहीं, तो नेताजी कहां गये? अगर देहांत नहीं हुआ, तो रांकोजी टैम्पल में ashes किसकी रखी हुई हैं, वह वहां कब आई? यह कहा जाता है कि श्री हबीबुर्रहमान साहब ने इस बात को चश्मदीद गवाह के तौर पर कहा कि वे उनके साथ थे और उनका देहांत हुआ और वह जहाज जल गया और उसमें वह मर गये, मेरे भी कुछ हाथ जल गये। इस का भी कमीशन ने बहुत स्पष्ट रूप से विश्लेषण किया है। कौन सा जहाज था, किसने जहाज दिलाया? जापानियों ने उनको जहाज दिलाया, इसके पूरे एविडेंस हैं कि वह पूरे तौर पर नया जहाज था। अगर आप सारे तथ्यों को देखेंगे, तो पायेंगे कि नेताजी ने कभी अपने लोगों को यह नहीं बताया कि उनका असली उद्देश्य कहां जाने का था? मैं समझ सकता हूं, अगर उनको रूस जाना था, तो वह अपने किसी भी व्यक्ति को ऐसा नहीं बता सकते थे या कहीं और भी जाना था कि मैं कहां जा रहा हूं। जो नेताजी का स्वभाव है, उसको देखना चाहिए। जब वह हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर गए, तब भी उन्होंने एक नाटक किया था, अन्धथा वह बाहर नहीं जा सकते थे। इस मामले में भी हमको समझना चाहिए कि एक मिलिट्री पर्सनल, एक इतना बड़ा संघर्ष करने वाला व्यक्ति, वह लोगों की आंखों में धूल झाँक सकता है ताकि यह पता नहीं चले कि मैं कहां जा रहा हूं? He can conceal his real destination और वह उन्होंने किया। हबीबुर्रहमान या और एक दो व्यक्ति उनके अत्यंत विश्वस्त सहयोगी थे और ऐसे मामलों में, जब फौज के मामले होते हैं, जो व्यक्ति शपथ लेता है, तो वह पूर्ण रॉयल्टी की शपथ लेता है और जिन कंडीशन्स में, जिन परिस्थितियों में ये लोग नेताजी के साथ थे, मैं ऐसा मानता हूं कि वे नेताजी के आदेशों का ही पालन कर रहे थे और हबीबुर्रहमान जैसा व्यक्ति जो अंत तक उनके साथ था, किसी भी कीमत पर, At no cost, even at pain of death, वह कभी यह नहीं बताता, जो कुछ नेताजी ने उसे न बताने के लिए कहा हो। मैं सारे रेवोल्युशनरीज की प्रवृत्ति को

9.00 P.M.

जानता हूँ कि उसमें क्या होता है? इसलिए हबीबुर्रहमान का यह कहना कि नेताजी का उसमें देहांत हो गया, यह अंग्रेजों की आंख में धूल झाँकने के लिए था। इसको सत्य नहीं मानना चाहिए कि जो वह कह रहा था कि एकधुअली उनकी डैथ हुई थी, क्योंकि हमने यह देखा है कि इसी ऐवीडेंस में और बहुत सी चीजें हमारे सामने आई हैं कि जिनसे यह पता लगता है, इसी के वॉल्यूम वन में पेज 98 में और पेज 84 में, Point No. 4.11.1: Attention has been drawn to the minute of a meeting of India and Burma Committee of British Cabinet, presided over by the Prime Minister Attlee on October 25, 1945. The relevant part of which, reads as under:

Treatment of Indian Civilians renegades: It was generally agreed that the only civilian renegade of importance was Subhas Chandra Bose. This is October 25, 1945, after several months of the so-called plane crash. Then further this says: the relevant minute recorded by the British Cabinet on October 25, 1945 *vide* Transfer of Power - Volume VI, was kept reserved till discussion of all other related materials on this point. Now that it has been found on a detailed and careful analysis of the materials on record that Netaji did not die in the plane crash, it must be said that the minute reassures the above finding.

अब यह ब्रिटिश कैबिनेट बोल रही है। ब्रिटिश कैबिनेट को तो उनकी तलाश थी, जरूरत थी। अगर नेताजी का देहांत हो गया होता तो वे यह लिख देते कि नेताजी का देहांत हो गया है। इसी तरह से मैंने देखा है कि अमेरिकन्स की भी जो कॉरस्पॉण्डेंस हुई है - अमेरिकन्स इस बारे में चिंतित थे कि यहां क्या हो रहा है, भारत में नेताजी का क्या हो रहा है, उसको भी अगर गौर से देखा जाए तो उन्हें भी संदेह था कि नेताजी का देहांत उस दिन नहीं हुआ। हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि यह जो कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है, यह हमारे इन संदेहों को वाकई पुष्ट करती है कि नेताजी का देहांत वास्तव में अगस्त, 1945 में नहीं हुआ था। वह सारी रिपोर्ट भी इसको कहती है, ऐवीडेंस को अगर आप देखेंगे, वह भी अगर प्वाइंट आउट करता है। इसी प्रकार हमारे सुरेश बोस की बात देखें, वे शुरू से इस बात को कह रहे हैं। इस प्रकार यह देखने की जरूरत है कि फिर हुआ क्या? वैसे भी एक कॅन्ट्रोवर्सी आ गयी है। एक कमीशन कहता है कि देहांत हुआ, दूसरा कहता है कि नहीं हुआ - काफी विस्तार से देखने के बाद कहता है कि नहीं हुआ। अब प्रश्न यह उठेगा कि हमें करना क्या चाहिए? मुझे सबसे पहले तो यह निवेदन करना था कि उस कमीशन को और काम करने दिया जाना चाहिए था। कई कमीशंस नौ-नौ साल से काम कर रहे हैं, 12-12, 13-13 साल से काम कर रहे हैं - लिब्राहन कमीशन 13 साल से काम कर रहा है। यह कमीशन अगर साल, दो साल और ले लेता तो heavens would have not fallen. कोई कठिनाई नहीं होती। अगर उसमें दो-चार करोड़, पांच करोड़ रुपया भी खर्च हो जाता तो वह भी ऐसी कोई बड़ी बात नहीं थी क्योंकि नेताजी के बारे में सही तथ्य पता लगें, इतिहास सही दृष्टि से जाए, कोई गलतफहमी न रहने पाए, यह बहुत जरूरी था। खैर, सरकार ने अपने विवेक से इस बात का फैसला किया, मैंने तो आपसे निवेदन किया था कि..

श्री शिवराज वी.पाटील : हमने उनका टाइम कम नहीं किया। हमने उनको कहा था कि जितना टाइम चाहें, दे देंगे और मैंने आपको भी बताया था।

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : जी हां, मैंने उनसे कहा था, लेकिन आपका जो पत्र उनके पास गया, उसमें लिखा था कि नवम्बर, 2005 तक आपको रिपोर्ट दे देनी होगी

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: If you prove it, I will apologise to the House.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : मुझे यही बताया गया था। ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: But, it is not correct.

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : उसके बाद आप यह देखें कि कमीशन की रिपोर्ट इस मामले में बिल्कुल साफ ... (व्यवधान) ... है कि उनका देहांत नहीं हुआ। अब एक डेथ सर्टीफिकेट, जिसकी मैं बात कर रहा था, उसके संबंध में भी कमीशन ने बताया है कि चालीस साल के बाद किसी का डेथ सर्टीफिकेट दिया गया है। और जब उसको क्रॉस एक्जामिन किया गया तो वह उसमें ठहर नहीं सका। चालीस साल बाद कोई डॉक्टर डेथ सर्टीफिकेट दे रहा है और यह कह रहा है कि because I was asked to do it. इसलिए मैंने कर दिया। आप देख लें, उस सारी रिपोर्ट में उसके बयानात् भी हैं। यह भी जाहिर होता है कि जो डेथ सर्टीफिकेट नेताजी के नाम पर दिया गया, वह सही नहीं था और सही होना भी नहीं चाहिए था क्योंकि उनका देहांत हुआ ही नहीं था। चूंकि बहुत साल के बाद बात आ रही है इसलिए बात खुल रही है। इस प्रकार यह एक छिड़ी हमारे पास है, जो कमीशन ने इसमें कोट की है। वह मैडम खुर्रूद नैरोजी, जो दादाभाई नैरोजी की ग्रैंड डॉटर थीं, उन्होंने इस विषय पर लिखी। वे गांधी जी की एक तरह से उस समय निजी सचिव भी थीं। वह यह कहती हैं कि At heart, the Indian Army is sympathetic with the Indian National Army. If Bose comes with the help of Russia, neither Gandhi nor the Congress will be able to reason with the country. यह छिड़ी उन्होंने 22.7.46 को लिखी है, यानी उनके तत्कालीन देहांत के एक साल के बाद she is writing, "If Bose comes with the help of Russia, neither Gandhi nor the Congress will be able to reason with the country." अब इसका अर्थ है कि गांधी जी के यहां यह चर्चा जरूर होती रही होगी, जिसके आधार पर उनके मन में यह भावना थी कि नेताजी अभी जीवित हैं और उनके हिन्दुस्तान में आने की संभावना है तथा रूस की मदद से आने की संभावना हो सकती है। यह भी इस बात-को प्रमाणित करता है या कम से कम इंगित करता है कि नेताजी का रूस के साथ संबंध और उनके यहां जाने की संभावना कांग्रेस के उच्च स्तरों पर चर्चित होती थी। इसी के साथ-साथ इसमें एक और उल्लेख एक इटैलीजेंस रिपोर्ट का है, जिसको कमीशन ने यद्यपि कानूनी तौर पर स्वीकार नहीं किया लेकिन इटैलीजेंस की फाइल्स में जो रिपोर्ट है, ऐसा नहीं होता कि बिना किसी थोड़े-बहुत प्रमाण के हो - ऐसा नहीं होता है। यह ठीक है कि प्रमाण इतना हो और इटैलीजेंस थोड़ी ज्यादा बढ़ जाए या प्रमाण इतना हो और इटैलीजेंस थोड़ी कम हो जाए। आप जानते हैं इटैलीजेंस रिपोर्ट्स किस तरह से आती हैं? तो उस रिपोर्ट में इस बात का उल्लेख है कि गांधी जी ने सार्वजनिक रूप से यह कहा कि नेताजी जीवित हैं और वे भारत में आएंगे। जब उनसे पूछा गया कि यह आपको कहां से पता लगा, तो

उन्होंने कहा कि यह मेरी inner conscience कह रही है। मेरी अंतरात्मा की यह आवाज है कि वे जीवित हैं। गांधी जी की अंतरात्मा - मैं उनको आध्यात्मिक पुरुष मानता हूँ, इसलिए उनको यह अनुभव हो सकता है। कोई ज़रूरी नहीं है कि किसी बाहर वाले ने उनको यह सूचना दी, तभी उन्होंने कहा हो। गांधी जी जिस प्रकार के व्यक्ति थे, उनको यह अंदर से महसूस हो सकता था कि वे हैं और कोई न कोई, उनका जैसा सुभाष चन्द्र बोस से संबंध था, उसके आधार पर भी वे यह समझ सकते थे, लेकिन उसी रिपोर्ट में यह भी कहा गया कि कांग्रेसजनों को यह भरोसा था कि गांधी जी को यह सूचना खुद बोस ने दी है। उनके पास कोई पक्की सूचना है। केवल आध्यात्मिक अनुभव ही नहीं, बल्कि कोई पक्की सूचना है, लेकिन यह इंटेलिजेंस रिपोर्ट में लिखा है, इसका कोई corroboration तो इंटेलिजेंस रिपोर्ट वाले नहीं करते हैं, जब तक कहीं मांगा न जाए, कुछ किया न जाए। लेकिन सरकारी फाइलों में, इंटेलिजेंस रिपोर्ट्स में अगर इस बात का उल्लेख है, तो फिर यह समझने में कि नेताजी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस के 1946 तक जीवित रहने की संभावना लोगों में थी, यानी तब तक इस air crash की कहानी को किसी ने नहीं माना था। गांधी जी भी नहीं मानते थे, या उनके और साथी लोग थे - बहुत लोगों ने कहा है, राधाविनोदपाल नहीं मानते थे, और लोग नहीं मानते थे। तो यह बात तब भी थी कि यह air crash की घटना यह एक smoke screen है। मुझे भी ये सारे प्रमाण देखकर लगता है कि वास्तव में जिस तरह के नेताजी थे, उन्होंने यह एक smoke screen पैदा किया। क्यों किया? वहां जाना चाहते थे। कहां गए, इसका मेरे पास कोई सबूत नहीं है। कहां गए, यही जानना चाहते हैं। नेताजी की भारत में जिस प्रकार की प्रतिष्ठा है और आज भी जितना लोगों के मन में उनके प्रति आदर है, मैं नहीं समझता कि किसी व्यक्ति के साठ साल चले जाने के बाद, जो भारत के पटल से निरंतर बाहर रहा हो, उसके बारे में इतनी अधिक श्रद्धा, आज भारत के नौजवान में, 18-20 साल के नौजवान में, जो उनके जाने के चालीस साल बाद पैदा हुआ, उसमें मन में जो आज श्रद्धा है, जो भावना है, वह सामान्य बात नहीं है और उन सबकी, देश की यह भावना है कि भई, पता तो लगे कि हमारा एक महापुरुष, जो एक सामान्य व्यक्ति नहीं था, वह कहां है। मैं बता रहा था इसी से, जो इसकी पुस्तक है Mr. Toye वाली, कि उनकी स्थिति क्या थी। 21 अक्टूबर, 1943 का जो उनका प्रोक्लेमेशन है, उसमें उनका designation था, Subhas Chandra Bose (Head of the State, Prime Minister and Minister for War and Foreign Affairs). किसका? जो भारत की एक प्रोविजनल गवर्नमेंट आज़ाद हिंद की बनी थी। तो इस तरह से वे भारत के सर्वप्रथम प्रधान मंत्री थे, जो आज़ाद हिंद फौज की तरफ से और देश के लोगों की तरफ से बनाए गए थे। नेताजी सुभाष का केवल यही स्तर नहीं था कि वे हमारे देश के स्वतंत्रता सेनानी थे, बल्कि वे पहले व्यक्ति थे, जो इस तरह से लोगों के मन में, लोगों ने उनको बनाया था कि जो उनका designation अभी मैंने आपको पढ़कर सुनाया था - Subhas Chandra Bose (Head of the State, Prime Minister and Minister for War and Foreign Affairs) on behalf of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind. तो भारत की आज़ादी का पहला परचा और आज़ाद भारत की पहली सरकार के पहले प्रधान मंत्री, बाहर प्रवास में, exile में वे थे। यह अपने आप में भारतवासियों के लिए एक गौरव का विषय होना चाहिए कि अंग्रेजों के रहते हुए उन्होंने स्वाधीन भारत की आज़ाद सरकार को बनाने की चेष्टा की और उसे कुछ राज्यों ने, कुछ राष्ट्रों ने सहयोग दिया। तो हमें अपने देश के ऐसे व्यक्ति के whereabouts पता न चलें, वह कहां चला गया और दूसरी बात यह है कि अगर आप गौर से देखेंगे कि उनके अनेक साथियों ने जो बयान दिए, उसमें disappearance

of Netaji शब्द का प्रयोग किया गया, आप रिपोर्ट को देखेंगे, तो disappearance कहा गया, death नहीं कहा गया। इसका अर्थ है कि कुछ लोग जानते थे कि Netaji will disappear, वे गायब हो जाएंगे। वैसे तो आदमी जब मरता है, तब भी गायब हो जाता है, लेकिन, to disappear, गायब होना, इस शब्द का प्रयोग उनके साथियों द्वारा किया जाना, यह इस बात का भी सबूत है कि वे सब इस बात से सहमत थे कि नेताजी का देहांत उस 18 अगस्त, 1945 को नहीं हुआ। तो अब क्या हुआ? अगर देहांत नहीं हुआ, तो Renkoji Temple में किसकी अस्थियाँ हैं, यह सवाल उठता है। एक बार पहले भी इन अस्थियों का जिक्र हुआ था। यह है श्री मथाई का पत्र, जो उस समय प्रधानमंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के सचिव थे। यह चिट्ठी 2.12.1954 की है। इसमें वे कहते हैं -

"2.12.1954. Prime Minister Secretariat. A small amount of Rs.200 and odd was received by the Minister of External Affairs from our Embassy in Tokyo along with ashes and other remains of the late Shri Subhash Chandra Bose. This money is being kept in the External Affairs Ministry. I have consulted the Prime Minister about this and he agrees that this amount might be transferred to the INA Relief Fund. The Ministry might get in touch with the General Secretary of the AICC, 7, Jantar Mantar Road and a receipt might be obtained for the Ministry's record. Signed, M.O. Mathai. 2.12.1954."

यह चिट्ठी कमीशन के सामने आई थी। 1954 में अगर ashes ले ली गई थीं, तो वे ashes कहाँ हैं। आप सीधा सा जवाब दे देंगे कि ये तो वही हैं, जो Renkoji Temple में रखी हैं, लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब 1954 में आपने नेताजी की ashes लीं, उसके साथ सिर्फ 200 रुपया मिला, यह और भी tricking है, क्योंकि उस समय सामान्य तौर पर जो लोगों की मालुमात थीं, उसके हिसाब से नेताजी के साथ INA का काफी बड़ा धन और साधन का विवरण था, वह कहाँ गया? उसके बारे में क्या हुआ? Where has it disappeared? Just like Netaji disappeared, has that also disappeared? ये सारे तथ्य हैं, जिन्हें देश के लोग जानना चाहेंगे। जो संपत्ति उस आज़ाद हिंद सरकार की थी, वह कहाँ गई, इसके बारे में लोग जानना चाहेंगे। उसका क्या बना, क्या वह भारत में आई, क्या वह भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच में बंटी, लॉर्ड माउंटबेटन ने उसमें क्या रोल play किया, ये सारे सवाल इस संबंध में उठ रहे हैं। इसलिए मेरा आपसे अनुरोध यह है कि इस सारे प्रसंग को समाप्त नहीं समझना चाहिए और एक रिसर्च स्कॉलर्स का ग्रुप, जो रूसी भाषा को समझता हो, फरमोसा की भाषा को समझता हो, चाइनीज़ भाषा को समझता हो, जर्मन भाषा को समझता हो, इन सब लोगों का आप एक ग्रुप बनाएं। आप रिसर्च स्कॉलर्स को काम दें कि जाओ और देखो तथा archives में जो चीज़ें मिलनी चाहिए, वे उन्हें मिल सकें, इसके लिए आप व्यवस्था करें। मैंने माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी से निवेदन किया था कि आप अपने स्तर पर रूस की सरकार से निवेदन करें, अनुरोध करें, at the highest level, कि हमारे कमीशन को उन तमाम archives की सुविधाएं दिलाएं, जहां नेताजी से संबंधित कोई documents होने की संभावना है। मैं यह नहीं कह सकता कि वे रूस गए या नहीं, मेरे पास कोई प्रमाण नहीं है, लेकिन मैं इतना कह सकता हूँ कि संकेत ऐसे मिले हैं, जिनसे संदेह होता है कि वे वहीं गए होंगे, क्योंकि वहां पुरानी गतिविधियां थीं और जिस तरह से

उस समय रूस के माध्यम से, जापान वाले surrender की negotiations कर रहे थे, इन सब बातों को देखने से, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति को देखने से, नेताजी की भावी गतिविधियों को देखने से, यह संदेह पुष्ट होता है कि शायद वे वहां गए होंगे। इसकी जानकारी अगर मिल जाए कि क्या वे वहां गए थे, क्या उनका देहांत वहां हुआ या वे वहां से कहीं और गए, यह हमारे देश के इतिहास को सही दृष्टि से देखने के लिए बहुत सहायक होगा, क्योंकि नेताजी का व्यक्तित्व इतना विशाल था और उनके आने से, जैसे कि मैडम खुशीदा ने चिट्ठी लिखी है कि उनके आने पर देश में उनका जो स्वागत होगा, जिस प्रकार से वे आएंगे, तो शायद गांधीजी भी देश को समझा नहीं पाएंगे कि यह क्या हो गया। इसलिए कई बार ऐसा लगता है कि नेताजी की स्मृति लोगों के पास न रहे या कम से कम रहे या पता न लगे कि वे मर गए, खप गए, यहीं खत्म करो मामला, and he is dead. मेरा कहना है कि यह हमारे देश की दृष्टि से अच्छा नहीं है। हमें चाहिए कि इसके लिए हम सब मिलकर काम करें। हम इसमें मदद करने के लिए तैयार हैं, यदि हमारी मदद की जरूरत है, तो हम तैयार हैं। हम उन तमाम शंकाओं को समाप्त करना चाहते हैं, जो देश में इस तरह से हुई, जितने साधुओं का जिक्र किया, उनकी वजह से बहुत सी गलतफहमियां फैली हुई हैं, हालांकि कमीशन ने उन पर विचार किया है। मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि इस मामले पर जिस तरह से cursory तौर पर, सरकार ने एक लाइन में यह कह दिया कि हम इसे नहीं मानते, यह मेरी दृष्टि से एक वैज्ञानिक और तर्कपूर्ण rejection नहीं था। हां, अगर आप कमीशन की findings का जवाब यह देते कि कमीशन ने यहां गलती की है, इसलिए हम नहीं मानते, तो शायद हमारा समाधान होता, लेकिन ऐसा नहीं किया गया।

श्री शिवराज वी. पाटिल : मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि आप मेरी बात सुनेंगे, आप मेरी बात सुनने के लिए बैठेंगे।

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी : मैं इसलिए सुबह से बैठा हूँ कि आप आएँ और कहें तो, लेकिन जिस तरह की बातें आपने लोक सभा में कही हैं, वे तो समाधानकारक नहीं हैं। उनसे समाधान नहीं होता। मैं अभी कोलकाता गया था, वहाँ इस रिपोर्ट के बारे में लोगों ने चर्चा की। वहाँ समाधान नहीं है, बहुत से रिसर्च स्कालर्स का समाधान नहीं है और स्वयं मेरा, इस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को पढ़ने के बाद और कुछ और चीजें पढ़ने के बाद मुझे भी इस बारे में पूरे तौर पर यह विश्वास नहीं हो सकता और बिल्कुल भी नहीं हो सकता कि नेताजी का देहांत उस दिन हुआ था। यदि वह नहीं हुआ था, the question is open as open as it was in 1945, 1946 or even today. मेरी आपसे यह अपील होगी कि इस मामले को सत्य तक, इसके आखिरी अन्त तक पहुँचाने के लिए सरकार को योजना बनानी चाहिए। वह कैसी योजना हो, इसके बारे में आप सभी पार्टियों से भी बात कर सकते हैं, स्कालर्स से भी बात कर सकते हैं कि इसमें कैसे हम सच्चाई तक पहुँचे, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि देश का उपकार होगा और देश का इतिहास सही ढंग से लोगों के सामने जा सकेगा और नेता जी के प्रति जो हमारा कर्तव्य है, उसका एक थोड़ा सा हिस्सा हम पूरा कर सकेंगे। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): Shri Priyaranjan Dasmunsi. He is not here. Shri Virendra Bhatia.

श्री वीरेन्द्र भाटिया (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, न्यायमूर्ति मुखर्जी जॉय आयोग, जो नेताजी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस की मृत्यु के कारणों का पता लगाने के लिए नियुक्त हुआ था, उस पर हम लोग विचार कर रहे हैं, एटीआर पर भी विचार कर रहे हैं। नेताजी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस का नाम आते ही देशभक्ति और राष्ट्रभक्ति अपने आप सामने आ जाती है। नेताजी का नाम लेते ही चाहे छोटा हो, बड़ा हो, नीजवान हो, वृद्ध हो, सबकी धमनियों में गरम रक्त प्रवाहित होने लगता है और ऐसा लगता है कि देश प्रेम की भावना से हम ओत-प्रोत हो गए हैं। नेताजी आज भी इतिहास पुरुष हैं। हो सकता है कि उनकी मृत्यु हो गई हो, हो सकता है कि उनका शरीर भारतवर्ष में या कहीं भी न हो, लेकिन नेताजी ने जो छाप छोड़ी है, वह आज भी हर भारतीय के दिल और दिमाग में राज कर रही है। नेताजी के बारे में कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं कि नेताजी का व्यक्तित्व, नेताजी वह राष्ट्रभक्त थे, प्रखर राष्ट्रभक्त थे, जिसकी तुलना किसी से नहीं की जा सकती। आजादी की लड़ाई में नेताजी की भूमिका किसी भी राजनेता, किसी भी स्वतंत्रता संग्राम सेनानी से अग्रणी थी। अगर हम यह कहें कि वे अग्रणी स्वतंत्रता संग्राम सेनानी थे, तो इसमें अतिशयोक्ति नहीं होगी। अगर गांधी जी ने अहिंसा का नारा देकर देश के अन्दर ब्रिटिश सरकार के विरुद्ध युद्ध किया, तो नेताजी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस ने आजाद हिन्द फौज बना कर देश के बाहर से ब्रिटिश हुकूमत पर वार किया। अगर हम यहाँ यह कहते हैं कि गाँधी जी के अहिंसक आन्दोलन ने हमें आजादी दिलाई, वहाँ इसे कहने में हमें हिचक नहीं होनी चाहिए कि नेताजी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस ने आजाद हिन्द फौज बना कर और नारा देकर कि तुम हमें खून दो, मैं तुम्हें आजादी दूँगा, इस नारे को बुलन्द किया, उसकी भी बहुत बड़ी भूमिका इस देश की आजादी की लड़ाई में है। यह देश का दुर्भाग्य है कि आजादी के बाद नेताजी को जो इतिहास के पन्नों में या भारत में जो सम्मान मिलना चाहिए था, वह सम्मान नहीं मिला। उनकी मृत्यु के बारे में भी प्रश्नचिन्ह लगे रहे। माफी चाहते हुए लोग तो यह कहते हैं कि क्योंकि नेताजी का व्यक्तित्व इतना ऊँचा था, नेताजी की पर्सनैलिटी इतनी टॉवरिंग थी कि बाद में जो भी राजनेता बने और जो सत्ता में आए, वे लोग नेताजी के सामने बौने थे और इसलिए वे नेताजी के व्यक्तित्व से डरते थे और इसलिए उन्होंने नेताजी को उचित सम्मान नहीं दिया। क्योंकि संभावनाएं सभी को रहीं कि कहीं नेता जी जीवित वापस आ गए, कहीं नेता जी भारतवर्ष में फिर से आ गए, कहीं नेता जी देश की जनता के सामने उपस्थित हो गए तो शायद सत्ता उन से छिनकर नेता जी की लोकप्रियता के कारण नेता जी के हाथों में अपने आप चली जाएगी। इसलिए उन के व्यक्तित्व के साथ, उन के उस पक्ष के साथ न्याय नहीं किया गया और उन की जो भूमिका आजादी की लड़ाई में थी, उस को उजागर करने की पूरी तरह से कोशिश नहीं की गयी।

मुझे कहने में कोई संकोच नहीं है कि इतिहास के पन्नों में नेता जी का नाम जिस तरह से लिखा जाना चाहिए, वह इतिहास के पन्नों में नहीं लिखा गया, उन को वह due नहीं दिया गया। अभी पाटिल जी ने कहा कि बताइए, क्या होना चाहिए? महोदय, राजीव गांधी के नाम से तमाम योजनाएं बन सकती हैं, इंदिरा गांधी के नाम से तमाम योजनाएं बन सकती हैं, हर राजनेता के नाम से तमाम योजनाएं बन सकती हैं, लेकिन आप कृपया मुझे बताने का कष्ट करें कि सुभाष जी के नाम से कोई योजना आज तक बनायी गयी है जबकि सुभाष जी का व्यक्तित्व उन सब से ऊपर था? यह व्यवहार उन के साथ किया गया। यह आप ने भी किया और अहलुवालिया साहब आप भी सुन लीजिए, महोदय कहीं-न-कहीं सुभाष चन्द्र बोस को बीना बनाने की कोशिश की गयी। डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी जी ने बड़ा सम्मान व्यक्त किया, कलराज मिश्र

जी चैयर पर हैं, लखनऊ में जब आप की साझा सरकार बनी तो लखनऊ में जहां एक सुभाष चौक है, वहां सुभाष जी की मूर्ति के सामने ऐसे लोगों की मूर्तियां लगाकर सुभाष बोस को बौना बनाने की कोशिश की गयी, जिन को शायद लखनऊ के लोग जानते भी नहीं होंगे। उस सुभाष चौक का नाम परिवर्तित कर के परिवर्तन चौक रख दिया गया। आप की पार्टी के लोगों ने आवाज भी नहीं उठायी, आप भी उस में भागीदार हैं। तो सुभाष चन्द्र बोस के साथ न्याय नहीं किया गया। आज भी ए०टी०आर० की रिपोर्ट में आप कह रहे हैं कि मुखर्जी कमीशन की फाईडिंग को स्वीकार न किया जाए। मैं समझता हूँ कि आप शायद पूर्वाग्रह से प्रसित थे या आप की सरकार ने मान लिया था कि हम मुखर्जी कमीशन को कोऑपरेट नहीं करेंगे और वह फाईडिंग नहीं आने देंगे। अगर आप उन तमाम पृष्ठों को देखें तो मुखर्जी कमीशन ने खुद कहा है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा हमें सहायता नहीं मिली।

मैं एक मिनट के लिए क्षमा मांगते हुए कहना चाहूंगा, आप पृष्ठ 10-11 का अवलोकन करें। वैसे मेरी खुद ही सांस फूल रही है और मैं बहुत जल्दी समाप्त करूंगा। यह पृष्ठ 8 से शुरू है, "इस तथ्य को ध्यान में रखते हुए कि कुछ विभागों/संगठनों ने सूचित किया है कि उन के पास नेता जी या आई०एन०ए० से संबंधित कोई कागजात उपलब्ध नहीं हैं, इसलिए इस संबंध में उन के द्वारा शपथ-पत्र दायर किए जाने को लेकर कुछ भ्रम की स्थिति है। इस तथ्य को ध्यान में रखते हुए और आयोग के आदेशों व निर्देशों का सम्मान करते हुए यह मंत्रालय निम्न की ओर से शपथ-पत्र दायर कर रहा है और तदनुसार मैं" और आगे निश्चयपूर्वक यह कहता हूँ कि, "उनके कब्जे में नेता जी या आई०एन०ए० से संबंधित कोई भी फाइलें या कागज कथित रूप से मौजूद नहीं हैं।" यह हलफनामा केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा दिया गया है और इस पर पृष्ठ 10 पर आयोग की टिप्पणी है, "संबंधित फाइलों से जुड़े तथ्यों के उपरोक्त सार से स्पष्ट है कि मंत्रिमण्डल सचिवालय ने जो रुख अपनाया है, वह टाल-मटोल वाला तथा अगाध था। प्रधान मंत्री कार्यालय जिसे संक्षेप में पी०एम०ओ० कहा जाएगा के निर्देशक ने दिनांक 4 जुलाई, 2000 को अपने पत्र में स्पष्टतः यह सूचित किया कि फाइल 1972 में नष्ट कर दी गयी थी। क्योंकि मंत्रिमंडल की कार्यवाहियों के रिकॉर्ड मंत्रिमण्डल सचिवालय में स्थाई रूप से उपलब्ध रहते हैं, जहां से वे प्राप्त किए जा सकते हैं। क्योंकि ऐसा बताया गया है कि वह फाइल मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय की स्थापना के 4 वर्ष बाद नष्ट की गयी थी और चूंकि मंत्रिमण्डल कार्यवाहियों के रिकॉर्ड मंत्रिमण्डल सचिवालय में स्थाई रूप से रखे जाने होते हैं, इसलिए इन स्थितियों से जो निष्कर्ष निकाला जा सकता है वह यह कि यदि फाइल किए गए दावे के अनुसार नष्ट की जा चुकी थी तो फाइल में मौजूदा दस्तावेजों की प्रतियां मंत्रिमण्डल सचिवालय में उपलब्ध थीं और स्पष्टतः इसी कारण पी०एम०ओ० के निर्देशक ने आयोग से यह फाइल मंत्रिमण्डल सचिवालय से प्राप्त करने के लिए कहा। उपरोक्त स्थितियों को देखे जाने पर यह आयोग इस मामले को मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय के साथ और आगे उठाता, तो उसकी ऐसी कार्रवाई का पूरा औचित्य था। यदि वह मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय की जानकारी में यह बात लाता कि उपरोक्त कारणों के चलते उनके द्वारा कागजात प्रस्तुत न करने की उनकी दलील सत्यभाषी तथा शालीन थी।

उसके बाद उन्होंने पेज 11 पर कहा- इसके उत्तर में भारत के तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने 28 अगस्त, 1978 को निम्न वक्तव्य दिया था, जो जोशी जी ने पढ़ दिया, इसलिए मैं उसको फिर से पढ़ना उचित नहीं समझता। "इसके फलस्वरूप आयोग ने प्रधान मंत्री

कार्यालय, विदेश मंत्रालय, मंत्रिमंडलीय सचिवालय, गृह मंत्रालय से ऐसे सभी आदेश, समकालीन सरकारी दस्तावेज रिकॉर्ड्स, जो प्रधान मंत्री के कहे अनुसार भारत सरकार को विभक्त हो चुके थे, साथ ही उनसे ऐसी सभी संगत सरकारी टिप्पणियों को अग्रहित सत्य पेजु मेजने के लिए कहा था, जिनके आधार पर भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने संसद में वक्तव्य दिया, लेकिन यह नहीं दिया गया होगा।

इसी प्रकार उन्होंने टिप्पणी की है कि ये ऐतिहासिक दस्तावेज नष्ट कर दिए गए, जिनको आर्काइव में रखना चाहिए था, जो नेता जी सुभाष चंद्र बोस की मृत्यु से सम्बन्धित महत्वपूर्ण दस्तावेज थे, जो इतिहास के पन्नों में अंकित होते, जो आर्काइव में प्रिजर्व किए जाने चाहिए थे, उनके बारे में आज भारत सरकार कह रही है कि ये नष्ट कर दिए गए।

इसी प्रकार उन्होंने फिर टिप्पणी की है। मैं टिप्पणी पढ़ देता हूँ।
...(समय की घंटी)... "विदेश विभाग से यह कहा गया कि पी०एम० के संयुक्त सचिव ने जो इस प्रकार का रुख बनाया, उससे ऐसा पता चलता है कि उन्हें स्व० मोरारजी देसाई ने अपने कथन में जिन सरकारी दस्तावेज रिकॉर्ड का उल्लेख किया, उसके बारे में तनिक भी जानकारी नहीं थी और जरनैल सिंह ने रिकॉर्ड्स के हिस्सों में निर्णय ले कर डायरेक्ट आयोग को सौंप दिया तथा पी०एम०ओ० को उपरोक्त फाइल भेज दी। वस्तुतः उपरोक्त फाइल में ऐसा कोई दस्तावेज रिकॉर्ड नहीं है, जिन्होंने श्री मोरारजी देसाई की पूर्व समिति और आयोग के निष्कर्षों के बारे में आपत्ति उठाई हो।

इसी प्रकार उन्होंने कहा कि "विदेश मंत्रालय से जब कहा गया कि आप कुछ डॉक्यूमेंट्स रूस से प्राप्त कीजिए, तो विदेश मंत्रालय ने उसके बारे में कार्यवाई नहीं की।" यह पृष्ठ 14 पर अंकित है। मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहूँगा, मेरी सांस भी फूल रही है। "कोई और विकल्प न मिलने के कारण आयोग ने हाउस ऑफ लाइव्स के एक सदस्य लॉर्ड पीटर आर्के के साथ मुलाकात की और उनसे अनुरोध किया। वे सम्बन्धित दस्तावेज को सुलभ कराने के लिए लॉर्ड चांसलर को राजी करें।" यह प्रयास किया है। इससे सरकार की मानसिक स्थिति पता लगती है कि सरकार इस मामले को गम्भीरता से नहीं ले रही है और इसीलिए मेरा

[उपसभाध्यक्ष(श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी)पीठासीन हुए]

स्पष्ट आरोप है। मुकजी आयोग ने पृष्ठ 36 और 37 पर यह भी कहा, अगर आप देखें, कि "कभी-कभी मौखिक साक्ष्य गलत हो सकते हैं, लेकिन परिस्थिति-जन्य साक्ष्य गलत नहीं हो सकते।" और जो परिस्थिति-जन्य साक्ष्य है, उनके आधार पर यह निष्कर्ष निकाला कि "जैसा कहा जा रहा है, जापान में नेता जी मृत्यु नहीं हुई।" उसको केवल सेट असाइड कर देना, जो आपने ए०टी०आर० में कहा है कि आयोग द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई रिपोर्ट की विस्तार से जाँच की है और आयोग के निष्कर्षों से सहमत नहीं है कि नेताजी की मृत्यु विमान दुर्घटना में नहीं हुई। क्या कोई कारण है? मुकजी कमीशन की फाइंडिंग्स से आप डिफर कर रहे हैं, जिसने तमाम प्रयास, तमाम एविडेंस, ओरल एविडेंस, तमाम डॉक्यूमेंटरी एविडेंस, circumstantial documents, लेने के बाद यह निष्कर्ष निकाला कि "उनकी मृत्यु विमान दुर्घटना में नहीं हुई" और एक लाइन में बिना application of mind के, बिना reason के, आप किन आधारों पर कह रहे हैं? आपने ए०टी०आर० की रिपोर्ट में यह कह दिया कि हम उस फाइंडिंग्स को स्वीकार नहीं करते। आखिर कोई तो आधार होगा? फाइंडिंग्स को स्वीकार न करने का कोई आधार होना चाहिए। किन

आधारों पर आपने ऐसा किया? जबकि जनता के मन में-- यह सही है कि जैसा जोशी जी ने कहा कि ठीक है, आज अगर वे जीवित हैं या नहीं हैं, लेकिन ऐसे महापुरुष ऐसे ऐतिहासिक पुरुष ऐसे प्रखर राष्ट्रभक्त, ऐसे स्वतंत्रता संग्राम शिरोमणि...

और जैसा अभी कहा गया कि भारत के आजाद हिंद फौज के संस्थापक, आजादी का पहला प्रधान मंत्री अगर उनको कहें, तो गलत नहीं होगा। ऐसे व्यक्ति के बारे में आज 60 वर्ष के बाद भी जनता यह जानना चाहती है कि वास्तव में उनकी मृत्यु कहां हुई और किन परिस्थितियों में हुई? जिन परिस्थितियों का लोग कह रहे हैं कि जापान में हुई, विमान दुर्घटना में हुई, इसमें जनता यह जानना चाहती है कि किन परिस्थितियों में यह असत्य बोला जा रहा है? नेताजी की मृत्यु का समाचार किसने प्रसारित किया, गलत समाचार किसने दिया और इसके पीछे कारण क्या थे? और, इस समाचार से बाद में कौन-कौन लोग लामान्वित होने वाले थे? ये कुछ प्रश्न हैं, जो अभी भी अनुत्तरित हैं।

महोदय, आपके माध्यम से माननीय गृह मंत्री जी से मेरा आग्रह होगा कि माननीय मंत्री जी, इस विषय को अभी इस तरह से कैजुअल लेकर समाप्त नहीं किया जाना चाहिए, क्योंकि मुखर्जी कमीशन ने ही अपनी रिपोर्ट में कई जगह कहा है, अगर आप रिपोर्ट पढ़ेंगे, मैं ज्यादा नहीं पढ़ना चाहता, लेकिन उसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि अभी बहुत से प्रश्न पुनः अन्वेषण के विषय हैं। अब अगर फिर से अन्वेषण के विषय हैं, तो किसी भी प्रकार से इसकी पुनः जांच होनी चाहिए और सही स्थिति सामने आनी चाहिए।

महोदय, एक बात और मैं कहना चाहूंगा, जैसा अभी मेरे एक साथी ने कहा कि किस प्रकार हम नेताजी को सम्मान दे सकते हैं? अभी टैक्सट-बुक्स के बारे में यहाँ चर्चा चल रही थी, हम लोगों ने जब इतिहास में या इंटरमीडिएट के लिटरेचर में, साहित्य की किताबों में नेताजी के बारे में, उनके व्यक्तित्व के बारे में पढ़ा, तो गांधी जी के बारे में जो एक चैप्टर होता था, वहाँ नेताजी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस के बारे में भी पढ़ाया जाता था। यहाँ तक इसमें कहा जाता था कि गांधी जी के समकक्ष उन्हें नहीं कहा जा सकता। अगर नहीं भी कहते, तो गांधी जी से उनका योगदान किसी प्रकार से कम नहीं था, आजादी की लड़ाई में उनकी भूमिका कम नहीं थी। उस व्यक्ति के बारे में आज भी इतिहास और सोशल साइंसेस की किताबों तक में सिर्फ कैजुअल रेफरेन्स होता है। यह अत्यंत दुख का विषय है। मेरी समझ से नेताजी के व्यक्तित्व के बारे में, नेताजी के कृतित्व के बारे में, नेताजी के कार्यों के बारे में, नेताजी के जीवन के बारे में कम से कम पांचवीं कक्षा से लेकर बी.ए., एम.ए. तक एक अलग चैप्टर पढ़ाया जाना चाहिए, जिससे मालूम हो सके कि आजादी की लड़ाई में नेताजी की क्या भूमिका थी? इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, जयहिंद।

DR. CHANDAN MITRA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am really grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to speak on this. It is, of course, very regrettable that this debate on such an important subject and something that concerns the whole nation, a part of our heritage, our history, is being held at a time when very few Members, unfortunately, are present here. But, I am sure that the Home Minister, who has been listening very intently to the debate, in his reply will take into account the sentiments

that have been expressed, and are certain to be expressed here. But, it does seem to be rather sad that a debate on Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose's disappearance does not seem to elicit any serious interest in the House, although people outside the House are so eager and so passionate to know about it. I wonder if film-maker Shri Shyam Benegal, who is sitting right here, next to me, who made the film 'Bose: the a forgotten Hero,' will now think whether we have truly forgotten him. The time has indeed come, I think, for the House to express in unison that Netaji can never be forgotten, and we will do everything in our power to go to the bottom of this mystery, and solve this problem once and for all because we cannot allow such a big blank to be left in Modern India's History that where did Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose go. What happened to him? We accept that Netaji cannot be alive today. He would have been 109 years old. In normal circumstances, it is most unlikely. So, the issue is not whether he is dead or alive. The issue is, what happened to him, what happened to the great son of India who struggled so relentlessly for Indian's freedom, taking such enormous personal risks, leaving this country, going to Germany and then taking a submarine, perhaps, unprecedented in history to travel from Germany right up to Japan across the Cape of Good Hope. For a man of such enormous courage, fortitude and who could go to any length to secure India's freedom, what happened to him? Unless we find out the answer to it, I think, Sir, the nation cannot be expected to agree that the mystery is over or that Netaji's death is a settled fact. Even if his death is a settled fact, the manner of his death needs to be probed and the Government must do everything within its power to try and find out how this happened.

That is why, Sir, I am very disappointed with the ATR that was submitted by the Government on the Mukherjee Commission's Report. It is a very cursory - I think, this point has been made by all previous speakers - rejection of the report; it simply says that the Government rejects the Mukherjee Commission's conclusion that Netaji did not die in the air crash at Taihoku on August 18, 1945. Sir, this is in double negatives. The Commission says that he did not die because there was no air crash in Taihoku. The Government rejects the finding. It means, the Government is saying that Netaji indeed died in the air crash of August 18, 1945. Sir, when the Government of Taiwan, the Taiwan authorities have categorically stated that there was no air crash in Taiwan on August 18, 1945, the only air crash that happened - Mukherjee Commission's Report records it - is at some time in September in southern Taiwan. The Taihoku airport, it says, no

longer exists and it is impossible to figure out what happened there. The Taiwanese categorically stated that there was no air crash. On what basis can the Government come to the conclusion that Netaji must have died in an air crash that did not happen?

Sir, I think, this is something which the Government seriously need to answer. I would like to draw your attention and, through you, that of the Home Minister that the British Government obtained a report from the Taiwan authorities regarding Subhas Chandra Bose's so-called death. Now, the receipt of that report from the Taiwan Government was never disclosed by the Government of India. It came to India via Britain. And this is something which several Members have just now mentioned that this crucial finding, the information passed on to the Government of India in 1956, that particular file the Government of India claims has been destroyed. Sir, this is a great tragedy. I think, there should have been an inquiry by now as to what happened to that file. How did it disappear? That file and the information arrived even when the first committee was there. The Shah Nawaz Committee was instituted for conducting an inquiry. At that point of time, that information arrived. It was not passed on to the Shah Nawaz Committee and subsequently the file, it is claimed, has been destroyed. I would request the Home Minister to kindly go into this matter and find out how and why and under what circumstances was it destroyed and what was the reason for the destruction of the file. Sir, in this context, it is equally important to point out that, the Mukherjee Commission points out that the British authorities have accepted that they have information on Subhas Chandra Bose. They have said that there is a file which shall be opened in the year 2020. That is, 75 years after the disappearance of Netaji. There are various rules about classified documents. The most secret, the highly classified documents are opened only after 75 years. The British Government have said that that will be opened in 2020. It was claimed and I heard the debate in the Lok Sabha in which it was claimed that whatever letters the British have, in this regard, were passed on to India.

But, Sir, the Mukherjee Commission was asking for it, and was told this cannot be passed on and the Government gave the reason that information contained in these files if disclosed will affect relations with friendly countries. I quote again, "information contained in these files will affect relations with friendly countries." Sir, this leads to further and even more serious doubts that: Did Netaji actually succeed in his Mission to go to

Russia? All evidence suggests that Netaji took the plane and persuaded Japanese that they could at least ferry him to Manchuria from where he would proceed to Russia. Now if that happened...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Will you yield for a minute? ...*(Interruptions)*... Now, you know Japan had fought against Russia or the Soviet Union, Germany had fought a war against the Soviet Union. Why had Netaji from Germany had gone to these South East Asian countries and in collaboration with Japan? And even after this do you think he would have gone to Russia?

SHRI SHYAM BENEGAL: Sir, may I say something? The Azad Hind Government had a legation in Omsk. Omsk is in Siberia, then a part of Soviet Union. That is number one. Two, Soviet Union went to war with Japan only in the last week before Japan surrendered. Until that time - this is one thing we do not really know - whether the Azad Hind Government was actually recognised by the Soviet Union or not. But there is no question about the fact that he left Taiwan, there was no question that he headed towards that with General Shiddei who was travelling with him. The real problem here is in terms of ambiguities that when General Shiddei, he and Habibur Rahman were travelling in that aircraft, the important thing is that when at Tahihoku Airport from that plane Salli, it was not a new plane, it was a very old Japanese aircraft and one of its engines was already defective and it started for Taiwan. All that sort of thing is known, but the important thing is that when that aircraft was taking off crashed and that is what Habib's constant testimony was until he died, he never changed the testimony. You can give all kinds of values to it, but, anyhow, it is all a sort of ambiguity of different kinds. But the important thing is that you see that General Chiddai, which is not accepted by Justice Mukherjee, but he actually died in that crash. But Chiddai's family has said that he died in that crash. So, the fact is and Chiddai himself, we know, where he was going. He was going to Manchuria, for what reason, to surrender the Japanese forces to the Soviet army in Manchuria. That is what he was doing. Thank you.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, it is very interesting because Shyam Benegalji has done a lot of research and I watch his films not once but two-three times. After this discussion was fixed, I watched it with more care and with a lot of interest. There are two points which are nagging us.

One, could he go to the Soviet Union because he was with Axis and not with Alliance? That is one. Why did he not come to India after India became free? These are the two points which are nagging us. I am not saying that wrong or right. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA (Jharkhand): At the time of transfer of power, an agreement was signed between the Government of Britain and the then Government of India that these papers would be kept secret for 30 years and these people would become the criminal of wars of British, if they were caught within 30 years, then, they should be handed over to the Government of Britain. So, these papers were never disclosed.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru donned the black coat and gown and went to the Red Fort to defend...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: That was INA for Shah Nawaz Khan. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, if I may continue, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I think, this debate is throwing up some very, very interesting points. We have such eminent experts who are here. Dr. Joshi has spoken with great detail with authority and information. Dr. Barun Mukherjee has spoken. Mr. Shyam Benegal has made an absolutely masterly film. I would like to make a recommendation that in every school in this country that film should be mandatorily shown. Shri Virendra Bhatia was just saying how Netaji's memory has not been adequately reflected in our books. But, today in an age of multi-media people will probably watch a film with far greater interest than read a book. So, at least, this we should definitely do. But that is only a diversion. So, the point I am trying to make is that there are some very, very important avenues that remain to be explored. Now, the Mukherjee Commission has established, although the Government does not accept it but, I think, the evidence is conclusive that there was no air crash in Taihuku on 18th August, 1945. We should have had no difficulty in accepting this reality. Therefore, the point has been made that the ashes at the Renkoji temple could not be that of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose. Anyway, DNA test is not possible because even if the bones had survived as it is claimed when the body is cremated, the DNA does not survive the burning and you cannot get a DNA as a conclusive result of that. So, it cannot be done. So, in these circumstances, we believe, at least, I believe,

that Government would have been well advised to accept the Mukherjee Commission's Report and set the stage for further probe. Dr. Joshi, has said that a Committee of Scholars could be set up to begin with. There could be further inquiry into this. Further inquiry is needed as to what happened, where Netaji could have gone. May be, the Terms of Reference could be defined separately. We can request the British Government to specifically de-classify that file which they have said they will open in 2020. This is a matter not so important for Britain. It is a matter, which is very, very important to India. ...*(Interruptions)*... Without those official requests it will never happen. Also the Mukherjee Commission went to Omsk and to Irkutsk because in Omsk, as Shri Shyam Benegal has just pointed out there used to be an INA legation. Now, the KGB archives could not be explored because the Russians flatly refused the Mukherjee Commission's access to the KGB archives. Now, this again has to be taken up and I say this again in the context of the same thing - that information contained in these files, if they become public, will affect relations with friendly country. Sir, are the friendly countries more important or are the people of India more important? Is our history more important to us than some collateral damage that may happen to relations with some countries more important? Sir, a lot of people are just waiting to speak, I have made my points. The only thing is, I would request the Government to approach this with an open mind. It is not a political question. It is a question of our nationhood, it is a matter of our pride, it is a matter of our tri-colour, the tri-colour that was hoisted at Andaman and Nicobar Islands and in Manipur. In the interest of truth, in the interest of re-discovering the heart and soul of the Indian freedom movement, the Government must not close this chapter, keep it open, until we get the truthful answer of what happened to Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose. I believe, the people of this country will not rest quiet even if it takes three more generations to come to that conclusion. Thank you.

SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, this debate should have come much earlier as appeared in the list of business. But anyway, the very purpose of participating in today's debate is that we wanted, the entire country wanted to know the exact reason of Netaji's death, time, place, and whether it was due to air crash or not. The truth should come out. It is also our duty, the hon. Minister was asking, how to preserve the ideals and teachings of Netaji as best as we can. Also, the further study of the entire Freedom Movement, the lives of many martyrs is

absolutely necessary because many truths have not yet come out. These teachings should be taken to the young generation. The issue is not that whether Netaji is still alive. If he would have been alive, this day his age would have been about 109 years. Because I am from West Bengal, fortunately I was in that Chair as a Mayor for ten years. The Municipal Corporation of West Bengal had also produced a film on the life of Netaji. We had also published one book and distributed it free to a serious of primary students of West Bengal. Some said that Netaji was hiding. Why will he be hiding? He was 'patriot of patriots'. I cannot authenticate it, but one of the historians of Calcutta reminded me about one of the very wonderful incidents of Netaji's life. But this is not an authenticated statement, I must say. He said that one of the headmasters of a Corporation Primary School was a freedom fighter. Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose was the Chief Executive Officer, not the Mayor, at that time Desbandhu Chittaranjan was the mayor at that time. Commissioner of Police of Calcutta wrote a letter to the Chief Executive Officer that such and such Headmaster was in the terrorists' movement; he was connected with the terrorists' movement. I was told by that historian, who is the elder brother of the present Education Minister of West Bengal, that Netaji immediately went to a market and purchased a flower bouquet and went to the residence of the headmaster and presented him the bouquet, and informed the Police Commissioner that he had presented the bouquet to the headmaster.

Many committees and commissions have been constituted but the mystery of Netaji's disappearance has not been solved. The real cause of his death has not come to light. Netaji wanted a very secular India. He has mentioned about his Ajad Hind Vahini that that was the real formation of Hindu-Muslim unity. The way the Azad brigade was formed is a lesson for all of us.

Sir, with a direction from the High Court for a further inquiry into the death of Netaji, the Union Government, after consulting the Chief Justice of Supreme Court, appointed Justice Mukherjee to inquire into the matter. The Legislative Assembly of West Bengal took a unanimous decision and requested for a further inquiry.

Sir, it took a long six-and-a-half years to complete the job. It is also a fact that the Union Government did not cooperate with the

Commissions, with the earlier commissions as well as the present one, to complete the job at the earliest.

It took one year to have an office. I remember, the West Bengal Government took the initiative, and one of its Ministers vacated his own office for locating the Commission's office. That was the situation. A liaison office in Delhi was set up after a lapse of another two years. This was the attitude of the Government.

Sir, the former Prime Minister declared, on the floor of the House, on 05.03.1952 that the Report submitted to him by Mr. S.A. Ayer, the former Information and Broadcasting Minister of the Provincial Government of *Azad Hind*, had to be taken as authentic. But, it has come to light that Ayer's visit to Japan was by no means official. And the Report was not prepared following the official order. So, an unofficial inquiry was authenticated by the former Prime Minister. On the other hand, the story of the alleged air crash and the authenticity of Mr. Ayer's report was never sought to be examined. Ayer in his book, "Unto him a witness" which was submitted to Khosla Commission stated, categorically, that it was he who drafted the Domain Despatch on the basis of which Reuters circulated the alleged death news. He has further stated that without visiting the alleged spot of the air crash, and without meeting Habibur Rahman, he drafted the Despatch on the basis of information he gathered from some Japanese officers. Thus he had no personal knowledge of the alleged incident. Shri Shah Nawaz Committee too, without visiting the alleged spot, gave its verdict that Netaji Bose died in an alleged air crash on 18.08.1945. The Government of India also accepted that.

Shri Habibur Rahman, who was also an eye witness, also made contradictory statements. According to Rahman, the dead body cremated on 20.08.1945 was stated to be that of Ichiro Okura. But, according to the Municipal Certificate, cremation took place on 22.08.1945. The Cremation Certificate mentions Ichiro Okura died on 19th August, 1945 and not on 18th. According to Habibur Rahman, the cremation took place in Taipei, but according to other information, the body was flown to Tokyo. There was a story that Dr. Yoshimi treated Netaji before his death. But Dr. Yoshimi confessed before the Justice Mukherjee Commission that he never saw Netaji and he could not identify the one whom he had allegedly treated as Netaji.

10.00 P.M.

It was reported that Justice Mukherjee asked Dr. Yoshimi, "Did he issue Death Certificate in the name of Netaji Subash Chandra Bose?" He replied, "No. I issued the Certificate in the name of Ichiro Okura." But when Justice Mukherjee showed the Death Certificate in the name of Netaji Subash Chandra Bose, signed in 1988, *i.e.*, 43 years after his reported death in 1945, Dr. Yoshimi said one India and a Japanese came to him and asked for a certificate after 43 years in the name of Netaji Subash Chandra Bose. All these things are very serious and require further scrutiny.

The statement of former Prime Minister, Morarji Desai, has been referred to here. I do not want to go into the details of that. But, it is gathered, he also expressed his doubt about the correctness of the conclusions reached in the two reports, namely, the Shah Nawaz Committee and the Khosla Commission. Anyway, Sir, the truth has not come out. This is a fact. It is an undoubted fact that Governments did not play their role to unearth the truth and did not cooperate with the Commission also. Sir, we demand from the Government that all reports, so far submitted, including the recent one, be studied further in depth. Experts and knowledgeable Members of Parliament should be consulted to arrive at a final reliable conclusion.

Finally, I would like to conclude by saying that Netaji is no more. But his great ideals of secularism, and his thought of economic development of the country should reach the nation, particularly, the younger generation of this country.

This is a very important thing. Netaji's corner can be set up in the Library Hall and the Government should take up steps that I have mentioned, so that his teachings can be spread among the people of this country, particularly, among the younger generation of this country.

With these two demands, namely, examination of all the reports submitted so far and setting up of a library in the memory of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, I conclude my speech. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SHYAM BENEGAL : Sir, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

Sir, I made a film called, 'Netaji Subhas - the forgotten hero'. The reason for calling him the forgotten hero was this. It wasn't my choice because I had called him the Last Hero; I don't believe we have created a

greater hero than him since that time; but, unfortunately, in many parts of India, it was found - the market researchers found - that the memory of Netaji was very dim among the younger generations. That was the reason why we changed the title and called him the forgotten hero. Now, while making that film, we researched the subject for several years and the only reason I could not myself give any kind of definitive answer at the end at what happened to Netaji was mainly because Justice Mukherjee Commission was in progress. And, also for every document, there would always be something else that would bring in some kind of ambiguity. But one thing is certain that if you look at some areas, for instance, particularly, related to his disappearance, then, nobody can doubt the fact that he left Saigon. Nobody can doubt the fact that he was travelling with General Shidei. Nobody can doubt the fact that Col. Habibur Rehman was travelling with him on that plane. And, we also know that the aircraft was an old Japanese aircraft, called Sally. This was two days after Japan had surrendered. On 15th of August, 1945 Japan had surrendered. There was no Government in place in Taiwan, which was called Formosa at that time, and there were really no records. When Mrs. Krishna Bose - it was discovered at that time - went to Taiwan recently, and when she asked about the crash, they said that they did not know. Nobody categorically said that there was no crash. Because they did not know as there were no documents, and the same answer was given even to the Justice Mukherjee Commission. It is a question of how you deduce this whole business. To say there was no crash is a deduction. Nobody knows whether there was a crash or there was no crash because there is no information about it. But many scholars, -- I mean, Professor Leonard Gordon who, probably, has written one of the most scholarly books on both, Sarat Bose and Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, worked on it for twenty years before he brought out his book called 'Brothers against the Raj'. - interviewed several survivors of the air crash. And, among them, was also Dr. Yoshimi, whom he interviewed in 1979. The interview that Justice Mukherjee had with him was very recently, just three or four years ago. Now, see the difference. Dr. Yoshimi was a very old man when Justice Mukherjee interviewed him. I remember when I went to Japan in the year 1998, I met several officers, several people who were associated with Netaji at that time. One of them was his interpreter Kunizuka. He told me that there was a crash. Now, I do not know. He said that there was a crash and there was no question of his being alive. Now, I had - who is now unfortunately deceased - an uncle of mine who happened to be a fifteen year old boy who was sent by Netaji

to the Japanese Imperial Military Academy in Tokyo in 1943-44 to be trained as a fighter pilot. He was in Tokyo and was among those who received the casket containing the ashes and travelled to Renkoji Temple with it.

Now, he was there in 1945, towards the end of August. This was before the American Army actually took charge of the Palace. As you may be knowing, when General MacArthur signed the Surrender Document, he did not send the American Army either to Japan or to any of the territories that Japan held at the time, which also had Taiwan. So, the question does not arise about any Government having been in place; there was no government in place.

Sir, to me, it appears to be a fruitless exercise. Let scholars do their work. According to me, scholars must continue to do their work, as they will. When I was making my film, I remember, I was in Germany, several wonderful new facts about Netaji's life in Germany came up; there was a book written by a young German scholar, Hans Kuhlman. He had just published that book; he came to see me on the location where I was shooting, in Berlin, and gave me certain details. Then, there was another book; when there was a certain amount of television coverage about the film that I was shooting, there was an Austrian, Oscar Pelinka, who had written a book; this was in 2003.

Now, work gets carried on like this. I personally don't believe that too much is going to be served by speculating, because sooner or later, these facts will come out. We are not quite sure how it will happen, but it will happen. I do not think anything is going to be served by thinking in terms of conspiracy theories. But, frankly speaking, I personally believe that we should celebrate Netaji's life, and if we don't do that and continue to start thinking about whether there was a conspiracy against him, I think we will never be able to appreciate this great man's work for this country. Look at the things that he did. He started the first Indian National Army, consisting of Indians, in different parts of the world, who were not in India. He got them mobilised; he created an army. He created a Provisional Government of Azad Hind. And let us also not forget that Azad Hind Government actually had land from which they ruled, which was the Andaman & Nicobar Islands; he called it the 'Shaheed and Swaraj Islands'. I would earnestly appeal to the Government of India to call the Andaman & Nicobar Islands Shaheed and Swaraj Islands, because I think, that will do more for the memory of Netaji than anything else.

Another thing, for instance, is, the term *Jai Hind*, as a greeting, came from the Azad Hind Provisional Government. *Jana Gana Mana* was his National Anthem for this Provisional Government, not only in South-East Asia but also in Germany. Unfortunately, he did not have a good person to translate it. He translated it into Hindustani; that was done by Abid Hasan, who was not particularly a literary person. Still, it is something quite extraordinary that that is what we, as independent India, chose for ourselves.

If you look at the other things that happened, the Planning Committee, which eventually found its position as the Planning Commission in free India, was his doing, in 1938, when he was the President of the Congress. There are so many things that we have taken from this incredible person. That is one aspect.

Then, Sir, there are other aspects. At the end of the Second World War, India was his constituency; nobody can argue on that, because it is a fact. It was a constituency; at the beginning of 1946, Wavell received a communication from Clement Attlee, when Attlee became the Prime Minister of Britain -- the Simla talks were collapsing at the time -- where he had said, 'what would happen if Gandhiji decided to start another Quit India movement at this time?' Would the Indian Army under the British actually fight against these people who would be carrying on the Civil Disobedience Movement, as the same Army had done so in 1942, particularly in places like Balia? The answer given by the C-in-C Auchinleck was, 'perhaps not'. Why did he say that? When the Indian Army experienced the INA fighting against them on the Burma front, it was an extraordinary phenomenon. Because one side was saying that we are fighting for our motherland, who are you fighting for? And this led to disaffection among the de-mobbed soldiers of the British Indian Army. When they went back to villages from where they came, they talked about this extraordinary Army that was fighting for the independence of the country. Why is this not known? Why are we not celebrating this extraordinary thing? These are the things we have not done, and it is high time we did it. And, to start with, I would suggest that we call Andaman and Nicobar islands as "*Shaheed* and *Swaraj*". To start with, I think that this is the first thing that should be done. Then, of course, I would be very happy, as I have spoken earlier, if the film that I have made could be shown to the younger generation, whenever it is possible. I have also done it. I am sorry, I should not be selling this idea, but I have done it as six-hour television series which

includes childhood and youth of Netaji. Anyway, thank you, very much, Sir. I have no more to say. I think, as far as the question of disappearance of Netaji is concerned, it would be much better if we celebrate his life than worried about his death because, whether anybody likes it or not, a man has to die and he died. But the important thing is, scholars will continue to do their work and they will find, sooner or later, how he passed away. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Maybe we should have this movie screened here for parliamentarians too.

SHRI SHYAM BENEGAL: Definitely, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): In the winter session, we should propose this. Shri Abani Roy. Not present. Hon. Home Minister.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, I seek your permission to read out my statement. At the same time, I would be ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I would like to say something. As a Congressman, I respect fully Netaji. I heard Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi. Now, I would like to seek clarifications from the hon. Minister when he will be making his statement. This Commission was notified on 14th May, 1999 and the report was filed on 8th November, 2005. It means, between this period, that is, about five years, the BJP's Government was there. Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi was the Cabinet Minister then. But when we read the Report, we find everywhere that the affidavit was given by the then Government officials saying that they don't have any records to show. Even I can read one portion on page No.17. I quote, "The Ministry of External Affairs, in reply, wrote a letter on December 18, 2001 wherein they stated that they did check the records available in their Ministry but could not locate any document referred to in the former Prime Minister's statement. This was followed by an affidavit filed by Shri Jayant Prasad, a Joint Secretary of that office wherein a sweeping statement was made indicating that no such document was available with them. The other Department with which the Commission corresponded in this regard was the Cabinet Secretariat and an affidavit was filed by a Joint Secretary in the Research and Analysis Wing at their Secretariat stating, *inter alia*, that there were no records relating to the statement of the late Prime Minister made on the floor of the Parliament on August 28, 1978."

In the same way, every report will show, in 2000, 2001, 2003, everywhere, the status report reveals, "The reports, particular documents as called for from the Ministry of Home Affairs are still awaited." This was the cooperation given by the BJP Government for five years. They had not at all given even a single document. They had not taken any step. Even there is a letter for the External Affairs Ministry to the British Government. There also, they did not take up any issue. They did not take any pain to find out what had happened in between. Therefore, this is only a thing where the Commission cannot go further. The Commission starts the report saying that already there are sufficient reports, commission reports, enquiry reports were there. Nothing more than that. Even though we are not sitting as an Appellate Court, we want to go through the earlier Report and give our Report. This is only resurrection of the same thing just for satisfaction of the political consumption, and nothing more than that. Therefore, I feel, Sir, that this Report need not be taken as it is and the Government has taken a correct step of ignoring this report and coming forward with the earlier report as the first one. Therefore, I submit that a national hero should be worshipped as it is. As our earlier speakers have said, history should be imbibed by all youth. Coming generation should remember him. Only to that extent, the hero should be worshipped.

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा): सर, यह तर्क कैसे कर रहे हैं? अगर उस समय की सरकार ने इस कमीशन के साथ न्याय नहीं किया, फिर भी कमीशन ने रिपोर्ट तो दी। तो कमीशन ने जो रिपोर्ट दी है, उस को इस सरकार को ग्रहण करने में कहां असुविधा है?

SHRI SHYAM BENEGAL : The Indian Political Intelligence (IPI), that is, British Foreign Office, has certain files. Of those files, there is a file L/P&J/12/217. These are the three sets of files that exist. Some documents from them are missing. The rest of them were opened up in 1997. In that, there was one particular document by certain Colonel Figgish, who happened to be working for the British Military Intelligence. He had done a report in 1946 about the crash in Taihoku. Now, there is a zerox copy of that, but the original does not exist. And, there are several papers there which may be fruitful for the Government of India to find out these particular files which are with the British Government and these are the only files that they have not opened up regarding Netaji, which exist with the British Government.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, I would, at the beginning itself, thank the hon. Members for having made good suggestions with respect to what can be done to respect the memory of Subhash Chandra Bose, for

participating in this debate and for remaining in the House to hear the reply. Sir, I seek your permission to read out the speech, the statement which I have made. Then, I will deal with some of the points which have been made by the hon. Members here separately.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Shri Subhash Chandra Bose, Shri Abul Kalam Azad, Shri Babasaheb Ambedkar, Shri Jaiprakash Narayan, were few young leaders of the people who were most respected by one and all in the country and who led the freedom movement with great courage and confidence. And, most of them contributed towards the development of the country later on.

Modern history of India cannot be written without mentioning the contribution of men like them towards the cause of freedom struggle and our country's development. They were the men of vision and indomitable courage who knew the country and the world and the potential the people of India had.

Their memories inspire the people of India and would keep doing so for many, many years to come. If we forget them, or if we cease to remember as to how they worked, struggled and built the freedom movement, we would become weaker and poorer, and lose our capacity to face the challenges of the present and the future.

On the eve of attainment of freedom, Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose was not in Delhi on the scene and we were deprived of his support for the construction and building of our future. Mahatma Gandhi was also not in Delhi. He was at Naokali on the day on which the tricolour was hoisted at the rampart of Red Fort. We should know in clear terms as to how their memories can be respected and as to how their spirit and vision can be used to build our future. We may be able to do it better by avoiding controversies and emphasizing on the positive aspects of their and our lives. Unfortunately, there arose a controversy about the existence or otherwise of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose and his whereabouts, and, that controversy has not been fully settled and allowed to disappear. He gave a clarion call to his fellow patriots to march towards Delhi to hoist the national flag on the rampart of the Red Fort. Had he come on the eve of independence, he would have been welcomed with open arms by millions and millions of the people in India. When he did not come after the Second World War was concluded, and when the country was emancipated, the people were disappointed. Against their wishes, they began to think that he

would not have been alive. Otherwise, he could not have resisted his desire to come to his dear motherland on the fulfilment of his dream of freedom for his country.

Sir, I have been asking a question. I ask that question today also. If he were alive, what made him stay away from the country? Why did he not come, if he were alive? That is a question, which is nagging us. They wish that he were alive, the people wish that he were alive and fear that he might have breathed his last. That was why there was hesitation in the minds of his kith and kin at that time. Even today, there is no one opinion expressed by the members of his own family. Some members hold that he died in the crash and some members hold that he did not die in the crash, and, the countrymen made the Government of the time to constitute a three-men committee to find out the truth about his existence and inform the country. The committee consisted of a person who was in the INA, his own brother and a senior administrator. The committee was constituted in 1956. The committee gave the report after examining the witnesses and the evidence available in the country and outside the country.

The majority in the Committee came to the conclusion that he was no more and he died in the plane crash and his ashes were kept in the Renkoji Temple in Tokyo. In fact, initially, all the members, one of whom was his brother, had come to the conclusion which was in line with the majority report, without any dissenting view on the same. However, later on -- and, may be because his brother's affection did not allow him to hold that the disappeared relation of his was no more, or, may be the people in the country were unwilling to think that he had died -- under pressure of his own emotional inclination, or, of the people around him, he changed his view and gave a dissenting view. However, the facts relating to the incident and inquiry and the initial view and later the dissenting view did convey the conclusion which was acceptable. However, which became, later on, not readily acceptable, convincing though it was. The most important thing with respect to the first Committee was, Sir, his own brother had come to the conclusion that he had died; his own brother had come to the conclusion that he had died. If he had stuck to that view, the report given by the Shah Nawaj Committee would have been a unanimous report. But, later on, he changed and gave the dissenting opinion. Now, this fact should be, in clear terms, understood by us. This inquiry held was closer to the date of incident. Let us understand why this report of the first inquiry committee should be accepted. And, these are the reasons. This inquiry held was

closer to the date of incident than the inquiries held later on. The evidence given by the witnesses could have been more reliable and independent, because they were closer in time to the incident. There was not valid reason for the witnesses to depose falsely and incorrectly. Shyam Benegalji has said that Habibur Rahman was with him. What was the reason for him to depose falsely and say that he died in the plane crash; I was with him; I sustained burn injuries? Why? What was the reason for him to say that? In matters of such enquiries, there was no valid reason for the witnesses to depose falsely and incorrectly. In matters of such inquiries, oral evidence, given by the witnesses, and more so the eyewitnesses, is equally, or, on occasions, more reliable than the documentary evidence. When murder takes place, when accidents take place, there are no documents written. Documents are valid in civil matters, when you have time to sit together and write the documents, agreements, or, write the *khakas*, or, write the office files. Those kinds of things are relevant in civil matters, not in criminal matters or in matters of this nature. You shall have to depend on the oral evidence, and, moreover, there are other facts also which have to be taken into consideration. The accident had taken place in the war time, immediately after the war was over, on 18th of August, 1945. The accident had taken place in the war time. After the war was over, the governments in the country of accident and the neighbouring countries were changed. They were not the same governments which were ruling those territories when the war was going on, or, before the war was concluded. The documents relevant to the incidents and the things related to it could not have been safely preserved or stored, or, could have been destroyed, or, burnt in the accident. Now, the third Commission's Report says that there were no documents relating to the plane, the pilot's documents. How could those kinds of documents be available?

If the accident had taken place and the plane was burnt to ashes, how could those kinds of documents be available? Some people are insisting that those documents were not available, but not paying attention to the fact that the Governments had changed, that was a war time, and are depending on document and not depending on a person who was actually with him. He was the eyewitness. He himself was burnt. He did not live in India. He lived in a foreign country. He came here and gave the evidence. Why his oral evidence, eyewitness's evidence, should not be accepted? Why are they insisting on the documentary evidence? It could not have been found or it could not have been preserved because the war was going on and the Government had changed. These facts have to be

borne in mind as to why the Report given by the Shah Commission is more acceptable. The Report given by the Khosla Commission is more acceptable than the Report given by the Mukherjee Commission. This has to be borne in mind. Good lawyers are sitting here. They would understand and appreciate this fact that in all murder cases or in all accident cases, it is the oral evidence, which is more important, because oral documents are not written there. They are not available there. This fact should not be lost sight of. Absence of those documents could not weigh heavily against the availability of the oral evidence, given by the unbiased eyewitnesses and others. However, Rahman falsely deposed before the Committee or the Commission, because he deposed before the Committee as well as the Commission. Therefore, it would not be judicially prudent to attach less importance to the findings given by the Shahnawaz Committee. The findings given were not inconclusive. The findings given by the Committee were not inconclusive. They were unambiguous, clear, and convincing. It is not easy to disbelieve the findings and brush them aside, and in their place, to accept the findings given in an Inquiry Report which took place nearly 50 years later and which was not conclusive - Mukherjee Commission's Report was not conclusive - and according to which, no definite finding could be pronounced in the matter of inquiry. We have a Committee Report which is conclusive and unambiguous. You have another Commission's Report, which is not conclusive. It says, and I am going to quote what he has said in the Report while giving the finding. He himself says that it is not possible to say where he lived and how he died. Now if he says that, what is it that you are asking us to accept and not reject? He himself is saying that he is not in a position to say how he died, and where he lived, and you are asking me to accept that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: But he says categorically that he did not die on 18th August 1945. ...*(Interruptions)*... That was very clear. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I am going to sit here to reply. I am asking if the Mukherjee Commission's Report says that he is not in a position to pronounce as to how he died and where he lived, what do you expect me to accept? ...*(Interruptions)*... I am coming to all the issues he has raised, and I am coming to the findings, which he has given on these issues. Let us go one by one.

The finding of the Shah Nawaz Committee convinced many, and it seems, for reasons known to them, failed to convince a few. Even at that time, they had expressed their doubts. The fact that inquiries made by an Indian journalist, an American, and a British, which were of the same kind, also did not find favour with the few persons, who had doubts, about the finding. It seems that majority of the population in the country did not share those doubts. Majority of the people in the country did not share those doubts and were inclined to think that the great leader was no more in his physical form in the world. The Khosla Commission was constituted to look into the matter again. It was done to remove the doubts entertained by a few citizens. The Commission was headed by a Judge. It was said that Shahnawaz Khan was a member of the Congress Party, close to some of the leaders of the Congress Party, but, Khosla was a Judge and he was appointed, he was an independent person. It was to remove the doubts entertained by a few citizens. The commission was headed by a Judge and had to function under the Inquiry Commission Act. Shahnawaz was a Committee, but this was a commission which had to work and function under the Inquiry Commission Act. It went to the country where the accident took place. Now, one of the points raised is that Shahnawaz Committee could not go to the place where the accident had taken place, but, Khosla Commission could go, they could go to that place and they could find out. It went to the country where the accident took place, to the country where the ashes were kept and examined the witnesses who were available at that time. Legal acumen to assess the validity and reliability of the evidence given by the witnesses and the evidence produced certainly was used by the Commission. The Report given was unambiguous. It was more unambiguous and conclusive. A few lines of it can be quoted to point out the nature of the report and this is what Justice Khosla says in the report, "I, therefore, find it proved beyond all reasonable doubt." This is what a Commission appointed under the Inquiry Commission Act said. A person who has the acumen to evaluate the evidence produced before him, oral as well as documentary, a person who is trained to judge, is saying this, "I, therefore, find it proved beyond all reasonable doubt that Bose travelled in a Japanese bomber from Touraine to Taihoku on the morning of 18th August, 1945..... The plane crashed to the ground, broke into two parts and caught fire. In this fire, the pilot and General Shidei died instantaneously; and of the other men on board, co-pilot died later and Bose also succumbed to his burn injuries during the course of the following night. His body was cremated and ashes were taken to Tokyo." I am

quoting this from page number 49, para 4.129. Now, this is the kind of report. He is giving his judgement in an unambiguous term. Now, should we accept such a judgement or should we accept a judgement which says that I am not in a position to tell you what actually happened? What is it that you are expecting us to accept? The question before us is: Why a report of this nature should be discarded in favour of a report which is of inconclusive nature? There was no reason for the Khosla Commission to arrive at a wrong conclusion. There was no reason for the witnesses to depose falsely. If all facts are borne in mind, it would be easier to rely upon this report than any other report of inconclusive nature. It is argued that in 1978, the then Prime Minister of India expressed his doubts about the reliability of the findings given in the two inquiries held. I respect Shri Morarji Desai very much. He is not with us today.

But, then, political facts also had to be borne in mind when he made the statement. It is said that he had doubted the reliability in view of the documents available in the office of the Government. No dates, no names, no numbers to identify the said files were given, which could help to find out the documents mentioned by the then Prime Minister. They could not have been found out in the offices if particulars about them were not provided. The fact, that the then Prime Minister had formed the Government by defeating the Government which was in power when the two inquiries were conducted, cannot be brushed aside, to come to the conclusion that his statement could have been motivated, not by reasons of law, but by reasons political. The two previous Prime Ministers had got two inquiries conducted to find out the facts and in a way, accepted the reports of the inquiries. The third Prime Minister had expressed doubt about the facts held proved, but had not constituted another inquiry which he could have done without any difficulty, as it was done about 20 years later.

If he had really doubted, he could have constituted an inquiry. But he did not do that.

The third inquiry was ordered in the period of the previous Government, and a judge of the Supreme Court was given the responsibility to discover facts. This inquiry was expected to do its job in six months' time. Initially, only six months were given. Six months were given, but this inquiry continued for six years! And the Government did not say that you would not get any time. In fact, the rumours were spread that the Government was asking them to see that the report was given. We did say to them, "Look, if you have been there for six years, please expedite the

matter." But nothing more than that. And I had personally told many of my friends, who wanted that the Inquiry Commission should be given more time so that the justice was done, that time would be given to them, as much time as they wanted to be given to them. And we were willing to give the time. There was no question of asking them to conclude the inquiry without completing the inquiry. There was no question. And we did that. It completed its task in six years' time. The Commission could have asked for the documents from the Government, which had brought it into existence. This point was made by Mr. Natchiappan very, very clearly, for how many years the previous Government was there. It were they who had appointed the Commission, and if they were depending on the statement given by Mr. Morarji Desai, that there were documents with the Government on the basis of which a conclusion could be drawn that he had not died in the plane crash, what was the difficulty in asking for those documents from that Government? And they were there for a pretty long time; for nearly six years or five years, they were there. This could have been done, but they had not done. But to say that you have not given these documents, to which a reference was made by Mr. Morarji Desai is not correct. I am not finding fault with them because it would not have been possible for them because no numbers were given, no names were given, and if it had been possible, they could have definitely given those documents to the Commission. But if there are no documents, if there are no specifications about the documents that were given, to expect the Government to find out the documents which were not in existence and to give them to the Commission is very, very difficult. It could not have been done. And it was, naturally, not done by Mr. Morarji Desai himself, by the previous Government. And now to say that this Government failed to give the documents is not being just to this Government. And I would simply say these things with respect to this. The Commission could have asked for the documents from the Government, which had brought it into existence. Enough time was available for it to get the necessary documents. Nearly more than four years were at its disposal. Why the documents were not got from the previous Government? Could it be explained in a convincing manner? I think, it cannot be done.

On the following points, the Commission had to give its findings. And what are those points? Whether Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose is dead or alive; if he is dead, where he died; whether he died in a plane crash, as alleged.

The third point is whether the ashes in the Japanese temple are the ashes of Netaji. The fourth point is whether he has died in any other manner at any other place and if so, when and how. On this point he has said, "I can't say anything". This is the most crucial point. The fifth point is, if he is alive, in respect of his whereabouts. The findings given are as follows: One, Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose is dead; two, he did not die in the plane crash as alleged; third, the ashes in the Japanese temple are not of Netaji; fourth, in the absence of any clinching evidence, a positive answer can't be given. In the absence of clinching evidence, you want me to accept this kind of findings given by this Commission! ... *(Interruptions)*...

DR. BARUN MUKHERJEE: That is in respect of the fourth point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, this is the fourth point. This is the most important point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BARUN MUKHERJEE: What are the findings on the first three points? We are only saying that you accept the findings of the Commission on the first three points. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: You may ask for anything. It is a different issue, whether to accept what you are asking. I am commenting on what the Judge has said. The comment is that the Judge is not sure as to what has happened to him. And you want me to accept that! *(Interruptions)* ...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: No, not that. He has also stated that he did not die in the plane crash. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Mr. Minister, may I suggest one thing? You finish your reply, and then they can seek clarifications. Otherwise, it will never end.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: What I am saying is that in the absence of clinching evidence, a positive answer cannot be given. To what? To the question whether he has died in any other manner. Now, the Judge says that he has not died in the plane crash. What is the Judge saying? He says, "I can't say in what manner he has died". Six years' time was given. More time could have been given to him. He was allowed to travel to any country. He did travel to many countries. All assistance, which could have been given, was given to him. After that he comes to a conclusion. What is the conclusion? On an issue, which is of great importance, whether he

has died in any manner at any other place and if so, when and how, "in the absence of clinching evidence, a positive answer can't be given". You expect us to accept this finding! And you find fault with us! If it is not for political reasons, for what it is?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): I think, most of the points are very well covered by the Minister.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: The reason is that from the findings of the Inquiry Commission you are trying to confuse the issue.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I will answer all your questions. You please jot down and ask me after I complete my reply.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): I think the hon. Minister has already covered all the points at length.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: The answer to the fifth point is that the answer is already given in (1) above, that is about his death. The findings on point No.4 are conclusive. Therefore, it is not possible to rely upon other findings also. The findings given in the previous reports are conclusive and hence more reliable. Therefore, the question is: Why should not the previous findings be preferred and why should the third finding be preferred? I am asking the question. There were one Committee and one Commission; reports were given; two Prime Ministers had accepted them. They were conclusive and you suggest that they should not be accepted, and you are asking us to accept the report of the third Commission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Mr. Minister, you have already mentioned that.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, I am trying to convey that these are the two reasons. When we have given these reasons, they may not be reported in the newspapers tomorrow. Then, you would say that these points were raised and they were not replied to. You are making an allegation that we have simply said that we reject this report. It is not like that. We could not have written a report like the Commission report again saying why this is accepted. Necessary comments have been made on that and they are part of the file. But all those things have been raised in the arguments. The findings in the previous reports are not conclusive and hence more reliable. The Government has preferred the findings of the two previous inquiries and not the third finding because it is inconclusive and not definite. I think the Government has not done any mistake or wrong in

doing so. The Government was criticised for having delayed the submission of the Action Taken Report. I am leaving that point.

It was also said that no cogent reasons were given for having not accepted the report, and for having rejected it. The reasons were given. The only thing is that they were not reported fully. The reasons are given fully on this occasion, when all aspects relating to the report, and its comparison with other two reports, are done. I do not know if all the points given in the discussion today would be reported or not. If they are not reported, allegations can be made that no valid reasons were advanced even in the debate on the subject. Two or three columns in a newspaper, or a few seconds visual on the T.V., cannot cover all the valid points and all the cogent arguments made by the hon. Members and those made in reply to the points made by the Members. Lacunae in reporting could generate mistaken perception and misunderstanding. Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose was the darling of the masses and more revered by the Congressmen and patriots of all shades and opinions. Whenever doubts were raised about his whereabouts and existence, steps were taken to find out the facts; not once, but three times. And all the help and assistance was provided to unravel the factual position. In view of these facts, should we hold that no steps were taken to know if he were alive or dead? The Government had decided to confer the Bharat Ratna on him, posthumously to revere his memory. If a person is not found to be alive for seven years, generally, he is supposed to be dead by law. This fact should have been borne in mind while objecting to the conferment of the highest award in the country. The reports given could also have been borne in mind. But that was not done. Why? This should not be explained. Comments can be given. But I do not want to enter into a dispute of this nature, and we leave this issue to the people to decide. Sir, the Government wanted to confer Bharat Ratna on Netaji, but it was refused. These statues and portraits put up in Parliament and other official buildings are indications of the desire to respect and perpetuate his memory. He is always mentioned in a very respectful manner. All the leaders pay obeisance to his memory and try to put his view and opinion in practice to strengthen the country and develop our people. The concept of planning was very near and dear to him. That was adopted to build our country's infrastructure and industry, trade and agriculture, science and technology. Now, they ask me: Why was it not mentioned in the 'Discovery of India'? There were many people who had struggled, and all names were not mentioned in the books written by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But the fact is that he was the President of the

Congress Party. He was responsible for floating this concept and getting this concept ultimately accepted. It didn't remain there. It became a part of the Constitution. Not only that; when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru found that this concept was not clearly accepted, by an administrative order, he appointed the Planning Commission, and the concept of planning was accepted. What more can be done to respect the memory of Subhas Chandra Bose than accepting the concept of planning and then adopting it, and not only adopting it, but acting upon it for these days? Anything more than this required to be done will be done, and that is why, I have been asking, "Tell us what more can be done?" Sir, certain good suggestions have come, and I assure you that all these good suggestions which have been given will be acted upon, and anything more suggested to us later on, will also be acted upon. But don't allege that we are not doing it. Don't do that. He was for democracy, social, economic and cultural justice for one and all. These principles have been incorporated in the basic law of the country and in the policy of the Government. If these are not the ways to pay homage...*(Interruptions)*... Your smiling disturbs me, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): I am smiling because Shri Ahluwaliaji is satisfied with the reply...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I think you are not satisfied with the reply. That is why you are smiling. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): I think he is satisfied with the reply...*(Interruptions)*. I think the hon. Minister has covered each and every point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री कलराज मिश्र : आपने कहा था कि हम सब लोगों के सुझाव ...*(व्यवधान)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): But, he has not finished it. ...*(Interruptions)*... After he is through.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: This is a Commission which has worked for six years. This is an issue which has been kept alive for 60 years. This is an issue which has been taken up at the fag end of the Session, and all hon. Members have been very kind to sit here. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): And they are all listening to you carefully.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Yes. But, if some friend of mine smiles in a particular manner, it disturbs the speaker.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: That is not fair.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Yes, that is not fair. You can laugh at other friends; or with them, if not at them.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): To see a smile on Mr. Ahluwalia's face itself is satisfactory. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: ...so, what can be done? There are some suggestions which have been made, which can be accepted. I have seen Shyam Benegalji's film. It has come out very well. It was suggested that it should be shown to the children. I would say that it should be shown to the politicians because of how the role he has played of Subhas Chandra Bose in the film. Now, it is said that when Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj died, Ramdas Swami had adopted the lines from the *Gita*, and told his son, 'you please remember how Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj used to speak, used to make friendship, used to walk, used to sit, used to decide, used to work. Now, these are the *shidpradnyas* qualities mentioned in the *Gita*. They were adopted in different ...*(Interruptions)*... Yes. Now, here also, Subhas Chandra Bose talks with confidence. One of the things which struck me the most was, when his subordinates had taken action against some of the soldiers and officers for having not followed his discipline, he does not order that you take them back. He said, "Can they not be taken back?" And, when later on, when the officer comes and tells him, "Yes, I would like to take them back", he will say, "I am very happy about that." This is how the governance has to be done; this is how the administration has to be done. Now, this aspect is not relevant to the children. This aspect is relevant to some of us, and we would learn a little more by watching that film. I am sorry to say this thing. When you are praising Subhas Chandra Bose, please look into your own heart. Are you trying to criticise some other leader while doing it? Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose were close friends. They were the darling of the people; they were the people who had seen the world; they were the people with new ideas; they were the people who were revolutionary in their own fashion. They were the people -- one gave the concept of planning and the other gave the concept of full *swaraj*. Let us ask ourselves. Are we saying something in the course of this debate in order to see that one is a greater hero than the other? Now, if we are doing it, we are not doing justice to Subhas Chandra Bose because Subhas Chandra Bose equally respected Mahatma Gandhi and Nehru also. And that is shown in the film. I did not know that he had named some of his military...

SHRI SHYAM BENEGAL: Military regiments.

11.00 P.M.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Yes, military regiments. Let us understand this thing. And, having said all this, I would like to say that we would definitely do anything which is necessary, possible for us to do. Certain other suggestions have been given here. I may not be in a position to say much. Yes, one or two suggestions which have been given, on that, I shall have to consult the Cabinet and the Prime Minister and others. But, as far as other suggestions are concerned, we would certainly like this movie to be seen by the people. Mahatma Gandhi movie, Attenborough did it. But, Shyam Benegalji did a movie on Subhas Chandra Bose, and it should be shown not only to the children but also to all the people in the country. And whatever can be done in that respect should be done. That is not the only thing. Somebody suggested some other things also. We would definitely include them. I would not refuse to receive the suggestions given by any of the Members in the House or outside the House to perpetuate and respect the memory of Subhas Chandra Bose in the manner in which we have been perpetuating and respecting the memory of other leaders.

There will be no difficulty in that and we will do that. But, I have been asking this question and nobody is answering this question. Why did he not come back? What made him stay away from the country after the country achieved Independence? If he could go to Manchuria he could have certainly come to India. In my opinion, he could not have gone to the Soviet Union. But he could have gone to Manchuria. Had he gone, could he not have come to India? If not in 1945, after 1947 he could have come. 1945, I can understand because the British were ruling and he would not have come because he would have been arrested. But, why not after 1947? What could have been done? Let us understand Shyama Prasad Mukherjee was a member of the Cabinet. Baba Saheb Ambedkar was a member of the Cabinet. If Subhas Chandra Bose could have come, he would have definitely guided the country if he were alive, and if we are fortunate enough, he could have come and he would have done that. Nobody could have objected. With Mahatma Gandhi, nobody could have objected. Mahatma Gandhi was with us for a small time after the Independence.

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : आप यह जो question करते हैं कि अगर वह ज़िंदा होते, तो क्यों नहीं आए, यह जो बार-बार आप question करते हैं, इससे कोई भी पूछ सकता है कि why are you so keen to prove that he is dead? Why are you so keen to prove that Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose is dead?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: No, no, we are not keen to prove that. On the contrary, we would be very happy. Some of us are not afraid of death. But, then, who is saying that we are afraid? But, what is the reality? Now, you are saying that he is alive. You were saying that he was alive, at least. You are saying that he did not die there. You are not in a position to say how did he die. Some people say that the ashes are of Subhas Chandra Bose, some of the family members say this thing. Some members are saying that these are not the ashes. What do you expect us to do?

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: This Commission's report also is saying that.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Which Commission's report? There are three Commissions.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Yes, Mr. Minister, you have been abusing. You are giving a great importance to Hazibur Rahman's evidence. This is the only eye-witness' evidence you are quoting that Netaji died in aircrash.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: No, you give us any convincing evidence, we will accept it.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: What was the nature of the evidence given by Hazibur Rahman? ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, the Commission had dissected and analysed every piece of evidence given by Hazibur Rahman's. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): If you can speak one by one, it would make sense. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, I will read from ...*(Interruptions)*... I will read it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): If you speak one by one, it makes sense.

श्री बीरेन्द्र भाटिया : एक मिनट के लिए मेरी बात सुन लीजिए। गृह मंत्री जी के पहले वाक्य पर मुझे बहुत आपत्ति है। आपने स्वयं कहा कि श्री सुभाष चन्द्र बोस को किसी से equate नहीं किया जा सकता, पंडित नेहरू की बात जाने दें, आपने जिन नेताओं का नाम श्री सुभाष चन्द्र बोस के साथ लिया है, मैं उन नेताओं का नाम आदर से लेता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि वे भारत के महान सपूत हो सकते हैं, लेकिन क्षमा मांगते हुए, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि डा. अम्बेडकर, मौलाना अबुल कलाम आज़ाद, इनको नेताजी से equate करना, नेताजी का अपमान है। अगर ये tall थे, तो नेताजी tallest थे और मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे गृह मंत्री जी को tall और tallest मैं

अंतर मालूम होना चाहिए। इतिहास में नेताजी का स्थान, अगर गांधीजी के बराबर नहीं, तो गांधीजी के बाद था और उस स्थान को केवल राजनीति के कारण आप अन्य तीन नामों के साथ equate कर रहे हैं, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह नेताजी का अपमान है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): One minute, please. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री श्रीगोपाल व्यास (छत्तीसगढ़): सर, इन्होंने जनता से पूछा है, मैं इतिहास के विद्यार्थी के नाते एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि नेताजी विभाजित भारत में आने के लिए ... (व्यवधान) ...

गृह मंत्री (श्री शिवराज वी. पाटिल): मैं आपकी बात सुनूँगा, उनकी बात का जवाब देने के बाद। प्लीज आप बैठ जाइए। मैं बड़े अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने जो कहा है, उससे मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ। हमारी संस्कृति हमें सिखाती है कि हर इंसान में भगवान होता है। यहाँ तो आप इंसान को इंसान के बराबर मानने के लिए भी तैयार नहीं हैं। हम यह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): अब इस बहस को आगे नहीं बढ़ाएंगे। ... (व्यवधान) ... आप कुछ कहना चाहेंगे।

श्री वीरेन्द्र भाटिया: मैं उसके आधार पर यह कह रहा हूँ कि आजादी की लड़ाई में नेताजी की भूमिका ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री श्रीगोपाल व्यास: जब उन्होंने सारे देश के लिए यह प्रश्न पूछा है ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री वीरेन्द्र भाटिया: उनको सामान्य व्यक्ति बताया जा रहा है ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री श्रीगोपाल व्यास: मान्यवर मुझे यह बात कहने दी जाए ... (व्यवधान) ... माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने अनेक बार यह बात कही है कि उनके मन में यह प्रश्न है, हो सकता है, मैं कभी-कभी सोचता हूँ, मैं अध्ययन करता हूँ, आह्वान करता हूँ, जो सुभाष जी को जानते हैं, जिन्होंने सुभाष जी के जीवन का अध्ययन किया है, उनकी प्रवृत्तियों का अध्ययन किया है, क्या वे यह कह सकते हैं कि सुभाष चन्द्र बोस विभाजित भारत में आ सकते थे?

श्री शिवराज वी. पाटिल: क्यों नहीं आ सकते थे? मैं आपसे ही पूछ रहा हूँ?

श्री श्रीगोपाल व्यास: उन्हें विभाजन स्वीकार नहीं हो सकता था। यह एक कारण हो सकता है कि वे नहीं आ रहे हों।

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी: समाप्ति जी, ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): This is the last question.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: It is not a question. I am just referring to the evidence given by Habibur Rahman. उन्होंने अपना सारा केस इस पर built किया है कि एक प्रत्यक्षदर्शी है, जिसने एयर क्रेश को देखा है और उस प्रत्यक्षदर्शी के

evidence को क्यों न माना जाए, इधर-उधर की बाकी evidences को क्यों माना जाए? यह इनका बेसिक केस था। कमीशन ने लिखा है, 4.12.6 page 89, मैं उसको पढ़ देता हूँ।

"It may be recalled that in assailing the story of plane crash it has been submitted on behalf of some of the deponents and their learned Counsel that considering the fact that the plane had not seats and seat belts and all the passengers were squatting on the floor the inevitable result immediately following the nosedive would have been rolling of all the passengers with luggage inside the plane down the floor to the cockpit. In that event, they argued, half of the passenger could not have survived or come out of the plane either unhurt or with some minor injuries as claimed by the survivors. This contention is well-reasoned more so if it is read in the context of the relevant evidence of Habibur Rahman (SW4). From his evidence it is seen that not only he testified to the above fact but went on further to say that the plane nose-dived from a fairly high altitude "possibly over 12-14000 feet." If this evidence of Habibur Rahman is to be believed then none of the 12/13 passengers - not to speak of the crew members - could have survived. Viewed in that context the explanation sought to be given by the surviving occupants of the ill-fated plane that as Netaji was sitting by the side of the petrol tank, gasoline flashed all over his body resulting in his sustaining their degree burns cannot also be believed, for Netaji, could not have been in his original position on the floor immediately following the plane's nose-diving.

4.12.7 Next comes the following version of Harbibur Rahman (SW-4) regarding the injuries he sustained in the plane crash as given out by him before the Committee: ...*(Interruptions)*...

"As for myself, my both hands were very badly burnt. As I came through the fire, right side of my face was burnt and I noticed I had received a cut in the forehead which was bleeding and also the right side of my right knee was also bleeding profusely as it had hit some hard substance..." अब 12-14 हजार फीट से गिरने के बाद यह हालत है।

"The head cut was caused by hitting the floor as the plane crashed. My clothes did not catch fire. My hands were burnt very badly in the attempt to take off Netaji's clothes." That is, he was not burnt in the plane, but then his hands were burnt in removing Netaji's clothes..

"Both my hands up to the wrist show marks of deep burning even after a lapse of more than ten years."

Rest of it you can see in the entire evidence about these injuries to Habibur Rahman, the nature of burn and every thing has been completely contradicted and dissected by several evidences in this. Therefore, the fact that Mr. Habibur Rahman survived and Netaji died, plane nose-dived from a height of 12-14,000 feet is completely untenable and, therefore, the only one survivor, he did not inform the people. Netaji died on 18th, why was he silent till 22nd or 23rd? Why did he not inform anybody in India or anybody in the INA? This is again, you see I have again said, why this was done. But why did he depose wrongly? I have made it clear because he was on oath to Netaji that he would protect this smokescreen and even he will not disclose it to anybody so that Netaji can go to any destination.

Now, after asking a question somebody should tell us why Netaji did not come to India. Suppose, Netaji was arrested by some country, suppose he was not a free man. How could he come? Now, this is a thing which you have to find out, which the country has to find out. What happened to him if he did not die in the crash as the Commission says? So, these are the questions which have to be answered, which have to be clearly decided. And there is no reason of denigrating any leader. But there should be no reason to deny the space to Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose in the history of freedom of India and his inspiring life to the coming generations of this country. We respect all leaders of the Indian freedom movement, all revolutionaries, all great heroes and the respect which people deserve is decided by the respect they command in the hearts of the people. There is no denying that each one of them commands a great respect. But, the place of Netaji in India's freedom movement and his whereabouts should be made correctly known to the people in order to give a very correct direction to the developments after 1945. That is the most important thing. If you want to know it, and, if you can help it, well and good; otherwise, people will decide themselves what to do.

श्री शिवराज वी० पाटिल : मैं आप के अंतिम नुकते पर अपनी राय पहले जाहिर करना चाहता हूँ। जोशी साहब ने कहा कि हम सब नेताओं को बराबर का मानते हैं। मैं उस से पूरी तरह से इत्फाक रखता हूँ। उन्होंने बहुत अच्छी बात कही है। दूसरी बात यह है कि हबीबुर्रहमान का evidence पहले की कमेटी ने accept किया था और ये दूसरे जज उस को एक्सेप्ट नहीं कर रहे हैं तो हम को उस में देखना चाहिए। उन्होंने बहुत अच्छी बात पूछी कि क्यों मानना चाहिए कि वह बच गए और सारे नहीं बच सके। इस के संबंध में मैं आप को बताना

चाहता हूँ कि रिपोर्ट में क्या लिखा है। "Regarding the altitude from the where the plane nose-dived, it is stated that the plane crashed immediately after take off." So, it could not perhaps gain the height of 12 or 14,000 feet as planes were not technologically very advanced. Moreover, the plane crashed within the precincts of the airfield. If, it really had gained the height, it could not have fallen within the boundary of the airfield.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: So, they have disbelieved Habib-ur-Rahman's comments that the plane took the height of 6000 - 14,000 and, then, nose-dived.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, I would give you a concrete example.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: This is what I am saying, "concrete example."

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। मोरारजी देसाई नॉर्थ-ईस्टर्न स्टेट्स से हमारी सरकार के हवाई जहाज में बैठकर आ रहे थे, उस का एक्सीडेंट हुआ(व्यवधान)... और मोरारजी बाहर आ गए। हम सब को खुशी हुई। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया : वह बहुत छोटा हवाई जहाज था। ...(व्यवधान)...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी : वह जहाज से बाहर आ गए, जब आदमी कहता है कि 12 हजार, 14 हजार फुट से nose dive किया। This is what he says.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): May I suggest something, Mr. Minister? I don't think so that anything is the last word. This is where the mystery is and this is where...(Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Sir, even if the plane crashes from 33,000 feet, there are several others in that. Mr. Joshi knows it. You are an expert in civil aviation. Therefore, I am referring to it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): If you had known the answers so clearly, we would not have been debating like this. So, obviously, there is an element of mystery, and answers would be sought by successive generations also like somebody said. So, I personally feel that it would be better if *Mantriji* make his concluding remarks.

श्री शिवराज वी० पाटिल : मैं अंत में सिर्फ एक वाक्य में यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस सदन की एक भावना से पूरी तरह से सहमत हूँ और वह भावना है कि नेता जी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस की स्मृति को हमें इस प्रकार से अपने दिल में और हमारे देश में रखना चाहिए जिस की वजह से उन की गरिमा ऊँची-से-ऊँची रहे।

यह हमको सौ टके मानने हैं और इसके लिए आप जो भी करने के लिए कहेंगे, वह हम करेंगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): बात तो यही है कि नेता जी जहाँ भी हैं, वह अमर हैं।

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I don't expect judgements from the Chair.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी) : नहीं, हम जजमेंट नहीं दे रहे हैं ...(व्यवधान)... नेता जी तो अमर हैं ही। आप उसको कैसे कहेंगे? उनकी यादगार है, हमारे सभी दिवंगत नेता अमर ही हैं। जिनके लिए दिल में प्रेम है, वे अमर ही तो कहलाते हैं।

The House then adjourned at fifteen minutes past eleven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 25th August, 2006.