

THE TASHKENT SPIRIT

*India's Banner
for Today*

*Mankind's
New Chapter*

By
ROMESH CHANDRA

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

THE TASHKENT SPIRIT

**INDIA'S BANNER FOR TODAY
MANKIND'S NEW CHAPTER**

By
Romesh Chandra

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

CONTENTS

Foreword	1
Eighteen Years	3
For and Against Tashkent	5
Seven Days in the City of Roses	8
Battle for Peace Still Goes On	11
Answering Anti-Tashkent Lobby	13
Carrying Forward Tashkent Spirit	15
Appendixes:	
I. Tashkent Declaration	18
II. Kosygin on Tashkent	21
III. Shastri Replies to Soviet Pressmen	23
IV. Shastri's Last Message to Nation	24

Price : 30 Paise

Printed and published by D. P. Sinha at New Age Printing Press, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 1, for Communist Party of India, 7/4 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi 1.

FOREWORD

The signing of the Tashkent Declaration on January 10, 1966 was a historic event not only for the peoples of India and Pakistan, but for all peace-loving mankind. It was a major milestone in the struggle for a world from which war has been banished for all time.

The victory was certainly that of the statesmanship of the leaders assembled in Tashkent—above all, that of the late Prime Minister Shastri, President Ayub Khan and Prime Minister Kosygin. But what gave them the strength to exercise that statesmanship was the will for peace of hundreds of millions in all lands, who watched the Tashkent deliberations with hope and expectation. It was these hundreds of millions who responded to the appeals of the peoples of India and Pakistan, and threw their entire might behind all efforts to end the conflict between the brother peoples of the two countries.

Prime Minister Shastri had rightly said before he left New Delhi for Tashkent that the eyes of the world would be on the summit deliberations. It was these eyes which stood on guard to prevent any sabotage of the talks, and helped in the final days to bring about success.

It is the peoples of the world, the witnesses of the Tashkent Declaration, who stand guarantee for its implementation. It is they who can help decisively to carry forward the Tashkent spirit.

This pamphlet is dedicated to those who strive for peace in every continent, in every nation. It is dedicated to the great and ever-growing world movement for peace, in whose ranks I have had the privilege of working for the last 15 years.

The Tashkent spirit is a new charter of peace for all humanity. It is the banner for today, which can lead the people of this country forward in their struggle for a new India in a new world.

*New Delhi,
Republic Day, 1966*

ROMESH CHANDRA

EIGHTEEN YEARS

To understand fully the meaning of Tashkent, it is necessary to recall, albeit briefly, the background and pinpoint the events which led to the summit meeting in the Uzbek capital.

The partition of India by imperialism in 1947 had one principal aim: that of keeping alive tension and conflict between the two newly-independent states of India and Pakistan, in order to provide continued opportunities to imperialism for interference and domination in the subcontinent.

The Pakistani aggression in Kashmir followed fast on the heels of independence. The strategic importance of the Kashmir Valley made it a most desirable region for imperialism's war bases.

When the Kashmiri people and the Indian armed forces beat back the Pakistani aggression, the imperialists conspired to keep the so-called Kashmir problem alive by arranging a cease-fire, which allowed Pakistan to retain a considerable portion of the Kashmir state under its forcible occupation.

This stratagem not only served to ensure that the flames of conflict were kept at a fairly high temperature, but also enabled the imperialist powers to use the Kashmir areas under Pakistani occupation for their war bases. The setting up of a key US base in Gilgit is no longer a secret.

Followed closer and closer military alliances and pacts between Pakistan and the imperialist powers. The US-Pakistan military pact of 1954 was the funnel through which the Pakistani armed forces were equipped with modern weapons out of all proportion to any reasonable 'defence' requirements. The SEATO and the Baghdad Pact (later it became the CENTO) were also major parts of imperialist conspiracy in this region.

Pakistan became a vital cog in the imperialist war machine in Asia. Its war bases were scattered all over its territory: it

was from Peshawar that the notorious American U-2 Spy-plane flew on its wicked mission over the USSR; and there are several such American planes in several bases in Pakistan.

As India's policy of non-alignment grew stronger and became an inspiration for more and more newly-independent countries, imperialism's hatred for India also grew. The US and British governments yearned to reverse the policy of non-alignment and give it a pro-imperialist direction.

Pressures were used again and again. India's food deficit became a handle for imperialist blackmail. So also the needs of India's economic development. Defence requirements were also used for imperialist pressures.

During all these years, the so-called Kashmir question was again and again brought up in the United Nations by Pakistan, at the instigation of the imperialist powers. The story of the imperialist conspiracy in Kashmir is a long one and cannot be recapitulated here.

Repeatedly the Kashmir issue was brought on to the agenda of the Security Council. Vicious anti-India resolutions were brought forward by the US and British representatives and their friends. Only the vote of the Soviet Union, which consistently took a principled position on Kashmir, prevented the imperialists from securing the stamp of the UN for their nefarious conspiracy.

Pretending to be interested in Indo-Pakistan peace, the imperialists actually did everything to encourage and assist the continuation and intensification of Indo-Pakistan tension.

This was the background to the actual hostilities which started with the largescale Pakistani infiltration into Kashmir in the first week of August 1965 and ended with the cease-fire of September 23, 1965.

The Indian people learnt more vividly than ever before of the role of the imperialist powers, as the main force behind the Pakistani aggression. The Sabre-jets and the Patton tanks and other armaments which gave the Pakistani armed forces the strength to launch the aggression, were all planfully supplied gratis by the imperialist powers.

The martyrs who gave their lives for the defence of our motherland, were killed by the US and British bombs, bullets and shrapnel. It was American napalm which burnt into Indian flesh.

To carry forward the Tashkent spirit today, one must not forget who the enemies of that spirit have always been. Today the imperialists pay lip service to Tashkent. Make no mistake, they are as anxious to destroy the Tashkent spirit and fan the flames of tension as they have always been for the last 18 years.

Against the imperialists are ranged the masses of the Indian and Pakistani peoples, who sincerely desire peace. The Indian and Pakistani peoples are brother peoples, tied to each other with bonds of common struggle against imperialism, common traditions, culture and language, common problems and aspirations. It is this essential unity of the peoples which if brought into play can defeat the most foul plots of imperialism.

FOR AND AGAINST TASHKENT

It was not an easy battle to ensure that the Soviet government's invitation to Tashkent would be accepted by both India and Pakistan. Of course, in India the overwhelming feelings of friendship for the Soviet Union ruled out any possibility of a refusal. But enthusiastic acceptance is far from mere inability to refuse.

As for Pakistan, there was more than hesitation, there was deep suspicion.

While the two countries considered the invitation, the imperialists made no secret of their opposition. How could the Soviet Union dare to 'interfere' in a problem which the US and British governments had made their exclusive preserve all these years?

There was indeed weeping and gnashing of teeth among the gods of war and their worshippers.

But precisely for the same reasons that they wept and conspired against Tashkent, the democratic and patriotic forces raised their heads in hope and with a new confidence.

The Tashkent meeting, they argued rightly, would give the possibility of lifting the entire Indo-Pakistan question out of the orbit of imperialism, out of the reach of imperialist interference—and, therefore, there was reason for their optimism that a beginning could be made towards peace.

January 4, 1966 could be a Red Letter Day in the world's peace calendar—said the anti-imperialists of the world confidently, despite the doubts and suspicions of the cynics and the chauvinists.

How can a problem which has been kept alive for 18 years suddenly begin to be solved? How can the words of so recent a conflict, the bitterness and enmities, be healed and ended so soon? These were questions which were asked even by those who sincerely desired a settlement.

The answer could be given only if one understood that Tashkent meant striking at the roots of the conflict, which lay in imperialist interference. The answer could be given only if one understood that the Soviet Union had no axe of its own to grind at Tashkent, but could act with strength, because its principal aim was peace and in this it had the backing of the entire world public opinion.

The imperialists took no chances. They began to increase their pressures a hundredfold.

President Johnson insisted that both Prime Minister Shastri and President Ayub Khan visit him in December, *before* Tashkent. Ayub Khan went. Shastriji did not.

The Indian democratic movement's campaign against American blackmail had reached such giant proportions that it succeeded in ensuring that India's Prime Minister did not go, cap in hand, to the lords of the dollar.

The Pakistani leader's visit to Washington was used to assure him of continued American and SEATO and CENTO military backing, and thus strengthen him to take rigid positions at Tashkent on the Kashmir problem.

As far as India was concerned, when the Prime Minister

declined to go till February, the Food Minister was summoned, assured of PL-480 bounty, and informed of the *quid pro quo* expected by Washington. At the same time, imperialist agents inside the country, led by the Jana Sangh-RSS gangs, began to campaign against the acceptance of the invitation to Tashkent, and to concoct lurid tales of Soviet 'pressures' on India.

In the early stages, Indian government spokesmen appeared to succumb to these imperialist and reactionary pressures, and argued apologetically in favour of the Tashkent meeting by saying that it was impossible to refuse the Soviet invitation in view of Soviet friendship for India.

Only later did Prime Minister Shastri himself change the atmosphere by arguing publicly in enthusiastic support of Tashkent. The climax was reached on the eve of his departure for Tashkent at a reception given for him by the Indo-Soviet Cultural Society. Here not only did Shastriji warmly praise the Soviet Union for its great initiative; he went further to pledge himself to make all possible efforts to reach an agreement at Tashkent, and to state categorically that failure at Tashkent would be his failure and that of President Ayub's.

Slowly the forces of peace were beginning to assert themselves. The World Council of Peace and its national committees had acted resolutely urging support for a non-aggression pact between India and Pakistan, for a consolidation of the ceasefire, for withdrawal of armed forces and other armed personnel, for an end to imperialist interference through the SEATO and CENTO.

This worldwide support had strengthened the hands of the peace-makers.

But the imperialists worked feverishly, blackmailing, threatening, spreading suspicions and lies.

In their anti-Tashkent campaign, the imperialists had a partner in the Chinese leadership. Having failed to prevent the Pakistani President from accepting the invitation to Tashkent, the Chinese leaders engaged themselves in hotting up the tension on India's borders.

This was interpreted by all commentators as an effort to assure the Pakistan government that the Chinese leaders were

ready to continue to assist in further aggression against India-- and thus encourage any tendencies to sabotage Tashkent.

The Chinese leaders made no secret of their displeasure that the Soviet Union's Asian soil had become the venue for an important peace effort affecting two major Asian countries. Tashkent's success would be a blow at the Chinese leaders' determination to deny the Asian character of the Soviet Union, and, of course, a blow at the anti-Soviet slanders and vituperations indulged in by the Chinese leaders.

Thus the battle lines were drawn up on the eve of Tashkent-- those for and those against; those who wished and worked for victory, for an agreement, and those who strove to wreck and sabotage the talks.

SEVEN DAYS IN THE CITY OF ROSES

The negotiations at Tashkent lasted for seven days. Tens of thousands of Tashkent citizens greeted the Indian and Pakistani leaders as they landed in the Soviet Union. Their confident cheers reflected the will not merely of the Soviet people, but the millions in all lands who earnestly wished that Tashkent must not fail.

The sentiments expressed by Prime Minister Shastri reflected in full measure the peace policy of this country. He rightly pointed out again that the eyes of the whole world were on Tashkent and they could not afford to disappoint the hopes which had been roused.

Shastriji was reflecting in his words the sentiments of the entire Indian people when he said:

'Instead of fighting each other, let us start fighting poverty, disease and ignorance.... They (the people of India and Pakistan) need not arms and ammunitions, but food, clothes and shelter.'

The key proposal which was put forward at Tashkent by the Indian delegation was that of agreement for the renunciation of force, a no-war pact, a non-aggression treaty or whatever else it might be called.

The Communist Party of India had put forward this proposal right in the thick of the conflict. On September 15, 1965 the central organ of the Party, *New Age*, had written in a front-page call by the editor:

'All those who sincerely seek an end to the conflagration without imperialist interference must throw themselves behind the demand for a no-war pact, which can guarantee for all time that peace triumphs now and remains triumphant in the future, against the forces of war and imperialism.'

The Communist Party campaigned for a no-war pact or any version of it, as the key to Indo-Pak peace.

On the initiative of the Indian peace movement, the Executive Committee of the World Council of Peace had on October 23 called for a 'non-aggression pact between India and Pakistan'. This call had been reiterated in November by the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council.

India could confidently put forward the proposal for renunciation of force at Tashkent because it had now the support of peace-loving people in all lands for such a proposal. Prime Minister Shastri insisted on the acceptance of such an agreement because he knew well that any refusal by Pakistan would isolate it more than ever in the world.

The spirit of peace prevailed. Whatever 'interpretations' may now be sought to be given to the Tashkent Declaration, the fact remained that a solemn pledge to renounce the use of force to settle Indo-Pakistan problems has been made. The Indian democratic movement can be proud that it was the Communist Party which kept up a non-stop national and international campaign for such an agreement and thus contributed in no small measure to the final victory.

As the Tashkent talks proceeded, the enemies of peace showed their guilty hands almost openly.

BATTLE FOR PEACE STILL GOES ON

The representatives of the imperialist press, who were covering the Tashkent talks, made no secret of their malicious glee at every hitch that took place. Their questions at press briefings were provocative and intended to create doubts and suspicions on both sides.

The Indian monopoly press reflected in full measure the anti-Tashkent bias of imperialism and reaction. Day after day, they prophesied a collapse of the talks. Vainly they tried to create the impression of Soviet 'pressures' on India, on the basis of a series of lies.

The British government came out into the open by releasing Prime Minister Wilson's anti-India letter to Noel Baker right in the midst of the Tashkent talks. The aim was clear enough: to assure the Pakistani delegation of continued British support for any further aggressions against India.

The Chinese leaders, not to be outdone, thought it fit to send India a threatening note also in the midst of the Tashkent talks. The obvious intention was to strengthen Pakistani obduracy and rigidity.

But the roses of Tashkent prevailed. The story of the tireless efforts of Prime Minister Kosygin and his colleagues has yet to be written. But Prime Minister Shastri himself paid tribute to the Soviet rôle in ensuring success at Tashkent. As a matter of fact, it is clear that but for the Soviet Union's sincere efforts, the Tashkent Declaration might never have been signed.

The Soviet Union could act with so much confidence and so much success, precisely because it knew it had the support of hundreds of millions in all parts of the globe for its peace efforts. It could act thus because in Tashkent, direct imperialist interference was not possible. It could act thus because the love and affection of the Soviet people and their burning passion for peace created an atmosphere in which the forces of war could not flourish, try as they might.

The world applauded the Tashkent victory as it had applauded few events before. The hearts of the Indian and Pakistani peoples surged with new hopes. The door to peace had indeed been opened.

But there is no occasion for complacency.

The Tashkent Declaration is indeed an abiding legacy, a monument to peace, a blueprint for the settlement of disputes between nations. It is a blow to imperialism and reaction, a rebuff to their efforts to increase their influence and interference in the internal affairs of India and Pakistan.

But the essential fact which must be grasped and understood by the democratic movement is this:

The Tashkent spirit can be carried forward only with the active and conscious intervention of the people.

It is good that the new Prime Minister has again and again confidently declared that she will do all that is possible to implement the Tashkent Declaration. Already the High Commissioners of the two countries have returned to their posts. The army commanders have met and plans for withdrawals are being finalised. The first withdrawals have already taken place. Ministerial level meetings are fixed for the coming days. Prisoners-of-war are being exchanged. Indian Airlines have begun overflights of Pakistani territory and vice versa.

Nevertheless, let us make no mistake by underestimating the capacity for sabotage of the imperialists and reactionaries who seek to destroy the Tashkent spirit by all possible means.

It would be disastrous to be lulled into complacency by the lip service paid to the Tashkent Declaration by imperialist statesmen in Washington and London.

As long as Pakistan remains a member of the imperialist military pacts, the dangers of imperialist interference remain. And as long as India does not march forward towards self-reliance, without making itself dependent on PL-480 and other imperialist 'aid', so long can imperialist blackmail make itself felt.

It would be blindness not to realise that Indian reaction has

launched a fullscale assault on the Tashkent spirit.

There are no longer only straws in the wind. The straws have grown into thick tree-trunks.

Mahavir Tyagi resigned from the cabinet on the ground that the Tashkent Declaration is against national interest. The anti-Tashkent lobby was heard even in the Jaipur session of the Indian National Congress. The Jana Sangh has organised a day and a week to attack Tashkent in the name of opposing withdrawal of our forces from the Haji Pir Pass and other places. A demonstration outside Parliament is also planned.

The rallying of right reactionary forces inside and outside the Congress in support of Morarji Desai in the succession battle has been an ominous portent with obvious lessons for the people.

It has been unfortunate that some leaders of parties like the Samyukta Socialist Party and the Praja Socialist Party should have thought it fit to join the rightwing, anti-Tashkent lobby.

This is a development of special concern for the democratic movement and underlines the difficulties which have to be faced in ensuring the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration and the carrying forward of the Tashkent spirit.

The scandalous manner in which Pakistani Foreign Minister Bhutto and his supporters have sought to 'interpret' the Tashkent Declaration has only helped the anti-Tashkent 'crusaders' in both Pakistan and India.

As for the imperialist powers, their chagrin is scarcely concealed, despite their formal words of support to the Tashkent Declaration.

The imperialists seek feverishly to destroy the Tashkent spirit by preventing the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration. They are using their supporters in both India and Pakistan to ensure that a development is brought about as a consequence of which Washington and London can come into the picture more actively once more as 'mediators' or 'peace-makers'.

Carrying forward the Tashkent spirit requires constant struggle against the efforts of imperialism and reaction to sabotage the implementation of the Declaration.

ANSWERING ANTI-TASHKENT LOBBY

The arguments of the anti-Tashkent propagandists must be confidently answered. The fears they seek to rouse among the masses must be allayed. And the real motives of the opponents of Tashkent exposed.

The Jana Sangh has repeatedly stated that the Tashkent Declaration is 'detrimental to national interests and derogatory to national honour.' The General Secretary of the Sangh, Din Dayal Upadhyaya, pompously announced that the Tashkent Declaration 'died with Shastriji's dying'.

Similar fulminations have been the stock-in-trade of the Jana Sangh mouthpiece *Organiser*. It has tried desperately to build up the theory that India signed the Tashkent accord because of the 'arm-twisting' and 'soul-squeezing' tactics of the Soviet Union.

The American lobby in the country, as represented by such papers as *Current*, has also been attempting to spread lies about so-called Soviet pressures, which 'compelled' India to agree to terms which are not palatable to us.

The Indian people have refused to swallow this anti-Soviet campaign. On the contrary, friendship and affection for the Soviet Union have grown by leaps and bounds in the post-Tashkent period.

What are the main arguments of the right reactionary anti-Tashkent 'crusaders' and do these arguments really have any basis?

The first point in the anti-Tashkent campaign is related to India's withdrawal from the strategic posts of Haji Pir and Tithwal. The Jana Sangh and others of its way of thinking argue that the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri had stated on the floor of Parliament that India would not withdraw from these posts unless we had a guarantee against infiltration by Pakistan into Kashmir. According to the Jana Sangh, no such guarantee has been secured, and Pakistan refused to sign a no-war pact.

The truth, however, is quite different. The substance of a

no-war pact is incorporated in the Tashkent Declaration, in the agreement to renounce force and in the guarantee of non-interference.

In these circumstances, the primary demand of the Government of India has been met—and there could not be any justification for refusing to withdraw from Haji Pir and Tithwal.

Let us also remember that the Security Council resolution of September 20 had categorically demanded that both sides withdraw to the August 5 positions. India was already committed to this resolution. The Tashkent Declaration, by securing Pakistan's agreement to the renunciation of force (concretely in regard to Indo-Pak relations) and non-interference, enabled India to accept and carry out the withdrawals, under far better conditions than provided by the Security Council resolution.

The anti-Tashkent lobby argues also that India should not have agreed to the clause on non-interference—on the fantastic ground that this prevents our people from assisting the democratic movements in East Pakistan, Pakhtoonistan, etc.

This is indeed a fantastic argument. At no time has India sought to interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan. There has been sympathy for the democratic movement in Pakistan—but this is *not* interference in the internal affairs of that country.

It has been the Ayub government which has been sending armed infiltrators into Kashmir, which has now solemnly pledged itself to stop such interference.

It is true that all sorts of 'interpretations' are sought to be put on the clause on non-interference by reactionaries in Pakistan. But the clear interpretation which all honest men in all parts of the world will give will be one which categorically states that infiltration of the kind indulged in by Pakistan in Kashmir in August 1965 is interference which is now banned under the Tashkent accord.

The arguments of the anti-Tashkent lobby are essentially hollow and carry no weight.

The declaration on the renunciation of force, the clearcut assurance of non-interference and of observance of the cease-fire agreement—these provide the guarantees which Indian demo-

cratic opinion rightly demanded against infiltration and aggression.

Therefore, in this context, the agreement to withdraw to the August 5 positions is in perfect conformity with India's repeated stand that it does not seek to use force for settling disputes.

India's national interests, the defence of our integrity and sovereignty are guaranteed by the assurances and pledges regarding the renunciation of force and non-interference. The Indian people must insist that these pledges are honoured.

To those who point out Bhutto's 'interpretations' and provocative utterances, the best answer is to quote Lal Bahadur Shastri himself. When he was asked at Tashkent, just before he died, whether he was convinced about the sincerity of Pakistan regarding implementation of the Tashkent accord, the late Prime Minister answered:

'Why don't you ask me about my own sincerity? Are there not people in my country who are every day calling for a total war against Pakistan?'

World public opinion has been a major factor in bringing about the Tashkent accord. It will continue to play a part in the future in ensuring its implementation. The Indian democratic movement must again and again turn to this world opinion to draw its attention to the necessity for continued pressure in support of the Tashkent spirit.

CARRYING FORWARD TASHKENT SPIRIT

While the major and immediate task certainly is to ensure the implementation of the Declaration and to combat the efforts of imperialism and reaction to sabotage it, there is another task also of great significance.

The Tashkent Declaration has created a climate of peace, which can and should be utilised by India for vital peace initiatives. First and foremost, there is the question which concerns

India itself—that of a settlement with China. It is true that the Chinese leaders have spurned all efforts for a peaceful settlement till now. On the contrary, they have restarted and intensified provocation on the borders.

The Chinese leaders have sought to pour oil on the flames of Indo-Pakistani conflict, and they made no secret of their desire that Tashkent should fail. During the Tashkent talks, the Chinese government sent a provocative note to India which could have had no other meaning than to encourage the Ayub government to take rigid positions. All these are facts and they cannot be ignored.

Nevertheless, the atmosphere created by Tashkent should be utilised by the Government of India to take fresh initiatives for a peaceful, negotiated settlement with the People's Republic of China.

Obviously it should be possible to take the help of the good offices of friendly powers for such initiatives. And obviously again, any such settlement can only be on a principled basis and consistent with India's national interests and integrity.

Again, it should be emphasised that here, too, as in the case of Indo-Pakistani differences, it would not be possible to ensure success if the imperialist powers or any one of them or their closest allies were allowed to interfere. It is not their 'good offices' which we want, but the good offices of anti-imperialist powers.

India's stature in the world would rise greatly if such initiatives were taken in the wake of the Tashkent victory.

Apart from the question of India-China differences, the Government of India can now confidently take initiatives by itself and together with other anti-imperialist governments for peace in different parts of the world.

In particular, an initiative to end US aggression in Vietnam on the basis of the withdrawal of all US forces and the recognition of the South Vietnam Liberation Front as the only representative of the South Vietnamese people, can and should be taken by India.

As one of the architects of the Tashkent monument to peace, India has the prestige once again and the duty to act more

resolutely than ever for peace and national independence, against war and imperialism.

The Tashkent spirit is the spirit of peace and anti-imperialism. To carry it forward is the sacred duty of our people. For India, the Tashkent spirit means strengthening peace, non-alignment and anti-imperialism.

Come, let us join hands in defending the Tashkent spirit from the hordes of imperialism and reaction. Let us join hands, all Indian democrats, in a nationwide campaign to ensure that, like the 'blithe spirit' that was Shelley's skylark, the Tashkent spirit also soars higher and ever higher.

APPENDIX I

TASHKENT DECLARATION

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan, having met at Tashkent and having discussed the existing relations between India and Pakistan, hereby declare their firm resolve to restore normal and peaceful relations between their countries and to promote understanding and friendly relations between their peoples. They consider the attainment of these objectives of vital importance for the welfare of the 600 million people of India and Pakistan.

I

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan agree that both sides will exert all efforts to create good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan in accordance with the United Nations Charter. They reaffirm their obligation under the Charter not to have recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means. They considered that the interests of peace in their region and particularly in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent and, indeed, the interests of the peoples of India and Pakistan, were not served by the continuance of tension between the two countries. It was against this background that Jammu and Kashmir was discussed, and each of the sides set forth its respective position.

II

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that all armed personnel of the two countries shall

be withdrawn not later than 25 February 1966 to the positions they held prior to 5 August, 1965, and both sides shall observe the cease-fire terms on the cease-fire line.

III

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that relations between India and Pakistan shall be based on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of each other.

IV

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that both sides will discourage any propaganda directed against the other country, and will encourage propaganda which promotes the development of friendly relations between the two countries.

V

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that the High Commissioner of India to Pakistan and the High Commissioner of Pakistan to India will return to their posts and that the normal functioning of diplomatic missions of both countries will be restored. Both governments shall observe the Vienna Convention of 1961 on Diplomatic Inter-course.

VI

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed to consider measures towards the restoration of economic and trade relations, communications, as well as cultural exchanges between India and Pakistan, and to take measures to implement the existing agreements between India and Pakistan.

VII

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that they give instructions to their respective authorities to carry out the repatriation of the prisoners of war.

VIII

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that the sides will continue the discussion of questions relating to the problems of refugees and evictions/illegal immigrations. They also agreed that both sides will create conditions which prevent the exodus of people. They further agreed to discuss the return of the property and assets taken over by either side in connection with the conflict.

IX

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that the sides will continue meetings both at the highest and at other levels on matters of direct concern to both countries. Both sides have recognized the need to set up joint Indian-Pakistani bodies which will report to their governments in order to decide what further steps should be taken.

X

The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan record their feelings of deep appreciation and gratitude to the leaders of the Soviet Union, the Soviet government and personally to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for their constructive, friendly and noble part in bringing about the present meeting which has resulted in mutually satisfactory results. They also express to the Government and friendly people of Uzbekistan their sincere thankfulness for their overwhelming reception and generous hospitality.

They invite the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR to witness this Declaration.

January 10, 1966

Prime Minister of India
LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI

President of Pakistan
MOHAMMED AYUB KHAN

APPENDIX II

KOSYGIN ON TASHKENT

On January 10, after the concluding session of the Tashkent meeting, Soviet journalists asked Alexei Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, to give his impressions of the talks between India's Premier Shastri and Pakistan's President Ayub Khan, which had just ended.

Alexei Kosygin said:

The Tashkent Declaration, which is a major political document, was signed here today. It marks a new stage in the development of relations between India and Pakistan, puts an end to the military conflict, indicates ways of overcoming difficulties that hamper normalisation of relations between the two major Asian powers, and in our opinion, furnishes real foundations for conditions of peace in that highly important area of Asia.

These were difficult talks but it could not be otherwise. For, disputed problems were accumulated in the course of many years. More, it should be borne in mind that the enmity between Pakistan and India was a heritage of the long period of domination by the colonialists, who set the enslaved peoples at loggerheads with each other. The situation was further aggravated by the flaring up of a military conflict between India and Pakistan.

We understand that it was not so easy for the leaders of the

two countries, which but recently were in a state of war, to meet at the conference table, to shake each other's hands and to begin a search for the solution of those difficult problems which divide Pakistan and India. However, both India's Premier Shastri and Pakistan's President Ayub Khan were able to rise above all this, accept the Soviet government's invitation and come to Tashkent for the talks. We regard this as manifestation of great statesmanlike wisdom and concern for the vital interests of the peoples of both countries.

How did the talks themselves proceed? These were seven days of patient search for mutually acceptable solutions. The intricate problems dividing Pakistan and India were examined item by item. The President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India worked hard in exploring avenues leading to a solution of these problems. It can be said boldly that they did everything to find a constructive approach to a solution of the problems in which both the Indian and Pakistani peoples are interested.

The Tashkent Declaration establishes peace, normalises diplomatic relations between Pakistan and India, settles many other questions which arose as a result of the conflict, paves the way for a reduction of military expenditures of both countries, and, hence, of the military burden which the peoples of India and Pakistan carried and still continue to carry.

All this enables both states to pass over to normal life. That is why, it seems to me, the peoples of India and Pakistan will pay tribute to their leaders for having been able to find solutions that accord with the fundamental interests of their peoples.

All people who sincerely desire that peace prevailed in this major region of Asia, will rejoice at the wise step taken by the statesmen of both countries.

The implementation of the Tashkent Declaration will depend on the ability and statesmanlike insight of those who will put this Declaration into life. The fulfilment of the provisions, recorded in the Declaration, will be of tremendous importance. As a result of their realisation the peoples of Pakistan and India will experience themselves the real results of the Tashkent Meeting.

I avail myself of this opportunity to convey the warmest congratulations to the peoples of India and Pakistan from the entire Soviet people and to wish them peace and happiness in every home, in every family.

APPENDIX III

SHASTRI REPLIES TO SOVIET PRESSMEN

Immediately after the signing of the Tashkent Declaration the Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri replied to the questions of Soviet Press correspondents.

★ ★ ★

Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister, what are in your opinion the most important results of the just concluded Tashkent meeting?

First of all I wish to note that here, in Tashkent, we received with the President of Pakistan a very important opportunity to discuss frankly our disputed problems. The Tashkent Declaration shows that we have achieved very tangible results. The most important one of them is that a concrete step has been taken towards the restoration of genuinely peaceful relations between India and Pakistan.

Second, not less important result of the Tashkent talks is that their outcome undoubtedly will promote the strengthening of the cause of peace in Asia and throughout the world. I am convinced that the peoples of India and Pakistan, at one with the other peoples of the world, will meet with satisfaction the results of the Tashkent Meeting.

Esteemed Mr. Premier, what specific steps is your government going to take to fulfil the Tashkent Declaration?

I imagine that appropriate Ministers of India and Pakistan will begin to work in the near future to outline specific steps

for the fulfilment of the Declaration. It seems to me that commissions may also be set up at various levels which will look after the implementation of the Declaration.

Mr. Prime Minister, to what extent did the conditions in Tashkent facilitate a success of your talks with the President of Pakistan?

To a great extent! First of all, I wish to note the great and noble role played in the holding of the talks, due to his good services, by the Soviet Prime Minister Mr. Alexei Kosygin, and we are very thankful to him for this.

The second thing that also helped us, was that both the welcome on the day of our arrival and the attitude of the people of Tashkent to what we were doing here, were also an important element in our successful work. I think that this is a reflection of the goodwill of the Soviet people who are striving for peace.

Mr. Prime Minister, what would you like to convey to the people of the Soviet Union?

Our good relations with the Soviet Union are commonly known. We wish to strengthen them, but I intend to express my feelings more fully tomorrow when we fly away from the wonderful city of Tashkent.

APPENDIX IV

SHASTRI'S LAST MESSAGE TO NATION

A few hours before his sad death Prime Minister Shastri told Indian journalists, why the agreement had been necessary for the good of our people and for peace.

'Our agreement has definitely reduced tension and conflict in

this part of the world, I am sure this will be generally welcomed in most countries,' he said.

The late Prime Minister added: 'It is a happy augury that we have ultimately agreed to this Declaration. In view of the agreement on no-use of force, peaceful methods and non-interference in internal affairs, we felt that we should also accept the withdrawal of forces.

'This was unique, unprecedented experiment and it succeeded. The whole world will acclaim the Tashkent Declaration as a victory for common sense and peace, an example of how long-standing problems need not stand in the way of mutual understanding and in the improvement of mutual relations.'

Shastri paid handsome tributes to the Soviet leaders and Premier Kosygin in particular for untiring efforts and for constructive, correct, sympathetic, friendly and patient attitude.

Soviet participation had played an important role in formulating the part dealing with renunciation of force. 'We are indeed deeply grateful to the Soviet Union for this most valuable contribution and active help in ironing out and narrowing differences,' he said.

Shastri said that we have to realise how important it was to conclude an agreement and to avoid the serious consequences of drift, incidents and provocations. 'This declaration is a harbinger of peace. We have pledged to live as good neighbours,' he said.

Shastri spoke of the great value of Indo-Soviet friendship for India's welfare, security and independence.

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATIONS
1965

WHY THIS FOOD CRISIS

by **Bhupesh Gupta**

20 Paise

●

**DEFENCE, DEMOCRACY, SECULARISM—
KASHMIR**

by **S. G. Sardesai**

50 Paise

●

QUIT COMMONWEALTH

by **Bhupesh Gupta**

40 Paise

●

OIL AND SELF-RELIANCE

by **B. Mehta**

30 Paise

Order from:

**PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE
PRIVATE LIMITED**

5 Rani Jhansi Road

New Delhi-1.