CONCLUSION

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 and the continued presence of Soviet troops on Afghan soil since then is unprecedented in the annals of international relations. Afghanistan is an ancient country, whose history dates back to over 5000 years. Since its emergence as a modern political entity about 25 decades back, Afghanistan has been the nerve centre of Super Power rivalry. The geo-strategic location of Afghanistan makes it share border with the Soviet Union. Despite the severe pressures of Anglo-Russian rivalry prior to the Second World War and Soviet-United States (US) rivalry in the post-war period, Afghanistan has always warded off the overtures of Super Powers by pursuing the policy of strict neutrality and genuine nonalignment. Thus, it also managed to safeguard its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Afghanistan had pursued this smooth course for centuries and even the change of regime did not affect the basic tenets of Afghan foreign policy.

However, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 changed the entire course of Afghan history and an independent and nonaligned country became a "satellite of Soviet Empire". The background of Soviet invasion was laid down during the last week of April 1978 when the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) seized power, with Soviet help, by overthrowing and simultaneously killing Sardar Mohammad Daud. Between April 1978 and December 1979, the Soviet military advisers, and troops had started reaching
Afghanistan for a virtual takeover. The PDPA regime had departed from the traditional path of genuine non-alignment and Afghanistan was gradually pushed into the Soviet orbit. The Soviet invasion in the last week of December finally sealed the fate of Afghanistan as an independent and sovereign country. Today's Afghanistan is a client and satellite state of Soviet Union.

The existing norms and practices of international relations and international law as well as the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations are opposed to the invasion and occupation of one country by another country. Afghanistan throughout the course of its history has always pursued the policy of strict neutrality and genuine non-alignment. Besides, the pursuit of peace and friendly relations have always been the main bulwark of Afghan foreign policy. It has never harboured territorial designs against any country, especially its neighbours. Rather, Afghanistan had been the victim of foreign aggression, three times by the British and three times by Soviet Union, prior to the Second World War and again by Soviet Union in December 1979.

Even during the heydays of Anglo-Russian rivalry, Afghanistan never fell a prey to either Soviet or British overtures nor it allowed its territory to be used by either side against the other. The Afghan rulers were convinced that they could retain the independence and territorial integrity of Afghanistan by pursuing a policy of strict neutrality. Even during its hostilities with the British, Afghanistan never accepted the Soviet help but defended itself with its own
indigenous resources. In the immediate aftermath of the conclusion of the Second World War, the Soviet-US rivalry for winning newly independent countries to their respective "spheres of influence" gave rise to the emergence of cold war which was followed by the founding of military alliances. Afghanistan remained aloof from the power politics of the cold war and did not join any military alliance. It pursued the policy of genuine nonalignment.

In the wake of these developments, the Soviet invasion and its consequent occupation of Afghanistan is very perplexing and unwarranted. There was not even a slightest provocation on the part of Afghanistan which could prompt the Soviets to invade Afghanistan. Moscow for long had been cherishing the goal of reaching the "hot waters" of the Indian Ocean through the Indian subcontinent or through Persian Gulf. The strategic location of Afghanistan was most congenial for Soviet Union to fulfil its centuries old dream. The Soviet action proves that Moscow, for long, had been harbouring territorial designs on Afghanistan and was looking for an opportunity which came in April 1978 and culminated in fulfilling Soviet aspirations in December 1979.

By invading Afghanistan, Soviet Union has violated its bilateral agreements with Afghanistan, violated the principles of the United Nations Charter and defied the world public opinion. But for the December 1978 Soviet Afghan treaty, all earlier treaties signed in 1921 and 1926 between Moscow and Kabul had reiterated Soviet affirmation in the independence and territorial integrity of Afghanistan. The Treaty of Neutrality
and Non-aggression signed between Moscow and Kabul on 31 August 1926 enjoined upon both the countries to maintain neutrality in case either of them was involved in a military conflict with a third country. It also provided that both countries would refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of each other. Before the advent of communist regime in Kabul in April 1978, the Afghan policy towards Russia had been based on good neighbourliness, mutual respect, and principles of peaceful coexistence. This policy was vigorously pursued by different regimes in Afghanistan. All the joint statements and joint communiques issued by the two countries prior to April 1978 had reiterated the faith of two countries in these principles.

The Afghan-Soviet friendship treaty signed on 5 December 1978 envisaged under Article IV that both countries sought continually to develop cooperation in the military field on the basis of appropriate agreements and also provided for consultations between the two countries and for the initiation of appropriate measures by mutual consent to ensure their security, independence and territorial integrity. It was under the pretext of this clause that the Soviets justified their invasion of Afghanistan. The Soviets claimed that they had been "invited" by the Kabul regime to defend Afghanistan against the "foreign intervention".

It is worth noting that the advent of the Soviet-backed communist government in Kabul in April 1978 was followed by exodus of Afghans opposed to the communist takeover from Afghanistan into neighbouring Pakistan and Iran. The people

---

1 For full text of the treaty see, Soviet Review (New Delhi), vol. 16, no. 58, 21 December 1978, pp. 31-34.
of Afghanistan also organized themselves into resistance groups to launch armed struggle against the Soviet occupation. Thus the Russian backed communist regime in Kabul was almost near collapse and Moscow also saw an opportunity to fulfill its long-cherished ambition of reaching the hot waters of the Indian Ocean by occupying Afghanistan. Consequently the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in the last week of December 1979 using the Soviet-Afghan Treaty of 1978 as a pretext.

The resolutions passed by the General Assembly have called for the immediate and total withdrawal of "foreign troops" from Afghanistan. But the Soviet Union has not cared to comply with those resolutions which are only recommendatory in nature. Moscow, being the permanent member of the Security Council, has already vetoed a resolution on Afghanistan on 7 January 1980 and can veto any such resolution which it deems detrimental to its interests. However in General Assembly where Moscow cannot influence every member, has passed several resolutions calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and even condemned the Soviet invasion on Afghanistan. This shows that the Soviet action in Afghanistan is in utter violation of the principles of the UN Charter and has dared to be unconcerned about what the General Assembly has called for.

Besides, the Soviet Union has also shown utter disregard for the international public opinion. The Soviet invasion and continued occupation of Afghanistan has been widely condemned by the nonaligned Summit Conferences held in New Delhi in 1983 and at Harare in 1986, by the Organization of Islamic
Countries, European Economic Community (EEC) and other regional organizations like ASEAN, Arab League, OPEC etc. The salient points common to the resolutions passed by these organizations have called for the immediate and total withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the return of the Afghan refugees to their homes with honour and dignity and the restoration of the independent and nonaligned status of Afghanistan. All such urgings and appeals have fallen flat on Soviet ears.

Under the contemporary international relations, act of one Super Power can be counterbalanced by the other Super Power. After all the countries of the Third World have been the victim of the Super Power rivalry which threatens their existence. The United States can definitely help in entangling the Afghan knot. The reaction of Washington to the developments in Kabul between April 1978 and December 1979 had been lukewarm. The Carter Administration also took time in imposing US sanctions against the Soviet Union. However, the US was itself engaged in the US hostages' affair in Iran during that period. These sanctions were softened by the Reagan Administration.

The advent of diplomatic relations between Kabul and dates Washington back to early 1940s but efforts in this direction were initiated as early as the second half of the second decade of the present century. The lukewarm US response to the Afghan endeavours to establish diplomatic relations between the two countries during 1920s and 1930s did not deter Kabul which continuously availed every opportunity to convince the policy makers in Washington of Afghanistan's anxiety and eagerness to establish diplomatic relations between the two countries.
The establishment of diplomatic relations between Afghanistan and the United States in 1942 coincided with the zenith of the Second World War. The United States was involved in the war. However, Afghanistan maintained the policy of strict neutrality throughout the period of Second World War. The Afghan policy of strict neutrality during the war period was highly appreciated by the Allied powers especially in United States.

The post-Second World War period witnessed the growth of cordial and friendly relations between Kabul and Washington. Afghanistan got economic and technical assistance from the United States which proved helpful in the economic and industrial development. In the wake of the onset of cold war hotly chased by the United States and Soviet Union to win over the newly independent countries to their respective "spheres of influence", Afghanistan pursued a genuinely nonaligned policy and maintained an independent posture in international affairs. Keeping in view the cold war situation and Afghanistan's proximity to Soviet Union, the United States failed to properly appreciate the geo-political significance of Afghanistan for US strategy. The US foreign policy under Dulles ignored Afghanistan. Afghanistan's requests for US arms during 1950s were also ignored. Moscow seized this opportunity to win Afghan favour by providing increased economic aid especially after mid 1950s. This does not mean that Afghanistan abandoned its traditional policy of genuine nonalignment and toed the Soviet line. But more enlightened US foreign policy during the Dulles period could have made Afghanistan less dependent on Soviet Union for economic and military assistance.
The Afghanistan-US relations thrived uninterruptedly since the beginning of early 1940s till the advent of Russian-backed communist coup in Kabul in April 1978 on the basis of mutual respect for each other, non-interference and peaceful coexistence. The United States provided substantial economic and technical assistance to Afghanistan during this period. There had been exchange of visits by the leaders of the two countries. Both countries shared common views on global and regional issues. Afghanistan had great admiration for US role in maintaining international peace and security while the United States greatly valued Afghanistan's policy of genuine non-alignment.

However, the lukewarm reaction by the United States to the advent of pro-Moscow communist regime in Kabul in April 1978 allowed the developments to take a decisive turn in December 1979 when Soviets invaded Afghanistan. A stern action in the form of diplomatic and economic sanctions against Moscow and stern warning to Moscow not to interfere into the internal affairs of Afghanistan could have prevented Soviet Union from invading Afghanistan in December 1979.

In the wake of Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Carter Administration took belated measures by imposing sanctions against the Soviet Union and warning the latter to "keep hands off from the Persian Gulf". By the time US sanctions were announced, the tens of thousands of Russian troops had entrenched their position in Afghanistan. An early and immediate strong action by Carter Administration could have saved the situation from further deterioration.
However, the United States under Reagan Administration has rendered valuable humanitarian assistance to the people of Afghanistan in their just struggle against Soviet invasion. Washington has condemned the Soviet act of aggression in the United Nations and its consistent stand on Afghan issue has helped in boosting the morale of Afghan freedom fighters.

Though United States has rendered diplomatic and humanitarian assistance to the Afghan Mujahideen, yet this alone is not sufficient to drive the Soviets out of Afghanistan. The US should take more tough stand in the United Nations and other international fora against the Soviet Union so that the latter should realize that its action in Afghanistan would strain its relations with the United States. Besides, the Reagan Administration should give direct economic and other types of assistance to Afghan Mujahideen and not through any third party. It is worth mentioning here that it was the tough stand of Washington which compelled Moscow to withdraw its troops from Iran in 1946. The Soviet Union should be made to realize that it would not be allowed to usurp Afghanistan. The US should re-impose severe diplomatic and economic sanctions against Soviet Union in order to pressurize Moscow to vacate the aggression in Afghanistan.

Another hope of defusing the Afghanistan crisis is the United Nations. Afghanistan is one of the founding members of the UN. It has played very active and constructive role in strengthening the world body. The moral support rendered by Afghanistan to the United Nations in tackling the crucial global issues has been instrumental in consolidating the constructive role of the world body in maintaining international peace and
security. But when one of its members - Afghanistan - has been invaded by another powerful member - Soviet Union - the world body has failed in discharging its basic duty of safeguarding the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan.

The First resolution passed by the General Assembly in January 1980 condemned the Soviet Union by name for invading Afghanistan and called for the "withdrawal of Soviet troops" from Afghan soil. But the subsequent resolutions passed by the General Assembly beginning with December 1980 resolution became mild in their condemnation of Soviet Union and called for the "withdrawal of foreign troops" from Afghanistan. It seems that Moscow succeeded in influencing the functioning of the General Assembly which is reflected in the softening tone of UN resolutions on Afghanistan. If such a state of affairs is allowed to continue the faith of the countries in the UN would be eroded.

The resolutions so far passed by the General Assembly suffer from many weaknesses. In the first instance, the invader (Soviet Union) is not mentioned by name. The Soviet troops are stationed on Afghan soil and the reference in the resolution to "withdrawal of foreign troops" defeats the very purpose of the resolutions. Instead, reference should be made to "immediate, complete and unconditional withdrawal of Russian troops from Afghanistan".

Secondly, though the resolutions passed by the General Assembly have recognized that Afghan problem is of political nature and it needs political solution, yet all the belligerent parties have not been invited for the negotiations. The communist regime in Kabul does not represent the entire population of Afghanistan but only the minority government backed by Moscow. More than one third of Afghan population are living as refugees in Pakistan, Iran and other countries, and the Afghan Mujahideen represent all Afghan people. Hence, the Afghan Mujahideen should be represented in the United Nations and not the pro-Moscow regime in Kabul. Thus the resolutions passed by the General Assembly do not reflect the genuine aspirations of the people of Afghanistan.

Soviet Union being a Super Power and one of the founding members of the United Nations owes a greater responsibility to abide by the principles of the UN Charter and safeguard the interests of the world body. Besides being the permanent member of the Security Council, it devolves on Moscow a special responsibility to see that the resolutions passed by the Security Council are implemented in letter and spirit. Paradoxically, Soviet Union has defied the basic principles of the UN by invading Afghanistan, a fellow member and misused its veto power to conceal its own political misadventurism.

The resolutions passed so far by the General Assembly have asked for the withdrawal of "foreign troops" and do not mention the withdrawal of "Soviet troops" from Afghanistan. It seems that Moscow has used pressure tactics to influence the
resolutions of the General Assembly. Besides, the resolutions have also failed to mention clearly the inalienable rights of the people of Afghanistan to safeguard the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of their homeland which has been jeopardized in the wake of Russian aggression.

The resolutions passed by the General Assembly have not condemned Russia as an aggressor by name. Besides, these resolutions are not asking for "complete, unconditional and immediate" withdrawal of Russian troops.

There is also no objection to the representation of the Soviet backed communist regime in Kabul in the UN in these resolutions. The resolutions passed by the General Assembly recognize that the question of Afghanistan needs a political solution. Any negotiations designed to seek the solution of political nature involves the participation of all belligerent sides. However the UN resolutions have failed to provide a belligerent status to the representatives of the Afghan Mujahideen in the Geneva Talks. The Afghan Mujahideen are fighting against the Russian aggression. These freedom fighters represent the bulk of Afghan population. Any resolution seeking political settlement of Afghanistan without the participation of Afghan Mujahideen would be unacceptable to the people of Afghanistan.

Apart from this, the UN resolutions have referred to "safeguarding security, national sovereignty, independence and
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territorial integrity of Afghanistan". In reality, the resolutions should ask for the "restoration of all rights" of the people of Afghanistan which have been curbed and violated in the wake of Russian aggression. After having restored all the rights of Afghan people, then only the question of preservation of independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan should be taken up.

The incorporation of these basic points is very essential and they form the basis of "restoration," "safeguarding" and preservation of national interest of Afghanistan. Any arrangements without the inclusion of these provisions would not be acceptable to the people of Afghanistan.

Thus it devolves on the UN General Assembly to provide representation to the representative of the Afghan Mujahideen who are the sole, legitimate and true representative of the people of Afghanistan, to present the Afghan case. Any resolution adopted by the General Assembly seeking the political solution of Afghanistan problem without the participation of Afghan Mujahideen would not be acceptable to the people of Afghanistan. And such arrangement would be unjust and unimplementable.

The hopes raised by the Geneva Talks have also been belied. In 1981 the General Assembly had asked the UN Secretary General to hold talks with Soviet Union, communist regime in Kabul, Pakistan and Iran to explore the possibility of finding a political solution to Afghanistan problem. In early 1982,
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the UN Secretary General appointed the UN Under-Secretary General, Cordovez, as his Special Representative, to hold talks with the concerned parties. This has come to be known as "Geneva Talks". The Special Representative of the UN Secretary General have held seven round of talks with the representatives of Kabul regime and Pakistan while Iran has been kept informed about the ongoing progress made in the talks.

The UN Secretary General in his report on Geneva Talks submitted to the General Assembly on 7 October 1986 said that in May 1986 an understanding was reached at between Kabul and Islamabad that the political settlement should consist of a set of instruments that would include a bilateral agreement on non-interference and non-intervention, a declaration on international guarantees; a bilateral agreement on the voluntary return of the refugees and an instrument that would set out the inter-relationship between the aforementioned instruments and the solution of the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops in accordance with an agreement to be concluded between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union.

However, the possibility of such an agreement to be accepted by the Afghan Mujahideen is very remote because they are not represented in the Geneva Talks. Neither the Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General nor the other countries party to the talks have ever bothered to ascertain the standpoint of Afghan Mujahideen. Any agreement with regard to Afghanistan without the participation of Afghan Mujahideen
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would not be acceptable to the people of Afghanistan.

The emphasis in UN resolutions and the Geneva Talks is on the withdrawal of "foreign troops" and the international guarantees of non-interference and non-intervention into Afghanistan. The Soviet Union and the communist regime in Kabul which is surviving on Moscow's support, have relegated the issue of withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan to a secondary place by laying stress on international guarantees. It is clear that Moscow and its puppet regime in Kabul have been overawed by the stiff resistance put up by the Afghan freedom fighters. Thus their pretext of international guarantees is nothing but a ploy to thwart the endeavours of the Afghan Mujahideen. Pakistan or any other country is not supporting in any way the Afghan freedom fighters. They are fighting themselves with their own resources. And though the United States has offered to give "international guarantee" but the Soviet Union has neither accepted the US guarantee nor is willing to withdraw its troops from the Afghan soil. The United States and other permanent members of the UN Security Council should impress upon the Soviet Union to secure a guarantee from Moscow to immediately withdraw its troops from Afghanistan unconditionally under the auspices of the Security Council. The basic crux of the whole issue is the unconditional, immediate and complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. The only pressing problem is the presence of Russian troops in Afghanistan. Once the invading forces are withdrawn, the Afghan refugees would automatically return to their homeland. It is a humanitarian issue which is the outcome of Russian invasion. The independent
and nonaligned status of Afghanistan should also be restored immediately.

The Geneva Talks were initiated after having acknowledged the fact that Afghan problem is of political nature and it needs a "political solution". Thus, it warranted the participation of all belligerents as equal parties in the negotiations. Like General Assembly resolutions, the Geneva Talks have ignored the participation of the Afghan Mujahideen as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Afghanistan. When none of the belligerents -- Russia as an invader and the Afghan freedom fighters as a defender are represented, then the very purpose of Geneva Talks becomes self-defeating.

The problem of a political nature needs a political solution. The negotiations concluded in this regard call for the equal representation of all belligerent groups concerned with a view to provide legitimacy and acceptability to such a solution under the existing norms and principles of international law and diplomacy. The mere consultations or proximity talks between puppet government in Kabul and other non-belligerents without the participation of Afghan Mujahideen have rendered Geneva Talks as infructuous and thus unacceptable to the people of Afghanistan.

From the Soviet side, the participation of Kabul regime in Geneva Talks, which does not have any independent status in negotiations but to support Soviet Union, is advantageous to Moscow. Such a move also helps the Soviets to be absolved of
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my responsibility. The Afghan Mujahideen are the true representatives of the people of Afghanistan and not the communist government in Kabul.

Besides, even if the base for participation in Geneva Talks is the neighbours of Afghanistan, then all the neighbours are not represented in Geneva Talks. Only Pakistan is represented while Iran is only kept informed. This criterion is also invalid because all neighbours are not involved in the negotiations.

Secondly, if the base or criterion is the Islamic countries, then only two Islamic countries — Pakistan and Iran — are involved. While Pakistan is participating in the proximity talks, Iran is only "kept informed". Islamic countries numbering over forty have neither been consulted nor participants to the Geneva Talks. This renders it as invalid.

Furthermore, if the base is regarded the presence of Afghan refugees in Pakistan and Iran, the Afghan refugees are present in the other countries as well. The refugee problem is a humanitarian issue which has emerged because of Russian invasion. The Soviet emphasis on Afghan refugee problem being of humanitarian nature is only a diversion from the basic issue which is of political nature. Moscow wants to mislead the international public opinion by such diversions. Thus, there is a dire need to be cautious of Soviet manoeuvres and not to be misled by it.

Besides, if the base of participation in Geneva Talks is political parties, then only one party — the People's
Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) which is in power in Kabul should not be represented in the talks. There are several other political parties in Afghanistan who should be equally represented. It is well known that when PDPA seized power in Kabul in April 1978 with the help of Soviet Union, the entire Afghan nation stood in revolt against it. The massive number of over five million Afghans who are living in Pakistan, Iran and other countries is a testimony to the fact that the people of Afghanistan are opposed to the present pro-Moscow communist regime and the presence of Soviet army on Afghan soil. Thus the PDPA is not the true representative of the people of Afghanistan. Its very representation in the Geneva Talks is against the accepted norms of international law.

The question of Afghanistan is absolutely and purely a political question of Russian invasion. Its only solution is the vacation of Russian aggression. The first condition for the political solution of Afghan problem is the unconditional, complete and immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. This also entails the complete and immediate withdrawal of Soviet non-military personnel, Warsaw Pact forces, dismantling of Soviet military bases and its propaganda machinery in Afghanistan.

Then follows the restoration of complete independence, national sovereignty, territorial integrity and the nonaligned status of Afghanistan. This is the basic and inalienable right
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of the people of Afghanistan to select their own political, economic, social and cultural system without any outside interference or intervention.

All these above mentioned bases are recognized under international law and all nations should respect and honour them. Thus, it devolves on every country to support the cause of Afghan people to help resolving the present crisis.

However, it is ironical that the response of the nonaligned movement (NAM) and the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) has been very mild to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Afghanistan has been the oldest nonaligned country. It has played a pivotal role in founding the NAM and furthering its cause. Afghanistan played a significant role in the Asian Relations Conference and the Bandung Conference. Afghanistan's role in the nonaligned summit conferences since Belgrade (1961) to Colombo (1976) has been commendable. Following the advent of pro-Moscow communist regime in Kabul in April 1978, the nonaligned status of Afghanistan was eroded because it was represented in the Sixth NAM Summit at Havana in 1979 where it endorsed the Cuban thesis that Soviet Union was the "natural ally" of the nonaligned countries. According to A.R. Pazhwak, the participation of Noor Mohammad Taraki as the leader of Afghanistan at the Havana summit was a "severe blow to the NAM as well as to Afghanistan".
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The New Delhi NAM Summit (1983) and the eighth NAM summit held at Harare (1986) have also failed to assuage the aspirations of the Afghans. The resolutions adopted by the New Delhi NAM summit and the Harare summit on Afghanistan have been ambiguous and very mild. The failure of the NAM to condemn the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is a severe blow to the basic principles of the nonaligned movement. Today a nonaligned Afghanistan has been the object of Soviet aggression, tomorrow other nonaligned countries would be the target of Soviet expansionism. The best course for the NAM would have been to oust the representative of the present Kabul regime and a representative of the Afghan Mujahideen would have been represented. Besides, the NAM should have condemned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in strongest terms. Emphasis could have been laid on the restoration of the nonaligned status of Afghanistan.

The Organization of Islamic Conference in its meeting in 1980 took a commendable step by expelling the Communist Government of Afghanistan from the membership of the OIC and adopted a strong resolution on Afghanistan. However, the subsequent resolutions adopted by the OIC became mild in their criticism of Soviet Union. After having expelled the communist representative of the DRA, the OIC should have initiated the representative of the Afghan Mujahideen to represent Afghanistan. Besides, the Islamic countries should impose severe diplomatic and economic sanctions against Moscow until the latter withdraws its forces from Afghanistan.
Besides, the Nonaligned Summit Conferences, Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) and other international forums should amend the weak points of their resolutions on Afghanistan as suggested supra. This will reflect the strong disapproval of the Soviet action in Afghanistan by the international public opinion and will also be an expression of solidarity with the people of Afghanistan.

Under the prevailing circumstances the member countries of NAM, Islamic Community and United Nations should suggest and support the convening of an international conference on Afghanistan. This conference on Afghanistan should be held under the auspices of the United Nations in which all the permanent members of the Security Council and the representatives of all the political parties of Afghanistan, including the Communist Party of Afghanistan as a political party, should be invited. This conference should work out a concrete and effective programme to ensure the immediate, unconditional and complete withdrawal of all Soviet troops, advisers and civilian personnel from Afghanistan.

After having the most urgent task of the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan been achieved, then the complete independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and nonaligned status of Afghanistan should be restored. The people of Afghanistan should be allowed, without
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any outside interference or intervention, to decide their own political, economic and social system keeping in consonance with the Afghan traditions. The Afghan Mujahideen should also unite themselves by sinking their differences and form a Government in exile. A Loya Jirga or Parliament should be formed which should include the people living inside Afghanistan, Afghan refugees living in Pakistan, Iran, USA, Europe and other parts of the world and the Afghan freedom fighters. The Loya Jirga should then select a "Council" and develop "a political personality", which should work as Afghan Government in exile. Then all freedom loving countries of the world should accord recognition to Afghan Government in exile. This will help in giving legitimacy to the struggling people of Afghanistan in their cause in the United Nations, Islamic Community, NAM and other international forums. Besides it will be an effective and legitimate instrument to seek the speedy solution of Afghan question more effectively.
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