

*United Nations***Viet Nam censured for 5th time**

THE UN General Assembly has adopted a resolution condemning Viet Nam for its invasion of Kampuchea and calling again on it to withdraw its occupation troops. The resolution — put forward by 49 countries including the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) — was carried on Oct. 27 by a vote of 105 to 23 with 19 abstentions. It was the fifth time Viet Nam has been condemned by the United Nations, an indication of how unpopular its aggressive and expansionist policy is.

The ASEAN countries (Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand) are close neighbours of Kampuchea. They recognize the gravity of the threat presented to peace and security in Southeast Asia by Viet Nam's aggression against Kampuchea. For five years they have refused to recognize the fait accompli of Viet Nam's occupation of Kampuchea, have supported the just struggle of the Kampuchean people against Vietnamese aggression and have actively sought to solve the Kampuchean question through reasonable UN resolutions. However, Hanoi, disregarding the appeals and demands of the international community, has stubbornly persisted in its aggressive and expansionist policies, refusing to implement the resolutions and withdraw its troops. That is the crux of the problem.

The UN General Assembly has once again adopted a resolu-

tion demanding the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea, which the international community holds to be the key to settling the conflict.

The Vietnamese authorities are expected to ignore the UN resolution. But they would be wise to recognize that debts must be paid. The UN resolutions are not empty papers, and the moral weight behind them

should not be underestimated. These resolutions will act to officially encourage the Kampuchean people in their struggle against Hanoi and to mobilize world opinion against the invaders.

There are changes happening in the international situation, in Viet Nam's internal situation and on the Kampuchean battlefield. Let's see how long Hanoi clings to its obstinate course of refusing to carry out the UN resolutions.

— Ren Yan

*Grenada***US armed invasion is condemned**

ON Oct. 25, the United States landed about 2,000 troops on tiny Grenada in the eastern Caribbean while that country was bogged down in internal turmoil. Fierce fighting immediately broke out between the Grenadian army and the US forces. This development in the Caribbean situation has shocked the international community and aroused great concern among the people of the world.

According to the Charter of the United Nations and the rules guiding international relations, a country's internal differences can only be solved by its people alone. No other country has the right to interfere. Any form of interference — subversion, the application of pressure, or direct armed invasion — is impermissible and firmly opposed by the international community.

Because the United States is a permanent member of the UN

Security Council, the onus is on it to abide by the principles of the UN Charter and to safeguard the rules of international relations. Its invasion of Grenada is a gross violation of the Charter and basic international behaviour. No pretext whatsoever justifies the outside interference in the internal affairs of Grenada, which can only be resolved by its people alone. The invasion is an act of power politics, of a strong country bullying a weaker one. This incident of violent interference cannot possibly restore order and stability in the Caribbean; it will only further complicate an already tense situation.

China has always upheld the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence guiding international relations and opposed outside interference. It strongly condemns the United States' armed intervention in Grenada and has called for the prompt withdrawal of US troops there. It demands that the Grenadian

people be allowed to settle their problems free from outside interference.

Central America and the Caribbean are among the most turbulent areas in the world today; but issues concerning the countries in these regions can be resolved only by themselves. Penetration and interference by the superpowers will only wor-

sen the tense situation. All questions and inner contradictions in these countries should be settled through peaceful negotiations. The United States must stop its armed intervention of Grenada, and the normal situation in this area must be restored.

— "Renmin Ribao"
Commentary, (Oct. 27)

Lebanon

Situation after the ceasefire

THE twin explosions in Beirut which killed 146 US marines and about 80 French soldiers on Oct. 23 have drawn strong reactions from all parties concerned, including the Lebanese Government. They complicate even further an already complex situation.

After the ceasefire agreement was reached on Sept. 26, there were signs of progress in the Lebanese situation. However, the ceasefire itself did not resolve all the contradictions in the Lebanese crisis, and violations of the ceasefire have continually occurred. It is obvious the agreement will not be easily implemented without an early national reconciliation.

In accordance with the agreement, the ceasefire on all fronts has been supervised by neutral observer troops stationed in Lebanon. The Lebanese Government's suggestion that the United Nations send troops received support from the United States and France. But the opposition factions in Lebanon and Syria resolutely rejected this proposal, because they thought it would set a precedent for UN intervention in Lebanon's internal affairs. Through the mediation of Saudi Prince Bandar bin Sultan, all the parties con-

cerned agreed that Italy and Greece would each send 400 soldiers to Lebanon to monitor the truce. Because the questions of who will command this unit, where it will be deployed and what role it will play remain unsettled, it is difficult to guarantee the actual implementation of the ceasefire agreement.

Under the agreement, the national reconciliation conference was supposed to have been held as soon as possible after the ceasefire agreement was signed. But, because the various factions could not agree on a location, the meeting was not scheduled until Oct. 31. Although the dispute over the conference location was not an essential question, it shows how deeply divided the factions are on some major issues. The Lebanese Government stressed that the conference would discuss the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Lebanon and opposed the idea that the conference might be used to distract attention from the problem of their continued presence. The Lebanese Salvation Front and other opposition factions demanded that the conference first discuss Israeli troop withdrawal from southern Lebanon. They also want to abol-

ish the Lebanese-Israeli agreement and revise the Democratic Constitution of 1943, which assigned power to the various religious sects.

Foreign influence has made the Lebanese situation more complex. Observers in Lebanon noted that Syria has played an important role in the ceasefire agreement and would participate in the Lebanese national reconciliation conference as an observer. Because Syria is the main force supporting the opposition factions in Lebanon, its attitude and views could significantly influence the conference.

Because of its presidential election next year, the United States has made efforts to promote the ceasefire agreement, hoping the truce would be maintained. Official US spokesmen have repeatedly expressed support for the legal government of Lebanon, and the US Congress decided that US marines would remain in Lebanon for 18 months. US President Ronald Reagan recently emphasized that the United States would never let the Middle East fall into the hands of the Soviet Union.

Moscow said that the ceasefire agreement is a positive step, but it is taking advantage of the fragile situation to weaken US influence and prepare for its return to the Middle East political arena. It is reported that the Soviet Union recently shipped a large number of sophisticated weapons into the Arab area, including SS-21 missiles. Israel has therefore asked the United States to provide Pershing missiles. People are afraid the US and Soviet arms race in the Middle East will further aggravate the tensions there.

— Chen Jichang, Zhou Guoming