INTRODUCTION TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Representatives of the Security Council should note that the agenda provided is only provisional and represents a fraction of the issues the Security Council discusses. Any issue regarding international peace and security may be brought before the Council. Many topics listed in this guide will change significantly before the Conference. Additional topics may be added as necessary or as the Council sees fit.

For this reason it is highly advised that representatives have a broad knowledge base regarding current events in the international community. Periodicals and online sources are some of the best sources available for day-to-day updates. Recommended sources include: *The New York Times*, *United Nations Chronicle*, *The Times of London*, *Al Jazeera*, *Mail & Guardian*, *Foreign Policy* and *The Economist*. The United Nations Foundation's online daily newsletter, United Nations Wire, is also an excellent resource for timely information. Whenever possible it is also recommended that representatives stay abreast of the most recent reports published by the Security Council and other relevant United Nations bodies. These can be found via the United Nations homepage under the Security Council section.

Unlike many other simulations, Security Council Members are able to make declarative statements and operational decisions that will affect the course of the simulation. It will be the job of Council representatives to actively bring their State's national policies and capabilities into the simulation. While AMUN Simulations Staff will frequently consult with Council Members, representatives are welcome and encouraged to make declarative statements—including real or implied threats and deals—that do not carry operational implications outside of the United Nations. Representatives must always consult with the Simulations Staff before making ANY operational decisions. Operational decisions would include announcements of the movements or actions of military forces, as well as any other actions that would have an effect outside of the United Nations. In these cases, the Simulations Staff would be equated with the actual home office or government of the involved Member States(s).

Representatives are also encouraged to seek out Simulations Staff to act in the home office capacity when they need to supplement their research on a situation. Simulations Directors wear many hats, including acting as an in-house resource for representatives about their countries as well as the topics at hand.

OTHER INVOLVED COUNTRIES

From time-to-time other States will be involved in the deliberations of the Council. Delegations representing these States, if present at AMUN, will be asked by the body to participate in deliberations by the Council. If they are not present, or choose not to participate in deliberations, a member of the AMUN Secretariat will represent them as necessary. It is customary for the Council to request the presence of relevant Member States during discussion of a topic relevant to that State's interests, however it is not required. Any State mentioned in the background research for a specific Security Council is a potential candidate for an outside participant in the Council as well as any State related to a topic relevant to international peace and security. For delegations that may be asked to appear before one of the Historical Security Councils (HSC) these States will be notified in advance by the Secretariat, and should have one or more representatives prepared to come before the HSC at any time. Because these States will not be involved in all issues, the representative(s) responsible for the HSC must be assigned to another Committee, preferably with a second representative who can cover that Committee while they are away. A floating Permanent Representative would also be ideal for this assignment. All delegations will be asked to identify their representative(s) to the HSC at registration, and to indicate where they can be reached if needed.

A NOTE ABOUT HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCILS

AMUN's HSCs are unique not only in their topics, but also in their treatment of those topics. History and time are the HSC's media and they are flexible. Both HSC Simulations will preempt history from their start date, which are provided later in this chapter. History will be as it was written until the moment the Council convenes. From that moment forward, however, what transpires will be dependent upon both Council Members' actions and Simulations Staff decisions. Council Members are encouraged to exercise free will based on the range of all the choices within their national character and upon the capabilities of their governments.

Effective roleplaying for an HSC Member State will not just be a routine replay of national decisions as they evolved in that year. Indeed, the problems of the era may not transpire as they once did, and this will force active evaluations—and reevaluations—of national policies. Thus, it cannot be said that the policy course a government took in that year was necessarily the wisest. While rote replays must be, by definition, in character, it is not a sure thing that—given a second opportunity to look at events—any given national government would do things exactly the same way. History is replete with the musings of foreign ministers and heads of state pining for second chances.

It will be the job of Council representatives to actively bring their country's policies and capabilities into the simulation when discussing problems and issues which may not have had adequate contemporary resolutions. There is almost always more than one alternative choice in any situation. In particular the international community has often chosen not to actively involve itself in many regional disputes or political crises where it might have shown greater involvement. The United Nations itself has often been a bystander to regional or international conflict. Representatives will need to decide what changes, if any, could have been made to the Security Council's posture on the various issues. One major factor representatives should consider when deciding whether or not to be actively involved, is the cost of involvement by the United Nations. An increase in costs often causes the Security Council to reprioritize its efforts.

While national governments often did not want international meddling in what they felt to be national policies or disputes, this in no way lessens the responsibility of Council Members to make the effort and find ways to actively involve themselves in crisis solutions. This task must, however, be accomplished without violating the bounds of the Member States' national characters.

Representatives should approach these issues based on events through the final days before the start date of the simulation and should do their research accordingly. In studying their roleplaying assignments, it is strongly recommended that research be done on these topics using timely materials. The world has changed dramatically over the years, but none of these changes will be evident within the chambers of the HSC. While histories of the subject will be fine for a general overview, representatives should peruse periodicals from 3-5 years prior to the year in question to most accurately reflect the world view at that time. Magazines featuring an overview of that year may give a particularly good feel for the international mood in which the simulation is set. Periodicals contemporary to the period, which can be easily referenced in a Readers Guide to Periodical Literature or the *New York Times* Index, should provide a much better historical perspective and feel for the times than later historical texts, which can be useful for general information.

Both HSC simulations will follow a flexible timeline based on events as they occurred and as modified by the representatives' policy decisions in the Council. The Secretariat will be responsible for tracking the simulation and keeping it as realistic as possible. In maintaining realism representatives must remember that they are roleplaying the individual assigned as their State's representative to the United Nations. They may have access to the up-to-the-minute policy decisions of their States, or they may be relatively in the dark on their State's moment-to-moment actions in the world.

In this area, the AMUN Simulations Staff will frequently consult with HSC members. Representatives are welcome and encouraged, as their State's spokesperson, to make whatever declarative statements they like. Declarative statements would include any comments or actions (including real or implied threats or deals) that an individual at the United Nations could normally make. Representatives must, however, always consult with the Simulations Staff before making ANY operational decisions. Operational decisions would include announcements of the movements or actions of military forces as well as any other actions which would have an effect outside of the United Nations. In these cases, the Simulations Staff would be equated with the home office or government of the involved State.

Representatives are also encouraged to seek out Simulations Staff to act in the home office capacity when they need to supplement their research on a situation. Simulations Directors wear many hats, including acting as an in-house resource for representatives about their countries as well as the topics at hand.

OPEN ISSUES

A unique feature of each Security Council in simulations at AMUN is the Council's ability to set its own agenda. In addition to the situations outlined in the council-specific topic guides on the following pages, each Security Council can discuss any topic that the body wishes. For the contemporary Security Council this includes any real-world event up until the day the simulation convenes. For the Historical Security Councils, representatives should have a working knowledge of the events prior to and including the start date for their respective simulation. For the Historical Security Council of 1973, the start date is 01 May 1973. For the Historical Security Council of 1990, the start date is 10 March 1990.

For the time periods in question, open issues could include any active United Nations peacekeeping operations, the work of any United Nations body active at the time, and any social or economic issue of the day. It is *strongly recommended* that all representatives be well versed on current and historical global events relevant to their simulation.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

The following are brief synopses of the main international situations facing the Security Councils. For the contemporary Security Council these briefs are current as of spring 2016. Information for the Historical Security Councils covers information available up until the respective start dates of each simulation. It is recommended that representatives have a solid foundational knowledge of the background of major international issues. The topics laid out in this handbook are provided as a starting point for further research.

THE CONTEMPORARY SECURITY COUNCIL

The Contemporary Security Council topics below are not all-inclusive of what the Council might talk about at Conference. With the ever-changing nature of international peace and security, these three topics are a guide to help direct your research for your State's position. The information below should be considered a briefing as to the general background of the topics presented. It is not meant to be comprehensive, and representatives are encouraged to do further research into each situation. A more complete and updated version of likely topics for the Contemporary Security Council will be posted online in September at www.amun.org.

For each topic area, representatives should consider the following questions. These questions should assist representatives in gaining a better understanding of the issues at hand, particularly from your country's perspective:

- How did this conflict begin? Is this a new conflict or a re-ignition of a previous conflict?
- How have similar situations and conflicts been peacefully resolved?
- What State and regional actors are involved in this conflict?
- If there are non-State actors involved in a conflict, are there any States supporting them? If so, which ones?

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

SYRIA

Civilian protests began in March 2011, when residents took to the city streets of Deraa to protest the torture of teenagers who had put up anti-government graffiti. The protesters called for the following reforms: resignation of President Bashir al-Assad; allowing political parties in the country; granting equal rights to the Kurdish population; and other political freedoms, such as freedom of the press. The protests turned violent when Syrian security forces fired on the protesters, killing several people.

After the incident, President Assad announced several conciliatory measures, including releasing dozens of political prisoners, dismissing the government and canceling the state of emergency that Syria had lived under since 1963. Unappeased by Assad's measures, protests spread to other communities and fighting between protesters and government forces escalated. By May 2011, Syrian forces had moved into the suburbs surrounding Derra, Banyas, Homs and Damascus to suppress protestors. The consistent attacks from government forces led the United Nations Security Council to condemn the atrocities in August 2011, with the Arab League suspending Syria and imposing sanctions in November.

In February 2012, Kofi Annan was appointed as the United Nations and Arab League Special Envoy to Syria, and a six-point peace plan was announced in March, which Syria accepted. However, the disjointed opposition groups did not agree to the proposal and the peace plan was never implemented. In April 2012, the Security Council passed Resolution 2043 to form the United Nations Supervision Mission in Syria (UNSMIS) to monitor cessation of violence. Syria did not cooperate with the mission and the mandate expired on 19 August 2012.

Violence continued unabated for the next several of years with the refugee and internally-displaced people counts rising. Neighboring countries such as Turkey had to temporarily halt the flow of refugees into the country, so more refugee camps could be built to house the continually-growing population, which already numbered over 200,000. Additionally, the international community grew concerned with the use of chemical weapons on civilian populations, leading to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2118. The resolution set out milestones for the Syrian government to meet in the destruction of its chemical weapons stockpiles and forgo Chapter VII action. The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) reported on 23 June 2014, that 100 percent of Syria's chemical weapons had been removed. Additionally, all chemical weapon production equipment had been destroyed in cooperation with Resolution 2118.

Threats from neighboring Iraq added to an already declining security situation throughout 2014. The Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) began systematically attacking Syrian forces and taking away major profit centers, including oil refineries near the Iraqi border. The United States began airstrikes against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in the fall of 2014, hoping to curb the violence against the Syrian population and working to stem the advance of ISIL from neighboring Iraq. While the airstrikes from the United States and its allies worked to a degree, the lack of coordination among the opposition groups on the ground allowed Syrian forces to continue to make gains against the protestors. By June 2015, government and opposition forces were fighting unchecked around the city of Aleppo with human rights violations on both sides, including the use of barrel bombs on civilians.

THE ISLAMIC STATE IN IRAQ AND THE LEVANT (ISIL)

While ISIL has had many incarnations since the early 1990s, it can trace its present roots to the release of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi from a Jordanian prison in 1999. Al-Zarqawi had been instrumental in key fights in Afghanistan with the Taliban in the 1980s and returned to Afghanistan and Pakistan after release. However, feeling that a United States invasion of Iraq was imminent, al-Zarqawi made his way to Iraq and began militant uprisings against American and Sunni forces. By

2004, al-Zarqawi's success garnered the attention of Al-Qaeda, and he pledged his support to their cause, a limited partnership that would last until 2014.

Even though al-Zarqawi was killed by a United States airstrike in 2006, his followers made impressive gains in the early years after the United States invasion of Iraq, before the surge of American troops between 2007 and 2010 forced them underground. It was not until 2011, when American troops began to withdraw, that they were able to make substantive gains again. With tensions high between the Iraqi government and the Kurdish population, ISIL moved to Mosul and began working to consolidate power and land. On 10 June 2014, ISIL seized Mosul and declared itself a caliphate on 29 June, claiming exclusive political and theological authority over the world's Muslim population. The seizures of the Iraqi cities of Mosul and Tikrit allowed ISIL access to oil fields in both Syria and Iraq. Additionally, ISIL destroyed the Sykes-Picot border, the demarcation between Iraq and Syria that was created after the first World War to divide the Middle East into British and French spheres of influence.

In 2014, ISIL began acquiring territory and exerting influence in Syria as well, working with a presumed agreement with President Assad to attack government opposition forces. However, ISIL forces attacked all forces, including civilian populations, causing a split with Al-Qaeda and encouraging Assad to note that only the Syrian government was strong enough to stand against terrorist forces. ISIL also worked to destroy museums and artifacts predating Islam and forced non-Muslim women into sex slavery. The United States and its allies began airstrikes against ISIL territory in the fall of 2014 with minimal success on the ground. By early 2015, ISIL was in control of several key areas in Syria and Iraq, including oil fields. Additionally, ISIL has worked to establish state institutions, such as a Council of Ministers, as well as recruit additional forces internationally through social media and the exploitation of the international media. On 12 February 2015, the Security Council passed Resolution 2199 condemning both trade with terrorist groups as well as the paying of hostage ransom fees.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BBC News (2015). Syria Profile-Timeline. BBC News. 25 June.

Cockburn, Patrick (2015). The Rise of Islamic State: ISIS and the New Sunni Revolution. New York: Verso.

Glass, Charles (2015). Syria Burning: ISIS and the Death of the Arab Spring. New York: OR Books.

Haddad, Bassam and Ella Wind (2014). The Fragmented State of the Syrian Opposition.

Beyond the Arab Spring: The Evolving Ruling Bargain in the Middle East. Pp. 397-435. New York: Oxford University Press.

Laub, Zachary and Jonathan Masters (2016). The Islamic State. Council on Foreign Relations. 3 March.

Lister, Charles (2015). The Islamic State: A Brief Introduction. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Lister, Charles (2014). Profiling the Islamic State. Brookings Doha Center Analysis Paper, Foreign Policy at Brookings.

UN News Centre (2014). "ISIL must be defeated," declares Security Council, urging "common effort" to halt militants' offensive. United Nations News Centre. 18 October.

UN News Centre (2014). Removal of Syria's chemical weapons material complete, announces OPCW-UN Mission. United Nations News Centre. 23 June.

Spencer, Robert (2015). The Complete Infidel's Guide to ISIS. New York: Regnery Publishing.

Young, William, David Stebbins, Bryan A. Frederick, and Omar Al-Shahery (2014). Spillover from the Conflict in Syria: An Assessment of the Factors that Aid and Impede the Spread of Violence. Santa Monica, California: RAND Corporation.

UN DOCUMENTS

United Nations, Security Council (2012). The Situation in the Middle East. 21 April. S/RES/2043.

United Nations, Security Council (2013). Resolution 2118. 27 September. S/RES/2118.

United Nations, Security Council (2015). Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. 12 February. S/RES/2199.

THE SITUATION IN UKRAINE

In February 2013, representatives from Ukraine and the European Union met to discuss the political and economic measures necessary for the adoption of a European Union Association Agreement with Ukraine and the entry of the Ukraine into a free trade zone with European Union members. In 2012 the European Union's members expressed concern that the weakening of democracy and human rights in the Ukraine posed a barrier to ratification of the agreement. Tensions escalated when Russia increased customs inspections on Ukrainian imports as a reaction to Ukraine's increasingly warm relationship with western Europe. Additionally, the Ukrainian Parliament declined to release former Prime Minister Yulia V. Tymoshenko from prison for medical treatment, a change required by the European Union before the political and trade agreements could be signed. Largely due to political pressure, President Viktor Yanukovich announced on 21 November 2013 that Ukraine would suspend its plans to sign the European Union agreement and would instead pursue closer ties with Russia. This announcement sparked outrage in many European capitals and spawned protests in Kyiv. International concern and pressure on the Yanukovich government to respond to protesters' demands grew. On 15 December, the European Union suspended negotiations with Ukraine after President Yanukovich failed to address protester and international concerns regarding Russia's involvement in Ukraine. In February 2014, Russian Special Forces extracted President Yanukovich from Ukraine. Upon learning that President Yanukovich had fled to Russia, the Ukrainian Parliament removed him from power and set up a provisional government until elections could be held.

Following President Yanukovich's removal, protesters in the Ukrainian province of Crimea, an autonomous republic within Ukraine where the majority of the population identifies as ethnically Russian, made calls to rejoin Russia. The idea soon garnered broad support within greater Crimea, including within the Crimean Parliament. On 28 February, Ukrainian officials accused Russia of invading Crimea with roughly 16,000 troops and trying to incite further violence in Ukraine. Russia denied these charges and noted that the troop movements were in line with any agreement made with the Ukrainian government for troops stationed in the area. On 6 March 2014, the pro-Russian Crimean Parliament set a date of 16 March for a referendum on whether to secede from Ukraine and become part of Russia. Over 90 percent of referendum voters voted to join Russia. Ethnic Russians make up the

majority of the population of Crimea, but there are a significant percentage Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar minorities.

The United States, the European Union and the United Nations (in A/RES/68/262) have called these elections invalid and have declared Russia's occupation of Crimea illegal. The conflict has since become a flashpoint, exacerbating tensions between Russia, the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The tensions have resulted in a series of economic sanctions against Russia by Western countries. Following the annexation referendum, a United Nations human rights monitoring team was deployed to Crimea with a pending invitation to visit the capital, Simferopol; they were denied entry. In March 2014, Russia vetoed an otherwise unanimous Security Council resolution declaring the Crimean referendum invalid.

Elections were held in Ukraine in May 2014, and Petro Poroshenko was elected President. President Poroshenko announced that he would push for early parliamentary elections and would work to mend ties with Russia, with reconciliation contingent on Russia's recognition of Ukraine's territorial claim to Crimea. Even with these gains, violence continued in eastern Ukraine between Ukrainian forces and pro-Russia rebels. The violence intensified on 17 July when Malaysian Airlines flight MH17 was shot down over Ukraine, killing everyone aboard. Western States believed rebels in eastern Ukraine were responsible for the attack and responded with new sanctions on Russia, while the United Nations called for an independent investigation into the incident. Violence continued throughout the summer, with intensified fighting in the south and east near Russia's border, leaving thousands of people dead or displaced.

In September 2014, a ceasefire between Ukrainian forces and pro-Russia rebels was reached, however rebel communities in Crimea continue to refuse to acknowledge actions by the Ukrainian government. In February 2015, the Minsk Agreement was adopted by Ukraine, Russia and other interested parties to help stem the violence in the eastern portions of Ukraine. This Agreement contains provisions for a ceasefire, withdrawal of heavy weaponry by both sides to create a demilitarized zone and constitutional reform in Ukraine, among other things. The Security Council adopted Resolution 2202 on 17 February 2015, calling on all parties to implement the Minsk Agreement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Erlanger, Steven (2015). Fragile Cease-Fire in Ukraine Inspires Little Confidence in West. New York Times. 28 March.

McMahon, Robert (2014). Ukraine in Crisis. Council on Foreign Relations. 25 August.

Sengupta, Somini (2014). Russia Vetoes U.N. Resolution on Crimea. New York Times. 15 March.

Sengupta, Somini (2015). Monitors of Ukraine Conflict Seek Help. New York Times. 24 February.

UN DOCUMENTS

United Nations, Security Council (2014). Security Council Briefed on Fast-Breaking Developments in Ukraine, as Political Official Warns Failure to Secure Russian-Ukrainian Border Obstructing Peace. 12 November. SC/11645.

United Nations, Security Council (2015). Letter from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation (The Situation in Ukraine). 17 February. S/RES/2202.

THE SITUATION IN THE SUDAN AND SOUTH SUDAN

Violence and political unrest in Sudan and South Sudan has spanned several decades. Two rounds of north-south civil war since 1962 have cost the lives of over two million people. A continuing conflict in the western region of Darfur over political control, sovereignty, religion, and land and water rights has driven millions from their homes and killed hundreds of thousands. South Sudan, which seceded in 2011, has also experienced infighting between different ethnic groups. The government of South Sudan continues to struggle to put an end to violence within its borders. Fighting between government troops and rebel factions erupted into a conflict that had killed thousands and prompted millions to flee their homes by the time a tentative internationally-mediated peace agreement was signed in August 2015. Between Sudan and South Sudan lies the oil-rich Abyei region, which both States claimed as their territory following South Sudan's independence, leading to continued conflict and outbreaks of violence.

SUDAN, THE NORTH-SOUTH WAR AND DARFUR

Between 1983 and 2011, more than two million Sudanese died, four million were internally displaced and at least 600,000 fled the country as a result of the north-south civil war. The majority of the fighting was between the southern rebel force, known as the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A), and the Sudanese government. In 2004 the United Nations Security Council approved a special Political Mission, the United Nations Advance Mission in the Sudan (UNAMIS), to facilitate contacts between involved parties and to prepare for the introduction of a United Nations peace support operation. In response to escalating violence in Darfur, the Security Council assigned additional tasks to UNAMIS, including: reinforcing efforts by the international monitoring team led by the African Union, activating inter-agency humanitarian mechanisms and facilitating the work of international monitors in the area. The Southern-aligned SPLM/A continued to clash with the northern Sudanese forces over southern autonomy and independence until 2005. In January 2005, a comprehensive peace agreement was reached between the government of Sudan and the SPLM/A, though South Sudan did not become independent for six more years. Also in 2005, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1590, creating the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) focusing on political support for the peace process, security, governance, and humanitarian and development assistance, among other goals. In 2006, the UNMIS mandate was expanded in the Darfur region to include a peacekeeping force of up to 18,600 troops to protect civilians, despite strong opposition from the Sudanese government.

Ethnic cleansing, systematic rape and the deaths of thousands have plagued the Darfur region. Despite United Nations efforts in the region, Darfur remains in a state of humanitarian and security crisis, with little to no progress toward ending the conflict. The United Nations estimates that around 450,000 people were displaced due to the violence in 2014 alone, placing the total number of displaced peoples at close to 2.5 million since the start of the most recent civil war in 2003. Following consultations in Ethiopia in November 2006, the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) augmented the existing African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) and deployed

an unprecedented joint peacekeeping operation in Darfur: the African Union/United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID). UNAMID was originally authorized by Security Council Resolution 1869 in July 2007 with 19,555 military personnel, 6,432 police and a significant civilian component. The mission was reauthorized in June 2015 for one year. The United Nations reports that this year more than 200,000 individuals have been displaced due to attacks, mainly in the Jebel Marra area of North Darfur.

The International Criminal Court has alleged that Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir has been ordering the repression and ethnic cleansing of the Darfur region's non-Arab population (e.g., ethnic groups such as the Fur, the Masalit and the Zaghawa), resulting in genocide. The International Criminal Court issued an arrest warrant for President al-Bashir in 2009, but he refutes the charges and refuses to turn himself in. Following South Sudan's independence in 2011, the Sudanese government terminated the presence of UNMIS in Sudan, including the Darfur region. However, there is still a large UNAMID peacekeeping force present in Darfur, despite the Sudanese government's efforts to restrict its operations. In June 2015, the United Nations voted to remain in the Darfur region until June 2016. President al-Bashir won another five-year term in April 2015 in an election marked by low turnout.

SOUTH SUDAN

South Sudan gained independence from Sudan in July 2011. The 2005 peace deal that ended the Sudanese civil war stipulated that Sudan hold a referendum on independence. In the January referendum, 98.83 percent of election participants voted for independence. Following this vote, the United Nations Security Council established a new mission, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), to assist with the transition.

Ethnically-charged attacks broke out in South Sudan's Central Equatoria, Jonglei, Lakes, Unity and Upper Nile states, among others, in December 2013. The fighting has been primarily between the Dinka, President Salva Kiir's ethnic group, and the Nuer, the ethnic group of his rival, Riek Machar; it has been about ethnic and political differences, as well as an overall lack of resources (e.g., food, cattle, etc.). Within weeks almost 500,000 peoples were displaced within South Sudan and around 74,300 people fled to neighboring countries. These numbers continued to grow, with total displacement by the end of February 2014 reaching 900,000 people, 167,000 of whom crossed into neighboring countries. The number of civilians classified in the "acute" or "emergency" categories of food insecurity increased from 1.1 million to 3.2 million.

Despite the peace agreement, infighting between ethnic groups continues to cause unrest in the country. In 2014, in response to the severe humanitarian crisis, UNMISS reprioritized its mission toward the protection of civilians, human rights monitoring and support for the delivery of humanitarian assistance. United Nations peacekeepers are sheltering nearly 200,000 people at six protection sites in South Sudan, and more than 2.3 million people have been displaced since the fighting began in 2013.

Security Council Resolution 2206, passed in March 2015, outlines sanctions against South Sudan, including, but not limited to, a travel ban on South Sudanese entering other Member States and freezing South Sudanese assets in Member State territories. Since July 2015, thousands of South Sudanese refugees have been moved to the Abyei region between Sudan and South Sudan in response to the humanitarian and food crises in the South Sudanese state.

ABYEI

The oil-rich Abyei Region is a disputed territory that sits between Sudan and South Sudan that has seen intense clashes between the governments of Sudan and South Sudan, as well as local ethnic groups, since 2008. As part of the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement, Abyei was scheduled to have a referendum in January 2011 to decide its fate, but it never took place, as Sudan and South Sudan disagreed on who should be able to participate. The Ngok-Dinka, a non-Arab ethnic group native to the southern part of the region, and the Misseriya, a nomadic Arab ethnic group from the northern part of the region, have long fought for control of the area. The Misseriya migrate south into Abyei from Sudan for half the year, seeking water and pasture for their cattle. Cattle raids, killings and revenge attacks are frequent and brutal in Abyei. The Misseriya have been known to abduct Ngok-Dinka children. The Ngok-Dinka held a unilateral referendum in 2013, voting to join South Sudan. Such an action would allocate the region's considerable resources entirely to South Sudan. This vote has never been recognized by the Misseriya tribe or by the Sudanese government. South Sudanese officials have been carrying out a diplomatic campaign to convince the international community to recognize the result of the 2013 referendum, with little success. In 2011 the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei (UNISFA) was sent to monitor the implementation of a demilitarized zone in the region, as per Security Council Resolution 1990. In December 2015, the United Nations Security Council voted to extend UNISFA until May 2016.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BBC News. (2015). South Sudan Profile- Timeline. 22 January.

Dumo, Denis. (2016). Ban Urges South Sudan President, Rebel Leader to Form Government. 25 February.

Gunn, Michael. (2016). Clashes in Sudan's Darfur Force 103,000 to Flee Homes, UN Says. 10 March.

Kushkush, Isma'il. (2015). South Sudan Peace Talks Stall. 6 March.

Nichols, Michelle. (2016). South Sudan Rivals Talk Peace While Killing Civilians. 20 February.

Radio Tamazuj. (2016). More Than 700 People From Abyei Participate in Peace Conference With Misseriya. 26 February. Radio Tamazuj.

UN News Centre. (2016). Security Council Renews UN Peacekeeping Force in Abyei For Another Five Months. 15 December.

UN News Centre. (2015). Darfur Security, Humanitarian Situations 'Deteriorated Significantly'- UN Peacekeeping Chief. 17 March.

What's In Blue (2016). Sudan/South Sudan Consultations. 17 February.

UN DOCUMENTS

United Nations, Security Council (2013). Report on the Situation in Abyei. 27 September. S/2013/577.

United Nations, Security Council (2014). Report on South Sudan. 6 March. S/2014/158.

United Nations, Security Council (2015). Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan. 26 February. S/RES/2205.

United Nations, Security Council (2015). Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan. 3 March. S/RES/2206.

United Nations Security Council (2016). Report of the Secretary-General on South Sudan. 9 February. S/2016/138.

United Nations, Security Council (2016). Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan. 10 February. S/RES/2265.

THE HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL OF 1973

HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL OF 1973

In 1972, several regional crises dramatically heightened world tensions, while new cooperation between the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of China began to ease the Cold War conflict that had been raging since the end of World War Two.

Overall, 1972 was a difficult year for the United Nations. The permanent members of the Security Council chose to handle many of their conflicts and disagreements outside of the United Nations, leaving the other Member States feeling that internationalism was going backward and fearing for the future of the organization. In particular, relations between the United States and the United Nations significantly deteriorated in 1972, with the United States going so far as to state that it would use its veto more liberally and no longer take a soft stance on "bad" resolutions, namely those which did not actively deal with world problems from the perspective of the United States. With Communist China receiving full recognition and assuming the Chinese seat at the United Nations in 1972, world focus was turned toward the East. United States and Soviet relations improved dramatically in 1972, with the President of the United States, Richard Nixon, and the General-Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev, signing a Strategic Arms Limitation pact in May and finalizing a United States/Soviet trade pact in October. Soviet and Chinese relations, however, deteriorated over the same time period. This was evidenced by territorial disputes, Soviet accusations that the Chinese were attempting to break apart the Communist world and Chinese support for anti-Soviet governments wherever possible. This is the atmosphere on May 1, 1973, in which representatives will begin their deliberations in the Security Council.

For each topic area, representatives should consider the following questions. These questions should assist representatives in gaining a better understanding of the issues at hand, particularly from your country's perspective:
- How did this conflict begin? Is this a new conflict or a re-ignition of a previous conflict?
- How have similar situations and conflicts been peacefully resolved?
- What State and regional actors are involved in this conflict?
- If there are non-State actors involved in a conflict, are there any States supporting them? If so, which ones?

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

After the Six-Day War of 1967, Arab and Israeli hostilities continued as before, with increased hostilities and continual small conflicts vexing the region. At the October 1967 Khartoum Conference, Arab leaders met and agreed that there would be "no peace with Israel, no recognition of Israel, no negotiations with it." Between 1967 and 1970, Egypt and Israel engaged in a three-year series of border engagements commonly referred to as the War of Attrition. A ceasefire between Egypt, Jordan and Israel was finally reached in 1970, but clashes along the Suez Canal continued. In addition to the border conflict with Egypt, Israel also faces disruption along its borders with Syria, as well as clashes with Palestinian guerrillas operating from Lebanon.

Military incidents between Israel and its neighbors continued throughout 1970, mainly revolving around Arab guerilla bases in Lebanon and Syria. Numerous Israeli attacks into Lebanon occurred, always in response to alleged terrorist attacks by Arabs into Israel. In September 1970, Jordan went on the offensive against the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), which was operating from within Jordan, ousting the PLO in order to reduce retaliatory attacks from Israel. The most significant attack happened at the Olympic Games held in Munich in September 1972. In this attack, 11 members of the Israeli Olympic team were murdered by Arab gunmen. There was a global outcry against the attacks, leading to large-scale retaliation by Israel against Arab bases in Lebanon and Syria. Israel's retaliatory attacks prompted admonition from Council Members, but the United States blocked strong Security Council action against Israel, supporting only resolutions that led to a non-specific cessation of hostilities and that did not include any one-sided condemnation of Israel.

The question of a Palestinian State continued as an issue for Israel through 1972. In March Jordan submitted a proposal for a semi-autonomous Palestinian state in the occupied West Bank. This proposal was quickly rejected by Israel. Arab states rejected the proposal as well, in retaliation for the aforementioned Jordanian expulsion of the Palestinian Liberation Organization from its borders.

In July 1972, in an attempt to secure better relations with Western governments, Egyptian President Anwar Sadat expelled all Soviet military advisors from Egypt and began nationalizing all former Soviet military bases in the country. Soviet advisors peacefully departed Egypt by early August 1972. This move to counter Soviet influence was a significant step toward lessening the superpower conflict in the Middle East, yet Sadat's attempts to build a better relationship with the West were largely unsuccessful. Diplomatic talks between the United States and Egypt stalled over Egypt's insistence that talks with Israel would only take

place under the pre-conditions that Israel would have to move its borders back to the ceasefire lines of 1967. Israel's Prime Minister, Golda Meir, rejected any proposal that would have restored the 1967 borders, and refused to enter into talks that carried any pre-conditions. With both sides holding fast to these conditions, a peaceful solution seems unlikely, and recent rhetoric from Egypt suggests that President Sadat is more interested in going to war than seeking peace.

Further affecting the tenuous situation was the early April Israeli raid on PLO members in Lebanon. The operation was part of Israeli Operation Wrath of God, which targeted those suspected of being involved in the attacks at the Munich Olympics. Two weeks ago, the Security Council condemned all acts of violence, taking human life and formally condemned Israeli commando raids into Lebanon as a violation of their territorial sovereignty. Not wanting to block the resolution's positive message of unity in opposition to the cycle of violence and terrorism in the region, the United States chose to abstain rather than vote no, as had been its common action on resolutions condemning Israel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CAMERA (2007). The Six Day War: The Three No's of Khartoum.

Fitzgerald, Peter. The War of Attrition. *The Finer Times.*

History of Israel: Key Events. *BBC News.*

Khalidi, Ahmed S. The War of Attrition (1973/74). *Journal of Palestinian Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, p 60. Institute of Palestine Studies.

Milestones: 1961-1968: The 1967 Arab-Israeli War. *US Department of State Office of the Historian.*

Milestones: 1969-1976: The 1973 Arab-Israeli War. *US Department of State Office of the Historian.*

Mrs. Mier Rejects Return to '67 Lines (1972). *New York Times*, 4 December.

Sadat is Said to Give Up Hope in US Peace Effort (1973). *New York Times*, 9 January.

Sadat Urges Egypt to Gird for Fighting (1972.) *New York Times*, 28 December.

Suez Canal Authority. Canal History.

The Knesset: Lexicon of Terms (2008). War of Attrition.

Tristham, Pierre. "Black September": The Jordanian-PLO Civil War of 1970 (2014). *About News*, November.

United Nations. Middle East UNEF I Background.

UN DOCUMENTS

United Nations, Security Council (1972). The Situation in the Middle East. 28 February. S/RES/313.

United Nations, Security Council (1972). The Situation in the Middle East. 21 June. S/RES/317.

United Nations, Security Council (1972). The Situation in the Middle East. 26 June. S/RES/316.

United Nations, Security Council (1973). The Situation in the Middle East. 20 April. S/RES/331.

United Nations, Security Council (1973). The Situation in the Middle East. 21 April. S/RES/332.

THE SITUATION IN UGANDA

In 1966, Ugandan President Milton Obote suspended the country's constitution and ended the power sharing agreement with King Mutesa II. The new head of the Ugandan Military and Police, Colonel Idi Amin, sent tanks to shell the King's palace; King Mutesa escaped and fled to the United Kingdom. President Obote consolidated his power by removing people in power from the Bagandas tribe and replacing them with people from his own Acholi and Langi tribes.

General Idi Amin seized political control of Uganda in 1971 through a military coup d'etat, overthrowing President Obote while Obote was at a meeting in Singapore. The leadership change was at first welcomed by Ugandans, but the country soon descended into a harsh authoritarian regime. Over the next two years, President Amin's government came under increased international scrutiny, largely because of its potential destabilizing influence on the East African region.

After the coup, President Obote sought refuge in neighboring Tanzania. Once there he began building a force of Tanzanian-backed rebels made up of Ugandan loyalists. Throughout September 1972, Obote waged a campaign of guerrilla raids, insurgent attacks and the incursion of over 1,000 troops from Tanzania into Uganda in an attempt to overthrow the Amin regime. The bulk of these troops advanced to as close as 100 miles of the Ugandan capital, Kampala, but were beaten back. Obote's plan relied heavily on mass defections by the Ugandan military to supplement their force; these defections failed to materialize, and his attempt to take back power failed.

President Amin accused the Tanzanian government of actively sponsoring and launching the attacks. Tanzanian officials have denied any involvement. President Amin's forces launched retaliatory attacks of their own into Tanzania. One air attack on the town of Bukoba killed nine and injured two hundred people. Tanzania responded by moving a battalion of roughly 1,000 troops toward the Ugandan border to prevent any incursions of the Ugandan military into the country. Hostilities ended in mid-October when Somali President Mohammed Siad Barre organized a peace conference, resulting in a formal agreement to end hostilities between Tanzania and Uganda.

During this time, President Amin formally ordered the expulsion of all Asians (mostly Gujaratis of Indian origin) from Uganda, calling them traitors and spies for the imperialist British government. This racist policy was decried by the global community, and provisions were rapidly made to deal with the large exodus of Ugandan refugees. Many went to the United Kingdom, as well as the United States and several European countries. The expulsion began a significant political conflict between Uganda and the United Kingdom, mainly focused on the treatment of the refugees and on their ability to take material goods out of the country, which was severely limited by the Amin regime.

Finally, the 18 December 1972 seizure by Amin's government of all foreign owned tea plantations and eight of the biggest commercial companies in Uganda (seven British and one American) raised anew the question of Uganda's destabilizing influence in the area. Uganda also ended ties with Israel and began a new political relationship with Libya, which only highlighted the perceived dangerous and unpredictable nature of President Amin and brought Uganda further into the international spotlight in 1973.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armed Invasion of Uganda by Followers of Ex-President Obote. – Resultant Conflict between Uganda and Tanzania. – Somali Mediation leads to Peaceful Settlement (1972). *Keesing's Record of World*

Events, vol. 18, November Uganda, Tanzania, Uganda, Page 25543.

Kaufman, Michael T. Idi Amin, Murderous and Erratic Ruler of Uganda in the 70's, Dies in Exile (2003). *New York Times*. 17 August.

Marshall, Julian. Obituary: Milton Obote (2005). *The Guardian*, 11 October.

The Commonwealth. Uganda: History. 2016.

Uganda and Tanzania Say Their Dispute is Settled (1972). *New York Times*. 5 October.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

The early 1960's brought independence to a number of French African colonies and gave momentum to the struggle for black nationalism in British Africa. The apartheid regime, based on white minority rule, in South Africa came under increasing scrutiny amid the changing attitudes toward such policies in Great Britain and the rest of the world.

In 1963, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was dissolved. In 1964, Nyasaland achieved independence, within the British Commonwealth of Nations, as Malawi; Northern Rhodesia became independent as Zambia that same year. The aftereffects of the dissolution were still being felt when, on 11 November 1965, the minority white government of Southern Rhodesia (known informally as Rhodesia) declared itself independent from Great Britain.

After the Universal Declaration of Independence, Rhodesia received significant international attention at the United Nations, especially for its apartheid regime and policies. The Security Council adopted resolutions endorsing economic sanctions on Rhodesia, barring all trade and support; however, South Africa and Portugal continued to violate the oil and petroleum stipulations of the trade embargo, undermining the will of the Council. Talks between the British and Rhodesian governments continued on and off for several years but did not make the headway hoped for by the affected African States.

The United States' tacit support for the Rhodesian government significantly complicated the issue. Starting in 1971, the United States resumed chrome trade with Rhodesia in full violation of the 1968 UN trade embargo. In July, 1972, the United States abstained in a 14-0 Security Council vote to condemn "all acts violating" the economic sanctions against Rhodesia, considering United States actions to be outside of these sanctions. In September, the United Kingdom vetoed an African-sponsored resolution on Rhodesia, which called for stronger economic sanctions and a direct settlement of the Rhodesian issue.

By 1972 the lack of change in the government's policies regarding formal discrimination against black Africans was the focus of attention for the United Nations. Many African states and black athletes threatened to boycott the 1972 Munich Olympic Games if Rhodesia was allowed to participate. Ultimately, the International Olympic Committee conceded and barred Rhodesian athletes from participating in the games.

The economy of Zambia, which relied upon trade with Rhodesia, suffered significant disruption from the attempts to divert trade in accordance with international sanctions brought against Rhodesia. Succeeding years saw wide fluctuations in the price of copper, Zambia's major export, and a sustained drought that required heavy agricultural imports. There was also additional political stress between the two states over rebel activity. The outlawed Zimbabwe African National Union,

ZANU, were operating out of border regions in Zambia, waging a guerilla campaign against Rhodesian troop and officials. In response, on 9 January 1973, Rhodesia closed its border to traffic with Zambia, stating it would stay closed until assurances could be made that Zambia would no longer permit terrorist to operate from within its borders. The border closing threatened the economic livelihood of Zambia, which relied on railrouts through Rhodesia for much of its trade. The United Kingdom lobbied Rhodesia to reopen the border, and, on 4 February, it reopened its side. Zambia, however, decided that its side would remain closed, stating that Rhodesias closure was "rebellious" and "irrecoverable and final." President Kaunda of Zambia later stated that the border closure has been "a blessing in disguise" that allowed Zambia's economy a fresh start that did not rely on its British colonial past.

The end of 1972 also saw the escalation of guerrilla warfare from Mozambique, where ZANU also had a strong presence. Both the guerrilla activity from Zambia and Mozambique were collectively called the Rhodesian Bush War. In these early months of 1973, guerilla activity has been increasing from both fronts, further destabilizing the region.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Keesing's Worldwide, LLC. (1973). "Confrontation after Border Closure by Rhodesia. - Zambian Efforts to secure Alternative Trade Routes. - U.N. Security Council Decisions." *Keesing's Record of World Events,* vol. 19. March.

Doxey, Margaret (1980) Economic Sanction and International Enforcement. Oxford, England. Oxford University Press.

Lake, Anthony (1976). *The "Tar Baby" Option*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Maxey, Kees (1975). *The Fight for Zimbabwe*. London: Rex Collings.

Moorcraft, Paul, Peter Mclaughlin (2010). The Rhodesian War: A Military History. Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books.

New World Encyclopedia (2015). Rhodesian Bush War. *New World Encyclopedia.* 10 July.

Associated Press (1973). Rhodesia-Zambia Border is Closed. *Herald-Journal*. 10 June.

UN DOCUMENTS

United Nations, Security Council (1965) Southern Rhodesia. 12 November. S/RES/221.

United Nations, Security Council (1965) Southern Rhodesia. 12 November. S/RES/216.

United Nations, Security Council (1966) Southern Rhodesia. 9 April. S/RES/221.

United Nations, Security Council (1968). Question Concerning the Situation in Southern Rhodesia. 29 May. S/RES/253.

United Nations, Security Council (1970). Southern Rhodesia. 18 March. S/RES/277.

United Nations, Security Council (1970). Southern Rhodesia. 17 November. S/RES/288.

United Nations, Security Council (1972). Question Concerning the Situation in Southern Rhodesia. 28 February. S/RES/314.

United Nations, Security Council (1972). Question Concerning the Situation in Southern Rhodesia. 28 July. S/RES/318.

United Nations, Security Council (1972). Question Concerning the Situation in Southern Rhodesia. 29 September. S/RES/320.

United Nations, Security Council (1973). Provocation by Southern Rhodesia. 2 February. S/RES/326.

United Nations, Security Council. (1973). Report of the Security Council Special Mission Established Under Resolution 326. 5 March. S/10896.

United Nations, Security Council (1973). Southern Rhodesia. 10 March. S/RES/328.

United Nations, Security Council (1973). Zambia's Decision to Impose Sanctions. 2 February. S/RES/327.

United Nations, Security Council (1973). Zambia's Decision to Impose Sanctions. 10 March. S/RES/329.

THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

Since World War I, South West Africa has existed as a Mandate territory under the guidance of South Africa. As manager of the Mandate, South Africa had certain obligations toward South West Africa, mainly to see that it developed its own governance and to transition it to independence. Since the early 1960s, the United Nations has expressed growing concern as to South Africa's willingness to meet these obligations. Of particular concern were the government of South Africa's policies of apartheid and racial discrimination, which the United Nations argued were contrary to the terms of South Africa's Mandate, the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

On 27 October 1966, the General Assembly, through Resolution 2145, declared that South Africa had failed "to fulfil its obligations in respect of the administration of the Mandated Territory and to ensure the moral and material well-being and security of the indigenous inhabitants of South West Africa." In the same resolution, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate and brought South West Africa under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. South Africa refused to cease its administration over South West Africa and continued to act as South West Africa's governmental presence. After several more years of tensions and disputes, in a move to undermine South African influence, on 12 June, 1968, the UN General Assembly attempted to force a change, proclaiming that, "in accordance with the desires of its people, South West Africa shall henceforth be known as Namibia." The situation remained unchanged into the beginning of the 1970s. Responding to a request by the UN Secretary-General on behalf of the Security Council, on 21 June 1971, the International Court of Justice confirmed that the United Nations had authority over Namibia. In direct violation of General Assembly Resolution 2145, South Africa continued its administration of Namibia, citing the League of Nations mandate which made South Africa the original administrator as justification.

Throughout 1972, Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, at the request of the Security Council, was in direct contact with the South African government, seeking clarification from South Africa on its policy regarding self-determination and independence for Namibia. The dispute continued to revolve around South Africa's insistence on pressing for a "homelands" policy for Namibian natives, that is, assigning black Africans to separate development areas based on their ethnic identity, thus limiting independence and continuing South African governance. South Africa also created and favored the use of an "advisory council" of regional leaders to assist South Africa in the governance of Namibia. Both of these proposals were unacceptable to the United Nations, as the Security Council expressed concerns that these proposals would lead to the fragmentation of Namibia.

In his report, dated 30 April 1972, Secretary-General Waldheim concluded that "the position of the Government of South Africa is still far from coinciding with that established in the resolutions of the United Nations concerning Namibia." Further, "[t]he question arises whether, in the light of the results achieved so far, the contacts and efforts initiated pursuant to resolutions 309 (1972), 319 (1972) and 323 (1972) should be continued. Should the Security Council decide to continue these efforts, it should bear in mind my earlier statement to the effect that time and protracted discussion would be required if any progress is to be achieved."

UN DOCUMENTS

United Nations, General Assembly (1960). Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. 14 December. A/RES/1514.

United Nations, General Assembly (1966). Question of South West Africa. 27 October. A/RES/2145.

United Nations, General Assembly (1967). Question of South West Africa. 16 December. A/RES/2324.

United Nations, General Assembly (1968). Question of South West Africa. 12 June. A/RES/2372.

United Nations, Security Council (1968). The Question of South West Africa. 25 January. S/RES/245.

United Nations, Security Council (1968). The Question of South West Africa. 14 March. S/RES/246.

United Nations, Security Council (1969). The Situation in Namibia. 20 March. S/RES/264.

United Nations, Security Council (1969). The Situation in Namibia. 12 August. S/RES/269.

United Nations, Security Council (1970). The Question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. 23 July. S/RES/282.

United Nations, Security Council (1970). The Situation in Namibia. 30 January. S/RES/276.

United Nations, Security Council (1970). The Situation in Namibia. 29 July. S/RES/283.

United Nations, Security Council (1970). The Situation in Namibia. 29 July. S/RES/284.

United Nations, International Court of Justice (1971). Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970). 21 June. ICJ Reports 1971, p. 16.

United Nations, Security Council (1971). The Situation in Namibia. 20 October. S/RES/301.

United Nations, Security Council (1972). The Question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. 4 February. S/RES/311.

United Nations, Security Council (1972). The Situation in Namibia. 4 February. S/RES/309.

United Nations, Security Council (1972). The Situation in Namibia. 4 February. S/RES/310.

United Nations, Security Council (1972). The Situation in Namibia. 1 August. S/RES/319.

United Nations, Security Council (1972). The Situation in Namibia. 6 December. S/RES/323.

United Nations, Security Council (1973). Report by the Secretary-General on the Implementation of Security Council Resolution 323 (1972) Concerning the Question of Namibia. 30 April. S/10921.

THE SITUATION IN VIET NAM

In the mid-1960s, the Republic of Viet Nam (South Viet Nam) and the United States began a more aggressive campaign to push the North Vietnamese out of South Viet Nam and to destroy North Vietnamese operations near Saigon and along the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong, an armed organization operating out of South Viet Nam and Cambodia, fought back violently. On 31 January 1968, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong launched a series of surprise assaults on cities, towns and military installations in South Vietnam, known as the Tet Offensive.

In 1968, peace talks began in Paris between the United States and North Viet Nam; North Viet Nam refused to recognize the government of South Viet Nam, but the talks did result in an agreement to partially halt bombing. The Paris talks continued into 1969. By early 1969, the United States began secret bombing attacks on Cambodia to target North Vietnamese supply caches. After a coup deposed Cambodian head of state Prince Sihanouk in 1970, the United States launched heavy air strikes into Cambodia and Laos against North Vietnamese supply camps in January 1971.

On 10 March 1971, the Republic of China pledged its complete support to the North Vietnamese in its conflict with the United States. The Situation in Viet Nam was a well visited topic in the General Assembly in 1972. The Council, however, chose not to formally discuss the issue at the instance of the United States, which claimed that the Viet Nam War was strictly in the United States' sphere of influence.

In March 1972, North Viet Nam attacked South Viet Nam across the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ), a line established by the 1954 Geneva Accords; this resulted in retaliatory bombing of the DMZ and North Viet Nam by the United States in April. Between March and September 1972, over 200,000 North Vietnamese soldiers waged an all-out campaign to conquer South Viet Nam known as the Easter Offensive. This offensive left several cities in North Vietnamese hands, yet was ultimately defeated by United States and South Viet Namese efforts.

The conflict peaked in December with heavy carpet bombing by the United States. Along with significant reports of bombing of civilian structures, including some foreign embassies and hospitals, considerable portions of heavily-populated civilian areas in Hanoi were devastated by the bombings. In December 1972, a ceasefire was upheld for two days over Christmas, but this was followed by the resumption of heavy bombing by the United States.

The Paris Peace talks continued throughout 1972, with US National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger engaging North Vietnamese leaders. These private talks continued with limited political success, although it was rumored that some significant technical and military issues were closer to resolution as a result. On 27 January 1973, the Paris Agreement was signed by the four parties: North Viet Nam, the Viet Cong, South Viet Nam and the United States. The peace settlement enabled the United States to withdraw from the fighting inside Viet Nam.

In early February, the United States continued its bombing of North Vietnamese military bases and supply routes in Cambodia. Meanwhile, Henry Kissinger met privately with Prime Minister Pham Van Dong of North Viet Nam to discuss the establishment of diplomatic relations. In March, the International Commission of Control of Supervision—called for in the Paris Peace Accords and established to supervise the ceasefire and report on implementation, or violation, of the Peace Agreements and Protocols—reported that the ceasefire has not been effective, with numerous violations by South Viet Nam, North Viet Nam and the Viet Cong. By the end of the month, the last American combat troops left Viet Nam. In early April, South Vietnamese President Thieu concluded a visit to the United States during which he was promised continued aid and assistance dependent upon United States approval.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Davidson, Philip (1991). *Vietnam at War: The History 1946-1975*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dillard, Walter Scott (1982). *Sixty Days to Peace: Implementing the Paris Peace Accords*. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University.

Spector, Ronald H. (2016). Vietnam War. Encyclopedia Britannica. 29 January.

Karnow, Stanley (1997). *Vietnam: A History*. New York: Penguin Group.

Langguth, A.J. (2002). *Our Vietnam: The War 1954-1975*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ross, Robert S. and Jiang Changbin (2001). *Re-Examining the Cold War: U.S.-China Diplomacy, 1954-1973*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Turley, William S (2009). *The Second IndoChina War: A Concise Political and Military History*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group.

Yancey, Diane (2001). *The Vietnam War*. San Diego: Greenhaven Press.

THE HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL OF 1990

MEMBERS OF THE HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL OF 1990

CANADA	ETHIOPIA	UNITED KINGDOM
CHINA	FINLAND	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
COLOMBIA	FRANCE	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
COTE D'IVOIRE	MALAYSIA	YEMEN
CUBA	ROMANIA	ZAIRE

HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL OF 1990

The Cold War began after World War II and was a state of political and military tension between the Western and Eastern blocs, particularly the United States of America and Union of Soviet Social Republics. Direct Cold War tensions began decreasing during the 1960s and 1970s when several important cooperative developments occurred, including the Helsinki Accords, the Biological Weapons Convention and the Anti-Ballistic Treaty. However, as direct tensions subsided, indirect tension through third-party conflicts increased, resulting in interference with issues in Africa and Southeast Asia. Despite the progress, human rights issues, particularly human rights violations, have remained a point of contention with the Soviet Union and the United States. Nevertheless, notable strides between the two blocs were made in the development of the International Space Station and with an increase in trade. As the Soviet bloc began to unravel in 1989, and with tension in the US-USSR relations having cooled, many States around the world feared losing aid from their Cold War allies.

The cooling of the Cold War was not limited to relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. In May 1989, Hungary removed its border fence with Austria, opening the Iron Curtain. As of September 1989, over 13,000 East Germans have used this path to flee to western-leaning Austria. The Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) attempted to stem the exodus by prohibiting travel to Hungary. Those remaining inside the Federal Republic of Germany have been engaging in peaceful protests and public demonstrations that challenge the SED and encourage reunification with the German Democratic Republic (GDR). As of October 1989, the East German exodus has continued through Czechoslovakia to the Federal Republic of Germany. On 9 November 1989, SED announced that, beginning immediately, it would allow travel through the Berlin Wall. At that same time, individuals have begun to physically and politically chip away at the Wall.

For each topic area, representatives should consider the following questions. These questions should assist representatives in gaining a better understanding of the issues at hand, particularly from your country's perspective:
- How did this conflict begin? Is this a new conflict or a re-ignition of a previous conflict?
- How have similar situations and conflicts been peacefully resolved?
- What State and regional actors are involved in this conflict?
- If there are non-State actors involved in a conflict, are there any States supporting them? If so, which ones?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dowd, Maureen (1989). Upheaval in East; Bush Defends China Visit; Is Open to East Berlin Aid. *New York Times*. 17 December.
Schmemann, Serge (1989). Upheaval in East; Free Travel Fails to Curb Exodus of East Germans. *New York Times*. 16 December.
Whitney, Craig (1989). Upheaval in East; Four Powers to Meet on East German Issue. *New York Times*. 11 December.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT

The longstanding conflict between Palestinians and Israelis turned violent again on 9 December 1989 after an Israeli Defense Force (IDF) truck crashed into a civilian vehicle near the Jabalia refugee camp, killing four Palestinians. In the following days, Palestinians engaged in an extensive civil disobedience campaign that included protests, economic boycotts of Israeli-owned businesses, boycotts of the Israeli Civil Administration organization, and demonstrations that included throwing stones and Molotov cocktails at Israeli infrastructure and IDF troops in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Israeli leadership responded with 80,000 IDF troops who were instructed to fire upon threats, causing significant civilian casualties. The Israeli response prompted more Palestinian resistance, including attacks on Israeli citizens.

Despite international pressure to engage in talks with Palestinian leadership, particularly the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir has maintained that the PLO is the main obstacle to peace, and continues the Iron Fist policy against Palestinian nationalism and disobedience. The United Nations has continued with its effort to find a peaceful solution to the Palestinian question and the ongoing humanitarian situation; in Resolution 641 the Security Council denounced both Israel's defiance of previous Security Council resolutions and recent deportations of Palestinian civilians.

Beyond the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) was created by the Security Council in 1974 to maintain the ceasefire between Syria and Israel after the end of the 1973 Arab-Israeli war. The Security Council has continuously renewed the UNDOF mandate since its inception, which has ensured the mission's continued success. Despite the current relative calm between Syria and Israel, high tensions across the Middle East jeopardize regional stability and will likely continue to do so until a more comprehensive solution to the Middle East conflicts can be reached.

Bibliography

Brinkley, Joel (1989). Israeli Army Expels Eight Palestinians. *New York Times*. 30 June.

Friedman, Thomas (1989). P.L.O. and Israel to Get Bush Ideas on Mideast Peace. *New York Times*. 12 March.

Pear, Robert (1989). Arafat Sends Bush a Message on Talks with Israel. *New York Times*. 23 November.

UN Documents

United Nations, General Assembly (1989). The Uprising of the Palestinian People. 28 September. A/RES/44/2.

United Nations, Security Council (1989). Territories Occupied by Israel. 6 July. S/RES/636.

United Nations, Security Council (1989). Territories Occupied by Israel. 30 August. S/RES/641.

The Conflict between Syria and Lebanon

The Lebanese civil war began in the late 1970s and pitted factions with different political and religious beliefs against one another. The Cold War had a powerful disunifying effect on Lebanon that was further exacerbated by the tension between Israel and Palestinians, polarizing the multi-sectarian parties, including Sunni Muslims, Shia Muslims and Christians, between pro-Soviet allies, pro-Western allies and pan-Arab groups. Factions in Lebanon received significant support from outside allies, including Israel, Iraq, the United States and Syria. While external military forces are officially unwelcome in Lebanon, Syrian troops have been present in Lebanon since 1976, when they entered to restore and maintain peace, and Israeli troops are present in the security zone in southern Lebanon. Since 1985 the sectarian conflicts have worsened as national reconciliation efforts have failed. Similarly, anti-Israel sentiments in Lebanon grew during the First Intifada as Israel imprisoned hundreds of thousands of Palestinians and Lebanese.

In September 1988, Lebanese President Amin Gemayel's term ended without a successor; Gemayel appointed Army General Michel Aoun as the interim prime minister, creating a military government based in the Baabda presidential palace in East Beirut. Syrian-backed Shi'a, Sunni and Druze forces support Selim el Hoss, former Prime Minister of Lebanon, who set up a competing civilian government based in West Beirut. Prime Minister General Michel Aoun declared war against Syrian army forces on 13 March 1989, and his Lebanese Forces began a war of liberation. Syria declared the military government illegitimate and, on 14 March 1989, launched an attack on the Baabda presidential palace, continuing to support militias opposing General Aoun. Months of fighting came to a tenuous end with a ceasefire, the Taif Agreement, negotiated by the Arab League in September 1989.

The success of the Taif Agreement is now threatened after President-elect Rene Muawad, who was committed to bringing peace and unity to Lebanon, was assassinated on 22 November 1989, only weeks after his election; no one has claimed responsibility for the attack. Despite Parliament electing Elias Harwas, a Maronite Christian, as president to replace Muawad, the conflict among religious groups, political parties and General Aoun casts doubt on a long-term peaceful resolution to Lebanon's conflict.

Bibliography

Arab Countries to Try to Help Lebanese Solve Political Crisis (1989). *New York Times*. 18 January.

Jaber, Ali (1989). Lebanese Appoint Centrist Official to Presidency. *New York Times*. 25 November.

Jaber, Ali (1989). Lebanon's President Killed as Bomb Rips His Motorcade; Peace Efforts are Set Back. *New York Times*. 23 November.

The Taif Accord (1989).

UN Documents

United Nations, Security Council (1974). United Nations Disengagement Observer Force. 31 May. S/RES/350.

United Nations, Security Council (1989). Israel-Syria. 29 November. S/RES/645.

Iran-Iraq

After nearly eight years of war between Iran and Iraq that killed more than a million soldiers and civilians on each side, the war ended in August 1988 when Iran accepted Security Council Resolution 598 and began implementing the terms of the ceasefire. At the end of the war, Iraq emerged as an intact state with Saddam Hussein holding his presidency. The United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) was established to and tasked with verifying, confirming and supervising the cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of all troops to the internationally-recognized boundaries. On 29 September 1989, the Security Council passed Resolution 642, extending UNIIMOG's mandate until 31 March 1990.

Despite surviving the war, Iraq was encumbered with massive national debt, having financed its war effort largely through loans. President Hussein asked the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait to cancel Iraq's war debts claiming that their loans allowed Iraq to protect the Arabian Peninsula. Iraq's economic situation worsened as Kuwait and UAE increased their oil production, driving down the global price of oil. With his requests for debt relief ignored by Kuwait and UAE, depleted financial reserves and a serious economic decline, President Hussein reasserted Iraq's claim of ownership of the oil-rich Warbah and Bubiyan regions in Kuwait.

Despite the implementation of the ceasefire and troop withdrawals, tension and instability continued to increase when Ayatollah Khomeini, the Supreme Leader of Iran, died on 3 June 1989 and was succeeded by Hashemi Rafsanjani as Iran's President. Both Iran and Iraq accused the other of numerous serious ceasefire violations, including Iraq's announcement in December 1989 of the successful tests of new missile technology.

Bibliography

Cowell, Alan (1989). Iran and Iraq Offer Rival Plans for Peace Pact. *New York Times*. 19 November.

Gordon, Michael (1989). U.S. Confirms Iraq Has Launched Rocket That Can Carry Satellites. *New York Times*. 9 December.

UN Documents

United Nations, Security Council (1987). The Situation between Iran and Iraq. S/RES/598. 20 July.

United Nations, Security Council (1988). Iraq-Islamic Republic of Iran. S/RES/642. 29 September.
United Nations. United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group.

THE SITUATION IN AFRICA

NAMIBIA

Since World War I, South West Africa has existed as a Mandate territory under the guidance of South Africa. As manager of the Mandate, South Africa had certain obligations toward South West Africa, mainly to see that it developed its own governance and to transition it to independence. South Africa did little to meet these obligations by 1966, and, in response the UN General Assembly passed Resolution 2145, ending South Africa's mandate over South West Africa, and placing South West Africa under its direct control. In 1968, the United Nations Council for South West Africa was renamed the United Nations Council for Namibia and, at that same time, announced that the territory would be known as Namibia. South Africa refused to acknowledge the transfer of Namibia's control to the United Nations Council for Namibia, and continued to administer Namibia. In 1971 the International Criminal Court issued an Advisory Opinion confirming that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal. In the years since South Africa has maintained its control over South West Africa, despite intense international political pressure to withdraw.

The United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) was established in 1974 to assist the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the South African withdrawal, facilitate free and fair elections and establish early independence for Namibia. Additionally. UNTAG is tasked with ensuring that all hostile acts are ended, each player's troops remain on military bases, discriminatory laws are repealed, Namibian refugees are allowed to return and all South African troops eventually withdraw from Namibia. The Security Council reiterated its call for Namibian independence, South Africa's compliance with previous United Nations resolutions, and the disbanding of ethnic and paramilitary groups in Resolution 643 (1989).

ANGOLA

During the last part of the Angolan civil war, the Angolan government began transitioning from communist to democratic policies. Having been involved in Angola militarily since 1975, Cuba has maintained troops inside Angola to support The People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), and intervened in 1988 when tension increased between MPLA, the National Liberation Front of Angola (FNLA), the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), and the People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola (FAPLA). On 22 December 1988, South Africa, the MPLA government of Angola and Cuba signed the Angola Namibia Accords, known as the Triparite Accords, which provide for Namibia's independence and Cuba's withdrawal of 50,000 troops from Angola. The Angola Namibia Accords were the result of long and arduous negotiations involving the United States and the Soviet Union to help bring an end to decades of conflict in southwest Africa. The Accords also mark the efforts of the United Nations to persuade South Africa to grant independence to SouthWest Africa. Under the terms of the Accords, Cuba will withdraw its troops by 1 July 1991. Despite the promises to bring stability and independence to Namibia, the Angola Namibia Accords were marked by angry exchanges and sharp accusations, highlighting that significant differences and tensions remain. The United States' refusal to suspend its military aid to Angolan rebels, as well as the Angolan government's failure to peacefully resolve its disagreement with rebels, are two key areas of continued disagreement. Finally, the governments of Angola and Namibia reserved their right to modify their obligations if blatant breaches of the agreements occur.

APARTHEID AND FRONT-LINE POLICY

After the National Party gained power and control of South Africa in 1948, the all-white government passed racially discriminatory and segregation laws known as apartheid. By the late 1980s, international pressure to end the apartheid policies, including years of international sanctions, saw the internal political climate in South Africa begin to change. This included the resignation of the chairman of the National Party. With these changes come risks: the potential destabilization of the National Party could lead to an internal political breakdown, with political parties outside the current power structure moving into place. The resulting political instability could negatively affect the region as a whole. As it stands, South Africa's involvement in neighboring countries, its apartheid practices and Front-Line Policy each play a contributing role to the overall stability of southern Africa.

ETHIOPIA AND ERITREA

The Ethiopian-Eritrean civil war is the longest-running civil war on the African continent. Eritrean rebel groups are fighting government troops in their bid for independence from Ethiopia and the establishment of a new country. The conflict's roots lie in Italy's colonization of Eritrea in the late 1800s and its failed attempt to colonize Ethiopia. Ethiopian Emperor Haile Selassie I annexed Eritrea in 1962, imposing restrictions against Eritrean language and heritage. The Dergue, a Marxist military organization led by Mengistu Haile Mariam, placed Emperor Haile Selassie I under house arrest until his suspicious death on 27 August 1975, and took control of Ethiopia's government, after which civil war fully erupted. Until recently, the Ethiopian government has described the twenty-seven year civil war as an isolated case of rogue bandits; now the government is focusing its efforts on the conflict. Beyond the ongoing political fighting, a severe drought continues to plague Ethiopia's northern region, causing extreme food shortages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Kraft, Scott (1988). Ethiopia Forgets Its Famine to Focus on Civil War. LA Times. 30 May.
Lewis, Paul (1988). Angola and Namibia Accords Signed. New York Times. 23 December.
Perlez, Jane (1989). Rights Group Deplores Level of Abuse in Ethiopia. New York Times. 4 August.
Tiruneh, Andargachew (1993). The Ethiopian Revolution, 1974 - 1987: A Transformation from an Aristocratic to a Totalitarian Autocracy. Cambridge University Press.
Wren, Christopher (1989). For South Africa, A Diplomatic Riddle. New York Times. 13 August.
Ethiopia Says It Will Allow U.N. to Extend Aid to Drought Areas (1988). LA Times. 30 May.
U.N. Unable to Verify Abuses by Swapo (1989). New York Times. 12 October.

UN DOCUMENTS

International Court of Justice (1971). Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South-West Africa) Notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion.

United Nations, General Assembly (1966). Question of South West Africa. 27 October. A/RES/21/2145.

United Nations, General Assembly (1989). Sanctions Against Apartheid. 22 November. A/RES/44/27 C.

United Nations, Security Council (1978). Namibia. 29 September. S/RES/435.

United Nations, Security Council (1989). The Situation in Namibia. 16 January. S/RES/628.

United Nations, Security Council (1989). South Africa. 16 March. S/RES/610.

United Nations, Security Council (1989). The Situation in Namibia. 31 October. S/RES/643.

United Nations, Security Council (1989). Angola. 20 December. S/RES/626.

United Nations, United Nations Transition Assistance Group Mission.

THE SITUATION IN CENTRAL AND LATIN AMERICA

During the 1980s, Latin and Central American countries experienced political and economic crises. El Salvador had been embroiled in civil war for more than a decade. Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala and other Latin American states suffered from internal economic, social and political unrest that had a significant impact on the region's overall stability. The Esquipulas I and II Agreements (sometimes called the Guatemala City agreements) aimed to bring lasting peace to Central America. The agreements were signed in 1986 and 1987 by the governments of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua, formalizing their consent to facilitate peace through dialogue and national reconciliation and called for an end to hostilities; they also requested United Nations' assistance to facilitate the agreements' terms. As a result, the United Nations Observer Mission in Central America (UNOCA) was established in November 1989 with a mandate to conduct verification of each State's compliance, include: ending aid to irregular forces and insurrection movements, the prevention of the use of one State's territory for attacks on another State, and the prevention of radio or television broadcasts by insurrectionists. The UNOCA mission began December 1989 and is currently under its initial mandate period of six months.

Nicaragua also agreed to move up its democratic elections by ten months, a move that received United Nations and international support. To facilitate the elections, Nicaragua requested United Nations observers for the election. In addition to UNOCA, the United Nations Observation Mission for the Verification of Elections in Nicaragua sent a team of 70 to observe elections scheduled for 25 February.

El Salvador has also benefited from peace talks and the Guatemala City agreements. The Agreements have brought progress toward political reunification between the Salvadoran government and Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN), a coalition of five guerrilla groups, after decades of fighting and civil war. The Guatemala City agreements aim to promote greater stability in Central America by building upon relationships, promoting democracy, and ending economic and political interference. The UNOCA mandate also includes El Salvador in its purpose to end aid to insurrectionist movements. Despite this, the FMLN attacked a hotel in San Salvador on 11 November 1989, taking more than 100 hostages. In response, the Salvadoran government began an intense military response, including ground troops and aerial bombing.

Despite ongoing conflicts, 1989 held much promise for stability in Central America. The United States and Soviet Union each called upon the other to end economic and military aid to outside militaries and paramilitary forces in the region.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lewis, Paul (1989). Honduras Shifts; Will Attend Nicaragua Talks; U.N. to Send Observers. *New York Times.* 8 November.

Lewis, Paul (1989). U.N. Monitor in Nicaragua Sees Threat to Vote in Rising Violence. *New York Times.* 13 December.

Osterlund, Peter (1987). Reagan plans to seek more arms for contras. *Christian Science Monitor.* 17 November.

Weinraub, Bernard (1989). U.S. Dismisses Call by Gorbachev to End Latin America Arms Aid. *New York Times.* 6 April.

Zamora, Ruben (1989). Our Peace Plan for El Salvador. *New York Times.* 7 February.

UN DOCUMENTS

Esquipulas Peace Agreement (1987).

United Nations, General Assembly (1985). Trade embargo against Nicaragua. 17 December. A/RES/44/188.

United Nations, General Assembly (1989). Nicaraguan Request for Observers. 7 July. A/44/375.

United Nations Information Service, United Nations Political Missions.

United Nations, Security Council (1985). Nicaragua. 10 May. S/RES/592.

United Nations, Security Council (1986). Letter from Permanent Representative of Guatemala to the United Nations. 28 May. S/18106.

United Nations, Security Council (1987). Letter to Secretary General. 31 August. S/19085.

United Nations, Security Council (1989). Central America. 27 July. S/RES/637.

United Nations, Security Council (1989). Situation in Central America. 7 November. S/RES/644.

United Nations, United Nations Observer Mission Group in Central America.

THE SITUATION IN KAMPUCHEA

The ongoing war in Vietnam during the 1940s-1970s challenged Cambodia's stability as the war spilled into neighboring countries. In 1975, the Khmer Rouge established Democratic Kampuchea in place of Cambodia after defeating Lon Nol's Cambodian government in 1975, with the help of an alliance with Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Cambodian prime minister who had been deposed in 1970. From 1975 to 1979, the country suffered greatly under Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge regime, which subjected its citizens to political re-education and forced labor that resulted in more than one million deaths. Border clashes between Cambodia, Viet Nam and Khmer Rouge supporters culminated with a Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia in 1978, installing the People's Republic of Kampuchea (PRK) in January 1979. In April 1989, Viet Nam announced that it would unconditionally withdraw all remaining

troops from Cambodia. Viet Nam maintained approximately 182,000 troops in Kampuchea until September 1989.

Currently the main political parties vying for control and power are the People's Republic of Kampuchea (PRK), controlled by the Khmer Rouge and the current representatives in the Kampuchean United Nations seat; the National Front for an Independent, Neutral, Peaceful and Cooperative Cambodia (FUNCINPEC) led by Prince Sihanouk; and the Khmer People's National Liberation Front (KPNLF) led by former Prime Minister Son Sann. The FUNCIPEC, KPNFL and PRK formed the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea (CGDK) in the 1980s. The PRK is supported by the Soviet Union and Viet Nam while the CGDK receives support from the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), China and the United States, which has further complicated the situation in Kampuchea.

At France's invitation, representatives from 18 countries, the four Cambodian parties and the United Nations Secretary-General met from July to August 1989 to negotiate a comprehensive settlement and discuss the formation of a United Nations Transitional Authority on Cambodia (UNTAC), whose purpose would be to aid the people of Cambodia into a transition to a democratic government.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

4 Cambodian Factions to Resume Discussions (1989). *New York Times*. 27 July.

Erlanger, Steven (1989). Vietnamese Quit Cambodia Today But Face Heavy Burdens at Home. *New York Times*. 26 September.

Ibrahim, Youssef (1989). U.N. Team Will Be Sent to Cambodia. *New York Times*. 2 August.

UN DOCUMENTS

Chapter 3: Asia and the Pacific (1989). *Yearbook of the United Nations*, vol. 43. pp. 177-181.

United Nations, General Assembly (1989). The Situation in Kampuchea. 19 November. A/RES/44/22.