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 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). <u>Iraq-Islamic Republic of Iran</u>. S/RES/642. 29 September.

United Nations. <u>United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group</u>.

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). <u>Ethiopia Forgets Its Famine to Focus on Civil War</u>. *LA Times*. 30 May.

Lewis, Paul (1988). <u>Angola and Namibia Accords Signed</u>. *New York Times*. 23 December.

Perlez, Jane (1989). <u>Rights Group Deplores Level of Abuse in Ethiopia</u>. *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). <u>For South Africa, A Diplomatic Riddle</u>. *New York Times*. 13 August.

<u>Ethiopia Says It Will Allow U.N. to Extend Aid to Drought Areas</u> (1988). *LA Times*. 30 May.

<u>U.N. Unable to Verify Abuses by Swapo</u> (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.