BAALMUN’25

H-UNSC STUDY GUIDE

Under Secretary General

Miraç Sarıel

Academic Assistant

Saniyar Safari

Table of Contents

1. Letter from Secretary General

2. Letter from Under Secretary General

Esteemed Delegates and Distinguished Participants,

I as Miraç Sarıel welcome you to the most emulated, chaotic but at the same time the most pleasant committee of BAALMUN'25. It is a big honor for me to bring up an idea like this and have the chance to shape this idea and serve it as the best way because that you , my delegates, would learn and have fun therewith. To talk briefly upon our only and precious agenda item: The Suez Crisis 1956. This crisis appears as an event that changed the direction of world politics and destiny during the Cold War period.

During these 4 days we will delve into the deep crises, politics and the operations of the 20th century. While representing your countries, bear in mind that we are in the UNSC of the 1950s, so the dynamics of the UN is far different from nowadays. Don't worry we all mentioned the structures, you can find it in the later pages of the guide. Lastly, I want to inform you about the process we will follow during the sessions. There will be a lot of crisis updates and you will be allowed to write directives in a free way. So buckle up for chaotic debates and the crisis reaching its peak.

In conclusion; I've really worked many nights for this committee with our dear Academic Assistant, my son, kıvırcık şeytan Saniyar Safari. There is one little thing that we highly demand from you, please ensure that you've made enough research upon the agenda and your allocation. It is crucial for you to deeply delve into the topic and maximize the fun you will get from the committee. We hope you will have the best committee you may ever see in your MUN career. See ya at the conference.

Do not hesitate to ask **any**thing via my email or phone.

E-mail: mszn3474@gmail.com
Phone Number: +90 545 637 5279

Sincerely,
Miraç SARIEL, Under Secretary General of UNSC

3. Letter from Academic Assistant

Most Distinguished Delegates,

I have the honor of addressing you regarding one of the most pivotal geopolitical crises of the 20th century, The Suez Crisis, as the Academic Assistant for the H-UNSC of BAALMUN'25. Our agenda challenges you to step back into 1956, a time when Cold War tensions, imperial interests, and regional struggles for sovereignty collided in a crisis that reshaped global power dynamics. As members of the Security Council, you must navigate a rapidly evolving situation, balance the interests of global superpowers, and determine the role of the UN in resolving a conflict that could define the future of the Middle East and beyond.

This conference presents an opportunity for you to engage in deep strategic thinking, diplomatic negotiations, and historical analysis. The Suez Crisis was not just a military conflict it was a confrontation over colonial influence, national sovereignty, and the emerging divide between Western powers and the Middle East. Your role as delegates is to consider the legal, political, and humanitarian dimensions of the crisis while crafting resolutions that uphold peace, stability, and international cooperation.

In this committee, you will work within the historical context of the 1950s, where Cold War rivalries and decolonization efforts shaped global affairs. You will engage with different perspectives, negotiate conflicting interests, and create resolutions that do more than just debate history, they must offer realistic solutions to de-escalate the crisis and redefine the role of the United Nations in global security, and most importantly have fun.

Let this committee be a testament to the power of diplomacy and the responsibility of world leaders in times of crisis. I am eager to see the depth of your discussions, the creativity of your resolutions, and the diplomatic skills you bring to this historic debate.

I genuinely hope the study guide is comprehensive enough to guide you through the conference and don't hesitate to contact me at saniyar68s@gmail.com or +905518125774 if you need help. Looking forward to meeting each of you and witnessing the valuable and brilliant contributions you will undoubtedly make to our committee.

Best regards,
Saniyar SAFARI, Academic Assistant for H-UNSC

4. Introduction to the Committee: United Nations Security Council

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is responsible for maintaining international peace and security, as outlined in Article 24 of the United Nations Charter. The UNSC is one of the six main organs of the United Nations and was established in 1945 in response to the devastation caused by World War II. The primary responsibility of the UNSC is to address threats to international peace and security and to take action to prevent conflict or resolve it when it occurs.

4.1. Mandate

The Security Council has in its mandate to furnish matters pertaining to disarmament, peacekeeping missions, protection of human rights, political deliberations and humanitarian crises.[1] Currently, the mandate of the United Nations Security Council has been modified, especially after inculcating the 2030 Agenda of Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda) to discuss the parallel between sustainability, peace and security.[2] The same has been discussed at the meeting on 17 November 2015 as the Security Council focused upon refining its goals post 2015 Sustainable Development Goals.[3]United Nations Security Council mainly discusses issues relevant to sustainable development, protection of human rights and protection of civilians during conflict zones, prevention of conflict and prevail peace through protecting humanitarian rights[4]. Security Council decisions are obligatory in nature as Article 25 of the United Nations Charter gives power to the Security Council to draft binding resolutions which become a requisite to be necessarily followed by all the member states or concerned member states[5]. The Council's position may be addressed by the President of the Security Council through Press Release[6] to address essential concerns and recommend possible solutions concerning the current situation or crisis[7].

1: Council on Foreign Relations, CFR Backgrounders: The UN Security Council, 2015; Encyclopaedia Britannica, United Nations Security Council, 2014. 2: UN General Assembly, Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1), 2015; UN DPA, Politically Speaking, Sustaining peace, Conflict Prevention, Human Rights and Sustainable Development High on Agenda for New Security Council Members, 2018. 3: Lebada, UN Security Council Discusses Links with 2030 Agenda, SDG Knowledge Hub, 2015. 4: UN DPA, Politically Speaking, Sustaining Peace, Conflict Prevention, Human Rights and Sustainable Development High on Agenda for New Security Council Members, 2018. 5: UN Security Council, What is the Security Council? 2018; Charter of the United Nations, 1945, Art. 25. 6: NGO Working Group on Women, Peace and Security, Mapping Women, Peace and Security in the United Nations Security Council: Report of the NGOWG Monthly Action Points, 2009-2010, 2010, p. 11. 7: ibid. p.15.

4.2. Structure

The United Nations Security Council consists of 15 members. Out of these 5 are permanent members, they are also known as "Veto Owners" or "P5 Nations". These permanent members are: the USA, France, China, Russia and the UK. Alongside these 5 member states, there are 10 non-permanent member states appointed for the tenure of 2 years by the United Nations General Assembly. These nations represent their region and foreign policies exhibiting leadership on an international platform. The presidency of the Security Council is held by each member for one month in alphabetical order. The Security Council can be convened anytime by the president at the request of the member states. Consequently, the president also holds the power to call upon member states for a meeting in an urgent crisis, emergency or dispute situation. The member states could extend an invitation to the observer nations who are not allowed to vote but could submit their proposals or draft resolutions. The observers are also welcomed to apprise the council regarding any contemporary issue ongoing in their territory.

The United Nations Security Council has established various subsidiary bodies under Article 29 of the UN Charter comprising: the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, sanctions committees, and ad hoc committees, such as the Ad Hoc Sub-Committee on Namibia, etc. The Security Council is also responsible for the supervision of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). Each nation is granted one vote, and it requires a special majority (2/3) to pass a resolution. However, if any P5 nation says no, the resolution won't pass, this is known as the exercise of "Veto Power".

Therefore; since the timeline of the Suez Crisis is in the year 1956, the United Nations Security Council (the delegates) will implement and follow the structure of that years' UNSC. According to that times' structure, the P5 Nations were the USA, France, UK, Soviet Union(USSR) and the Republic of China(Taiwan). Alongside these 5 member states, the rest of the member states will be by the year 1956. In addition there are 4 more countries that will serve in the UNSC as observers: Israel, Egypt, Canada and Saudi Arabia. On the other hand the United Nations Peacekeepers hadn't been established in the year 1956. The organisation was just established during the Suez Crisis. So while representing the member states and observers you delegates, bear in mind these factors. In contrast, the rest of the structure of the UNSC is the same as the present time's UNSC.

4.3. Function and Powers

Knowing the functions and powers are extremely important to know what and in which manner could the Security Council perform in order to drive the required possible solution which must also be considered while delegates write their draft resolution. The powers and functions of UNSC are mentioned in Chapter V, VI, VII, VIII and XII of the UN Charter. These could be understood as follows;

- Submit a special annual report to UNGA for consideration to maintain international peace and security. (Art. 24)
- UNSC could investigate any issue which might endanger maintenance of international peace and security. (Art. 34)
- UNSC could call upon the parties to settle disputes amicably through alternative dispute mechanisms, the procedure for such adjustments could also be provided by UNSC. (Art. 33 & 36(1)) The case could again be referred to UNSC and if the dispute still persists, the parties could settle as it may be considered appropriate. (Art. 37)
- UNSC shall determine and make recommendations for threat to peace, breach of peace and act of aggression. (Art.39) UNSC would also ensure the adherence to such measures. (Art. 41) without the use of arms but would include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. (Art. 41) In case of further failure UNSC could take actions such as demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations. (Art. 42)
- UNSC may deliberate upon any dispute occurring, and has been reported by member or non-member nations. (Art. 35)
- UNSC could refer legal disputes to the International Court of Justice. (Art. 36)
- Member states of the UN could facilitate UNSC with special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including right of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. (Art. 43)
- UNSC is responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Article 47, plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments. (Art.26)

- Member states could assist UNSC for employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces in case of necessity of use of force (Art. 44). UNSC could also take Military Measures and application of Armed Forces with assistance from the Military Staff Committee. (Art. 45,46 & 47)
- UNSC could make recommendations for pacific settlement by itself or by regional agencies of dispute in case alternative dispute settlement or legal settlement is not available. (Art. 38 & 52)
- UNSC shall approve the terms of Trusteeship agreements and assist the Trusteeship Council, in return the Trusteeship Council would undertake its obligation towards UNSC. (Art. 83 & 84)
- UNSC could utilize regional arrangements or agencies for their enforcement and ascertain information in such regards to maintain international peace and security. (Art 53 & 54)

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) stands as a paramount force on the global stage, holding significant influence in matters concerning international peace and security. Established as a central organ under the United Nations Charter, the UNSC plays a pivotal role in addressing complex geopolitical challenges. With its inception dating back to the foundation of the United Nations, the UNSC is steadfast in its dedication to maintaining global stability, preventing conflicts, and fostering sustainable development. Covering a spectrum of issues, including diplomatic resolutions, peacekeeping operations, and crisis management, the UNSC strives to uphold its fundamental objective, ensuring peace and security worldwide through collaborative and decisive action.

4.4. Key Terms and Definitions

Security Council: The principal organ of the United Nations responsible for maintaining international peace and security.

Permanent Members (P5): The five countries with permanent seats on the UNSC - the United States, Russia (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as of the timeline), China (Republic of China as of the timeline), France, and the United Kingdom.

Veto Power: The authority of any of the P5 members to block a substantive resolution, regardless of the level of international support for it.

Peacekeepers: Individuals or groups that are tasked with maintaining peace and security in conflict zones through monitoring, protection, and support activities.

5. Introduction to the Agenda Item: Suez Crisis

The Suez Crisis of 1956 was a turning point in both Middle Eastern history and world geopolitics with other names such as the Second Arab-Israeli War, the Tripartite Aggression in the Arab world and the Sinai War in israel. Following the nationalization of the canal by former president Gamal Abdel Nasser, Israel invaded Egypt on October the 29th, 1956, aiming to reopen the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran, shut by Egypt for eight years. Israel's shipments were harmed by this restriction, and the escalating tensions over this led to the invasion. Shortly afterwards, on November the 5th, the United Kingdom and France joined the military operation in an attempt to overthrow Nasser and retake the Suez Canal previously nationalized by him.

The critical Suez Canal which connects the Red Sea to the Mediterranean, has long been an important tool that is mostly under the control of the French and the British through the Suez Canal Company. Nasser was perceived as directly challenging the West following the nationalization of the canal. The United States and the Soviet Union, opposing the invasion, demanded an immediate ceasefire and put significant political pressure on the Israel-Britain-France trio as they started their coordinated invasion. The three countries were forced to withdraw from Egypt as a result of this external pressure and the disapproval of the UN.

The objective of Israel which was to ensure the freedom of navigation across the Straits of Tiran was partially accomplished by the invasion and Israeli forces briefly took control of Egypt’s Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip, however the Suez Canal itself remained closed from October 1956 to March 1957, making it completely ineffective. Gamal Abdel Nasser’s reputation was further enhanced in the Arab world, with his resistance against Western powers being hailed as heroic acts. Following the violence, the UN deployed the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF), its first ever peacekeeping force to supervise the ceasefire and patrol the Egypt-Israel border. In the aftermath of the crisis, Canadian Foreign Minister Lester Pearson was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his diplomatic efforts in ensuring the ceasefire through UN measures, while British Prime Minister Anthony Eden resigned.

The crisis signaled a dramatic change in the balance of authority in the world during the Cold War, while also showcasing the decreasing influence of colonial powers, The U.S. and the USSR became the two main superpowers, to the extent that some argue the Soviet Union gained great confidence due to the Suez Crisis and that it led to the

Invasion of Hungary, while the British and French were humiliated internationally, indicating that their position as world powers was weakening.

5.1. Key Terms and Definitions

Map of the Sinai Peninsula

Sinai Peninsula: A strategically important region in northeastern Egypt that connects Africa and Asia which is primarily desert with flat plains in the north and mountains in the south. It is neighbored by the Gulf of Aqaba and the Red Sea to the east and south, the Strait of Tiran to the southeast, Israel and the Gaza Strip to the northeast, the Mediterranean Sea to the north, and the Suez Canal to the west. The strategic significance of the Sinai Peninsula was reaffirmed during the Suez Crisis of 1956, when it became a major battleground and this further led to it playing a significant role in conflicts like the Yom Kippur War (1973) and the Six Day War (1967).

Suez Canal: A man-made waterway which connects the Mediterranean and Red Sea. It lies from Port Said in the north to Suez in the South, and has been a significant route for maritime trade across the globe. The time it would take to go from Europe to Asia is considerably reduced since it would not need one to sail across Africa. It was first constructed by the French Suez Canal Company, but remained under the administration of British and French representatives until 1956, when it was nationalized.
The Suez Canal became the center of gravity of the Suez Crisis when Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser, in response to the withdrawal of US and British funding for the Aswan High Dam, nationalized it on July 26, 1956. This became an infuriating move to Britain and France, which relied mostly on the canal for trade and oil transit. Consequently, Britain and France, in retaliation, coordinated a secret military invasion with Israel in line with the Sèvres Protocol.
The Suez Crisis was a major milestone in world geopolitics, establishing Egypt as a leader of Arab nationalism and the effective end of British and French imperial power. To this day, the canal remains one of the most important waterways in the world and is crucial in both international trade and political conflicts.

The Suez Canal, 1956

Suez Canal Company: A French-owned company that ran and administered the Suez Canal from its founding in 1858 until its nationalization in 1956. The canal, which formally opened in 1869, was built, financed, and maintained by the corporation. French investors initially held the bulk of the enterprise, but in 1875 Britain acquired a 44% share, which gave them considerable control over canal operations and earnings. Operating under a 99-year concession that was scheduled to end in 1968, the Suez Canal Company regulated ship transit and collected tolls to control maritime traffic between Europe and Asia. However, on July 26, 1956, Gamal Abdel Nasser nationalized the canal and gave the Egyptian government all of its assets, bringing a sudden and unexpected end to the authority the company had.

Gulf of Suez: An extension of the Red Sea which lies between the Sinai Peninsula and Egypt's eastern coast. The gulf is a strategically important waterway for global trade and maritime navigation because it is the southern entrance to the Suez Canal. It is a vital economic resource for Egypt because of its offshore oil and natural gas deposits. Major ports are located in the gulf's waters, facilitating trade and industry. After the Suez Canal was nationalized, Egypt attempted to keep control of its marine area. The gulf is still a vital route for international trade and has been under Egyptian authority ever since. Today, the Gulf of Suez remains one of the world's most significant waterways, serving both as a trade corridor and a resource hub for Egypt’s energy sector. Its strategic importance continues to shape regional geopolitics and global trade.

Strait of Tiran: The Strait of Tiran is a narrow maritime passage located at the southern tip of the Sinai Peninsula, connecting the Red Sea with the Gulf of Aqaba and it lies between Egypt's Sinai Peninsula and Saudi Arabia. This strait is a key element in sea trade, for it is the only sea entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, making it significant for the ports of Eilat in Israel and Aqaba in Jordan.
Through the years, the Strait of Tiran has achieved strategic importance and stood at the focus of several conflicts in the Middle East. The strait, along with the town of Sharm el-Sheikh, was taken over by Israel in 1956 to make certain that passage remained free when it was blocked by Egypt for Israeli navigation. Under pressure from the United Nations, Israel withdrew in 1957 and the UNEF began policing the region as a result to prevent conflict from recurring.

Gulf of Aqaba: Another extension of the Red Sea, bordered by the Sinai Peninsula and the Arabian Peninsula. The gulf is a vital maritime passage, connecting the Strait of Tiran to the Red Sea and providing crucial access to the ports of Eilat, Aqaba and Taba. The Gulf of Aqaba plays a crucial strategic significance in both regional trade and military security. It is essential to Israel's and Jordan's economic stability because it is

their only marine point of entry. Additionally, the gulf supports the fishing and oil transportation sectors, which boost the economies of the neighboring countries. The Gulf of Aqaba has been the center of gravity of Middle Eastern battles throughout history, especially those involving Egypt and Israel. The economies of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia are all heavily dependent on the Gulf of Aqaba. In addition to being a vital conduit for international trade, it also represents regional collaboration and diplomatic pacts.

Aswan High Dam: The Aswan High Dam was constructed to control the Nile River's flow, avoid floods, enhance agriculture, and produce hydroelectric power. Under President Gamal Abdel Nasser's guidance, the dam was built between 1960 and 1970. It revolutionized Egypt's water management system and was essential to the nation's modernization initiatives. Egypt had depended on the yearly floods of the Nile for generations and although necessary for agriculture, these floods were unstable and frequently disastrous. In addition to providing a consistent supply of water for agriculture, the Aswan High Dam was built to manage these floods and store water for dry periods. The dam was also anticipated to provide hydroelectric power, which would lessen Egypt's reliance on foreign fuel and promote industrial growth.
Egypt first approached to Western countries for funds, and in 1955 the United States and Britain agreed to contribute to the project's funding. But as Nasser’s connections with the Soviet Union grew deeper and as he sought an independent foreign policy, tensions increased. The United States and Britain ended their financial assistance in July 1956, expressing worries about Egypt strengthening its ties with the Soviet Union, especially following the military deal with Soviet Czechoslovakia. In response, Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal on July 26, 1956, with the intention of using the toll money to build the dam, bringing on the Suez Canal Crisis. Egypt asked the Soviet Union for financial assistance, expertise in technology, and building supplies after Western funding was cut off. Beginning in 1960, construction of the Aswan High Dam resulted in the creation of Lake Nasser, one of the biggest artificial lakes in the world, by 1970. The dam produced hydroelectric power, which supplied a sizable amount of Egypt's electricity, guaranteed year-round agriculture, and offered long-term water storage.

Gamal Abdel Nasser: Former president of Egypt following the overthrow of King Farouk. He nationalized the Suez Canal and was loved by the people of Egypt due to the resistance he showed against the West.

Nikita Khrushchev: Former leader of the Soviet Union, who condemned the Western intervention in Egypt and threatened possible military action in response.

Dwight David Eisenhower: Former president of the United States who strongly opposed the British-French-Israeli invasion and pressured them to withdraw from Egypt. Following the crisis of the Suez Canal, he adopted a doctrine named after himself with the aim of supporting the middle eastern allies of the USA.

Eisenhower Doctrine (1957): A Cold War-era American diplomatic strategy intended to prevent the rise of communism in the Middle East. Following the 1956 Suez Crisis, which revealed the decreasing authority of Britain and France and the growing significance of the United States in Middle Eastern politics, it was a response to the expanding Soviet dominance in the area. According to the doctrine, any Middle Eastern nation under threat from communism or Soviet expansion would get military and economic support from the United States.

Baghdad Pact (1955): Also known as the Central Treaty Organization and the Middle East Treaty Organization, was a military alliance aimed at countering Soviet influence in the Middle East during the Cold War. Initially formed by Iraq, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom, it aimed to promote mutual defense against external threats, particularly the Soviet influence. The United States supported the pact however did not join formally. The alliance weakened after the 1958 coup in Iraq, which led to the withdrawal of Iraq, and internal conflicts among members. By the early 1970s, the pact had dissolved, marking a shift in regional dynamics and U.S. alliances in the Middle East.

Sevres Protocol (1956): An agreement signed on October 24, 1956, between Israel, France, and the United Kingdom during the Suez Crisis. The protocol was a secret plan to coordinate military action against Egypt following the nationalization of the Suez Canal and the increasing influence of Gamal Abdel Nasser in the Middle East. The plan outlined a joint military strategy in which Israel would invade the Sinai Peninsula and advance toward the canal, enabling Britain and France to intervene militarily with the aim of protecting the canal and separating the warring parties. The goal was to remove Nasser from power and restore Western control over the canal. The Sevres Protocol was imaginably kept as a secret from the United States, due to its strict opposition to military intervention in Egypt. When the plan was discovered, international pressure forced the Britain France Israel trio to cease their military operations, and they eventually withdrew, marking a humiliating diplomatic defeat for the three.

Operation Kadesh (1956): Following the nationalization of the Suez Canal and blockage of Israeli trade, Israel, France, and the United Kingdom planned a military response against Egypt, of which the Kadesh Operation was a crucial component. Israel intended to invade the Sinai Peninsula, advance on the Suez Canal, and claim it as part

of Operation Kadesh in order to provide a pretext for French and British action. Israel aimed to safeguard its borders, especially from Egyptian attacks from the Sinai, weaken Nasser's power, and interfere with Egyptian military facilities. Despite early victories, international pressure, especially from the US and the USSR, caused Israel, Britain, and France to stop their military operations by November 6, 1956. The operation started on October 29, 1956, with Israeli forces moving quickly into the Sinai. Israel achieved military success with the operation, but the diplomatic consequences and following agreement made it a political tragedy. Operation Kadesh demonstrated how Britain and France's influence in the Middle East began to decrease and signaled the rise of the United States as the main force that could bring up peace in the area.

Operation Musketeer (1956): The Anglo-French military operation in Egypt during the Suez Crisis, known as Operation Musketeer, aiming to take over the Suez Canal and overthrow Gamal Abdel Nasser under the disguise of peacekeeping; as agreed in the Sevres Protocol. Regaining control of the Suez Canal, guaranteeing Western supremacy in the area, and weakening Nasser's regime they saw as an increasing threat to their interests were the main goals of the operation. The attack would target Port Said, a crucial city near the canal's northern entrance, even though the original plan was to launch an invasion on Alexandria. Following Operation Kadesh and the ultimatum Britain and France gave, British and French paratroopers landed in Port Said on November 5, 1956, marking the start of the Anglo-French attack. After intense battles, Royal Marines and other naval forces launched a full-scale invasion the next day and took control of much of the city. Although Egyptian forces resisted, the invading forces' superior weaponry outnumbered theirs. Even though the operation was initially successful militarily, it was immediately criticized by the world community. The United States put immense pressure on Britain and France to withdraw because it worried about Soviet invasion and wanted to avoid a larger conflict. The Soviet Union directly threatened Western Europe with missile attacks if the invasion went on, while the United Nations, supported by both the US and the USSR, called for a ceasefire. Economic retaliation was also brought on by the situation; the United States froze British financial assets and any kind of IMF support, which left the British government unable to

continue the operation. Right before they could acquire full command of the canal, Britain and France agreed to a ceasefire on November 6 in response to intense diplomatic and financial pressure. The withdrawal was supervised by the United Nations Emergency Force.

United Nations Emergency Forces: The first peacekeeping forces created in 1956. It was established to supervise a ceasefire and uphold peace following military actions against Egypt by Israel, France, and Britain due to Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal. It was the first extensive UN peacekeeping mission. The UNEF was sent in to oversee the ceasefire, keep an eye on the Israeli and Egyptian forces, and help the invading soldiers leave. The force, which was made up of peacekeepers from Canada, India, and Sweden, was entrusted with separating both sides of the conflict until a more long-term agreement could be reached. By supervising the ceasefire and guaranteeing that Egypt reclaimed control of the Suez Canal, the UNEF was instrumental in bringing the conflict to a close. It established a standard for upcoming peacekeeping operations and was the first time the UN had successfully intervened in a significant international conflict. After the incident, the UNEF helped to keep the peace in the area until 1979.

United Nations Emergency Forces

5.2. Historical Background and Overview

The Construction of the Canal and Afterwards

The dream of a canal connecting the Mediterranean and Red Seas goes back to ancient Egyptian pharaohs, but a truly modern effort didn't begin until the mid-1800s. Ferdinand de Lesseps, a French diplomat and engineer, led the effort to considerably improve global trade routes.

Between 1859 and 1869, the Suez Canal Company constructed the canal, employing many tens of thousands of Egyptian laborers. The project faced important challenges. These included harsh desert conditions, labor unrest and political pressure, yet it was completed in a decade.

The Suez Canal's projected importance stemmed from its ability to shorten maritime trade routes, considerably decreasing travel time between Europe and Asia. Global economic as well as political affairs were directly affected by its importance to oil, trade goods, along with military transport.

Egypt controlled the canal, as well as France. Faced with severe financial difficulties in 1875, Egypt sold large shares to Britain, thereby granting Britain effective control. British priorities were securing large access to India and maintaining their large Middle Eastern power.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser led Egypt and Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal in 1956. Britain's as well as France's interest in the canal fueled resentment over this action, thereby igniting the Suez Crisis. Nasser's strong actions greatly inspired Arab nationalism, yet also resulted in meaningful military intervention by Britain, France and Israel. This resulted in a complete ceasefire, accompanied by large international criticism of the aggression.

The Revolution of 1952

Common discontent with King Farouk I's monarchy was important in Egypt by the early 1950s and this discontent stemmed from views of corruption, ineffectiveness and excessive British influence. Important economic instability and common poverty fueled large public discontent and foreign control over key assets such as the Suez Canal further strengthened this discontent.

A number of nationalist military officers, known as the Free Officers Movement, formed in the late 1940s with the objective of dealing with a deficiency of reform along with ending British influence. Gamal Abdel Nasser and Anwar Sadat were extremely important figures in this group. Abdel Hakim Amer was another meaningful member. Their primary objective was to completely overthrow the monarchy and to create an unified republic.

A revolution, spearheaded by a Free Officers' coup, started on July 23, 1952. They seized key government facilities, including the palace, on July 23, 1952, encountering little resistance. The monarchy's sudden abolition abruptly forced King Farouk into exile.

The coup resulted in the formation of the Revolutionary Command Council (RCC). General Mohamed Naguib became president and Nasser served as his deputy. Nasser strengthened his control, ousting Naguib and becoming Egypt's president in 1954.

Nasser's reforms included land redistribution, nationalization of key industries and a focus on modernization and economic independence. To considerably reduce foreign influence and, along with that, elevate Egypt's prominence in the Arab world, he enacted Arab socialist policies.

Nasser's Pan-Arabism and participation in the Non-Adjusted Movement promoted his image as a leader of Arab nationalism, thus realizing his vision for Arab unity. He advocated for pan-Arabism, imagining a single unified Arab state and he worked to separate several Arab nations from Western imperialism. His important analytical role in the Non-Adjusted Movement considerably contributed to Egypt's emergence as a leading voice advocating independence during the Cold War.

Egypt's emergence as a key player in Middle Eastern geopolitics resulted from the revolution. Nasser's impactful policies considerably changed Egypt's internal affairs and its foreign policy. Gamal Abdel Nasser's 1956 nationalization of the Suez Canal, initially seen as a triumph for Egyptian sovereignty, resulted in the Suez Crisis, prompting military intervention from Britain, France and Israel and pointing out the challenges faced by newly independent nations in the region.

Suez Crisis of 1956

The Suez Crisis of 1956, also known as the Second Arab-Israeli War or the Tripartite Aggression, was a major international conflict focused on the tactically important Suez

Canal, linking the Mediterranean and Red Seas. Post-World War II decolonization, Cold War tensions and regional power struggles caused the crisis. This marked an important shift in global power. The weakening of European colonial influence and the rise of the United States and the Soviet Union signified this change.

Gamal Abdel Nasser, the Egyptian president, decisively seized control of the Suez Canal Company and this action occurred on July 26, 1956. The company was controlled by British and French authorities. This action resulted directly from the United States and Britain's total cessation of funding for the Aswan High Dam, an important infrastructure project designed to modernize Egypt's economy and improve its irrigation systems. Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal demonstrated Egypt's complete sovereignty and opposition to an important degree of active Western economic dominance.

The Suez Canal's importance, especially to Britain as well as France, derived from its large role as a trade route for many Middle Eastern oil shipments, providing inexpensive along with tactical advantages. About two-thirds of Europe's oil supply traveled through the canal then. Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal was viewed by Britain and France as a direct challenge to Western interests, leading them to consider options for regaining control. They feared this action. This could encourage other post-colonial nations to seize Western assets.

Israel's long-standing tensions with Egypt stemmed from many Palestinian fedayeen raids emanating from Egyptian-controlled Gaza and Egypt's complete blockade of the Straits of Tiran, consequently preventing some Israeli access to the Red Sea. Israel's severe crisis offered an important chance to greatly weaken Egypt's military and this also secured its navigation rights and potentially reshaped the regional balance of power more favorably. Israel considered Nasser's growing power in the Arab world a major security threat and this caused important concern.

On October 29, 1956, Israel initiated Operation Kadesh, achieving important improvements in the Sinai Peninsula and securing important areas. Britain and France issued a formal ultimatum demanding some Israeli and Egyptian troop withdrawals from the entire canal zone to justify their military intervention. Egypt refused. Britain and France responded with Operation Musketeer, including airstrikes, naval bombardments and paratrooper landings at Port Said.

The intervention initially achieved meaningful military successes, but subsequently encountered large international criticism, especially from the United States and the Soviet Union. U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower strongly opposed the invasion, viewing it as a reckless colonial attempt and he believed this action could destabilize several Middle Eastern nations and greatly escalate Cold War tensions. The Soviet

Union, under Nikita Khrushchev, denounced the invasion and warned of strong action, up to and including nuclear retaliation, if the invaders did not retreat. The situation risked escalating the regional conflict into a full-blown global crisis.

Many diplomatic negotiations focused on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). U.S. efforts to achieve a resolution heavily pressured Britain and France to withdraw, as well as Soviet threats of intervention. The crisis led to the first use of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) to oversee the ceasefire and the force oversaw the withdrawal of foreign troops.

Britain, France and Israel completed their withdrawal from Egypt by March 1957. The United States played a key role in pressuring some of Britain and France. This action was taken to maintain stability in the Middle East and to counter Soviet influence. Nasser, a meaningful figure, rose to prominence as a hero of Arab nationalism because of his strong opposition to Western intervention. This crisis considerably changed global geopolitics and it simultaneously strengthened the United States' leadership in the Western alliance while pointing out the Soviet Union's expanding influence over many newly independent nations.

Establishment of UNEF

Lester B. Pearson, Canada's top diplomat, spearheaded the creation of the United Nations Emergency Force. Pearson, a diplomat as well as a future Canadian Prime Minister, played a key role. He suggested a peacekeeping force to separate the warring sides and enforce a ceasefire. His diplomatic efforts focused on de-escalating the conflict without UN military intervention.

The UN General Assembly passed a resolution on November 5, 1956. This resolution created a plan for an emergency force to supervise the ceasefire. The resolution passed with large support despite British and French opposition, based on their belief that it violated their sovereign rights and necessitated military intervention to safeguard the canal.

The UNEF's role was to act as a buffer between Egyptian and Israeli forces, overseeing the ceasefire. It targeted to halt all further fighting and it targeted to ease the complete withdrawal of invading forces while maintaining peace until a lasting political solution could be found. UNEF's purpose was to avoid taking sides. Its role was to act as neutral peacekeepers. UNEF included soldiers from many countries and these soldiers mainly

hailed from an important number of neutral and non-adjusted nations. Canada contributed the most, while troops from India, Norway, Finland, Brazil, Colombia and other countries also participated. General E.L.M. Burns, a Canadian officer, led the force, overseeing operations and guaranteeing the ceasefire's observance.

UNEF troops began deploying to the Egyptian-Israeli border and key Suez Canal areas in November 1956. The peacekeeping force was targeted to prevent fighting between Egyptian and Israeli forces and monitor the end of hostilities. UNEF bore the primary responsibility and this major role involved guaranteeing full compliance with the ceasefire. UNEF's success in separating Egyptian as well as Israeli forces stabilized the situation, setting the stage for diplomatic negotiations.

UNEF's establishment was a major step forward for UN peacekeeping. This was the first meaningful use of peacekeepers, creating a precedent for future UN actions in conflict zones. The UN's ability to use a neutral force for mediating complex geopolitical crises was demonstrated by UNEF's deployment, a success achieved during the tense Cold War period. The UNEF played an important role in easing the resolution of the Suez Crisis. Its contribution was meaningful from an analytical perspective. Intense pressure from the international community, including the U.S., Britain, as well as France, resulted in a cessation of military action; a ceasefire was subsequently agreed to. UNEF's presence guaranteed the safe withdrawal of all foreign troops from Egypt. This resulted in a resolution where Egypt retained control of the canal.

UNEF's remarkably successful role in the Suez Crisis considerably set the stage for subsequent UN peacekeeping operations; these included missions in Cyprus, along with those in the Congo. The UN Emergency Force showed that international cooperation and peacekeeping can be effective in stabilizing and managing post-conflict situations.

An United Nations Emergency Force was present in Egypt until 1967. The Six-Day War between Israel and several Arab states prompted the UN's withdrawal of its peacekeeping force. Tensions sharply escalated in the region and Nasser had urgently requested the immediate departure of all of UNEF's forces. UNEF's creation and large operations were meaningful. These considerably influenced the later development of UN peacekeeping doctrines. Its neutral, non-combatant role set an important standard for subsequent peacekeeping operations. Its large success demonstrated the effectiveness of multinational forces in maintaining peace following conflicts.

The creation of the UN Emergency Force addressed the Suez Crisis' immediate military emergency, becoming a meaningful event in the history of UN peacekeeping. Its deployment considerably simplified ceasefire management and was important to ending

the conflict. This action created a meaningful precedent for the UN’s ability to intercede in worldwide wars, as well as deploying peacekeeping forces in these wars.

5.3. Humanitarian Impact

Port Said, November 5, 1956

The 1956 Suez Crisis had serious humanitarian consequences, especially for Egypt's civilian population and military. Long-term regional instability, infrastructural loss, economic hardship, and civilian casualties were the results of the conflicts. The military intervention by Britain, France, and Israel resulted in significant loss of life among Egyptian civilians. While exact figures remain uncertain, it is estimated that hundreds of Egyptians were killed due to bombardments, naval gunfire, and ground combat. The British and French deaths however totalled to just 26.

The battle caused significant civilian losses in Port Said, the center of the Anglo-French invasion. Although Egyptian military sites were the focus of British and French airstrikes, homes, businesses, and public infrastructure were also struck, resulting in significant harm. Due to the conflict, many Egyptians ended up having to flee their homes. The overwhelming number of injured people overflowed hospitals and medical institutions, and it was becoming increasingly challenging to get food, clean water, and medical supplies.

The battle caused significant civilian losses in Port Said, the center of the Anglo-French invasion. Although Egyptian military sites were the focus of British and French airstrikes, homes, businesses, and public infrastructure were also struck, resulting in significant harm. Due to the conflict, many Egyptians ended up having to flee their homes. The overwhelming number of injured people overflowed hospitals and medical institutions, and it was becoming increasingly challenging to get food, clean water, and medical supplies.

Beyond Egypt, the crisis has wider humanitarian effects. The situation for Palestinian refugees, many of whom had already been displaced from the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, worsened as a result of the conflict, which increased tensions between Israel and the Arab world. Additionally, the crisis increased regional instability, resulting in additional displacement in the years that followed. In the end, the Suez Crisis ended physically in December 1956, but its humanitarian effects persisted for much longer as Egypt and the surrounding area struggled with the fallout from the conflict, financial instability, and heightened geopolitical tensions.

5.4. Timeline of Key Events

July 23, 1952: Gamal Abdel Nasser became president after the Egyptian Revolution overthrew King Farouk.

October 19, 1954: Britain agreed to withdraw troops from the Suez Canal Zone, although completing the withdrawal two years later.

February 24, 1955: The Baghdad Pact was signed, leading to the growing distrust of Egypt towards the West.

September 27, 1955: Nasser announced in a speech that he has signed a major arms deal with Soviet-backed Czechoslovakia and that the fifth goal of his revolution, building a strong national army, has been achieved.

July 19, 1956: The USA and Britain withdrew funding for Egypt's Aswan High Dam project which made Nasser furious.

July 26, 1956: The Suez Canal was nationalized by Nasser, infuriating Britain and France.

July–October 1956: Britain, France, and Israel secretly negotiated military intervention against Egypt.

October 29, 1956: Israel launched Operation Kadesh and invaded Egypt's Sinai Peninsula.

October 31, 1956: Egyptian and Israeli withdrawal from the Suez Canal was demanded by Britain and France, though Egypt refused.

October 31–November 1, 1956: Operation Musketeer was launched, British and French airstrikes began against Egyptian targets.

November 5, 1956: French and British paratroopers moved towards the canal after landing at Port Said and Port Fuad.

November 6, 1956: Under the pressure of the USA and USSR, Britain and France agreed to a ceasefire.

November 7, 1956: The United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF), was created to moderate the ceasefire. This was the first peacekeeping mission of the Security Council

December 22, 1956: Britain and France completed their withdrawal from Egypt.

March 8, 1957: Israel completed its withdrawal from the Sinai under the pressure of the USA; and the Suez Canal, despite remaining under Egyptian control, was reopened to international traffic.

5.5. International Policies

Australia: Australia's close relations to France and the United Kingdom during the 1956 Suez Crisis influenced its foreign policy, indicating both its commitment to backing Western countries during the Cold War and its standing within the British Commonwealth. Australia was a close ally of the United Kingdom at the time, and both countries had a stake in gaining access to the Suez Canal, which was important for international trade and oil supplies. Following the nationalization of the canal by Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser, Australia backed the military intervention led by Britain, France, and Israel. Australia, under the leadership of Prime Minister Robert Menzies, denounced Nasser's conduct and supported the military reaction because it believed that this action threatened Western interests. However, Australia did not

directly participate in the military operations, as its focus was on other areas like the Korean War, but it offered political and moral support.
However, when the United States, led by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, opposed the military action out of concern for escalation and possible Soviet participation in the area, the situation grew more complex. Despite Australia's early support for Britain and France, the United States pressed for a ceasefire and a peaceful resolution, which led to Australia aligning with U.S. policy. The United Nations participated in the ceasefire talks, and Australia and other Western countries ultimately backed the establishment of the UNEF to oversee the ceasefire and stop future hostilities. Although at first in favor of the military action, Australia was ultimately compelled to accept the U.S. position, marking a shift in the global order and the increasing influence of the United States in shaping international diplomacy.

Belgium: Belgium's membership in the Western bloc during the Cold War, its dedication to assisting its NATO allies, especially the United Kingdom and France, and its keen interest in safeguarding Middle Eastern stability all influenced its foreign policy during the 1956 Suez Crisis. As a major NATO member from Europe, Belgium had a stake in regional security and open access to the Suez Canal, which was essential for European trade and oil supplies. Like many Western countries, Belgium backed Israel, Britain, and France's military action after Egyptian President Nasser nationalized the canal. Belgium did however acknowledge the geopolitical dangers of increased relations with the Soviet Union, which reduced its support for the action. Belgium supported the operation politically but did not actually provide soldiers because its main priorities were managing its own colonial troubles in Congo and defending Europe through NATO. The United States put immense pressure on Belgium and other European nations to stop the military action as the crisis developed. Fearing that the crisis could lead to Soviet intervention, the United States advocated for a UN ceasefire, which ultimately resulted in the evacuation of the invading forces. Following its alliances and the increasing sway of U.S. diplomacy, Belgium backed the UN ceasefire and the establishment of the UNEF to keep the peace.

Canada: Canada's membership in the British Commonwealth and its constant commitment to multilateralism, peacekeeping, and UN support both shaped its foreign policy during the 1956 Suez Crisis. Canada handled the issue in a rather independent manner, prioritizing diplomacy and a UN-led solution above military involvement, in contrast to many other Western nations. Like other Western countries, Canada first voiced support for the British and French response to Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal because of its concerns about the threat Nasser posed to regional stability and international shipping. However, Canada quickly became critical of the military intervention by Britain and France, particularly because of

the potential for escalation with the Soviet Union and the diplomatic rift it caused with the United States. Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, was a key figure in shaping the country's strategy and was instrumental in promoting a peaceful conclusion through the UN. He had a key role in suggesting the establishment of the UNEF, since he felt that the dispute should be resolved diplomatically. His efforts, which aimed to stop the crisis from worsening into a larger conflict, were based on Canada's strong commitment to multilateralism and peacekeeping. As part of the UNEF, Canada responded to the ceasefire proposal by sending peacekeeping soldiers to the area to supervise the withdrawal of invading forces and assist in monitoring the ceasefire. Canada’s role in this peacekeeping mission was a demonstration of its commitment to international cooperation and its leadership in the field of UN peacekeeping.

Cuba: The Cuban government was affiliated with the United States and had close relations to Western powers. As the Cold War and decolonization movements began to impact the Caribbean and Latin America region, Cuba's place in the world was progressively changing. The events of the Suez Crisis influenced Cuba's changing foreign policy under Batista's administration, despite the fact that Cuba was not directly participating in the conflict. The nationalization of the Suez Canal was seen by Cuba as an acceptable assertion of sovereignty by a post-colonial nation against the influence of imperial powers such as Britain and France, and the country voiced solidarity with the Arab countries involved, especially Egypt. The anti-imperialist sentiment that was then widespread throughout Latin America was reflected in Cuba's position. The events in the Middle East were seen as a continuation of larger decolonization movements and opposition to Western countries' control over vital resources like the Suez Canal, even though Cuba's government was not yet ideologically affiliated with the Soviet Union in 1956. Although the government did not yet fully embrace the Soviet Union or the Eastern Bloc as it would after the Cuban Revolution in 1959, Cuba's official response to the Suez Crisis was in line with other Latin American nations that aimed to support Egypt and the Arab world in their struggle for autonomy and independence from Western imperialism.

Egypt: As the focal point of the 1956 Suez Crisis, Egypt's actions directly challenged Western powers, especially Britain and France, and asserted its own authority over the strategically important Suez Canal. A major act of rebellion against colonial powers, Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal under President Gamal Abdel Nasser signaled a shift in Egypt's position in the Middle East and the wider world. Nasser's decision to nationalize the Suez Canal in July 1956 was the direct cause of the crisis. The removal of American and British finance for the construction of the Aswan High Dam, which Nasser planned as an essential infrastructure project for Egypt's development, was one factor in this action. Since the canal was essential to international shipping, especially

the movement of oil from the Middle East to Europe, Nasser's nationalization was viewed as an insult to French and British interests. Guerrilla warfare and Egypt's determination to oppose foreign invasion were ultimately successful. The position for the Western countries was worsened by the strong opposition put up by Nasser's soldiers, who were supported by the Soviet Union and the Arab world. Fearing a wider conflict with the Soviets, the United States, led by President Dwight D. Eisenhower opposed the invasion when the Soviet Union threatened military action on behalf of Egypt.

France: Along with Britain and Israel, France was one of the main players in the military intervention against Egypt during the 1956 Suez Crisis. The Suez Canal Company had previously managed the canal and thus resulted in its nationalization being viewed by France and Britain as a direct danger to their influence and strategic interests in the Middle East. Given its colonial past in North Africa, France had long-standing political, military, and economic ties to Egypt and the Arab world as a whole. The French government, which saw Nasser as a destabilizing force and an enemy of French interests, was concerned about his expanding influence in the Arab world and his backing of anti-colonial groups, such as those in Algeria. Nasser’s actions were seen by France as a challenge to their authority in the Middle East and an affront to Western colonial powers.France joined with Britain and Israel in planning and executing military intervention in Egypt. As one of the three members of the Kadesh Operation, France began bombing and deploying forces to secure the waterway. Under intense diplomatic pressure from the United States and the United Nations, France was forced to halt their military operations.
The limitations of French military and political power in the post-World War II era were exposed, although despite the failure of the intervention, France did manage to maintain its strategic influence in the region, particularly through its role in NATO. To sum up, driven by its desire to protect its colonial interests and maintain its influence in the Middle East, France played a significant role in the military intervention against Egypt during the crisis. However, as the United States and the United Nations became the main arbiters of international dispute resolution, the crisis revealed the boundaries of French dominance and signaled the start of a change in world geopolitics. France's participation in the crisis demonstrated the diminishing role of European nations in world politics and the increasing significance of superpower competition during the Cold War.

Imperial State of Iran: The Imperial State of Iran's foreign policy maintained a balance between its strategic alliance with the West, keeping in mind the close relationship His Imperial Majesty Mohammad Reza Shah had with the United States, and its significant regional influence. Using its enormous oil wealth, modernizing military, and geopolitical importance, Iran was growing into a major superpower in the Middle East and

attempting to maintain important partnerships while claiming a more independent role. Iran was concerned about the nationalization of the Suez Canal because Nasser's anti-Western and pan-Arabist stance clearly contradicted Iran's Middle East agenda and threatened regional stability. Since Iran was a sovereign, emerging power rather than a post-colonial state, it was not impacted by Nasser's interests for anti-colonial struggle, in contrast to many Arab countries. Furthermore, Iran, which aimed to preserve its own strategic independence while limiting Soviet influence in the area, was extremely concerned about Nasser's deepening relations with the Soviet Union.
Despite being the most powerful regional force, Iran chose not to get directly involved in the Suez Crisis. However, Iran's overall political goals were in line with Western countries as a major participant in the Baghdad Pact. Iran adopted a realistic stance, putting regional security and its long-term strategic objectives ahead of direct conflict, rather than openly supporting the British-French-Israeli military involvement. It supported the UNEF's deployment as part of larger initiatives to stabilize the area, although not providing soldiers for it. Iran supported diplomatic initiatives led by the United States and the United Nations given the pro-Western stance of His Imperial Majesty Mohammad Reza Shah and the membership of Iran in the Baghdad Pact. It also considered the deployment of UNEF as a way to restore order while preventing Egypt from gaining uncontrolled dominance in the region.

Israel: Israel was an important player in the military intervention against Egypt during the 1956 Suez Crisis, joining forces with Britain and France in a coordinated assault known as the Sèvres Protocol. Israel's main reasons for getting involved in the war were economic, strategic, and security considerations. By 1956, Israel was dealing with escalating Egyptian aggression, such as Palestinian fedayeen border attacks, Israeli shipping blockades across the Strait of Tiran, and Nasser's expanding military buildup with Soviet assistance. Israel viewed Egypt as its biggest regional danger and worked to destroy guerrilla attacks supported by Egypt, weaken Nasser, and gain unfettered access to the Red Sea. Israel began Operation Kadesh to seize the Sinai Peninsula on October 29, 1956. The Israel Defense Forces moved quickly, capturing strategic areas including the Gaza Strip and Mitla Pass with the help of armored divisions and paratroopers. The attack was a component of a covert deal with Britain and France, who intended to retake control of the Suez Canal while intervening under the disguise of separating Israeli and Egyptian forces. Israel had to flee Sinai despite its military victory because of pressure from the United States and other countries. Israel received UN guarantees in exchange, including the creation of the UNEF to stop Egyptian aggression and freedom of passage through the Strait of Tiran. The Suez Crisis ultimately strengthened Israel’s military reputation but highlighted the limits of relying on European powers, pushing Israel to develop closer ties with the United States as its primary ally in the coming decades.

Peru: Peru primarily allied with the Western bloc during the crisis and backed the UN's diplomatic attempts to end the conflict. As a pro-Western, non-aligned nation, Peru saw Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal as a threat to global trade and maritime stability, even though it had no direct interest in the conflict. Peru supported resolutions at the UN advocating for a ceasefire and the use of the UNEF to reduce tensions. It was in line with Peru's overall foreign policy, which placed a high priority on stability in international trade and multilateral solutions through the UN. Peru largely supported de-escalation and opposed independent military operations that might disrupt global stability, even though it did not take a strong stand against neither Egypt nor the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion.

Republic of China: The Republic of China took a pro-Western stand during the 1956 Suez Crisis but had no direct involvement in it. During the Cold War, the ROC was a close ally of the United States and typically supported Washington's diplomatic stance, which opposed the Anglo-French-Israeli military involvement and called for a UN-led settlement. The ROC backed the UNEF to stabilize the area and supported attempts to de-escalate the conflict at the UN. It was concerned with preserving its international legitimacy and Western alliances, especially as it wanted ongoing USA support against the People's Republic of China, even though it had no direct strategic interests in the Suez Canal. The Republic of China followed USA's lead, stressing the need for a peaceful conclusion while avoiding direct involvement in the conflict because of its reliance on the support of the USA for both military and diplomatic security.

Saudi Arabia: Saudi Arabia strongly opposed the Anglo-French-Israeli intervention during the crisis and supported Egypt in its fight against the rule of the West in the area. The crisis marked a turning point in Saudi Arabia's foreign policy because it reaffirmed the kingdom's resistance to Israeli territorial expansion, anti-colonial posture, and dedication to Arab unity. Saudi Arabia viewed the invasion as an outright imperialist assault on an Arab state and considered Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal as a legitimate response to Western economic dominance. King Saud called for Arab cooperation and economic action against Western countries and denounced Britain, France, and Israel. In response to the crisis, Saudi Arabia cut off oil supplies to Britain and France, using its influence as an oil-producing nation to pressure the West into withdrawing. Saudi Arabia supported Egypt diplomatically in the UN, encouraging moves to restore Egyptian sovereignty over the Suez Canal and calling for a cease-fire. Despite not using force, Saudi Arabia was instrumental in mobilizing Arab and Muslim opposition to the intervention. Saudi-Egyptian ties were improved by the Suez Crisis, but as Nasser's pan-Arab nationalist views became increasingly extreme, tensions between Egypt and Saudi Arabia would eventually surface. However, in 1956, Saudi

Arabia asserted its dominance in the Arab world by advocating against colonialism and utilizing politics dependent on oil as a means of influencing world events.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republic: The USSR positioned itself as an ally of Arab nationalism and anti-colonial movements and strongly condemned the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt. The crisis gave the USSR a crucial chance to oppose Western imperialism, increase its power in the Middle East, and reinforce its ties with Egypt under Gamal Abdel Nasser. The Soviet Union, which saw Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal as a valid claim to sovereignty, immediately gave Egypt financial, military, and political backing. The USSR condemned the invasion as an act of imperialist aggression and demanded an immediate withdrawal when Israel, Britain, and France commenced their attack. By making broad nuclear threats and threatening to launch missile strikes if the invasion persisted, Khrushchev heightened tensions. He also hinted at military intervention in defense of Egypt, though in reality, the Soviet Union had no immediate plans for direct confrontation. In the end, the USSR benefited from the Suez Crisis because it caused a major decrease in French and British power in the Middle East, which made room for Soviet growth. In turn, Egypt emerged as a crucial ally of the Soviet Union, obtaining substantial financial and military support, including backing for the construction of the Aswan High Dam. As both superpowers pushed Britain, France, and Israel to leave, the crisis further strengthened the already growing rivalry between the USSR and USA showing that European colonial powers were no longer in control of the world. The USSR advanced its Cold War strategy of opposing Western dominance globally by establishing itself as an advocate of anti-colonialism and enhancing its reputation among Arab and recently independent countries.

United Kingdom: After Gamal Abdel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, the UK was instrumental in planning the Anglo-French-Israeli intervention against Egypt. The crisis accelerated Britain's fall as a world imperial power and revealed the boundaries of its post-war influence, marking an important turning point in British foreign policy. In order to maintain its international trade routes and guarantee access to Middle Eastern oil, Britain saw the Suez Canal as a crucial strategic and commercial asset. Nasser's nationalization was viewed as a direct danger to Western influence in the area and a challenge to British interests. In response, Britain used the Sèvres Protocol to secretly cooperate with France and Israel. Following Israel's Operation Kadesh invasion of the Sinai Peninsula on October 29, 1956, Britain and France issued an ultimatum requiring both sides to leave, according to the plan in the protocol. Britain was compelled to discontinue military activities and accept a UN-backed ceasefire after coming under intense diplomatic pressure, including financial threats and an oil embargo spearheaded by the United States. Britain suffered a devastating setback during the Suez Crisis,

which exposed its declining influence on the world stage and growing reliance on the United States. Britain stopped pursuing imperial goals and instead aligned itself more closely with the USA. Along with speeding up the decolonization process and proving the loss of European supremacy in world affairs, the crisis also signaled the beginning of the end of Britain's direct influence in the Middle East.

United State of America: The United States strongly opposed the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt during the 1956 Suez Crisis and was instrumental in achieving a ceasefire. Because the United States put more emphasis on limiting Soviet influence in the Middle East than on assisting its longstanding European allies, the crisis was a turning point in the Cold War. The United States first had mixed feelings about Nasser, while acknowledging that French and British colonial power in the area was waning, it was also concerned about the deepening connections of him with the Soviet Union. The United States viewed Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal in July 1956 as an economic conflict that should be settled diplomatically as opposed to militarily. The fact that its allies had taken action without the consent of the United States outraged the Eisenhower administration. The United States was concerned that the invasion would weaken Western influence in the area by driving Arab countries closer to the Soviet Union. The United States coordinated diplomatic efforts to reject the invasion and demand a quick ceasefire at the UN. The British pound would have collapsed as a result of Eisenhower's economic pressure tactics, which also included promises to sell off British bonds. One of the major turning points in American foreign policy was the Suez Crisis. It proved that the United States was now the leading Western power and that Britain and France were no longer world superpowers. Eisenhower responded to the problem by announcing the Eisenhower Doctrine in 1957, which committed the United States to providing financial and military support to Middle Eastern nations under communist attack.

Yugoslavia: Yugoslavia sided with Gamal Abdel Nasser as a part of its larger anti-colonial and non-aligned position, and fiercely opposed the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt. The crisis turned into an essential turning point in Yugoslavia's foreign policy, establishing the nation as an ally of recently independent countries opposing Western imperialism. In line with its resistance to Western colonialism, Yugoslavia saw Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal as a valid display of sovereignty. Yugoslavia backed diplomatic attempts through the UN for a withdrawal when Britain, France, and Israel launched their synchronized attack, denouncing the action as an imperialist operation. At the UN, Yugoslavia supported resolutions calling for an early ceasefire and later supported the deployment of the UNEF to oversee the withdrawal of invading forces. Yugoslavia's relationship with Egypt was additionally strengthened by the crisis. The Suez Crisis gave Yugoslavia the chance to firmly

establish itself as a leader among countries challenging Soviet and Western domination and advancing national sovereignty and self-determination on the international scene.

6. Questions to be Answered

- How should the international community respond to the nationalization of the Suez Canal? Should it be considered an act of sovereignty or a threat to global trade?
- What role should the United Nations play in resolving the crisis? Should a peacekeeping force be deployed, or should a diplomatic resolution be prioritized?
- How do Cold War tensions influence the actions of major global powers in this crisis, and what potential consequences could their involvement have?
- What measures should be taken to prevent similar conflicts in the future while maintaining both regional stability and international trade security?
- How should former colonial powers like Britain and France navigate their influence in the Middle East in the post-colonial era? Should they continue to intervene in regional affairs or adopt a non-interventionist approach?
- What are the long-term implications of the Suez Crisis for global power dynamics, particularly regarding the shift in influence from European powers to the United States and the Soviet Union?

7. Bibliography

- https://main.un.org/securitycouncil/en
- https://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/lw/97179.htm#:~:text=The%20Suez%20Crisis%20of%201956,Eastern%20countries%20and%20European%20allies.
- https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/suez
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Suez_Crisis
- https://peacekeeping.un.org/ar/mission/past/unefi.htm
- https://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/lw/98683.htm
- https://www.britannica.com/topic/Central-Treaty-Organization
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Central_Treaty_Organization
- https://www.suezcanal.gov.eg/English/Pages/default.aspx
- https://www.nationsonline.org/oneworld/map/Sinai_map.htm
- https://www.suezcanal.gov.eg/English/About/SuezCanal/Pages/CanalHistory.aspx
- https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/eisenhower-doctrine
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protocol_of_Sèvres
- https://peacekeeping.un.org/ar/mission/past/unefi.html
- https://malevus.com/suez-crisis/
- http://www.zionistarchives.org.il/en/datelist/Pages/Kadesh.aspx
- https://www.iwm.org.uk/history/10-photographs-of-operation-musketeer
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lLvqZ1ufLwk&pp=ygUPdGhlIHN1ZXogY3Jpc2lz