



VMUN 2022

The Cold War, 1956

CRISIS BACKGROUND GUIDE



VANCOUVER MODEL UNITED NATIONS

The Twenty-First Annual Session | February 4–6, 2022

Armaan Jaffer
Secretary-General



Andrew Liu
Chief of Staff

Mia Tsao
Director-General

Eric Li
Director of Logistics



Caitlin Adams
USG General Assemblies

Joshua Dar Santos
USG Specialized Agencies

David Deng
USG Operations

Emily Chen
USG Conference

Daniel Aminbakhsh
USG Finance



Richard Chen
USG Delegate Affairs

Lauren Thomas
USG Delegate Affairs

Sakura Gibson
USG Design & Media

Dear Delegates,

On behalf of the INTEL team, I would like to extend a warm welcome to VMUN 2022. My name is Ben Kang, and it is my pleasure to direct the Intelligence Crisis Committee this year. I am joined by Allysén Kwok, your Chair, and Annie Wang, your Crisis Staff. They are all incredibly competent individuals whom I have absolute confidence in, and they are the ones who will make INTEL an unforgettable experience.

The Intelligence Crisis Committee is a new, exclusive committee at VMUN 2022 that will provide some of the most nuanced, thrilling, and challenging debates that can be had in Model UN. Composed of two distinct types of delegates—government and intelligence delegates—whose decisions will immediately affect the crisis at hand, INTEL will see two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, pitted firmly against one another, creating an exciting experience filled with diplomacy, espionage, and overarching suspense.

INTEL will enter the chaotic times of the Cold War, taking the sides of both the Eastern and Western blocs. As the conflict that defined the latter half of the 20th century, the Cold War takes place in a time where geopolitical rivalry determines the actions of all countries. In INTEL, your actions will determine how history is written; therefore, the committee may come to a conclusion that is drastically different from the history known to us. The path that the committee will go down is completely unknown, and it is you, with your actions, that will decide that path.

Please do not hesitate to email me if you have any questions or concerns at intel@vmun.com.

Best regards,

Ben Kang
INTEL Director

Position Paper Policy

What is a Position Paper?

A position paper is a brief overview of a country's stance on the topics being discussed by a particular committee. Though there is no specific format the position paper must follow, it should include a description of your positions your country holds on the issues on the agenda, relevant actions that your country has taken, and potential solutions that your country would support.

At Vancouver Model United Nations, delegates should write a position paper for each of the committee's topics. Each position paper should not exceed one page and should all be combined into a single document per delegate.

For the Intelligence Crisis Committee, position papers are mandatory, especially for a delegate to be considered for an award.

Formatting

Position papers should:

- Include the name of the delegate, his/her country, and the committee
- Be in a standard font (e.g. Times New Roman) with a 12-point font size and 1-inch document margins
- Not include illustrations, diagrams, decorations, national symbols, watermarks, or page borders
- Include citations and a bibliography, in any format, giving due credit to the sources used in research (not included in the 1-page limit)

Due Dates and Submission Procedure

Position papers for this committee must be submitted by midnight on **January 28, 2022**. Once your position paper is complete, please save the file as your last name, your first name and send it as an attachment in an email, to your committee's email address, with the subject heading as your last name, your first name — Position Paper. Please do not add any other attachments to the email or write anything else in the body.

Both your position papers should be combined into a single PDF or Word document file; position papers submitted in another format will not be accepted.

Each position paper will be manually reviewed and considered for the Best Position Paper award.

The email address for this committee is *intel@vmun.com*.

The Cold War, 1956	2
Overview.....	2
Timeline.....	3
Historical Analysis	4
Current Situation	5
Germany and Europe	5
Egypt, Israel, and the Middle East	7
Cuba and Latin America.....	9
Vietnam and Asia	10
Initiating Crisis.....	12
Bloc Positions.....	13
United States of America	13
Soviet Union.....	14
United Kingdom	14
France.....	15
Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany)	15
People’s Republic of China.....	16
Yugoslavia.....	16
German Democratic Republic (East Germany).....	17
Israel	17
Discussion Questions.....	18
Bibliography.....	19

The Cold War, 1956

Overview

Since the conclusion of World War II in 1945, global politics have been sharply divided by the tensions between the world's two superpowers: the United States and the Soviet Union (USSR). The two nations lead the Western Bloc and Eastern Bloc respectively, informal alliances through which the two superpowers exert influence and spark conflicts across the world in the form of proxy wars—wars where smaller belligerents are responsible for the vast majority of warfare but are supported by major powers. Although the conflict between the blocs is grounded in opposing ideologies of democratic free market capitalism and authoritarian communism, the lines of ideological division have been blurred. The United States and its liberal democratic allies increasingly align with right-wing, authoritarian states to counter the power of the Soviet Union, its associated satellite states, and international left-wing allies. This state of world tension, known as the Cold War, will define the latter half of the 20th century.

Stretching across the globe, the struggle for power and influence between the Western Bloc and Eastern Bloc has taken root in countless regions. In communist Hungary, opposition to Soviet influence and totalitarianism could potentially simmer into an uprising that would spell the first major threat to Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe since the fall of the Nazis and could test the Western Bloc's desire to push communism out of the continent. Neighbouring Germany, now divided between West and East, remains a flashpoint because of the uneasy division of the country's capital, Berlin, and the presence of Western and Eastern Bloc forces in the area. 3,000 kilometres away, the decolonization of the Middle East and Africa threatens to uproot the economic advantage of its ex-colonizers—with some hesitating to let go, including the United Kingdom and France in their de facto control of the critically valuable Suez Canal. Across the Atlantic Ocean, Cubans have grown tired of a corrupt, authoritarian, and American-backed dictatorship and look towards revolution, potentially igniting a power struggle directly on the United States' doorstep. A similar situation unfolds in Vietnam, which—although newly independent from France—is now divided between a communist North and an anti-communist South: a division that fans fears in the West that the entirety of Asia could fall to communism country by country.

In the Intelligence Crisis Committee (INTEL), delegates will dive into the tumultuous times of the Cold War from the perspectives of national governments and their associated intelligence agencies within the context of the five spheres of conflict—in historical chronological order—discussed above. These agencies play a part in covert military operations that overthrow governments, the collection of information pertaining to the enemy, and counterintelligence operations to stifle the activities of foreign intelligence agencies.¹ Governments will then be forced to scramble and deal with the diplomatic and public fallback from oft controversial military and espionage activities. This unique crisis will see governments and intelligence services work together—or take their own paths—to achieve their aims within an intelligence war that spans countries, continents, and decades.

¹ Kevin Stack, "The Cold War Intelligence Score," *American Intelligence Journal* 18, no. 1/2 (1998): 69-72.

Timeline

May 8, 1945 — Nazi Germany surrenders unconditionally in Berlin, ending World War II in Europe.²

August 1, 1945 — The Potsdam Agreement is concluded between the United States, Soviet Union, and United Kingdom, where Germany is divided into four occupation zones for the post-war period.³

1946 – 1949 — Soviet satellite states are established across Eastern Europe, most notably in East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary.

March 12, 1947 — U.S. President Harry Truman establishes the Truman Doctrine, an informal doctrine aimed at supporting anti-communist regimes to prevent countries from falling to communism. The doctrine will define U.S. foreign policy for much of the Cold War.⁴

April 4, 1949 — The North Atlantic Treaty is signed by 12 North American and Western European states, founding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which commits member states to collective defence—where an attack against a NATO member is considered an attack against all.⁵

October 1, 1949 — Mao Zedong declares the foundation of the People's Republic of China.⁶

July 23, 1952 — A revolution in Egypt topples the British-aligned monarchy and brings to power a revolutionary government with Arab nationalist, socialist, and anti-imperialist tendencies, sparking a wave of decolonization across the Middle East and Africa.⁷

July 26, 1953 — A small group of revolutionaries led by Fidel Castro attempts and fails to capture a Cuban military barracks in Santiago de Cuba, marking the beginning of the Cuban Revolution.⁸

July 20, 1954 — The Geneva Conference concludes the First Indochina War. Vietnam, the largest part of former French Indochina, is divided into North and South Vietnam; North Vietnam becomes a communist state, while South Vietnam becomes a broadly anti-communist, Western-aligned state.⁹

May 14, 1955 — The Warsaw Pact is established between the Soviet Union and multiple Eastern European communist states as a collective defence treaty in opposition to NATO.¹⁰

² Harry S. Truman Library & Museum, "Timeline of the Cold War," *Harry S. Truman Library & Museum*, n.d., https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/public/TrumanCIA_Timeline.pdf.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Bob Bowker, "Egypt's Revolution and the Lessons for Today," *Australian Institute of International Affairs*, July 21, 2017, <https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/egyptian-revolution-1952-lessons/>.

⁸ PBS, "Castro's Failed Coup," *PBS – American Experience*, n.d., <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/castro-failed-coup-moncada-barracks/>.

⁹ Harry S. Truman Library & Museum, "Timeline of the Cold War."

¹⁰ Ibid.

July 18, 1956 — Mátyás Rákosi, the hardline Stalinist leader of Hungary, is forced to resign due to widespread protests demanding social and economic reforms amid the de-Stalinization process spearheaded by Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev.¹¹ The crisis begins.

Historical Analysis

During the Second World War, the United States, United Kingdom, Soviet Union, and France were among the core members of the Allied powers opposing the Axis powers, most notably Nazi Germany. Despite their alliance against the Axis, the four nations were deeply entrenched with vastly different political traditions. The United States, United Kingdom, and France were liberal democracies—states with regular elections, free market capitalist economies, respect for the rule of law, and protection of human rights and freedoms.¹² On the contrary, the Soviet Union labelled itself a communist state, where only one political party held power, political opponents of the party were repressed, and the state controlled a command economy.¹³ These divisions were less at play during the War, but soon became relevant upon the War's conclusion in 1945.

The beginnings of tensions in the Cold War period could be attributed to a desire to expand the influence of the two blocs—the Western bloc and its liberal democratic leaders, opposed by the Eastern bloc of the Soviet Union and its communist and socialist allies—and their respective ideologies. Western states, particularly the United States, saw the promotion of capitalist ideals as beneficial to the economic prosperity of the West, as it would supply and strengthen the economies of Western nations, often by means of cheap goods and raw materials that would be exported from allied developing nations to the West.¹⁴ Although many politicians in the West asserted that the bloc was simply attempting to promote ideas of democracy and freedom, the reality was that a number of states allied to and backed by the West in the Cold War were dictatorships, including in Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic.¹⁵ Confrontation between the Western and Eastern blocs was essentially inevitable, as Soviet support of communist movements globally would likely hurt Western economic expansion due to the inherent anti-capitalist nature of communist ideology.

While the conflict of the Cold War period is seemingly dominated by the United States and the Soviet Union, the other powers in the blocs play key roles as well. For example, Western powers like the United Kingdom or France remain important geopolitical players on the world stage due to their influence and presence in British and French colonies and ex-colonies. Many of these regions—for example, Egypt or Vietnam—are the subject of anti-colonial movements that often take on ideologies with socialist tendencies and receive support from the Soviet Union. Consequently, the other members of the Western bloc remain critically important within the Cold War alongside the United States. Within the Eastern bloc, a number of Soviet satellite states and allies retain a degree of autonomy despite being tethered to the Soviet Union for military and economic support. Many of these

¹¹ U.S. Department of State Archive, “Hungary, 1956,” *U.S. Department of State Archive*, n.d., <https://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/lw/107186.htm>.

¹² European Center for Populism Studies, “Liberal democracy,” *European Center for Populism Studies*, n.d., <https://www.populismstudies.org/Vocabulary/liberal-democracy/>.

¹³ University of North Carolina, “Communism: Karl Marx to Joseph Stalin,” *Center for European Studies – University of North Carolina*, n.d., <https://europe.unc.edu/iron-curtain/history/communism-karl-marx-to-joseph-stalin/>.

¹⁴ Thomas G. Paterson, “The Origins of the Cold War,” *OAH Magazine of History* 2, no. 1 (1986): 6.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

nations, such as Poland or Hungary, were fully independent states prior to World War II and have populations among whom a desire for greater independence remains. These countries will remain vital to the balance of power surrounding the Iron Curtain in Europe.

A number of other states play more minor roles in the tension between the Western and Eastern Blocs. China and Yugoslavia are considered communist states, but their national leaderships often disagree with the direction of Soviet leadership and foreign policy. Since the death of the late Soviet leader Joseph Stalin in 1953, Chinese leader Mao Zedong had grown to oppose the policies of new Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev. Despite traditional cooperation with the Soviets, most notably in the Korean War, China disagreed with its northern neighbours on a variety of issues, including disputes with India and their interpretations of communist ideology.¹⁶ As for Yugoslavia, its leader, Josip Broz Tito, had frequently pursued foreign policy directly contradictory to Moscow's desires. Although once considered among the Soviets' most loyal allies and one of the foremost socialist states in Europe, Yugoslavia had deviated from the Eastern bloc since the end of World War II.¹⁷ The Yugoslavs' decision to intervene militarily in the Greek Civil War and Tito's desire to annex Albania into Yugoslavia hurt Soviet-Yugoslav relations to the extent that the Yugoslavs were removed from the Cominform, a cooperative alliance of Soviet and satellite communist parties, in 1948.¹⁸ Although the two nations remain broadly sympathetic to international communist movements, their relationships with the Soviet Union remain frosty at best.

Current Situation

The following section will cover each major regional sphere of conflict within the Cold War, focusing on the specific countries and areas that will be relevant for the crisis.

Germany and Europe

The crisis in Europe will focus on the situation as of 1956 in two areas: divided Germany and Eastern Europe. The Eastern European element of the crisis will have a specific focus on Hungary as a nation whose situation is broadly reflective of other Soviet satellite states. For a description of the current situation in Hungary, refer to the Initiating Crisis section of the backgrounder.

After multiple years of division between Allied and Soviet occupation zones, Germany was divided in 1949 into its two present states: the Western bloc-aligned Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany), and the Soviet satellite German Democratic Republic (East Germany).

Led by American-allied Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, West Germany is a democratic country with a free market economy, a welfare state, and a relatively high standard of living. American aid provided under the Marshall Plan—a comprehensive program of loans, investments, and aid boosting reconstruction, industrial development,

¹⁶ National Cold War Exhibition, "Sino - Soviet Split," *Royal Air Force Museum*, n.d.,

<https://www.nationalcoldwarexhibition.org/schools-colleges/national-curriculum/detente/sino-soviet-split.aspx>.

¹⁷ Jeronim Perović, "The Tito-Stalin Split: A Reassessment in Light of New Evidence," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 9, no. 2 (2007): 40.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 45.

and agriculture—has helped to strengthen West Germany’s conditions for recovery.¹⁹ An already skilled labour pool was boosted by ethnic Germans moving to West Germany after being deported from other central and eastern European states, such as Czechoslovakia or Hungary, as a result of post-war policies.²⁰ Consequently, West Germany has rebounded economically in a process known as the *Wirtschaftswunder*, meaning “economic miracle,” with the West German economy returning to and surpassing pre-war levels of production and exports.²¹ In spite of the recency of hostilities with Germany, Allied forces, primarily the United States, see a stable and economically strong West Germany as a critical ally in preventing the expansion of communism and Soviet influence from eastern Europe. Although Allied military forces retain a significant presence in West Germany and play a key part in its defence, West Germany was permitted to re-establish its own sovereign armed forces in 1955.

On the contrary, East Germany is a highly centralized regime dominated by the communist Socialist Unity Party (SED) with a planned economy. In the post-war reconstruction period, the Soviet-aligned government focused on developing industries that would help supply the Soviet Union instead of the consumer needs of East Germans.²² Alongside the collectivization of agriculture, these economic decisions proved to be extremely unpopular in the country and contributed to a lagging recovery from the war; although industrial production was gradually restored, East Germany’s standard of living remained low and below that of the West.²³ Labour strikes continue to protest the economic policies of the government.²⁴ The East German regime, however, has chosen to respond to discontent with repressive political policies, propaganda, and intimidation.²⁵ As a result, thousands of East Germans—including many intellectuals, workers, and farmers—fled to West Germany until 1952, when the East German government closed its borders with the West. Discontent continued to remain rampant in the East, culminating in the first post-war uprising in the Eastern bloc: a workers’ strike involving over one million people across the country that was eventually suppressed by Soviet armed forces, resulting in over 21 dead, hundreds injured, and thousands imprisoned.²⁶

The present peace in Germany remains highly fragile. The dichotomy of the two German states and their different post-war trajectories has led to immense frustration particularly within East Germany. Many East Germans continue to attempt to flee to the West through Berlin, where the border between West Berlin—a part of West Germany—and East Berlin is significantly more open.²⁷ Germany is also home to a large number of NATO and Soviet armed forces, with NATO forces remaining present in West Germany and Soviet forces

¹⁹ University of Luxembourg, “The Marshall Plan and the establishment of the OEEC,” *CVCE.eu by the University of Luxembourg*, n.d., <https://www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/84c940fe-a82b-4fe8-ad53-63144bfe30b1>.

²⁰ Peter Alt and Max Schneider, “West Germany’s ‘Economic Miracle,’” *Science & Society* 26, no. 1 (1962): 51.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 49.

²² Henry Ashby Turner, “Political consolidation and economic growth, 1949–69,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*, n.d., <https://www.britannica.com/place/Germany/Political-consolidation-and-economic-growth-1949-69>.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Erin Blakemore, “Why the Berlin Wall rose—and how it fell,” *National Geographic*, November 8, 2019, <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/why-berlin-wall-built-fell>.

²⁵ Turner, “Political consolidation and economic growth, 1949–69.”

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Blakemore, “Why the Berlin Wall rose—and how it fell.”

wielding significant power in the East. Although both sides remain extremely hesitant to pursue an aggressive policy in the region—the Western bloc was hesitant to intervene in the 1953 East German uprising—tensions between the two Germanies and their aligned powers could easily spark new crises, as evidenced by the 1948 Berlin Blockade, where Soviet forces blocked British and American access to West Berlin. Both blocs will likely attempt to achieve their goals through more subtle means, including espionage; for the West, this means preserving the economic prosperity and stability it has thus far acquired, while for the East, this means alleviating the country's economic woes, preventing further discontent, and bringing an end to the exodus of East Germans to the West.

Egypt, Israel, and the Middle East

Egypt

Egypt is currently led by President Gamal Abdel Nasser, who came to power in a military-led coup in July 1952. Egypt was previously ruled under a complex system where the United Kingdom possessed suzerainty over a nominally independent Egypt. Control of Egypt was particularly important to Britain due to the country being the site of the Suez Canal, the key link between the Mediterranean Sea and the Indian Ocean. Built under an Anglo-French partnership, the canal allowed the British to more effectively access its colonies and trade interests in Asia, east Africa, and Oceania.²⁸ In 1953, an Egyptian republic was declared by Nasser's regime, bringing an end to British suzerainty in the country. The 1952 Egyptian Revolution was marked by anti-imperialist sentiments opposing British rule, a desire for modernization, the nationalization of key industries, and advocacy for social justice by means of economic reform.²⁹ Opposed to both Western capitalism and Soviet-style communism, Nasser's regime followed an ideology that is commonly labelled Arab socialism, wherein redistributive policies aimed to create more equality and a common sense of identity and heritage among Arabs of all nations sought to unite Arabs into its own distinct power bloc separate from both the Western and Eastern blocs in global politics.³⁰ In 1954, Nasser's government negotiated with the British to begin the gradual withdrawal of the last remaining British forces in Egypt, in the Suez Canal zone. The British would, however, be permitted for seven years to maintain civilian contractors at British bases on the canal and the right to intervene militarily in the case of a war. Most importantly, the Suez Canal Company, the company that operated the canal based largely on British and French investors, would continue to operate the canal.³¹ Although these changes still gave the U.K. some influence over affairs in the region, the dramatically reduced British influence in Egypt only made preserving stability in the region east of the canal, the Levant, even more important to the West.

Israel and the Arab-Israeli Conflict

The tumultuous political situation in the Levant—the geographic area comprising Palestine, Transjordan, Syria, and Lebanon—in the late 1940s and early 1950s was clearly defined by the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. In the first four decades of the 20th century, large numbers of Jews immigrated to Palestine, beginning prior to the end of Ottoman rule and continuing into the British mandate period. This period of immigration

²⁸ Lorenz Luthi, *Cold Wars: Asia, the Middle East, Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 17.

²⁹ Peter Johnson, "Egypt Under Nasser," *MERIP Reports*, no. 10 (1972): 3.

³⁰ Peter Mansfield, "Nasser and Nasserism," *International Journal* 28, no. 4 (1973): 675.

³¹ *Ibid.*

was further accelerated by World War II and the Holocaust. By 1948, nearly half the population of Palestine was Jewish.³² Already opposed to British rule, the Arab Palestinian population already living in the territory harshly opposed increased Jewish immigration and the U.K.'s tacit support for the establishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine.³³ Amid growing conflict between Palestine's Arab and Jewish populations and unable to resolve the situation, the United Kingdom decided to refer the question of Palestine's status to the newly-formed United Nations. The United Nations General Assembly subsequently chose to partition Palestine into two states: an independent Jewish state comprising 55 percent of the territory of Palestine—despite Jews making up less than half Palestine's population—and an independent Arab state in the remaining territory.³⁴ The independent Jewish state of Israel was declared soon after in May 1948.³⁵

However, the U.N. partition was opposed by the Arab Palestinians supported by the Arab League, an alliance of Arab states in the Middle East. Due to the growing sense of Arab nationalism and solidarity, the Arab League states—most prominently Egypt, alongside Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and newly-independent Syria, Lebanon, and Transjordan—intervened and entered Palestine, attacking Israeli forces. This war, known as the First Arab-Israeli War of 1948, was inconclusive, with Israel retaining and even expanding the territory it controlled into areas originally slated to be part of the Arab Palestinian state.³⁶ Successful in defending itself in the war, Israel came to be seen as a fairly strong player in Middle Eastern politics, both due to its powerful military and intelligence service, as well as the high levels of Israeli economic and societal development in the years after the war.³⁷

Conclusions

The present situation in the Middle East remains highly volatile, with each country possessing distinct goals that bring them into conflict with each other. Egypt's desire to be the leader of the Arab world pushes it to take on the cause of the Palestinians and spearhead Arab opposition to a hostile Israel, but also to strategically retain beneficial relationships with both the Western nations and the Soviets. Consequently, due to the U.S. refusal to supply Egypt with more arms, the Egyptian government signed an arms deal with the Soviets in September 1955 where the Soviets agreed to supply Egypt with Soviet weaponry through Czechoslovakia.³⁸ Although Nasser's Egypt favours a negotiated resolution, the Egyptians remain prepared for war. In Israel, the government remains hesitant to negotiate a settlement with the Arabs, with many in Israel's government desiring a preventative war, where the Israelis strike first against Egypt and the Arab states.³⁹ The Arab League has thus far continued to block oil deliveries to Israel, harass Israeli shipping, and limit Israeli access to the Suez Canal, frustrating Israeli interests and pushing the country to see a first strike by its powerful military as a more viable option for security.⁴⁰

³² Luthi, *Cold Wars: Asia, the Middle East, Europe*, 194.

³³ *Ibid.*, 190-191

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 194.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 195.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 197-198.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 199.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 203.

³⁹ Michael Fry, *The Suez Crisis, 1956* (Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, 1989), 7.

⁴⁰ Luthi, *Cold Wars: Asia, the Middle East, Europe*, 203.

The foreign powers involved in the region each also have their own broader goals within the present circumstances. The Western nations—most importantly the United Kingdom, France, and the United States—all desire to prevent Soviet influence from expanding into the Middle East, a concern exacerbated by the Egyptian-Soviet arms deal. For the United Kingdom and France, as key stakeholders in the Suez Canal Company, preserving a robust flow of oil and shipping and international access to the canal is critical for their economic interests. France has the additional goal of keeping Nasser's Egypt and its Arab nationalism in check, as the Egyptians are a threat to French colonial interests due to their support and supply of Arab rebels that destabilize French Algeria.⁴¹ However, the three Western nations disagree on how to resolve the tensions in the region. France—Israel's closest ally and most important arms supplier—is more open to, if not favouring, military operations to counter Egypt and preserve access to the Suez. The United Kingdom is hesitant to support armed intervention, while the United States staunchly favours a negotiated resolution.⁴² The U.S. still retains some connections to the Egyptian government, including an American offer to fund the Aswan High Dam, a key project for the government in Egypt's industrialization.⁴³ The Soviets, on the contrary, want to extend Soviet influence into the Middle East, a natural move considering the anti-imperialist and socialist rhetoric of many Arab leaders. As shown by the Egyptian arms deal, the Soviets are willing to aid and supply the Arab nations in order to make new allies that would counter the Western influence in the region.⁴⁴

Cuba and Latin America

A former Spanish colony, Cuba gained formal independence in 1898 with American assistance as a consequence of the Spanish–American War. The United States, however, continued to hold significant influence over Cuban affairs, including guaranteeing the U.S. right to intervene in Cuban politics among other imperialist restrictions.⁴⁵ The Cuban economy remained highly dependent on its sugar industry, American investment and aid, and Cuban goods purchased by and exported to the United States.⁴⁶ This economic policy focused on goods for export as opposed to consumption, being favourable to U.S. interests instead of Cuban interests, and became highly unpopular in Cuba, propelled by the dictatorial nature of many American-backed Cuban presidents.⁴⁷ When Ramón Grau San Martín, a progressive who promoted Cuban workers' rights and opposed American business interests, took office as President in 1933, the United States conspired with Cuban military leader Fulgencio Batista to install a series of pro-American Cuban presidents, including Batista himself, who was elected to office in 1940.⁴⁸ Despite leaving Cuba at the end of his term in 1944, Batista returned to Cuba in 1952 and seized power in a coup d'état; he remains the country's president. Batista's second tenure as president has been exceedingly bloody and marked by continued close ties between the Cuban government and American business interests and industry. Opposition was banned, including Cuba's communist party, labour unions were taken

⁴¹ Fry, *The Suez Crisis*, 1956, 8.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 10-11.

⁴³ Luthi, *Cold Wars: Asia, the Middle East, Europe*, 205.

⁴⁴ Fry, *The Suez Crisis*, 1956, 9.

⁴⁵ *Cuban–American Treaty of Relations*, 1903, Havana.

⁴⁶ Kevin Grogan, "Cuba's Dance of the Millions: Examining the Causes and Consequences of Violent Price Fluctuations in the Sugar Market Between 1919 and 1920," *University of Florida*, August 2004, http://etd.fcla.edu/UF/UFE0006301/grogan_k.pdf.

⁴⁷ Leslie Bethell, *Cuba: A Short History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 54.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

over by pro-government leadership, and massive wealth inequality plagued the nation; over three-quarters of the Cuban population was either in poverty or struggling to make ends meet, while roughly 15 percent of the population controlled nearly half the country's wealth.⁴⁹

The opposition to the Batista government remains quite fractured and disunited. While the opposition broadly agrees on policies regarding redistributive agrarian reform, reducing foreign involvement in the Cuban economy, and anti-corruption, no single group is dominant and many groups favour differing approaches to opposing Batista.⁵⁰ For example, Cuba's communist party, the Popular Socialist Party, favours an approach that would use the strength of the organized labour movement to bring change to Cuba.⁵¹ The party is one of many active Latin American communist parties, and although it is broadly aligned with the Soviet Union and its Comintern allies, the Soviets generally have provided little support to left-wing groups in the region and have favoured labour-based approaches instead of armed revolution. On the contrary, other opposition groups in Cuba believe that only an armed struggle can succeed in ending Batista's regime. Among the opposition groups that favours the latter approach is the 26th of July Movement (M-26-7), led by brothers Fidel and Raúl Castro. The Castro brothers led a failed attack on the Cuban military's Moncada Barracks in July 1953, before being imprisoned and then sent into exile in Mexico.⁵² Although M-26-7 and its attack on Moncada remain one among many opposition groups and failed uprisings respectively, the group is slowly building connections and fundraising networks outside of the country, particularly among the Cuban diaspora in the United States and their fellow Cuban exiles.

The situation in Cuba continues to be unstable and marred by protests and suppressed rebellions. Although Western powers, most importantly the United States, are supportive of Batista's regime, they are primarily concerned that the situation will soon spiral out of control to the extent that Western economic interests in Cuba will be compromised by a new government.⁵³ Indeed, a successful change of power in Cuba that sees economic wealth transferred from foreign businesses and investors to the workers and local population could set a damaging precedent for many Western nations with economic interests in Latin America, whether that be tobacco companies in Honduras or banana plantations in Guatemala.⁵⁴

Vietnam and Asia

Ruled within the French colony of Indochina since the late 19th century, Vietnam was occupied by Japan and its Axis collaborationist ally Vichy France during World War II and heavily exploited for its natural resources.⁵⁵ During the war, the collaborationist French colonial government and Vietnam's Japanese occupiers were opposed by members of the Vietnam Independence League, known as the Viet Minh, a united front of left-wing anti-imperialist political parties led by the Indochinese Communist Party.⁵⁶ The Viet Minh possessed

⁴⁹ Aviva Chomsky, *A History of the Cuban Revolution* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2015), 28.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 31.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² *Ibid.*, 30.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 35.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ Vu Hong Lien and Peter Sharrock, *Descending Dragon, Rising Tiger: A History of Vietnam* (London: Reaktion Books, 2014), 186.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

widespread popularity and when Japan's defeat in the war appeared imminent in August 1945, the Viet Minh seized power from the Japanese in Hanoi and declared an independent, communist Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV).⁵⁷ However, French forces soon returned to Indochina to force the Viet Minh government into underground resistance, thus beginning the First Indochina War. By 1954, the situation in Indochina had reached a stalemate and the war had become increasingly unpopular in France. The DRV was already recognized by the world's two major communist powers—the Soviet Union and the newly-established People's Republic of China (PRC)—and had been receiving arms support from both nations.⁵⁸ The subsequent Geneva Conference saw French forces withdraw from Indochina and Vietnam was divided in two: the communist DRV (hereafter known as “North Vietnam”) would control all of Vietnam north of the 17th parallel, while the anti-communist, American- and French-linked State of Vietnam (later the Republic of Vietnam; hereafter known as “South Vietnam”) would control the area south of the 17th parallel boundary.⁵⁹

This uneasy arrangement remains fraught with tension, with all actors possessing their own desires and fears. North Vietnam, led by former Viet Minh leader Ho Chi Minh, aspires to reunify all of Vietnam under its control, but reunification as the North desires remains unlikely.⁶⁰ The land reforms undertaken by the communist North Vietnamese government have thus far been unsuccessful and bloody, while the government continues to persecute its political opponents, as well as individuals linked with the previous French colonial regime and the Catholic Church.⁶¹ The North's two key allies, the PRC and the Soviet Union, decline to support military endeavours to reunite the country, preferring to preserve the terms of the Geneva Conference. However, Chinese and Soviet economic, military, and technological support continues to flow to the North Vietnamese, slowly allowing the country to stand on its own feet.

On the other hand, South Vietnam, led by the highly conservative, autocratic, and anti-communist President Ngo Dinh Diem, desires to preserve its independence from the communist North. In this effort, the South's primary ally is the United States, with France being an ally to a much lesser extent. The United States has grown increasingly concerned about the situation in Vietnam, seeing the rise of the communist North as a part of the “domino theory,” which posits that the fall of one nation to communism will mean its neighbouring countries would eventually fall to communism as well. With the takeover of mainland China by the communist PRC, the PRC's support of communist North Korea in the Korean War, and continued PRC tensions with the American-allied Republic of China on Taiwan, the United States fears that North Vietnam will simply become another base for the expansion of communism in Southeast Asia.⁶² As a result, the United States and its Western allies have begun supplying South Vietnam with vital economic and military aid that keeps the regime afloat, in spite of Diem's corruption, failure to implement land reforms, and persecution of political opponents.⁶³ The West does so begrudgingly, seeing no better options than Diem as bulwarks against the North's communism.⁶⁴

⁵⁷ Ibid., 188.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 192.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 203.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 207-208.

⁶¹ Ibid., 210.

⁶² Ibid., 208.

⁶³ Ibid., 208-212.

⁶⁴ James Waite, *The End of the First Indochina War: A Global History* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 203.

While the situation in Vietnam has yet to return to full-scale war between the North and South, the clear reality is that both North and South require the support of their great power backers in order to achieve their own aims. The United States and its main allies in the region, France and the United Kingdom, will continue to oppose communist expansion and prop up the South, while the Chinese and Soviets will continue supplying the North with the aid it needs to rebuild. Although the Soviets and Chinese have diverged on key foreign policy decisions elsewhere in the world, they presently remain united and committed to Ho Chi Minh's government in Vietnam. Thus, the future of Vietnam will rely on both internal developments in the North and South and the external policy direction of the world powers with stakes not just in Vietnam, but across Southeast Asia.

Initiating Crisis

A fully independent state since the end of World War I, Hungary was occupied by the Soviet Union at the end of World War II. A nominally independent Hungarian state was subsequently established, but after Soviet interference in Hungarian politics and elections, a Soviet-backed Stalinist, Mátyás Rákosi, was put in power to lead a satellite government closely linked to and allied with the Soviets. Rákosi implemented widespread political and economic changes in a war-torn nation, replacing the civil service with communists, forcing peasants into collectivized agriculture systems, and investing in heavy industry.⁶⁵ These changes were ineffective; Hungarian raw materials were insufficient to supply industry, existent materials were often exported directly out of the country to supply the Soviet Union, and agricultural production stagnated tremendously.⁶⁶ Rákosi's regime arrested and deported those it deemed untrustworthy to internment and labour camps or to remote villages in the Hungarian countryside, further damaging the conditions of post-war Hungarian society.⁶⁷ Soviet forces also remained stationed in Hungary even after the conclusion of the war, placing a further burden on the country.⁶⁸

Upon the death of Stalin in 1953, Rákosi was replaced by Imre Nagy as leader of Hungary. More popular among Hungarians, Nagy advocated a more moderate political and economic policy. Hungarian economic production was reoriented to suit the needs and demands of Hungarian society, internment camps were closed, and political suppression relaxed.⁶⁹ However, the Soviet government—still wielding immense control of Hungarian affairs—ousted Nagy a mere two years later and reinstated Rákosi, who proceeded to resume his hardline policies. When Nikita Khrushchev delivered his “Secret Speech” denouncing the uncompromising policies of Stalin and his cult of personality, Hungarians were emboldened to demonstrate against Rákosi's Stalinist policies. Students and intellectuals across Eastern Europe, most notably in Hungary and Poland, demanded that reforms be made in accordance with Khrushchev's speech to move away from Stalinism and its policies and pursue more moderate policies—those that were initially implemented in Hungary under Nagy.⁷⁰ Poland itself had seen mass protests

⁶⁵ Carlile Aylmer Macartney, “Hungary in the Soviet orbit,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*, n.d., 2021, <https://www.britannica.com/place/Hungary/Hungary-in-the-Soviet-orbit>.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ BBC Bitesize, “The Hungarian Uprising, 1956,” *BBC Bitesize*, n.d., <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/zq9hg82/revision/4>.

⁶⁹ Macartney, “Hungary in the Soviet orbit.”

⁷⁰ U.S. Department of State Archive, “Hungary, 1956.”

in the city of Poznań in late June 1956, with workers demanding greater rights and working conditions. The protests were forcibly suppressed, resulting in dozens killed and hundreds injured.⁷¹

Eager to avoid the same situation, Khrushchev and the Soviet leadership forced Rákosi to resign on July 18, 1956, replacing him with his deputy, Ernő Gerő. Despite the change in leadership, the situation in Hungary remains tense. Hungarian protestors, mostly students and the well-educated, continue to demand widespread change to government policy. The Hungarian population itself has seen little benefit from Soviet-backed communist governance in the aftermath of the war and is unlikely to support the Soviets in the case of an uprising. For Khrushchev and the Soviet leadership, the resolution of the situation in Hungary and the remainder of Eastern Europe will define the ways in which the Soviets can maintain control over their side of the Iron Curtain while simultaneously pursuing de-Stalinization. Further removed from the situation, the Western bloc pays close attention to the situation in Hungary. Western intelligence maintains an extremely limited presence in the region, but how the situation unfolds in the country could give an indication of how other events in Eastern Europe could play out in the future.⁷²

Bloc Positions

This section will describe the broad powers, beliefs, and responsibilities of each of the nine powers involved in the crisis and their associated intelligence agencies. Generally, each power's government will be responsible for taking all standard military actions, directing formal diplomatic efforts, and addressing domestic situations—including following public opinion. Intelligence agencies, on the other hand, will be responsible for espionage, counterintelligence, sabotage, and other covert activities. More specific content pertaining to each individual country or intelligence agency, including details about committee mechanics, will be included in separate backgrounders released to delegates at a later date.

United States of America

A global superpower, the foremost power of the Western bloc, and perhaps the most influential member of NATO, the United States sees itself as a responsible great power that opposes imperialism. As such, the country will always support negotiation over force in conflict resolution and will oppose any colonial powers from attempting to hold on to undue influence in their ex-colonies.⁷³ However, American foreign policy continues to be defined by a desire to stop the spread of communism and protect American economic and commercial interests globally—two elements that the U.S. will take into account in all diplomatic decisions. As a liberal democracy, the Government of the United States must pay particular attention to U.S. public opinion and the desire of various lobby groups, as unnecessary shedding of American blood and failures to protect U.S. companies could be devastating to foreign policy goals. Although it is a government agency, the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and its activities are usually free from the scrutiny of the public; however, the CIA still

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Brian McCauley, "Hungary and Suez, 1956: The Limits of Soviet and American Power," *Journal of Contemporary History* 16, no. 4 (1981): 782.

⁷³ Fry, *The Suez Crisis, 1956*, 10.

must remain aware of potential backlash from public opinion in the case any controversial activities become public knowledge.

The United States will play a key role in the spheres of conflict surrounding Germany, Cuba, and Vietnam due to the direct U.S. military presence in West Germany, the proximity of Cuba to U.S. and the scale of American business interests on the island, and U.S. support of South Vietnam as the most powerful Western actor in the Asia Pacific region. Due to a lack of intelligence capability, the United States will simply be an observer to developments in Hungary and Soviet-aligned Eastern Europe. Although the country will pay close attention to the situation surrounding the Suez Canal, the U.S. will not directly involve itself militarily and may instead choose to provide support to its allies.

Soviet Union

The Soviet Union is a global superpower, the leader of the communist Eastern bloc, and the supporter of countless international communist and left-wing parties and organizations, albeit to varying extents. Soviet foreign policy is defined by a desire to push Western—imperialist, according to the Soviets—influence out of various regions and to support fellow communist movements whenever strategically reasonable. That being said, the Soviets remain cautious to avoid unnecessary destabilization and conflict with NATO.⁷⁴ Moreover, the Soviets are well aware of the unstable situation within its own sphere of influence and will likely choose to prioritize preserving order in the Eastern bloc countries over riskier attempts to push communist ideology abroad. Both the Government of the Soviet Union and its intelligence agency, the Committee for State Security (KGB), wield fearsome domestic power with few checks, but failure to keep Soviet and Eastern bloc citizens may lead to troublesome uprisings and rebellions. Although technically accountable to the Soviet Government, the KGB is a highly independent apparatus with significant ability to take decisions on its own accord—not those of the Government.

The Soviet Union will possess significant power in approaching the conflicts in Hungary and Germany, primarily due to the direct presence of Soviet forces and the extent to which Soviet influence and aid permeates those countries. Cuba—to a certain extent in the future—and Vietnam are two countries where Soviet support of local political movements is critical and consequently, the Soviets will have an important role there as well. Lastly, direct Soviet military intervention in the Suez Canal situation will not happen, although Soviet support of various actors in the conflict may occur.

United Kingdom

Once the world's most influential global power and possessing an empire spanning all inhabited continents, the role of the United Kingdom in global politics has nonetheless declined since the end of World War II and the following period of decolonization. However, the U.K. still cares significantly about preserving its national prestige and influence and will thus attempt to protect the influence it still has in regions where it once had colonies.⁷⁵ Anglo-American relations are generally strong, with both countries opposing the spread of communism, but the U.K. will often have to choose between pursuing its own aims or keeping relations with the

⁷⁴ Ibid., 9.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 10.

U.S. at a high due to the two nations' occasionally different goals. The U.K. is a liberal democracy and as such, both the U.K. Government and the U.K.'s Secret Intelligence Service (MI6) will have to remain cautious that their actions do not upset the public opinion for fear of backlash.

The United Kingdom will play a critical role in the situation in the Suez Canal owing to its historical links to the region and the Suez Canal Company. Additionally, the presence of British forces in West Germany will mean that the U.K. must closely follow developments in the country. British influence in Hungary, Cuba, and Vietnam is highly limited due to limited intelligence capability, although some smaller efforts could be pursued alongside British allies.

France

France has held a principal role in both European and global politics for centuries, but amid the embarrassment of being overrun and occupied in World War II, the role of France in international affairs has slowly waned. As such, France's primary foreign policy focus is on preserving and strengthening whatever prestige and influence it has in regions where it either has colonies or ex-colonies, particularly the Middle East, North Africa, and Indochina.⁷⁶ Although presently a NATO member, French tensions with the Soviets, China, and other communist powers does not originate from a desire to restrain communism, but instead arises from communist support of independence and anti-colonial movements in French colonies. On matters outside of France's colonial interests, France in fact wants to see itself as the leader of a third, separate bloc independent from the two superpowers—the U.S. and Soviet Union—and is willing to support all negotiation efforts over force. Like other liberal democracies, the French Government and the French intelligence agency, the Directorate-General for External Security (DGSE), must use caution to avoid public backlash against any controversial French activities abroad.

France is a key player in the tensions in the Suez region, particularly due to France's close ties with Israel and desire to stop Egyptian destabilization of nearby French Algeria. Although its influence in Indochina has declined, France still holds some sway among the anti-communist Vietnamese elite and desires to play a part in directing the country's future. Some French forces are present in West Germany, meaning that France will likely play a role in resolving the tensions on the intra-German border, although to a lesser extent than the U.S. or U.K. France's influence in Hungary and Cuba is highly limited due to a lack of intelligence capability and the reality is that the priorities of French foreign policy lie elsewhere.

Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany)

Miraculously emerging from the devastation of World War II, West Germany has quickly developed into a powerful European state and an important NATO member, although its military and intelligence power is still re-emerging from the shadow of war. The primary concern of West German foreign policy is the situation of East Germany and Eastern Europe, with West Germany likely opting to seek peace and normalization in recognition of the fact that German reunification is thus far not a possibility and the central and eastern European

⁷⁶ Ibid., 8.

status quo is unlikely to be broken.⁷⁷ However, West Germany is intrinsically linked to its NATO allies and due to its relative lack of foreign influence, the country will likely choose to support the diplomatic direction of either the Anglo-American alliance or the French. A liberal democratic state, West Germany's Government and its intelligence agency, the Federal Intelligence Service (BND) will have to remain cautious to avoid upsetting public opinion through their activities. The BND itself retains close links to the American CIA and is primarily focused on affairs in central and eastern Europe.

West Germany is critical to the present situation of inter-German relations, with the presence of NATO forces on West German soil and the exodus of East Germans to the West being key elements of the tensions. West German intelligence also maintains a comparatively strong intelligence capability in central and eastern Europe, making the situation in Hungary a topic of focus for the West Germans. Due to West Germany's lack of foreign influence, the country will not play a major role in the situation in the Suez Canal region, Cuba, or Vietnam, apart from support it extends to its NATO allies.

People's Republic of China

Not even a decade removed from winning the brutal Chinese Civil War, the People's Republic of China is eager to play a bigger role at the regional and global scales as the second most powerful communist state in the world. Since the conclusion of the Korean War, in which Chinese forces intervened on the side of North Korea, Chinese foreign policy has been keen to avoid direct confrontation with the United States, instead trying to build an image of China as a peaceful, responsible global power.⁷⁸ Although it remains an important ally for North Vietnam, China opposes destabilization of the current status quo in the country. In addition, Sino-Soviet relations have slowly deteriorated and may see China split from the Soviets on other world issues. China also struggles with internal instability amid mass social and economic reforms, limiting the extent to which the Chinese Government desires to spend significant resources on external affairs. The Chinese Government and the newly established Central Investigation Department (CID) are extremely powerful domestically, but the unstable socio-political situation within China will prove detrimental to asserting Chinese influence abroad. As a new agency, the current capabilities of the CID are also highly limited, with most Chinese intelligence focusing only on east and southeast Asia and still relying on Soviet KGB training.

China will play an observer role in all early spheres of conflict, especially those outside of Asia. China does possess a cordial relationship with Nasser's regime in Egypt, and may choose to extend some support to Egypt within the Suez Canal situation. Otherwise, the primary focus for China will be on Vietnam and continuing to supply the North Vietnamese regime with economic and military aid.

Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia is one of the few European states that professes to follow communist ideology yet does not fall under the domination of the Soviet Union. Yugoslav foreign policy under its leader, Josip Broz Tito, has taken a non-aligned position that retains cordial ties with the West and the United States, as well as a frosty but peaceful

⁷⁷ Wolfram Hanrieder, "The Foreign Policies of the Federal Republic of Germany, 1949-1989," *German Studies Review* 12, no. 2 (1989): 325.

⁷⁸ Chen Jian, "China's Involvement in the Vietnam War, 1964-69," *The China Quarterly*, no. 142 (1995): 357.

relationship with the Soviets. The primary focus of Yugoslav foreign policy will be on containing and suppressing the unrest in Hungary, even if that means aligning with the Soviets. Although opposed to the Stalinist tendencies of Mátyás Rákosi, Yugoslavia fears that Hungarian nationalism—in opposition to Soviet suzerainty—could spill into Yugoslavia and cause unrest in the highly multiethnic state.⁷⁹ This is especially concerning considering the numerous Yugoslav civilian and media connections to Hungary. On other diplomatic issues, the Yugoslavs will likely take a position between the West and the East, aiming to negotiate and collaborate with both sides, similarly to the French.⁸⁰ Much like the Soviets and China, the Yugoslav Government and the Yugoslav Counterintelligence Service (KOS) are immensely powerful within the country's borders, with the capability to do nearly anything. The KOS, however, has limited influence outside the country, with most Yugoslav intelligence capability focusing on central and eastern Europe, both inside and outside the Eastern bloc.

In terms of the spheres of conflict, Yugoslavia will play its greatest role in the crises in Hungary and Germany due to its proximity and intelligence capability. In all other spheres of conflict, Yugoslavia may pursue a non-aligned policy—including potentially offering aid or support—but will not directly involve itself in any conflicts.

German Democratic Republic (East Germany)

One of the most important Soviet-aligned satellite states in Eastern Europe, East Germany remains an unstable hotspot for the Eastern bloc. East Germany's primary foreign policy concern is with West Germany and trying to stop the exodus of East Germans to the West. Consequently, East Germany's foreign policy will be guided by its need to build a sustainable domestic economy and prevent discontent—likely leading it to support other communist governments dealing with internal problems, particularly Hungary. On most other diplomatic questions, East Germany will likely follow a similar trajectory to the Soviets, supporting communist, anti-imperialist, and labour movements.⁸¹ The East German Government—although highly closely tied to the Soviets—and its intelligence agency, the Stasi, possess a fearsome Soviet-like power within its borders and will be able to pursue more or less whatever activities it desires. However, East Germany's internal instability and reliance on the Soviets will limit any East German influence abroad. The capabilities of the Stasi itself are mainly focused on inter-German affairs, as well as situations elsewhere in the Eastern bloc.

As one of the two German states, East Germany is critical to the tensions between the two Germanies, with the influx of East Germans into the West being a major issue. As an Eastern bloc state in close proximity to Hungary, East Germany will also be highly interested in the progression of the situation in Hungary. Due to East Germany's lack of foreign influence and alignment with the Soviets, the role of East Germany in other spheres of conflict will be limited to the support it extends to its fellow communist movements.

Israel

Despite its small size and having only come into existence eight years ago in 1948, Israel has developed into a state with a formidable military force and a feared intelligence agency, the Mossad. Israeli foreign policy could

⁷⁹ Johanna Granville, "Hungary, 1956: The Yugoslav Connection," *Europe-Asia Studies* 50, no. 3 (1998): 497

⁸⁰ Sabiha Hasan, "Yugoslavia's Foreign Policy Under Tito (1945-80)," *Pakistan Horizon* 34, no. 3 (1981): 103.

⁸¹ David Childs, "East German Foreign Policy: The Search for Recognition and Stability," *International Journal* 32, no. 2 (1977): 337.

simply be defined as a desire for survival within the context of Arab-Israeli relations and the tensions surrounding the Suez zone. Many in the Israeli government support preventative war to strike first against the Arab states and discourage Arab hostility against Israel. Neither aligned with NATO nor the Eastern bloc, Israel currently prioritizes its relationship with France, Israel's main arms supplier and closest ally. Israeli foreign policy sees the U.S. as unreliable, with the Americans declining to offer significant military support to the Israelis, while also distrusting the Soviets, who supply Israel's primary enemy at the moment, Egypt.⁸² As a democracy, the Israeli Government must remain accountable to the Israeli public but also cognizant of the societal instability within Israel, especially with regards to the many Arab Palestinians who reside within Israeli-governed territories. Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, is highly powerful, willing to take any measures to achieve its aims, and possesses a reach unlike other intelligence agencies due to the highly diverse backgrounds of its agents. That being said, Mossad remains closely aligned with the Government and will likely pursue actions in line with the Government.

Israel lies at the heart of the tensions surrounding the Suez Canal and will play a vital role in any diplomatic, political, or military developments in the region. Although Israeli foreign policy is highly focused on the Arab-Israeli conflict, Israel's extensive intelligence capability will allow the country to involve itself in other conflicts at more subtle levels as opposed to direct involvement.

Discussion Questions

1. What goals does each power possess with respect to the five spheres of conflict, and how do those goals come into conflict with the goals of other powers?
2. How should the global political aims of each power be pursued in terms of the public actions of its government or the covert actions of its intelligence agency?
3. To what extent should each power become directly involved in each sphere of conflict in terms of aid or direct military support and intervention, particularly in proxy conflicts that centre around nations with powerful allies?
4. Should the powers which are members of the Western and Eastern blocs follow a unified approach to each respective sphere of conflict, or should their differing aims lead them towards independent involvement separate from their bloc?
5. How can each power exploit the unstable alliances and relationships between other powers, including the non-aligned powers?

⁸² Fry, *The Suez Crisis, 1956*, 7.

Bibliography

- Alt, Peter, and Max Schneider. "West Germany's 'Economic Miracle.'" *Science & Society* 26, no. 1 (1962): 46-57.
- BBC Bitesize. "The Hungarian Uprising, 1956." *BBC Bitesize*, n.d.
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/zq9hg82/revision/4>.
- Bethell, Leslie. *Cuba: A Short History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Blakemore, Erin. "Why the Berlin Wall rose—and how it fell." *National Geographic*, November 8, 2019.
<https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/why-berlin-wall-built-fell>.
- Bowker, Bob. "Egypt's Revolution and the Lessons for Today." *Australian Institute of International Affairs*, July 21, 2017. <https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/egyptian-revolution-1952-lessons/>.
- Chen, Jian. "China's Involvement in the Vietnam War, 1964-69." *The China Quarterly*, no. 142 (1995): 356-387.
- Childs, David. "East German Foreign Policy: The Search for Recognition and Stability." *International Journal* 32, no. 2 (1977): 334-351.
- Chomsky, Aviva. *A History of the Cuban Revolution*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
- Cuban–American Treaty of Relations*, 1903, Havana.
- CVCE.eu by the University of Luxembourg. "The Marshall Plan and the establishment of the OEEC." *CVCE.eu by the University of Luxembourg*, n.d. <https://www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/84c940fe-a82b-4fe8-ad53-63144bfe30b1>.
- CVCE.eu by the University of Luxembourg. "The USSR and the creation of the buffer zone." *CVCE.eu by the University of Luxembourg*, n.d. <https://www.cvce.eu/en/collections/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/78447da2-d383-4cf5-ab86-905b745401d0>.
- Fry, Michael. *The Suez Crisis, 1956*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, 1989.
- Granville, Johanna. "Hungary, 1956: The Yugoslav Connection." *Europe-Asia Studies* 50, no. 3 (1998): 493-517.
- Grogan, Kevin. "Cuba's Dance of the Millions: Examining the Causes and Consequences of Violent Price Fluctuations in the Sugar Market Between 1919 and 1920." *University of Florida*, August 2004.
http://etd.fcla.edu/UF/UFE0006301/grogan_k.pdf.
- Hanrieder, Wolfram. "The Foreign Policies of the Federal Republic of Germany, 1949-1989." *German Studies Review* 12, no. 2 (1989): 311-332
- Harry S. Truman Library & Museum. "Timeline of the Cold War." *Harry S. Truman Library & Museum*, n.d.
https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/public/TrumanCIA_Timeline.pdf.
- Hasan, Sabiha. "Yugoslavia's Foreign Policy Under Tito (1945-80)." *Pakistan Horizon* 34, no. 3 (1981): 82-120.

- Johnson, Peter. "Egypt Under Nasser." *MERIP Reports*, no. 10 (1972): 3-14.
- Lien, Vu Hong, and Peter Sharrock. *Descending Dragon, Rising Tiger: A History of Vietnam*. London: Reaktion Books, 2014.
- Luthi, Lorenz. *Cold Wars: Asia, the Middle East, Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Macartney, Carlile Aylmer. "Hungary in the Soviet orbit." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, n.d.
<https://www.britannica.com/place/Hungary/Hungary-in-the-Soviet-orbit>.
- Mansfield, Peter. "Nasser and Nasserism." *International Journal* 28, no. 4 (1973): 670-688.
- McCauley, Brian. "Hungary and Suez, 1956: The Limits of Soviet and American Power." *Journal of Contemporary History* 16, no. 4 (1981): 777-800.
- National Cold War Exhibition, "Sino - Soviet Split," *Royal Air Force Museum*, n.d.
<https://www.nationalcoldwarexhibition.org/schools-colleges/national-curriculum/detente/sino-soviet-split.aspx>.
- Paterson, Thomas G. "The Origins of the Cold War." *OAH Magazine of History* 2, no. 1 (1986): 5-18.
- Perović, Jeronim. "The Tito-Stalin Split: A Reassessment in Light of New Evidence." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 9, no. 2 (2007): 32-63.
- PBS – American Experience. "Castro's Failed Coup." *PBS – American Experience*, n.d.
<https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/castro-failed-coup-moncada-barracks/>.
- Stack, Kevin. "The Cold War Intelligence Score." *American Intelligence Journal* 18, no. 1/2 (1998): 69-72.
- Turner, Henry Ashby. "Political consolidation and economic growth, 1949-69." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, n.d.
<https://www.britannica.com/place/Germany/Political-consolidation-and-economic-growth-1949-69>.
- U.S. Department of State Archive. "Hungary, 1956." *U.S. Department of State Archive*, n.d. <https://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/lw/107186.htm>.
- Waite, James. *The End of the First Indochina War: A Global History*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

