



Boston University Academy Model United Nations Conference X

Saturday, January 29th to Sunday, January 30th, 2022

Boston University Academy

Boston, MA

JCC: Suez Canal

Egypt

Background Guide

Introduction from the Chair and Vice-Chair:

Hello, Delegates!

My name is Connor Swartz, I am a sophomore at Boston University Academy, and I will be your Chair at BUAMUN X. Leo Wang '23 will be my vice chair. At my school I participate in soccer, robotics and Model UN. I was part of numerous Model UN conferences throughout middle school and had experience on my debate team. I have always loved the engaging experience and numerous complex ideas that Model UN explores. From water privatization to the Afghanistan crisis, Model UN has motivated me to explore topics I never would have considered beforehand. My fellow delegates have always been respectful and open to new ideas and occasionally controversial ones. To enjoy the upcoming conference don't be afraid to speak up about something you're passionate about or something with which you simply disagree. I hope you enjoy Model UN as much as I do. Best of luck!

Sincerely,

Connor Swartz

Boston University Academy '23

cs02467@bu.edu

Leo Wang

Boston University Academy '23

leo2004@bu.edu

Position Paper Guidelines:

This committee requires 1 position paper. It is on the topic of the Suez Canal Crisis. The absence of at least one position paper will disqualify you (the delegate) from receiving an award. The quality, depth, and clarity of your position paper will influence award decisions. Each position paper should be 1-3 pages and double spaced. This includes citations which are preferably in the format of footnotes. To insert a footnote, simply click *Insert > Footnote*. Note: a footnote goes after the period. Position papers should follow a general outline with three paragraphs. This is only a suggestion, as long as the paper fits the aforementioned specifications, the number of paragraphs will not be taken into consideration.

Possible position paper outline:

- 1) Introduction to your delegation and the topic as a whole
- 2) The position of your delegation
- 3) Your delegations proposed solutions

Furthermore, the position paper must be titled in the following format:

Delegation: Connor Swartz and Leo Wang

School: Boston University Academy

Committee: UN Security Council – USA

Position: Dwight D. Eisenhower (this should be the person you represent)

General Overview:

On July 26, 1956, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser announced the nationalization of the Suez Canal Company, the joint British-French enterprise which had owned and operated the Suez Canal since its construction in 1869. Nasser's announcement came following months of mounting political tensions between Egypt, Britain, and France. Although Nasser offered full economic compensation for the Company, the British and French Governments, long suspicious of Nasser's opposition to the continuation of their political influence in the region, were outraged by the nationalization. The Egyptian leader, in turn, resented what he saw as European efforts to perpetuate their colonial domination. The Eisenhower administration, worried by the prospect of the outbreak of hostilities between its NATO allies and an emergent, influential Middle Eastern power (and the possible intervention of the Soviet Union in such a conflict), attempted to broker a diplomatic settlement of the British-French-Egyptian dispute. On September 9, U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles proposed the creation of a Suez Canal Users' Association (SCUA), an international consortium of 18 of the world's leading maritime nations, to operate the Canal. Although SCUA would have given Britain, France, and Egypt an equal stake in the Canal, this, and various other U.S. and international mediation efforts failed to win the full support of any of the contending powers. In discussions with the United States between August and October, the British Government repeatedly hinted that it might resort to force in dealing with Nasser. At the same time, the British and French held secret military consultations with Israel, who regarded Nasser as a threat to its security, resulting in the creation of a joint plan to invade Egypt and overthrow its President. In keeping with these plans, Israeli forces attacked across Egypt's Sinai Peninsula on October 29, 1956, advancing to within 10 miles of the Suez Canal. Under the pretext of protecting the Canal from the two belligerents, Britain and France landed troops of their own a few days later.

In response, the Eisenhower administration, concerned about dissociating the United States from European colonialism—especially in light of its strident condemnation of the Soviet intervention in Hungary the same week—as well as the possibility that the Soviets would intervene to assist Nasser, pressured Britain and France to accept a United Nations ceasefire on November 6. Moreover, the United States voted for U.N. resolutions publicly condemning the invasion and approving the creation of a U.N. peacekeeping force. Washington's public censure of two of its most important allies temporarily soured relations with London and Paris and helped contribute to the resignation of British Prime Minister Anthony Eden in January 1957. Concurrently, U.S. worries about the continued viability of European (particularly British) political and military power in the Middle East in the aftermath of the Suez Crisis prompted the creation of the Eisenhower Doctrine, which gave the administration increased power to aid countries in the region. By March 1957, however, the U.S.–U.K. bilateral relationship had recovered under Eden's successor, Harold Macmillan.

Suez Canal Historical Background:

The Suez Canal was completed in 1869. Financed by the French and Egyptian governments and after almost ten years of work it was completed. The area surrounding the canal was Egyptian territory and the only bridge between Africa and Asia. The canal became one of the most strategically important places on the planet because it provided the shortest ocean path from the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean. Trading was made significantly easier for nations and particularly helped European countries. However in 1875 because of the financial crisis the Egyptian ruler had to sell to the British government. The French private investors gained majority shareholdings. With the 1882 invasion and occupation of Egypt, the United Kingdom then took complete control over the canal as well as control of the country as well as the canal proper, and its finances and operations. The 1888 Convention of Constantinople declared the canal a neutral zone under British protection. In ratifying it, the Ottoman Empire agreed to permit international shipping to pass freely through the canal, in time of war and peace. The Convention came into force in 1904, the same year as the Entente cordiale, between Britain and France. Despite this convention, the strategic importance of the Suez Canal and its control were proven during the Russo-Japanese War of 1904—1905, after Japan and Britain entered into a separate bilateral agreement. Following the Japanese surprise attack on the Russian Pacific Fleet based at Port Arthur the Russians sent reinforcements from their fleet in the Baltic Sea. The British denied the Russian fleet use of the canal and forced it to steam around the entire continent of Africa, giving the Japanese forces time to solidify their position in the Far East. Suez Crisis 2

The importance of the canal as a strategic intersection was again apparent during the First World War, when Britain and France closed the canal to non-Allied shipping. The canal continued to be strategically important after the Second World War for the shipment of oil. Control over the canal could no longer be preserved on grounds that it was critical to the defense either of India or of an empire that was being liquidated. And yet, at exactly the same moment, the canal was gaining a new role — as the highway not of empire, but of oil.... By 1955, petroleum accounted for half of the canal's traffic, and, in turn, two thirds of Europe's oil passed through it. At the time, Western Europe imported two million barrels (bbls) per day from the Mideast, 1,200,000 by tanker through the Canal, and another 800,000 via pipeline from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, where tankers received it. The US imported another 300,000 bbls. daily from the Mideast. In August 1956 the Royal Institute of International Affairs published a report titled "Britain and the Suez Canal" revealing government perception of the Suez area. It reiterates several times the strategic necessity of the Suez Canal to the United Kingdom, including the need to meet military obligations under the Manila Pact in the Far East and the Baghdad Pact in Iraq, Iran, or Pakistan. The report also points out how the canal was used in past wars and could be used in future wars to transport troops from the Dominions of Australia and New Zealand in the event of war in Europe. The report also cites the amount of material and oil which passes through the canal to the United Kingdom, and the economic consequences of the canal being put out of commission,

concluding. The possibility of the Canal being closed to troopships makes the question of the control and regime of the Canal as important to Britain today as it ever was.

The opening of the Suez canal is a long-term wish to ease the trade between the Mediterranean Sea and the Red Sea: the isthmus is indeed a bridge between Asia and Africa. It also gives a strategic importance to Egypt in terms of trade relations. The idea of such an opening was in fact a very long-lasting project that only the technological innovations of the nineteenth century made possible. Even since Antiquity, both seas were connected through a system of canals. During the byzantine and Muslim period, Egypt was experiencing a period of prosperity, and it was known as the “country of trade”. Since the eighth century, trade has been intense between Asian and African countries through this particular area. The coming of Islam around the Red Sea modified the political situation: the Red Sea became a forbidden area for Europeans, until the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope in 1497. Portugal therefore threatened the supremacy of the Venetian trade in the region. In 1574, Venice submitted the first ever project to open the Suez Canal. The project was denied because of its costs, and it remained forgotten until Napoleon Bonaparte put together an expedition in Egypt in 1798, in order to counter the English ambitions in the area and open a new way to the Indies. Engineers studied the system of the Pharaohs and decided to construct a lock canal.

The project was abandoned once again in 1801. The development of the steamboats in the nineteenth century placed the Egyptian area at the center of Mediterranean trade. From 1830, the East Indian Company offered a line between Bombay and Suez. After that, many lines were installed in the Red Sea during the 1840-1860's, but the conditions of the Egyptian crossing were still tough and very costly. The English government hence decided to construct a railway that was finished in 1858. Under the reign of Mohamed Ali (1805-1848), there was a wide plan of construction and equipment that greatly improved the irrigation system and the canal network. In 1846, the Suez Canal Study Society was founded in Paris by French, Austrian and British engineers. It had at this time two goals: verify the scientific means for the construction of such a canal and attract businessmen and politicians towards the project. This study group rectified the conclusions of the French expedition and concluded that a regular canal is indeed possible.

The caliph finally agreed to the construction of the Suez Canal in 1866, after the intervention of the French emperor, Napoleon III. But with the construction of the canal also came the development of all cities involved in the process, with among them Suez, Port-Said or Ismailia. On the 17th of November 1869, the Suez Canal was effectively declared navigable. But in 1882, the British forces intervened in Egypt and took effective control of the Suez Canal after an insurrection against the Egyptian government. In this year an informal protectorate of the British government was started over Egypt. In 1886, after numerous concerns being voiced by French diplomats, the Constantinople Convention is signed under four main principles: freedom of passage for trade ships, freedom of passage of military ships if they do not debark on the

Egyptian ground, the territory of the Canal considered as neutral and the right for the Egyptian government to intervene in case of a threat to its territory. Bombay is twenty days away from London! This information created at the end of the nineteenth century a nervous and imaginative atmosphere. The introduction of the steam navigation changed drastically the stakes and possibilities around trade and globalization. In 1909, the Suez Canal Company proposed a modification to the original contract with Egypt to further its responsibility on the Suez Canal after 1968, when it was supposed to go to the Egyptian government. The project faced a wide opposition of the Egyptian political parties, and started a crisis about national sovereignty in the country. It led to the assassination of Prime Minister Boutros Ghali in 1910 and a new occupation by British troops after this event. The nationalist motto "Egypt to the Egyptians" became in those years "The Canal to the Egyptians". With the First World War started in August 1914, the Suez Canal became of prime importance to the British Navy. The Ottoman Empire, having an alliance with Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire: this situation forced the British to cut any link between the Ottoman Empire and Egypt. It officially became a British condominium.

The Canal was during the War a prime objective for all forces in the Mediterranean Sea: it became the "British Canal". But in 1919, an enormous insurrection arose in Egypt against the British protectorate. A general strike began in the country and led to the end of the official protectorate in 1922 and a new Constitution was written: nevertheless, the British influence is still present deep in the institutions and diplomacy of Egypt. The nationalist ideas were growing in those days and the idea of negotiations to take over the Suez Canal was a leading one in the nationalist party. In 1936, London started to negotiate on the basis of the example of Iraq to further the independence of Egypt, with changes over the control of interior policy and the permanent installation of British forces in the Suez Canal. At the same time, secret negotiations were taking place to represent the interests of the Egyptian government in the benefits of the Suez Canal Company.

In 1937, an agreement was signed that gave 0.03% of the Suez Canal Company benefits to the Egyptian nation. With the Second World War, the British control over the Suez Canal became once again very strong: the coalition ensured total control over the navigation in its area. But the defeat of France in June 1940 created a loop that the British government ended in October by declaring its total control over the Suez Canal Company. The alliance between Italy and Germany and finally, Mussolini's war entry in 1940 started a new conflict in the Mediterranean Sea, mainly over the control of Egypt and its canal. After several defeats of Italian troops in North Africa, Hitler sent the Deutsche Afrika Korps in February 1941 with Erwin Rommel at its head. With the intervention of American forces in 1942, the conflict in North Africa ended in the fall of 1943. But with the end of the war came other conflictual matters: the fact that the Company ran without a French leadership reinforced the will of the nationalist party to ask for a Suez Canal Company run by both British and Egyptian

representatives. After the war, the renewed interest for the oil of the Middle East continued to thrive in the Suez Canal. In order to get the refined oil in Europe, most of the oil was going through the Suez Canal rather than in pipelines. With numerous works and changes to the Suez Canal's capacity, the frequency and attraction of the Canal grew rapidly and multiplied the benefits of the Suez Canal Company. But with its growing capacity, the Egyptian government still only got 2% of the overall benefits of the Suez Canal Company. In 1951, the nationalization of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company by the Prime Minister of Iran, Mossadegh, disturbed the control of the British nation over the Middle East. In October 1951, the decision of the Egyptian government to supersede the treaties of 1936 and 1899 started a frontal opposition between English forces and nationalist commandos. A general strike started in the Suez Canal Company in December 1951 that would lead afterwards to the nationalization of the Suez Canal. The nationalization of the Suez Canal occurred in a favorable context to the rise of a third voice, opposed to the logic of blocks and the colonial powers. In fact, the idea behind the nationalization of the Suez Canal was to cope with the western will to maintain its authority within the African continent and in the Middle East. Nasser's political program

After the Egyptian defeat against Israel in 1948, Gamal Abdel Nasser, a young military man, deplored the disorganization of the Egyptian army. His country had to free itself from British control and more widely from colonialism, which clearly affected the Egyptian military abilities during the war. According to Nasser, King Farouk (the Egyptian leader at the time) was a pro-British leader who had to be ousted, in order to accomplish Egyptian independence. Thus, he created in 1952 the Free Officers committee, whose first objective was to "liquidate colonialism and the Egyptian traitors that back Sciences Po Rennes International Model United Nations." Therefore, on July 23rd, 1952, he overthrew the Egyptian king and took power along with General Mohammed Naguib and his fellow officers. Based on the idea of a strengthened Egypt, he quickly decided to suspend the parliament, widely criticized for its inefficiency and corruption, and forbid political parties. The military, embodied by Nasser, was thereby controlling the Egyptian government. Gamal Abdel Nasser built a strong ideology based on a union of the Arab people called pan Arabism. Nasser wanted to renew the Arab world, newly independent from Europe. Thus, the "Free officers" program was composed of five key principles: struggle against feudality, the capital, social despotism, political corruption and the weakening of the military. One of his first goals was the evacuation of the Suez Canal by the British troops. As a cornerstone of the Egyptian strategic location, Nasser considered that the canal had to return under the control of his government. The United Kingdom military had, throughout the XXth century, insured its protection against the Turkish in 1917 and the Germans in 1942. Eventually, in 1954, a treaty between the United Kingdom and Egypt was signed, according to which the British would have to evacuate the Canal within two years.

Indeed, for the new Egyptian leaders, the British presence was lived as a continued colonial domination, which was incompatible with his will of complete independence towards

the West. On the other hand, for the British, this evacuation came with a clear degradation of its relations with Egypt, considered hitherto as a strategic ally in the Middle East. Nonetheless, in 1954, the nationalization was not yet considered, or at least not publicly. This first blow to the British presence in the Middle East occurred in a context favorable to the emergence of a third voice. The 1955 Bandung Conference In 1955, the first African Asian international conference was held in Bandung, from April 17 to 24. The “Third World”, which refers to the underdeveloped, newly independent world that does not respond to the logic of the blocks, came to reality. India, Pakistan, Myanmar, Indonesia and Ceylan were at the origins of this conference. 20 other Asian countries, as well as 14 African and Middle Eastern countries were invited, and among them, Egypt. If a wide majority agreed upon a fostered economic cooperation, cleavages appeared regarding the participants’ political positions. Indeed, some countries such as Iraq or Turkey wanted to maintain their relationship with the Western powers, notably by the adoption of military agreements. On the other side, other newly independent states were militating for a complete independence towards the former colonial powers. Eventually, a compromise allowed the participants to join international military alliances. In fact, this decision became a major point of dispute between the West and Nasser’s Egypt prior to the Suez Canal Crisis.

Despite these political divisions, the Bandung conference led to the adoption of numerous principles, such as the respect of territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, noninterference in internal affairs, reciprocity of benefits, and peaceful coexistence. Egypt, among the Bandung conference participants, was clearly in favor of putting an end to the military and political influence exerted by the colonial powers. Nevertheless, he still looked towards the West, as well as the East, as potential allies. As a former British colony, Nasser always had seen the United States as an example. When he took power in 1953, his officers even ordered a weapons delivery to the American administration, which was stopped after British Prime Minister Winston Churchill’s opposition. During the Bandung conference, he eventually asked for China's help. Later on, after having transmitted the demand to the USSR, Czechoslovakian weapons were delivered in Egypt. This will definitely question Nasser’s neutrality and position towards the United States and the USSR. Sciences Po Rennes International Model United Nations Egypt and the world powers at the dawn of the Suez Canal nationalization Between the United States and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics At the dawn of the Cold War, the United States administration developed the containment policy, in order to limit the expansion of communism, sustained by the Union of the Socialist and Soviet Republics. By signing international military agreements with Europe (the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949) or with South East Asia (the South East Asia Treaty in 1954), the United States government was willing to circle the USSR. The United States applied their ideology in the Middle East with the adoption of the Baghdad Pact (later called the Middle East Treaty) by Iran, Iraq, Turkey, Pakistan and the United Kingdom in 1955, which was debated a few months later in Bandung. However, Nasser, for whom this defense pact is associated with Western imperialism, rejected it. He considered

that “the idea of a Pact leads to division of the Arab world, isolates Egypt and puts the Arab unity in danger”.

Despite this will for independence, Nasser still needed financial support from the West to build a major project for his country: the Aswan Dam. This project, initiated by the British, was particularly expensive, and thus required international funding. The World Bank accepted to fund half of it, but Egypt still needed support from the United Kingdom and the United States, which eventually agreed to grant a 70 millions dollars loan each. The United States’ decision was explained by John Foster Dulles, Eisenhower’s Secretary of State, himself: “if we cannot offer him weapons, we will offer him prosperity”. Nevertheless, due to very harsh refunding conditions, the Egyptian president began to seek other solutions, and asked the USSR to finance its project. If Dulles was at first in favor of granting financial help to Egypt, he progressively realized that Nasser was playing a double role. In addition to the Czechoslovakian weapons delivery, the latter had also recognized the communist China, and concluded an anti-Baghdad Pact with Syria and Yemen. Therefore, Dulles, who no longer saw Egypt as a potential ally, finally took the decision to cancel the American loan on July 19th, followed by the United Kingdom and the World Bank. The Egyptian government found itself deprived of international support, which was seen, from the West, as a victory. Nasser and the Colonial empires Despite the retreat of the British troops from the Suez Canal, relations remained tense between the United Kingdom and Egypt. The United Kingdom still considered this agreement as forced and obliged. The first blow following the treaty was the accelerated independence of Sudan at the initiative of the United Kingdom. If Nasser was publicly in favor of the right of self determination, the independence procedure is clearly at the benefits of the former colonial power. Thus, the establishment of a pro-British government in Sudan prevented Nasser from concluding agreements with his historical ally. However, Nasser continuously competed with the British’s will to maintain the Middle East under their influence.

First, by refusing to sign the Baghdad treaty and concluding a pact with Syria and Yemen as said above, but also by spreading anti-imperialist ideas through the Arabs Voice (the National Egyptian radio) in the region. Indeed, his program had a large echo in the Middle East, particularly in Bahrain, in Yemen or in Jordan, where the popular classes succeeded in forcing the King to dismiss the British officer in place. Therefore, the United Kingdom’s government is progressively losing control in the region, at the benefits of Egypt, but also the United States, which has substituted the British presence for the past 5 years. Eventually, the nationalization was felt as the last occasion to Sciences Po Rennes International Model United Nations intervene, put an end to Nasser’s ambitions and build back the historical British’s sphere of influence. France played a very particular role in this context. In 1956, France still saw the region as a competition zone with the United Kingdom, as showed its opposition to the Baghdad Pact. As the Algerian war started, France also wanted to make sure that Egypt was not supporting the National Liberation Front. If the independence of Tunisia and Morocco were

unavoidable, Algeria's, as a French department, was not conceivable for the government nor for the population. Given the unpopularity of the 4th republic successive governments, the Algerian war had to be a success, and therefore, any external support was to be avoided. But according to Nasser's ideology, helping an Arab people to free itself from a colonial power was a duty. This decision led to the delivery of weapons to the NLF throughout the war. If this material help was significant, it was the political and public support that definitely convinced the French government to see Nasser as an enemy, like the United States and the United Kingdom did. Therefore, when the international Aswan dam financial support was eventually suspended on July 19th, France considered it as a huge failure for Nasser.

Nasser had concentrated troops around Suez and was therefore surprised by an attack in the Sinai Peninsula. In the afternoon of Tuesday, October 30, Anthony Eden, British prime minister, officially announced his will to intervene at the House of Commons, which gave a vote of confidence by 270 in favor and 218 against. At the same time, Guy Mollet obtained 368 votes in favor and only 182 against. In France, all the media coverage, the ruling class and the whole public opinion also supported the action. Both belligerents gave them an ultimatum. Israel accepted, subject to an affirmative answer from Nasser who refused it as expected. That is why the Westerners started the attack, mainly through aerial bombardments in Cairo –Cyprus and aircraft carriers were the base camp. The 5th of November, Port-Fouad and Port-Said surrendered, after two days of grueling battles. Victory is perceived to be quite near, but politics and diplomacy took precedence over the conflict... International pressures On October the 29th, same day as Israel had crossed the Egyptian borders, the United States called for the convening of the United Nations Security Council so as to stop the Israeli military operation. The permanent members plus Cuba, Australia, Belgium, Iran, Peru and Yugoslavia therefore met on 30th. A draft resolution invoking a cease-fire and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli occupation forces was proposed and sponsored by the United States. Both Australia and Belgium abstained, both France and the United Kingdom vetoed. The United States of America had set the tone: it condemned every military action. A United Nations General Assembly special session was held on 1st and 2nd of November. The USSR denounced a well-thought-out plan, the United States of America confused the assembly supporting Egypt –which was quite unexpected-. The delegate of The United Kingdom and Northern Ireland reminded the need of ensuring peace and insisted on the temporary measures, which have been taken so far, whereas the delegate of France highlighted the UN powerlessness. A resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire, the withdrawal of Egyptian and Israeli troops on their own borders as defined in 1949, and the restoration of freedom of movement over the Canal was there adopted by 64 votes in favor and 5 against and 6 abstentions. The text also urges the state not to provide weapons or any military equipment in the area. Another meeting of the United Nations General Assembly was held on the 3rd of November, on the request of Egypt to take actions against military aggression from French-English troops. The cease-fire should have entered into force from the 5th of November, but this was not taken into account at all. The same day, another resolution for the

establishment of a UN army in the Middle East was also adopted. Personal letters exchanged between French, English, Israeli, American and Soviet leaders kept an extra level of tension. The Franco-British position became less and less comfortable and even increasingly unsustainable. On the 6th, a last economic pressure from the United States of America towards the United Kingdom, plus the Sciences Po Rennes International Model United Nations threat from India to withdraw from the Commonwealth and Anthony Eden eventually bowed. Guy Mollet followed. The members of the Security Council will therefore have to find a settlement upon a possible retreat of the French and British troops from the Egyptian soil, in accordance with the respect of the principle of territorial integrity.

Bloc Positions:

Hamed Bansara – Governor of Cairo

Hamed is the governor of the most populated city in Egypt which means that he occupies a large amount of power thus he is able to control every aspect of the city's administration. He is able to control and use his power for the advancements of the city and is informed about most of the Suez Crisis.

Abdal Mansour Hassan – Minister of Public Information and Social Affairs

As the Deputy Prime Minister for Economic Affairs, Hassan is responsible for overseeing the maintenance of economic ties between Egypt and foreign states. While certainly a large amount of Egypt's economic health will be decided at home, Egypt must also concentrate on becoming a player in the global economy as well as maintaining its positive connections to foreign financing. This mandate means that Egypt must seek to increase its trading partners and find new ways to distinguish itself economically

Abbas Amnar – Ambassador to the UN

As Ambassador to the United Nations, Amnar carries considerable influence over Egypt's relationships with various foreign governments and international organizations. This is in many ways a difficult position to hold because Egypt has conflicts with the rest of the UN. Much of the communication with the UN is through Amnar and he is the voice for many of Egypt's decisions.
Fathi Radwan- Minister of Communication

Mahmuf Hasem – Minister of Foreign Affairs

As the Minister of Communications Hasem is in charge of the cultural policy of Egypt. His goal is not only to help the growth and development in Egyptian culture but also to push an overall social solidarity. He is the oldest member of the Egyptian cabinet and is fluent in English.

Mustafa Abdul Zaki – Minister of Agriculture

As Minister of Agriculture, Zaki must ensure that Egypt produces enough food for its citizens that said food meets safety standards. Historically, due to Egypt's mostly desert climate, the country has had troubles producing enough crops to feed its population. The Suez Canal marks an important way of delivering traded food and resources which could help the expansion of agriculture in Egypt.

Camal Abdel Nasser – President of Egypt

As the President of Egypt Nasser is the chief of state with the highest executive position within the country. They must evaluate the needs of their country and meet the standards that their people show in their values and beliefs. His goal is to ensure everyone else is meeting their standards and the overall situation with the Suez Canal is under control.

Other possibilities include:

- Sami Yassa
- Abdel Jalil-Alimari
- Salah Salem
- Aadedden Mutawally
- Jaadar Al-Abd

Cited Works & Further Research:

<https://www.suezcanal.gov.eg/English/About/SuezCanal/Pages/CanalHistory.aspx>

Selak, Charles B. "The Suez Canal Base Agreement of 1954." *The American Journal of International Law* 49, no. 4 (1955): 487–505. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2194417>.

https://www.nsa.gov/portals/75/documents/news-features/decclassified-documents/cryptologic-histories/Suez_Crisis.pdf

<https://www.bu.edu/bulawreview/files/2015/07/LAHAV.pdf>

<https://www.britannica.com/topic/Suez-Canal>

<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/mission/past/unef1backgr1.html>

<https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/mod/1956nasser-suez1.asp>

https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/mid015.asp

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/suez>

<https://www.press.umich.edu/pdf/0472108670-06.pdf>