

HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL

President: María Paula Royero



CERVMUN X
UNLOCK THE VISION, BUILD THE LEGACY

INDEX

- I. Letter from the Historical Security Council committee president.
- II. About the committee.
- III. Topic A: The Korean War (1950-1953) — The Beginning of Cold War Armed Conflicts
 - a. Introduction.
 - b. Historical Background.
 - c. Current Situation.
 - d. Approach and Expectations for Debate.
 - e. Guiding Questions.
- IV. Topic B: The Suez Crisis (1956) — The Decline of Colonial Powers and Cold War Tensions
 - a. Introduction.
 - b. Historical Background.
 - c. Current Situation.
 - d. Approach and Expectations for Debate.
 - e. Guiding Questions.
- V. Positions
- VI. Glossary
- VII. Bibliographic References

COORDINACIONES

PBX: 3784172 - 3784173 - 3784174 - 3784175
Cra. 51B N° 87-99 | Barranquilla, Colombia
www.liceodecervantes.edu.co

I.

LETTER FROM THE HISTORICAL SECURITY COUNCIL
COMMITTEE PRESIDENT

Dear Delegates,

First and foremost, I would like to extend my heartfelt congratulations to each of you reading this guide. I sincerely commend your courage and initiative in joining such a significant committee. Rest assured, you will not regret taking part in this enriching journey.

Throughout my years participating in MUN, one of the most valuable lessons I've learned is the importance of self-confidence in the face of challenges. Believing in yourself, regardless of the circumstances, is a powerful tool that will guide you toward success. By choosing to participate, you are already standing out, you have chosen to raise your voice, embrace your individuality, and make a meaningful impact. That is what defines an exceptional delegate.

As Mahatma Gandhi once said, "I will not let anyone walk through my mind with their dirty feet." Let no one diminish your aspirations. Be the change you wish to see in the world.

As your chair, I stand not only as a guide but as a fellow delegate who shares your passion, capabilities, and values.

With that, I warmly welcome you to CERVMUN X. Let us embrace this experience together.

See you soon.

-President Maria Paula Royero
maria.royero@liceodecervantes.edu.co
3330393643

II.

ABOUT THE COMMITTEE

The Historical Security Council (HSC) committee represents one of the most prestigious and challenging committees in Model United Nations simulations. Unlike contemporary committees that address current global issues, the HSC places delegates in the shoes of historical decision-makers, requiring them to navigate past crises with the knowledge, limitations, and perspectives of that specific time period.

The HSC recreates the United Nations Security Council as it existed during critical moments in history, maintaining the authentic composition, procedures, and political dynamics of the era. Delegates must embody the foreign policy positions, domestic pressures, and ideological constraints that influenced their countries' actual decision-making processes during these pivotal moments.

Following authentic UN Security Council procedures, the HSC emphasizes formal diplomatic protocol, requiring delegates to master parliamentary procedure, draft resolutions with historical precision, and engage in substantive debate that reflects the gravity of international crisis management. The committee typically features crisis elements that evolve based on delegate actions, mirroring the unpredictable nature of real-time diplomatic decision-making.

The creators of the United Nations Charter conceived that five countries — China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) [which was succeeded in 1990 by the Russian Federation], the United Kingdom, and the United States because of their key roles in the establishment of the United Nations, would continue to play important roles in the maintenance of international peace and security. They were granted the special status of Permanent Member States at the Security Council, along with a special voting power known as the "right to veto". It was agreed by the drafters that if any one of the five permanent members cast a negative vote in the 15-member Security Council, the resolution or decision would not be approved. All five permanent members have exercised the right of veto at one time or another. If a permanent member does not fully agree with a proposed resolution but does not wish to cast a veto, it may choose to abstain, thus allowing the resolution to be adopted if it obtains the required number of nine favorable votes.

III.

TOPIC A: The Korean War (1950-1953) — The Beginning of Cold War Armed Conflicts

INTRODUCTION

The Korean War represents a watershed moment in the evolution of the Cold War, transforming the ideological confrontation between the United States and Soviet Union into a deadly military conflict that would claim over three million lives and establish the template for proxy wars throughout the remainder of the twentieth century. This conflict emerged from the complex intersection of Korean nationalism, great power rivalry, and the ideological struggle between capitalism and communism that defined the post-World War II era.

The war's significance extends far beyond the Korean Peninsula itself. It marked the first direct military intervention by the United Nations in an international conflict, establishing precedents for collective security that would influence international relations for decades to come. The conflict demonstrated the limitations of both superpowers in achieving decisive victory while avoiding nuclear escalation, creating a new paradigm of "limited war" that would characterize many Cold War confrontations.

Furthermore, the Korean War established the geopolitical framework that would dominate East Asian politics for the remainder of the twentieth century. The involvement of China fundamentally altered the balance of power in the region, while the division of Korea created a permanent flashpoint that continues to influence international relations today. The conflict also highlighted the challenges facing the newly formed United Nations in maintaining international peace and security when confronted with great power competition.

The war's impact on domestic politics in participating nations was equally profound. In the United States, the conflict contributed to the rise of McCarthyism and fundamentally altered American defense policy, leading to a permanent military buildup and the establishment of a global network of military alliances. In China, the war solidified the Communist Party's control and established the People's Republic as a major regional power. For the Soviet Union, the conflict represented both an opportunity to test Western resolve and a dangerous precedent for superpower confrontation.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The roots of the Korean War trace back to the complex history of Japanese colonial rule and the broader dynamics of World War II in the Pacific. Korea had been under Japanese control since 1910, with the colonial administration implementing policies of cultural suppression and economic exploitation that generated significant Korean resistance. The prospect of Korean independence emerged only with Japan's defeat in World War II, but the manner of liberation would prove to be a source of enduring conflict.

The Cairo Conference of 1943 had promised Korean independence “in due course,” but the actual process of liberation was complicated by the rapid collapse of Japanese resistance following the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Soviet forces, which had entered the war against Japan only on August 8, 1945, rapidly advanced into northern Korea, while American forces landed in the south. The 38th parallel, initially conceived as a temporary administrative boundary for accepting Japanese surrender, became the de facto division line between Soviet and American occupation zones.

The period from 1945 to 1948 witnessed the gradual solidification of this division as the Cold War intensified. In the north, Soviet authorities worked closely with Korean communists, particularly Kim Il-sung, who had spent years in the Soviet Union and commanded significant credibility as an anti-Japanese guerrilla leader. The Soviet occupation established a socialist economic system, implemented land reforms, and created a political structure dominated by the Korean Workers' Party under Kim Il-sung's leadership.

In the south, American military government faced greater challenges in establishing a stable political order. The United States initially hoped to work with moderate Korean leaders but found itself increasingly dependent on anti-communist forces led by Syngman Rhee, despite concerns about his authoritarian tendencies. The American occupation confronted significant social unrest, including peasant uprisings and strikes, which were often suppressed with considerable violence.

The establishment of separate governments in 1948 formalized the division of Korea. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) was proclaimed in the north on September 9, 1948, with Kim Il-sung as premier, while the Republic of Korea (ROK) was established in the south on August 15, 1948, with Syngman Rhee as president. Both governments claimed legitimacy over the entire Korean Peninsula, setting the stage for future conflict.



Tensions escalated throughout 1949 and early 1950, with both sides engaging in border provocations and military buildups. The withdrawal of American combat forces from South Korea in June 1949, combined with Secretary of State Dean Acheson's exclusion of Korea from the

American defensive perimeter in his January 1950 speech, may have contributed to miscalculations about American commitment to South Korea's defense.

The decision to launch the invasion was ultimately made by Kim Il-sung, but required Soviet approval and support. Stalin's motivation for supporting the invasion was complex, involving calculations about American resolve, the desire to test Western unity, and the opportunity to expand Soviet influence in East Asia without direct confrontation. The timing of the invasion coincided with the Soviet boycott of the UN Security Council over the representation of China, which would prove crucial in enabling the UN response.

COORDINACIONES

PBX: 3784172 - 3784173 - 3784174 - 3784175
Cra. 51B N° 87-99 | Barranquilla, Colombia
www.liceodecervantes.edu.co

CURRENT SITUATION (as of July 1950)

The military situation on the Korean Peninsula has reached a critical moment. North Korean forces, led by the Korean People's Army (KPA), launched their invasion across the 38th parallel at 4:00 AM on June 25, 1950, achieving complete tactical surprise. The invasion



force, numbering approximately 135,000 troops supported by 150 T-34 tanks and significant artillery, overwhelmed the lightly equipped South Korean forces along the border.

The Republic of Korea Army (ROKA), numbering only about 65,000 troops and lacking heavy weapons, tanks, and adequate training, collapsed under the initial assault. Seoul fell within three days of the invasion, forcing the South Korean government to flee

southward. The rapid advance of North Korean forces has created a humanitarian crisis, with hundreds of thousands of refugees fleeing south and civilian casualties mounting as the war engulfs the entire peninsula.

American forces in the region, consisting primarily of the 24th Infantry Division stationed in Japan under General Douglas MacArthur, were initially unprepared for combat operations. The first American ground troops, Task Force Smith, were hastily deployed to Korea but suffered a devastating defeat at the Battle of Osan on July 5, 1950. The psychological impact of this defeat, combined with the continued North Korean advance, has created a crisis of confidence in American military capabilities.

The international response has been unprecedented in the history of the United Nations. The Security Council passed Resolution 82 on June 25, condemning the invasion and calling for the immediate cessation of hostilities and withdrawal of North Korean forces. Resolution 83, passed on June 27, authorized UN members to furnish assistance to South Korea, while Resolution 84, passed on July 7, established a unified command under the United States and authorized the use of the UN flag.

The Soviet Union's absence from the Security Council due to its boycott over Chinese representation has enabled these resolutions to pass, but also raised questions about the legitimacy of UN action taken without the participation of a permanent member. The Soviet boycott, intended to protest the continued seating of Nationalist China rather than the People's Republic of China, has created an unexpected opportunity for Western powers to act through the UN framework.

President Harry S. Truman's decision to commit American forces without congressional authorization has significant constitutional implications and has sparked debate about executive power in foreign affairs. The decision, made during a series of Blair House meetings from June 25-30, reflected Truman's belief that the invasion represented a test of American resolve and the broader principle of collective security.



The current military situation sees UN forces, primarily American and South Korean troops, compressed into the Pusan Perimeter in the southeast corner of the Korean Peninsula. This 140-mile defensive line represents the last major South Korean port and the only remaining area under UN control. The defense of this perimeter is critical to preventing the complete collapse of South Korea and maintaining a foothold for any future counteroffensive.

General MacArthur, commanding UN forces from his headquarters in Tokyo, has requested significant reinforcements and is reportedly planning a major amphibious operation to break the stalemate. However, the success of such an operation depends on maintaining the Pusan Perimeter and securing adequate forces from UN member states.

The international community faces crucial decisions about the scope and objectives of the UN intervention. While the immediate goal is to repel the North Korean invasion, questions remain about whether UN forces should be authorized to cross the 38th parallel and pursue the reunification of Korea under UN supervision.

APPROACH AND EXPECTATIONS FOR DEBATE

Delegates should expect crisis updates that can completely change the Korean conflict. The committee will simulate the real-time pressure faced by Security Council members as military situations evolved hourly, casualties mounted, and the risk of global war escalated. Revolutionary thinking means abandoning textbook solutions in favor of creative diplomatic innovations that could have altered history's trajectory.



My Expected Revolutionary Elements:

- Secret negotiations and back-channel diplomacy.
- Proposals for radical solutions like international trusteeship.
- Creative peacekeeping mechanisms beyond traditional UN frameworks.
- Economic warfare strategies alongside military considerations.
- Exploration of early Cold War alliance structures.

COORDINACIONES

PBX: 3784172 - 3784173 - 3784174 - 3784175
Cra. 51B N° 87-99 | Barranquilla, Colombia
www.liceodecervantes.edu.co

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What are the legal foundations for UN intervention in Korea, and how does the absence of the Soviet Union from Security Council deliberations affect the legitimacy of UN actions?
2. Should the UN establish precedents for intervention in civil conflicts, and what are the implications for national sovereignty and the principle of non-interference?
3. Should UN forces be authorized to cross the 38th parallel and pursue the reunification of Korea, or should the mandate be limited to restoring the status quo ante bellum?
3. How should the UN respond to warnings from the People's Republic of China about the consequences of UN forces approaching the Chinese border? What diplomatic channels should be established to prevent escalation into a broader East-West conflict, and how can the UN balance deterrence with the risk of nuclear war?
4. What precedents does the Korean conflict establish for the principle of collective security, and how should the UN balance the need for effective action with the rights of member states? Should the UN develop new mechanisms for rapid response to international aggression, and what role should regional organizations play in maintaining international peace?
5. How should the international community address the massive refugee crisis and civilian casualties resulting from the conflict?
6. How should the costs and risks of the Korean intervention be distributed among UN member states, and what obligations do members have to contribute to collective security operations? How does the Korean conflict affect existing alliance structures, particularly NATO and bilateral defense agreements?

IV.

TOPIC B: The Suez Crisis (1956) — The Decline of Colonial Powers and Cold War Tensions

INTRODUCTION

The Suez Crisis of 1956 represents one of the most significant defining point in post-World War II international relations, marking the definitive end of the European colonial era and the emergence of the United States and Soviet Union as the dominant global powers. The crisis emerged from the complex intersection of Arab nationalism, Cold War competition, European imperial ambitions, and the Arab-Israeli conflict, creating a perfect storm that would fundamentally reshape the Middle East and the broader international system.



The crisis's significance extends far beyond the immediate military conflict over the Suez Canal. It represented the last major attempt by European colonial powers to act independently of their Cold War superpower patrons, resulting in a humiliating defeat that

permanently altered the balance of power in international relations. The crisis demonstrated that the age of European global dominance had definitively ended, while simultaneously establishing the United States and Soviet Union as the arbiters of international conflicts.

The Suez Crisis also marked a crucial turning point in the development of the Third World non-aligned movement, with Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser emerging as a symbol of successful resistance to Western imperialism. The crisis contributed to the acceleration of decolonization worldwide, as colonial powers recognized their inability to maintain their empires in the face of superpower opposition and rising nationalism.

Furthermore, the crisis had profound implications for the Atlantic Alliance, creating the most serious rift between the United States and its European allies since the formation of NATO.

The American decision to oppose its closest allies during the height of the Cold War demonstrated the limits of alliance solidarity when national interests diverged, while also establishing American hegemony within the Western alliance system.



The crisis's impact on the United Nations was equally significant, as it marked the first deployment of UN peacekeeping forces and established important precedents for international intervention in conflicts. The crisis also highlighted the challenges facing the UN when permanent Security Council members were directly involved in conflicts, leading to innovations in

UN procedures and the development of new mechanisms for international peacekeeping.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Suez Canal had been the lifeline of European imperial commerce since its completion in 1869, representing the shortest maritime route between Europe and Asia and serving as the critical link between Britain and its Indian Empire. The canal was constructed by the Suez Canal Company, a joint British-French enterprise that operated under a concession from the Ottoman Empire and later the Egyptian government. British control over the canal was formalized in 1882 when Britain established a protectorate over Egypt, ostensibly to protect European investments but actually to secure British imperial communications.



The strategic importance of the Suez Canal was demonstrated repeatedly throughout the first half of the twentieth century. During World War I, the canal served as a crucial supply route for the British Empire, while during World War II, control of the canal was essential to maintaining

Allied communications with the Middle East and Asia. The canal's importance only increased after the war, as it became the primary route for Middle Eastern oil exports to Europe, making it essential to European economic recovery and security.

The Egyptian Revolution of 1952 fundamentally altered the political landscape of the Middle East, bringing to power a group of young army officers led by Gamal Abdel Nasser who were committed to ending British influence in Egypt and establishing Egypt as the leader of the Arab world. The Free Officers movement that overthrew King Farouk was motivated by a combination of nationalist sentiment, social reform objectives, and determination to restore Egyptian dignity after the humiliating defeat in the 1948 Arab-Israeli War.

Nasser's rise to power represented a new type of Third World leadership that would become characteristic of the decolonization era. His philosophy of Arab socialism combined elements of nationalism, socialism, and pan-Arabism, creating an ideology that appealed to Arabs throughout the Middle East and beyond.

The process of negotiating British withdrawal from Egypt proved to be lengthy and contentious, reflecting the broader challenges of decolonization throughout the British Empire. **The Anglo-Egyptian Agreement of 1954** provided for the withdrawal of British forces from the Suez Canal Zone within twenty months, ending 72 years of British military presence in Egypt.

However, the agreement also contained provisions for the reactivation of the base in case of attack on Arab states or Turkey, creating ambiguity about the extent of British withdrawal.

The Cold War dimension of Middle Eastern politics became increasingly important as both the United States and Soviet Union sought to extend their influence in the region. The formation of the Baghdad Pact in 1955, linking Britain, Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan in a pro-Western alliance, was viewed by Nasser as an attempt to maintain Western control over the Middle East through new mechanisms. Nasser's decision to pursue a policy of non-alignment, accepting aid from both East and West while maintaining Egyptian independence, represented a direct challenge to Western attempts to incorporate the Middle East into the Cold War alliance system.



The arms deal between Egypt and Czechoslovakia in September 1955 marked a crucial turning point in Cold War competition in the Middle East. The deal, which provided Egypt with modern military equipment including tanks, aircraft, and naval vessels, was negotiated through Czechoslovakia but was actually a Soviet initiative designed to challenge Western influence in the region. The arms deal demonstrated that Third World nations

could play the superpowers against each other to achieve their objectives, while also raising Western concerns about Soviet penetration of the Middle East.

The Aswan High Dam project became a symbol of Egyptian aspirations for modernization and development, as well as a focal point for Cold War competition. The dam, designed to control flooding, provide electricity, and increase agricultural production, was essential to Nasser's plans for Egyptian economic development.

Initial Western support for the project, including offers of financing from the United States, Britain, and the World Bank, reflected recognition of the dam's importance to Egyptian stability and Western interests in preventing Soviet influence.

However, the deterioration of Egyptian-Western relations throughout 1955 and 1956 gradually undermined support for the dam project. Nasser's criticism of Western policies, his recognition of Communist China, his support for Algerian independence, and his arms deals with the Soviet bloc all contributed to growing Western suspicion of Egyptian intentions.

The withdrawal of Western support for the Aswan Dam project in July 1956 represented a calculated attempt to pressure Nasser into aligning with the West, but instead provided the immediate catalyst for the nationalization of the Suez Canal.

CURRENT SITUATION (as of November 1956)

The international community faces an unprecedented crisis as three UN member states: Britain, France, and Israel have launched coordinated military operations against Egypt in clear violation of the UN Charter. The crisis began on October 29, 1956, when Israeli forces launched Operation Kadesh, a comprehensive military campaign aimed at destroying Egyptian military positions in the Sinai Peninsula and eliminating the fedayeen bases that had been launching attacks against Israeli settlements.

The Israeli operation, while presented as a response to Egyptian aggression, was actually the first phase of a carefully coordinated plan developed in secret negotiations between Israeli, British, and French leaders. The Protocol of Sèvres, signed on October 24, 1956, outlined a complex scenario whereby Israeli attacks would provide the pretext for Anglo-French intervention to “protect” the Suez Canal and separate the combatants.



Following the predetermined script, Britain and France issued an ultimatum on October 30, demanding that both Israeli and Egyptian forces withdraw ten miles from the Suez Canal and accept the temporary occupation of key positions along the canal by Anglo-French forces. The ultimatum was designed to be acceptable to Israel, whose forces were still advancing toward the canal, but unacceptable to Egypt, whose territory was being invaded.

When Egypt predictably rejected the ultimatum, British and French forces launched **Operation Musketeer** on October 31, beginning with airstrikes against Egyptian airfields and military installations. The bombing campaign, which continued for several days, destroyed much of the Egyptian air force and caused significant civilian casualties.

The operation represented the largest military undertaking by European powers since World War II and demonstrated the continued capability of European nations to project military power globally.

The international response to the crisis has been immediate and overwhelmingly negative. The United States, which had been kept uninformed of the operation by its allies, condemned the action in the strongest terms and demanded immediate withdrawal of all invading forces. President Eisenhower’s decision to oppose his closest allies during the height of the Cold War has created the most serious crisis in the Atlantic Alliance since its formation.

The Soviet Union, simultaneously dealing with the Hungarian Revolution, has exploited the crisis to deflect attention from its own actions in Eastern Europe while positioning itself as the defender of Third World independence. Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin's threats of military intervention, including hints about the use of nuclear weapons, have raised the spectre of superpower confrontation and potential world war.



The United Nations has faced its greatest test since the Korean War, with the Security Council paralyzed by British and French vetoes of resolutions calling for withdrawal. The crisis has led to the first use of the "Uniting for Peace" procedure, transferring the

matter to the General Assembly where no vetoes are possible. The General Assembly has passed overwhelming resolutions condemning the invasion and demanding immediate withdrawal, but the effectiveness of these measures remains to be seen.

The military situation continues to evolve rapidly. Israeli forces have achieved most of their objectives in the Sinai Peninsula, capturing the Gaza Strip and advancing toward the Suez Canal. British and French forces are preparing for bicameral landings at Port Said and Port Fuad, despite international opposition and logistical challenges. Egyptian forces, while suffering heavy casualties, are maintaining resistance and have blocked the Suez Canal by sinking ships in the waterway.

The economic implications of the crisis are becoming increasingly apparent. The closure of the Suez Canal has disrupted global shipping routes, while the sabotage of oil pipelines in Syria has reduced petroleum supplies to Europe. The pound sterling has come under intense pressure on international markets, forcing the British government to consider emergency measures to prevent a currency crisis.

APPROACH AND EXPECTATIONS FOR DEBATE

The Suez Crisis represents an important moment where traditional colonial powers faced emerging post-colonial nations. Revolutionary debate will explore how this crisis fundamentally reshaped international power dynamics, requiring delegates to navigate the collapse of old world orders while building new ones.



My Expected Revolutionary Elements:

- Exploration of economic sanctions as alternatives to military force.
- Creative solutions for international waterway governance.
- Alliance destruction and superpower manipulation.
- Examination of how Cold War competition could be channeled constructively.
- Competitive decolonization and veto power democratization.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How should the international community respond to the flagrant violation of the UN Charter by three member states, and what precedents does this crisis establish for future international interventions?
2. What are the implications of the crisis for the principle of national sovereignty and the prohibition on the use of force in international relations?
3. What does the paralysis of the Security Council due to permanent member vetoes reveal about the effectiveness of the UN collective security system?
4. How does the Suez Crisis affect the broader Cold War competition between the United States and Soviet Union, and what are the implications for alliance solidarity when national interests diverge?
5. How should the international community balance support for decolonization with concerns about regional stability and the rights of established powers?
6. How should the international community respond to the use of economic weapons, such as the closure of the Suez Canal and oil embargoes, in international conflicts? What are the implications of economic interdependence for international security and the ability of small states to resist great power pressure?
7. How should the international community respond to Soviet threats of nuclear intervention, and what are the implications for nuclear non-proliferation and the prevention of nuclear war?

V. POSITIONS

Permanent Members (P5):

1. **United States** - Leader of UN forces in Korea; opposed Britain/France in Suez.
2. **Soviet Union** - Boycotted UN during Korean War; supported Egypt in Suez.
3. **United Kingdom** - Major UN contributor in Korea; military aggressor in Suez.
4. **France** - UN forces participant in Korea; military aggressor in Suez.
5. **China** - Major combatant supporting North Korea; neutral in Suez.

Topic-Specific Key Players:

1. **North Korea** - Primary aggressor in Topic A only.
2. **South Korea** - Primary victim in Topic A only.
3. **Egypt** - Canal nationalizer in Topic B only.
4. **Israel** - Military participant in Topic B only.

Regional Representative:

Philippines - UN forces contributor in Korea; developing nation perspective.

Major powers:

1. **India** - Non-aligned leader; mediator in both conflicts.
2. **Canada** - UN forces contributor in Korea; peacekeeping architect in Suez.
3. **Australia** - Major UN forces contributor in Korea; Commonwealth ally in Suez.
4. **Turkey** - UN forces participant in Korea; NATO ally concerned about Suez.
5. **Brazil** - UN Security Council member; Support Egypt's rights to nationalize the canal.
6. **Netherlands** - UN forces contributor in Korea; Officially opposed Anglo-French military action while supporting Egypt's nationalization rights.
7. **Belgium** - UN forces participant in Korea; European colonial power.
8. **Norway** - UN member; Scandinavian perspective on both crises.
9. **Sweden** - Neutral mediator; peacekeeping contributor.

VI. GLOSSARY

TOPIC A:

- 38th Parallel:** Border dividing North and South Korea.
- Armistice:** Ceasefire agreement ending active fighting (1953).
- DPRK:** Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea).
- **ROK:** Republic of Korea (South Korea).
- UNC:** United Nations Command coordinating international response.
- Proxy War:** Conflict where superpowers support opposing sides indirectly.
- Cold War:** The period of geopolitical tension between the United States and Soviet Union and their respective allies from 1945 to 1991.
- Collective Security:** The principle that an attack on one member of an international organization is considered an attack on all members.
- Demilitarized Zone (DMZ):** A heavily militarized strip of land running across the Korean Peninsula near the 38th parallel north. The demilitarized zone (DMZ) is a border barrier that divides the peninsula roughly in half.

TOPIC B:

- Canal Zone:** The area surrounding the Suez Canal, previously under British military control and administration.
- Collective Security:** The principle of international cooperation to maintain peace and security through multilateral action.
- Eisenhower Doctrine:** U.S. policy promising military and economic aid to Middle Eastern countries resisting communist aggression.
- Nationalization:** 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.
- Non-Aligned Movement:** Countries that chose not to align with either NATO or the Warsaw Pact during the Cold War.
- Operation Musketeer:** The Anglo-French military operation to retake the Suez Canal from Egypt.
- Pan-Arabism:** Political ideology advocating for the unity of Arab peoples and states.
- Suez Canal:** Strategic waterway connecting the Mediterranean and Red Seas, crucial for international shipping.

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Office of the Historian. “Note on Sources - Korean War.” U.S. Department of State,
<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1950v07/sources>

Joint Chiefs of Staff. “Volume III, 1950-1951 The Korean War, Part One.” U.S. Department of Defense,
https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/History/Policy/Policy_V003_P001.pdf

Truman Presidential Library. “The Korean War and Its Origins.” Harry S. Truman Presidential Library,
<https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/online-collections/korean-war-and-its-origins>

Eisenhower Presidential Library. “Korean War.” National Archives and Records Administration, <https://www.eisenhowerlibrary.gov/research/online-documents/korean-war>

Britannica. “Korean War | Dates, Countries, Summary, Map, Casualties, & Facts.” Encyclopædia Britannica, May 4, 1999, <https://www.britannica.com/event/Korean-War>

Imperial War Museum. “A Short History Of The Korean War - The Cold War.” IWM, <https://www.iwm.org.uk/history/a-short-history-of-the-korean-war>

Boston College Libraries. “Korean Studies Primary Sources.” Boston College Research Guides, <https://libguides.bc.edu/koreanstudies/primarysources>

Sam Houston State University. “Korean War - U.S. History: Primary Source Collections Online.” Research Guides, <https://shsulibraryguides.org/c.php?g=86715&p=558995>

Office of the Historian. “United States Diplomacy and the Sinai and Suez Campaigns, October 29–November 6, 1956.” U.S. Department of State,
<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1955-57v16/comp1>

National Security Agency. “The Suez Crisis: A Brief Coming History.” NSA Declassified Documents,
https://www.nsa.gov/portals/75/documents/news-features/declassified-documents/cryptologic-histories/Suez_Crisis.pdf

U.S. Department of State. “Suez Crisis, 1956.” Office of the Historian,
<https://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/lw/97179.htm>

Oxford Academic. "Suez 1956: The Crisis and its Consequences." Oxford University Press, February 21, 1991, <https://academic.oup.com/book/10548>

Oxford Academic. "Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives on the Crisis and its Aftermath." The English Historical Review, April 1, 2010, <https://academic.oup.com/ehr/article-abstract/CXXV/513/497/525450>

University of Michigan Press. "The 1956 Suez Crisis." Academic Publications, <https://www.press.umich.edu/pdf/0472108670-06.pdf>

Boston University Law Review. "The Suez Crisis of 1956 and Its Aftermath: A Comparative Study of Constitutions, Use of Force, Diplomacy and International Relations." BU Law Faculty Scholarship, https://scholarship.law.bu.edu/faculty_scholarship/200/

Taylor & Francis Online. "The Suez Crisis of 1956 as a moment of transnational humanitarian engagement." Journal of Transatlantic Studies, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13507486.2015.1121970>

Academia.edu. "Suez 1956 The Crisis and Its Consequences." Academic Research Platform, May 6, 2018, https://www.academia.edu/36573011/Suez_1956_The_Crisis_and_Its_Consequences