



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Aalborg Universitet

Revisiting the first United Nations peacekeeping intervention in Egypt and the Gaza Strip, 1956-1967

a case of imperial multilateralism?

Jørgensen, Martin Ottovay

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
[10.5278/vbn.phd.socsci.00047](https://doi.org/10.5278/vbn.phd.socsci.00047)

Publication date:
2016

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Jørgensen, M. O. (2016). *Revisiting the first United Nations peacekeeping intervention in Egypt and the Gaza Strip, 1956-1967: a case of imperial multilateralism?* Aalborg Universitetsforlag.
<https://doi.org/10.5278/vbn.phd.socsci.00047>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**REVISITING THE FIRST UNITED
NATIONS PEACEKEEPING INTERVENTION
IN EGYPT AND THE GAZA STRIP, 1956-1967:
A CASE OF IMPERIAL MULTILATERALISM?**

**BY
MARTIN OTTOVAY JØRGENSEN**

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED 2016



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

**REVISITING THE FIRST UNITED
NATIONS PEACEKEEPING
INTERVENTION IN EGYPT AND THE
GAZA STRIP, 1956-1967: A CASE OF
IMPERIAL MULTILATERALISM?**

by

Martin Ottovay Jørgensen



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Dissertation submitted 26.05.2016

Dissertation submitted: 26.05.2016

PhD supervisor: Associate Professor Marianne Rostgaard,
Aalborg University

PhD supervisor: Professor Eric Vanhaute,
Ghent University

PhD committee: Professor Mogens Rüdiger (chairman)
Aalborg University

Associate Professor Berber Bevernage
Ghent University

Research Professor, Jane Parpart
University of Massachusetts Boston

PhD Series: Faculty of Social Sciences, Aalborg University

ISSN (online): 2246-1256
ISBN (online): 978-87-7112-713-3

Published by:
Aalborg University Press
Skjernvej 4A, 2nd floor
DK – 9220 Aalborg Ø
Phone: +45 99407140
aauf@forlag.aau.dk
forlag.aau.dk

© Copyright: Martin Ottovay Jørgensen

Printed in Denmark by Rosendahls, 2016

Standard pages: 394,6 pages (2,400 characters incl. spaces).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY IN ENGLISH.....	7
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY IN DANISH.....	9
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	11
INTRODUCTION.....	13
In Short.....	13
State of the Art on International Interventions	14
The Challenges of the Field.....	21
The Aims and the Main Research Questions.....	26
CHAPTER 1: THEORISING IMPERIALISM AND INTERNATIONAL INTERVENTIONS.....	29
Empires and the Modalities of Imperialism: Anchoring Cunliffe's 'Imperial Multilateralism' in Imperial Historiography.....	29
Systems, Networks, Agency and Places: Anchoring Cunliffe's 'Imperial Multilateralism' in Imperial Frontier Studies	37
Spatializing and Networking the 'Mission Areas' of International Interventions as 'Frontier Zones of Imperial Multilateralism'	42
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY.....	47
Why (only) UNSCO and UNEF?	47
Research On UNEF and UNCSO: The Building, institutionalisation and Internationalisation of the Myth of Imperial Multilateralism	50
My Working Questions and the Dissertation Structure	60
On Records and Research	62
PART 1: THE MAKING OF 'IMPERIAL MULTILATERALISM' AND ITS FRONTIER IN THE MEDITERRANEAN AND THE MIDDLE EAST	67
CHAPTER 3: FROM 'NATIONAL' EMPIRES TO 'IMPERIAL MULTILATERALISM': THE ROOTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS.....	69
'Multinational imperialism', 1900-1918: An Ad Hoc Expansion	69
'Multinational Imperialism', 1918-1941: Towards 'Imperial Multilateralism'	74
The First Act: The United Nations Military Alliance, 1942-1945.....	81
The Second Act: The UN, 1945-1956.....	87
CHAPTER 4: BUILDING THE FRONTIER OF IMPERIAL MULTILATERALISM IN THE MEDITERRANEAN AND THE MIDDLE EAST, 1880-1955	95
The Mediterranean and in Middle East in the 19th and early 20th Centuries: The Piecemeal Expansion of the Frontier of European Multinational Imperialism	96
The Failure to Institutionalise European Multinational Imperialism in the Mediterranean, 1918-1942.....	99
The Ad Hoc Building of the Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, 1942-1950	104
A Troubled Expansion: The Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, 1950-1955	109
CHAPTER 5: INCORPORATING EGYPT AND THE GAZA STRIP IN THE FRONTIER OF IMPERIAL MULTILATERALISM VIA THE 'SUEZ CRISIS' AND THE UN INTERVENTION(S).....	119

Overstating the Cold War Binary in Frontier-building: The American and British withdrawal of Finances for the Aswan Dam and the Egyptian Response, 1953-1956	120
Washington Versus London/Paris/Tel Aviv: The Near Implosion of the Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, 1956.....	124
Repairing the frontier of Imperial Multilateralism - I: The Sixth Fleet and Economic Diplomacy.....	132
Repairing the Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism - II: The UN	137
SUMMARY OF PART 1: THE MAKING OF 'IMPERIAL MULTILATERALISM' AND ITS FRONTIER IN THE MEDITERRANEAN AND THE MIDDLE EAST	145
PART 2: NEGOTIATING AUTHORITY AND LIFE IN A FRONTIER ZONE OF WESTERN IMPERIAL MULTILATERALISM	151
CHAPTER 6: FORMING UNEF AND UNSCO IN EGYPT, 1956	153
Building UNEF in Naples: 'Dotting the Map' and 'Connecting the Dots' of the Web of Imperial Multilateralism	154
Bringing UNEF to Abu Sueir: The First Step in Building the Frontier Zone	160
Bringing UNEF to Port Said: Expanding the Frontier Zone on the Back of NATO	165
London, Paris, Tel Aviv and More 'Dots in the Web': Expanding the UN Force	170
The Clearing of the Suez Canal: UNSCO and The Re-establishment of the Western Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism	177
CHAPTER 7: RE-ESTABLISHING THE SUEZ OIL ARTERY, MISSION CREEP IN THE GAZA STRIP: MISSION CREEP AND UN-ISRAELI RELATIONS	187
Redeploying through the Sinai Peninsula: Expanding the Frontier Zone	188
What of the Gaza Strip? Mission Creep as a Condition to re-open the Canal.....	194
Riots and Redeployment in the Frontier Zone: A Failed Internationalisation?	200
Becoming a Frontier-Regime: 'Connecting Dots across Time and Space at the ADL.....	207
The Relationships between UNEF and Israel, the IDF and the Israeli Settlers, 1957-1967.....	214
CHAPTER 8: POSTCOLONIALITY? THE UN AND THE MILITARISATION OF LIFE IN THE FRONTIER ZONE OF IMPERIAL MULTILATERALISM, 1957-1967	223
As Before (I)? Land Ownership and Usage as a Prism to understand the Negotiation of the UN Regime in the Gaza Strip	224
As Before (II)? Security and Insecurity as a Prism to understand the Negotiation of the UN Regime in the Gaza Strip	233
As Before (III)? Labour and Economic Relations as a Prism to understand the Negotiation of the UN Regime	246
SUMMARY OF PART 2: NEGOTIATING LIFE AND AUTHORITY IN A FRONTIER ZONE OF IMPERIAL MULTILATERALISM ...	255
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	257
The Challenges of the Research Context, the Aims and the Research Questions	257
My Findings: On The 'Frontier Zone of Imperial Multilateralism' (Part 2)	259
My Findings: On the 'Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism' (Part 1).....	261
What do my Research Findings contribute to the Research Field on International Interventions?	264
Some Thoughts on Myth-busting and Levelling the Playing Field Between Otherwise Loud Old 'white' Men, Noisy Soldiers, Audible Brown Men, and Inaudible Brown Children and Women	265
ARCHIVES.....	269
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	271

List of Abbreviations

ADL: Armistice Demarcation Line
 AIOC: Anglo-Iranian Oil Company
 ANZUS: Australia, New Zealand, United States Security Treaty
 AOETA: Allied Occupied Enemy Territory Administration
 ARAMCO: Arabian American Oil Company
 AU: African Union
 BIOC: British-Iranian Oil Company
 CAF: Central African Federation
 CIA: Central Intelligence Agency
 CMC: Collective Measures Committee
 CTO: Central Treaty Organization
 DNBA: Danish National Business Archives
 DANOR: Danish-Norwegian Battalion
 DOD: Department of Defense
 ECA: Economic Cooperation Administration
 EIMAC: Egyptian-Israeli Military Armistice Commission
 EURATOM:
 FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization
 FATU: Federation of Arab Trade Unions
 FBI: Federal Bureau of Investigations
 FF: Ford Foundation
 FPSC: Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee
 FRUS: Foreign Relations of the United Nations
 GNP: Gross National Product
 IIAA: Institute of Inter-American Affairs
 IBRD: International Bank of Reconstruction and Development
 ICS: International Chamber of Shipping
 IDF: Israeli Defense Forces
 IMF: International Monetary Fund
 IPA: International Peace Academy
 INGO: International Non-Governmental Organization
 JCS: Joint Chiefs of Staff
 JSGMF: John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation
 LON: League of Nations
 MEDO: Middle East Defense Organization
 MEEC: Middle East Emergency Committee
 MESOC: Middle East Supply Center
 MIT: Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 MSP: Mutual Security Programme
 NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization
 NGO: Non-Governmental Organization

OAU: Organization of African Unity
 OEEC: Organisation for European Economic Co-operation
 OELAC: Oil Emergency London Advisory Committee
 OSS: Office of Strategic Services
 PAWS: Palestine Arab Workers Society
 PIEG: Petroleum Industry Emergency Group
 PLA: Palestinian Liberation Army
 RF: Rockefeller Foundation
 SCC: Suez Canal Company
 SCUA: Suez Canal User Association
 SEATO: South East Asia Treaty Organisation
 UAR: United Arab Republic
 UK: United Kingdom
 UN: United Nations
 UNA: United Nations Archive
 UNAA: United Nations Association of America
 UNC: United Nations Command
 UNDP: United Nations Division of Population
 UNDP: United Nations Development Programme
 UNEF: United Nations Emergency Force
 UNEFCA: United Nations Emergency Force Advisory Committee
 UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
 UNFED: United Nations Fund for Economic Development
 UNFS: United Nations Field Service
 UNGA: United Nations General Assembly
 UNOSPA: UN Office of Special Political Affairs
 UNPC: United Nations Palestine Commission
 UNRRA: United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration
 UNRWA: United Nations Relief and Works Agency
 UNTSO: United Nations Truce Supervision Organization
 UNSC: United Nations Security Council
 UNSCO: United Nations Suez Clearance Organization
 USCOP: United Nations Special Committee On Palestine
 UNTAP: United Nations Technical Assistance Program
 US: United States of America
 USAF: United States Air Force
 USMI: US Maritime Institute
 USN: United States Navy
 USNSC: US National Security Council
 USSAS: United States Strategic Air Service
 USSR: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
 WB: World Bank
 WEU: Western European Union

Executive Summary in English

For several centuries, imperial and global historians have shown, the world was dominated by dynastic and tributary empires until bureaucratically-organized and market-oriented imperial formations came to dominate from the mid-1800s. Increasingly, scholars within the research fields of international history, international relations and development studies recognize that this global imperial system has influenced deeply the structural logics, ways of organising and practices of the United Nations regime, which emerged in and after the Second World War.

However, this is far from the case within the research field on UN peacekeeping that is dominated by primarily contemporary oriented social science disciplines. Only a handful of scholars, here set as the ‘imperial segment’, see the interventions—that install externalising and unaccountable systems of governance in former colonies at a growing speed—and the international system they are part of, as imperial in nature. Despite their contributions, most peacekeeping scholars link the mounting problems of the interventions and their state-building components in the ‘mission areas’ post-Cold War Western hegemony and the associated rise of neoliberalism.

In the context of an expanding interventionist international regime and research concerned mainly with the synchronic aspects thereof, the dissertation seeks to realise two aims. First, it seeks to advance interdisciplinary dialogue by linking the research on UN peacekeeping from the social sciences with imperial historiography, in other words by adding a diachronic dimension. Secondly, it seeks to build a theoretical framework and provide a two-part analysis of the first UN intervention in Egypt and the Gaza Strip from 1956 to 1967 to ground a new ‘peacekeeping’ narrative.

Taking as its point of departure scholar of international relations Philip Cunliffe’s concepts of ‘multinational imperialism’ and ‘imperial multilateralism’, the theoretical framework joins these with the systemically oriented imperial historiography on the one hand and the network-, space- and people-centred imperial frontier studies on the other. Thus both historicising the interventions and the international system and creating linkage between what is conventionally seen as ‘global’ geopolitics and ‘local’ everyday life, the theoretical framework insists that the international political and military systems of governance the interventions embody are not unchangeable global structures but simultaneously local and global human practices that can be understood, problematized, challenged and subsequently transformed.

Taking a predominantly systemic view on the basis of not only but especially imperial and international historiography, the first part of the analysis examines initially how the history of the UN paradigm needs to be understood in extension of the shift in the imperial system from only imperial competition to imperial competition *and* inter-imperial cooperation in the late 19th century. It then turns to show how this changing frontier system manifested in the Mediterranean and Middle East, the region that would host the first United Nations peacekeeping operation in late 1956. Lastly, the first part examines how the increasing regional competition engendered by the shifting British, American and Soviet imperial frontiers created a

situation—the joint British, French and Israeli invasion of Egypt—that led to the making of the UN intervention. In contrast to most scholarship, the dissertation suggests that the intervention was not only set up as a means to avoid a (world) war with the Soviet Union and renewed fighting between Israel and Egypt, but also represented one of several Western multilateral initiatives aimed at reopening and stabilising the oil deliveries to the increasingly anxious Western European members of NATO following the closing of the Suez Canal.

Shifting to linking geopolitics and everyday life on the basis of research literature, published sources and hitherto mostly unused UN records, the second part of the analysis shows initially how—on the one hand—the UN force was built using mainly NATO military infrastructure and Western or Western-trained forces which led to conflicts with the Egyptians ‘on the ground’ during the UN force ‘escorting’ the French and British forces out, and—on the other—the canal clearance was done with nearly only Western companies and paid for only by Western canal users. It then turns to examine how the UN had to deploy the force into the Gaza Strip to ensure the withdrawal of the Israeli occupation forces for Egypt to allow the Suez Canal to reopen. In turn, this led to confrontations with the Gaza Strip residents, which forced the UN to both abandon the emerging idea of a joint UN-Egyptian administration and change the UN area of operations from the entire Gaza Strip and to only near the Armistice Demarcation Line. Again in contrast to most scholarship, the dissertation argues that the UN force in this way came to favour Israeli to Palestinians security. Finally, the second part examines the diverse relations between the UN units and the Palestinians of the Gaza Strip, native residents and refugees alike, and Bedouin, confined by both Israel and Egypt, both near the ADL and inside the Gaza Strip, suggesting that the UN intervention resembled the British Mandate regime and that its ways of engendering ‘security’ similarly often translated into ‘local’ experiences of ‘insecurity’.

At a time when the West is funding the UN (and other ‘security’ organisations) to launch more interventions with forces mostly from former colonies and install more externalising and unaccountable systems of governance in other former colonies, the dissertation’s theoretical framework and critical re-examination of the first UN intervention offer a fundamentally different point of departure for understanding ‘peacekeeping’. In doing so, it both suggests that the research field of imperial history offers timely, if not crucial, theoretical and methodological tools to understand, problematize and contest the interventions and state-building projects, and calls for scholars to consider both their research context and work.

Executive Summary in Danish

Imperial- og globalhistorikere har med deres forskning vist, at dynastiske og tributære imperier i flere hundrede år dominerede verden indtil bureaukratisk organiserede og markedsorienterede imperiale formationer blev dominerende fra omkring midten af 1800-tallet. Indenfor forskningsfeltene international historie, internationale relationer og udviklingsstudier har forskere i stigende grad anerkendt, at dette globale imperiale system kraftigt har påvirket de strukturelle logikker, organisationsformerne og praksisserne i de internationale organisationer der hører under FN og som opstod under og efter Anden Verdenskrig.

Dette er imidlertid ikke tilfældet indenfor forskningen i FN's fredsbevarende operationer, der domineres af de primært samtidsorienterede samfundsvidenskaber. Kun en håndfuld af forskere, her samlet og betegnet som det "imperiale segment", ser interventionerne – der med stigende hastighed opretter eksterne styreformer, der ikke kan drages til ansvar, i de tidligere kolonier – og det internationale system, de er en del af, som imperiale. På trods af disse forskeres bidrag, har deres tanker tilsyneladende ikke vundet bred opbakning. Dette har bevirket, at de fleste forskere, der arbejder med fredsbevarende operationer, udelukkende kæder de voksende problemer, der erkendes i forbindelse med interventionerne, og deres "state-building" i "missionsområderne", sammen med neoliberalismens udbredelse.

Set i lyset af et sådant ekspanderende regime af interventioner i tidligere kolonier samt forskningen, der overvejende behandler de synkroniske aspekter heraf, søger denne afhandling at opnå to mål. For det første søger den at fremme en tværfaglig dialog ved at forbinde den samfundsvidenskabelige forskning i FN's interventioner med historieforskningen i inter-imperiale sikkerhedssamarbejde, eller med andre ord, at tilføje en diakronisk dimension. For det andet søger afhandlingen, at opbygge en teoretisk ramme og på baggrund af denne at fremsætte en analyse af den første FN-intervention i Egypten og i Gaza-Striben fra 1956 til 1967, der kan danne grundlag for en ny fortælling om FNs "fredsbevarende" operationer.

Med udgangspunkt i forskeren Philip Cunliffes begreber om "*multinational imperialism*" og "*imperial multilateralism*", forbinder den teoretiske ramme den systemisk-orienterede imperiale historieforskning med det mere netværks-, steds- og menneske-centrerede historieforskningen "*imperial frontier studies*". Ved således både at historisere interventionerne og det internationale system samt at skabe en forbindelse imellem, hvad der konventionelt ses som "global" geopolitik og "lokal" hverdagsliv, fastholder den teoretiske ramme, at de internationale politiske og militære systemer og styreformer, som interventionerne repræsenterer, ikke er uforanderlige globale strukturer men sideløbende lokale og globale praksisser som kan forstås, problematiseres, udfordres og efterfølgende ændres.

Analysen består af to dele. Igennem et systemisk blik hovedsageligt på baggrund af imperial og international historieforskning undersøger den første analysedel hvordan FN paradigets historie bør forstås i forlængelse af udviklingen i det imperiale system i slutningen af det 19. århundrede, der betød et skifte fra alene et

system styret af imperial konkurrence til imperial konkurrence og inter-imperialt samarbejde. Dernæst vises hvordan det imperiale systems ”frontiers” manifesterede sig i Middelhavsområdet og Mellemøsten, hvor den FNs første ’fredsbevarende’ operation blev igangsat i 1956. Afslutningsvist undersøges det hvordan den stigende regionale rivalisering mellem de britiske, amerikanske og sovjetiske imperiale ”frontiers”, skabte en situation – i form af den fælles britiske, franske og israelske invasion af Egypten – der førte til iværksættelsen af FN interventionen. Modsat størstedelen af forskningen med fokus på interventionen forslår afhandlingen, at FN-interventionen ikke kun fungerede som en måde hvorpå man kunne undgå en (verdens-) krig med Sovjetunionen og en ny krig mellem Israel og Ægypten, men også repræsenterede et af flere vestlige multilaterale initiativer, der havde til formål at genåbne og stabilisere olieleverancerne til de vesteuropæiske medlemmer af NATO, der blev stadigt mere urolige ift. deres olieforsyninger i kølvandet på lukningen af Suezkanalen.

Analysens anden del skifter fra vægte de systemiske og geopolitiske forhold til at vægte udviklingen ”på jorden” og hverdagslivet på baggrund af forskningslitteratur, publiceret kildemateriale og indtil nu mestendels ubenyttede FN arkivalier. Det afdækkes, at FN-styrken især blev opbygget på baggrund af NATOs militære infrastruktur og med vestlige eller vestligt trænede styrker, hvilket førte til konflikter med en række ægyptere under den del af operationen der skulle eskortere de franske og britiske styrker ud. Det vises også, at genåbningen af Suezkanalen næsten alene blev gennemført af vestlige virksomheder og ligeledes udelukkende blev finansieret af vestlige kanalbrugere. Herefter vises hvorledes FN blev nødsaget til at indsætte styrken i Gaza-Striben med henblik på at sikre de israelske besættelsesstyrkers tilbagemækning før Egypten ville genåbne kanalen. Indsættelsen af FN-styrken i landsbyerne og byerne i Gazastriben medførte konfrontationer, hvilket tvang FN-styrken ud til ”the Armistice Demarcations Line” (ADL), der adskilte Israel og Gaza-Striben. Igen i modsætning til størstedelen af forskningen argumenteres det således, at FN-styrken derved kom til at fungere som et ekstra lag grænsekontrol for Israel. Afslutningsvis vises igennem en analyse af relationerne imellem FN-enhederne og palæstinenserne og beduinerne, der var ’spærret inde’ i Gaza-Striben af både Israel og Egypten, både nær ADL’en og i selve Gaza-Striben, hvorledes interventionen på mange måder mindede om det britiske mandatregime og at dets ”sikkerhedsregime” også ofte kunne opleves af de ”lokale” som ”usikkerhed”.

På et tidspunkt hvor vesten betaler FN (og andre sikkerhedsorganisationer) for at lancere flere interventioner med styrker hovedsageligt fra tidligere kolonier for at oprette flere eksternaliserende regeringssystemer, der ikke kan drages til ansvar, i andre tidligere kolonier – tilbyder afhandlingens teoretiske ramme og kritiske undersøgelse af den første FN-intervention et fundamentalt anderledes udgangspunkt for at forstå FNs ”fredsbevarende” operationer. Ikke blot foreslås herved, at den imperialhistoriske forskning tilbyder rettidige, måske endog vitale, teoretiske og metodiske værktøjer til at forstå, problematisere og anfægte interventionerne og disses ”state-building” komponenter. Forskerne indenfor for forskningsfeltet opfordres også på denne baggrund til at reflektere over deres kontekst og forskning.

Acknowledgements

Written at the last minute, this section cannot fully express the depths of my gratitude for the care, support, feedback and healthy critique I have enjoyed and the debts I have accumulated over the course of this project. Nevertheless...

First, I would like to thank the Research Foundation - Flanders, the History Department at Ghent University and the Department of Culture and Global Studies at Aalborg University for making this project possible.

I would also like to thank the UN Archive for tolerating me for three months and granting me access to several hundreds of boxes of records and their very kind front desk clerical staff for their help in doing so. Thank you.

I would also like to thank my students at the History Programme at Aalborg University for listening to my premature ramblings on this topic (and others) and co-thinking my argument, even if not all realised that this was going on. Thank you.

I would also like to thank my fellow PhD-students, colleagues and friends in both Aalborg and Ghent (and Brussels) for good times in and out of the office(s), lively discussions, support in times of pressure, help on the journey of maturing into an adolescent scholar and much more. Alexander, Anne, Baz, Bas, Berber, Deborah, Emil, Eva, Gillian, Gisele, Giselle, Greet, Hanne, Henrik, Johan, Joris, Kenan, Lore, Lorena, Maren, Marianne, Pieter, Robrecht, Stephanie, Sven, Tessa and Tom. Thank you, Bedankt, Gracias and Obrigado. I will respond to emails again now.

Thanks also to my friends in Denmark, Belgium, England, France and the US: Troels and Berit, Lise and Bjarke, Benjamin and Marie, Katrine and Jesper, Benjamine and Franck, Natasha and Sasha, Claudia and Jennine, Heidi and Rasmus, Marcia and Yorqui, Brigita, Carla, Helbo, Daniel, Stuart, and the joint lot of 15, soon 16, lovely and promising little kiddos for keeping it real. Thank you, Merci, Bedankt, Tak, Köszönöm, Gracias, Danke, and Спасибо. I hope you still remember me.

Moreover, I have to mention and thank Vivian, our former secretary at the History Programme at Aalborg University, who passed away in late 2015, for her kindness and role in keeping me to the task at hand, whether that be my BA, MA or PhD, sending postcards or bringing home French and Belgian chocolate. You are missed.

Additionally, I would be remiss not thank my colleague Marianne who became both test subject and consultant towards the very end of the writing process. Thank you, you know where to find me soon enough.

Importantly, I want to thank my supervisors—Marianne, Eric and Dries in both Aalborg and Ghent—without whom this project would literally not have happened. I hope that I have done your efforts justice and will do so onwards. Thank you.

Moreover, I want to thank my parents and sister—Eva, Frede and Sofie—for giving me space, support, and not least dealing with a son and brother who turned into a right old grumpy git decades before time. I will paint the house soon. Thank you.

Finally, I want to thank Katy for finding me (again), non-marrying me (despite me being lost in the process of ‘eating the elephant’), being here and there, having English as your mother tongue, and your endless backing. My turn now. Thank you. 🐘

Introduction

“A peacekeeping force is like a family friend who has moved into the household stricken by disaster. It must conciliate, console, and discreetly run the household without ever appearing to dominate or usurp the natural rights of those it is helping”¹

Brian Urquhart (Former British military officer, UN Under-Secretary-General, and involved in several interventions)

In Short....

Global and imperial historiography have shown that a large portions of humankind lived under dynastic and multi-ethnic empires from 1400 to 1800s and what we label imperialism from the mid-19th century to the middle of the 20th century. Today, however, our schools and universities teach us— as our politicians and representatives of international organisations remind us—that we live in an international system comprised of nation states and international organisations that want nothing more than to eradicate poverty, save the planet and so forth. Would it not be odd, however, if the nation states, as both relatively new phenomenon in global history and the children of colonial empires and imperialism, influenced our international system more than the dynamics of empires and imperialism, which for several centuries dominated the history of our world?

With this dissertation, I seek to link this broader question of the links between the ‘imperial’ and the ‘international’ to the recent lines of concrete and critical enquiry in research on international military interventions (known as ‘peacekeeping’ operations). Scholars from a range of disciplines have taken to examine these issues from various perspectives. As of now, however, only few scholars studying international interventions have clarified what they exactly mean by ‘empire’ or

¹ B. Urquhart, *A Life in Peace and War*, New York, 1987, 248.

‘imperialism’.² The discussion has yet therefore to lead to radical new narratives that go beyond the scholarship itself. I consequently seek to expand the existing common ground to invite ‘mainstream’ scholars into the debate. To do so, the dissertation ‘imperialises’ the traditional narratives of the 20th century by way of a composite theoretical framework rooted in both imperial historiography and research on international interventions and an analysis of the first ‘peacekeeping’ intervention on basis of hitherto unused and unpublished sources.

This may seem a radical step. However, it is not. It is merely an invitation to take part in a long overdue contestation of the prevailing Western periodization of the 20th century in most research on international interventions. Periodization, American foreign policy historian Andrew Bacevich notes, obscures rather than clarifies.³ This has to do with how, historian of Asia Prasenjit Duara contends, “*Periods are shaped by structures emerging from centres of power that tend to dominate historical life. Like all hegemonic formations, such structures tend to channel and restrict the imagination of the social, the political, and selfhood (...)*.”⁴ However, the counter-narrative scholars tuned in on the ‘imperial’ already promote needs to be expanded into, rather than identity itself in opposition to, ‘mainstream’ research on international interventions.

State of the Art on International Interventions

To this day, students of political science and international relations still read the textbook narratives that have their roots in the 1940s. Typically, these place nation-states and the United Nations at the centre of a completely ‘new’ international system that facilitated the end of imperialism by 1960 by promoting peace, development, human rights, and democracy on the one hand and decolonisation as the end of imperialism on the other. For example, one textbook argues that, “*The demise of imperialism in the twentieth century was a fundamental change in world politics.*”⁵ Subsequently, most textbooks do not emphasise institutional continuities; try to historicise the emerging global hegemony of the US (and the Soviet contestation thereof) beyond the Cold War logic; gender and racialize the narrative of

² For more on this point, see Philip Cunliffe, “Still the Spectre at the Feast: Comparisons between Peacekeeping and Imperialism in Peacekeeping Studies Today,” *International Peacekeeping* 19, no. 4 (2012): 426–42.

³ Andrew J Bacevich, *The Long War: A New History of U.S. National Security Policy since World War II* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), XII.

⁴ Prasenjit Duara, “The Cold War as a Historical Period: An Interpretive Essay,” *Journal of Global History* 6, no. 3 (2011): 458.

⁵ John Baylis, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens, *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 95.

‘peacekeeping’; or challenge the end of the Cold War as another rupture.⁶ However, the influence of these narratives go beyond textbooks.

Within the multi-disciplinary research field on international interventions,⁷ many scholars view the interventions through the narratives’ rupture-oriented periodization with imperialism (1945/1960), decolonisation (1945-1960), and the end of the Cold War (1989). Consequently, many critical scholars see the growing problems of insecurity, gendered violence, economic failure, and aid dependency associated with neo-liberalism rather than outcomes of the international system’s deeper dynamics. Despite the mounting criticism of the early post-Cold War and current interventions, many scholars nevertheless still do not question the Cold War interventions, assuming these were simple and consensus-based ‘peacekeeping’ within a pluralist and all-new international framework working towards decolonisation.⁸ Following the interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, however, an upward number of scholars across a range of disciplines have unsurprisingly re-introduced the notions ‘imperial’ and ‘imperialism’ in the debate on the American interventions,⁹ the international interventions and the broader paradigm of governance these are part of. Countering Urquhart by putting the UN in the role of a ‘false friend’, the latter group of scholars is the one relevant here.

Far from uniform, the group of scholars that study international interventions and use an imperial vocabulary span several disciplines, analyse different interventions with different methodologies, and display various different attitudes towards the logic and execution of the interventions. For analytical purposes, the scholars can be seen as making up two loose clusters rather than two established ‘schools’. Scholars that explicitly or implicitly accept the narratives of decolonisation and Cold War

⁶ See for instance Robert H Jackson and Georg Sørensen, *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, 2013; Emilian Kavalski, *Encounters with World Affairs: An Introduction to International Relations*, 2015; Norrie MacQueen, *The United Nations since 1945: Peacekeeping and the Cold War* (Essex, U.K.; New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999); Norrie MacQueen, *Peacekeeping and The International System* (Milton Park, New York: Routledge, 2006); Jill Steans, Lloyd Pettiford, and Thomas Diez, *Introduction to International Relations: Perspectives and Themes* (Harlow, England; New York: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2005).

⁷ Research on international interventions now spans at least anthropology, cold war history, conflict studies, development studies, international history, international law, international relations, military history, military sociology, peace studies, security studies, strategic studies and war studies.

⁸ See for instance Paul Higate and Marsha. Henry, *Insecure Spaces: Peacekeeping, Power and Performance in Haiti, Kosovo and Liberia* (London; New York: Zed Books, 2009); Béatrice Pouligny, *Peace Operations Seen from below: UN Missions and Local People* (Bloomfield: Kumarian Press, 2006); Laura Zanotti, *Governing Disorder: UN Peace Operations, International Security, and Democratization in the Post-Cold War Era* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011).

⁹ See for instance Derek Gregory, *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, and Iraq* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004); Niall Ferguson, *Colossus: The Price of America’s Empire* (New York: Penguin Press, 2004); Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000).

peacekeeping, but find the post-Cold War interventions akin to different forms of imperialism make up the first cluster. Scholars that perceive the broader international system as imperial in nature and accordingly decolonisation as a mere shift and the interventions within that framework make up the second. I take the first cluster to consist of Austrian military historian Erwin Schmidl, Canadian historian turned international relations and human rights scholar Michael Ignatieff, American political scientist Kimberly Marten Zisk, British scholar of international relations David Chandler, and American anthropologist Robert Rubinstein. While all see the interventions launched after the Cold War as a new form of imperialism (Schmidl who focused on the Cold War interventions excluded), the attitudes towards the interventions differ vastly. Yet, common for this group is the hierarchical attention to states, institutions, policy-making, and modes of governance, rather than spaces and how people in everyday life negotiate the presence of the interventions.

Writing before the US interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, Austrian military historian Erwin Schmidl showed how the European interventions in the Mediterranean and Ottoman provinces in the 19th and 20th centuries reflected the waxing of the European imperial frontiers and the waning of the Ottoman Frontiers. While he tried to engage in the discussions of social science scholars, writing for social science journals addressing scholars of strategic, military and war studies as well as the international interventions, his important insights appear to have been overlooked either on account of his historicising approach being ‘too early’ or perhaps too nation-state-centric or his lack of connecting to the post-Cold War interventions.¹⁰

An example of a scholar adopting the prevailing narrative, Canadian historian turned human rights scholar Michael Ignatieff focused on the US-led interventions in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan, categorising them as manifestations of an ‘empire lite’ that has failed to deliver on its promises of democracy and progress.¹¹ However, he saw the execution rather than the goals in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan as flawed. In doing so, his work reflected not only the long-standing Canadian loyalty to the US,¹² but also a defence of the work of the pro-interventionist International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, where he worked.

Publishing soon after the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, American political scientist Zisk used some of the troubled post-Cold War interventions to argue that current interventions should find inspiration in the imperial interventions of Great Britain, France and the US to narrow their focus from state-building to security.¹³

¹⁰ Erwin A. Schmidl, “The Evolution of Peace Operations from the Nineteenth Century,” *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 10, no. 2 (1999): 4–20; Erwin A. Schmidl, “The International Operation in Albania, 1913–14,” *International Peacekeeping* 6, no. 3 (1999): 1–10.

¹¹ Michael Ignatieff, *Empire Lite: Nation Building in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan* (London: Vintage, 2003).

¹² See for instance Bruno Charbonneau and Wayne S. Cox, “Global Order, US Hegemony and Military Integration: The Canadian-American Defense Relationship,” *International Political Sociology* 2, no. 4 (2008): 305–21.

¹³ Kimberly Zisk Marten, *Enforcing the Peace: Learning from The Imperial Past* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).

However, schooled in ‘classic’ American political science (and its traditions of proximity to power, state-centrism, selective approach to and use of history, and distance to the ‘receiving ends’ of foreign policy),¹⁴ her use of imperial historiography left much to be desired. Indicative hereof, a fellow American political scientist subsequently diplomatically noted that she was (...) *generally stronger on the contemporary cases than the historical cases of imperialism.*¹⁵

Writing a few years later as part of a group of scholars challenging American intellectual hegemony within the discipline of international relations,¹⁶ British Chandler saw international interventions as new colonial framework far more intrusive of the nineteenth century empire creating “(...) ‘phantom states’ whose governing institutions may have extensive external resourcing but lack social or political legitimacy.”¹⁷ Explicitly stating that the emergence of western hegemony at the end of the Cold War replaced the ‘pluralist post-war framework of the United Nations’ overnight, however, Chandler seems to accept the narratives of the UN and decolonisation unequivocally.¹⁸

More recently, American anthropologist Robert Rubinstein have labelled the post-Cold War interventions as ‘the return of imperial policing’ due to the outward-oriented turn of the local systems of governance and economies, the merger of UN civilian and military objectives and the emergence of an intervention culture of violence. As Chandler, he also contrasted post-Cold War and Cold War interventions, seeing the latter as unproblematic expressions of a legitimate and consensus-based international system.¹⁹ As with Ignatieff, however, his work can also be read as a defence of his own pro-interventionist position permeating his applied work for the US Army Center for Strategic Leadership, the US Army Peacekeeping Institute, and the UN after the Cold War.²⁰

¹⁴ Lucian M. Ashworth, “Interdisciplinarity and International Relations,” *European Political Science* 8, no. 1 (2009): 16–25; J. M. Hobson and George Lawson, “What Is History in International Relations?,” *Millennium* 37, no. 2 (2008): 415–35; George Lawson, “The Eternal Divide? History and International Relations,” *European Journal of International Relations* 18, no. 2 (2012): 203–26; Ole Waever, “The Sociology of a Not so International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations.,” *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 687–727.

¹⁵ David M. Edelstein, “Enforcing the Peace: Learning from the Imperial Past.(Book Review),” *Political Science Quarterly* 120, no. 4 (2005): 680.

¹⁶ Ashworth, “Interdisciplinarity and International Relations”; Wayne S. Cox and Kim Richard Nossal, “The ‘Crimson World’: The Anglo Core, the Postimperial Non-Core and the Hegemony of American IR,” in *International Relations Scholarship around the World* (London: Routledge, 2009), 287–307.

¹⁷ David Chandler, *Empire in Denial: The Politics of State-Building* (London, Ann Arbor: Pluto Press, 2006), 8.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹⁹ Robert A. Rubinstein, *Peacekeeping under Fire: Culture and Intervention* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2008); Robert Rubinstein, “Peacekeeping and the Return of Imperial Policing,” *International Peacekeeping* 17, no. 4 (2010): 457–70.

²⁰ For more, see Rubinstein, *Peacekeeping under Fire*. The tradition of anthropology serving western geopolitical objectives has, if anything, been revived. Recently, American

As should be clear, research in international interventions, and applied research especially, does not take place in powerless vacuum: disciplinary legacies, national historical narratives, and the international situation matter. To recap, these scholars (aside Schmidl who did not address contemporary interventions) had no illusions on the current interventions (although their attitudes differed markedly). They did lack, however, a deeper historical understanding of how the emerging international system before the Second World War and the American expansion during and after the war, which led to the formation of the UN, re-actualised colonial and imperial practices.

I see the second cluster consisting of Canadian historian turned sociologist Serene Razack, British scholar of development studies Mark Duffield, Australian international relations scholar Philip Darby, British imperial historian John Kent, Canadian scholar of international relations Bruno Charbonneau, and last but not least British scholar of international relations Philip Cunliffe. Aside Kent, who did not consider post-Cold War interventions, they have all—with variation—argued that international interventions reflect the imperial character of the international system.

Not focused on Iraq or Afghanistan despite writing in 2004 when the debate on imperialism had kicked into a higher gear, Canadian historian turned sociologist Serene Razack focused on the 1992 intervention in Somalia. Anchoring her analysis in the Canadian court case that saw Canadian soldiers on trial for racial violence and the fact that the trial was in Canada (rather than Somalia), she portrayed the Canadian participation in the Cold War interventions as a continuation of settler-colonialism in Canada and as serving US interests. In extension thereof, she linked the violent and racist settler colonial history of Canada and the Canadian military violence in Somalia in 1992. Subsequently, she saw the Canadian narrative of ‘peacekeeping’ as a national mythology masked as a history of ‘doing good’, thus contesting the strong rupture orientation of the aforementioned narratives seeing the post-Cold War international interventions constitute a ‘new imperialism’.²¹

Broadening the scope, British development scholar Mark Duffield used British imperial history and the notion of the ‘western external frontier’ to argue that the post-Cold War interventions more broadly constitute an integral part of a Western-dominated international regime to contain the fleeing Third World populations generated by the global market economy. He placed this in contrast to how previous surplus underdeveloped populations were exported, e.g. the British settler colonies that became the US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.²²

Along the lines of Duffield but preferring the older if still much-contested notion of ‘imperialism’, Australian and scholar of international relations Philip Darby argued

anthropologists (and sociologists, geographers and other social scientists) deployed with American military forces in Afghanistan as part of the Human Terrain System project. Similarly albeit at a much smaller scale, the Danish Army has also found it useful to turn to an anthropological after a sociologist failed to deliver a loyal publication.

²¹ Serene Razack, *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping, and the New Imperialism* (Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2004).

²² Mark R. Duffield, *Development, Security and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples* (Cambridge: Polity, 2007), 1–31.

that international interventions are cast in the colonial mould of intervention from above and outside and are part of upholding an inequitable global order that locks non-European people into a world not of their making. As one of the few scholars concerned with how local populations claim agency by negotiating the interventions, he argues that future interventions must entail locally rooted and accepted mechanisms.²³

Focusing on a single intervention, British imperial historian John Kent used the early Cold War intervention in the former Belgian colony Congo to connect Cold War geopolitics with the conditions of the Congolese population, their struggles and ethnic tension. He argued not only that the intervention was used to advance an African system of nation states with allegiance to “(...) *the principles, if not old colonial practices, of Western capitalism*”,²⁴ but also that the UN was central for the US in promoting its vision of a broader world order, thus challenging the narratives of the UN and decolonisation. Framing his analysis within the Cold War historiography, however, Kent targeted the debates amongst Cold War and African historians rather than those in the multi-disciplinary field mostly interested in the recent or ongoing international interventions.²⁵

Writing a few years later with the aim of joining the dialogue on the imperial via a study of French interventions in their former African colonies, Canadian scholar of international relations Bruno Charbonneau initially argued that the interventions represented colonial continuities recast in a neo-imperial world dominated by the US and Great Britain. Using works by historians on French imperialism, his research stood out as building bridges.²⁶ While still recognising imperial legacies in “(...) *old capabilities, new organising logics and, specific practices and power relationships*”,²⁷ Charbonneau has since stepped back, calling for scholars to bring in the historicity of particular imperial experiences to challenge what he argued to be a too simplistic duality between imperialism and internationalism on the one hand, and the local and international on the other.

Finally, British scholar of international relations Philip Cunliffe also considers the systemic and its structural components, concentrating on the states that provide troops for the interventions. In 2012, Cunliffe noted that it was impossible for scholars to overlook how military forces are sent to pacify unruly marginal areas in the international system with force while installing institutions and ideals found useful by the dominant members of the international system.²⁸ Subsequently, he argued that the

²³ Philip Darby, “Rolling Back the Frontiers of Empire: Practising the Postcolonial,” *International Peacekeeping* 16, no. 5 (2009): 699–716.

²⁴ John Kent, *America, the UN and Decolonisation: Cold War Conflict in the Congo* (London, New York: Routledge, 2010), 193.

²⁵ Kent, *America, the UN and Decolonisation*.

²⁶ Bruno Charbonneau, *France and the New Imperialism: Security Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa* (Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate, 2008).

²⁷ Bruno Charbonneau, “The Imperial Legacy of International Peacebuilding: The Case of Francophone Africa,” *Review of International Studies* 40, no. 3 (2014): 629.

²⁸ Cunliffe, “Still the Spectre at the Feast,” 427.

current interventions are not only rooted in an historic tradition of imperial security, but also that they amount to a system of imperial multilateralism, envisioned at its formation to carry out tasks hitherto carried out by colonial empires.²⁹ The supply of colonial forces for imperial service, especially during the two world wars and later counter-insurgency operations, ensured the formation of a shared transnational military culture of experience, doctrine, habits and training. In his view, it was not coincidental that the colonial territories supplying imperial military units became the largest troop suppliers after the Cold War. Finally, he argued that: “(...) *the imperial functions of peacekeeping are therefore a congenital component of the United Nations and not merely a by-product of the overstretch resulting from the multiplication of UN missions after the end of the Cold War.*”³⁰

Razack, Duffield, Darby, Charbonneau, and Cunliffe—hereon onwards the ‘imperial segment’—confronted how the interventions from the outset generated hierarchical and gendered relations through their lack of accountability, asymmetries in political action and systems of ordering rooted in the waxing and waning of imperial frontiers. Aside Kent, these scholars view the overall international system as imperial and the interventions within that framework. They also, some more explicit than others, say that our analytical frameworks support status quo and therefore need to de-centre the West and the state and concurrently re-centre the imperial, the colonial and the local. As in the other cluster of scholars, however, disciplinary legacies, national narratives, and the international situation still take centre stage. Indicative of the continued Western dominance of the research field, American researchers are not only markedly absent in the ‘imperial segment’. The strongest attempts of decolonising knowledge of the interventions have also so far come from scholars from other Western countries and not ‘peacekept’ countries, even if they view the interventions and the international system from different platforms, move in different directions and agree little on the concepts and the importance of the ‘mission areas’ and their populations.³¹ To the best of my knowledge and indicative both of my own position within this Anglo-Saxon dominated research field and the intimate links between the knowledge we generate on international system and this very system, scholars working in or on the former colonies as well as in other languages than English have also yet to untether from the mainstream or counter-neoliberal narratives to fully engage with the challenge of historicizing the interventions systemically³² or have

²⁹ Philip Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace: UN Peacekeepers from the Global South* (London: Hurst, 2013).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 220.

³¹ Awareness of the settler colonial and imperial origins of the Australian, Canadian, New Zealand, American and South African academic worlds is gradually emerging. See for instance, James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783-1939* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Tamson Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850-1939* (Manchester, New York, Vancouver: Manchester University Press, Palgrave Macmillan and UBC Press, 2013).

³² See for instance Adekeye Adebajo, *UN Peacekeeping in Africa: From the Suez Crisis to the Sudan Conflicts* (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2011); Kwesi Aning, Kwesi and

begun to do so in English.³³ Consequently, the debate on the imperial in the international, in my view, face three challenges.

The Challenges of the Field

The first challenge relates to how the connections between imperialism and Western academia have left significant blind angles in research on ‘peacekeeping’. The second connects to the question of how to overcome the difficulties created by the multidisciplinary research field (and thus how scholars relate across disciplinary divides). Partly an attempt to deal with these challenges, the third revolves around how to go about historicize the international system, the networks of the states that contributed forces and the ‘mission areas’ in a way that crosses the disciplinary differences.

A consequence of the entangled histories of the disciplines with colonial imperialism, the first challenge concerns the blind spot of research on international interventions, including the ‘imperial segment’: the links between the interventions and the historical angle that is the colonial, social and political geographies of the ‘mission areas’ and the colonial experiences of their populations. As the American scholar of international relations J. Ann Tickner argued, “(...) *most western knowledge cannot be separated from its implication in the history of imperialism.*”³⁴ This is also true for the disciplines involved in the study of international interventions. Having been debated since the 1960s, the ties between anthropology and colonial systems probably represent the well-known connections. The discipline cannot be understood without its intellectual linkage to European colonial imperialism or how many but not all anthropologists served imperial projects and colonial states.³⁵ As historians and development scholars aware of their discipline’s origins have shown, the field of development also has a history of origins tied to Western colonial

Samuel Atuobi, “Responsibility to Protect in Africa: An Analysis of the African Union’s Peace and Security Architecture,” *Global Responsibility to Protect* 1, no. 1 (2009): 90–113; Tony Karbo, “Peace-Building in Africa,” in *Peace and Conflict in Africa* (London ; New York: Zed Books, 2008), 113–32; Germain Ngoie Tshibambe, Grace Maina, and Erik Melander, “Analysing the Peace Process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo : From War to the Uncertain Peace,” in *Peace Agreements and Durable Peace in Africa* (Capetown: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2016), 161–91; Rashed Uz Zaman and Biswas, Niloy Ranjan, “Bangladesh’s Participation in UN Peacekeeping Missions and Challenges for Civil–Military Relations: A Case for Concordance Theory,” *International Peacekeeping* 21, no. 3 (2014): 324–44.

³³ Bruno Charbonneau, “Dreams of Empire: France, Europe, and the New Interventionism in Africa,” *Modern & Contemporary France* 16, no. 3 (2008): 279–95; Charbonneau, “The Imperial Legacy of International Peacebuilding.”

³⁴ J. Ann Tickner, “Retelling IR’s Foundational Stories: Some Feminist and Postcolonial Perspectives,” *Global Change, Peace & Security* 23, no. 1 (2011): 12.

³⁵ Helen Tilley and Robert J Gordon, *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism and the Politics of Knowledge* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

imperialism.³⁶ Vernon Hewitt argued, “As a project, international development can be defined as a product of empire, a universal language of ‘improvement’ and civilisation acted out through a series of complex – and contradictory – processes and interactions.”³⁷ Sociology is less known for its ties to colonial imperialism as most see sociology as originating in studies of industrialising urban Europe. However, sociology has a link to imperialism as ‘on the ground’ advisors not only in European colonies in Africa, but also the Russian continental and American Pacific and Caribbean expansions.³⁸ History has also had a similar role. The strong favour of British imperial historians of the British Empire is probably the more famous, but historians of other European colonial powers were equally busy writing their nations’ paths to glory. Dismissing the US being an empire, American historians claimed that the US was ‘exceptional’.³⁹ The discipline of international relations has its roots in European 19th century studies on politics, but coalesced into a proto-research field involving geographers, historians and political economists placing emphasis on imperialism and war in an international system only from 1880. After the Second World War and the rise of the US politically, militarily, economically, and academically in the social and natural sciences,⁴⁰ focus shifted to the US, thus aligning the discipline with the view from Washington until the end of the Cold War. With this shift, history fell into the background, often to become a selective pool of evidence with little regard to historiographical traditions. This removed imperialism, gender and geography from the British pre-war and inter-war international relations tradition.⁴¹ Finally, colonialism was not peripheral but central to international law due

³⁶ Duffield, *Development, Security and Unending War*; Mark Duffield and Vernon M. Hewitt, eds., *Empire, Development & Colonialism: The Past in the Present* (Woodbridge, Rochester: James Currey, 2013); Joseph Morgan Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2007).

³⁷ Vernon Hewitt, “Empire, International Development & the Concept of Good Government,” in *Empire, Development and Colonialism: The Past in the Present* (Woodbridge, Rochester: James Currey, 2013), 31.

³⁸ George Steinmetz, ed., *Sociology & Empire: The Imperial Entanglements of a Discipline* (Durham, London: Duke University Press, 2013).

³⁹ See for instance Julian Go, *Patterns of Empire: The British and American Empires, 1688 to the Present* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 14–19; Remco Raben, “A New Dutch Imperial History?: Perambulations in a Prospective Field,” *BMGN - Low Countries Historical Review* 128, no. 1 (2013): 5–30; Athena Syriatou, “National, Imperial, Colonial and the Political: British Imperial Histories and Their Descendants,” *Historein* 12 (2013): 38–67; Jackson Frederick Turner and John Mack Faragher, *Rereading Frederick Jackson Turner: “The Significance of the Frontier in American History” and Other Essays* (New Haven (Conn.): London: Yale univ. press, 1998).

⁴⁰ For the natural sciences, see especially John Krige, *American Hegemony and the Postwar Reconstruction of Science in Europe* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006).

⁴¹ Ashworth, “Interdisciplinarity and International Relations”; Lucian M. Ashworth, “Feminism, War and the Prospects for Peace: Helena Swanwick (1864-1939) and the Lost Feminists of Inter-War International Relations,” *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13, no. 1 (2011): 25–43; Lucian M. Ashworth, *A History of International Thought: From the Origins of the Modern State to Academic International Relations*, 2014; Wayne Cox and Kim

to the need of colonial empires to legitimise the governing of non-European peoples.⁴² Indeed, as Tickner argued, Western knowledge production and imperialism have intimate relations, something that continued in Cold War research. Most of this work shows that the outlook of the imperial metropolises on the one hand and the colonial state apparatus' quest for technologies of power and knowledge on the other continued to inform the different disciplines' ways of looking and understanding beyond decolonisation.

To be sure, 'white' male American, and to a lesser extent British and Canadian, researchers of the state- and Western-centric disciplines of international relations, international law and political science undeniably held research on the interventions in an iron grip during the Cold War. They promoted them in publications on legal, financial and logistical issues as well as foreign policy decision-making processes in the leading Anglo-American journals, New York, Washington and London-based think tanks reports and American university publications, thus fuelling the narratives on the UN and decolonisation in the mainstream.⁴³ Although a few American and British scholars of area studies and international relations were able to escape the militarisation of their research fields and offered critical work,⁴⁴ they did not reflect on the colonial era, just as their work soon drowned in 'technical' articles by other scholars and pro-intervention publications by ('white', male) UN officials.⁴⁵

Nossal, "The 'crimson' World: The Anglo-Core, the Post-Imperial Non-Core, and the Hegemony of American IR," in *International Relations Scholarship around the World* (London: Routledge, 2009), 287–307; Hobson and Lawson, "What Is History in International Relations?"; Lawson, "The Eternal Divide?"

⁴² Antony. Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty, and the Making of International Law* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁴³ The literature is vast and too large to go into detail with here, but see for instance Edward H. Bowman and James E. Bowman, "The Logistics Problems of a UN Military Force," *International Organization* 17, no. 2 (1963): 355–76; Lincoln P. Bloomfield, "China, the United States, and the United Nations," *International Organization* 20, no. 4 (1966): 653–76; J. W. Bridge, "The Legal Status of British Troops Forming Part of the United Nations Force in Cyprus," *The Modern Law Review* 34, no. 2 (1971): 121–34; Dudley H. Chapman, "International Law: The United Nations Emergency Force: Legal Status," *Michigan Law Review* 57, no. 1 (1958): 56–81; James Joseph Combs, "France and United Nations Peacekeeping," *International Organization* 21, no. 2 (1967): 306–25; Geoffrey L. Goodwin, "The Political Role of The United Nations: Some British Views," *International Organization* 15, no. 4 (1961): 581–602; Nand Lal, *From Collective Security to Peace-Keeping: A Study of India's Contribution to the United Nations Emergency Force, 1956-67* (Calcutta: Minerva Associates, 1975).

⁴⁴ Alan James, *The Politics of Peace-Keeping* (New York: Published for the Institute for Strategic Studies by Praeger, 1969); Paul van Der Veur, "The United Nations in West Irian: A Critique," *International Organization* 18, no. 1 (1964): 53–73. For the militarisation of American area studies from the Second World War onwards, see for instance; David Nugent, "Knowledge and Empire: The Social Sciences and United States Imperial Expansion," *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 17, no. 1 (2010): 2–44.

⁴⁵ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli* (New York: George Harrap and Co., 1962); E. L. M. Burns, "The Withdrawal of UNEF and the Future of Peacekeeping," *International Journal* 23, no. 1 (1967): 1–17; Indarjit Rikhye, Michael Harbottle, and Bjørn Egge, *The Thin Blue*

Additionally, the broader militarisation of the American social sciences through the formation of 40 research centres run by the US military and Defence Department and the military contract work of civilian universities pushed closer the social sciences to the interests of power.⁴⁶ It is indicative that the few sociologists who tried to look beyond ‘the state’ in works intended as responses to the militarisation of the social sciences also failed to escape the paradigm of the interventions despite introducing field work and arguing that local populations were relevant.⁴⁷ Moreover, the few third world PhD fellows that studied UN interventions in American universities (mainly close to power in Washington and New York) appear not to have published on UN interventions after defending their dissertations, leaving the field to westerners, mostly also male.⁴⁸ Due to the origin of the Western and state-centric top-down ways of looking and knowing of Cold War scholarship in the connections between the disciplines and imperialism, these prisms effectively rendered the local population and geographies of each ‘mission area’ unimportant and with them their colonial histories invisible.

This effect, so deeply engrained in the involved disciplines, is to some extent visible amongst even the scholars in the ‘imperial segment’. While Razack was attentive to the meaning of Canadian Settler colonial history in the violence of the Canadian soldiers in Somalia, she focused almost only on the soldiers, leaving the different Somali she let us encounter only as victims. As Duffield analysed an adapting system, the few individuals that made it into his analysis were largely from the Western political elite. Darby spoke of indigenous agency in relation to the interventions as something necessary to integrate into the fabric of future interventions, not in relation to past interventions. Throughout his work, Kent focused only on Congolese politicians as individuals although he recognised Congolese agency and means to negotiate the outcome of the intervention with force via the countrywide riots as the UN was leaving and the US taking over via mercenaries.

Line: International Peacekeeping and Its Future (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974); Brian E. Urquhart, “United Nations Peace Forces and the Changing United Nations: An Institutional Perspective,” *International Organization* 17, no. 2 (1963): 338–54.

⁴⁶ Nugent, “Knowledge and Empire: The Social Sciences and United States Imperial Expansion”; Joy Rohde, “Gray Matters: Social Scientists, Military Patronage, and Democracy in the Cold War.(Essay),” *The Journal of American History* 96, no. 1 (2009): 99–122; Joy Rohde, *Armed with Expertise: The Militarization of American Social Research During the Cold War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013).

⁴⁷ Ingrid Eide, “Some Factors Affecting Local Acceptance of a UN Force – A Pilot Project Report from Gaza,” in *Peace, War and Defence – Essays in Peace Research*, ed. Johan Galtung (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen, 1976), 240–63; Johan Galtung and Helge Hveem, “Participants in Peacekeeping Forces,” in *Peace, War and Defence – Essays in Peace Research* (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen, 1976), 264–81.

⁴⁸ See for instance Abbas. Amirie, “The United Nations Intervention in the Congo Crisis, 1960–1961: With Special Emphasis on the Political Role of the Late Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld.” (1967); Babalola. Cole, “The United Nations Peace-Keeping Operations: The Actions and Policies of the African Nations in the Congo.” (1967); Abdul-Hafez M. Elkordy, “The United Nations Peace-Keeping Functions in the Arab World” 1967; Mumulla Venkat Rao. Naidu, “United Nations Force: Legal Theory and Political Practice” 1967.

Despite his call to challenge to the local-international binary Charbonneau has rarely focused on other 'local' actors than politicians, mobs and demonstrators. Seeking to move beyond states, Cunliffe's analyses of some 'mission areas' made it clear that international relations still has difficulties analysing non-state relations such as socially and spatially integrated interactions between people.

The second challenge links to the multidisciplinary character of the research field and the histories of the different disciplines. As argued by scholars of planning and development Arild Buanes and Svein Jentoft, disciplines are not only organised in departments, but also ordered epistemologically through internal 'languages' of methodologies, concepts and theories, and normatively regulated by norms and values of what is proper scholarship and what is not.⁴⁹ This has made informed dialogue on the imperial and the international, let alone broadening it to include others, difficult. That scholars from a number of disciplines got involved when the debate on empire and imperialism picked up in the 2000s may also have allowed too many scholars, as Cunliffe argued in 2012, to get away with equalling interventions to imperialism without qualifying these claims. While it is necessary to qualify such claims, even when the connections seemed obvious, it has been harder for most. As Cunliffe notes, "(...) imperialism remains under-theorized and under-utilised in the study of peacekeeping (...)."⁵⁰ While Cunliffe is right here, there has been little to connect to not only because few scholars in the field have qualified their critiques of international interventions as imperialism empirically and theoretically, but also because most researchers remain oblivious or disinterested in the deeply entangled imperial histories of their own disciplines. While exploring different aspects of the interventions, Kent, Duffield, Charbonneau, Razack, Darby and Cunliffe in many ways qualified their ideas (and asked others to do so also), for the most part connected to each other's work (when possible) and to various extents sought to pull the overall research field towards common ground, especially by way of publishing in the main research journals. Their efforts and the deeper entanglements of the connections between Western scholarship and colonial imperialism notwithstanding, however, the lack of what the historians and sociologists Anne Markowich and Terry Shinn called 'disciplinary elasticity'⁵¹ has not aided the interdisciplinary dialogue on the links between imperial and international. The second challenge is thus to not only to continue to seek common ground in a field that is still governed by disciplinary boundaries, methodological traditions, conceptual languages and limitations while elucidating the issue of the imperial, but also to continue to engage the interdisciplinary mainstream.

Subsequently, the third challenge revolves around the historicization of the international system, the networks of states that contributed and still contributes forces and the 'mission areas' on the one hand and doing so in a way that bridges the

⁴⁹ Arild Buanes and Svein Jentoft, "Building Bridges: Institutional Perspectives on Interdisciplinarity," *Futures* 41, no. 7 (2009): 446–54.

⁵⁰ Cunliffe, "Still the Spectre at the Feast," 427.

⁵¹ Anne Marcovich and Terry Shinn, "Where Is Disciplinarity Going? Meeting on the Borderland," *Social Science Information* 50, no. 3–4 (2011): 582–606.

disciplinary differences of the multidisciplinary research field on the other. A sensible point of departure, I argue, would therefore be the gap between imperial and colonial historiography and the blind angle of both the ‘imperial segment’ and ‘mainstream’ critical research towards the colonial, social and political geographies of the ‘mission areas’ and the colonial experiences of their populations. As philosopher of history Frank Ankersmit notes, “(...) *big problems have long histories; and as long as we remain in the dark about these histories we shall be unable to deal with them.*”⁵² Hence, this challenge entails both moving past how much research has indirectly served the status quo by not re-centring the ‘mission areas’ as a means to understand better the links between imperial and international. Accordingly, the webs between the countries sponsoring the interventions, the countries supplying the troops, vehicles and supplies, the UN bureaucracy providing the experts and the ‘mission areas’ themselves central to understanding the international system in the same way the imperial webs were key to the different forms of imperialism. Thus, it becomes necessary to pay attention to see the ‘mission areas’ as webbed socio-spatial palimpsests in which colonial, imperial and international regimes of governance overlapped and re-actualised imperial practices and conflicts, often to the detriment of most of the ‘mission area’ populations.

Connecting these challenges, the ‘imperial segment’ requires a counter-narrative that both connects colonial and imperial historiography with the ‘imperial segment’ as a way to emphasise the links to the imperial and the international and both the importance of people in the ‘mission areas’ on the one hand and works towards broadening the interdisciplinary dialogue on the other.

The Aims and the Main Research Questions

Consequently, my first aim is to join and advance the interdisciplinary dialogue on the imperial and the international as a historian with an awareness of both the imperial historiographies and the research done by scholars in the ‘imperial segment’. The International Centre for Trans-disciplinary Research that see transdisciplinarity as that “(...) *which is at once between the disciplines, across the different disciplines, and beyond all discipline (...)*” and has as its goal “(...) *the understanding of the present world, of which one of the imperatives is the unity of knowledge.*”⁵³ If going by their understanding, transdisciplinarity may thus be a long-term goal, and interdisciplinary dialogue the short- and intermediate term means to move towards it. As ought to be clear, this involves asserting that research does not take place in a vacuum. If anything, scholarly inquiries are inherently political. Positions are not choices but inevitable. It is thus before anything else a question of thoroughness. With this goal of interdisciplinarity is also therefore also the hope to promote self-reflection amongst

⁵² Frank Ankersmit, “Manifesto for An Analytical Political History,” in *Manifestos for History*, ed. Keith Jenkins, Sue Morgan, and Alan Munslow (London: Routledge, 2007), 186.

⁵³ <http://ciet-transdisciplinarity.org/transdisciplinarity.php> (24.05.2016)

scholars as disciplinary legacies, prisms of nation, age and gender, and possible military experiences are factors on our work and how in extension thereof how we dare re-envision the international.

My second aim is twofold. First, I intend to take a step towards a broader framework, a way of looking and understanding rooted in the marriage of imperial and colonial historiography and Philip Cunliffe's notion of 'imperial multilateralism' that can work towards unpacking the imperial dynamics of the international interventions and elucidate how the interventions re-actualise colonial practices and ideas. Second, I aim to provide an analysis that via the framework both elucidates the shift from dynastic empires over modern imperialism to a broader Western networked form of imperialism—imperial multilateralism—and shows how people in the 'mission areas' relate to and resist the form of governance sought implemented via the apparatuses of the international interventions, civilian and military alike. Paying greater attention to both the networked character of the interventions and the 'minor histories' of the 'mission areas' can be a way to not only unpack the imperial dynamics of the international system and expound how the interventions re-actualise colonial practices and ideas, but also a way to keep the dialogue on common ground, if not expand it. Focusing on the networks of the interventions is a way to explicate the dynamics of the shifting forms of governance as the colonial empires gave way to a Western dominated networked means of retaining influence by partially internationalising the regimes of governance of the new formally decolonised members of the international community. Moreover, granting equal importance to the histories of everyday life in the mission area that many scholars probably consider minor histories given the continued role of Western- and state-centric perspectives are all but unimportant. 'Minor' histories, anthropologist and imperial historian Ann Laura Stoler has suggested, "(...) *should not be mistaken for trivial ones. Nor are they iconic, mere microcosms of events played out elsewhere on a larger central stage.*"⁵⁴ Rather, they mark "(...) *a differential political temper and a critical space. It attends to structures of feeling and force that in "major" history might be otherwise displaced.*"⁵⁵

Aiming to link between the imperial and the international on the one hand and the systemic and the practices of everyday life on the other, I thus want to understand

- How the post-1945 regime of international organisations under the umbrella of the United Nations emerged from inter-imperial cooperation and the systemic significance thereof;
- And in this context, what forms of civilian and military regimes of regulation and governance the interventions of the United Nations, intentionally and

⁵⁴ Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain – Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 7.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

unintentionally, transferred to and engendered 'on the ground' in the 'mission areas';

- And accordingly within this context, how different population groups 'on the ground' in the 'mission areas' related to and/or resisted the forms of civilian and military regimes of regulation and governance the interventions of the United Nations, intentionally and unintentionally, transferred to and engendered in the 'mission areas'.

To attempt to provide some satisfactory answers to these questions and tackle the challenges laid out, I choose to focus on the first intervention designated 'peacekeeping': the clearing of the Suez Canal in 1956 and 1957, and the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) that operated in Egypt in 1956 and the Egyptian-controlled Gaza Strip from 1957 to 1967. Before taking to generating research questions to this joint intervention and explaining why this is the better choice compared to other interventions, however, I must pave the way by attending to my theoretical framework. The following two chapters are dedicated to discussing these.

Chapter 1: Theorising Imperialism and International Interventions

My theoretical framework is rooted in a merger of the various imperial historiographies and an operationalisation of the scholar of international relations Philip Cunliffe's concept of 'imperial multilateralism' from his main work on international interventions. For obvious reasons, the broader imperial historiography is indispensable in discussing imperialism. I use Cunliffe's work and primary concept because—as will be clear in the following section—he provides a strong point of departure that is still open to debate and modification. Cunliffe does not base his work on a structured theoretical framework (as is otherwise common in his field of international relations). Rather, he uses what he calls a “*moving prism (...) to catch light from as many angles as possible*”.⁵⁶ This involves both critically engaging the wider mainstream and mainstream critical interventions scholarship and incorporating British and French imperial and colonial military historiography albeit not in a chronological structure. It is therefore not fair to distil his thoughts into a theoretical framework. It is, nevertheless, necessary to 'freeze' his arguments in order to first anchor and thus strengthen, rather than juxtapose, them in the theoretical discussions of the historiography he seeks to utilise against the mainstream interventions literature, and then operationalise it as the base of my analytical framework via imperial frontier studies.

Empires and the Modalities of Imperialism: Anchoring Cunliffe's 'Imperial Multilateralism' in Imperial Historiography

Cunliffe's fundamental idea is that “*As such, UN peacekeeping can be assimilated into a long history of imperial security in which metropolitan centres of power have sought to reduce the costs of policing empire by devolving these responsibilities to the periphery itself.*”⁵⁷ Thus, he notes, UN forces are the heirs to colonial armies, NGOs the heirs to missionaries, Special UN Representatives the heirs to Viceroy and civilian UN Staff the heirs to colonial administrators. While Cunliffe thus ventures well out of the confines of most international relations schools of thought by seeing imperialism as integral to the international system, he does not define or discuss what he sees the concepts of empire and imperialism to entail, something Bruno Charbonneau rightly criticises him for in his review.⁵⁸ Reading backwards from the way in which Cunliffe sees 'the essence of empire' as distilled into the post-war UN

⁵⁶ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*, 24.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁵⁸ Bruno Charbonneau, “Legions of Peace: UN Peacekeepers from the Global South,” *International Peacekeeping - London* 21, no. 4 (2014): 539–40.

system as “(...) a hierarchic and paternalistic regime for maintaining order across a diverse set of peoples, while recreating political dependency as part of a global civilising mission”,⁵⁹ it is clear that he sees empires as hierarchical, paternalistic and ruling over diverse sets of peoples. However, he leaves too much unsaid. Concepts find use in particular contexts.

As the conceptual historians Helge Jordheim and Iver B. Neumann have pointed out, the discussions of ‘empire’ and ‘imperialism’ (and other forms) are today global.⁶⁰ Recognising this, many of the foremost imperial and global historians, as well as some anthropologists and political scientists, have adopted global and systemic perspectives on empires, in direct opposition to the heretofore-dominant teleological Western-centric and (nation) state-centric historiographies.⁶¹ Taking a broad view, Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, two prominent imperial historians who see empires as “(...) large political units, expansionist or with a memory of power extended over space, polities that maintain distinction and hierarchy as they incorporate new people”,⁶² link the empires in a global framework. They argue that the formation and expansion of empires from 1400 until the late 1700s both shaped and were shaped by what was essentially the making of a global system. According to Burbank and Cooper, the dominant empires of Eurasia, the Chinese, Russian, Mughal and Ottoman empires mainly relied on similar ‘repertoires of power’ in the form of strongly hierarchal dynastic and patrimonial forms of rule, the co-optation of conquered peoples and lands by various connective measures such as tribute, marriages, and the acceptance of difference in customs, religion and social organisation. In contrast, the Habsburg, Portuguese, Dutch, British and French empires over the 16th and 17th centuries relied on less hierarchical merchant elite and aristocratic networks, trade and—later—plantation and mining slavery to both expand and sustain themselves as empires. While their expansion led to settlements along the African and Indian coastlines, in what became Latin and North America and the Indonesian archipelago the European empires were unable go beyond the fringes of the larger Eurasian and interior African empires and kingdoms for centuries technologies, local arbitrators and non-hostile terrains facilitated entry. Altogether, most scholars are united in the view that most early-modern empires were hierarchical power structures revolving around centres dominating their geographically adjacent

⁵⁹ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*, 82.

⁶⁰ Helge Jordheim and Iver B. Neumann, “Empire, Imperialism and Conceptual History,” *Journal of International Relations and Development* 14, no. 2 (2011): 153–85.

⁶¹ See for instance David B. Abernethy, *The Dynamics of Global Dominance: European Overseas Empires, 1415-1980* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000); Karen Barkey, *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2010); Frederick Cooper, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); John Darwin, *After Tamerlane: The Global History of Empires, 1400-2000* (London: Penguin Books, 2008).

⁶² Burbank and Cooper, *Empires in World History*, 2010, 8.

peripheries, if the Habsburg, Dutch and British Empires were also ‘hybrids’ indicative of the following centuries.⁶³

As multiple scholars have noted, this balance of power between the larger Eurasian and smaller European empires began changing from the early to mid-19th century. Cunliffe does not address this change directly; he only does so implicitly and very briefly, speaking of a long transition from empires to multilateral imperialism.⁶⁴ Here, however, we enter the heart of the discussion on the global imperial system changing from being dominated by dynastic and tributary empires ruling geographically adjacent territories towards being led predominantly by non-dynastic empires with growing bureaucratic state apparatuses and geographically non-adjacent territories over the 19th century. A commonly accepted periodization distinguishes between the dynastic empires with adjacent territories from the corporatist empires engaging in imperialism from the middle of the 19th century. For decades, historians (and others), however, were unable to agree whether or not to use the concept of imperialism and what it meant. While some heavyweights active before (formal) decolonisation had taken place argued that imperialism was no word for scholars as it both was imprecise and led to violent and emotional responses,⁶⁵ others later argued in favour of accepting the debate as an irritating ‘*fact of life from which historical analysis must begin*.’⁶⁶ Fernando Coronil, anthropologist of the Americas, noted, “(...) *imperialism is out in the streets as an indispensable political term*”, and that the question has become “(...) *not so much whether to use this term or not but how to recast it to make it useful*.”⁶⁷ Most scholars now accept a distinction between ‘early modern empires’ and ‘modern empires’ and the use of the concept of ‘imperialism’, understood “(...) *as the “process by which they are established, extended, or maintained”*”,⁶⁸ in relation to ‘modern empires’. Again, Cunliffe’s ‘moving prism’ makes it rather difficult to elucidate what his view of imperialism entails as ‘it’ is spread over two separate chapters. Imperialism in one place appears as a state-led (rather than dynastic-led one assumes) expansion.⁶⁹ In another, he also sees it as a hierarchical and paternalistic form of governance with colonial armies to incorporate indigenous authorities and reduce costs.⁷⁰ However, he also argues, “*Historically, empire has been the solution to the gap between liberal ideas and a non-liberal reality—imperialism being the means for*

⁶³ Ibid., 93–218.

⁶⁴ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*, 24.

⁶⁵ For examples on the heated character on these debates, see for instance Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Jürgen Osterhammel, *Imperialism and After: Continuities and Discontinuities* (London, Boston: German Historical Institute & Allen & Unwin, 1986).

⁶⁶ Wolfgang J. Mommsen, “Preface,” in *Imperialism and After: Continuities and Discontinuities* (London; Boston; Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1986), XI.

⁶⁷ Fernando Coronil, “After Empire: Reflections on Imperialism from the Americas,” in *Imperial Formations* (Santa Fe, Oxford: School for Advanced Research Press & James Currey, 2007), 255.

⁶⁸ Go, *Patterns of Empire*, 7.

⁶⁹ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*, 86.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 152–53.

realising liberal ideas where they do not exist”,⁷¹ thus implying that the Japanese, Italian and German imperial projects cannot be classified as imperialism. Indicatively, Cunliffe refers mainly to British and French imperialism before 1945 and American empire after 1945, apparently overlooking the broader debate amongst historians on the global dynamics of the different modalities of imperialism. For example, John Darwin, a global and imperial historian, plays down the liberal dimension of imperialism as he casts it as a continuum with wide variation in its objects and methods revolving around “(...) *the attempt to impose one state’s pre-dominance over other societies by assimilating them to its political, cultural and economic system.*”⁷² Darwin thus emphasises the connections between imperialism and colonial rule rather than imperialism and liberalism and imperialism and capitalism. The work of Cunliffe, reflecting his choice to exclude the political economy of the contemporary interventions while recognising its importance, also disregards the links between imperialism and capitalism.⁷³ This narrow focus is odd as he elsewhere links imperialism with colonies, making economic spheres of influence, establishing privileged trading zones that could exclude rivals and the taxation of local populations.⁷⁴ In contrast, Coronil ties imperial expansion and capitalism as twin forces, arguing “*Just as imperialism makes evident the political dimension of capitalism, capitalism makes visible the economic dimension of imperialism, revealing ‘states’ and ‘markets’ as dual faces of a unitary process.*”⁷⁵ Burbank and Cooper link the collective rise of the European empires to both the bureaucratisation of the imperial repertoires of power and the emerging nexus of imperial expansion, capitalism, and industrialisation. As for the former, the desire to keep control with their colonial territories and the increasingly fierce milieu of inter-imperial competition to expand, Burbank and Cooper argue, led all empires to modernize their repertoires of power. The European empires were the first to make simultaneously ‘national’ and ‘imperial’ institutions such as census and tax collection systems, health systems, gendarmes and imperial armies. Seeing the potential, the expanding continental Russian and American empires, the ‘unified’ Italian and German empires and the hard-pressed Ottoman and Japanese empires followed suit. This, Burbank and Cooper posit, led to a wide range of imperial authorities and sovereignties, many of which were increasingly sought grounded in the racialised idea of the superiority of ‘white’ civilisation’ (despite the orientation of the empires of the US, Germany, Italy and Russia towards the idea of a nation state).⁷⁶ As for the emergent nexus of imperialism, capitalism, and industrialisation, Burbank and Cooper see it as a globally contingent process that both shaped and were shaped by the expansions via the

⁷¹ Ibid., 100.

⁷² Darwin, *After Tamerlane*, 416.

⁷³ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*, 28.

⁷⁴ Cunliffe, “Still the Spectre at the Feast.”

⁷⁵ Coronil, “After Empire: Reflections on Imperialism from the Américas,” 259–60.

⁷⁶ Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 219–368.

militarisation of the commercial circuits.⁷⁷ Focused on the world rather than only empires, the global historians Michael Geyer and Charles Bright also saw the mid-19th century as the opening of the modern era with the globally transformative processes of the expansion in the industrial forms of production and destruction, migration and new (imperial) regimes of order and state building projects.⁷⁸

As for the subsequent phase of the global rule of imperialism, the scholarly debate has largely revolved around the question of whether it is best understood as the coming apart of modern empires and imperialism, or, better, as a phase of transformation towards new decentralised forms of empire and cooperative forms of imperialism. In line with recent scholarship that favours seeing imperialism through the prism of cooperation, decentralisation and internationalisation in different ways, and Cunliffe who speaks of ‘multinational imperialism’, I opt for the latter view. While Cunliffe does note the emergence of ‘multinational imperialism’, which he argues amounts to a step towards imperial multilateralism from around 1900, he sticks to the narrow view once again. He mentions only the inter-imperial force, the so-called ‘Eight-Nation Alliance’, deployed against the Chinese anti-foreign rebellion in 1900, the creation of Albania in 1912-13 at the edge of the Ottoman Empire by the European empires and their deployed military forces, and the policing operations and mandates of the League of Nations.⁷⁹ Again, his idea would have been had he rooted his work more broadly in historiographical works on the higher degree of inter-imperial cooperation, the increasingly bloc-fixed forms of imperialism, and the emergence of webs of semi-autonomous inter-imperial institutions in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. For example, imperial historian Valeska Huber contended, “(...) *colonialism and internationalism were not contradictory projects but rather intricately intertwined*”⁸⁰ in her work on how the Suez Canal became part of turning the Mediterranean into a European imperial space by both supporting imperial military logistics and serving as a space for disease surveillance.⁸¹ Antony Anghie, a legal scholar, similarly sees international law, its principles and doctrines—such as the concepts of ‘sovereignty’ and ‘belligerent occupation’—and the international institutions promoting it as formed by (and forming) the legal practices of the different colonial projects, their gradual universalisation and late 19th century ‘internal’ European practices regarding colonial occupation.⁸² Also working on the imperial legal and security systems, imperial historian Daniel Brückenhaus likewise points to the roots of early 20th century police cooperation in metropolitan Europe in inter-

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Michael Geyer and Charles Bright, “World History in a Global Age,” *American Historical Review* 100, no. 4 (1995): 1034–60.

⁷⁹ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*, 95–96.

⁸⁰ Valeska Huber, “Colonial Seas: The ‘International’ Colonisation of Port Said and the Suez Canal and Beyond, 1869-1914,” *European Review of History: Revue Européenne D’histoire* 19, no. 1 (2012): 156.

⁸¹ See also Valeska Huber, *Channelling Mobilities: Migration and Globalisation in the Suez Canal Region and Beyond, 1869-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

⁸² Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty, and the Making of International Law*.

imperial needs to monitor anti-colonialists.⁸³ Imperial historian Ulrike Lindner has also shown how inter-imperial knowledge exchange was increasingly formalised.⁸⁴ International historians Naomi Nagata and Tomoko Akami have likewise argued that the paradigms of the League of Nations on diseases both evolved out of imperial concerns and inter-imperial cooperation, and became sites for Japan to claim equality with the “white” imperial powers.⁸⁵ Daniel Gorman, historian of the British Empire, notes similar inter-imperial “white” concerns and ‘pro-’white’ dynamics in the humanitarian responses to not only, but especially, the trafficking of women and children in the 1920s.⁸⁶ In relation to the launch of the League of Nations, the international historian Mark Mazower operates with an ‘imperial internationalism’ that took for granted not only the durability of empire and the idea of “white” superiority, but also that international organisations should serve as vehicles for both. In light of the global preponderance of British imperialism from the middle of the 19th century to the First World War, he also contends that the League can be seen as a liberal imperial bloc in contrast to the collapsed Russian Empire that the Bolsheviks recast as the Soviet Union.⁸⁷ As for these bloc-oriented forms of imperialism, Prasenjit Duara, historian of Asia, sees initially Japan in the 1930s and subsequently the US and the Soviet Union after 1945 engaged in ‘imperialism of nation states’. Duara saw this form of imperialism as having “(...) a *strategic conception of the periphery as part of an organic formation designed to attain global supremacy for the imperial powers*”,⁸⁸ even if that meant promoting anti-colonial ideologies, making major economic investments and turning subordinate territories into (nominally) sovereign nation states.⁸⁹ Interestingly, Duara’s ‘imperialism of nation states’ appears to roughly

⁸³ Daniel Brückenhaus, “The Origins of Trans-Imperial Policing: British-French Government Cooperation in the Surveillance of Anti-Colonialists in Europe, 1905-25,” in *Imperial Cooperation and Transfer, 1870-1930* (New York; London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015), 171–96.

⁸⁴ Ulrike Lindner, “New Forms of Knowledge Exchange between Imperial Powers: The Development of Institut Colonial International (ICI) Since the End of the Nineteenth Century,” in *Imperial Cooperation and Transfer, 1870-1930* (New York; London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015), 57–78.

⁸⁵ Tomoko Akami, “Beyond Empires’ Science: Inter-Imperial Pacific Science Networks in the 1920s,” in *Networking the International System: Global Histories of International Organizations* (Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer, 2014), 97–132; Naomi Nagata, “International Control of Epidemic Diseases from a Historical and Cultural Perspective” (Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer, 2014), 73–90.

⁸⁶ Daniel Gorman, “Empire, Internationalism and the Campaign against the Traffic in Women and Children in the 1920s,” *Twentieth Century British History* 19, no. 2 (2008): 186–216.

⁸⁷ Mark Mazower, “An International Civilization? Empire, Internationalism and the Crisis of the Mid-Twentieth Century.,” *International Affairs* 82, no. 3 (2006): 553–66; Mark Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

⁸⁸ Prasenjit Duara, “The Imperialism of ‘Free Nations’: Japan, Manchuko and the History of the Present,” in *Imperial Formations* (Santa Fe, Oxford: School for Advanced Research Press & James Currey, 2007), 212.

⁸⁹ Duara, “The Cold War as a Historical Period,” 411.

correspond to both Fernando Coronil's mode of 'national imperialism', which he sees as "(...) *the informal dominion of a nation-state over independent nations*",⁹⁰ and his mode of 'global imperialism', which he defines as "(...) *the informal dominion by a network of capital and states over an increasingly integrated worldwide system*."⁹¹ Additionally, historian of modern American history Paul Kramer sees the US as a 'colonial nation-building project' also embracing and practising 'international empire, producing "(...) *asymmetries in the scale of political action, regimes of spatial ordering, and modes of exceptionalizing difference enable and produce relations of hierarchy, discipline, dispossession, extraction and exploitation*."⁹² As for the bloc the UN represented, Mazower argues that the charter agreed upon in 1945 came to form—as it evolved out of both the ideas and practices of British imperialism and American war planning—“(...) *in this respect, a more effective and ideologically more liberal, version of the 1940 Tripartite Pact between Germany, Italy and Japan*.”⁹³ With regard to the links between the development and demographic paradigms of the British Empire and those of the UN, Gorman speaks of an internationalisation of British imperialism,⁹⁴ while imperial historian Joseph Morgan Hodge sees the UN as a form of internationalisation of the late imperial British agricultural and science doctrines.⁹⁵ International historian Michael Connelly similarly see the demographics programmes under the auspices of the UN as the heirs to British settler colonial programmes and “(...) *another chapter in the unfinished history of imperialism*.”⁹⁶ Similarly, political scientist Véronique Dimier contends that the aid system of the European Economic Community and later the European Union in many ways were shaped primarily by French colonial officials and on account of their experiences.⁹⁷

The heir to his pre-1945 'multinational imperialism', Cunliffe sees 'imperial multilateralism' as emerging in three phases, beginning with the period from 1945 to 1989 that includes the formation of the UN and decolonisation.⁹⁸ For him, the UN both reflected the American imperial expansion after 1945 and served as a means to reduce the disorder brought about by the dissolution of the European colonial

⁹⁰ Coronil, "After Empire: Reflections on Imperialism from the Americas," 260.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Paul A. Kramer, "Power and Connection: Imperial Histories of the United States in the World," *The American Historical Review* 116, no. 5 (2011): 1349.

⁹³ Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace*, 62.

⁹⁴ Daniel Gorman, "Britain, India, and the United Nations: Colonialism and the Development of International Governance, 1945–1960," *Journal of Global History* 9, no. 3 (2014): 471–90.

⁹⁵ Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism*; Brett M Bennett and Joseph Morgan Hodge, *Science and Empire: Knowledge and Networks of Science across the British Empire, 1800-1970* (Houndmills, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

⁹⁶ Matthew James Connelly, *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008), 378.

⁹⁷ Véronique Dimier, *The Invention of a European Development Aid Bureaucracy: Recycling Empire*, 2014.

⁹⁸ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*, 125.

empires.⁹⁹ Rather than seeing decolonisation as a systemic rupture, Cunliffe notes that it corresponded “(...) *with the growth of international institutions to discipline and regulate the behaviour of newly independent states in place of old imperial strictures.*”¹⁰⁰ Additionally, Cunliffe argues that this period also saw how the experience of imperial warfare overseas had “(...) *laid down a transnational military infrastructure of experience, doctrine, habit, organisation, training and manpower that was inherited by the United Nations via its newly independent member states and thereby re-directed to the purposes of post-colonial peacekeeping.*”¹⁰¹ As colonies became states, the military dependence and engagement in international interventions of many former British and French colonies during the Cold War sustained the ‘new’ imperial security system.¹⁰² Providing cover for the withdrawal of the British, Dutch and Belgians from their colonies, the Cold War interventions thus saw the participation of units from the armies of many former British and French colonies and small states and middle powers such as the Scandinavian countries, Austria, Canada and Australia.¹⁰³ In contrast, the US, Great Britain, France as well as Spain and Italy dominated the interventions of Cunliffe’s second phase from 1990 to 2000 due to the political space the collapse of the Soviet Union gave the West to concentrate legal, military and political power in the UN system.¹⁰⁴ Accordingly, the third phase from 2000 saw a massive increase in the use of units from former colonial armies,¹⁰⁵ marking thus neither “(...) *a cosmopolitan break with previous patterns of military deployment*”¹⁰⁶ nor the emergence of a single, unitary empire,¹⁰⁷ but a transformation of the interventions to “*reduce the costs of policing empire by devolving these responsibilities to the periphery itself.*”¹⁰⁸

A brief recap of the discussion is necessary at this point. In contrast to the early modern dynastic and tributary empires, several scholars see modern European, American and Japanese imperialism both furthering and furthered by capitalism and other exploitative socio-economic practices and racialised colonial regimes of order based on direct intervention. Due to the end of incorporable territory, an increasingly aggressive ‘multinational imperialism’ took on the Chinese and Ottoman empires, both previously out of reach for the smaller European early modern empires, at the beginning of the 20th century. It is now common amongst scholars to see the League of Nations as the institutionalisation of this still racialised inter-imperial system with the British Empire and direct colonial rule and ‘internationally’ sanctioned territorial rule at the centre. To use Cunliffe’s concepts, several scholars also see the system of

⁹⁹ Ibid., 248.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 82.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 147.

¹⁰² Ibid., 155.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 125 & 249.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 125–26.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 9–16.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 125.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 2.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

‘multinational imperialism’ become a system of ‘imperial multilateralism’ not with the British Empire and direct colonial rule at the centre, but the US, the British Empire and the Soviet Union and indirect rule via the UN and new national elites of postcolonial states with complex loyalties.

When thus embedded in and qualified by the broader historiography, Cunliffe’s concept of initially ‘multinational imperialism’ and later ‘imperial multilateralism’ concept become even more compelling, analytically potent and the antithesis of the purely “ideological construct” Hughes sees it as,¹⁰⁹ despite focusing on the works on the military history of the British, French and American imperial modalities.

Systems, Networks, Agency and Places: Anchoring Cunliffe’s ‘Imperial Multilateralism’ in Imperial Frontier Studies

To begin with, I want to emphasize the need of adopting a both-and approach to the global imperial system and its manifestation ‘locally’ (rather than either-or). This will enable capturing, theoretically and conceptually, not only the system’s transformative dynamics, its forms, and technologies of power, but also the human agency making up the system and how it is negotiated ‘locally’. With this approach, rooted in Cunliffe’s concept of ‘imperial multilateralism’, I will show, it becomes possible to elucidate the shifting character and thus turn to the time dimension as a means to explain systemic change. Promoting a micro-spatial approach to global history more broadly, global historian of punishment Christian De Vito argues that planetary, macro or structural approaches for the most part create a false local-global divide. Instead, he calls for approaches that see local and global as connected, parts of one another and as simultaneous concrete spatialised processes involving individuals in various numbers and settings around the world (but do not focus exclusively on individuals).¹¹⁰ Linking directly to imperialism, cultural and political geographer John Morrissey similarly argues “(...) *it would be a mistake to either consider the local as always ‘on the periphery’ or overlook imperialism’s perennial concerns with localized techniques of occupation and economic production.*”¹¹¹ Similarly, global anthropologist Eric Wolf has argued, global processes link to peoples’ lives ‘locally’ and vice versa. He therefore argues it necessary to delineate the significant elements working in these processes, their systemic combinations and negotiated transformative characters. In other words, we need to consider the ‘local’ histories of

¹⁰⁹ Geraint Hughes, “Legions of Peace: UN Peacekeepers from the Global South,” *Round Table* 103, no. 3 (2014): 353–56.

¹¹⁰ Christian Guisepp De Vito, “Micro-Spatial History: Towards a New Global History” (Cosmopolis Seminar, Leiden, 2014).

¹¹¹ John Morrissey, “The Imperial Present: Geography, Imperialism and Its Continued Effects,” in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Cultural Geography*, ed. Noala C. Johnson, Richard H. Schein, and Jamie Winders (Somerset: John Wiley & Sons, 2013), 495.

incorporation into the global processes—such as the rise of Cunliffe’s system of ‘imperial multilateralism’.¹¹²

There should be no doubt that Cunliffe is taking to task the lack of attentiveness to imperialism within both the discipline of international relations and the other social sciences in the research field on international interventions. In brief, he focuses on the changes in the countries that contributes military forces for the interventions. In doing so, however, he is also grappling with the parallel line of thought amongst imperial historians that he relies on when it comes to local agency and the importance of not only who contributes troops but also where they go.

The tradition of imperial historians in short reads as follows. For more than a century, imperial historians have discussed the transformative character of imperialism in the Middle East, Europe, East Asia, South Asia, Central Asia, and South East Asia, and the relationships between their different parts and other empires. Although occasionally still the case, imperial historians traditionally analysed the empires through studies of the military strategies of the government and metropolitan elites, the big picture in relation to economic dynamics and trade patterns of histories of expansion (and decline). For many years, this privileged the top-down and outward views from what were perceived to be the ‘centres’, binary views of home and empire, and grand narratives of empires bringing civilisation and modernity to the colonies. In turn, these perspectives engendered the colonies—and the people living in them—mostly insignificant in themselves but often also invisible, despite being perhaps the most important locations in a systemic sense. Prior to the Second World War (and in some cases beyond), most imperial historians were also apologetic to the particular projects of imperialism they linked to due to a sense of shared (national) imperial identity rooted in ideas of race and religion.¹¹³ While Cunliffe is both clearly attentive to and critical of the evolution of the broader system of imperial multilateralism, he appears to offer little theorisation on the ‘mission areas’ in themselves and their relation to the emerging system, nor on the associated importance of local agency and the social categories of race, gender, class, age and so on. Rather than reflecting his analytical choices, this mirrors the broader weaknesses of the fields of international relations and imperial military history due to their epistemological and ontological links to their subjects and subsequent state-centric character. I therefore turn to anchor his system of ‘imperial multilateralism’ further in the imperial frontier studies, a particular segment of research linking the imperial and colonial fields of study.

This link, or spill over if you will, between the imperial and colonial fields evolved out of the socio-political changes that happened with decolonisation and the immigration ‘waves’ from former colonies to the former metropole. With people from

¹¹² Eric R Wolf, *Europe and the People without History*, ed. Thomas Hylland Eriksen (Berkeley, Calif.; London: University of California Press, 2010), 21–23.

¹¹³ For more on the discussions, see for instance Burbank and Cooper, *Empires in World History*, 2010; Darwin, *After Tamerlane*; Stephen Howe, “British Worlds, Settler Worlds, World Systems, and Killing Fields,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 40, no. 4 (2012): 691–725; Athena Syriatou, “National, Imperial, Colonial and the Political: British Imperial Histories and Their Descendants,” *HISTOREIN* 12 (2013): 38.

the former colonies migrating, scholars such as colonial historians, anthropologists and geographers began paying attention to the colonised and colonisers, albeit initially as static categories. However, with the combined and growing influence of social and cultural history, the French post-structuralist Michel Foucault and the postcolonial scholar Edward Said, they changed their focus with time. Gradually, attention was granted to the ways in which the colonial regimes of governance and local populations negotiated power materially, institutionally, spatially and discursively, how they mutually shaped each other and formed interconnected hybrid identities through the ambivalent intimacy of everyday life or the ways in which the colonial violence affected indigenous communities. Accordingly, colonial historians (and others) thus broke down gradually the traditional divide between imperial and colonial historiography by placing the metropolises and colonies on the one hand, and the coloniser and colonised on the other, in the same (intra-imperial and inter-imperial) analytical field(s). Recently, these scholarly currents have crystallised into what has become known as ‘critical imperial studies’ and ‘new imperial history’, or rather ‘new imperial histories’.¹¹⁴ Scholars relating to this current, or at least inspired by it, have conducted studies on how imperialism and, for example, diseases, family and motherhood, gender, sexualities, race and bodies in both colonial and broader imperial spaces were connected. Their work has shown that the imperialism of modern empires was not only spatially configured, but also as intimate as the personal was political and, therefore, negotiated by some and downright violently resisted by other ‘locals’ in the colonies.¹¹⁵ Within this body of research, imperial frontier studies stands out. By emphasising not only systems, networks, but also agency and places, it is able to capture the transformative dynamics, forms, technologies of power making up the changing global imperial system and how it is negotiated through human relations.

The analytical use of the ‘frontier’, however, originates not in imperial studies, but in the field of American history in the 19th century. While the American historian

¹¹⁴ Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Durba Ghosh, “Another Set of Imperial Turns?,” *The American Historical Review* 117, no. 3 (2012): 772–93; Kathleen Wilson, “Old Imperialisms and New Imperial Histories: Rethinking the History of the Present,” *Radical History Review*, no. 95 (2006): 211–34.

¹¹⁵ M. Bourdaghs, “The Disease of Nationalism, the Empire of Hygiene,” *Positions* 6, no. 3 (1998): 637–73; Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); E. M. Collingham, *Imperial Bodies: The Physical Experience of the Raj, C. 1800-1947* (Cambridge; Malden: Polity Press; Blackwell Publishers, 2001); Daniel Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship: Empire and the Question of Belonging* (Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press and Palgrave, 2006); Jean J. Kim, “Experimental Encounters: Filipino and Hawaiian Bodies in the U.S. Imperial Invention of Odontoclasia, 1928–1946,” *American Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2010): 523–46; Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault’s History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995); Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*, 2nd Revised edition (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010); M. -C. Thoral, “Colonial Medical Encounters in the Nineteenth Century: The French Campaigns in Egypt, Saint Domingue and Algeria,” *Social History of Medicine* 25, no. 3 (2012): 608–24.

Frederick Jackson Turner was most probably not the first scholar to use the notion of a 'frontier',¹¹⁶ he made the analytic use of the concept popular from 1893 onwards. Writing not long after the US had extended its imperial reach to the Pacific, he saw the frontier operated as an incorporative 'edge of civilisation' that given its character and advancement of individualism initially by 'white' settlers and later by federal institutions of the United States, promoted American democracy, economic equality and ultimately political equality. Ignoring the genocide against indigenous populations the expansion entailed, Turner saw the 'white' settlers and American state institutions as culturally superior and thus as bringing 'civilisation' to the lands of 'primitive' indigenous peoples.¹¹⁷ Subsequently, many historians of the United States detached this racialising aspect of Turner's frontier concept and emphasised instead (especially from the 1990s) how the frontier was a fluid physical space of contact and conflict, which also, when seen from the indigenous perspective, brought destruction and havoc.¹¹⁸ Historians studying Eurasian and South American ancient, medieval and early modern empires have since also adopted the concept in this capacity, as a fluid space on political-geographical periphery in relation to the centres of the agrarian empires.¹¹⁹

More importantly here, however, scholars studying modern European empires and imperialism also turned to the 'frontier', emphasising also its systemic dimension to its territorial dimension. This broadened the understanding of the 'frontier' from strictly a political-geographic space between geographically adjacent territories or several patches of such territories making up a larger frontier-belt as promoted by Turner, historians of the United States before the 1870s and historians of ancient, medieval and early modern empires. No longer limited to the study of large land-based and dynastic empires, the analytical value of the 'frontier' increased for historians of modern empires and imperialism. Historians and others therefore turned to the concept to analyse, for example, how metropolitan imperial imaginaries mobilised

¹¹⁶ Tuttle and Tuttle, "Forerunners of Frederick Jackson Turner: Nineteenth-Century British Conservatives and the Frontier Thesis," *Agricultural History* 41, no. 3 (1967): 219–27.

¹¹⁷ Turner and Faragher, *Rereading Frederick Jackson Turner*.

¹¹⁸ Ethan R. Bennett, "Frontier," *Encyclopedia of Politics of the American West* (Los Angeles: Sage Reference & CQ Press, 2013); Ian Tyrrell, "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History," *The American Historical Review* 96, no. 4 (1991): 1031–55.

¹¹⁹ See for example David Abulafia and Nora Berend, eds., *Medieval Frontiers: Concepts and Practices* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002); Sonia Alconini, "The Southeastern Inka Frontier against the Chiriguanos: Structure and Dynamics of the Inka Imperial Borderlands," *Latin American Antiquity* 15, no. 4 (2004): 389–418; Yingcong Dai, *The Sichuan Frontier and Tibet: Imperial Strategy in the Early Qing* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009); Michael Khodarkovsky, *Russia's Steppe Frontier: The Making of a Colonial Empire, 1500-1800: Indiana-Michigan Series in Russian and East European Studies* (Indiana University Press, 2002); Steven B. Miles, "Imperial Discourse, Regional Elite, and Local Landscape on the South China Frontier, 1577-1722," *Journal of Early Modern History* 12, no. 2 (2008): 99–136; Nigel Mills, ed., *Presenting the Romans: Interpreting the Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site*, Heritage Matters (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013); Peter C. Perdue, "Empire and Nation in Comparative Perspective: Frontier Administration in Eighteenth-Century China," *Journal of Early Modern History* 5, no. 4 (2001): 282–304.

support for the imperial projects from public rather than state initiatives; how imperial warfare depended on the populations of the colonies for soldiers; how colonial governmentalities were resisted and modified; and how shifting imperial frontiers affected the global power relations between the empires. In other words, historians and others of modern empires and imperialism have taken up the use of and appropriated the concept of the ‘frontier’ to show not only how ‘the periphery’ was central to the ‘centre’. They have also shown how imperial formations are best understood as fluctuating two-way processes that shape and are shaped by both the imperial institutions, the agency of the people and places incorporated into the empires and the networks connecting the metropolises and the colonies.¹²⁰ In extension thereof, the aforementioned scholar of development Mark Duffield has also used the frontier concept in relation to the building of a fluid and relational ‘external sovereign frontier’ via imperialism that the new international institutions helped to maintain upon decolonisation in form of de facto condition of state inequality via technologies of security such as development and international interventions.¹²¹ It is thus fair to say that scholars have proven the worth of the frontier in relation to De Vito and Wolf’s similar calls to link global systemic processes to peoples’ lives ‘locally’ and Morrissey’s warning to consider local peripheral or ignore the strong imperial attention to the development of local technologies of governance.

While Hessel Duncan Hall, League of Nations official, Commonwealth historian and geographer, did not appreciate frontiers as two-way systemic processes, it is necessary to use also his notion of the ‘frontier zone’ as the particular site of incorporation. Already in 1948, he used the ‘frontier’ to conceptualise what he called ‘earth’s political crust’ and ‘frontier zones’ as the multi-sited institutions in which this manifested. In other words, he used the concept of the ‘frontier zone’ to show how the emerging international organisations were intimately intertwined with European and American imperialism in ways not too dissimilar to Duara’s ‘imperialism of nation states’, Fernando Coronil’s modes of ‘national imperialism’ and ‘global imperialism’,

¹²⁰ Hanne Cottyn, “Renegotiating Communal Autonomy. Communal Land Rights and Liberal Land Reform on the Bolivian Altiplano. Carangas, 1860-1930” (University of Ghent, 2014); Daniel Goh, “Postcolonial Disorientations: Colonial Ethnography and the Vectors of the Philippine Nation in the Imperial Frontier,” *Postcolonial Studies* 11, no. 3 (2008): 259–76; Andrew Tait Jarboe and Richard Standish Fogarty, eds., *Empires in World War I: Shifting Frontiers and Imperial Dynamics in a Global Conflict* (London; New York: I.B. Tauris; Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); James D Lunt, *Imperial Sunset: Frontier Soldiering in the 20th Century* (London: Macdonald Futura, 1981); Spencer Mawby, “Britain’s Last Imperial Frontier: The Aden Protectorates, 1952–59,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 29, no. 2 (2001): 75–100; Patricia O’Brien, “Remaking Australia’s Colonial Culture?: White Australia and Its Papuan Frontier 1901–1940,” *Australian Historical Studies* 40, no. 1 (2009): 96–112; W. Michael Ryan, “The Influence of the Imperial Frontier on British Doctrines of Mechanized Warfare,” *Albion* 15, no. 2 (1983): 123–42; Antonio C. Tavares, “The Japanese Colonial State and the Dissolution of the Late Imperial Frontier Economy in Taiwan, 1886–1909,” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 64, no. 2 (2005): 361–85.

¹²¹ Mark Duffield, “Development, Territories, and People: Consolidating the External Sovereign Frontier,” *Alternatives* 32, no. 2 (2007): 225–46.

Cunliffe's 'multinational imperialism' and Mazower's 'imperial internationalism' manifested themselves in particular political-geographical modalities. Examples on this list of 'frontier zones' counted Suez Canal regime, demilitarised islands under peace agreements, the mandates in the colonial territories of the collapsed German and Ottoman empires and international regimes in Danzig and Tangier of the League of Nations, the UN trusteeships and Germany and Korea after 1945.

Altogether, the concepts of the 'frontier' and the 'frontier zone' are well suited to operationalise Cunliffe's 'imperial multilateralism'. They offer a systemic, but spatialised and networked approach to the interventions that historicises the systems, networks, agency and places that shaped and were shaped by the interventions. In the following section, I therefore offer my theoretical framework based on the marriage of the two concepts.

Spatializing and Networking the 'Mission Areas' of International Interventions as 'Frontier Zones of Imperial Multilateralism'

Following the previous sections of this chapter, the expansion of the system of imperial multilateralism was not merely a geographical expansion of the existing global imperial system revolving around American and European imperialism. The expansion in itself also changed the overall system 'centrally' as well as 'locally'. In this sense, it makes sense to speak of understanding the building of imperial multilateralism as frontier building with both diachronic and synchronic dimensions. The diachronic dimensions involve more than the formation and practices of the UN as an institutional paradigm in 1945. Part thereof were also the palimpsest foundations of the UN contained in the gendered and racialised ideas and practices of the principally inter-imperial military alliance from 1942; the increasingly region- and bloc-oriented modalities of American, British, Soviet and French imperialism of the 1930s and 1940s; the inter-war 'imperial internationalism' that took empire for granted and internationalism as a means to sustain it; and, finally, the pre-First World War 'multinational imperialism'.

Within the framing of the frontier of imperial multilateralism, the systemic expansion happened not via colonies, as did the modern empires, but via especially the 'mission areas' the international interventions', or 'frontier zones of imperial multilateralism'. These zones were political-geographical palimpsests of actively and passively occasionally conflicting or cooperative colonial, post-colonial and international gendered and racialised regimes of governance in which actors negotiate both the international presence and the imposition of regimes of social and spatial ordering. Here, actors encompass national and international decision makers, UN military and civilian staff, 'local' decision-makers, and various 'local' communities, their population groups and individual members thereof. In extension of the various forms of incorporation as spheres of influence, protectorates, colonies or commonwealths into the modern empires, the territories incorporated into the UN

system as frontier zones by way of interventions attained different degrees of sovereignty and forms of governance.¹²² Consequently, the frontier of imperial multilateralism can be seen as being both a gendered and racialised multi-sited political assemblage and simultaneously but by no means linear and uncontested expansive processes of broadening and deepening.¹²³

As for the systemic expansion in breadth, it follows that this overall process relied on several factors. Firstly, the growing number of troop contributors amongst the group of small Western states or pro-western former Western colonies ensured the means to expand. Secondly, the establishment of new frontier zones in the ‘Third World’ provided a growing number of sites for expansion. Thirdly, the making of an analytically relevant but much-ignored gendered and racialised multi-sited web of imperial multilateralism via 1) Western military infrastructure such as airfields, naval and military bases, 2) supply systems by water and air, and 3) the Western dominated UN bureaucracy steeped in the ways of Western knowledge systems and conventions (i.e. cartography and ‘development’ ideology) ensured the ability of the system to reproduce itself.

Equally part of continuing what was essentially the—if negotiated—internationalisation of Western and western colonial governmentality and military infrastructure, the expansion in depth hinged on the continuation of these processes of tying all systemic actors and sites closer together. The use of Western (male) experts in top positions in the UN in New York and each ‘mission area’ ensured their and the broader Western systemic influence. Providing military units repeatedly also guaranteed political and institutional ‘alignment’ amongst former colonies or small Western states. Additionally, the longer each intervention was active by way of renewed mandates, the deeper the integration of each frontier zone in the overall system and the reach of its ways of operation and dynamics. That is not, however, to say that the processes of expansion by establishing new interventions, further integrating existing mission areas, and reproducing the overall system were not sought negotiated both in the bodies of the UN and ‘on the ground’ in the ‘mission areas’.

At the political arenas of the UN in New York, the members partly or wholly opposed to or in favour of the interventions acted within both the formal and informal spaces for political manoeuvring to further their own interests or counter their opponents. However, states are both institutions and processes of territorialised systems of power. At the UN, the analytically relevant actors are hence not only ‘states’ as such, but also the involved clusters of predominantly male national and international decision makers, government representatives and diplomats and equally predominantly male UN officials, many of whom were former colonial employees,

¹²² Burbank and Cooper, *Empires in World History*, 2010; Darwin, *After Tamerlane*; Go, *Patterns of Empire*.

¹²³ Here, I have adapted the Hanne Cottyn’s broader theoretical idea that a frontier expands in both breadth (degree of global reach) and depth (degree of integration of particular area in broader system) to suit this theoretical framework in particular. See Cottyn, “Renegotiating Communal Autonomy. Communal Land Rights and Liberal Land Reform on the Bolivian Altiplano. Carangas, 1860-1930.”

and the relations in between the states and organisations they represented. The dynamics of the negotiations at the General Assembly, the Security Council and the corridors can thus be understood as influenced by the probable dominant group of representatives' common experiences from colonial or international deployments and self-identification in relation to race, gender and class on the one hand, and the geopolitical alignment of the different member states, the geopolitical importance of the mission area to these, and their formal/informal authority in the international hierarchy on the other. The views of governments and organisations were subsequently not always uniform, but could (and did) vary from adamant resistance to establishing missions or covering operational expenses to 'barking but no biting' and quietly supporting the interventions, perhaps with troops, as a means to get influence 'on the inside'. Although the Soviet Union under Stalin had been a founding partner of the UN and the number of representatives of former colonies that were becoming legally independent states was increasing year by year, they put forward their different forms of opposition at the UN initially in the context of Western dominance of the organs of the organisation. However, the shifts in the balance of power allowed the representatives of the opponents of the interventions, as Cunliffe notes, to 'storm the citadel' from the late 1960s.¹²⁴ While not a linear process, the 'siege' lasted until the Soviet system weakening and collapse and the Western bloc became able to gain further control with the UN system and subsequently outsource further the maintenance of system stability.¹²⁵

The frontier zones of imperial multilateralism were and are not top-down projects in the same way the colonial regimes were not what geographer Doreen Massey calls 'power-geometries'¹²⁶ with strict linear top-down dynamics due to the relations between the different colonial regimes of governance and different 'local' actors that drew upon a wide spectre from violent resistance to cooperation.¹²⁷ As the gendered and racialised colonial regimes, they were and are part of everyday life, sometimes very intimately so. In line with De Vito, Wolf and Morrissey, it is therefore not sufficient to analyse only the relations between national and community decision makers and the UN headquarters in the mission areas as important as these relations are. Even if spatial theorists argue "(...) *space is fundamental in any exercise of power*",¹²⁸ and how spaces, therefore, can be "(...) *delineated for various purposes: to produce grids of classification, order and discipline; but equally to foster particular kinds of environmental qualities (...)*",¹²⁹ it is necessary to study the everyday

¹²⁴ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*, 257.

¹²⁵ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*.

¹²⁶ Doreen Massey, *For Space* (London; Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2005), 131.

¹²⁷ Ann Laura Stoler and Cooper Cooper Frederick, "Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda" (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1995), 1–43.

¹²⁸ Margo Huxley, "Geographies of Governmentality," in *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*, ed. Jeremy W. Crampton and Stuart Elden (Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate, 2007), 190.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 195.

negotiations of the interventions with members of the ‘local’ communities and population groups. The cluster of analytically relevant actors thus expands from mainly national and international decision makers and UN officials at the UN to include also deployed UN military and civilian staff, ‘local’ decision-makers, and not the least various ‘local’ communities, their population groups and individual members thereof. As for the former, the positions and perspectives of the ‘international’ different actors ‘on the ground’ in what they see as ‘mission areas’ were and are different than those involved mostly or only at the arenas of the UN in New York or the institutions in the web of imperial multilateralism around the world. The deployed UN staff, whether civilian or military, may be additionally influenced by for example their orders, organisational culture, experience from previous colonial or deployments, understanding of the ‘mission areas’ geopolitical and cultural histories, relations to other civilian organisations/military units, and previous encounters with ‘locals’ and the dynamics of the site of encounter within the ‘mission area’. As for the latter, ‘local’ decision-makers and members of ‘local’ communities and population groups were likely shaped by experiences in the colonial era, the degree of external orientation and militarisation of their post-colonial society and communities, self-identification in relation to ethnicity/race, gender, class and age, previous encounters with international personnel and the dynamics of the site of encounters. Given how the various actors ‘on the ground’ had shifting agendas that sometimes overlapped and other times conflicted, the pluralised spatial reflections by sociologist Brooke Neely and scholar of race Michelle Samura are useful here. They argue, “*Space is 1) contested, 2) fluid and historical, 3) relational and interactional, and 4) infused with difference and inequality.*”¹³⁰ This means not only that “*(...) meanings and uses of space change over time*”¹³¹ and “*(...) social actors create, disrupt and re-create spatial meanings through interaction with one another*”,¹³² but also that “*(...) political struggles over space play out through structures of difference and inequality that define and organize spaces according to dominant interests (...)*”.¹³³ While one use of space can thus reinforce regime power, another can be used to resist the very same power. Contested spaces, Neely and Samura note, are therefore gendered and racialised “*(...) geographic locations where conflicts in the form of opposition, confrontation, subversion, and/or resistance engage actors whose social positions are defied by differential control of resources and access to power.*”¹³⁴ Additionally, geographer and spatial theorist Doreen Massey notes, “*From the symbolic meaning of spaces/places and the clearly gendered messages which they transmit, to straightforward exclusion by violence, spaces and places are not only gendered themselves gendered but, in their being so, they both reflect and affect the ways in*

¹³⁰ Michelle Samura and Brooke Neely, “Social Geographies of Race: Connecting Race and Space,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34, no. 11 (2011): 1938.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 1939.

¹³² *Ibid.*

¹³³ *Ibid.*

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1938.

which gender is constructed and understood."¹³⁵ The gendered and racialised everyday negotiations of the interventions in fields, roads, checkpoints, villages, urban neighbourhoods and so on were and are all thus simultaneously both part of the geography and materiality of the 'mission areas' and the homes and communities in which people sought to make the best of their lives.

Altogether, the building of the frontier and each frontier zone thus shifted the centre of gravity forth and back between the various states involved, the UN bodies in New York and the frontier zones that were simultaneously 'mission areas' and 'home'. In other words, the processes of systemic expansion were if unequal, gendered and racialised encounters nonetheless negotiated and thus reversible multi-sited and multi-dimensional processes. To sum up, the frontier zones were, in all their diversities, as integral to and reflective of the frontier of imperial multilateralism as the spectre of imperial possessions such as settler colonies, crown colonies, plantation colonies, protectorate and dependent territories, and spheres of influence were to the different empires and imperial projects.

¹³⁵ Doreen Massey, *Space, Place and Gender* (London: Polity Press, 1994), 79.

Chapter 2: Methodology

In this chapter, I offer my methodological reflections. In the first section, I explain why the first United Nations intervention is the best suited of all to answer the broader questions I outlined in the introduction. I use the second section, a historiography, to place the scholars and their works on the first UN intervention in their political and disciplinary contexts, linking thus to the discussion of the research field in the introduction. Calling for attention to the links between research, scholars, the international organisations and the interventions, I would be remiss not to offer any on reflections my own context. I do so in the third section, connecting to scholarship on reflective research practices and auto-ethnography within both International Relations, imperial history and ‘peacekeeping’ research. In the fourth section, I introduce the unpublished and published records and materials I use in the chapters 4 through 9 and situate the material within a theoretical understanding informed by critical archive theory. Finally, I provide both my intervention-specific questions that I ask as the point of departure for an interdisciplinary and historicising counter-narrative and an outline of the structure of the thesis, linking specific research questions to specific chapters.

Why (only) UNSCO and UNEF?

Why choose the intervention in Egypt and the Gaza Strip from 1956 to 1967—or rather the United Nations Suez Clearance Organization in the Suez Canal from 1956 to 1957 and the United Nations Emergency Force in Egypt and the Gaza Strip until 1967—over other interventions, or several others for the site(s) in which to build my analytical political history?

As for the early international interventions of the UN, several others stand out in their own rights. I could have chosen the broader mandated intervention in Congo from 1960 to 1964, which the aforementioned Cold War historian John Kent, whom I linked to the ‘imperial segment’, has argued was used to advance an African system of nation states with allegiance to “(...) *the principles, if not old colonial practices, of Western capitalism*”.¹³⁶ In his scathing works, the American political scientist David Gibbs has also argued that the UN intervention was an extension of US foreign policy.¹³⁷ Another option could be the intervention in West Papua from 1963 to 1964, which historian John Saltford has similarly argued was akin to “(...) ‘big power’ *Cold*

¹³⁶ Kent, *America, the UN and Decolonisation*, 193.

¹³⁷ David N. Gibbs, *The Political Economy of Third World Intervention: Mines, Money, and U.S. Policy in the Congo Crisis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); David N. Gibbs, “The United Nations, International Peacekeeping and the Question of Impartiality: Revisiting the Congo Operation of 1960,” *Journal of Modern African Studies* 38, no. 3 (2000): 359–82.

War politics in which the rights of the Papuans counted for nothing,¹³⁸ in relation to the agreement between the United Nations, Indonesia and the Netherlands on the Papuans' right to self-determination upon decolonisation in 1962. Additionally, I could also have considered the intervention on Cyprus, which was initially to have been a NATO force but became a UN force deployed in 1964, inviting to Cyprus an influx of NGOs, INGOs and international agencies promoting not entirely problem-free Western forms of development.¹³⁹ An interesting case study linked to the later part of Cunliffe's first phase of imperial multilateralism could also have been the intervention launched by the Organization of African Unity in Chad from 1981 to 1982, which political scientist Terry M. Mays argues "(...) served as a foreign policy tool for Nigeria, France, the United States, and, to a lesser extent, Great Britain".¹⁴⁰ In Cunliffe's later phases, the interventions in Somalia from 1992 that both Razack and Cunliffe reviewed scathingly as imperial in character,¹⁴¹ and in Cambodia that French political scientist Beatrice Pouligny has shown was little popular with the local communities and that led to aid dependency according to Cambodian-American political scientist Sophal Ear¹⁴² are also interesting as potential case studies. More recently, the interventions in Haiti, Kosovo and Liberia, which sociologist Paul Higate and developmental scholar Marsha Henry argue produced insecurity for the populations in the 'mission areas' in the context of a global neo-liberal security scape, provide other interventions to scrutinise in relation to the main research question.¹⁴³ So again, why the first UN intervention instead of the following interventions?

When considering the body of research on international interventions several decades has produced, there is no doubt that the interventions following the end of the Cold War have received the most scholarly attention. This is perhaps not surprising given that both the pace of initiating new interventions along with the scope of their mandates have only increased following the end of the Cold War and it is now possible to speak of a multi-disciplinary research field rather than scholars from various disciplines merely taking an interest for intra-disciplinary purposes. The little interest in the Cold War epoch also characterises 'the imperial segment' that predominantly focused on the post-Cold War interventions. Only Kent, who focused on the

¹³⁸ John Saltford, *The United Nations and the Indonesian Takeover of West Papua, 1962-1969: The Anatomy of Betrayal* (London; New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), 180.

¹³⁹ Peter Hocknell, "Contested Development: A Retrospective of the UN Development Programme in Cyprus," in *The Work of the UN in Cyprus: Promoting Peace and Development* (Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave, 2001), 157–92; James Ker-Lindsay, "The Origins of the UN Presence in Cyprus," in *The Work of the UN in Cyprus: Promoting Peace and Development* (Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave, 2001), 50–73.

¹⁴⁰ Terry M. Mays, *Africa's First Peacekeeping Operation: The OAU in Chad, 1981-1982* (Westport: Praeger, 2002), 145.

¹⁴¹ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*; Sherene Razack, *Dark Threats and 'white' Knights: The Somalia Affairs, Peacekeeping and New Imperialism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004).

¹⁴² Sophal Ear, "The Political Economy of Aid and Governance in Cambodia," *Asian Journal of Political Science* 15, no. 1 (2007): 68–96; Pouligny, *Peace Operations Seen from below*.

¹⁴³ Higate and Henry, *Insecure Spaces: Peacekeeping, Power and Performance in Haiti, Kosovo and Liberia*.

intervention in Congo from 1960 to 1964, and Cunliffe, who offers a section on the end of empire and birth of imperial multilateralism, have taken an interest. As mentioned before, however, Kent did not link his work to the research on international interventions, but only the research field of Cold War history. Cunliffe on the other hand specifically argues, “*The imperial character of peacekeeping is visible even in the much reduced peacekeeping operations of the Cold War era*”¹⁴⁴ as they were often used to either cover the retreat of the American allied European colonial empires or prevent a violent aftermath following imperial divide-and-conquer practices. If we also recall the broader views of the Cold War interventions of, for instance, David Chandler and Robert Rubinstein, who both saw them as relatively trouble-free and rooted in a consensus-based international community,¹⁴⁵ it becomes even more interesting to focus on the Cold War interventions.

Then why focus ‘only’ on the intervention in Egypt and the Gaza Strip and not also the Cold War interventions in Congo, West Papua and Cyprus, since these were clearly problematic and have not yet been properly contextualized? Indeed the intervention in Egypt and the Gaza Strip does not appear to stand out as extreme with regard to dimensions such as the geopolitical bearings of the interventions, the degree of racism, and everyday low-level violence towards members of the communities of the ‘mission areas’. Future research may suggest that the interventions in Congo and West Papua were perhaps clearer examples thereof.

However, the joint interventions in Egypt and the Gaza Strip from 1956 to 1967 is pivotal as the expansion of the frontier of imperial multilateralism hinged on them, as the use and deployment of UN forces in the Korean War under US command had only materialized due to the Soviet boycott of the Security Council. In much research, the intervention in Egypt and the Gaza Strip therefore stands as the ‘first real’ and the best example of a ‘classic’ peacekeeping operation as since articulated by politicians, scholars and veterans. The UNEF and its smaller sibling in the form of UNSCO are thus not merely any (‘joint’) case study of a frontier zone of imperial multilateralism from the Cold War. They are, as I will show in the following section of this chapter and in chapter 5, the first stitches in the myth of ‘peacekeeping’ and the success of UNEF, which is woven into military culture and organisation, officer academies, high school and university textbooks, university and think-tank research, policy recommendations, policymaking, public narratives, and frontier building in other ‘mission areas’. Showing how ‘peacekeeping’ is anything but, and consequently is not only the most effective way to attempt to pull the threads of the still very dominant narrative of ‘peacekeeping’ with what that unravelling could potentially bring, but also the intervention in which to anchor the counter-narrative of the interventions expanding the frontier of imperial multilateralism.

Additional factors weigh in as well. In most research, the oil and shipping dimensions of the intervention are severely under-studied, intentionally or not. Often,

¹⁴⁴ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*, 249.

¹⁴⁵ Chandler, *Empire in Denial*; Rubinstein, *Peacekeeping under Fire*; Rubinstein, “Peacekeeping and the Return of Imperial Policing.”

scholars do not mention them at all. If acknowledged, as I will show in the following section, they mention only briefly the United Nations Clearance Organization, without offering any further comments. The process started at the beginning of the 20th century, but Western Europe only made the full transition to an oil-based economy after the Second World War, with strong American nudging by way of the Marshall aid.¹⁴⁶ The UN's concerns about disturbances in the Suez Canal regime in the years following the establishment of Israel in 1948 and the American and European concerns with keeping the oil flowing through the canal—to keep growth rates high enough to check the attraction of Communism to Western European working class voters—were therefore all but insignificant. While of lesser geopolitical significance, the shipping dimension was also important.

Finally, the intervention also appears, as far as I have been able to ascertain, to be the Cold War intervention that has seen interest from the broadest range of disciplines. Not only foreign policy historians, military historians, legal scholars and scholars of international relations have taken an interest. Sociologists, peace scholars and anthropologists have also published on the intervention. This would suggest that it is the perhaps most suitable Cold War intervention to use as a point of departure for further interdisciplinary dialogue.

Research On UNEF and UNCISO: The Building, institutionalisation and Internationalisation of the Myth of Imperial Multilateralism

The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu suggested that scholars of the social sciences often take over 'problems' as they are defined by state apparatuses and governments.¹⁴⁷ As will be clear, his argument appears valid for most of the research in English on the intervention's two components. While I am unsure of how much research exists beyond that in English,¹⁴⁸ I focus here on works in English not only because I (aside from being able to read them) feel confident they make up the largest cluster. I also centre them as they—reflecting global power relations—unveil much about the links between American foreign policy and social sciences, the influence of American imperialism on the social sciences in the West via the dissemination of the

¹⁴⁶ This will be addressed in chapter 4. For the connection between the shift to oil and the Marshall Plan, see David Painter, "The Marshall Plan and Oil," *Cold War History* 9, no. 2 (2009): 159–75.

¹⁴⁷ Pierre Bourdieu, "Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field," in *State/Culture – State-Formation after the Cultural Turn*, ed. George Steinmetz (London: Cornell University Press, 1999), 53–75.

¹⁴⁸ Given the composition of the UN force, works Portuguese and Serbo-Croatian might exist since Brazil and (the former) Yugoslavia sent contingents. Works in German, French and Italian might also be likely given the strong status of standard of funding of research on international politics compared to smaller countries in the Global South.

transnational narrative of ‘peacekeeping’ that includes UNEF’s success, and, once UNEF ended in 1967, the institutionalisation and internationalisation thereof.

Before moving to the research from UNEF’s operational period, it is necessary to note that, as anthropologist David Nugent argues, the funding of social science research fields (such as area studies and international politics), journals and internationally oriented think-tank’s by American trusts established in late 19th and early 20th centuries by the wealthiest American businessmen was all but coincidental. Rather, as Nugent argues, the financial support from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation and others to universities was fundamental in building a post-war global geography of knowledge aimed at securing capitalist development and political stability around the world.¹⁴⁹ For example, the formation of the journal, *International Organization*, was one of the vehicles the Rockefeller Foundation funded. In 1954, the Rockefeller Foundation convened a conference. Several former, serving and future political heavyweights and private actors took part and requested that the predominantly political scientists from the well-connected American East coast universities such as Columbia, MIT, and Tufts show ‘what they could do for them’.¹⁵⁰ While many scholars were former UN diplomats and military officers, the growing presence of the military in American social science both as an employer of researchers and sponsor of policy-oriented university research pulled, as Cold War historian Joy Rohde has shown, many scholars closer to the interests of power.¹⁵¹ As I will show, the American and Canadian academic landscapes were rather similar and would come to influence the emerging research on UNEF.

Within six months of the operation, Maxwell Cohen, Canadian former soldier turned legal scholar and later UN representative for Canada, published the first article in a Canadian journal in the spring of 1957. Seeing the European empires and the Commonwealth as the basis of world order, his framing revolved around the use of troops from ‘independent’ nations, Canadian resolve, and praise of the UN Secretary-General.¹⁵² Another Canadian, Graham Spry, historian turned oil executive with Middle Eastern tasks, had an article published in the Rockefeller Foundation-sponsored journal of the British think tank, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, in which he praised Canada, expressed concern with the internal Western rift, and other worries of several “‘white’” Commonwealth states.¹⁵³ At Columbia University,

¹⁴⁹ Nugent, “Knowledge and Empire: The Social Sciences and United States Imperial Expansion.”

¹⁵⁰ Inderjeet Parmar, “American Hegemony, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Rise of Academic International Relations in the United States,” in *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*, ed. Nicholas Guilhot (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 182–209.

¹⁵¹ Rohde, “Gray Matters”; Rohde, *Armed with Expertise: The Militarization of American Social Research During the Cold War*.

¹⁵² Maxwell Cohen, “The United Nations Emergency Force: A Preliminary View,” *International Journal* 12, no. 2 (1957): 109–27.

¹⁵³ Graham Spry, “Canada, the United Nations Emergency Force, and the Commonwealth,” *International Affairs* 33, no. 3 (1957): 289–300.

American political scientist Leland M. Goodrich and his Ph.D. student Gabrielle Rosner, enrolled in a research programme backed by the Rockefeller Foundation,¹⁵⁴ wrote another ‘loyalist’ article in *International Organization*. Goodrich was not only the editor of the journal, but also a member the international secretariat at the San Francisco conference, co-drafter of the UN Charter and a recipient of Rockefeller Foundation funds for work on American UN policy in 1951. As insiders, they praised the UN Secretary-General and Canada, professed hope for the intervention to last, and backed the making of a permanent UN force.¹⁵⁵ In an article in ‘his’ journal, the editor of *Foreign Affairs* (that has roots in the *Journal of Race Development*) Hamilton Fish Armstrong, both admired the intervention and supported expanding the UN’s organisational and military abilities.¹⁵⁶ Also publishing in the journal of which he was chief editor, American historian Matthew A. Fitzsimons applauded the US government for co-opting the UN.¹⁵⁷ Framing UNEF as in compliance with international law in an American law journal, legal scholar Dudley H. Chapman he recommended that it be granted greater discretion with respect to its authority and deployment and the Secretariat be expanded for future interventions.¹⁵⁸ Prominent Western scholars, who published in ‘their own’ journals and were involved in frontier building by academic legitimization within the fields of international law, political science and international relations, establishing the UN or securing Western access to Middle Eastern oil, thus not only dominated research from the outset. They were also instrumental in founding a pro-interventionist scholarly discourse rooted in western imperial knowledge conventions.

For a while, Western scholars shifted focus away from the Middle East as the hostility of both the Soviet Bloc and the governments of several newly independent third world states towards the growing costs and number of UN interventions intensified. However, in 1963, the Rockefeller Foundation convened scholars and UN officials at MIT to take stock of the ongoing interventions, provide ‘lessons learned’, and emphasise the need for permanent standby forces. The participants included for example Lincoln P. Bloomfield, former officer of the US Navy and the Office of Strategic Services turned political scientist and counsel for the State Department and Henry V. Dicks, officer for US military intelligence and psychological warfare expert in the Second World War turned psychiatrist. The journal edited by Goodrich instantly published their papers. In one article, the British political scientist touring American East-coast universities Herbert Nicholas commended UNEF for providing both contingents from countries detached from local and great power conflicts and making

¹⁵⁴ The Rockefeller Foundation, “The Rockefeller Foundation Annual Report 1956” (New York: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1956), 209.

¹⁵⁵ Leland M. Goodrich and Gabriella Rosner, “The United Nations Emergency Force,” *International Organization* 11, no. 3 (1957): 413–30.

¹⁵⁶ Hamilton Fish Armstrong, “The U. N. Experience in Gaza,” *Foreign Affairs* 35, no. 4 (1957): 600–619.

¹⁵⁷ Matthew A. Fitzsimons, “The Suez Crisis and the Containment Policy,” *The Review of Politics* 19, no. 4 (1957): 419–45.

¹⁵⁸ Chapman, “International Law.”

its temporary character the solution to the Middle East problem.¹⁵⁹ In another, Edward E. Bowman, a strategic and corporate management scholar at MIT and consultant with the arms manufacturer Honeywell, and James E. Fanning, one of Bowman's graduate students, summarised the logistical 'lessons learned' on basis of UNEF and the intervention in Congo. Adopting a pro-interventionist position, they argued that the UN needed to work on coordination, planning, air transport capabilities, and supplies.¹⁶⁰ Aside praising the clearance of the Suez Canal and the intervention in which he had been part, Brian Urquhart, former British officer and diplomat turned special advisor to the UN Secretary General from 1953 to 1961, advised using ad hoc forces to acclimatise governments to the idea of a permanent force.¹⁶¹ Combined, these publications were outwardly moderate manifestations of the Western ideas for how to use the UN. The same year, Rosner also had her dissertation published as the second book in a Columbia book series that the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored and Goodrich edited along with William T. R. Fox, a fellow Columbia scholar. Fox was as embedded in the power matrix as Goodrich, having been in the international secretariat in San Francisco, co-founder of the journal in which Goodrich and Rosner and the 1963 conference papers were published, anchor-person in the 1954 Rockefeller conference, consultant for the State Department, and finally lecturer for the US military. Moreover, Andrew Cordier served both as an interviewee for Rosner and in an 'advisory capacity' for the book series. Cordier was no small fish in neither the US nor the UN. He served as national security advisor in 1944 and a US delegate at San Francisco in 1945 before becoming Undersecretary-General in charge of the General Assembly and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in several interventions until forced to resign (to Columbia University) due to the Soviet criticism of his partial actions in the Congo intervention.¹⁶² Expectedly, she was kind towards the UN and UNEF and ended by supporting a permanent force.¹⁶³ The first internationalisation of the narrative took place within the 'white' Commonwealth the same year when two Australian scholars of international relations, Arthur Lee Burns who had spent time at Princeton and spent time with Fox amongst others and Nina Heathcote, also took to promoting the narrative of success in their book in a Princeton book series on world politics.¹⁶⁴ As the Congo intervention divided the UN on 'peacekeeping', the American MIT political scientist Norman J. Padelford offered a

¹⁵⁹ Herbert Nicholas, "UN Peace Forces and the Changing Globe: The Lessons of Suez and Congo," *International Organization* 17, no. 2 (1963): 320–37.

¹⁶⁰ Edward H. Bowman and James E. Fanning, "The Logistics Problems of a UN Military Force," *International Organization* 17, no. 2 (1963): 355.

¹⁶¹ Urquhart, "United Nations Peace Forces and the Changing United Nations."

¹⁶² For more on Cordier's role in the Congo intervention, see Gibbs, *The Political Economy of Third World Intervention*; Gibbs, "The United Nations, International Peacekeeping and the Question of Impartiality: Revisiting the Congo Operation of 1960."

¹⁶³ Gabriella Rosner, *The United Nations Emergency Force*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963).

¹⁶⁴ Arthur Lee Burns and Nina Heathcote, *Peace-Keeping by U.N. Forces, from Suez to the Congo* (New York: Published for the Center of International Studies, Princeton University by Praeger, 1963).

theoretical model of the negotiation of support and his reflections on how to, on basis of UNEF, move on from the financial and political ‘stalemate’. His position was not surprising as a member of the US delegation at the Dumbarton conference in 1944, co-author of the UN charter and a board member of the journal, *International Organization*, in which he published.¹⁶⁵ Fellow American political scientist Jacob C. Hurewitz took it even further, arguing that the involvement of the UN and the US in the Middle East after 1945, including the UNEF intervention, was ‘dis-imperialism’. Considering Hurewitz’ ‘pedigree’, this is not surprising. He was deeply embedded in the American power matrix, having served in the OSS’ Middle East Section in the Second World War, then the State Department and finally as counsel to several administrations before turning to academia. Predictably, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Council of Foreign Relations, the Ford Foundation, and the Rand Corporation all funded his work on the Middle East.¹⁶⁶ Peter V. Bishop, a Canadian political scientist and recipient of Ford Foundation funds, engaged in the debate in Canada. He both depicted international law and ‘peacekeeping’ as a global public good and praised Canada’s role in UNEF, ‘peacekeeping’, and the financial dilemma.¹⁶⁷ In 1966, a Scandinavian journal published a different kind of article. Part of promoting the emerging field of peace studies, the Norwegian sociologist from the Norway-based Peace Research Institute Ingrid Eide was perhaps the second scholar (after Armstrong) to visit the ‘mission area’ and the first to argue that the ‘locals’ were important to an intervention.¹⁶⁸ Few, however, took notice.

When UNEF was terminated in 1967, the ‘old’ generation of American and Canadian scholars either retired or lost interest in UNEF due to its end, the continued deployment on Cyprus, and the launch of a second intervention in the Sinai Peninsula in 1973. However, most researchers were still predominantly ‘white’ and pro-interventionist American and Canadian males rooted in state-centric disciplines that saw the world as a system of nation states, providing mostly ‘technical’ perspectives. Topics as the Palestinians and the links between UNEF, imperialism and oil had no traction. An example of this group, aforementioned Canadian legal scholar Cohen published his disappointment as he saw in the end of UNEF at the request of Egypt a sign that peacekeeping had lost momentum and the more encompassing peacemaking interventions as taken off the agenda.¹⁶⁹ After having been a Rockefeller Fellow at Columbia in 1968, the British international relations scholar Alan James also praised UNEF for diffusing the ‘Suez Crisis’, maintaining the truce and keeping quiet the border in a book for the British Institute of Strategic Studies (a British think tank) in

¹⁶⁵ Norman J. Padelford, “Financing Peacekeeping: Politics and Crisis,” *International Organization* 19, no. 3 (1965): 444–62.

¹⁶⁶ J. C. Hurewitz, “The UN and Disimperialism in the Middle East,” *International Organization* 19, no. 3 (1965): 749–63.

¹⁶⁷ Peter V. Bishop, “Canada’s Policy on the Financing of U.N. Peace-Keeping Operations,” *International Journal* 20, no. 4 (1965): 463–83.

¹⁶⁸ Ingrid Eide, “Some Factors Affecting Local Acceptance of a UN Force – A Pilot Project Report from Gaza,” *International Problems* 1, no. 2 (1966).

¹⁶⁹ Maxwell Cohen, “The Demise of UNEF,” *International Journal* 23, no. 1 (1967): 18–51.

1969.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, only few non-Western and female scholars had gained access to the debate. An example of this group and in part the upward influence of the emerging Third World at the ‘citadel’, the Ugandan international relations scholar Yashpal Tandon was one of the very few not to argue the intervention a success but rather that it had relaxed the pressure for a political solution. Nevertheless, he had the advantage of hindsight and his point was first made by UN Secretary-General U Thant. His interest in ‘peacekeeping’, hereunder UNEF, also began only after having met Goodrich and others during a fellowship at Columbia.¹⁷¹ In the following years, UN-associated scholars institutionalised and Indian and Scandinavian scholars further internationalised the narratives of ‘peacekeeping’ and UNEF’s success. In 1972, for example, the James Boyd, who had served as US Air Force attaché in Egypt from 1956 to 1959 and subsequently Chief-of-Staff at the UN Military Staff Committee, applauded UNEF’s success.¹⁷² In 1974, Indar Jit Rikhye, Bjørn Egge and Michael Harbottle, three army officers from Norway, India and Great Britain turned UN military officials in Egypt and the Gaza strip, Congo, and Cyprus and insiders *par excellence*, saw UNEF as successful and its ending as unfair.¹⁷³ Indicatively, their book was born out of a conference at the New York-based International Peace Academy created after the launch of a new UN force in 1973 and the call for a permanent UN force at the General Assembly by US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.¹⁷⁴ After a ten-year pause reflecting the drop in the political interest in ‘peacekeeping’, Canadian political scientist and director of peacekeeping programs of the International Peace Academy Henry Wiseman again took to promoting both UNEF and interventions generally with other UN-scholars and officials.¹⁷⁵ Predictably, Rikhye also began promoting UNEF’s success again.¹⁷⁶ Altogether, these most often ‘white’ men using ‘temporally flat’ (nation) state-centric epistemologies successfully institutionalised the narrative between 1967 and 1989. Additionally, a

¹⁷⁰ James, *The Politics of Peace-Keeping*, 2–5, 98-108-314.

¹⁷¹ Yashpal Tandon, “UNEF, the Secretary-General, and International Diplomacy in the Third Arab-Israeli War,” *International Organization* 22, no. 2 (1968): 529–56.

¹⁷² James M Boyd, *United Nations Peace-Keeping Operations a Military and Political Appraisal* (New York: Praeger, 1972).

¹⁷³ Rikhye, Harbottle, and Egge, *The Thin Blue Line*, 47–70.

¹⁷⁴ Kissinger is quoted to open the book. Rikhye, Harbottle, and Egge, *The Thin Blue Line*.

¹⁷⁵ However, Nabil A. Elaraby, then Egyptian ambassador to Egypt and former UN representative, made it clear that Egypt at the time saw the intervention as a breach of its sovereignty, but accepted as opposed to Israel. Michael Comay, former Israeli UN representative and ambassador to Canada turned scholar of international relations, merely saw UNEF as keeping a superficial stability and thereby allowed Egypt to prepare for war. Michael Comay, “UN Peacekeeping: The Israeli Experience,” in *Peacekeeping: Appraisals and Proposals* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1983), 93–117; Nabil E. Elaraby, “UN Peacekeeping: The Egyptian Experience,” in *Peacekeeping: Appraisals and Proposals* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1983), 65–92; Henry. Wiseman, *Peacekeeping, Appraisals and Proposals* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1983), 19–64.

¹⁷⁶ Indar Jit Rikhye, *The Theory & Practice of Peacekeeping* (New York: Published for the International Peace Academy by St. Martin’s Press, 1984); Indar Jit Rikhye, *The Future of Peacekeeping* (New York: International Peace Academy, 1989).

new generation of UNEF-oriented scholars in troop-contributing countries such as India and the Scandinavian countries and historically interested international relations scholars further internationalised the narrative. An example of the former, Indian international relations scholar Nand Lal, who did his doctoral research at the Jawaharlal Nehru University in 1973, praised India's non-aligned foreign policy, its engagements with the UN, and the Indian involvement in setting up, staffing and running UNEF an article in both an Indian journal and his re-written dissertation, also published in India.¹⁷⁷ That his view reads similar to earlier Canadian scholars was no coincidence. For decades after independence, Indian international relations thinking, argues scholar of international relations Navnita Behera, suffered from intellectual dependency on Western traditions. The dominance of foreign policy thought by the Ministry of External Affairs, again informed by Nehru's idea of India's need to 'join the existing system and modernity', she contends, only exacerbated the centring of the West by Indian scholars.¹⁷⁸ Another example was Swedish-based Abdel-Latif M. Zeidan whose international law dissertation on UNEF opened with a pro-interventionist quote by the (Swedish) Secretary-General who initiated UNEF and ended with a chapter on how to form a permanent force.¹⁷⁹ Finally, Evan Luard, British diplomat turned politician and scholar, wrote a chapter on the 'Suez Crisis', as the invasion of Egypt is known as in Great Britain (and the US), and the UNEF in his broader UN history. Having left the British diplomatic service over the invasion of Egypt in 1956,¹⁸⁰ he was naturally very fond of both the UN operation and the UN.¹⁸¹

A new group of historically oriented scholars of international relations and historians began to review UN 'peacekeeping', the 'Suez Crisis' and UNEF after the call for a New World Order with the UN-sanctioned but US-led intervention against Iraq in 1990 and Somalia in 1992 as well as the release of American, Canadian, British, Israeli and UN archival records. An example of the first group of primarily American think tanks experts at and military officers turned scholars in the 1990s, Israeli and US-educated Middle Eastern scholar Mona Ghali repeated the narrative of UNEF's success. Tellingly, her work appeared in an anthology on 'lessons learned' by the Henry L. Stimson Center, a think tank formed in 1990 not in New York where the UN was located, but Washington (as several others) as an indication of the ongoing

¹⁷⁷ N. Lal, "India and the Withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, 1967," *International Studies* 13, no. 2 (1974): 309–23; Nand Lal, *From Collective Security to Peace-Keeping: A Study of India's Contribution to the United Nations Emergency Force, 1956-67* (Calcutta: Minerva Associates, 1975).

¹⁷⁸ Navnita C. Behera, "Re-Imagining IR in India," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 7, no. 3 (2007): 341–68.

¹⁷⁹ Abdel-Latif M. Zeidan, *The United Nations emergency force: 1956-1967* (Stockh.: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1976).

¹⁸⁰ Adam Roberts, "Evan Luard as a Writer on International Affairs," *Review of International Studies* 18, no. 1 (1992): 63–73.

¹⁸¹ Evan Luard, *The Age of Decolonization, 1955-1965*. (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989), 18–57.

tectonic shift in the international realm.¹⁸² In contrast, the initially Israeli and British diplomatic and Cold War historians were mostly empirically concerned with the ‘Suez Crisis’, the Israeli-UN relationship, and the British view on a permanent force in light of UNEF.¹⁸³ Their interests in ‘high’ politics came to inform the main current in historical and ‘IR’ scholarship interested, if peripherally, in UNEF. Viewing through the (nation)state-centric lenses and released government records, scholars continued to focus on the onset of the ‘Suez Crisis’, the role of the Secretary-General, and the different countries’ involvement, reactions, and policy changes only until early 1957 as well as the financing of UNEF. Although this scholarship unveiled, to some extent, the Canadian-American collusion with the Secretary-General in creating UNEF and the Eisenhower administration’s wish for the UN to deflect the Soviet criticism and get oil flowing again, records and perspectives remained limited to the views of and relations between Tel Aviv, London, Paris, New York, Washington and Ottawa. Only Prithvi Muidiam, an Indian historian, provided a non-Western view on the ‘Suez Crisis’ in his work on India and the Middle East.¹⁸⁴

By the mid-2000s, however, the horizon began to broaden. Using European records and literature in addition to works and records in English, diplomatic historian Ralph Dietl showed that the governments in at least Bonn, Rome and Brussels informally supported the French-British attack on Egypt, reflecting broader West European frustrations with the increasingly bi-polar world order.¹⁸⁵ It is indicative that

¹⁸² Mona Ghali, “United Nations Emergency Force I,” in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping: Case Studies and Comparative Analysis* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993), 104–30. See also; Martha Bills and D.C.) Center for Strategic and International Studies, *Options for U.S. Military Support to the United Nations* (Washington: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1992).

¹⁸³ Edward Johnson, “A Permanent UN Force: British Thinking after Suez,” *Review of International Studies* 17, no. 3 (1991): 251–66; Keith Kyle, *Suez* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991); W. Scott Lucas, *Divided We Stand: Britain, the US, and the Suez Crisis* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1991); Michael B. Oren, “Ambivalent Adversaries: David Ben-Gurion and Israel vs. the United Nations and Dag Hammarskjold, 1956-57,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 27, no. 1 (1992): 89–127.

¹⁸⁴ See for instance Eitan Barak, “On the Power of Tacit Understandings--Israel, Egypt and Freedom of Passage through the Suez Canal, 1957-1960,” *The Middle East Journal* 58, no. 3 (2004): 444–68; Michael Carroll, “Canada and the Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force, 1957-1963,” *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 13, no. 1 (2002): 217–34; Motti Golani, *Israel in Search of a War: The Sinai Campaign, 1955-1956* (Brighton; Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 1998); Edward Johnson, “‘The Umpire on Whom the Sun Never Sets’: Dag Hammarskjold’s Political Role and the British at Suez,” *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 8, no. 1 (1997): 249–78; Sean M. Maloney, *Canada and UN Peacekeeping: Cold War by Other Means, 1945-1970* (St. Catharines: Vanwell Pub., 2002), 61–78; Prithvi Ram Muidiam, *India and the Middle East* (London: British Academic Press, 1994); Marc J. O’Reilly, “Following Ike? Explaining Canadian-US Co-operation during the 1956 Suez Crisis,” *The Journal of Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 35, no. 3 (1997): 75–107; Simon C Smith, *Reassessing Suez 1956 New Perspectives on the Crisis and Its Aftermath* (Aldershot; Burlington: Ashgate, 2008).

¹⁸⁵ Ralph Dietl, “Suez 1956: A European Intervention?,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 43, no. 2 (2008): 259–78.

it took Sohail Hashmi, an US-educated and based Pakistani scholar of international relations to draw attention to the economic interests of Pakistan in re-opening the Suez Canal and subsequent involvement.¹⁸⁶ Yet, the internationalised story of ‘peacekeeping’ still dominates. An example thereof, Canadian diplomatic historian Michael Carroll provided a Western- and nation-state-centric analysis, despite the recent achievements on the importance of the Commonwealth in both the ‘Suez Crisis’ and the formation and running of UNEF as well as empire in relation to Canadian foreign and UN policy¹⁸⁷. Despite using most of the Cold War literature discussed here, Carroll failed to see it in context. Finally, his ‘on the ground’ chapter considers only the standpoint(s) of Canadian soldiers.¹⁸⁸ Writing from a university in the illegal settlement of Ariel in the West Bank, Israeli- and US-educated historian turned political scientist and national security consultant for Israel Alexander Bligh expresses a historical interpretation from the Israeli far right. Ignoring several decades of UNEF research and using uncritically only British and Canadian (and therefore naturally anti-Egyptian) cabinet and embassy records from 1956 and 1957(!), he remarkably argues both that the UN and UNEF were anti-Israeli and pro-Egyptian from 1956 to 1967(!) and that Egypt’s sovereignty and political space for manoeuvring threatened Israel.¹⁸⁹ However, a handful of political scientists, anthropologists, and scholars of international relations offer wider frameworks, illuminating the weakness of the methodological nationalism of diplomatic historians. That said, their mostly non-records-based frameworks are not problem free either. While British scholar of international relations Norrie MacQueen examined ‘peacekeeping’ as a self-interested response of the international system to conflicts, he stuck to the established storyline on UNEF.¹⁹⁰ Looking at ‘peacekeeping’ from a tool for a pluralist international organisation, the American anthropologist Robert Rubinstein argued UNEF as against big power interests and a “(...) *model peacekeeping operation, maintaining peace and order in a buffer zone in the Sinai and Gaza Strip between Israel and Egypt.*”¹⁹¹ Despite using a good number of records from UNEF to focus on the everyday interactions between the Gaza Strip residents and UNEF soldiers, the ‘temporally flat’ perspective of Alana Feldman, another (American) anthropologist, reproduced the underlying narrative of UNEF.¹⁹² Arguing that the interventions in the Middle East from 1948 onwards should be seen as a useful

¹⁸⁶ Sohail H. Hashmi, “‘Zero Plus Zero Plus Zero’: Pakistan, the Baghdad Pact, and the Suez Crisis,” *The International History Review* 33, no. 3 (2011): 525–44.

¹⁸⁷ See for instance John Price, *Orienting Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011); Razack, *Dark Threats and ‘white’ Knights: The Somalia Affairs, Peacekeeping and New Imperialism*.

¹⁸⁸ Michael K. Carroll, *Pearson’s Peacekeepers Canada and the United Nations Emergency Force, 1956-67* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009).

¹⁸⁹ Alexander Bligh, “The United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF), 1956–67: Past Experience, Current Lessons,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 50, no. 5 (2014): 796–809.

¹⁹⁰ MacQueen, *Peacekeeping and The International System*.

¹⁹¹ Rubinstein, *Peacekeeping under Fire*, 21.

¹⁹² Ilana Feldman, “Ad Hoc Humanity: UN Peacekeeping and the Limits of International Community in Gaza,” *American Anthropologist* 112, no. 3 (2010): 416–29.

international regime to discipline the states in the region, American army officer Kenneth R. Dombroski turned political scientist at a university in Washington also supported the narrative of UNEF's success, using pro-interventionist Cold War literature and overlooking the advances in historical scholarship.¹⁹³ Taking a more critical view of the UN against the backdrop of the American rise to global power in 1945, UK-educated Brazilian political scientist and scholar of international relations Richard Kareem Al-Qaq sees 'peacekeeping' as social ordering on the global periphery. Relying on Luard, several works by British and American historians, the memoirs of several key figures and published UN documents, Al-Qaq, however, focuses only on Egypt and, as others, bypass the importance of oil and imperialism more broadly. Nevertheless, he convincingly argues UNEF is a "(...) *novel political formula for policing Southern states that that [sic, MOJ] had fallen foul of the international political economy, which did not necessarily rely on gunboat diplomacy or impinge, at least formally, on the sovereignty of these new states.*"¹⁹⁴ Finally, Cunliffe goes beyond both an American post-war global order and American empire. He argues UNEF the onset of imperial multilateralism, the post-1945 heir to what he has called multinational imperialism, although he under-emphasises the importance of the Gaza Strip in relation to understanding the character of the intervention due to a reliance on Al-Qaq, Macqueen as well as Israeli diplomatic and military historian (turned diplomat) Michael Oren.¹⁹⁵

To recap, especially American and Canadian scholarship from 1957 to 1967 served to legitimise the expansion of the frontier of imperial multilateralism via a narrative of 'peacekeeping' that scholars associated with either the UN, the troop contributing countries or the "white" Commonwealth then institutionalised and further internationalised. Especially in the last decade, however, historians and historically interested scholars of international relations have turned to archival records and thereby begun to unravel gradually the Cold War narrative of 'peacekeeping', and UNEF as part thereof. On basis of Western records, researchers have pointed towards but not illuminated in detail the collusion between Washington, Ottawa and New York to prevent Moscow from interfering, to repair the damaged internal Western relations, and to re-open the flow of oil to Western Europe. Additionally, scholars have begun to move beyond the nation state frameworks and connect peacekeeping, UNEF included, to changes in the global imperial system. Finally, scholars have also, using UN records and interviews, begun a turn to viewing the intervention 'on the ground'. Nevertheless, the interwoven narratives of UNEF as successful, and 'peacekeeping' as a global good, have not so far been deconstructed. Moreover, scholars have yet to examine in more detail the role of the Middle East in relation to the emergence of the frontier of imperial multilateralism; the informal empire of both Great Britain and the US in the Middle East until 1956; the oil and

¹⁹³ Kenneth R. Dombroski, *Peacekeeping in the Middle East as an International Regime* (New York: Routledge, 2007) (Digital reprint from 2010).

¹⁹⁴ Richard Kareem Al-Qaq, *Managing World Order: United Nations Peace Operations and the Security Agenda* (London; New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2009), 24.

¹⁹⁵ Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace*, 252–56.

trade dimension; the connections between the US, UN and troop contributing countries such as Brazil, Yugoslavia, the Scandinavian countries, and India; the local realities when it comes to experiencing a shift from British imperialism to the UN; and the negotiations of agency, race, gender, class and so on in the 'mission areas'. Thus, much remains to be done.

My Working Questions and the Dissertation Structure

To link together my aims and main research questions, theoretical framework and state of the art on UNEF and UNSCO, I to ask a series of six working questions. Given the need to both situate UNEF in the larger global imperial system and see it from the 'inside' via the everyday negotiation of its regime between the soldiers of the different contingents and the Palestinians, Bedouin, Egyptians and Israelis 'on the ground', a two-part structure seems suitable to answer my research questions.

The first set of three questions, then, focus on 'the making of the frontier of imperial multilateralism', while the second revolves around 'the negotiation of life and authority in the frontier zone of imperial multilateralism':

- *How did the creation of the United Nations as a predominantly inter-imperial military alliance in 1942 (and its conversion to a broader security organisation in 1945) link to the late 19th century shift from agrarian tributary empires towards increasingly bureaucratic, industrialised and trade-oriented imperial state-systems and colonial state powers as the systemically dominant actors on the one hand, and from centring imperial competition to also emphasize inter-imperial cooperation in on the other?*
- *How did both the mounting reach and capacities of the imperial state-systems and colonial state powers at the expense of the agrarian tributary empires and the coincidence of imperial competition and inter-imperial cooperation manifest in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, the region in which the first UN intervention took place?*
- *How did these deeper systemic changes in the Mediterranean and the Middle East eventually accrue to create a situation that not only led to the Suez Crisis, but also in turn made a United Nations intervention in the form of both the United Nations Emergency Force and United Nations Suez Clearance Operation a viable (or the only) option in late 1956?*
- *How did amassing the UN intervention force, forcing out the British, French and Israeli forces from Egypt and reopening the Suez Canal in late 1956 relate to the global and the regional manifestations of the earlier shift towards parallel imperial competition and inter-imperial cooperation both*

systemically and 'on the ground' in the form of military cultures, rationalities and mental geographies?

- *How did the UN deployment from Egypt into the Gaza Strip 'mission area' in early March 1957 relate to the global and the regional manifestations of the earlier shift towards imperial competition and inter-imperial cooperation both systemically and 'on the ground' in the form of military cultures, rationalities and mental geographies?*
- *In this context, how, and with what outcomes, did the different actors of the Gaza Strip 'mission area'—Palestinians, Bedouin and Egyptians—engage the different contingents of the UN force, and thus negotiate the broader UN regime in the Gaza Strip, in its operational period from 1957 to 1967?*

In this way, each working question provides the basis for a chapter that sets the scene for the subsequent chapter. In this way, the six chapters each historicise the global-regional context and the various dimensions of the intervention, thus providing my contribution to the counter-narrative of the United Nations interventions when combined.

In the first part, thus, I focus on the building of the global system of imperial multilateralism, then to the regional place of the Mediterranean and Middle East within the global system and, finally, the place of the Gaza Strip within the regional system and the making of the system in the Gaza Strip. Picking up the discussion from the theoretical chapter, I concretely examine in chapter three how the global imperial system shifted from 'national' imperial systems towards inter-imperial cooperation, or from 'imperial frontiers' to the emerging 'frontier of multinational imperialism' and 'the frontier of imperial multilateralism', in the period from the late 19th century to the 1950s. In the following chapter, I initially interrogate how these changes manifested in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, or how the frontiers of 'multinational imperialism' and 'imperial multilateralism' incorporated the region, ending with the joint British, French and Israeli invasion in late 1956. In extension of the invasion and the threat it came to represent, chapter five examines how UNEF and the clearing of the Suez Canal subsequently became one of several American-supported and largely controlled means to sustain both the regional status quo and the overall frontier system.

In the second part, I shift focus from the global imperial system and imperial multilateralism to the frontier zone by examining the formation of the UN regime(s) and their practice 'on the ground'. In other words, I turn to what I term the expansion in both breadth and depth of the frontier by focusing on networks, technologies of power and human agency in the frontier zone, which over late 1956 mirrored the UN deployment from the Suez Canal area and canal towns in Egypt eastwards over the Sinai Peninsula to the Gaza Strip. As the canal clearance finished in spring 1957, it contracted to the Gaza Strip and a few logistical sites in Egypt. As suggested in the theoretical chapter, the systemic expansion of the frontier in breadth entails the

making of frontier zones and the linking of chiefly Western military infrastructure, supply systems and knowledge systems. Accordingly, chapter six initially ‘dots the map’ and ‘connects the dots’ to elucidate how UNEF was built on chiefly Western military infrastructure and supply and knowledge systems before it examines UNSCO’s clearing of the Suez Canal, and finally the redeployment of UNEF to the Gaza Strip. Focusing on the expansion of the frontier in depth in extension thereof, the following three chapters shift attention to the practices of UNEF’s regime and how its authority was negotiated ‘on the ground’ in the interactions with local actors. With the formation of Israel as the main political change in and near the Gaza Strip from 1948 to 1956, chapter seven scrutinizes, firstly, the relations between UNEF and the Israeli border regime and, secondly, the Israelis living in settlements near the Gaza Strip against the backdrop of the British relations with the Jewish settlements in the Mandate period. Subsequently, chapter eight turns to the Gaza Strip and the relations between the UN force and the existing UN aid and development regime, the local Egyptian military, and, not least, the different Palestinian and Bedouin populations against the backdrop of the British regime in Mandate period.

On Records and Research

In this section, I will link the structure with the research literature and the archival material I use to build my analysis. However, I will merely do so in an overall way here: the broader topics of discussion and trends in the main bulk of the research literature has already been dealt with in some detail in the theoretical chapter and the specifics of the records, or the necessary ‘nitty-gritty’ of the craft of the historian, will be dealt with in the different chapters. Altogether, however, it can be said that the structure—which moves from an examination of the development of the overall system and how it manifested in the region of the Mediterranean and the Middle East to an interrogation of the everyday negotiatedness of the systemic incorporation of Egypt and the Gaza Strip as a frontier zone—entails a gradual movement from grounding the analysis in mostly research towards grounding the analysis in archival material growing number of both published and unpublished records and unpacking these with contextualising research literature.

Examining the shift ‘imperial frontiers’ to the emerging ‘frontier of multinational imperialism’ and ‘the frontier of imperial multilateralism’ from the late 19th century to the 1950s in the first chapter, this chapter is built first and foremost on research showing changes in the global imperial system by focusing on respectively the early modern empires, the various ‘national’ imperial systems, the emerging paradigm of inter-imperial cooperation within the spheres of logistics, health, or security and how these systems of governance were put in place and negotiated. Mostly, I have already introduced these scholars: imperial and international historians as for example Laura Briggs, John Darwin, Daniel Gorman, Greg Grandin, Joseph Morgan Hodge, Valeska Huber Gabriel Kolko, Paul Kramer, Peter Lowe, Mark Mazower, Naomi Nagata,

Susan Pedersen, Dan Plesch and on the one hand and scholars from other research fields and disciplines such as military history, US history (whose practitioners do not place their work within imperial historiography), Korean history, Cold War history, sociology, and defence studies as for example Thomas Borstelmann, Catherine Lutz, Julian Go, Ruth Oldenziel, Eric Ouellet, Nicole Sackley, Erwin Schmidl, J. Adam Tooze, and Odd Arne Westad on the other. By and large, these works come from separate research fields, but commonly revolve around geopolitical decision-making, strategic landscapes, institutional change, regimes of governance and state-centric networks and how these tied together (although several of these works appear not to have been put in contact before).

Interrogating how these global changes manifested in the systems of governance in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, or how the frontiers of ‘multinational imperialism’ and ‘imperial multilateralism’ sought to incorporate the region, chapter four similarly builds on research literature. Aside building on several scholars also used in the first chapter, I have also linked historians of the Ottoman Empire such as for example, E. Attila Ayteykin, Karen Barkey, Chales Issawi, Nadir Özbek, Eugene Rogan and Mehmet Soytürk and Mandate historians such as Jacob Norris and Peter Sluglett, with energy historians such as Anand Toprani, Steven G. Galpern, and David S. Painter with historians of post-Ottoman and Cold War Southern Europe and the Middle East such as for example Reem Abou-El-Fadl, Mordechai Bar-On, Peter Beck, David Cohen, Mohrez N. El-Husseini, Guy Laron, Zach Levey, Amikam Nachmani, Mogens Pelt, Tore Tingvold Petersen, Elieh Podeh, Süleyman Seydi, Michael T. Thornhill, B. Yeşilbursa. As with the research used to build the first chapter, the works of these primarily historians dealt with the (Ottoman) system of governance, the emerging paradigm of inter-imperial European cooperation and how these regimes were negotiated.

Common for the research used in these two first chapters, is, fortunately, trends of diversification among scholars with regard to origin, but overall commitment to complexity, layers and scales and multiple perspectives, and (accordingly) an intensifying use of an ever-growing base of archival materials not just from a growing range of state archives beyond those located in London and Washington, but also from a growing number of regional and local corporate and private archives, newspapers, memoirs and in some cases also interviews. If there is still space for further pluralisation, the utilised research has, in other words, generally come a long way with regards to with regard not only to who writes, but also what they write about, and on which basis they do.

In extension of the shift from the ‘global’ to the ‘regional’, chapter five the global and regional in the ‘local’ in that it examines the beginning of the systemic incorporation of Egypt. Concretely, it studies how UNEF and the clearing of the Suez Canal subsequently became one of several American-supported and largely controlled means to sustain both the regional and the overall status quo. While research on Egypt, the US, France, Great Britain, Soviet Union and Israel remains important here, I increasingly include both published and unpublished records in this chapter. Specifically, I have used the volumes of Foreign Relations of the United States (a

selection of American foreign policy-related documents made available online) on the Suez Crisis and the Middle East, published UN documents, communication between various European shipping organisations held in the Business Archive of Denmark in Aarhus, and the Archive of the UN in New York: documents on the dredging companies contracted by the UN to clear the Suez Canal produced by the UN Office of Special Political Affairs and the Field Operations Service, and finally the minutes of the meetings of the UNEF Advisory Committee. While arguably important to UNEF and UNSCO, my main interest has not been the invasion of Egypt and Israeli occupation of the Gaza Strip, but rather what followed and the subsequent decade. I have not, therefore, looked for archival materials in London, Paris, Tel Aviv, Cairo, Moscow, and Washington. As for the records on the commercial shipping dimension obtained in Denmark, the archive of the Suez Company, located in Roubaix in France, is not insignificant. However, the Danish archive had much both broad and valuable material, which was also readily accessible since it was not under any confidentiality regime, needed no further translation (as it was mostly in English) and yet remained unexploited.

In the sixth chapter (and thus the first chapter of the second part of the analysis), I shift to an everyday perspective and frontier-zone related research and sources. The chapter initially ‘dots the map’ and ‘connects the dots’ to elucidate how UNEF was built on chiefly Western military infrastructure and supply and knowledge systems before it lastly examines UNSCO’s clearing of the Suez Canal. Consequently, I use again unpublished UN documents on the UNSCO and UN Field Service documents on the logistics of UNEF and the volumes of the Foreign Relations of the United States Series pertaining to both the Suez Crisis and the Middle East on the one hand, and add the memoirs of not only Mohamed Heikal, the advisor to the Egyptian President, and E. L. M. Burns, the first UN Force Commander, but also several Danish soldiers on the other. Finally, I turn to already mentioned Cold War Middle East scholarship and others more specifically concerned with the Suez Crisis, Israel, Egypt, and the states contributing troops for the UN force, such as for example R. Thomas Bobal, Silvia Borzutzky and David Berger, Bruno Charbonneau, Eric Crove, Ralph Dietl, Mikael Nilsson Hilde Henriksen Waage, to contextualise the records.

The seventh chapter studies the redeployment of UNEF to the Gaza Strip, the failure to internationalise the control of the Gaza Strip, the relocation of the operational area of the UN force and a large part of its contingents to the ADL, and the relations between UNEF and the Israeli border regime the Israelis living in settlements near the Gaza Strip against the backdrop of the British relations with the Jewish settlements in the Mandate period. Consequently, I use documents from FRUS, unpublished cables and reports of the UN-employed military observers of the Egyptian-Israeli Military Armistice Commission (EIMAC) that were already in the Gaza Strip when the ‘Suez Crisis’ broke out as part of the larger the military observer organisation UNTSO, published memoirs of UN soldiers and already mentioned research on Israel, Egypt, the British Mandate for contextualisation. Here, I have chosen not to try to find supplementary material from the governments and militaries of neither Egypt nor Israel the Egyptian, although their views are of importance, as I

estimate the time I would have had to spend finding these, applying for access, learning enough Arabic and Hebrew to read these and other relevant records, and visiting the archives would have surpassed both the value of what could be found and the time allocated to my project. Finally, the material I was able to put together for this also nevertheless also allows for a new, and perhaps controversial, reading of the processes examined.

The last of the six-chapter analysis, chapter eight, in tune with my theoretical framework, links up with Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey, both London-based scholars of international relations, who argue that we need to move past the orthodox ‘Westphalian’ model of the international system and the politics therein as it remains caught in ‘the territorial trap’ of the state and thus populated by only diplomats, soldiers and capitalists. Questioning if this framework was ever viable, they suggest that we ‘thicken’ (and deepen) the framework to make the international include also “(...) *social and cultural flows as well as political-military and economic interactions in a context of hierarchy.*”¹⁹⁶ The shift in attention to the relations between the UN force and the existing UN aid and development regime, the local Egyptian military, and, not least, the different Palestinian and Bedouin population groups requires a different set of records than those used hitherto. Therefore, I have here utilised documents on the Armistice Demarcation Line regime such as observation and incident reports from both the EIMAC observers and various departments of UNEF itself, traffic incident reports, labour records and so on. For context, I linked to research on the British Mandate in Palestine, the militarisation of the Israeli foreign policy, border space and public sphere, the Palestinian nationalist movement and the UN aid regime in the Gaza Strip. Here, I have again chosen not to supplement out material from neither the governments and militaries of Egypt and Israel nor the Egyptian governor-general in the Gaza Strip in UNEF’s operational period for the same reasons as chapter seven. I also decided not to pursue any examination of any UNEF-generated or related records in the archives of the Canadian, Brazilian, Indonesian, Norwegian, Swedish, Indian, Finnish and Colombian ministries of defence, armies and deployed units My ‘cost-benefit’ reflections are again very similar. Such an effort, which would be aimed at the unattainable ‘complete history of’ rather than a dislocation and deconstruction of the existing narrative by way of an alternative, would have to be the efforts of a multi-lingual and multi-national research team.

Altogether, I, thus, seeks to engage broad body of research and a large material of a certain breadth and depth to convincingly support my aims and arguments.

¹⁹⁶ Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey, “Retrieving the Imperial: Empire and International Relations,” *Millennium* 31, no. 1 (2002): 110.

PART 1

The Making of 'Imperial Multilateralism' and its Frontier in The Mediterranean and the Middle East

Chapter 3: From ‘National’ Empires to ‘imperial multilateralism’: The Roots of the United Nations

Focusing on bringing together recent European and American imperial historiography and thus broaden the discussion from the theoretical chapter, I here present the argument that the period from the last decades of the 19th century to the end of the First World War saw a rather significant change in the global imperial system.

From consisting of mainly (the last) remnants of the dynastic and tributary form of (early modern) empire and modern increasingly industrialising, bureaucratic and market oriented imperial systems, the system also came to be characterised by new forms of various inter-imperial forms of cooperation and informal empire often involving several empires in the Mediterranean and the Pacific domains of the Ottoman and Chinese empires. The different processes in this paradigmatic shift gradually became even clearer in the former Ottoman, Russian and German lands following their collapses in the First World War, in increasingly American-dominated South America in the 1930s, and in the United Nations military alliance from 1942 and organisation from 1945 onwards.

‘Multinational imperialism’, 1900-1918: An Ad Hoc Expansion

The gradual paradigmatic shift towards various inter-imperial forms of cooperation and informal empire, I argue, involved the three simultaneous and increasingly interwoven processes of 1) the emergence of Cunliffe’s ‘multinational imperialism’, 2) the American ascendancy as an aspiring international empire, and not least 3) the coupled British ‘decentralisation’ and turn to the US.

As for the first process, historians have shown how inter-imperial cooperation already existed in the later decades of the 19th century. Collaboration was mostly a practice within the sphere of logistics and mobilities in form of agreements and autonomous institutions dealing with post and telegraph services and river trade between European powers. The Suez Canal, in contrast, required the cooperation of both most European imperial powers and the Ottoman Empire as co-signatories.¹⁹⁷ Scholars have shown that Health was another increasingly important issue. While the health conferences saw mostly European representatives, both Japanese and Ottomans

¹⁹⁷ Valeska Huber, “Connecting Colonial Seas: The ‘International Colonisation’ of Port Said and the Suez Canal During and After the First World War,” *European Review of History* 19, no. 1 (2012): 141–61; Huber, *Channelling Mobilities: Migration and Globalisation in the Suez Canal Region and Beyond, 1869-1914*.

participated.¹⁹⁸ Gradually, the universalisation of the colonial legal practices of the European empires led to the formulation of international law.¹⁹⁹ At a more informal level, the imperial powers also exchanged knowledge on plantation economies. For example, American colonial officials travelled to both Dutch Java and East Indies and the British Straits Settlements and Federated Malay States to study plantation economies.²⁰⁰ The use of bureaucratic technologies and knowledge to advance imperial interests—be that trade, the regulation of the mobilities of imperial subjects, ideas and goods—and claims of superiority for ‘white’ civilisation grew common.

By late 19th century, however, military historian Schmidl shows how the inter-imperial cooperation extended beyond these spheres and the European part of the Eurasian continent into the sphere of imperial expansion in both the Mediterranean and the Pacific.²⁰¹ Following the sociologist Eric Ouellet, the Boxer Rebellion, a Chinese revolt in 1900 against the growing foreign influence, is instructive. Although the instant reaction of the imposing empires related to how their privileges of economic concessions, religious influence and extra-territoriality were challenged by the ‘Boxers’, they each had their own agendas. The American government wanted to keep its ‘open-door’ policy. The French wanted more influence close to French Indochina. Imperial latecomers, Germany and Italy wanted Chinese colonial territory. The regional powers, Russia and Japan, coveted Manchuria. The British sought to protect their economic concessions. Commanding the strongest forces, the British sent almost as many naval vessels as the other combined and along with the French and Germans most troops. At its peak, the inter-imperial force consisted of about 100.000 soldiers. Reflecting both past and future practices, the inter-imperial intervention both killed an estimated 30-100.000 Chinese and formed hybrid practices of ‘single-empire’ governance involving foreign military governors at districts levels and the larger cities and basic Chinese institutions locally. However, inter-imperial cooperation faded quickly once the military campaign ended in 1901. No common institutions were set up aside a single international city administration. Instead, cooperation had been organised ‘on the ground’ (even if the forces of Germany and France as well as Russia and Japan had to be separated) and helped by a common concept of operations in form of a colonialist approach of a ‘punitive’ action against ‘semi-primitive’ people. Soon after the campaign, Russia also seized Manchuria the following year, resulting in the war between Russia and Japan in 1904.²⁰²

On the issue of the US rise to join the ranks of the empires with global reach, the US government deployment of forces to China in 1900 reflected not only a growing

¹⁹⁸ Nagata, “International Control of Epidemic Diseases from a Historical and Cultural Perspective.”

¹⁹⁹ Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty, and the Making of International Law*.

²⁰⁰ Paul A. Kramer, “Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between the British and United States Empires, 1880-1910,” *The Journal of American History* 88, no. 4 (2002): 1315–53.

²⁰¹ Schmidl, “The Evolution of Peace Operations from the Nineteenth Century”; Schmidl, “The International Operation in Albania, 1913–14.”

²⁰² Ouellet, “Multinational Counterinsurgency.”

interest in the wider Pacific, but also, as scholars of American imperial history have shown, a longer history of imperial expansion. Historian of American imperialism Paul Kramer's view of American imperialism entail a shift from empire-building nation to 'international' empire over the 19th to the 20th century. Sociologist of American imperialism Julian Go see the US expansion in three waves after declaring its independence as a British settler colony. From 1810-1825, the governments sought to oust rival European powers from the North American continent, secure territory and achieve regional dominance through 16 interventions, wars and annexations in the North American continent, Mexico, the Caribbean, and Latin America. From 1825 to 1840, Go argues, the focus of the American political and economic elites turned to stabilisation. From 1840, emphasis shifted towards hemispheric dominance. Lasting until 1870, this wave of expansion included not only 24 interventions, wars and annexations in the North American continent, Mexico (that lost half of its territory to the US), the Caribbean, and Latin America, but also another 22 interventions, wars and annexations in the Asia-Pacific region. By the turn of the century, the US had increased its original territory by four times. However, some new territories remained military governorships for decades²⁰³ to remove native resistance, prevent settler rebellions, and secure conditions for further settlement and commercial development. This meant that people in the territories remained imperial subjects rather than (imperial) citizens until the federal government granted statehood.²⁰⁴ With the expansion, Greg Grandin, historian of US-Latin American relations, notes, followed trade. Initially with Cuba, then other Caribbean and Latin American countries and finally China and India. Once trade ties were established, the largest American corporations and richest investors also trailed to invest massively in banking, infrastructure, and mining, oil, agricultural, and fruit industries. Subsequently, the US government not only allowed two private tycoons to invade Latin American and Caribbean countries to establish their own fiefdoms, it also sent warships into Latin American ports almost 6.000 times between 1869 and 1897. By 1898, the expansion of American governments and corporations resulted in war with the Spanish Empire, already fragile from the loss of most of Latin America in the 1820s. The war led to the independence of Cuba, the subjugation of Guam, Puerto Rico and the Philippines by American imperial forces, and another war with the peoples of the Philippines who did not want one colonial rule replaced by another.²⁰⁵ Moreover, as scholars of gender and race have shown, the differentiation on basis of ideas of race was integral to American expansion and the efforts to sustain it. 'Whites' were the only frontier subjects sure to become citizens. Not only were people from the Midway, Samoa, Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, the Panama Canal Zone and the Virgin Islands (all acquired between 1867 and 1917) never granted a say in their relations with the US. Many were also exposed to racist and gendered violence within the spheres of

²⁰³ For Alaska and New Mexico, this process lasted 45 and 62 years

²⁰⁴ Go, *Patterns of Empire*, 28–102.

²⁰⁵ Grandin, *Empire's Workshop*, 11–51.

colonial ‘health’, ‘education’, and ‘policing’.²⁰⁶ For example, as Grandin argues, “Troops understood their time in the Caribbean, Central America, and the Philippines as an extension of their experience with political violence at home. Many of them had either firsthand experience in the wars against Native Americans or hailed from parts of the United States where Jim Crow held sway.”²⁰⁷ Taking the argument further, Go notes, “America’s continental colonialism was more imperial and authoritarian than Britain’s settler empire in theory, and it was even more so in practice.”²⁰⁸

With the First World War, a war among globally aspiring empires, the US government was granted a free hand. It expanded the navy, its presence on the profitable Japan-Brazil trade routes and into the hitherto British-dominated Caribbean (that had already seen the landing of Marines in Cuba in 1902 and Nicaragua in 1912). Without much scrutiny from other imperial powers, the US landed marines in Haiti in 1915 and the Dominican Republic in 1916.²⁰⁹ Thus, Kramer’s view of US imperialism as (...) *a dimension of power in which asymmetries in the scale of political action, regimes of spatial ordering, and modes of exceptionalising difference enable and produce relations of hierarchy, discipline, dispossession, extraction, and exploitation*²¹⁰ sums up well the American ascendancy as an aspiring international empire between 1810 and 1918.

With regard to the British, the expansion of the American Empire was not only a concern for Spain as historians of British and American imperialism have shown. In the years following the American takeover of the Philippines, several members of both the British political and economic elites also grew irritated the Americanisation of the colonial administration and economy of the Philippines, which they—despite Spanish colonial rule—had dominated.²¹¹ At the same time, the apprehensions of British politicians, military strategists and officials were to a much higher extent a reflection of the mounting pressures of a global imperial system in which the British Empire

²⁰⁶ Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico*; Christina Duffy Burnett, “‘They Say I Am Not an American ...’: The Noncitizen National and the Law of American Empire,” *Virginia Journal of International Law* 48, no. 4 (2008): 659–718; Sam Erman, “Meanings of Citizenship in the U.S. Empire: Puerto Rico, Isabel Gonzalez, and the Supreme Court, 1898 to 1905,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 27, no. 4 (2008): 5–33; Julian Go, “Chains of Empire, Projects of State: Political Education and U.S. Colonial Rule in Puerto Rico and the Philippines,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42, no. 2 (2000): 333–62; Paul A. Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Kuzmarov, *Modernizing Repression*; Eric Tyrone Lowery Love, *Race over Empire Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 115–58.

²⁰⁷ Grandin, *Empire’s Workshop*, 20–21.

²⁰⁸ Go, *Patterns of Empire*, 47.

²⁰⁹ Go, *Patterns of Empire*.

²¹⁰ Kramer, “Power and Connection,” 1349.

²¹¹ Due to the close proximity to British colonies in South East Asia and thus short connections with shipping, telegraph and naval communications, the British had dominated the economy of the Philippines with the 3 largest banks, 70% of the foreign trade and massive involvement in infrastructure projects in the late 19th century. This changed rapidly after the American conquest in 1898. Kramer, “Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons.”

was omnipresent. Indeed, British and American inter-imperial intellectual and elite social contacts led to the formation of a sense of shared ‘whiteness’ and ‘anti-Slavic’ mission in the ‘Anglo-American Pacific’. Consequently, several members of the British imperial elite hailed the American expansion into the Pacific with the takeover of the Philippines and territories in the Caribbean as a great ‘white’ achievement.²¹²

However, imperial historians Mark Mazower and Duncan Hessel Hall have shown how the growing pressures led to an increased British pressure on the governments in the settler colonies of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa to take part in the ‘defence of the realm’ such as the 1899 war against the Boers.²¹³ Although Germany was perceived to be the main threat to the realm (especially during the Boer war), the British remained somewhat uneasy with the US. To be sure, it helped that the British and American imperial governments had improved formal and informal relations upon settling a border dispute between Venezuela and British Guiana, and US traders had provided 100.000 horses, 80.000 and US banks provided massive loans covering about 20% of the Boer war costs. Nevertheless, the widespread public Anglophobia caused by the ‘white’-on-‘white’ war as well as Irish, Dutch and German immigration was one factor pulling the other direction. The American Pacific policy of an informal commercial empire that included the ‘open door’ approach in China (and Latin America) and formal colonialism in the Philippines, Hawaii, Guam and Samoa was another.²¹⁴

However, the British were also preoccupied by the imperial activities of the French, the Russians and the Germans in China and Japan. While the aforementioned intervention in China in 1900 brought the British and Americans closer, the British never suspended their concerns. Imperial historians have shown how the British, fearful of additional expansion plans of the Russian Empire that had already put pressure on the Ottoman Empire since the 1850s and conquered Manchuria following the joint intervention (if only to lose it to Japan in 1905), entered an uneasy, but strategically necessary naval alliance with Japan in 1902. While they gained a favourable regional military balance, the British anxieties regarding the tense ties between the US and Japan following the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-05 lingered on. Both rapidly rising militarist powers in the Pacific, their tension was at that point rooted in the American takeover of Hawaii and the Philippines, the construction of a coaling station in Japan, the racialised anti-Japanese (and anti-Chinese) immigration scheme and colliding designs on the Pacific Ocean. Additionally, strategists of the British naval establishment had concerns about the American build-up of naval

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ H. Duncan Hall, *Commonwealth: A History of the British Commonwealth of Nations* (London; New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971); Peter Lowe, “The Round Table, the Dominions, and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1911–1922,” *Round Table* 86, no. 341 (1997): 81–93; Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace*.

²¹⁴ Kramer, “Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons”; William N. Tilchin, “The United States and the Boer War,” in *International Impact of the Boer War* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 107–20; Keith Wilson, “The Boer War in the Context of Britain’s Imperial Problems,” in *International Impact of the Boer War*, ed. Keith Wilson (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 158–67.

capabilities that they were unable to match due to existing commitments. Consequently, the Dominions were requested to partake more actively in financing imperial security. Simultaneously with the alliance with Japan being renewed, the ‘white’ settler colonies were therefore asked to both pay more towards the imperial navy and not be overly against the immigration schemes favoured by Tokyo. This, to put it mildly, challenged the intra-imperial and especially colonial sense(s) of ‘Britishness’/British ‘whiteness’ and thus the colonial racist anti-migration schemes aimed at preventing ‘Asiatic’ immigration such as the ‘white Australia’ policy. While the Anglo-Japanese alliance remained active, the racial and intra-imperial tension did not fade, despite several imperial defence conferences.²¹⁵ Altogether, the onset of the ‘decentralisation’ of the British Empire and turn to the US was therefore not only linked to changes in the global imperial system such as the end of territory not occupied by other empires, the rise of Germany, the US and Japan, and inter-imperial alliances linking both ends of Eurasia, but also its own global presence. When the First World War broke out, the British were therefore forced to be somewhat humble when it became necessary to both ask its settler colonies for hundreds of thousands of troops and the US for massive war loans.²¹⁶

To recap, merging European and American imperial historiography reveals that that the global imperial system from the close of the 19th century to the end of the First World War shifted from being dominated by the dynastic form of empire and modern imperialism with colonies to also promote informal empire(s), imperial alliances and new inter-imperial forms of cooperation.

‘Multinational Imperialism’, 1918-1941: Towards ‘Imperial Multilateralism’

In continuation of the previous section and with support from both imperial and international historiographies, this part expounds further the argument that the changes in the global imperial system towards new forms of imperial cooperation and governance became more visible following the end of the First World War.

²¹⁵ John Chapman, “The Secret Dimensions of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1900-1905,” in *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1902-1922* (Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2009), 82–98; Kramer, “Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons”; Kramer, *The Blood of Government*; Lowe, “The Round Table, the Dominions, and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1911–1922”; William Michael Morgan, *Pacific Gibraltar U.S.-Japanese Rivalry over the Annexation of Hawai‘i, 1885-1898* (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press, 2011); Keith Neilson, “The Anglo-Japanese Alliance and British Strategic Foreign Policy, 1902-1914,” in *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1902-1922* (Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2009), 48–63; Phillips Payson O’Brien, “The Titan Refreshed: Imperial Overstretch and the British Navy before the First World War,” *Past & Present*, no. 172 (2001): 146–69.

²¹⁶ J. Adam Tooze, *The Deluge: The Great War and the Remaking of Global Order 1916-1931* (London, New York: Allen Lane, 2014), 205–320.

As for the inter-imperial cooperation (Cunliffe's 'multinational imperialism'), the end of the First World War, which is now widely recognised as a war for empire,²¹⁷ saw the formation of the League of Nations and several sub-agencies. While international historian Mark Mazower notes that the League of Nations "(...) *whose members included Abyssinia, Siam, Iran and Turkey was already something with a very different global reach to the old European Conference*",²¹⁸ he also makes well clear that the League did not question imperialism as such, nor its permanence more broadly or the idea of 'white' superiority. As he notes, several of the architects of the League, most forcefully personified in the South African general Jan Smuts who was key in the racialisation of South Africa, had grown up to respect, defend and expand modern imperialism (and thus seen the Boer War as fratricide). That the new international organisations were thus to serve as vehicles for imperialism using the very same 'civilizational hierarchies' of imperialism is to him therefore little surprising.²¹⁹

Indeed, both the League and its sub-agencies accordingly took up issues colonial administrations were already to some extent focused on. For example, the sphere of health continued to be important. The international historians Naomi Nagata and Tomoko Akami have argued that the League organisations concerned with diseases, which evolved out of imperial concerns and inter-imperial cooperation, continued to reflect predominantly 'white' imperial concerns. However, for that reason Japan used the health and disease conferences to claim equality with the 'white' imperial powers.²²⁰ Also of importance for the growing imperial attention to health—before the Depression set in and put stability via (some level of) welfare on the colonial agendas—was the growing importance of public opinion, and, not least, the involvement of women's organisations as part thereof. The women's organisations, argues imperial and international historian Susan Pedersen, put on the international agenda equal political rights, health and education services, and trafficking. However, this, she notes, reconciled social progress and imperialism rather than oppose internationalism and imperialism.²²¹ Similarly, historian of the British Empire Daniel Gorman contends that the initiatives and policy recommendations concerning trafficking were similarly directed mainly by "white" concerns and 'pro-white' dynamics.²²² Speaking of 'old wine for new bottles' and 'a half-way house between imperialism and internationalism', these dynamics, Gorman argues, were even clearer

²¹⁷ Darwin, *After Tamerlane*; Jarboe and Fogarty, *Empires in World War I*.

²¹⁸ Mazower, "An International Civilization?," 559.

²¹⁹ Mazower, "An International Civilization?"; Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace*.

²²⁰ Akami, "Beyond Empires' Science: Inter-Imperial Pacific Science Networks in the 1920s"; Nagata, "International Control of Epidemic Diseases from a Historical and Cultural Perspective."

²²¹ Susan Pedersen, "Metaphors of the Schoolroom: Women Working the Mandates System of the League of Nations," *History Workshop Journal* 66, no. 1 (2008): 188–207.

²²² Alison Frank, "The Children of the Desert and the Laws of the Sea: Austria, Great Britain, the Ottoman Empire, and the Mediterranean Slave Trade in the Nineteenth Century," *The American Historical Review* 117, no. 2 (2012): 410–44; Gorman, "Empire, Internationalism and the Campaign against the Traffic in Women and Children in the 1920s."

in the mandates system for the territories of the former Ottoman and German empires set up by the League. While formulated by Smuts and then adopted and promoted further by the US President Woodrow Wilson, the mandate system reflected fundamentally the state of affairs at the end of the war. Australia came to govern New Guinea and Nauru, both of which Australian forces had occupied early in the war. New Zealand was put in charge of German Samoa its forces had occupied in the war. South Africa was to govern South-West Africa. Great Britain proper, France and Belgium divided the German colonies in Africa, which they had also occupied, and Great Britain and France also those of the collapsed Ottoman Empire. Only the small and peripheral nations of the collapsed German empire were, as ‘whites’, given national self-determination as so strongly promoted by US President Wilson.²²³ Pedersen continues, “*In general, mandated powers governed their mandated territories along the same lines, and with the same personnel, that they governed their colonies; mandatory oversight affected their rule only indirectly and in no consistent way.*”²²⁴ As Mazower reminds us, “*Not surprisingly, what one historian calls ‘the Wilsonian Moment’ was greeted with demonstrations and protests from north Africa to China, even Japanese diplomats felt rebuffed.*”²²⁵ From the perspective of the populations in the mandates, it also appeared as similar systems of governance as its predecessors. Pedersen contends, “*Indeed one of the striking things about the mandates system is that, for all its rhetoric of training in civilization, in many territories it was politically a step back.*”²²⁶ Not only were most of the mandate populations exposed to patronising racial attitudes, several of them could also see similar dynamics of economic imperialism to those of the previous colonial power.²²⁷ This resulted in more than 3.000 petitions to the League’s Permanent Mandates Commission. Composed of predominantly high officials or former colonial governors thus uncritical of empire, the commission registered only around 1500 and made reports on only 325 petitions, or around 10% of the total amount they received.²²⁸ Predictably, ‘disturbances’ broke out in South-West Africa, Syria and Palestine.²²⁹ Beyond the sphere of neo-colonial governance, the League also dabbled in imperial geopolitics with various results. For example, the Soviet Union, which had initially been against the League seeing it as a continuation of imperialism, slowly warmed

²²³ Daniel Gorman, “Liberal Internationalism, The League of Nations Union, and the Mandates System,” *Canadian Journal of History* 40, no. 3 (2005): 449-; Susan Pedersen, “The Meaning of the Mandates System: An Argument,” *Geschichte Und Gesellschaft* 32, no. 4 (2006): 560–82.

²²⁴ Pedersen, “Metaphors of the Schoolroom,” 192.

²²⁵ Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace*, 560.

²²⁶ Pedersen, “Metaphors of the Schoolroom,” 197.

²²⁷ Gorman, “Liberal Internationalism, The League of Nations Union, and the Mandates System.”

²²⁸ Susan Pedersen, “Back to the League of Nations,” *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 4 (2007): 1091–1117.

²²⁹ Gorman, “Liberal Internationalism, The League of Nations Union, and the Mandates System.”

towards the organisation once Stalin took over leadership.²³⁰ In contrast, the League wound up unable to deal with Japanese and Italian imperial expansions into China and Abyssinia in the 1930s. The more important of the two, Japan had for more than a decade respected and supported the emerging inter-imperial regime, not least because it had received a mandate in the Pacific. However, the lack of recognising its rule in Manchukuo, the continued denial of equal status with the larger 'white' empires and the British lack of interest in renewing the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1922 (despite continuing a strategy of extended credits, trade concessions, market guarantees and loans to bring to power moderates) led to the militarisation and nationalisation of Japan. After 'losing' Japan, the League subsequently also failed to manage the fallout of the Versailles Treaty in Europe, which pushed many frustrated Germans towards Nazism²³¹ (despite a similar British strategy of empowering moderates through trade etc.) and the Tripartite Pact between Germany, Italy and Japan, and thus prevent the outbreak of the Second World War, another global war for empire.²³²

Another reason of the League's failure as an inter-imperial security system was the American absence. The US, which had assisted the British in the Boer War, helped both British the British and French in the First World War by joining their inter-imperial alliance and contributed troops²³³ and arms, even if too late and too little. As

²³⁰ For more on the discussion on Soviet imperialism, see Martin Aust, "Writing the Empire: Russia and the Soviet Union in Twentieth-Century Historiography," *European Review of History* 10, no. 2 (2003): 375–91; Jean Houbert, "Russia in the Geopolitics of Settler Colonization and Decolonization," *Round Table* 86, no. 344 (1997): 549–61; Boris Kagarlitsky, *Empire of the Periphery: Russia and the World System* (London; Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press, 2008); Adeeb Khalid, "The Soviet Union as an Imperial Formation: A View from Central Asia," in *Imperial Formations* (Santa Fe; Oxford: School for Advanced Research Press & James Currey, 2007), 113–40; Dominic Lieven, "The Russian Empire and the Soviet Union as Imperial Politics," *Journal of Contemporary History* 30, no. 4 (October 1, 1995): 607–36; Eric Lohr, *Russian Citizenship: From Empire to Soviet Union* (Harvard University Press, 2012); Liliana Riga, *The Bolsheviks and the Russian Empire*, 2012; Sanna Turoma and Maxim Waldstein, *Empire De/centered: New Spatial Histories of Russia and the Soviet Union* (Farnham; Burlington: Ashgate, 2013).

²³¹ For the discussion on German imperialism after 1918, see Shelley Baranowski, *Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Sebastian Conrad, "Rethinking German Colonialism in a Global Age," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 41, no. 4 (2013): 543–66; Jens-Uwe Guettel, *German Expansionism, Imperial Liberalism and the United States, 1776-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Uta G. Poiger, "Imperialism and Empire in Twentieth-Century Germany," *History and Memory* 17, no. 1 (2005): 117–43.

²³² Thomas W. Burkman, *Japan and the League of Nations: Empire and World Order* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008); Mazower, "An International Civilization?"; Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace*; Phillips Payson O'Brien, "Britain and the End of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance," in *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1902-1922* (Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2009), 264–84; Steven E. Lobell, "Second Face of Security Strategies: Anglo-German and Anglo-Japanese Trade Concessions During the 1930s," *Security Studies* 17, no. 3 (2008): 438–67.

²³³ The soldiers also arrived without equipment, which thus fell upon the British and French to supply. While in better physical condition than the undernourished European forces, the

American loans had kept the British and French empires afloat, however, US President Wilson was the dominant politician at the peace negotiations. There, he got what he wanted: bilateral relations with allied debtors after the war and a return to free-market economics.²³⁴ As its focus was to the south, however, the US never joined the League. Still, as British historian of 20th history Adam Tooze notes, “*In its pomp Victorian Britain had never commanded the kind of leverage over Prussia, or Napoleon III’s France, or Alexander III’s Russia, that Washington was accumulating.*”²³⁵ At the same time, as Grandin argues, a growing number of Latin American populations gradually began to challenge the American grip on Latin America. Most importantly, the large-scale and aggressive American intrusions in Mexican politics, economy and society that cost half of its original territory Mexico’s at independence, high levels of profit repatriation and labour repression resulted in a decade-long revolution from 1910 and thereby the nationalisation of the oil industry and the destruction of several US-owned mines and plantations. Most American corporations and investors wanted to ‘intervene and clean up as usual’. Yet, Mexico was not a small Caribbean island state. Latin American nationalism, the US learned (and would learn again), was to be reckoned with.²³⁶ However, the attention required by the Mexican revolution was soon forgotten as the First World War granted the US hegemony in the Americas, the Caribbean and a large part of the western Pacific as the new dominant exporter, banker and investor. American investments in Latin American went from \$754.1 million in 1915 to \$2,819.2 million in 1924.²³⁷ After several interventions, the US in 1927 came to face a seemingly endless struggle in Nicaragua due to their opponent’s guerrilla tactics and will to fight. By 1928, the severe and rather open criticism ventilated at the Pan-American conference (and growing critical press coverage all over the continent) added to the hatred that had resulted in the Mexican Revolution and began to influence more broadly than hitherto American politicians, diplomats and political pundits. The Depression only made a shift further necessary as American companies came to find the increasingly protectionist European markets harder to access. While the Hoover administration had initiated the ‘Good Neighbor’ policy (as opposed to previous ‘Big stick’ policies) and withdrawn from the Dominican Republic in 1924 and Nicaragua in 1925, the Roosevelt administration took the shift further. Following the withdrawal of troops from several countries, the US began to promote better relations via political, economic, scientific and cultural cooperation in form of military and political treaties, trade agreements, multilateral bodies of consultation and arbitration and cultural exchange. As Grandin argues, “*In short, the 1930s and 1940s marked a turn in the*

American forces were also not immediately deployed to the front lines due to their inexperience. Tooze, *The Deluge*, 203–4.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, 205–320.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, 211.

²³⁶ Grandin, *Empire’s Workshop*, 29–31.

²³⁷ Alan McPherson, “World War I and US Empire in the Americas,” in *Empires in World War I: Shifting Frontiers and Imperial Dynamics in a Global Conflict*, ed. Andrew Tait Jarboe and Richard Stan Fogarty (London, New York: I. B. Tauris, 2014), 328–50.

*fortune of the American Empire, when diverse expressions of what political scientists call “soft power” began to congeal in a coherent system of extraterritorial administration (...)*²³⁸ Having more or less created an American parallel to the League, Washington had diversified its strategy. Intervention, war and occupation were to a large extent replaced by regional multilateralism, bilateralism ‘under the radar’ in form of political pressure as in Mexico and the support of pro-American regimes as in Nicaragua, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba.²³⁹ Nonetheless, Roosevelt was still a man of geopolitics. In line with his emphasis of an offensive naval strategy combined with air power by way of island bases, Roosevelt already in 1933 asked the companies of the emerging American military industry to line up innovative weapon systems, one of which was a long-range bomber. Out of tune with the Congress, however, it failed. In 1938, Roosevelt’s request of Congress of 20.000 warplanes for a military build-up also failed.²⁴⁰ However, Roosevelt successfully initiated in secrecy a broad programme under the advisory body of the Council on Foreign Relations to make proposals to the State Department on how to safeguard US interests and enhance the ability to influence the post-war world via multilateralism following the joint Anglo-Polish declaration of war against Germany. Commanding a smaller standing military force than each European colonial empires fighting in Europe and facing opposition in Congress, however, Roosevelt and his expansionist factions in the State Department and various military institutions faced an uphill struggle. When the hard-pressed British requested military aid, however, Congress moved a step closer to war.²⁴¹

In a similar way in which the US was forced to turn to informal imperialism, Great Britain grew less able to reign supreme in its own realm, having moved from ‘a Brotherhood of Nations’ to the Commonwealth in 1911 and a new Supreme Command in 1917 that granted the ‘white’ Dominions greater influence throughout the war. As influence, autonomy and constitutions seized the intra-imperial agenda, Great Britain saw Governor-Generals be exchanged with High Commissioners, Ireland achieve independence and its ‘children’ within the British Commonwealth claim power for themselves.²⁴² The pressure from the Dominions also influenced imperial strategy overall. The alliance with the Japanese was not renewed mainly due to strategic reconsiderations that placed Japan in the role of a potential regionally

²³⁸ Grandin, *Empire’s Workshop*, 38.

²³⁹ Go, *Patterns of Empire*; Grandin, *Empire’s Workshop*; Clark A. Miller, “‘An Effective Instrument of Peace’: Scientific Cooperation as an Instrument of U.S. Foreign Policy, 1938-1950,” in *Global Power Knowledge: Science and Technology in International Affairs*, ed. John Krige and Kai-Henrik Barth (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2006), 133–60.

²⁴⁰ Ruth Oldenziel, “Islands: The United States as a Networked Empire” (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011), 13–42; Daniel Plesch, *America, Hitler and the UN: How the Allies Won World War II and a Forged Peace* (London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011), 14–16.

²⁴¹ Smith, *American Empire*.

²⁴² Hessel Duncan Hall, *Commonwealth: A History of the British Commonwealth of Nations* (London; New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971).

dominant opponent²⁴³ (as Japanese and British goals in China increasingly collided) and the US that of a friend and to lesser extent American pressure rooted in the animosity towards Japan.²⁴⁴ However, pressure from Canada and South Africa that were both very sensitive to American concerns and against the alliance with Japan as well as Australia and New Zealand that increasingly looked to the US, helped the decision.²⁴⁵ As the global presence of the US grew stronger after the First World War, the British Empire came to rely further on American economic military and economic support. Both the British and French thus sought to align themselves with the US when necessary and lure the US closer when possible. In the matter of the Irish quest for independence, for example, the British were able to secure the support of both Wilson and the subsequent Harding administration that both declared their support for the Irish in principle, but that it was an internal British question.²⁴⁶ On their part, the French sought to stave off the repayment of war loans as long as possible.²⁴⁷ The British were also able to prevent the potential re-orientation towards Washington, and thus effective loss, of Canada after Ottawa was granted permission to open its own embassy in Washington following the new conception of Dominion status.²⁴⁸ Likewise and indicative of the importance of oil to the global imperial system, the British, French and American governments and oil companies split the oil concessions of the Middle East into three portions with American companies gaining dominance in the newly founded kingdom of Saudi Arabia in 1927.²⁴⁹ To keep the Americans close, the British (and the French) also sought an increased contact between the more internationalist-minded of the British, French and American imperial elites over the 1920s.²⁵⁰ Military cooperation also became a part of the increasingly friendly relationship as when, partly an echo of the intervention in 1900, the Chinese nationalists saw a joint Anglo-American attack in 1927. By that time, the British and the French recognised the US and its hegemony as a ‘phenomenon with no parallel’:

²⁴³ In skipping the Japanese as allies, however, the British also let go of the leash the alliance had become in light of Japanese regional ambitions. Then turning to sell them the latest naval and aerial technologies until the late 1930s only further fuelled Japanese regional designs. John Ferris, “Armaments and Allies: The Anglo-Japanese Strategic Relationship, 1911-1921,” in *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1902-1922* (Abingdon: New York: Routledge, 2009), 249–63.

²⁴⁴ The US naval establishment was particularly angry with and nervous about Japan taking over the German island territories in the Pacific during and after the end of the First World War.

²⁴⁵ O’Brien, “Britain and the End of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance.”

²⁴⁶ David Sim, *A Union Forever the Irish Question and U.S. Foreign Relations in the Victorian Age* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013).

²⁴⁷ Benjamin D. Rhodes, “Reassessing ‘Uncle Shylock’: The United States and the French War Debt, 1917-1929,” *The Journal of American History* 55, no. 4 (1969): 787–803.

²⁴⁸ Daniel Gorman, *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s*, 2012.

²⁴⁹ Øystein Noreng, *Crude Power Politics and the Oil Market* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2006), 56–58.

²⁵⁰ This led to a rather large unofficial American presence in and private funding of the League of Nations bodies, the establishment of the elite Anglo-American foreign policy link between the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council for Foreign Relations, and in the formal sphere of foreign policy, the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact making illegal unsanctioned war. Gorman, *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s*, 175–284.

“*The Advantages to Britain of cooperating with the US were vast, whereas confrontation was unthinkable.*”²⁵¹ In the following years, therefore, several imperial naval conferences also ensured Anglo-American naval parity (rather than American primacy)²⁵² When the British Empire thus entered the war, London thus again turned to both its Dominions, colonies and Washington. As in the First World War, however, American aid in 1941 did not come cheap. With the deal, the British got 50 aging ships at the cost of 99-year base rights to British bases in both the Caribbean and the Atlantic, thus enabling Roosevelt’s idea of a network of island bases.²⁵³

Linking scholarship thus shows that the period from 1918 to 1941 saw the formation of the League, an American imitation thereof, and intensifying inter-imperial political, economic and military ties between the American, British and French Empires on the one hand and the German, Italian and Japanese on the other. While multi-imperial, many of these projects, organisations and alliances simultaneously reproduced and reactualised previous colonial and imperial power relations and categories of race and gender ‘locally’ and internationally. With the outbreak of the Second World War (whether marked as 1937, 1939 or 1940), these different processes came together, spawning the UN military alliance.

The First Act: The United Nations Military Alliance, 1942-1945

In agreement with Cunliffe, I have argued that the United Nations builds on a tradition of inter-imperial military alliances, cooperation and governance. In this section, I also argue—again on basis of imperial and international historiography as well as scholars from other disciplines—that the UN also reflected the immediate situation of the Second World War, more concretely the American wartime planning and the Roosevelt administration’s thoughts on using multilateralism as a vehicle for informal empire with global reach.

As Europe, Africa, and Asia became engulfed in war, the Roosevelt administration requested and received funding for a call-to arms that involved the building of a dozen aircraft carriers that could serve as a network of mobile bases and airfields in support of or as replacement of island bases. Missing the American aircraft carriers at the American navy and air force base on Hawaii in late 1941, Japan enabled the US to enter the war earlier and as more than a supporter as in the Boer War and the First World War. As a means to defeat Germany while containing Japan, the Roosevelt administration announced the multilateral ideas of the Council of Foreign Relations to its British ally. As demonstrated by international historian Dan Plesch, US President Franklin Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill put aside

²⁵¹ Tooze, *The Deluge*, 476.

²⁵² Gorman, *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s*, 296–99; Tooze, *The Deluge*, 272, 394 & 484.

²⁵³ Plesch, *America, Hitler and the UN*, 16–18; Christopher T. Sandars, *America’s Overseas Garrisons*, 2000.

existing ideas on a strictly military alliance with a supreme military council and conceived the idea of the United Nations as a military alliance when they met in the Washington a few weeks after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour.²⁵⁴ Looking at the signatories of the Declaration of the United Nations from Washington in 1942 and the place they signed it, the inter-imperial character of the military alliance is clear. The UN alliance consisted of the various parts of the British Empire, the United States and most of the central and southern American countries under the informal empire of the US, the Chinese republican heir to the Qing Empire, the Belgian and Dutch colonial empires and finally Yugoslavia and Norway. Indeed, the US sought to make the most of the alliance while aiding its allies, sometimes at a high cost.

Soon after the establishment of the alliance in early 1942, the State Department—the US executive in other words—took over the making of the proposals on how to shape the post-war world order from the strongly influential but merely advisory Council of Foreign Relations. By then, the secret project had provided 670 reports, held 361 meetings, and involved more than 100 high-ranking US officials, indicating it was no small undertaking.²⁵⁵ Subsequently, the various factions in the US administration and military institutions began to link their different ambitions and ideas on the post-war functions of the UN. Increasingly they all came to see it as a vehicle to expand American influence globally. In line with the regional ‘Open Door Policy’ from the late 1890s, State Department officials increasingly argued against following the European model of colonial imperialism and suggested instead a single world economy with American global economic preponderance. This was partly to be achieved by loosening the grip of the colonial and mandate powers—mostly members of the UN military alliance and thus US imperial allies—through what became the UN trusteeship system, which would be oriented towards building sufficient capabilities and institutions for national self-governance. While the Department of Defence wanted permanent bases, Roosevelt agreed with the State Department, seeing a globally nation state based international system tied together by a single market economy as pivotal for American global primacy.²⁵⁶ Thus, none of the different factions, noted historian of US foreign policy Gabriel Kolko, worked towards a neutral, unaligned system of equal states. Moreover, Kolko argued, the US increasingly tied the questions of American post-war bases to the formation of the world organisation.²⁵⁷

Consequently, the US took part in the war efforts and sought to use the alliance in ways that primarily suited its own interests. While the US deployed a significant number of forces to the UN theatres of war in the Atlantic, Europe and the

²⁵⁴ Plesch, *America, Hitler and the UN*.

²⁵⁵ Smith, *American Empire*.

²⁵⁶ Hal M Friedman, *Creating an American Lake United States Imperialism and Strategic Security in the Pacific Basin, 1945-1947* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001); Go, *Patterns of Empire*, 118–21; Oldenziel, “Islands: The United States as a Networked Empire”; Smith, *American Empire*, 274–415.

²⁵⁷ Gabriel Kolko, *The Politics of War: The World and United States Foreign Policy, 1943-1945* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1990), 275.

Mediterranean compared to its pre-war levels of mobilisation, its combat efforts mainly concentrated on the Pacific, the area of primary interest to the Roosevelt administration. The US did not bear, however, the burden of the Pacific battles that cost a significant amount of losses, especially amongst the Japanese and Chinese. In fact, the US also came out of war having lost the smallest amount of lives of the members of the UN alliance, far behind for example the smaller members of Poland and Yugoslavia. The number of dead from the British Empire and its colonies amounted to 650.000. Having seen a Japanese occupation, approximately 1.310.000 Chinese lost their lives. Having seen most combat during the war, around 18 million Soviets died. In contrast, 'only' 298.000 Americans lost their lives during the war.²⁵⁸

Besides a means to coordinate the war efforts in the different theatres (which the US also dominated), the UN alliance also comprised of a military-economic network. Not surprisingly, the dynamics of the exchanges that saw millions of tonnes of food and military equipment, hundreds of thousands of military trucks for logistics and combat, thousands of military aircraft, tanks and trains and raw materials shipped between the allies were also dominated by the US and its Lend-Lease agreement. While the US initially spent 7% of its GNP to provide supplies to primarily the war efforts of the British and Soviet imperial powers, it was less of a charity than the British Prime Minister and his ministers remarked to the British public. Washington forced London to surrender the rights and royalties on nuclear technology and other technologies such as radar, antibiotics, and jet aircraft.²⁵⁹ The war and these agreements effectively turned the US into the world's workshop. By 1942, the British and Soviet empires were both out-produced by the US. The following year, US factories produced double that of the factories in Germany and Japan combined and roughly a third more than Great Britain, the Soviet Union and Canada. While the goods and food were produced according to British and Soviet needs, the US also gained additional influence on strategic planning with particular goods such as tanks for Egypt, where American companies had major investments, when the British stood to lose the Suez Canal and thus their ability to protect their Middle Eastern oil production in 1941. However, the advantages for the US went beyond bypassing rights and royalties of British technologies and gaining influence on strategic planning. It also got access to the colonial markets of several of the European colonial powers, the markets of the informal European colonies in the Middle East and Ethiopia, to which it offered trade, loans and arms for base rights and an Italian-built military radio station for intelligence purposes. The picture was more complicated in the Middle East. Trade went through the Middle East Supply Centre, an Anglo-American military organisation populated by numerous colonial officials that centralised Middle Eastern trade control and economic mobilisation much to the irritation of local elites who saw it as commercial imperialism as local industries lost

²⁵⁸ Plesch, *America, Hitler and the UN*, 10; Price, *Orienteering Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific*, 114.

²⁵⁹ The American nuclear bombs dropped on Japan in 1945 were only possible with the transfer of technology, material and scientists from Great Britain to Canada and the US. Price, *Orienteering Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific*, 102–5.

out to Commonwealth competitors and American companies frustrated with the military import-export regime. Nonetheless, the US became the largest consumer of colonial goods during the war. Its economic ties with Latin America also grew stronger: Nearly 60% of Latin American imports in 1941 came from the US, which until 1945 only became more involved in the trade of the continent's strategic materials and connected the Latin American industries and militaries.²⁶⁰ As for bases, the US had fewer colonial bases than Great Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands, Italy and Japan when it joined the war. As the war came to encompass the entire globe, however, the alliance put the number of US bases beyond the wildest dreams of Roosevelt and his military strategists and planners. By 1945, the gradual US build-up in several Pacific colonies conquered from the Japanese, in French colonies in North Africa and the Pacific, and in Portuguese and Danish colonies in the Atlantic left it with more than 30,000 military installations in 100 countries.²⁶¹

Moreover, the American presence in British imperial politics reached new heights. British officials grew irritated with US personnel that they felt was causing tension within various imperial locations on purpose. In some cases, US representatives were indeed seeking to do so intentionally, although these attempts were often rebutted locally, as it happened in Australia. By 1944, however, the British government began to fear for its security system if Canada and South Africa isolated themselves and New Zealand and Australia turned to US. The untying of the Commonwealth would take decades, but the war made the US the big elephant in the room. However, the British had both ignored calls for power sharing and failed in the eyes of the Dominions, also known as the 'white' Commonwealth, to treat them with the respect they felt was due given their troop contributions. The Japanese attack on Australia in 1942 only increased tension, as it became clear that London could not keep its promises on security. Additionally, their UN membership only added to the Dominions' growing awareness of their strategic differences and their international recognition and networks.²⁶² Another aspect was the widespread racism rooted in wider ideas of racial

²⁶⁰ Go, *Patterns of Empire*, 138; Mark Atwood Lawrence, "Explaining the Rise to Global Power: U.S. Policy toward Asia and Africa since 1941," in *America in the World: The Historiography of American Foreign Relations since 1941*, ed. Frank Costigliola and Michael J. Hogan (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 236–59; Donna Mehos and Suzanne Moon, "The Uses of Portability: Circulating Experts in the Technopolitics of the Cold War and Decolonization," in *Entangled Geographies*, ed. Gabrielle Hecht (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2011), 43–74; Plesch, *America, Hitler and the UN*, 59–73; David Rock, "War and Postwar Intersections: Latin America and the United States," in *Latin America in the 1940s: War and Postwar Transitions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 15–40; Rosemary Thorpe, "The Latin American Economies in the 1940s," in *Latin America in the 1940s: War and Postwar Transitions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 41–58; Martin W. Wilmington, *The Middle East Supply Centre* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1971).

²⁶¹ Catherine Lutz, *The Bases of Empire the Global Struggle against U.S. Military Posts* (London: Pluto Press, 2009); Sandars, *America's Overseas Garrisons*, 2000.

²⁶² Andrew Stewart, *Empire Lost Britain, the Dominions and the Second World War* (London: Continuum, 2008).

superiority and ‘whiteness’. Entangled in the war, the narrative of ‘white’ superiority informed, often in conflicting ways due to the large number of colonial and African American troops, perceptions on who was fighting and for what.²⁶³ With the entry of the US, the links between US expansion, violence and racism embedded in the state apparatus and legislation exacerbated the manifestations of racism in the different theatres.²⁶⁴ Indeed, the Japanese attack on the US in 1941 was seen as a manifestation of the growing Japanese influence and threat to global ‘white’ superiority. As put by historian of US foreign policy Thomas Borstelmann, it threatened not only the “*political order of the western Pacific, but also the social order of the United States and the European colonies*”.²⁶⁵ Subsequently, many ‘white’ soldiers from the US, Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand racialised the war (as did African-American and colonial soldiers), enabling a broader male-dominated bond of the ‘white race’ and not only British imperial history and culture. Race was not the only social marker at work. In several war zones and areas for ‘rest and recreation’, opposing views on gender and race intersected in fights on ‘coloured’ soldiers’ relationships with ‘white’ women, the role(s) of women in colonial societies etc.²⁶⁶

As the UN increasingly looked as the winning alliance and inter-imperial market access thus to trump the trade systems of European colonial imperialism, US Treasury Department officials connected with the post-war the State Department planners to shift from strategic thinking to policy-making. In late 1944, their ideas emerged fully

²⁶³ The literature is vast, but see for instance Tarak Barkawi, “Peoples, Homelands, and Wars? Ethnicity, the Military, and Battle among British Imperial Forces in the War against Japan,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46, no. 1 (2004): 134–63; Kristen Stromberg Childers, “The Second World War as a Watershed in the French Caribbean,” *Atlantic Studies* 9, no. 4 (2012): 409–30; Myron Echenberg, “‘Morts Pour La France’: The African Soldier in France during the Second World War,” *Journal of African History* 26, no. 4 (1985): 363–80; Tony Kushner, “‘Without Intending Any of the Most Undesirable Features of a Colour Bar’: Race Science, Europeaness and the British Armed Forces during the Twentieth Century,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 46, no. 3–4 (2012): 339–74; Catherine Merridale, *Ivan’s War: The Red Army 1939–1945* (London: Faber and Faber, 2005); Price, *Orienteering Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific*; S. O. Rose, “Race, Empire and British Wartime National Identity, 1939–45,” *Historical Research* 74, no. 184 (2001): 220–.

²⁶⁴ Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Paul A. Kramer, “Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire: The Philippine-American War as Race War*,” *Diplomatic History* 30, no. 2 (2006): 169–210; Kuzmarov, *Modernizing Repression*, 17–52; Diana Preston, *The Boxer Rebellion: The Dramatic Story of China’s War on Foreigners That Shook the World in the Summer of 1900* (New York: Walker, 2000).

²⁶⁵ Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line*, 39.

²⁶⁶ Abroad (in India, Great Britain, Ireland, France, and Australia), ‘white’ racist American soldiers caused tension and conflict, if not downright violence. At home, Roosevelt had to deploy 6,000 federal soldiers to 45 towns to stop racialised killings of African Americans. See for instance *ibid.*, 30–50; Khan, “Sex in an Imperial War Zone”; Price, *Orienteering Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific*; Mary Louise Roberts, “The Price of Discretion: Prostitution, Venereal Disease, and the American Military in France, 1944–1946,” *The American Historical Review* 115, no. 4 (2010): 1002–30; Mary Louise Roberts, *What Soldiers Do: Sex and the American GI in World War II France*, 2014.

at the Bretton Woods Conference with the creation of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund, which were to regulate post-war financial flows and direct capital into the lesser developed areas of the world, including European colonies. The British economic and military dependency on the US²⁶⁷ forced London to accept this link between economy and military matters at the Dumbarton Oaks conference in Washington. The Soviet Union also accepted.²⁶⁸ The San Francisco conference followed in 1945.²⁶⁹ Here, the US had to accommodate the Soviet Union and British Empire to get their final support.²⁷⁰ However, the different factions more or less got what they sought: a veto-imbued Security Council, a weak General Assembly, a weak Secretariat, several Japanese League of Nations Mandates as ‘Strategic Trusteeships’,²⁷¹ bases ranging from Western Europe and the Atlantic to the Pacific,²⁷² and a vehicle of global American imperial frontier building by opening “*the world to ordering political-economic expansion.*”²⁷³ Fearing a future as uninviting as the past, a West African journalist contended, “*New life has been infused into predatory imperialism.*”²⁷⁴ While failing to mention the American influence in the emerging international institutions, the imperial historian John Darwin nonetheless saw the influence of the US in both ends of Eurasia as unprecedented and called the new American ‘system’ “*(...) imperial in all but name.*”²⁷⁵

As the US stood ready to remake the world in its image in 1945, the Soviet military presence in Europe made it a power to be reckoned with. While the American and Soviet governments had cooperated extensively during the war, all had hinged on the shared goal of defeating the members of the Tripartite Pact. Indeed, the tension that were to grow into hostility and the mutual readjustment of enemy images and strategies were rooted in the joint Euro-American intervention in the Russian

²⁶⁷ By the end of the war, the UK owed the US £15 Billion, an astronomical amount. Stewart, *Empire Lost Britain, the Dominions and the Second World War*, 167.

²⁶⁸ The British were also initially against Roosevelt’s idea of bringing China into the executive organ of the post-war organisation, the Security Council as it tipped the balance too much in favour of anti-colonial powers. However, they came around when Roosevelt also included France

²⁶⁹ Smith, *American Empire*, 274–415.

²⁷⁰ Indicative of its intentions, the US began intercepting the diplomatic cables of both enemies, neutrals and allies six months before the conference. It continued this practice during the two months the conference lasted. This gave Roosevelt and his negotiators advance knowledge of the negotiating positions of all the partaking countries. Stephen Schlesinger, “Cryptoanalysis for Peacetime: Codebreaking and the Birth and the Structure of the United Nations,” *Cryptologia* 19, no. 3 (1995): 217–35.

²⁷¹ Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty, and the Making of International Law*.

²⁷² By 1948, the US still had approximately 2.000 of the 30.000 military bases it had acquired during the war. Lutz, *The Bases of Empire the Global Struggle against U.S. Military Posts*, 10.

²⁷³ Smith, *American Empire*, 411.

²⁷⁴ Quoted in Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace*, 63.

²⁷⁵ Darwin, *After Tamerlane*, 469.

Revolution in favour of the Tsar's regime.²⁷⁶ As the war ended, the Soviet Union and its leader, the General Secretary of the Communist Party's Central Committee, had grown increasingly frustrated with the UN. Soviet negotiators had failed to get both UN memberships for each of the Soviet republics to minimise the gap between the Soviet and the Western blocs, to get influence on the American 'Strategic Trusteeships', and to have the Secretariat divided to install a Soviet official in a top post. Consequently, Stalin sought to empower the Security Council, where the Soviet Union could counter the Western influence with its veto, and to counter what he saw as American abuse of the UN.

Against the backdrop of the previous three sections of this chapter, it would appear entirely reasonable to understand the UN military alliance as a new imperial system built on previous racialised and gendered modalities of imperialism and, not least, a direct tool for the US to expand its imperial frontiers. The following section will make this additionally clearer.

The Second Act: The UN, 1945-1956

If the UN military alliance had not provided the US with opportunities to expand its frontier beyond its paradigm of 19th century colonial imperialism and its informal empire in Latin America, the post-war version of the UN military alliance certainly would.

However, the UN allies fell out with each other soon after the war and the transformation of the alliance into a post-war regime cluster of UN organisations. In the changing worldviews of Washington and London, the Soviet Union increasingly appeared as a potential adversary with more than just defensive plans.²⁷⁷ This understanding also spilled over into the UN. However, many of the immediate post-war geopolitical incidents handled by the UN testified to the Western domination of the UN despite the attempt of the Soviet Union to gain a foothold as the British international historian Evan Luard showed. Despite Soviet criticism of the British military presence in Greece and Indonesia, its own military presence in the Azerbaijani region of Iran ended by way of the UN in summer 1946. The UN commission tasked with investigating the external meddling in the Greek civil war also led to a public setback for the Eastern bloc when the interference of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania was made public. Soon after, the US took over the support of both Greece and Turkey from the British after the latter had declared its resources

²⁷⁶ Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 8–72.

²⁷⁷ It is interesting to note that the American Department of the Army in 1947 began characterising Soviet soldiers (regardless of ethnicity) as primitive, emotional, and passive in units, thus creating a "Soviet African American". Merridale, *Ivan's War*, 11.

inadequate.²⁷⁸ Subsequently, Greece began to receive Marshall Aid on top of and beyond the already flowing support from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration that was operating in Europe and Asia on basis of American, British and Canadian funding and often relying on colonial officials coming in from colonial positions in Asia and Africa.²⁷⁹ Occupied by British, American and Yugoslavian forces, the city of Trieste was divided by Italy and Yugoslavia, notably after the latter had broken with the Soviet Union. In South East Asia, problems arose with the British troops in Indonesia and the Dutch attempt to re-take the colony after the Japanese Empire had occupied it during the war. Initially most Western countries rallied to their support. However, the Dutch military operations against the independence movement made it a hard sell over time. When Washington shifted position, a Dutch-Indonesian republic was established via the UN in 1949, appearing to settle the matter in a pro-Dutch way until the nationalists declared an independent republic. Initially enjoying the support of the Soviet Union, the first UN Secretary-General of the UN Trygve Lie also gradually leaned more and more towards the Western bloc, also purging his Secretariat for Americans marked by the FBI as potential leftists.²⁸⁰ As Luard noted for the first decade of the UN, “(...) *the West used its majority bestowed on it to ensure that the organisation acted in ways favourable to its own political interests and contrary to the principle of great-power consensus (...)*”. Accordingly, it seemed that the Soviet Union was about to leave the UN in 1947—the same year the US according to historian of the US Gene A. Sessions multilateralised the Monroe Doctrine via the mutual defence agreement known as the Rio Treaty—²⁸¹when it established the Cominform for Eastern Europe.²⁸² As noted by Mazower, the dividing line between the US and the international organisation was hard to see.²⁸³

However, Washington and other Western governments grew worried with the combination of what was seen as slow beginnings of the Marshall plan, the failure of the American plans for global economic expansion to come to full fruition, the apparent success of Soviet rapid industrialisation, the expansion of the Cold War beyond Europe, and the ‘loss of China’. These developments had not been on the horizon in 1945.²⁸⁴ In 1949, therefore, the Truman administration announced a new global initiative that brought together the efforts in Europe under the Marshall Plan

²⁷⁸ Evan Luard, *A History of the United Nations. The Years of Western Domination, 1945-1955* (London: Macmillan, 1982), 118–31.

²⁷⁹ Eli Karetny and Thomas G. Weiss, “UNRRA’s Operational Genius and Institutional Design,” in *Wartime Origins and the Future of the United Nations*, ed. Dan Plesch and Thomas G. Weiss (London; New York: Routledge, 2015), 99–120.

²⁸⁰ Luard, *A History of the United Nations. The Years of Western Domination, 1945-1955*, 132–360.

²⁸¹ Gene A. Sessions, “The Multilateralization of the Monroe Doctrine: The Rio Treaty, 1947,” *World Affairs* 136, no. 3 (1973): 259–74.

²⁸² Mark Mazower, *Governing the World: The Rise and Fall of an Idea* (London: Allen Lane, 2012), 234–47.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, 277.

²⁸⁴ Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism*.

and the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the projects in Latin America under the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and private American companies. Turning to indirect governance, as argued by historian of US development policy Stephen Macekura, the programme architects “(...) *envisioned a clear relationship between national economic development, international economic integration, and the promotion of liberal political institutions, a relationship that would, in turn, comport with the strategic interests of the United States.*”²⁸⁵ From 1953, Eisenhower’s administration increased government spending in the programme and intensified its cooperation with the World Bank, the United Nations Technical Assistance Program, and the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, having realised the US private sector alone was an insufficient approach. Moreover, Eisenhower connected the programme with military aid under the Mutual Security Programme, the hitherto largest reconfiguration of the programme in a strategic direction. Seeing the programme as a means to combat Communism, Washington also began to ‘urge’ its European allies, especially the colonial empires, to expand Third World aid via international or multi-lateral organisations,²⁸⁶ organisations in which the US had influence.²⁸⁷ The British, French, Dutch and Italian governments were not the only European governments to do so from the late 1950s. As masters of colonial empires, however, they stood to gain more from looking after their own interests such as maintaining the Sterling Area, develop colonial resources, lead the colonies’ entries into the global market economy, and gain goodwill with the US. Western bilateral and multilateral organisation increased their aid upon decolonisation, perceiving the stakes to be higher as the Soviet Union also engaged itself with the world more actively either through proxies as had been the case in South East Asia or directly as Africa and Latin America following Khrushchev’s ascendance to power,²⁸⁸ While the presence of Soviet agents was new to many former colonial societies in Africa, South East Asia, the Middle East, the Caribbean and Latin America from the late 1950s, the experts that came from the international and European multi-lateral and national institutions and agencies were often not. Not unlike the situation in mandates in the former German and Ottoman Empires, European colonial officials dominated the international staff. Many simply stayed after decolonisation. Moreover, many former colonial officials and scientists also found work for the European bilateral and multilateral institutions and agencies

²⁸⁵ Stephen Macekura, “The Point Four Program and U.S. International Development Policy,” *Political Science Quarterly* 128, no. 1 (2013): 140.

²⁸⁶ Agencies such as UN agencies and the Organisation of European Economic Cooperation/Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

²⁸⁷ Macekura, “The Point Four Program and U.S. International Development Policy.”

²⁸⁸ Esther Helena Arens, “Multilateral Institution-Building and National Interest: Dutch Development Policy in the 1960s,” *Contemporary European History* 12, no. 4 (2003): 457–72; Gerard Bossuat, “French Development Aid and Co-Operation under de Gaulle,” *Contemporary European History* 12, no. 4 (2003): 431–56; Elena Calandri, “Italy’s Foreign Assistance Policy, 1959-1969.,” *Contemporary European History* 12, no. 4 (2003): 509–25; Jim Tomlinson, “The Commonwealth, the Balance of Payments and the Politics of International Poverty: British Aid Policy, 1958-1971,” *Contemporary European History* 12, no. 4 (2003): 413–29.

not to mention the UN organisations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Bank Development Service.²⁸⁹ Staff in new ministries and villagers in the rural districts, whom according to historian of US development policy Nicole Sackley “(...) became both subjects and objects of expert and state campaigns to develop and secure the ‘The World’”²⁹⁰ and could therefore experience former colonial officials return with similar if not the same colonial models and strategies they used before departing. Sackley argues, “Through expert knowledge and state power, the reconstructed village (or the model village built from the ground up) promised to secure and legitimate empires, Cold War alliances, and new nation-states.”²⁹¹ In extension thereof, as international historian Amy Sayward and geographer Tony Weis contend, the re-actualisation of the Western colonial agricultural models through the international organisations combined with the Western need for outlets for subsidised surplus food production not only expanded the colonial monoculture cash crop regime over the 1950s and 1960s. It also led to dramatic rises in Third World food imports.²⁹² Also within the realm of development, the health and demographic programmes and strategies of the United Nations Division of Population, UNESCO, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Bank, and a range of American and British NGOs led to sterilization of the “unfit” or ethnic cleansing in extreme cases. As the historian of international health and demographic policy Matthew Connelly argued, “(...) the link between population control and imperialism is not merely conceptual, but historical. The ambition to control the population of the world emerged directly from the travails of territorial empires.”²⁹³ Summing up, scholar of development Mark Duffield and political scientist Vernon Hewitt maintained, “While specific changes to the international system and the capacities of international organisations since World War II may have reconfigured some of these techniques, they remain embedded in the same assumptions and work towards the very same outcomes.”²⁹⁴

Connected directly to how the US had turned the Pacific into its imperial lake as Friedman phrases it,²⁹⁵ the imperial dynamics of the UN were perhaps the most visible

²⁸⁹ Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism*.

²⁹⁰ Nicole Sackley, “The Village as Cold War Site: Experts, Development, and the History of Rural Reconstruction,” *Journal of Global History* 6, no. 3 (2011): 481.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 482.

²⁹² Amy L Sayward, *The Birth of Development: How the World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization, and World Health Organization Changed the World, 1945-1965* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2006), 64–121; Anthony John Weis, *The Global Food Economy: The Battle for the Future of Farming* (London; New York; Halifax; Winnipeg: Zed Books; Fernwood, 2007), 89–127.

²⁹³ Connelly, *Fatal Misconception*, 378. The works of other scholars point in the same direction, showing how international health and disease cooperation has its roots in inter-imperial concerns and cooperative projects on diseases. See for instance; Akami, “Beyond Empires’ Science: Inter-Imperial Pacific Science Networks in the 1920s”; Nagata, “International Control of Epidemic Diseases from a Historical and Cultural Perspective.”

²⁹⁴ Mark Duffield and Vernon Hewitt, “Introduction,” in *Empire, Development and Colonialism: The Past in the Present* (Woodbridge, Rochester: James Currey, 2013), 2.

²⁹⁵ Luard, *A History of the United Nations. The Years of Western Domination, 1945-1955*, 383.

in the Korean War from 1950 to 1953 than in any other aspect of what Luard called the decade of Western supremacy. Korea was effectively divided not long after the arrival of the Soviet and American forces in 1945. Using the UN umbrella as a cover for engaging in informal empire, the US Accordingly began industrialising the largely agricultural south as it had done in Europe. Under the supervision of Western experts and the protection of US armed forces, the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency administered this modernisation project. As both the largest donor in the UN program and bilateral donor, the US reigned supreme in South Korean affairs until the formal declaration of independence in 1948 (as in Japan until 1951). Subsequently, Washington pressured the UN into employing large numbers of administrators whom had previously worked for the Japanese colonial regime as in Western Germany where Nazis administrators were able to re-enlist, not least in the security services. South Korea thus inherited not only the legacies of an authoritarian Japanese colonial state, but also those of a security force controlled by foreigners and a forced industrialisation run by Japanese-educated elites.²⁹⁶ The mounting tension between the two regimes eventually led to a war, initiated with the Communist regime invasion of the South. The US managed to form a UN military operation due the Soviet boycott of the UN Security Council in anger with Taiwan representing China in the Security Council. While cautious, the ‘white’ Commonwealth states and Great Britain rallied to support the Truman administration militarily within days of the war.²⁹⁷ The US, NATO states, ‘white’ Commonwealth states, US client states (such as the former US colony of the Philippines²⁹⁸ and US occupied Japan) and finally Latin American countries, thus provided close to 300.000 troops for the United Nations Command (UNC). Supported by Western dominance in the UN General Assembly, the pro-western UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie in New York, as well as the US Army headquarters in Japan, the

²⁹⁶ Carter J Eckert, *Offspring of Empire: The Koch'ang Kims and the Colonial Origins of Korean Capitalism, 1876-1945* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2014); “Rehabilitation and Development of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries in South Korea” (Food and Agriculture Organization, 1954); Gene M. Lyons, “American Policy and The United Nation’s Program For Korean Reconstruction,” *International Organization* 12, no. 2 (1958): 180–92.

²⁹⁷ Worth noting, the US had also intensified its military and intelligence ties with the Dominions that almost all had Pacific interests via a joint project with Britain (but not France Hugues Canuel, “French Aspirations and Anglo-Saxon Suspicions: France, Signals Intelligence and the UKUSA Agreement at the Dawn of the Cold War,” *The Journal of Intelligence History* 12, no. 1 [2013]: 76–92; Michael J. Cohen, “From ‘Cold’ to ‘Hot’ War: Allied Strategic and Military Interests in the Middle East after the Second World War.,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 43, no. 5 [2007]: 725–48; Mark A Stoler, *Allies and Adversaries: The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Grand Alliance, and U.S. Strategy in World War II* [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000], 258–68.

²⁹⁸ The US granted the Philippines independence in 1946, having realised it was better off with the Philippines as a friendly nation offering base rights in the Pacific base network than a colony that needed to be kept under control. As Go succinctly puts it, “Decolonizing the Philippines, the American state simply recolonized the rest of the Pacific.” Go, *Patterns of Empire*, 121.

American and Western use of the UN was painstakingly clear for all to see.²⁹⁹ Not surprisingly, the Korean peninsula in extension thereof witnessed an influx of technologies and practices with roots in Western and Japanese colonial security operations as well as inter-imperial warfare experiences during the Second World War. For instance, aerial surveillance rapidly developed as a colonial security technology in the Middle East; in Korea, scholarship shows, it gained new prominence. UNC aircrafts soon began bombing civilian targets, and used incendiary bombs on North Korean cities and villages (in some cases in the South also) – just like UN declaration partners had used incendiary bombs on Japanese and German cities in the Second World War. Most North Korean cities were flattened.³⁰⁰ The UNC also established relief organisations, and a joint council with South Korea. However, civilian Koreans soon learned that UN forces showed as little regard for their lives as had the Japanese colonial forces. As historian of the Korean War Steven Lee argues, the “*emphasis of civil assistance was not to stop soldiers from firing on or towards civilians, but to prevent civilians from hindering military offensives and other activities, an important distinction which reflected the acceptance of violence towards civilians underlying UNC relief programs.*”³⁰¹ UN brutality, however, was possibly also linked to racism as much as military objectives and military cultures. ‘White’ Australian and Canadian soldiers were known as racists already before the war - in the context of the long reign of the ‘white Australia’ policy and the racialised views of the eastern Pacific.³⁰² UNC pilots from Apartheid South Africa also had reputations as eager fighters of ‘gooks’ and Communists.³⁰³ Reflecting over a century of ‘white’ American racist violence in the US, the Caribbean and the Philippines, ‘white’ American soldiers often sported Confederate Flags as a sign of resistance to the integration of ‘white’ and ‘black’ units.³⁰⁴ , the US had a long tradition of presidents

²⁹⁹ Robert Barnes, “Branding an Aggressor: The Commonwealth, the United Nations and Chinese Intervention in the Korean War, November 1950–January 1951,” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 33, no. 2 (2010): 231–53; Robert Barnes, *The US, the UN and the Korean War: Communism in the Far East and the American Struggle for Hegemony in the Cold War* (London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2014); Paul Edwards, *Unusual Footnotes to the Korean War* (Osprey Publishing, 2013); Luard, *A History of the United Nations. The Years of Western Domination, 1945-1955*, 348–52; James I. Matray, “Korea’s War at 60: A Survey of the Literature,” *Cold War History* 11, no. 1 (2011): 99–129.

³⁰⁰ Suh Hee Kyung, “Atrocities before and during the Korean War,” *Critical Asian Studies* 42, no. 4 (2010): 553–88; Taewoo Kim, “Limited War, Limited Targets,” *Critical Asian Studies* 44, no. 3 (2012): 467–92.

³⁰¹ Steven Lee, “The United States, the United Nations, and the Second Occupation of Korea, 1950-1951,” *Japan Focus* 8, no. 50 (2010).

³⁰² Laksiri Jayasuriya, David Walker, and Jan Gothard, *Legacies of ‘white’ Australia: Race, Culture, and Nation* (Crawley: University of Western Australia Press, 2003); Price, *Oriental Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific*.

³⁰³ P. M. J. McGregor, “The History of No 2 Squadron, SAAF, in the Korean War,” *Military History Journal* 4, no. 3 (1978): 1–11.

³⁰⁴ Michael Cullen Green, *Black Yanks in the Pacific: Race in the Making of American Military Empire after World War II* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2010); Kramer, “Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire”; Brent Byron Watson, *Far Eastern Tour*

seeing the world in racial terms with ‘whites’ as the superior race, and ‘Negros’, ‘Hispanics’ and ‘Asians’ as weaker ‘races’. This also went for their officials as the “*elite ‘white’ men who ran the State and Defense Departments and the intelligence agencies were comfortable with the world they had grown up and succeeded in, a world marked by European power, Third World weakness, and nearly ubiquitous racial segregation.*”³⁰⁵ Accordingly, racism and extremist ideologies may well have led to violence against Koreans fleeing the war in search of safety. Such interactions between militarised spaces, racialized bodies, and insecurity—against the backdrop of western and Japanese colonialism and imperialism—also influenced gender relations. Over 180,000 women in prostitution ‘catered’ for western soldiers during the Korean War; a number exceeding those under the earlier Japanese and American regimes. Although most women were involved in prostitution due to the poverty caused by the war, many were also forced by the South Korean regime to keep the western forces content and prevent them from raping other women. The racialised arrangement not only forbade South Korean soldiers to enter UN ‘comfort stations’, the UN force’s military hygiene regime predominantly enforced regulation upon the women rather than the soldiers in order to reduce the risk of disease. This regime was similar to the previous Japanese regime of military hygiene, the regime associated with the fifty US military bases established in South Korea over the 1940s, and British and American imperial regulations elsewhere.³⁰⁶ During the war, several American and British formal proposals and informal enquiries by UN Secretary General Lie suggested to make the Korean operation permanent – either in the form of a UN and European legion of volunteers or as a permanent UN military force. Not only did these initiatives and the concept of a standing UN force fail (or were dismissed by the Soviet Union), the war had also left Great Britain distanced on the matters of Asia and frustrated with the increasing American orientation of the Dominions.³⁰⁷

To recap, I have by way of imperial, international and Cold War scholarship shown that Washington beyond doubt intentionally used the UN regime web of organisations to serve its imperial interests around the globe, to draw in closer the British and the

the Canadian Infantry in Korea, 1950-1953 (Montreal; Ithaca: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002).

³⁰⁵ Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line*, 49.

³⁰⁶ Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico*; Na Young Lee, “The Construction of Military Prostitution in South Korea during the U.S. Military Rule, 1945-1948,” *Feminist Studies* 33, no. 3 (2007): 453–81; Philippa Levine, *Prostitution, Race & Politics – Policing Venereal Disease in the British Empire* (New York: Routledge, 2003); Seungsook Moon, “Regulating Desire, Managing the Empire: U.S. Military Prostitution in South Korea, 1945-1970,” in *Over There: Living with the U.S. Military Empire from World War Two to the Present*, ed. Maria Höhn and Seungsook Moon (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 39–77.

³⁰⁷ Stephen Kinloch-Pichat, *A UN “Legion”: Between Utopia and Reality* (London; New York: Frank Cass, 2004), 58–70; Peter Lowe, “Waging Limited Conflict: The Impact of the Korean War on Anglo-American Relations, 1950-1953,” in *War and Cold War in American Foreign Policy, 1942-62*, ed. Dale Carter and Robin Clifton (Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 133–55.

'white' commonwealth, and counter the Soviet Union around the. As part thereof, both intentionally and unintentionally, the UN regime web also sustained, if in altered and occasionally contradicting forms, elements of the European and American imperial power relations, ideas and practices that enabled and produced regimes of spatial ordering, relations of hierarchy, of asymmetries in the scale of political action, and modes of exceptionalising difference.

Chapter 4: Building The Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, 1880-1955

Above, I focused on the emergence of American imperialism within what became the United States, its regional spheres of formal and informal empire and its increasing influence on the British and French empires, as well as the emerging regime of the web of international institutions, many of which were of American design.

To set the stage for the international intervention in 1956, I change the focus to the region of the eastern Mediterranean as it gained global importance over the 19th and 20th centuries. Linking imperial and international historiographies with my theoretical framework, I recast the orthodox nation state-based histories of the Mediterranean in a broader imperialised perspective. Put differently, I argue that the Mediterranean began to shift from a mainly Ottoman intra-imperial space to, from the late 19th century, a space of initially European and later primarily British and French multinational imperialism and then a space of imperial multilateralism in which the US and USSR would make their influence felt after 1945.

That is not to say that Washington, however initially disputed their allies expanding spaces of formal and informal empire in the region. While sticking to the regional partnerships with London and Paris, Washington nonetheless began to engage the growing number of post-Mandate governments after the outbreak of the Korean War as the British influence began to decline and its attempt to create a regional military framework weakened its own influence. The new emerging political forces of the region in the form of both governments and citizens not only both shaped and were shaped the dynamics of the relationship between London and Washington, but also their views on what appeared possible, wise or the opposite. Nevertheless, I will argue that the Anglo-American interdependence and promotion of imperial multilateralism in the Mediterranean and the Middle East both maintained and furthered several of the imperial traits related to the British regional informal (mandate) and formal imperialism and, increasingly, the expanding American informal imperialism. The ordering of space, the generation of hierarchies and asymmetric political action as well as exceptionalising difference in many ways merely changed form rather than disappeared.

The Mediterranean and in Middle East in the 19th and early 20th Centuries: The Piecemeal Expansion of the Frontier of European Multinational Imperialism

For several centuries, the Ottoman Sultans managed to expand their influence in the Mediterranean and Middle East to become the dominant empire with their heartlands in the eastern Balkans and Anatolia and peripheral domains in the northern Balkans, the southern shores of the Mediterranean and far beyond its eastern shores into the land of the old Mesopotamian river empires. With the expansion, Ottoman historian Karen Barkey argues, the Ottoman Empire grew into the ‘typical’ dynastically ruled and religiously and ethnically diverse empire with a patchwork pattern of relations with its peripheral regions via various networks and forms of ties to local elites with the imperial state ruling supreme, if reliant on provincial compliance, in military and economic matters.³⁰⁸ Eventually, however, the growing military assertiveness of both the Habsburg and Russian empires with standing imperial armies at the western and northern peripheries, Barkey argues, forced the sultans to begin to centralise their tax and military systems, emulating the European and Russian empires in the last decades of the 18th century. Failing to do so successfully while also losing wars, however, led several European empires to shield the Ottoman regime from a harsh Russian peace settlement in 1792, the first manifestation of European inter-imperial cooperation in the eastern Mediterranean. In its attempt to improve its imperial ‘repertoires of power’ with a standing army and a centralised tax system, however, the regime estranged its provincial elites. Consequently, the Sultan saw a march of several provincial notables and their armies to Istanbul demanding an economic and political empowerment of a broader social base in 1808.³⁰⁹ Although the regime managed to partially reform the tax system and build a standing army, even if smaller than the Russian imperial army, European inter-imperial cooperation, imperial and military historians show, became a growing challenge, both militarily and economically. Having already acquired Gibraltar in 1713, the British Empire continued to acquire passage routes and islands such as Malta in 1802, the Ionian Islands in 1815, and Aden in 1839 whereas the French went for land and took Ottoman Algeria in 1830.³¹⁰ With the European support for the Greek independence, the Sultan also felt the growing influence of European multinational imperialism closer to Istanbul in 1827. Additionally, Austrian, British and French forces also engaged in localised ad hoc inter-imperial cooperation in the predominantly Christian Ottoman province we today know as Lebanon in 1840 (and 1860).³¹¹ Moreover, the European

³⁰⁸ Barkey, *Empire of Difference*.

³⁰⁹ Ibid.

³¹⁰ Manuel Borutta and Sakis Borutta, “A Colonial Sea: The Mediterranean, 1798–1956,” *European Review of History* 19, no. 1 (2012): 1–13.

³¹¹ Schmidl, “The Evolution of Peace Operations from the Nineteenth Century.”

empires also forced the sultan to agree to trade and customs agreements with the British in 1838 and later the French empire and others, which caused Ottoman imports, deficits, debts and borrowing to explode. Following several wars with the Russian Empire, the Ottoman Empire was forced to eventually declare a moratorium on its foreign debts in 1875 and in 1881 cede control of its finances to a debt administration that was formally Ottoman, but de facto under joint British, French and German control.³¹² The inter-imperial project of the Suez Canal, which opened in 1869, also led to increased British interest in Egypt, as it reduced significantly the distance to the majority of British imperial territories along the shores of the Indian Ocean, in the Malacca Straits and in Oceania. Obtaining a large number of shares in the Canal Company, and thus joining the French, the British Empire grew more invested and in 1888 pushed through a convention on canal neutrality protected obviously by the British Empire.³¹³ Finally, many British, French and increasingly German experts and companies—invited by the sultan to take part in the modernisation of the communications (ports, railways, telegraphs) and financial infrastructure (banks and insurance firms)—began to seize ownership of these and export capital generated in the Ottoman Empire. This combination, I therefore suggest, marked the informal institutionalisation of European multinational imperialism in the Mediterranean from the late 19th century.

While the following decades allowed this process of frontier building to shift into the open and the European empires to cater for their own interests, the Ottoman Empire grew less able to do so. Moreover, from 1878 to 1899 the Ottomans lost Cyprus in 1878, Egypt (and thereby also Sudan) to the British. The Ottomans lost Tunisia in 1881 and East Morocco in 1912 to the French. After the internal colonisation of Italy, the Italian Risorgimento also acquired areas in what is today Eritrea in 1886 (after failing to take Tunisia) and Ottoman Libya in 1911.³¹⁴ When recently independent Greece sent troops to support an anti-Ottoman revolt on Crete in 1896, the frontier of multinational imperialism was formally institutionalised. Realising that the Ottoman Empire was threatened and thus potentially the broader imperial order, the British, French, Italian, Habsburg, German and Russian empires organised a joint naval blockade and inter-imperial force of 20,000 troops to be stationed in Crete. European consuls, military attaches and officers from the multinational imperial force subsequently reorganised the Cretan administration, the police, and the judiciary. Crete gained wide autonomy under inter-imperial supervision, but remained part of the Ottoman Empire. In 1908, however, the Austro-

³¹² Barkey, *Empire of Difference*, 264–96; Geyikdağı, *Foreign Investment in the Ottoman Empire International Trade and Relations 1854-1914*.

³¹³ Huber, “Connecting Colonial Seas”; Huber, *Channelling Mobilities: Migration and Globalisation in the Suez Canal Region and Beyond, 1869-1914*; Steve Morewood, “Prelude to the Suez Crisis: The Rise and Fall of British Dominance over the Suez Canal, 1869-1956,” in *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 13–34.

³¹⁴ Borutta and Borutta, “A Colonial Sea”; Schmidl, “The Evolution of Peace Operations from the Nineteenth Century.”

Hungarian Empire annexed Bosnia-Herzegovina in, reducing further the Ottoman European territory. Soon after, the European imperial powers, in another example of institutionalised European multinational imperialism, created the Muslim state of Albania in another inter-imperial intervention in the Balkan War in 1913 to prevent the post-Ottoman, pro-Russian and expanding Serbia from getting ocean access and thereby strengthen the Russian Empire in the Mediterranean.³¹⁵

Within the Ottoman Empire, historians have shown that the populations also felt the effects of the European multinational imperialism and the Ottoman Empire's attempts to counter it. Following the influx of more than two million Muslim refugees after wars with Russia (that changed the balance between Muslims and Christians in many provinces), the global crisis from the late 1870s (that reduced Ottoman commercial agricultural exports), and the de facto deindustrialisation of the countryside, a growing number of people were left without means to fend for themselves. While locally rooted religious care systems cared for sick, old and disabled people, and urban poor, conversely, came under an increasing pressure, suddenly becoming 'idle' and potential criminals requiring surveillance. Having already disabled the constitution in 1876, the Ottoman state criminalised the increasingly insecure lower urban classes of homeless people, unemployed and striking workers under pressure from a budding Ottoman bourgeoisie able to navigate the frontier building of European multinational imperialism. 'Idleness' and unemployment came to be seen as a disregard for society and work a duty. After having been integral to attempts of colonising the imperial countryside, pacify peasant revolts and improve tax collection, the Ottoman gendarmerie also became involved in dealing with both the growing levels of unemployment and the number of strikes as working conditions grew worse. By 1900, the gendarmerie saw the protection of the community of commerce as its most important task. Additionally, the regime also used Muslim refugees from the wars with Russia in forced internal colonisation programmes to populate and develop commercial agriculture in thinly populated lands in the Syrian provinces and Anatolia after the 1878 war (thus shifting their ethnic-religious balances). Although the constitution from 1876 was reinstalled after a coup in 1908, temporary laws on strikes, vagrancy and suspected criminals were passed. Subsequently, mass-arrests, deportations and class-based spatial segregation became the norm in the bigger cities. Not surprisingly, discontent in the provinces grew significantly. Feminist writings, tax-revolts, peasant uprisings, growing political opposition to the regime and the ever-growing foreign influence, and mutinies in the army and navy defined several Ottoman provinces in the early twentieth century.³¹⁶

³¹⁵ Schmidl, "The Evolution of Peace Operations from the Nineteenth Century"; Schmidl, "The International Operation in Albania, 1913–14."

³¹⁶ E. Attila Aytakin, "Tax Revolts During the Tanzimat Period (1839–1876) and Before the Young Turk Revolution (1904–1908): Popular Protest and State Formation in the Late Ottoman Empire," *Journal of Policy History* 25, no. 3 (2013): 308–333; F. Ergut, "Policing the Poor in the Late Ottoman Empire," *Middle Eastern Studies* 38, no. 2 (2002): 149–64; Nadir Özbek, "Policing the Countryside: Gendarmes of the Late 19th Century Ottoman Empire (1876–1908)," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 40, no. 1 (2008): 47–67; Nadir Özbek, "Beggars"

The Ottoman Empire thus weakened considerably between 1810 and 1918 due to a combination of 57 years of war that not only cost territory and tax revenue but also burdened the regime with growing military costs, an externally driven process of deindustrialisation and the European inter-imperial collaborative expansions. Nevertheless, notes Ottoman historian Eugene Rogan, it did not dissolve early in the First World War, a war fought for empire mainly by the German, Habsburg and Ottoman Empires on one side and the British, French, Russian and American empires on the other. It took four years of campaigns, the mobilization of the Ottoman Arab populations by way of several different promises of a post-Ottoman independent Arab world and the use of millions of British ‘white’ settler colonial and both British and French ‘coloured’ and ‘black’ colonial forces before the Ottoman Empire eventually succumbed.³¹⁷

The Failure to Institutionalise European Multinational Imperialism in the Mediterranean, 1918-1942

Unintentionally buoyed by the then collapsed Russian Empire, the British and French empires continued building a frontier of multinational imperialism in the Mediterranean region with the demise of the Ottoman Empire without the also collapsed Habsburgs and defeated Italians. It came initially in the form of the occupation of several Ottoman provinces as the regime of the Allied Occupied Enemy Territory Administration and later as carved-out Mandates under the new League of Nations, marking a new degree of institutionalised multinational imperialism. Moreover, the British increased their part of the Suez Canal Company shares to nearly 80% and installed a permanent British military force to relieve the war-time deployment of British, Australian, Indian and Egyptian troops. Imperial historians have shown that this was less than London, Moscow and Paris arranged for with a plan to divide the region and a British war-time campaign to revive, or rather take over, what they called a ‘declined landscape of oppressed Arab, Armenian and Jewish nations’ as a ‘new’ British ‘Middle East’ within the American president Wilson’s plan

and ‘Vagrants’ in Ottoman State Policy and Public Discourse, 1876–1914,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 45, no. 5 (2009): 783–801; Irvin Cemil Schick, “Print Capitalism and Women’s Sexual Agency in the Late Ottoman Empire,” *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 31, no. 1 (2011): 196–216; Mehmet Soytürk, “Modern State and Security: The Gendarmerie System in France, Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire,” *History Studies* 4, no. 2 (2012).

³¹⁷ Jarboe and Fogarty, *Empires in World War I*; Manela, R. Gerwarth, and Manela, “The Great War as a Global War: Imperial Conflict and the Reconfiguration of World Order, 1911-1923,” *Diplomatic History* 38, no. 4 (2014): 786–800; Eugene L Rogan, *The Fall of the Ottomans: The Great War in the Middle East*, 2015.

for a nation state-based capitalist system.³¹⁸ After the American president fell sick, Washington became less combative and grew willing to let London “(...) *exercise substantial political control in the Middle East provided that this control would act as an umbrella under which American interests could prosper and be protected.*”³¹⁹ The American involvement in the rapidly expanding oil business in Iraq and Saudi Arabia (beginning in the 1920s) needs to be seen in light of this inter-imperial relationship.³²⁰ Despite not joining the League of Nations, the US took over Armenia as a mandate, thus joining, in effect if informally, the new regime in the Mediterranean and the ‘new’ ‘Middle East’. Regardless of their plans and that the Russian Empire turned on itself in a revolution, the British and French mandate regimes would continue to face the same problems as the late Ottoman regime. Rather than dealing with the broad and massive socio-economic problems rooted in the increasing regional reliance on cash and monocrops³²¹, the rising living costs and urbanisation, the British and French mandates expanded their wartime military regimes into frontier zones of multinational imperialism.

Throughout the 1920s, riots broke out in several Mandates. Accordingly, the emerging quasi-colonial security states responded by honing their technologies of power in the form of map-making, aerial and demographic surveillance, ID cards, the differentiated regulation of mobilities, medical standards, and education. The mandate regimes also built networks of linked police stations, military bases, naval facilities and airfields, as well as recruited local forces.³²² As noted by Darwin, none of these states was “(...) *to be governed on a shoestring and garrisoned with a corporal’s guard of local levies.*”³²³ Altogether, the legal, fiscal, military, medical and social regulation of the mandates and the European colonies both failed to consider ethnic and religious groups and internationalised popular racialised imperial imaginaries. Expressions of cultural imperialism, the racialised frontiers, which often cast Europeans as rational, civilised and masculine and the subject of the ‘Near East’ and

³¹⁸ John Darwin, “An Undeclared Empire: The British in the Middle East, 1918–39,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 27, no. 2 (1999): 159–76; Morewood, “Prelude to the Suez Crisis”; James Renton, “Changing Languages of Empire and the Orient: Britain and the Invention of the Middle East, 1917–1918,” *Historical Journal* 50, no. 3 (2007): 645–67.

³¹⁹ Sluglett, “An Improvement on Colonialism?,” 418.

³²⁰ Charles Issawi, *An Economic History of the Middle East and North Africa* (London: Routledge, 2010); Noreng, *Crude Power Politics and the Oil Market*.

³²¹ Citrus fruits, cotton, olive oil and tobacco became typical crops.

³²² Darwin, “An Undeclared Empire”; Randi Deguilhem, “Turning Syrians into Frenchmen: The Cultural Politics of a French Non-Governmental Organization in Mandate Syria (1920–67)—the French Secular Mission Schools,” *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 13, no. 4 (2002): 449–60; Panagiotis Dimitrakis, *Military Intelligence in Cyprus From the Great War to Middle East Crises*. (London: I.B. Tauris & Co., 2010), 11–22; David Kenneth Fieldhouse, *Western Imperialism in the Middle East 1914–1958* (Oxford university press, 2006); Huber, *Channelling Mobilities: Migration and Globalisation in the Suez Canal Region and Beyond, 1869–1914*; Issawi, *An Economic History of the Middle East and North Africa*; Sluglett, “An Improvement on Colonialism?”; Martin Thomas, *Empires of Intelligence: Security Services and Colonial Disorder after 1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).

³²³ Darwin, “An Undeclared Empire,” 160.

‘Orient’, the Arab or/and Muslim as mostly emotional, primitive and feminine, expanded beyond the internationalised medical surveillance of mobilities of ‘oriental’ passengers passing through the Suez Canal. European and American tourists as well as Jewish settlers thus came to be ‘good’ circulation, while nomads, militant nationalists and criminals came to be ‘bad’ circulation, having mobilities that needed restriction. Similarly, the attempts to handle Mediterranean trafficking was mainly concerned with ‘white’ slavery.³²⁴ Predictably, governing the mandates and the broader region only got increasingly harder for the British and French.

By the mid-1930s, as historians have showed, the onset of the global economic crisis and the regional integration process therein made it necessary to devolve power to local notables, to increase the troop numbers, and to broaden the powers of enforcement. The Saudi royal regime installed by the British came to enjoy increasing freedom as it grew central to stability in the Gulf already by 1931. In the late 1930s, however, the Saudi kingdom grew aggressive to British dismay. Egyptian nationalist pressure and the Italian invasion of Ethiopia in 1935 meant that the British had to grant Egypt formal sovereignty and withdraw their reduced forces to several newly built bases along the Suez Canal in 1936. In Iraq, formal independence in 1930 left the British with both a military presence and growing ethnic and religious tension. Transjordan was quiet due to subsidies to the new regime and the de facto British military force.³²⁵ The same year, Palestinians clashed with security forces. The threat of martial law calmed matters initially, but the lack of British willingness to provide balanced policies and curb Jewish immigration that was dramatically altering both the Palestinian socio-economic fabric and access to land, soon led to peasant guerrilla warfare. The British responded by not only censoring the press, issuing collective fines, demolishing houses and installing travel restrictions, but also by putting the police under military jurisdiction, arresting people without warrants, and bringing in more forces. As the revolt escalated, the British resorted to beatings, humiliations, indiscriminate killings and death penalties, eventually ending the rebellion in 1939 by the brutality of more than 20,000 soldiers.³²⁶ The French struggled with similar problems in both its mandates of Syria and Lebanon and its North African colonies of Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. The security regimes faced urban dissent, student rallies and violent resistance due to economic trouble, nationalist or Islamic mobilisation, biased political reforms, broken French promises of political reform and not least the Palestinian revolt. Although security forces ended these, their increasing

³²⁴ Kobi Cohen Hattab, “The Attraction of Palestine: Tourism in the Years 1850-1948.,” *Journal of Historical Geography* 27, no. 2 (2001): 166-; Stephanie Malia Hom, “Empires of Tourism: Travel and Rhetoric in Italian Colonial Libya and Albania, 1911-1943,” *Journal of Tourism History* 4, no. 3 (2012): 281-300; Gorman, “Empire, Internationalism and the Campaign against the Traffic in Women and Children in the 1920s.”

³²⁵ Darwin, “An Undeclared Empire”; Fieldhouse, *Western Imperialism in the Middle East 1914-1958*; Sluglett, “An Improvement on Colonialism?”; Thomas, *Empires of Intelligence*.

³²⁶ Jacob Norris, “Repression and Rebellion: Britain’s Response to the Arab Revolt in Palestine of 1936-39,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 36, no. 1 (2008): 25-45.

repression and growing influence on policy formation and urban policing only intensified the conflicts, eventually leading to martial law.³²⁷

However, pressure on this frontier of British and French multinational imperialism also mounted from other imperial powers and alliances through the disenfranchisement of the League of Nations and the ‘peace’ after the First World War. For a century before 1914, imperial historian John Darwin argues, London had seen Berlin as a counterweight to Moscow in the Middle East given the region was peripheral to Germany’s immediate interests. While Germany had opened a railway line from Istanbul to the Persian Gulf to open up the Ottoman economy and provide an alternative to the French-British controlled Suez Canal at the end of the 19th century, the British understanding only changed in the First World War when the Russian Empire was part of defeating the German Empire along with the British. Moreover, the collapse of Russia brought, as Darwin put it, “(...) *flood-tide of German influence swirling round the Black Sea and towards North Persia.*”³²⁸ However, Mandate regime led Arabs to see Germany as a “(...) *fellow victim of the post-World War I settlement, and perhaps the only major European without imperial ambitions in the Middle East.*”³²⁹ Nationalism and anti-Semitism also gained traction, as it was never realised that Nazi ideology placed Arabs at the bottom of its racial hierarchy and that Germany would not support Arab independence.³³⁰ Over the 1930s, the British and French both saw German influence increase in Turkey and feared it would do so in Transjordan and Saudi Arabia. The Italian invasion of Abyssinia, however, challenged the regime of the League of Nations, as Abyssinia was a member. Accordingly, as imperial historians have shown, London and Paris resorted to various measures. First, they used the League to impose sanctions on Italy, even if ineffectual given they left oil out. Second, they co-opted Istanbul by recalling the Italian post-World War I occupation of Anatolia, the meddling in Albania in the 1920s, and the offensive maritime military preparations on the one hand, and handing over Alexandretta, a part of French Syrian mandate, on the other. Thirdly, the British turning to tested methods, also began supporting rebels in Italian East Africa, consisting of Abyssinia, Eritrea and Italian Somaliland. Finally, the British also sought to restrain Italy, Germany and Japan that by then had gotten together in first an Anti-Communist Pact between the German and Japanese empires and later in a formal military alliance through secret negotiations with Italy and an incorporative trade policy aimed at strengthening conservatives in Germany and Japan who preferred economic growth to imperial war.³³¹

³²⁷ Fieldhouse, *Western Imperialism in the Middle East 1914-1958*; Thomas, *Empires of Intelligence*.

³²⁸ Darwin, “An Undeclared Empire,” 162.

³²⁹ Francis Nicosia, “Arab Nationalism and National Socialist Germany, 1933–1939: Ideological and Strategic Incompatibility,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 12, no. 3 (1980): 351.

³³⁰ Nicosia, “Arab Nationalism and National Socialist Germany, 1933–1939.”

³³¹ Dilek Barlas, “Friends of Foes? Diplomatic Relations between Italy and Turkey, 1923-36,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 36, no. 2 (2004): 231–52; Darwin, “An

These attempts failed. Berlin, in the meantime, had allied with both Tokyo and Rome, forming a competing inter-imperial alliance with Berlin recognising Tokyo's imperial project as a parallel to what Mazower has called a Nazi-version of the Monroe doctrine bound by territory, history and blood.³³² Initially fought in northern Europe, the theatres of war soon expanded beyond Europe, the Mediterranean and Middle East included. However, not only the Italian interests and failures in Greece, North Africa and British Somaliland drove the Axis interest in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. The realisation of the German leadership that a larger supply of oil and ability to process and distribute would be needed to rid Germany's dependence on Anglo-American oil companies after the war was also a major driving factor. As shown by military and energy historian Anand Toprani, contemporary experts of the international oil industry warned "(...) *that the confiscation of the British and French oil interests in Rumania and the Far and Near East and the acquisition of Norwegian tanker fleet was the least [of] what could be expected.*"³³³ Indeed, the French Vichy regime began to aid Germany and Italy in seizing control of Iraq's oil fields and the pipelines to the Mediterranean. Moreover, the recently founded German oil giant, Kontinentale Öl, was preparing to send engineers to Iraq if the German Afrikakorps broke through the British defences in North Africa. Finally, Germany was readying subsidiaries to purchase, lease or construct tankers, oil loading and offloading facilities and pipelines in the Mediterranean as well as the Black Sea.³³⁴ Consequently, the involvement of the Soviet Union and the US grew necessary, much in the same way that the British and French empires had needed Russia and the US in the First World War, thus reconfiguring the frontier of multinational imperialism and its regional manifestation. In late 1941, the Japanese attack on the main American naval complex in the Pacific led the US to join the alliance dominated by the British and Soviet empires and what remained of the French under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt. By early 1942, as shown in the previous chapter, the inter-imperial military alliance of the United Nations had been formed. As it would turn out, the members of the UN were just as interested in the Middle Eastern and Mediterranean facilities and systems of oil production, refinery and distribution as Germany.

Undeclared Empire"; Andrew Holt, "'No More Hoares to Paris': British Foreign Policymaking and the Abyssinian Crisis, 1935," *Review of International Studies* 37, no. 3 (2011): 1383–1401; William C. Mills, "The Chamberlain-Grandi Conversations of July–August 1937 and the Appeasement of Italy," *The International History Review* 19, no. 3 (1997): 594–619; Lobell, "Second Face of Security Strategies"; F. Rodao, "Japan and the Axis, 1937–8: Recognition of the Franco Regime and Manchukuo," *Journal of Contemporary History* 44, no. 3 (2009): 431–47; G. Bruce Strang, "'The Worst of All Worlds': Oil Sanctions and Italy's Invasion of Abyssinia, 1935–1936," *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 19, no. 2 (2008): 210–35.

³³² Mazower, "An International Civilization?"; Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace*.

³³³ Anand Toprani, "Germany's Answer to Standard Oil: The Continental Oil Company and Nazi Grand Strategy, 1940–1942," *Journal of Strategic Studies* 37, no. 6–7 (2014): 963.

³³⁴ Toprani, "Germany's Answer to Standard Oil."

The Ad Hoc Building of the Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, 1942-1950

As were to become clear to the British and French imperial governments, however, the United Nations was not merely a military alliance. As historians of the American and British Middle East war-efforts and post-war foreign policies have shown, the formation of the UN connected the frontier of American informal empire in Latin America, and its basis in the idea of strong promotion of a capitalist web of dependent nation states revolving around the US and multilateral organisations, with what was left of the British-French frontier of multinational imperialism and its practices of direct interventions and neo-colonial regimes, a legacy predating the First World War. In the Middle East, this showed in several ways. First, the British lost the military command of the Middle East theatre of war once American forces were deployed to Northern Africa in late 1942: the only theatre that British generals had commanded from the moment the US joined the war. Friction soon went beyond military command, the prestige and strategic influence associated with commanding a theatre. As the war had cut off regional trade with Europe aside Britain by 1942, the US began to take part in supplying the British and imperial forces via the aforementioned lend-lease agreement and the Middle East Supply Centre. As was soon clear to American and British officials involved, the essentially militarised trade network increased living costs for people all over the Middle East as it curtailed the already reduced civilian trade many had come to depend on due to the shift from subsistence farming to commercial crops, and industrialisation. Neither the British nor the Americans were particularly concerned with this dimension. Rather, the British grew frustrated as they began to fear for their post-war markets and the strength of the Sterling Area, a tariff-based neo-mercantilist Commonwealth protection scheme that although it dated back to first attempts in 1932 had only been fully realised during the war. On their part, American export companies were furious that the British were hiding behind military logistics to keep them out, since massive profits could be made. Although Washington wanted to enforce the long-standing 'open door' policy and push London towards granting its mandates and colonies in the Middle East independence as the majority of these were part of the Dollar arrangement, it accepted the trade drawbacks as a wartime arrangement. Predictably, additional mistrust developed over oil, which had been a point of contention since the 1930s. The US desired an arrangement that would secure equal American access, something the British were not keen on given their ability to acquire oil in Sterling rather than Dollars and thereby avoid worsening the trade balance. Heated discussions followed through 1944 and most of 1945 until the issue faded for the time being as the oil companies made their own provisions. The French also felt the effect of coming to rely on the US as the French government, or what was left of it in the French African colonies, was forced to grant its mandates of

Syria and Lebanon independence in 1944 to let them formally join the UN military alliance after being recognised by both Washington and Moscow.³³⁵

Once the war ended, Anglo-American regional inter-imperial cooperation continued, as did the occasional tensions. Whereas London still favoured direct control, Washington preferred indirect influence and regional multilateralism after gaining successes with this model in Latin America. Multinational imperialism thus began to shift towards imperial multilateralism in the Middle East and Mediterranean as it did around the world. Washington's insistence that London grant Trans-Jordan independence and end the occupation of Iraq that had been formally independent since 1930, resulted in Jordanian independence in 1946 and the British withdrawal from Iraq to retain only air force bases in Iraq from 1947. The region's oil was another cause of disagreement. To London, buying oil in Sterling rather than Dollars was essential to preserve the advantages of the Sterling area and protect its already weakened balance of payments. Additionally, the British oil refinery in Abadan in Iran was the world's largest and the main oil supply of the British Empire just as the Suez Canal had returned in its role as the imperial 'jugular vein'. By 1946, nearly 200,000 British troops remained in both in what had become the largest military complex in the world with 10 separate airfields and 34 individual base areas along the Suez Canal and Egyptian cities.³³⁶ As energy historian Stephen Galpern eloquently puts it, "One need not guess how the British felt about this encroachment in their sphere of influence."³³⁷ To Washington, however, it was not merely a question of American oil companies getting sales to the Sterling area or an attempt to weaken the machinery of the British Empire. Rather, its access to Middle Eastern oil, and thus also in the Sterling area, was an integral means in a broader plan of getting Western Europe into an oil-based growth economic paradigm that was believed able to dissuade Western European citizens from potentially becoming attracted by Communism.³³⁸ Having surveyed the past two decades' literature on Anglo-American relations in the Middle East, Galpern argues that they, despite minor conflicts on the shared goals and how to achieve these, were able collaborate both strategically and economically to defend their regional interests as they and their former Soviet ally had grown more than suspicious of each other.³³⁹

³³⁵ Fieldhouse, *Western Imperialism in the Middle East 1914-1958*, 245-334; Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*; Martin W. Wilmington, "The Middle East Supply Center: A Reappraisal," *The Middle East Journal* 6 (1952): 144-66; Wilmington, *The Middle East Supply Centre*.

³³⁶ Fieldhouse, *Western Imperialism in the Middle East 1914-1958*, 245-334; Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*; Morewood, "Prelude to the Suez Crisis"; Wilmington, "The Middle East Supply Center: A Reappraisal"; Wilmington, *The Middle East Supply Centre*.

³³⁷ Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 13.

³³⁸ Painter, "The Marshall Plan and Oil," 2009.

³³⁹ Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 13.

London was therefore finally not too worried seeing Washington increase its influence in the region by keeping war-time air base rights in Libya and Morocco,³⁴⁰ promoting a growing number of American companies to get involved in the trade of oil, cars, hotel construction, kitchen equipment, cameras, sewing machines, rubber products and so on via headquarters in Egypt,³⁴¹ and expanding the technical assistance programmes of the UN organisations within most sectors of the Middle Eastern states.³⁴² If anything, the British imperial government came to rely increasingly on its ally. One example of this was in Iran, where both the Soviet Union and Great Britain in 1942 deployed troops to prevent Iran from falling under German control and made an agreement with the Iranian government to withdraw no later than six months after the end of the war. Looking to expand its frontier as in Eastern Europe and secure access to oil, however, Stalin allowed for the establishment of a left-leaning administration in Azerbaijan, the part of Iran occupied by Soviet forces, just as the Red Army prevented the Iranian army from entering the region in 1945. Moscow suggested that Azerbaijani autonomy and oil agreement could resolve the matter in the subsequent bilateral negotiations. Unable to do much alone, London had Washington put pressure and consider relocating naval forces to the region. Against that backdrop, the Iranians accepted to enter an agreement concerning the acceptance of the leftist Tudeh party and oil negotiations. Once the Red Army left in the spring of 1946, however, Tehran crushed the Azerbaijani administration and abandoned its promises of oil negotiations, much to the satisfaction of both Washington and London who hoped to keep the Soviet Union out of the oil-rich region.³⁴³ Another example was the Soviet pressure on the Turkish government. In line with the Tsarist imperial ambitions of expanding into the Mediterranean, Stalin initially attempted to refute the existing legal framework that granted Turkey control of the access to the Mediterranean in 1945. As part thereof, he sought to reach an agreement of a joint defence system agreement with Turkey (which had been neutral in the war), which would allow for the building of at least one base in the region. Although the Turkish government declined, both top officials in the State Department and Truman himself began fearing that Turkey could fall to the Soviet Union. Similarly, the British were only just able to handle the Greek civil war, initiated in 1946, when Stalin, in accordance with their agreement on zones of influence, reigned in the new Yugoslavian, Bulgarian and Albanian post-war Communist regimes that all with varying agendas supported the Greek communist faction against the British-trained

³⁴⁰ National Defense Research Institute (U.S.), ed., *Overseas Basing of U.S. Military Forces : An Assessment of Relative Costs and Strategic Benefits* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2013); Stacie L Pettyjohn, *U.S. Global Defense Posture, 1783-2011*, 2012, 53–56.

³⁴¹ Robert L. Tignor, “In the Grip of Politics: The Ford Motor Company of Egypt, 1945-1960,” *The Middle East Journal* 44, no. 3 (1990): 383–98.

³⁴² Walter R. Sharp, “The United Nations System in Egypt: A Country Survey of Field Operations,” *International Organization* 10, no. 2 (1956): 235–60.

³⁴³ Luard, *A History of the United Nations. The Years of Western Domination, 1945-1955*, 106–12; Kelly R. Shannon, “Truman and the Middle East,” in *Companion to Harry Truman*, ed. Daniel S. Margolies (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2002), 362–88.

and -backed national army and right-wing faction.³⁴⁴ Feeling increasingly unable to resist the Soviet pressure and facing a financial crisis due to a dollar shortage, London informed Washington of its inability to support the Turkish and Greek governments in February 1947.³⁴⁵ Recent Cold War scholarship has showed the different ways the British disengagement mobilised the Truman administration. As mentioned above, the US first abandoned its support for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency, as it offered aid to Albania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, China and Greece, of which only the latter two did not belong to the Soviet bloc. To replace it, Washington initiated a US programme, the Marshall Plan. Athens and Ankara were not surprisingly amongst the first to receive funding and aid via the new scheme in 1948.³⁴⁶ The US also began supporting the Greek right in the civil war with finances, equipment and the assistance of special forces. The scholar of the Mediterranean Amikam Nachmani argued the “(...) *US involvement, political, economic and military etc., was literally overwhelming*”³⁴⁷ and that “(...) *the role played by the United Nations and its bodies was, if not an integral part of the Truman Doctrine, at least a complimentary form of Western intervention.*”³⁴⁸ The Greek right predictably won the civil war, although the political system ensured a centre coalition government. Additionally, the recently formed CIA opened a station in Athens for its Balkan operations and to serve as a model for the new Greek intelligence service.³⁴⁹

On a broader scale, Truman’s global anti-Communist development programme from 1949 also resulted in the opening of programme offices in Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan, Pakistan and Israel over 1950 and 1951.³⁵⁰ Additionally, as naval and military historians have shown, the US also supplemented the British military measures by increasing its own military presence. The first step was to maintain existing base rights in Libya and Morocco. The second was to acquire access to more facilities, which from 1947 to 1949 also put Aden, Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Trans-Jordan, and Oman on the wish list.³⁵¹ The third step for Washington was to

³⁴⁴ Amikam Nachmani, “Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece: 1946-49,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 25, no. 4 (1990): 489–522; Süleyman Seydi, “Making a Cold War in the Near East: Turkey and the Origins of the Cold War, 1945–1947,” *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 17, no. 1 (2006): 113–41.

³⁴⁵ Nachmani, “Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece”; Shannon, “Truman and the Middle East.”

³⁴⁶ Karetny and Weiss, “UNRRA’s Operational Genius and Institutional Design”; Mogens Pelt, *Tying Greece to the West: US-West German-Greek Relations 1949-1974* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2006); Plesch, *America, Hitler and the UN*, 119–40.

³⁴⁷ Nachmani, “Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece,” 499.

³⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 500.

³⁴⁹ Daniele Ganser, *NATO’s Top Secret Stay-behind Armies and Terrorism in Western Europe* (New York: Frank Cass, 2005), 215–17; Christos Kassimeris, “United States Intervention in Post-War Greek Elections: From Civil War to Dictatorship,” *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 20, no. 4 (2009): 679–96.

³⁵⁰ Macekura, “The Point Four Program and U.S. International Development Policy.”

³⁵¹ Douglas Little, “Cold War and Covert Action: The United States and Syria, 1945-1958,” *The Middle East Journal* 44, no. 1 (1990): 51–75; Macekura, “The Point Four Program and U.S. International Development Policy”; Pettyjohn, *U.S. Global Defense Posture, 1783-2011*,

boost—initially temporarily—its Mediterranean fleet, originally a small task force of only 3 ships from its post-war force, in 1946, and to expand the fleet to one aircraft carrier, 16 ships, and 15 support vessels and make it permanent two years later. Another clear sign of Washington assigning importance to the region was the institutionalisation of annual Middle East meetings with the British and the Canadians from October 1947. Indicative of the balance of power, the first joint American, British and Canadian meeting took place at the Pentagon, but left the British in command of the Middle East. While the US committed fighting units, the strength of the British forces and numerous bases in Egypt, Iraq, and Jordan and on Cyprus were decisive. However, as historian of British imperial history in the Middle East, Michael Cohen notes, the Atlee government had contemplated, if shortly, using the new United Nations to take over British Middle Eastern imperial interests, given its focus on balancing social reform and budget problems. As a way to share the burden, the British ideas on military arrangements for the Middle East thus involved American bombers operating from air bases in Egypt and Palestine, not the bases in Morocco and Libya further to the west to which the US had access. This combination would allow the goals of both being able to resist a Soviet first strike to retain control of the Middle East and to keep the Soviet Union from its oil production in Romania, the Caucasus and Baku, as the air bases in Britain only put 25% of the Anglo-American bombing targets in the Soviet Union within range. The Egyptian bases, in contrast, placed 94% of the bombing targets within range.³⁵² In 1948, however, the British departure from Palestine to the UN forced the British to focus only on Egyptian bases. This grew increasingly problematic because of the much hated British influence and large military presence. Indeed, the growing Egyptian nationalism forced the royal regime to take the British military presence before the UN, thereby forcing the British to withdraw to the Suez Canal bases, to pass legislation to increase the number of Egyptians in the Suez Canal Company management and staff, to demand ten days' notice from any state wishing to use the canal for warships, and finally to install a regime of inspecting and searching vessels from the ports of Suez and Port Said to prevent Israeli ships from passing through. The British sought to co-opt the French, the Americans and the UN Security Council to counter these measures, but failed.³⁵³ London and Washington also soon disagreed over costs and the deeper issue of what the Americans saw as British unwillingness to open the region further and the British saw the Americans as overly meddlesome. Additionally, Washington had a period of internal disagreement on how proceed. By October 1949, the Pentagon wanted to withdraw altogether whereas the State Department, in touch with American companies (most notably the oil companies that controlled most of the oil production in Saudi Arabia, a quarter of the Iraqi production and shared the Kuwaiti production

53–69; Elie Podeh, “The Drift towards Neutrality: Egyptian Foreign Policy during the Early Nasserist Era, 1952–55,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 32, no. 1 (January 1996): 159–78.

³⁵² Cohen, “From ‘Cold’ to ‘Hot’ War”; James F. Miskel, “US Post-War Naval Strategies in the Mediterranean Region,” in *Naval Policy and Strategy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, ed. John B. Hattendorf (Abingdon; New York: Frank Cass, 2005), 147–63.

³⁵³ Morewood, “Prelude to the Suez Crisis.”

with the British-Iranian Oil Company) wanted to stay. However, the outbreak of the Korean War, which began not long after the Chinese Communists took over power, brought together the hitherto occasionally estranged staffs of the Pentagon and the State Department, thereby expanding and further militarising the frontiers of imperial multilateralism, including its manifestation in the Mediterranean and the Middle East.³⁵⁴

A Troubled Expansion: The Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, 1950-1955

Less concerned with the Korean War, London sought to retain its influence for primarily economic and strategic reasons while Washington took the Korean War as an ill-willed attempt of its former ally in Moscow to expand its influence and idea of an opposing world order globally. As historians have shown, the Truman and Eisenhower administrations responded in kind.³⁵⁵ In the Mediterranean and the Middle East, scholars have shown, this translated into a growing American interest in a regional military arrangement aimed at Moscow, due to concerns about the ability

³⁵⁴ Cohen, "From 'Cold' to 'Hot' War"; Little, "Cold War and Covert Action."

³⁵⁵ In Asia, this resulted in the further entanglement in the European colonies in South East Asia. As their economic and military resources grew strained with multiple wars of independence, Great Britain and France also sought to get the US closer for mostly economic but also military support. Moreover, the US also entered a military alliance with New Zealand and Australia in 1951 as the latter re-evaluated their security ties with Great Britain. In Africa, Washington kept its acquired base rights in the North African colonies of London and Paris, but left them as deputies, responsible for keeping Communism out. The US also intensified its political and economic ties with South Africa and Belgian Congo. In the latter case, several of the highest-ranking officials in the Eisenhower administration ran or sat on the boards of many of the companies that invested in minerals, petrol networks and plantations. In Latin America, the US put the Organisation of American States to use when Guatemala and the Soviet Union brought the 1953 interference by US-supported forces from Honduras and Nicaragua before the UN. Washington successfully insisted on using the OAS to sort out the matter. As American economic interests and covert operatives were involved, however, the US toppled the elected Guatemalan government the following year. See Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line*; Hal Brands, *Latin America's Cold War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010); Gnehm, "ANZUS"; Mohieddine Hadhri, "U.S. Foreign Policy Toward North Africa During the Cold War: From Eisenhower to Kennedy (1953–1963)," *The Journal of the Middle East and Africa* 5, no. 2 (2014): 95–110; Jonathan E. Helmreich, "U.S. Foreign Policy and the Belgian Congo in the 1950s," *The Historian* 58, no. 2 (1996): 315–28; Gibbs, *The Political Economy of Third World Intervention*; Albert Lau, "Introduction: South East Asia and the Cold War," in *Southeast Asia and the Cold War* (Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2012), 1–13; Luard, *A History of the United Nations. The Years of Western Domination, 1945-1955*; Hiroyuki Umetsu, "The Birth of ANZUS: America's Attempt to Create a Defense Linkage between Northeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 4, no. 1 (2004): 171–96.

of the existing British arrangement to protect American oil projects, and thus its hold on Western Europe.³⁵⁶ A month into expanding the frontier in East Asia with troops in Korea Washington, London, Paris and Istanbul invited the Egyptian monarchy to join talks on the arrangement, thus intentionally and openly seeking to take further both the ad hoc Anglo-American inter-imperial cooperation and what had hitherto been institutionalised in the still Western dominated UN regime. Already under nationalist pressure, the monarchy both rejected and brought up the 1936 Egyptian-British base right treaty and the issue of de facto sovereignty. The British wanted the US, Egypt and Israel involved, but failed to engage the latter two. The Egyptian king wanted no part before the British had withdrawn their forces that were already four times the number allowed for in the 1936 treaty and sought to stress the British by restricting their canal access, effectively closing their refineries in Haifa, Israel. Hurting from the Iranian nationalisation of its oil production in 1951, London doubled its military presence to 83,000 soldiers. In doing so, London forced about a coup and a military regime that not only rejected any British defence scheme but also initiated a guerrilla campaign in the canal area until 1954.³⁵⁷ In line with the American experiences in Latin America, a CIA committee led by President Eisenhower explicitly formulated a principle of indirect imperial control in a strategy for the Middle East in 1951: “*Our principle should be to encourage the emergence of competent leaders, relatively well-disposed towards the West, through programs designed for this purpose, including, where possible, a conscious, though perhaps covert, effort to cultivate and aid such potential leaders, even when they are not in power.*”³⁵⁸ Preferring therefore the older imperial ‘repertoire of power’ of indirect control to direct intervention and recognising Egypt as less central than hitherto, Washington refused to join London’s proposal for secret collusion against Cairo with Paris, complicating both Anglo-American relations and the defence project throughout 1952.³⁵⁹ Moreover, engaged in both Korea and Western Europe, the US wanted the British to lead in the region as hitherto the case. While London favoured a project rooted in the Arab Middle East, Washington, as I will show, grew weary of Egypt throughout 1953 and therefore wanted to involve Turkey due to its strategic location, its strong anti-Communist tradition³⁶⁰ and its massive debt to the US from

³⁵⁶ For more on this dimension of the relationship between the US and Western Europe, see David S. Painter, “The Marshall Plan and Oil,” *Cold War History* 9, no. 2 (2009): 159–75.

³⁵⁷ Michael T. Thornhill, “Eden, Churchill and the Battle of the Canal Zone, 1951-1954,” in *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 35–51.

³⁵⁸ Quoted from Scott Lucas and Morey, “The Hidden ‘alliance’: The CIA and MI6 before and after Suez,” *Intelligence and National Security* 15, no. 2 (2000): 97. The British Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, would come to the same conclusion in February 1953. However, the British never managed to harness rather than struggle against the emerging nationalist movements. Tore Tingvold Petersen, “Anglo-American Rivalry in the Middle East: The Struggle for the Buraimi Oasis, 1952-1957,” *The International History Review* 14, no. 1 (1992): 71–91.

³⁵⁹ Morewood, “Prelude to the Suez Crisis.”

³⁶⁰ In 1921, the new Turkish state eliminated the entire Communist leadership.

the Marshall Aid, and Iran to counter the potential military advantages of location and oil of Iran of a Soviet invasion. Turkey was interested, but preferred NATO as it expected it had larger funds and it would not come to depend on the British any more than necessary due to strong anti-British sentiment. However, it did not help that the US consulted unilaterally Turkey and Iran, both already receiving US military aid, and Pakistan, which was potentially interested in a scheme without the British.³⁶¹ However, with British consent, a Turco-Pakistani cooperation agreement was carefully announced to avoid Pakistani nationalist sentiment and Soviet ire in 1954. The agreement reached with Egypt on using the Suez Canal base complex in the event of war soon after changed little: the US wanted a northern tier project, leaving the British irritated with what they saw as a lack of solidarity in managing Egypt. Although the British hoped to keep Iraq out, and the Arab prime ministers had met in Cairo on Egypt's initiative to dissuade Iraq from turning so strongly towards the Western bloc, Iraq joined Turkey and Pakistan in what became known as the Baghdad Pact in early 1954 after having received US military aid.³⁶² Despite British concerns and Egypt's insistence on a neutral Pan-Arabic scheme, the British joined the pact soon after, also renewing its bilateral agreement with Iraq. However, Washington grew concerned that London was turning the pact into an instrument of British rather than Western policy, and therefore, to (re)gain control, joined the military deputies committee, but not the pact itself (later renamed the Central Treaty Organization) in 1955.³⁶³

At the same time, relations between London and Paris and Washington also soured. The continued failure to make progress with the regional military arrangement was one factor. Cold War and Middle East historians have shown that other factors included the expansion of Germany and NATO into the Mediterranean, the British frustrations with American meddling in Iran, the growing British dependence on the US in relation to Egypt, and a conflict over strategically important territory on the border between Saudi Arabia and three British-dominated Gulf States. Having 'taken over' Greece and Turkey in the late 1940s, Washington not only forced the moderate Greek government to resign in favour of a right-wing government, it also—to British frustrations—demanded that West Germany, as the potentially strongest European power, share the burden in the Mediterranean by providing industrial credits to Greece and Turkey as well as economic aid to Israel. Also to British and French irritation, the US accommodated the Greek and Turkish wishes to join NATO and saw the formation of right wing 'stay behind' networks as in Western Europe, due to strategic considerations and goodwill from the contribution to the Korean War. This not only

³⁶¹ Cohen, "From 'Cold' to 'Hot' War"; Steve Marsh, "Continuity and Change: Reinterpreting the Policies of the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations toward Iran, 1950-1954," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 7, no. 3 (2005): 79–123; B. Yeşilbursa, "The American Concept of the 'Northern Tier' Defence Project and the Signing of the Turco-Pakistani Agreement, 1953-54," *Middle Eastern Studies* 37, no. 3 (2001): 59–110.

³⁶² Yeşilbursa, "The American Concept of the 'Northern Tier' Defence Project."

³⁶³ Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 152; Podeh, "The Drift towards Neutrality."

reflected Eisenhower and his broader foreign policy apparatus' sense of the British becoming a burden (Secretary of State Dulles phrased it as 'millstones around our neck') in early 1953, but also left the British and French frustrated as they remembered the earlier loss of regional influence to the Germans.³⁶⁴ Moreover, the inclusion of Greece and Turkey into NATO added a naval dimension to NATO. While American vessels in the Mediterranean that had been increased to somewhere between 40 and 70 were included, it also reduced British, French and Italian strategic autonomy in the Mediterranean as it came to encompass a large part of the assigned British, French and Italian naval assets in the spirit of 'burden sharing'.³⁶⁵ This, however, harmonised little with how the US, despite the protests of the populations in several cases against imperialism and militarisation, also acquired new or further access to facilities, base rights or bases in Greece, Spain, Italy, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Libya, and Algeria.³⁶⁶ Concerning Iran, Anglo-American dealings grew increasingly difficult due to their different views on the rise of Iranian nationalism. The White House favoured a fairer deal in the negotiations about the main issue of oil than did Whitehall. The immediate outcome was that the moderate Mossadeq government nationalised the oil industry after a series of talks, which had also involved US negotiators who had applied pressure on the British as well as granted Iran a platform from which to negotiate following an agreement that would share 50% of the profits with Saudi Arabia. Subsequently both failing at the UN and the International Court of Justice and unable to launch a large scale military operation due to the loss of the Indian army and the deployment of a large number of British troops in Malaya and Korea, London could only boycott Iranian oil and buy American oil from Saudi Arabia. Seeing how Whitehall both struggled to cope with rising military budgets and an economic crisis due to the lack of previously cheap oil on the one hand and Mossadeq's turn to the previously illegal leftist Tudeh party on the other, the White House therefore had the CIA—with the support of MI6—execute a coup against Mossadeq. To British frustrations, the deal with the new Iranian regime subsequently granted American oil companies 40% ownership of the new Iranian oil consortium.³⁶⁷ Until (and despite) the joint intervention in Iran with the White House under the Truman administration that had retained some British access to Iranian oil, Whitehall, and especially the secret 'Suez Group' of MP's, intelligence officials and cabinet members that began to emerge after the Iranian crisis, felt abandoned by their wartime allies regarding the Egyptian guerrilla operations against the British forces in the canal and thus the safety

³⁶⁴ William J. Daugherty, "Truman's Iranian Policy, 1945-1953: The Soviet Calculus," *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 15, no. 4 (2002): 580–93; Ganser, *NATO's Top Secret Stay-behind Armies and Terrorism in Western Europe*, 212–44; Kassimeris, "United States Intervention in Post-War Greek Elections"; Pelt, *Tying Greece to the West*; Petersen, "Anglo-American Rivalry in the Middle East."

³⁶⁵ Miskel, "US Post-War Naval Strategies in the Mediterranean Region."

³⁶⁶ Pettyjohn, *U.S. Global Defense Posture, 1783-2011*, 53–69.

³⁶⁷ Peter J. Beck, "Britain and the Suez Crisis: The Abadan Dimension," in *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath*, ed. Simon C Smith (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 53–65; Steve Marsh, "The United States, Iran and Operation 'Ajax': Inverting Interpretative Orthodoxy," *Middle Eastern Studies* 39, no. 3 (2003): 1–38; Marsh, "Continuity and Change."

of the British oil supply and, ultimately, stability. Since 1945, the overall shipping volume passing the Suez Canal had tripled with two thirds being European oil, and, as the British boycott of Iranian oil meant that British oil had shifted to oil from the Persian Gulf emirates and Saudi Arabia, made Metropolitan Great Britain the largest importer of oil.³⁶⁸ By the second half of 1953, however, Eisenhower had lost patience with the new Egyptian military regime under the nationalist Abdel Gamel Nasser regarding its potential as the foundations for an American Middle East policy in part due to racialised imaginations of Arabs being irrational, mercurial, and emotional. Not long after the coup in Iran, Washington (and Langley) thus turned away from the Egyptian regime and recognised the need to stabilise further the British oil supply to uphold its main ally and prevent the Soviet Union from gaining influence. Initially manifested in propaganda against Cairo within Egypt, pressure on the Egyptian cotton trade, and support of Canada and France to discretely supply Israel with fighter jets, this soon ensured a common interest between the US and the British in removing the Egyptian regime despite differences in how to do so. While this suited British strategic interests, the British soon came to feel the same sense of both losing influence and military capacity and a growing dependence on the US in Egypt as they had in Iran.³⁶⁹ Further to the east, Anglo-American relations grew even more antagonistic. Having lost their influence in Saudi Arabia to the US, London reacted angrily to the incursion of Saudi troops into the Buraimi Oasis, an oasis on the southeast tip of the Arabian Peninsula controlling both potential oil reserves and the strategic access to the British-dominated emirates of Abu Dhabi, Muscat and Oman, in August 1952. London and Washington convened talks as the former wanted to regain control and the latter to safeguard lucrative oil deals and important airbases in Saudi Arabia. However, disagreement lasted until 1957, reflecting an emerging rupture between the two wartime allies and founders of the UN.³⁷⁰ As the American National Security Council concluded in 1954, “*Efforts to prevent the loss of the Near East will require increasing responsibility, initiative, and leadership by the United States in the area.*”³⁷¹

As shown by naval and Cold War historians, the third problem for Anglo-American frontier building was the growing assertiveness of the Soviet Union. After the Second World War, the Kremlin supported Jewish immigration to Palestine to pressure the British. Subsequently, Stalin saw to it that substantial amounts of rifles, machines, fighter planes and tanks were delivered to Israel during the 1948 war and Israel recognised *de jure* to force the British out of Palestine and thereby loose, most importantly, the port of Haifa and the numerous airfields. However, with the Soviet Jewry’s growing fascination with Israel and Israel’s zigzagging in relation to the

³⁶⁸ Danish Prime Minister H. C. Hansen to the Danish Parliament on the Suez Canal 25. September 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, the Danish National Business Archives

³⁶⁹ Beck, “Britain and the Suez Crisis: The Abadan Dimension.”

³⁷⁰ Petersen, “Anglo-American Rivalry in the Middle East.”

³⁷¹ David A Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956: The President’s Year of Crisis : Suez and the Brink of War* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2011), 15.

Korean War, the Kremlin broke its diplomatic ties with Israel.³⁷² The following few years of absence in both the Middle East and the broader Mediterranean region, it must be noted, had less to do with Anglo-American successes in building regional alliances than with strategic decisions in Kremlin foreign policy-making. After failing to get a foothold, Stalin had initiated a long-term plan to build a blue water navy to counter the Anglo-American naval supremacy with the ordering of new battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers and submarines. Until these vessels were ready, however, the Soviet navy was to operate with strategically defensive but tactically offensive vessels that could operate under the protection of land-based air power. The second phase therefore required naval and air facilities. After the break with Yugoslavia and Israel and NATO's expansion into Greece and Turkey, neutralist Egypt increasingly appeared promising.³⁷³ Rooted in Stalin's pursuit of resources and technology, Soviet relations with Eastern Europe and, partially, China had been brutal and often close to pillaging, a practice named 'imperial scavenging' by historian of the Soviet Union Austin Jersild. After Stalin's death, Khrushchev and the other Politbureau members grew increasingly aware that the Soviet approaches beyond the Communist bloc, had to be far more modest if not supportive of local regimes, as it had no Red Army presence or offensive blue water navy units.³⁷⁴ This shift, as the historian of Soviet-Egyptian relations Mohrez Hussini, historian of Soviet naval strategy Milan Vego, and historian of US foreign policy David W. Lesch have convincingly shown, reflected not only the second phase of navy building. It also coincided with the formation of the Baghdad Pact. With the pact, Moscow was able to capitalise on the growing Arab irritation with the Anglo-American expansion. First, the new leadership under Nikita Khrushchev struck a trading deal involving Egyptian cotton for wheat. By 1953, Cairo was considered able and willing to 'provide' once relations with the West had degraded and ties with Moscow improved. Shortly after the visit of Dulles, the American Secretary of State, in mid-1953, which estranged Cairo and Washington, Moscow got another deal.³⁷⁵ Additionally, the Baghdad Pact enabled Khrushchev to capitalise on the situation in Syria. Here, a pro-Western military coup

³⁷² Gyoo-hyoung Kahng, "Zionism, Israel, and the Soviet Union: A Study in the Rise and Fall of Brief Soviet-Israeli Friendship from 1945 to 1955," *Global Economic Review* 27, no. 4 (1998): 95–107.

³⁷³ El Hussini, *Soviet-Egyptian Relations, 1945-85*; Vego, "Soviet and Russian Strategy in the Mediterranean Since 1945."

³⁷⁴ See for instance Brands, *Latin America's Cold War*; Alessandro Iandolo, "The Rise and Fall of the 'Soviet Model of Development' in West Africa, 1957–64," *Cold War History* 12, no. 4 (2012): 683–704; Alessandro Iandolo, "Imbalance of Power: The Soviet Union and the Congo Crisis, 1960–1961," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 16, no. 2 (2014): 32–55; Austin Jersild, "The Soviet State as Imperial Scavenger: 'Catch Up and Surpass' in the Transnational Socialist Bloc, 1950–1960," *The American Historical Review* 116, no. 1 (2011): 109–32; Macekura, "The Point Four Program and U.S. International Development Policy". See also footnote 98 for more literature on the discussion of the Soviet Union and Imperialism.

³⁷⁵ El Hussini, *Soviet-Egyptian Relations, 1945-85*; David W. Lesch, "When the Relationship Went Sour: Syria and the Eisenhower Administration," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 28, no. 1 (1998): 92–107; Vego, "Soviet and Russian Strategy in the Mediterranean Since 1945."

had seen growing anti-government and anti-American riots so strong that the new regime had been forced to leave Truman's global 'development' programme along with Egypt to move towards each other.³⁷⁶ Despite political differences, a growing number of Syrians, not least military officers, were tired of Western intrusion. This was manifested in the 1954 counter-coup against the pro-western military dictatorship, thereby ending any Western hopes of Syrian participation in the pact. Adding fuel to the fire, a right-wing group rumoured to have CIA ties killed the main leader of the 1954 countercoup, removing Syria completely from the West.³⁷⁷

With both Washington and Moscow expanding as London, not to mention Paris, faced several colonial confrontations, many of the newly independent states began to seek more space for autonomy and strategic manoeuvring by either engaging in a balancing act between Moscow and Washington, or moving towards either. The new Egyptian regime, for example, realised its 1953 cotton-for-oil-and-war-materials-deal added a military dimension to Soviet-Egyptian relations. Cairo therefore sought to strike a balance by accepting the military presence of Great Britain at the Suez base complex in case of war, engaging in dialogue with the CIA and seeking finances and arms from the US, Great Britain, Belgium and Sweden. This strategy, however, proved to no avail. Mistakenly feeling betrayed, Whitehall refused to deliver the tanks paid for by Egypt before the military coup in 1952, just as Washington declined a request the same month as Iraq joined Turkey and Pakistan in the pact, adding insult to injury.³⁷⁸ When Iraq joined Turkey and Pakistan in 1954, the new Syrian government also next announced its support for the Egyptian attempt to counterbalance Western influence via Pan-Arabism. Together, and not long before the Yugoslavian leader made a trip to India and Burma later in 1954 to find an alternative, Egypt and Syria announced a new Arab defence framework under Egyptian command, which both Saudi Arabia and Yemen later applauded. In line with the 1950 French-British-American agreement not to sell weapons in the Middle East, the US refused to sell arms to Egypt. With US knowledge, however, both the British and French struck deals with Israel on British tanks and French fighter jets, not only in violation of their agreement, but also leaving Cairo behind in an arms race on Israeli initiative.³⁷⁹ Eisenhower would offer only to finance Egypt's modernisation: important to the new regime but only if it would be able to defend itself, whether it be with or against its former imperial overlord. In late 1955, Egypt eventually bought the vessels and arms it had sought from the West from the Soviet Bloc. It did so in a deal

³⁷⁶ Little, "Cold War and Covert Action"; Macekura, "The Point Four Program and U.S. International Development Policy"; Podeh, "The Drift towards Neutrality."

³⁷⁷ Little, "Cold War and Covert Action."

³⁷⁸ El Hussini, *Soviet-Egyptian Relations, 1945-85*; Reem Abou-El-Fadl, "Neutralism Made Positive: Egyptian Anti-Colonialism on the Road to Bandung," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 42, no. 2 (2015): 219–40; Lucas and Morey, "The Hidden 'alliance'"; Podeh, "The Drift towards Neutrality"; Vego, "Soviet and Russian Strategy in the Mediterranean Since 1945."

³⁷⁹ Mordechai Bar-On, *The Gates of Gaza: Israel's Road to Suez and Back* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994); Oren, Barak, and Shapira, "How the Mouse Got His Roar."

that also facilitated a Soviet cultural centre in Cairo and talks of more cotton and rice for industrial products and potentially finances for the electrification of the country by way of the Aswan dam. The deal, however, was arranged only seven months after an Israeli attack on Egyptian forces in the Gaza Strip, after the US had refused to sell arms to obtain parity and threatened to (illegally) blockade all Egyptian ports, and after Nasser's personal notice to the American ambassador and insurances from the Egyptian ambassador to the US that the Soviet Union would gain no political influence.³⁸⁰ By then, US officials also managed to estrange the government in Belgrade from the West, which it—since its involvement in the Greek Civil War—had been forced to turn to for economic and military aid and Italy for trade due to the split with the Soviet bloc. The US only succeeded in pushing the Communist 'outcast' towards a new path of non-alignment in which both India and Egypt also grew interested.³⁸¹ Aside the Greek, Iranian and Turkish frontier zones ensured by Anglo-American cooperation and interventions, Israel, the Jewish settler colonial state carved out of the frontier zone of European multinational imperialism of Palestine, sought better relations with the Western bloc by way of France. While France had donated weapons in 1948 (along with the US that had also sought to gain some sway in Israel via economic aid during the Soviet flirt),³⁸² it had since kept Israel at a distance. Paris had done so to balance its needs in the Mediterranean for a stable oil supply, protected lines of communications to Indochina, colonial stability in Northern Africa, and vast profits from selling arms to Syria (until the anti-western coup). From 1952, France also began to do several deals on arms, artillery pieces, tanks, and transport, fighter and bomber planes with Israel, some of which, as mentioned, had US support. Additionally, France found attractive Israeli intelligence on Egypt's involvement in Algeria where it was embroiled in colonial warfare, albeit Israeli intelligence staff exaggerated the Egyptian support of the Algerian rebels. To Tel Aviv, the deals with Paris were the best it could get when Washington and London were holding back.³⁸³ More importantly, as Israeli historian Guy Laron shows, the Israeli armed forces were being re-organised following its higher echelon's push for

³⁸⁰ El Hussini, *Soviet-Egyptian Relations, 1945-85*; Mohamed Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes* (Guernsey: Transworld Publishers, 1988), 85–93.

³⁸¹ Mehta, "The CIA Confronts the Tito-Stalin Split, 1948–1951"; Nemanja Milošević, "Yugoslavia, USA and NATO in the 1950s," in *How Far Is NATO from the Western Balkans?*, ed. Miroslav Hadžić, Sonja Stojanović, and Filip Ejodus (Belgrade: Belgrade Centre for Security Policy, 2007), 64–80; Karlo Ruzicic-Kessler, "Italy and Yugoslavia: From Distrust to Friendship in Cold War Europe," *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 19, no. 5 (2014): 641–64.

³⁸² Stuart A. Cohen and Robert O. Freedman, "Light and Shadows in the US-Israeli Military Ties, 1948-2010," in *Israel and the United States: Six Decades of US-Israeli Relations* (Boulder: Westview Press, 2012), 143–64; Roby Nathanson and Ron Mandelbaum, "Aid and Trade: Economic Relations between the United States and Israel, 1948-2010," in *Israel and the United States Six Decades of US-Israeli Relations*, ed. Robert O. Freedman (Boulder: Westview Press, 2012), 124–42.

³⁸³ Zach Levey, "French-Israeli Relations, 1950-1956: The Strategic Dimension," in *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 87–106.

an offensive strategy to fight wars beyond Israeli territory and in accordance with Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion's craving for a war to conquer the West Bank from Jordan. A middle class revolt, however, took funds from the military border regime. To keep expelled Palestinians from returning to their homes and villages, the Prime Minister instead used violent raids on the border forces of the surrounding states to force these to control the Palestinians and passed legislation that made 'infiltration' a political crime. Although Ben-Gurion resigned in 1953, his successor failed to gain enough support to alter the new military strategy. Riding/promoting a wave of popular militarism driven by fear, Ben-Gurion returned to the post of Prime Minister again in 1955 and a Chief of Staff, his protégé, looking for a war with Egypt by way of the Gaza Strip.³⁸⁴

In summary, the 1950s initiated a new phase of external scheming, this time not only by the British and French Empires, but also by the heir to the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellite system and the Western Bloc under Anglo-American leadership. In this process, the new states of the Mediterranean and the Middle East sought to navigate a number of pressures: which model of modernisation to choose and which arms to procure to deal with 'post-colonial' conflicts caused by British and French multinational imperialism as well as Ottoman imperialism. Combined, the mounting external pressures, the growing regional popular and strategic frustrations in the context of nationalism, and the regional stocking up of military hardware was building up to a substantial crisis on a regional scale. With Egypt not surprisingly at the centre, the following year would reveal both how this was to unfold and how Washington, with Moscow's unwitting help, once again, enrolled the UN to serve as a vehicle for its geopolitical interests.

³⁸⁴ Paula Kabalo, "Dialogues with Young People David Ben-Gurion's Youth Campaigns, 1939–1954," *Israel Affairs* 14, no. 2 (2008): 218–36; Korn, "From Refugees to Infiltrators: Constructing Political Crime in Israel in the 1950s"; Guy Laron, "'Logic Dictates That They May Attack When They Feel They Can Win:' the 1955 Czech-Egyptian Arms Deal, the Egyptian Army, and Israeli Intelligence," *The Middle East Journal* 63, no. 1 (2009): 69–84; Guy Laron, "The Domestic Sources of Israel's Decision to Launch the 1956 Sinai Campaign," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 42, no. 2 (2015): 200–218; Oren, Barak, and Shapira, "'How the Mouse Got His Roar.'"

Chapter 5: Incorporating Egypt and The Gaza Strip in the Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism via The ‘Suez Crisis’ and The UN Intervention(s)

The crisis would be a result out of how Anglo-American frontier building in the Mediterranean and the Middle East grew more complex after the Korean War. Firstly, the creation of a regional defence regime proved hard. Secondly, Anglo-American relations soured with Washington’s increasing influence and military presence. Thirdly, the Soviet Union, which also sought a strategic foothold in the region, partly managed to use the waning British influence. Finally, both Washington and London misread Arab nationalism and the increasingly assertive post-mandate Arab regimes, which the British and French had fostered, resulting in among other the nationalisation of the Suez Canal in 1956.

However, the Western bloc’s attempt to build a new ‘international’ canal regime, the British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt (and the Gaza Strip) and American ‘economic diplomacy’, as Diane Kunz calls it,³⁸⁵ also need to be seen in relation to the Soviet invasion of Hungary in late 1956. Both crises can be seen as serious rifts in the frontier systems the US and the Soviet Union built after 1945. While the Polish army was enough for the Polish riots in mid-1956, Moscow, pressed by a regime unable to contain popular ire, took to a unilateral military intervention in Hungary. This reflected that the turn from an imperial model with native yet heavily supervised regimes that Hungarian historian Lazlo Borhi calls ‘empire by coercion’³⁸⁶ to a co-produced model with the Warsaw Pact as a first step was still premature. In contrast, Washington was able to combine, if painstakingly, its growing global political and economic clout and the making of a UN military force and UN clearing operation to hold together, if not expand, its frontier system, and thus appear less aggressive than Moscow.

³⁸⁵ Diane B Kunz, *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991).

³⁸⁶ László Borhi, *Hungary in the Cold War, 1945-1956 between the United States and the Soviet Union* (Budapest; New York: Central European University Press, 2004), 197–269. For more on Kreml’s decision making process; Csaba Békés, “The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and the Declaration of Neutrality,” *Cold War History* 6, no. 4 (2006): 477–500.

Overstating the Cold War Binary in Frontier-building: The American and British withdrawal of Finances for the Aswan Dam and the Egyptian Response, 1953-1956

The regional confrontation would come to unfold in Egypt, which was at the centre of the build-up of opposing agendas, the militarisation of the region and the involvement of all the imperial powers and the paternalist policies of the Eisenhower administration, the trigger for the subsequent escalation of tension into war. As in other Middle Eastern states, and shown above, the Egyptian military government was seeking to navigate between external and domestic pressures on the path to modernisation. Over the period 1954 to 1956, the Egyptian president came to see domestic political repression and the building of a massive dam to modernise its electric supply as the largest step in modernising the country as a way to balance these pressures.³⁸⁷

After speaking to Eugene Black, the President of the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank) in 1953, Eisenhower decided to use Egypt's push to via the Aswan Dam, which was to provide 50% of the total Egyptian power production, as the carrot to rein in the Egyptian military regime. Cairo joined the game, and sent representatives from its High Dam Authority to London to hire British consulting engineers in September 1955, perhaps to show an interest in the Western Bloc as it purchased weapons from the Soviet Bloc the same month.³⁸⁸ By November 1955, Washington had brought London and the World Bank in on the arrangement to finance the dam, but the British government was nervous that the Soviet Union, whose presence was increasingly felt in the Mediterranean, would offer finances. Due to Egyptian scheming, the deal would also bring the British an enormous contract with a consortium with German and French partners. Less concerned with the contract and intending to find out whether or not Cairo was revising the budget upwards, Washington held back to check the numbers until February 1956, when a deal of 200 million US Dollars was signed.³⁸⁹ Additionally, Eisenhower initiated Operation Alpha, a plan to guide Egypt and Israel to a peace agreement. However, this failed, mainly due to the Israeli want for a war at a time when Egypt had yet to integrate the Soviet arms from 1955.³⁹⁰

However, a little group of high-ranking officials accordingly devised Operation Omega, viewing Egyptian attempts to increase its space of manoeuvring through a racial lens and deciding they were expressions of irrational emotionalism. This

³⁸⁷ Silvia Borzutzky and David Berger, "Dammed If You Do, Dammed If You Don't: The Eisenhower Administration and the Aswan Dam," *The Middle East Journal* 64, no. 1 (2010): 84–102.

³⁸⁸ Diane B Kunz, *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 43–48.

³⁸⁹ Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 10–11, 49–52 and 75.

³⁹⁰ Laron, "'Logic Dictates That They May Attack When They Feel They Can Win.'"

scheme was meant to if not rein in at least shrink the Egyptian government's options by plotting to overthrow the Syrian government, to damage the Egyptian cotton industry, and if oil routes were threatened in response potentially occupy not only pipeline installations in Syria but also the Suez Canal. As the document read, "*Measures, even drastic, would have to be seriously contemplated.*"³⁹¹ Additionally, American officials concerned with oil in both the State Department and the Department of the Interior met with one another and NATO petroleum experts several times to consider the impacts of a potential closing of the canal to Western ships carrying oil.³⁹² In effect, as the former aide to the Egyptian military government Mohamed Heikal noted, the Omega plan was to isolate Egypt from the rest of the Arab world to increase American influence.³⁹³ Allen Dulles, the Secretary of State also wanted to pull the funding of the dam. In June 1956, Black told the Eisenhower administration that Nasser "*gave every indication of preferring to make an agreement with the West (...)*",³⁹⁴ but also warned the administration against withdrawing from the dam project as it not only "*would have a tremendous impact*"³⁹⁵ but also that "*(...) all hell will break loose.*"³⁹⁶ Nevertheless, Dulles kept pushing for a withdrawal against the recommendation of several officials. Recovering for several weeks after surgery, Eisenhower did not reject Dulles' plans even if Black sought to do so.³⁹⁷ From December 1955, Dulles also expanded an existing strategy of pressuring Egypt from the south with exuberant British support. The presence of the Egyptian government was considered a nuisance not only in Sudan after the agreement with the British, but also in Ethiopia following the 1953 UN backed annexation of Eritrea, where the US since the Second World War had maintained and gradually expanded a communication station to gather signals intelligence in the Middle East. Consequently, they called for Egypt to expand its 'Unity of Nile Valley' scheme to include also joint water sharing and development plans for several states in east Africa and the great lakes region.³⁹⁸

Predictably, as most historians taking an interest in the 'Suez Crisis' have shown, regional tension increased further. Washington, Dulles in particular, grew frustrated with what the Americans saw as an increasingly threatening presence of its Muscovite imperial rival in the region. Factions in London were angry but could do little about neither the withdrawal from the bases along the Suez Canal nor the US. In Paris, frustrations linked to the US, but even more so with the Egyptian support of Algerian nationalists and the disruption of French shipping in the canal partly in relation

³⁹¹ Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 91.

³⁹² M. S. Venkataramani, "Oil and US Foreign Policy During the Suez Crisis 1956-7," *International Studies* 2, no. 2 (1960): 105-52.

³⁹³ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 99.

³⁹⁴ Eugene Black in Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 115.

³⁹⁵ Eugene Black in *ibid.*

³⁹⁶ Eugene Black in *ibid.*

³⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 138-39.

³⁹⁸ Borzutzky and Berger, "Dammed If You Do, Dammed If You Don't"; Jeffrey A. Lefebvre, "The United States and Egypt: Confrontation and Accommodation in Northeast Africa, 1956-60," *Middle Eastern Studies* 29, no. 2 (1993): 321-38.

thereto. Tel Aviv was frustrated as its attempts to start a war with Egypt kept getting sidelined while Cairo grew frustrated with being refused arms by the West while Israel got deals and therefore engaged in the loading and unloading of French shipping in the ports of the Suez Canal.³⁹⁹ Finally, the Egyptian president left for Yugoslavia to speak to both Tito and Nehru, the Prime Ministers of Yugoslavia and India and allies in the struggle to build a space beyond either imperial bloc, on how to move forward.⁴⁰⁰ It was at this moment, when the three most important leaders from the Third World involved in contesting the increasingly rigid and dangerous international atmosphere, Washington and London decided to cancel the funding for the dam.⁴⁰¹ Dulles gave the decision to Ahmed Hussein, the Egyptian ambassador, on the 19th of July as the Egyptian president was returning home and after six months of silence from the US on the funding since the 200 million Dollar agreement. Informed before he was granted permission to speak, Hussein responded to Dulles' paternalism the only way he could, by letting him know that Egypt would then be forced to consult with the Soviet Union, which Dulles found a problematic message but delivered with dignity. The same evening the British also withdrew their offer to co-fund the Egyptian Aswan Dam project. Although the Egyptian president consulted with the American ambassador, Henry Byroade, who had grown fond of Nasser as both were military men, he offered no immediate reaction due to a religious two-day-long holiday in Egypt in which no newspapers were published.⁴⁰²

A week later, the Nasser made his intentions of the Egyptian nationalisation of the Suez Canal public in a speech to a large crowd in Alexandria.⁴⁰³ As he had calculated that the risk of war with the British as 90% in the first days to fade by late October with world opinion in Egypt's favour, he had decided that Dulles' political decision needed a political response.⁴⁰⁴ The ire of the Egyptian president was understandable after having not only been told off after an agreement had been made, but also told off in a paternalist fashion. However, putting aside the Western racial lens, the nationalisation could also been seen an attempt to increase the Egyptian share of the canal profits to avoid getting in bed with the Soviet Union, the—to most—only option left open by Washington. Indeed, in 1956, when Egypt received the highest rate of the profits, only 800.000 out of 39 million Pounds were passed on from the Suez Canal Company.⁴⁰⁵ Considering that most high-ranking Egyptian officials had not considered nationalisation an option (most if not all were surprised, some terrified when they realised it had taken place) and with the cost of building the dam assessed

³⁹⁹ Dietl, "Suez 1956"; Laron, "Logic Dictates That They May Attack When They Feel They Can Win"; Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*; Golani, *Israel in Search of a War*; Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*.

⁴⁰⁰ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 120–24.

⁴⁰¹ Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 156.

⁴⁰² Borzutzky and Berger, "Dammed If You Do, Dammed If You Don't"; Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 130–32; Kunz, *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis*, 1991, 72; Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 124–29.

⁴⁰³ Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 130.

⁴⁰⁴ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 133–38.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 113.

to 400 million pounds this seems logical. Moreover, although missed by most historians, the historians Silvia Borzutzky and David Berger have pointed out that the Egyptian president also discussed dam finances with Eugene Black, the president of World Bank, rather than the visiting Soviet foreign minister, Dmitry Shepilov when both were in Cairo only four days after Dulles withdrew the American financial support.⁴⁰⁶ This also seems plausible given the ever-closer consultation with the Yugoslavian and Indian leadership. In any case, a handful of Egyptian military units with high ranking officers who had been instructed under the threat of death to ensure the continued function of the canal during his speech. The nationalisation of the canal thus took place to the loud and wild excitement that could be heard in all larger Egyptian cities and towns.⁴⁰⁷

Nasser's move also realised the fears of not only the American Association for the United Nations that dated back to the British-Egyptian low-intensity war for the canal between 1951 and 1954. The United Nations Association of America's Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, which was populated by several American political scientists and scholars of international relations with years of service to the US State Department on international matters such as the formation of the UN and strong ties to east-coast universities, Columbia especially, and corporate research institutions, also grew worried. The commission thus re-sent a statement from November 1951 to both Dulles and Hammarskjöld. In this, it was argued for the establishment of an International Straits Commission and a network of international bases based on that of the US to ensure the access of all nations to international waterways such as the Suez Canal on basis of the Uniting for Peace resolution used by the US in the Korean War, and argued.⁴⁰⁸ However, the nationalisation had already caused concern in the UN Office of Special Political Affairs. This concern was probably not a coincidence, as the American Under-Secretary-General Ralph Bunche, a former US Office of Strategic Services analyst, State Department official and major figure in the development of the UN trusteeship organisation, led this office. His office subsequently produced a minor series of four—by historians hitherto un- or under-consulted—draft memoranda that reveal the importance Western high-ranking UN officials assigned to the Suez Canal. On basis of the report of the Collective Measures Committee that was born out of passing of the United for Peace resolution and possibly also the statement from the American Association for the United Nations, UN top officials, most probably from the core of high-echelon Westerners, wrote an internal memorandum reflecting on how to obtain facilities for a UN force in the Suez Canal area.⁴⁰⁹ Within a few days, however, a rewritten version of the memorandum

⁴⁰⁶ Borzutzky and Berger, "Dammed If You Do, Dammed If You Don't."

⁴⁰⁷ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 137–41.

⁴⁰⁸ 'Statement on Waterways and Strategic Bases by Commission to Study the Organization of Peace' November 1951, Correspondence and Clippings 2/3, Nationalization, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0002, UNA

⁴⁰⁹ 'Memorandum on Strengthening Collective Security Arrangements in the Middle East' 10 December 1951, Suez Canal Area 10 Dec 1951 – 15 April 1957, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-1066-0001-0007, UNA

shifted focus from only the issue of facilities to also the establishment of either a UN legion ‘for the defence of the Suez Canal Area’, an ‘Executive Military Authority’ drawing troops from a pool provided by ‘individual states’. Although it was deleted, the draft suggested that the troops were to be supplied by states with a ‘primary interest’ in the utilisation of the Suez Canal, thus an internally designed vehicle of imperial multilateralism within the UN.⁴¹⁰ Dated the 13th of December but with the same name, the third draft stated: “(...) *it seems desirable for the United Nations to consider what methods might be appropriate to maintain peace in the Canal Zone and secure the free passage of ships through the Suez Canal. It is evident that armed forces will be necessary to accomplish these purposes.*”⁴¹¹ The last but also unrealised draft of the memorandum uplifted the functioning of the frontier of imperial multilateralism to “*the basic principle of freedom of passage to peaceful international traffic through the Suez Canal*” and “*the recognition of special interests of States whose vital lines of communication are dependent on free passage of shipping through the Suez Canal*”,⁴¹² which it was suggested a ‘UN Security Authority’ along with the states with ‘primary’ interests should uphold.

Having been of great importance in the world wars and subsequently, the Suez Canal had become linked to the British military presence, the oil supply of Western Europe and the Commonwealth trade. As argued above, the trigger, reflecting the growing American influence, was Washington’s withdrawal of its offer to fund the Aswan dam, the centrepiece in the Egyptian military regime’s modernisation project. While Arab nationalism and anti-British sentiments informed the Egyptian regime, it also resembled its predecessor, the British dominated monarchy, in its centralised form, which enabled the Egyptian government to respond without consulting its broader political apparatus.

Washington Versus London/Paris/Tel Aviv: The Near Implosion of the Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, 1956

With the Egyptian nationalisation, the Western frontier of imperial multilateralism would soon come under pressure due to the very different perceptions of how it should be handled. Although a French ship was allowed to pass through the canal without

⁴¹⁰ ‘Memorandum on Arrangements for the Maintenance of Peace in the Suez Canal Area’ 12 December 1951, Suez Canal Area 10 Dec 1951 – 15 April 1957, S-1066-0001-0007, Office of Special Political Affairs, UNA

⁴¹¹ ‘Memorandum on Arrangements for the Maintenance of Peace in the Suez Canal Area’ 13 December 1951, Suez Canal Area 10 Dec 1951 – 15 April 1957, S-1066-0001-0007, Office of Special Political Affairs, UNA

⁴¹² ‘Memorandum of Peace and Security – Suez Canal Area’ 14 December 1951, Suez Canal Area 10 Dec 1951 – 15 April 1957, S-1066-0001-0007, Office of Special Political Affairs, UNA

paying up front, which was the norm under the Suez Canal Company, as a signal of the continued functioning of the canal, the first British reaction was to wage financial warfare against Egypt, freezing 60% of the Egyptian Pound reserves, and then put all Mediterranean forces on alert. This led Eisenhower, who had now returned, to inform Eden, the British prime minister in a stern tone that he found it unwise even to think about using force even if the oil situation could become critical. Soon, Eisenhower both received word from Eden that the metropolitan part of the British Empire had oil for only six weeks and most of Western Europe less and that France was also readying for war from the US embassy in Paris.⁴¹³ Aware of their want for war and the rift that was emerging and learning that the nationalisation was the result of the withdrawal of American finances, Eisenhower sought to broaden the base of states addressing the Suez issue.

Even if Eisenhower and his officials by way of the CIA knew that London and Paris were hesitant about an attack without Washington's approval, his administration, however, to some extent failed to realise but certainly overrode the growing aspirations of several European (not to mention several Middle Eastern and Eastern European) governments for strategic autonomy.⁴¹⁴ Not only had the Marshall Aid, while offering financial support, tied the Western European economies into an US dominated economic sphere, it had also turned Western Europe into addicts of oil.⁴¹⁵ Additionally, several of the western European governments and politicians had grown weary of what they saw as American divide-and-conquer politics in Europe. The US had not only nuclearized Great Britain (with Canadian help)⁴¹⁶ and used 'the special relationship' to separate it from Europe. Washington had also pressed Western Germany into NATO (after the American push for the European Defence Community had failed as Cold War historian Michael Creswell has shown),⁴¹⁷ forcing about in the process an Soviet military bloc on the doorstep of Western Europe, to, as Cold War historian Ralph Dietl argues, "(...) assure US control over the Western European subsystem and superpower control over a future all-European structure emerging out of the Western European subsystem."⁴¹⁸ Subsequently, France abandoned the idea of the 'Atlantic community', which Canada and Great Britain had also supported. Instead, Paris turned to the vision of *Eurafrique*, intending to re-centre the Mediterranean, co-opt West-Germany and reel Great Britain back in.⁴¹⁹ Furthermore, this divisive effect also marked the Western sectors of nuclear technology and energy, even if, as the historian of technology and science John Krige argues, "*The force field*

⁴¹³ Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 161; Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 143; Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 133–35.

⁴¹⁴ Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 138–42.

⁴¹⁵ Painter, "The Marshall Plan and Oil," 2009.

⁴¹⁶ Price, *Orientalism: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific*, 102–5.

⁴¹⁷ Michael Creswell, "Between the Bear and the Phoenix: The United States and the European Defense Community, 1950-54," *Security Studies* 11, no. 4 (2002): 89–124.

⁴¹⁸ Dietl, "Suez 1956," 263.

⁴¹⁹ Dietl, "Suez 1956"; Ralph Dietl, "The WEU: A Europe of the Seven, 1954–1969," *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 7, no. 4 (2009): 431–52.

of empire that emanated from Washington was co-produced".⁴²⁰ Another factor in promoting Western European dissent—and in relation to 'Eurafrique' as well as the upkeep of empire—was European shipping. Indeed, a projection by the Suez Canal User Association (formed during the crisis) of the figures from 1955 to 1956, had a handful of Western imperial and colonial powers and NATO members pay 78% of the canal dues (of which the British paying 40%, and then the French 11%, the Americans 11%, the Italians 6%, the Norwegians 5%, and the Dutch 5%).⁴²¹

It was therefore foreseeable that the August 1st emergency meeting that was initiated to prevent a silent approval of the nationalisation by the International Chamber of Shipping, the globally dominant and western-led corporative shipping interest organisation, was only the beginning of a broader European/Western response. The representatives from the British Empire, the 'white' Commonwealth and India, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, and the US agreed that they should meet with American oil representatives to discuss a users' association and in relation thereto make a small working committee with representatives from Great Britain, the Scandinavian states, Italy, France, the Netherlands and India. Although the more moderate Danish, Indian and Greek agents abstained from voting, the chamber also passed a resolution stating that—since the canal was international and not the domestic affair of one country—using it to finance national projects was unacceptable.⁴²² The chamber also lent its support to the Suez Canal Company for which its director thanked the chamber as the company 'felt'—after having run a canal that cost thousands of Egyptian lives to marginal benefit of Egyptians—"(...) *so unjustly robbed*".⁴²³

Seeking to uphold overall control, Dulles also met with Eden and stated that Washington would not back military intervention, as it was necessary to use other means to regain control of the oil and communications supply lines. Although he, in line with the wishes of the International Chamber of Shipping, called a conference in London to rein in the American allies, he failed to reduce London and Paris' frustrations,⁴²⁴ which went deeper than imperial lines of communications, shipping and weary relations with the US. Facing not only the Suez group and a media landscape in favour of intervention despite a regime of censorship but also a growing

⁴²⁰ Krige, *American Hegemony and the Postwar Reconstruction of Science in Europe*, 255 See also; John Krige, "The Peaceful Atom as Political Weapon: Euratom and American Foreign Policy in the Late 1950s," *Historical Studies in the Natural Sciences* 38, no. 1 (2008): 5–44.

⁴²¹ Note from Suez Canal User Association attached to letter from the Danish Shipowners Association to the Director of East Asia Company (Østasiatisk Kompagni) 14. September 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, the Danish National Business Archives (DNBA)

⁴²² Minutes of Emergency Meeting of International Chamber of Shipping 1 August 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

⁴²³ Letter from Manager of Suez Canal Company to Director of International Chamber of Shipping 1 August, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

⁴²⁴ Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 151.

financial crisis and pressure on the Pound, the Eden government called up reservists on the 2nd of August, thereby increasing the risk of war.⁴²⁵ Mollet's government was equally enraged. Having lost its mandates earlier and struggling with the violent collapses of the discriminative racially ordered social-political colonial states in Indochina and Algeria and rising tension in Morocco and Tunisia, Paris wanted to keep not only empire and status. The French government also wanted to reduce its dependence on the US and NATO (that had paid for communication services in north-west Africa), even if it was to make a standby-agreement with the International Monetary Fund by mid-October.⁴²⁶ Indeed, Tito's cordial visit to Paris in July had left him with the impression that the French were (also) sick of the global duality and, mistakenly, interested in non-alignment, which he told Nasser.⁴²⁷ Not only was the defence ministry and industry selling large numbers of fighter jets, tanks and arms to Israel, the Israeli-French intelligence and political ties also grew closer, especially after the nationalisation, thus putting Paris and Cairo ever more at odds.⁴²⁸ In the Jewish settler colony, Ben-Gurion had re-seized power. Increasingly armed with French, British and West-German weapon systems and a wish for war with Egypt (before the integration of the Soviet arms was complete) and Egypt all but interested in a war, he, other hardliners, and the military built up a public expectance of war.⁴²⁹ Moreover, Israel's relationship with the UN deteriorated. The General-Secretary had already driven though the Gaza Strip in 1955 to draw attention to the border tension just as the Security Council had called on Tel Aviv to respect the armistice rather than raid Egypt and Jordan (to instigate war and force these to restrict the Palestinians from returning).⁴³⁰

Fearing that the conference might fail, Eisenhower ordered the State and Defense departments to make contingency plans for supplying Western Europe with oil at a solely canal-oriented meeting of the US National Security Council on the 9th of August. Accordingly, the US Maritime Institute notified the International Chamber of Shipping that American companies owned and controlled many of the vessels

⁴²⁵ Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 174–78; Jeff Hulbert, "Right-Wing Propaganda or Reporting History?: The Newsreels and the Suez Crisis of 1956," *Film History* 14, no. 3/4 (2002): 261–81; Tony Shaw, *Eden, Suez, and the Mass Media: Propaganda and Persuasion during the Suez Crisis* (London; New York; New York: Tauris Academic Studies, I.B. Tauris ; In the U.S.A. and Canada distributed by St. Martin's, 1996).

⁴²⁶ James M. Boughton, "IMF Working Paper: Northwest of the Suez: Crisis and the IMF" (International Monetary Fund, 2000); Peter J. Schraeder, "Cold War to Cold Peace: Explaining U.S.-French Competition in Francophone Africa," *Political Science Quarterly* 115, no. 3 (2000): 395–419; Martin Thomas, "France's North African Crisis, 1945-1955: Cold War and Colonial Imperatives," *History* 92, no. 306 (2007): 207–34.

⁴²⁷ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 128.

⁴²⁸ Levey, "French-Israeli Relations, 1950-1956: The Strategic Dimension."

⁴²⁹ Laron, "'Logic Dictates That They May Attack When They Feel They Can Win'; Laron, "The Domestic Sources of Israel's Decision to Launch the 1956 Sinai Campaign"; Levey, "French-Israeli Relations, 1950-1956: The Strategic Dimension."

⁴³⁰ Oren, "Ambivalent Adversaries."

operating under foreign flags.⁴³¹ When the British transferred 5.000 troops to Cyprus two days later, Eisenhower, in recognition that the canal was still open and functioning, decided that his administration would not support its allies should they resort to force, confidentially accepting thereby the nationalisation by Egypt.⁴³² Although both Eisenhower and Dulles expected failure at the conference, they sought to set up an international organisation to run the canal over two conferences in London.⁴³³ In doing so, they proposed a civilian organisation very similar to those proposed (internally) by staff in the UN Office for Special Political Affairs and the American Association for the United Nations (USAA=). Perhaps not surprisingly, as the USAA had sent the aforementioned statement to both Dulles and the US Mission to the UN (and the UN Secretary-General) the day after Nasser had nationalised the Suez Canal (and to all its chapters across the US two weeks later in a pro-British/French and anti-Nasser letter).⁴³⁴ At the same time as pursuing the users' organisation, the Eisenhower administration also considered a boycott of the Suez Canal with other canal user governments to strike at Nasser by taking oil tankers around Africa instead.⁴³⁵

Wanting to use force but uncertain how, London and Paris saw both options as insufficient to legitimise this. Whitehall also, once more, sought support from the (white) Commonwealth despite their gradual turn towards the US over the late 1940s and early 1950s. To bring the parties closer, Australia led a mission with representatives from states belonging more in the American camp than anywhere else: Ethiopia, Iran, and Sweden (and the US). However, Australia was no neutral arbiter. Canberra had not only found that "*The continued commercial and defence importance of the Suez Canal in our communication with the Mediterranean and Europe cannot be doubted, and the liberty and security if the Canal remain an important Australian interest*"⁴³⁶ over the 1950s. By 1956, 60% of Australia's imports and exports went through the canal just as the Middle East provided 65% of its crude and partly refined petroleum and 40% of its total petroleum imports.⁴³⁷ Predictably, therefore, the Australian Prime Minister Robert Menzies failed. For its part, Pretoria had long seen Cairo as communism's potential gateway to eastern Africa, and therefore seen the

⁴³¹ Minutes of Emergency Meeting of International Chamber of Shipping 1 August 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

⁴³² Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 151.

⁴³³ Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 162-66.

⁴³⁴ 'Press Release by American Association for the United Nations' 1 August 1956, Correspondence and Clippings 2/3, Nationalization, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0002, UNA, and 'Release to the Officers and Chapters of the American Association for the United Nations' 17 August 1956, Correspondence and Clippings 2/3, Nationalization, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0002, UNA

⁴³⁵ Venkataramani, "Oil and Us Foreign Policy During the Suez Crisis 1956-7."

⁴³⁶ Robert Bowker, "Playing Second Fiddle in a Dysfunctional Orchestra: Australia, Britain and the Suez Canal 1950-56," *Global Change, Peace & Security* 25, no. 3 (2013): 325-37.

⁴³⁷ J. Mohan, "Parliamentary Opinions on the Suez Crisis in Australia and New Zealand," *International Studies* 2, no. 1 (1960): 60-79.

British act unwise and estrange a natural ally and not least the host of the base complex along the Suez Canal. Additionally, the South Africans could relate to the Egyptian argument that domestic affairs were domestic and not British affairs. Along with the Canadians, who had gotten close with the US politically, economically and militarily, the South Africans, therefore, preferred a conference to settle the differences.⁴³⁸ Disappointed, the British sought to enlist the Scandinavians, also shipping nations dependent on oil passing through the canal. The Norwegian shipowners wanted western control while Norway's foreign minister, Halvard Lange wanted an international control but no military force. Unaware of British and French intentions, Lange saw Great Britain and France as moderate and willing to compromise. While the Americans and the British recognised Lange as a hardliner given Norway was the second largest canal user by 1956, they saw Danish and Swedish diplomats as weak and putting the new organisation at risk. Accordingly, they sought to pressure Lange to influence the other Scandinavian governments to take firmer stand.⁴³⁹ Additionally, London was frustrated with Washington taking middle and not supportive positions.⁴⁴⁰ With the British economy effectively left, as Galpern notes, in the hands of the Egyptian president, London (and Paris) encouraged all the non-Egyptian staff to quit to prevent Egypt from running the canal efficiently (although the Egyptian pilots managed to bring through more ships than had the British and French pilots).⁴⁴¹ In response, Egypt on the 10th of September stated that although it had not infringed the rights of any government Great Britain had immediately met it with hostile economic measures and threats of war, just as the US, Great Britain and France had demanded the appointment of an international organisation. Furthermore, it also criticised their invitation of 21 other governments without consulting and inviting Egypt. It therefore praised the Sri Lankan, Indonesian and Soviet governments calling for negotiations to include Egypt. The note ended with a plea for negotiations that would lead to an outcome protecting Egyptian sovereignty.⁴⁴²

The Egyptian government was not alone in disputing both the intentions and the legality of a user association in relation to the conferences. Perhaps more interestingly, several of the larger British shipping owners informed Whitehall that they foresaw great difficulties in international scheme. Moreover, the Nordic shipping owners also made clear that although they would support the resolution at the conference they

⁴³⁸ Carroll, *Pearson's Peacekeepers Canada and the United Nations Emergency Force, 1956-67*, 13-20; Charbonneau and Cox, "Global Order, US Hegemony and Military Integration"; F.J. Nöthling, "A Dilemma of Conflicting Interests: South Africa, Suez and Egypt, 1947-1956," *Kleio* 35, no. 1 (2003): 41-61.

⁴³⁹ Hilde Henriksen Waage, "Norway and a Major International Crisis: Suez - the Very Difficult Case," *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 9, no. 3 (1998): 211-41.

⁴⁴⁰ Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 162-66.

⁴⁴¹ Carroll, *Pearson's Peacekeepers Canada and the United Nations Emergency Force, 1956-67*, 18; Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 162-66.

⁴⁴² Note by Egyptian Government on Suez Canal dated 10 September 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

would let their governments know there would be problems.⁴⁴³ In the sphere of international law, Max Sørensen, a renowned Danish expert on international law, sent the Danish Foreign Ministry a highly critical memo that was passed to the Danish Shipowners Association (and probably beyond). He argued that the plan of letting a user association take over the coordination, the pilot service and the exercise of 'other' rights appeared incompatible with Egypt's sovereignty over the canal and the adjacent area without Egyptian consent. Sørensen also argued that the plan of having only this organisation collect transfer fees from its members would challenge Egyptian sovereignty. He ended by noting that Egypt would be legally free to refuse the organisation to operate in Egypt, to stop ships using other pilots than those approved or supplied by Egypt and finally be in her full rights to prevent ships that refused to pay to use the canal.⁴⁴⁴ Not invited to the conference, the UN representatives of Lebanon and Syria, which both had experienced European and especially French meddling, sent a joint letter to the UN Security Council, which was also released to the international press. Using information from the French and British press, their letter expressed both concern with the French military build-up on Cyprus under the pretension that these forces (of more than 30.000 soldiers, troop transport ships, warships and jets) were only to potentially rescue French citizens. Finally, they wished for the Security Council to intervene as the build-up, not wrongly, constituted a "(...) *definite threat to the maintenance of international peace and security in the region*",⁴⁴⁵ and that a potential armed intervention would constitute "(...) *a violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter and of International Law*".⁴⁴⁶ Additionally, the continued and effortless operation of the canal was noticed in the West. However, the Danish Foreign Ministry, to take one example that was most probably typical, assumed Egypt had brought in experienced Soviet pilots, thus racialising the Egyptians via a discourse of low expectations even if the Danish shipping companies were saying everything was as normal.⁴⁴⁷

However, Great Britain and France would ignore not only these criticisms, but also the growing domestic opposition, especially in London, and their most important ally and sponsor over late September and the first half of October. London and Paris thus disregarded (what they may have known about) the Eisenhower administration's

⁴⁴³ Memo on basis of phone call from shipowner A. P Møller to Danish Foreign Ministry 13 September 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

⁴⁴⁴ "Memo to the Danish Foreign Ministry's Department for Political and Juridical Affairs" 13 September 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

⁴⁴⁵ "Statement to the Press by Permanent Representatives of Syria at the United Nations" 19 September 1956, Correspondence and Clippings 2/3, Nationalization, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0002, UNA

⁴⁴⁶ "Text of Joint letters submitted by the Representatives of Lebanon and Syria to the President of the Security Council" 19 September 1956, Correspondence and Clippings 2/3, Nationalization, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0002, UNA

⁴⁴⁷ "Minutes from meeting in Danish Foreign Ministry" 29 September 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

attempt to use the World Bank as an intermediary to Nasser at the suggestion of the former president of the World Bank John McCloy,⁴⁴⁸ Dulles' repeated warning against using force again,⁴⁴⁹ and, finally, that American oil companies had increased their production in the US and Venezuela following Eisenhower's request to the Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee (so that it by mid-September passed the oil going through the Suez Canal in volume).⁴⁵⁰ If anything, the cooperation through the recently formed corporatist Middle East Emergency Committee and Oil Emergency London Advisory Committee, another vehicle of the frontier of imperial multilateralism, as argued by the Indian scholar of international relations M. S. Venkataramani, "(...) *was a major factor in emboldening Eden and Mollet to go on the war path.*"⁴⁵¹ After secret deliberation in France (as the Israeli attacks on Jordan, the British ally, had nearly forced London to war with Tel Aviv),⁴⁵² a three-phase plan was consequently agreed upon during October. First, British planners made Egypt their target and Israel their ally. Second, Israel was to attack Egypt and the Gaza Strip. Third, this would to allow London and Paris to make an ultimatum to Egypt and Israel on ending combat and withdrawing from the canal, insert bombers to demolish Egyptian defences, and then, when Nasser would expectedly fell, deploy a joint expedition force to 'protect' the canal.

The plan was set in motion with the Israeli attack against the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula on October 29th. During the Israeli operations, Eisenhower, in the dark of the invasion, informed Nasser that the Western powers would not get involved. However, British reconnaissance aircraft overflew the Sinai, Suez and Port Said to gather intelligence for the invasion and London and Paris issued their ultimatum the following day despite Egyptian pilots still taking ships through the canal.⁴⁵³ Embodying the near implosion of the frontier of imperial multilateralism and its oil supply, British planes bombed airfields in Cairo that London itself had paid for while thousands of Americans evacuated to Alexandria on the 31st of October and the British Prime Minister engaged in what historian Keith Kyle has called 'mounting anti-Americanism'.⁴⁵⁴ Altogether, the British and French mustered 230 warships, freighters and aircraft carriers, 20.000 vehicles and landing craft, 100.000 troops and supplies.⁴⁵⁵

⁴⁴⁸ Kunz, *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis*, 1991, 111.

⁴⁴⁹ Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 158–61.

⁴⁵⁰ Internal Note of Danish Ministry of Trade on oil 17 September 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

⁴⁵¹ Venkataramani, "Oil and Us Foreign Policy During the Suez Crisis 1956-7," 132.

⁴⁵² Eric Grove, "Who to Fight in 1956, Egypt or Israel? Operation Musketeer versus Operation Cordage," in *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath* (Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), 79–86.

⁴⁵³ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 194–200; Kyle, *Suez*, 314–91; Barry Turner, *Suez, 1956: The First Oil War* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2006), 323.

⁴⁵⁴ Kyle, *Suez*, 377.

⁴⁵⁵ Carroll, *Pearson's Peacekeepers Canada and the United Nations Emergency Force, 1956-67*, 26.

Repairing the frontier of Imperial Multilateralism - I: The Sixth Fleet and Economic Diplomacy

Although perspectives are changing, as can be seen in the references in these sections, many of the conventional British and American histories of the ‘Suez Crisis’ still hold strong influences in historiography in the form of nationally-focused post-war histories on ‘the end of empire’ and the Eisenhower doctrine.⁴⁵⁶ I argue here, conversely, that it is necessary to understand the Eisenhower administration’s navigation of the ‘Suez Crisis’, which was in part its own and Eden’s government making, not as two national histories, but as a single history of the frontier of imperial multilateralism, which saw American involvement from the First World War.

In Washington, Eisenhower and his officials were not aware that a plot had been hatched. The reaction to the Israeli attack on Egypt and the Gaza Strip in October 29th therefore reflected an initially narrow, if sharp, reaction. Having both sought to negotiate a solution to the nationalisation of the canal and been left dissatisfied with the Israeli in relation to the Alpha Plan, Eisenhower had moved further away from his predecessor’s affinity for Israel. When his staff informed him both that army units in Europe and the US had been placed on alert and the Sixth Fleet repositioned and of the risk of all-out war, Eisenhower therefore screamed at Dulles “*Foster, you tell ‘em, God-damm-it, that we are going to apply sanctions, we’re going to the United Nations, we’re going to do everything we can to stop this thing.*”⁴⁵⁷ Eisenhower grew furious as the British and French forces started to bomb Egypt after the Egyptian president’s rejection of the false ultimatum. It did not help that Nasser, which Eisenhower (via the racialised lens most American officials viewed Arabs through)⁴⁵⁸ not unlike Eden and Mollet considered a ‘villain’,⁴⁵⁹ asked Eisenhower to commit the US militarily to Egypt, something which he had indeed offered earlier. While

⁴⁵⁶ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion’s Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*; Keith Kyle, *Suez Britain’s End of Empire in the Middle East* (London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011); William Roger Louis and Roger Owen, *Suez 1956: The Crisis and Its Consequences* (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1989); Lucas, *Divided We Stand*; Scott Lucas, *The Lion’s Last Roar: Britain and the Suez Crisis* (Manchester, UK; New York: Manchester University Press, 1996); Morewood, “Prelude to the Suez Crisis”; Donald Neff, *Warriors at Suez: Eisenhower Takes America into the Middle East* (New York: Linden Press/Simon and Schuster, 1981); Ray Takeyh, *The Origins of the Eisenhower Doctrine the US, Britain, and Nasser’s Egypt, 1953-57* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, in association with St. Antony’s College, Oxford, 2000); Turner, *Suez, 1956: The First Oil War*; Salim Yaqub, *Containing Arab Nationalism: The Eisenhower Doctrine and the Middle East* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

⁴⁵⁷ Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 203.

⁴⁵⁸ R. Thomas Bobal, “‘A Puppet, Even Though He Probably Doesn’t Know So’: Racial Identity and the Eisenhower Administration’s Encounter with Gamal Abdel Nasser and the Arab Nationalist Movement,” *The International History Review* 35, no. 5 (2013): 943–74; Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line*.

⁴⁵⁹ “Document 443 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d., 443.

Eisenhower wanted to prevent Eden and Mollet from invading Egypt—unless they could topple Nasser first in which case they would American support—he would not attack them as Nasser was in effect asking.⁴⁶⁰ As Truman had used the Uniting for Peace Resolution to make the UN a coercive instrument in Korea, Eisenhower also decided to use the UN, having already considered it to restrain Israel while also seeing an intensifying Soviet propaganda campaign (to shift attention from Hungary to Egypt and the Gaza Strip), and learning from the embassy in Cairo that Nasser did not want Moscow involved.⁴⁶¹ Thus, Washington had its UN representatives consult with the UN Secretary-General (who had previously showed himself to be a man willing to go against the Soviet Union when he as a Swedish minister had signed a treaty with the US on exporting strategic and thus prohibited commodities to the Soviet Bloc)⁴⁶² and his staff and Yugoslavian, Indian, Latin American and Soviet diplomats. As Yugoslavia stood to gain from brokering a deal as relations with Moscow were turning sour and the Soviet Union was trying to control its own frontier system, the US gained a bit of breathing space by having both the Soviet Union withdraw its criticism of the British and French and the General Assembly to take over the matter via the Uniting for Peace Resolution from 1950.⁴⁶³ Although the British had not been keen on the resolution when Truman pushed it through the UN due to fears of it being used against their empire and that it would anger the Soviet Union, they had supported it due to the backing of the ‘white’ Commonwealth and the wish to avoid a rift with the US.⁴⁶⁴ To the White House’s benefit, the governments of the ‘white’ Commonwealth states were partially irritated, as they had not been consulted. While the Prime Minister of Australia Robert Menzies, the Prime Minister of New Zealand Sidney Holland (who had a naval vessel with the British Mediterranean forces from an earlier posting), and the extremist Prime Minister of the Central African Federation Roy Welensky were supportive, their political landscapes or foreign policy apparatuses were not. This left the British isolated within both the Commonwealth and NATO. Finally, London stood weaker in the Mediterranean and Middle East not only with the members of the

⁴⁶⁰ Kyle, *Suez*, 419; Lucas and Morey, “The Hidden ‘alliance.’”

⁴⁶¹ The Egyptian regime had already established that the Soviet Union as unable to counter the Western powers due to its weak capabilities of projecting power. El Hussini, *Soviet-Egyptian Relations, 1945-85*, 68.

⁴⁶² Mikael Nilsson, “Aligning the Non-Aligned: A Re-Interpretation of Why and How Sweden Was Granted Access to US Military Materiel in the Early Cold War, 1948–1952,” *Scandinavian Journal of History* 35, no. 3 (2010): 302.

⁴⁶³ “Document 444 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 445 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 450 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 453 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁴⁶⁴ Dimitris Bourantonis and Konstantinos Magliveras, “Anglo-American Differences over the UN during the Cold War: The Uniting for Peace Resolution,” *Contemporary British History* 16, no. 2 (2002): 59–76.

Baghdad Pact, but also Libya, in which it had base rights. Subsequently, London's hope of using airfields, bases and ports in Libya as staging grounds was shut down with the Libyan denunciation of the Israeli attack, and the British ambassador in Libya warned London that violence would break out if it were realised that the British planes in Libya were covering the fleet bombarding Egypt.⁴⁶⁵

On the 2nd of November, however, London undid the work of Washington. The US, and thereby the fabric of its frontier in Europe, was again put under pressure by the attacks on Egyptian airfields by British and French aircraft from Malta, Cyprus and several aircraft carriers. Aware by way of the CIA's prior overflights of Egypt and Syria with U-2 reconnaissance planes (which the CIA had passed to the British) that Kremlin did not immediately have naval and air force assets in place, the Eisenhower administration expected a Soviet-led UN blockade against the invading nations as the most likely counter-move. Moreover, as Egypt began blocking the canal, which had been functioning past the first joint attacks on Egypt, with cement-laden ships, the oil supply to Western Europe going via the Suez Canal was cut off. Adding pressure, pro-Egyptian units in the Syrian army incapacitated three pumping stations on the Iraqi pipeline going through Syria to Tripoli in Lebanon, nearly leading the pro-Western Iraqi regime to attack Syria to protect its oil outlets.⁴⁶⁶ Finally, the Egyptian population and Nasser's opponents did not rise to a regime change as the British hoped for. Rather, the national guards were armed just as university and secondary school students signed up for national service.⁴⁶⁷

Consequently, the US took several measures. Both a short term and strategic aim was to on the one hand help and on the other pressure its allies to back into the fold and move towards re-establishing the oil supply regime via re-opening the canal (as the Egyptian regime had not collapsed). Moreover, it was a strategic goal to keep out the Soviet Union. The Joint Middle East Planning Committee and the Joint Chiefs of Staff feared it would not only intensify its anti-Western propaganda against both NATO and the Baghdad Pact, transfer large numbers of Soviet forces onto the Soviet Bloc periphery, and potentially provide 'volunteers'. The Soviet Union was also feared to seek to turn to indirect means of leverage such as to encourage oil pipeline sabotage, offer material support to Egypt, seek Israel expelled from the UN, and finally, seek to be appointed by the UN to restore order in the Middle East.⁴⁶⁸ The Joint Chiefs of Staff were therefore tasked with both intimidating the British and French and protecting them from potential both small and large-scale Soviet attacks. Subsequently, the Sixth Fleet moved closer than previously and placed some vessels between those of the British and French and let US planes overfly these, in effect beginning to cast a web of NATO protection over the forces of its British and French allies despite their status as the aggressive belligerents.⁴⁶⁹ Until the British and French

⁴⁶⁵ Kyle, *Suez*, 392–401.

⁴⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 380–81; Turner, *Suez, 1956: The First Oil War*, 327–35.

⁴⁶⁷ Kyle, *Suez*, 416–17.

⁴⁶⁸ "Document 489 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d., 489.

⁴⁶⁹ Kyle, *Suez*, 412.

forces were landed in Egypt, more vessels would be added over the first days of November to enhance the reception of this message with multiple addressees.⁴⁷⁰

Moreover, Washington also resorted to economic diplomacy although it initially refused to talk of financial aid and oil replacements until a ceasefire and troop withdrawal had been agreed upon (even if preparations had been made). As Galpern notes, “*The administration pursued this policy not only to penalize Britain for what it viewed as country’s disloyalty and irresponsible action, but also to protect US interests in the Middle East, which it feared would be damaged by any open association with Britain and France.*”⁴⁷¹ This hit the British harder than the French as the latter had drawn on its gold and credit allotments from the International Monetary Fund before the invasion, and the Eisenhower administration initially refused the British access to funds via the IMF or the Export-Import Bank of the United States and American oil companies got permission to sell oil for Sterling. Soon, therefore, the British faced a veritable run on their reserves, which led them to plummet below what was considered necessary for the Sterling area to function and thus a great fear in Whitehall that the Sterling crisis would not only lead to the break-up of the Sterling area but also the Commonwealth.⁴⁷² As the White House and Whitehall conferred, the issue of funds from the IMF came up again. Wishing to withdraw 75% of its allowance (more than 4 times the hitherto largest withdrawal), London nevertheless feared that the American, Egyptian and Latin American directors of the executive board of the IMF would be able to oppose its withdrawal rights if the Chinese, Indian and Japanese directors could not be convinced to vote with the European, Australian and Canadian directors.⁴⁷³ Indeed, the British request was approved only after the acceptance of the ceasefire and troop withdrawal and the American treasury overcame its concern that there would be a run against the IMF as there had been against the Sterling. Once that had happened, however, as Boughton argues, “*All that remained was for the Executive Board to ratify the arrangements that been agreed bilaterally between the two great powers.*”⁴⁷⁴ It is telling both that the IMF became an international irregular lender when it was needed to support the American goal of maintaining its frontier system and that the loan had been agreed upon bilaterally for the board later to accept. As a last way to ease the financial pains of its ally, the Eisenhower administration waived a loan on 143 million Dollars due to fall on December 31st.⁴⁷⁵

In addition to the military and financial measures, the White House reactivated the Middle East Emergency Committee to supply its NATO allies with extra American and Venezuelan oil until the canal reopened.⁴⁷⁶ However, it was careful not to do this

⁴⁷⁰ Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 242–51.

⁴⁷¹ Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 183.

⁴⁷² Boughton, “IMF Working Paper: Northwest of the Suez: Crisis and the IMF”; Galpern, *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East*, 173–89.

⁴⁷³ Boughton, “IMF Working Paper: Northwest of the Suez: Crisis and the IMF.”

⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁴⁷⁵ Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 274.

⁴⁷⁶ “Document 554 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

too fast so as not to outwardly appear to be helping the British and French imperial powers.⁴⁷⁷ At the same time, the Soviet Union slowly began what American political scientist Arthur Jay Klinghoffer has called an ‘oil offensive’, which made the re-opening of the canal and American-directed supplements key. The Soviet Union was at the time increasing its export of southbound oil (even if most oil was northbound), selling oil to China and transporting to its far eastern regions, as overland transport was too expensive.⁴⁷⁸ By Mid-November, several Western European governments had approached Washington to enquire as to when the oil-scheme would provide oil as their resources were dwindling to approximately two weeks of crude supply and purchasing oil in Dollar would threaten their Dollar holdings.⁴⁷⁹ The need for oil, however, went far beyond rationing, oil and Dollar economics. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs and the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs recognised and informed the Secretary of State, “*If we show ourselves unresponsive to their needs, it is questionable whether we could count indefinitely upon their unreserved cooperation with respect to Western defense and NATO.*”⁴⁸⁰ Thus, at stake was no less than the frontier of imperial multilateralism. Washington consequently reactivated the MEEC and also closed the Oil Emergency London Advisory Committee. However, to keep up appearances before not only the Arabs, which “*(...) are moved by emotion and not by the judgement of businessmen*”,⁴⁸¹ and the governments of the non-aligned states, Washington also had the Council of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation establish the broader Petroleum Industry Emergency Group within the OEEC. Next, Eisenhower also wrote a personal message to the Saudi King, King Saud, to thank him for his understanding and continued efforts in keeping the oil running (so as not to make matters worse than retaining oil from the British and French empires aside their Muslim colonies).⁴⁸² As the memorandum of a phone conversation between the Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, and the President had Humphrey note, “*(...) we have got to keep working with the Arabs. We are on their side until these fellows get out.*”⁴⁸³ Not surprisingly, the State Department instructed its personnel in

⁴⁷⁷ “Document 584 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁴⁷⁸ Arthur Jay Klinghoffer, “Soviet Oil Politics and the Suez Canal,” *The World Today* 31, no. 10 (October 1, 1975): 397–405.

⁴⁷⁹ “Document 581 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 596 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁴⁸⁰ “Document 585 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁴⁸¹ “Document 554 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁴⁸² “Document 580 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁴⁸³ “Document 599 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

Middle Eastern countries producing oil for Western Europe (and the US) that “*Maximum effort should be made to play up their self interest and to demonstrate that the US is continuing to do everything possible to minimize financial impact upon them*”,⁴⁸⁴ although American officials would continue to focus on ensuring that the US kept the Saudi Monarchy’s “(...) *interests uppermost in mind*.”⁴⁸⁵ Despite problems due to the hostility against its allies, the US managed well. Until the oil supply problems caused by ‘Suez Crisis’ had been resolved, this, if ad hoc, US-dominated oil supply scheme thus managed to provide as much as 80% of the Western European oil needs and strengthen the interdependency within the overall frontier.⁴⁸⁶

As in the First World War, the US was able to either support or damage its British and French imperial counterparts, especially as it had turned to multilateralism as a 20th century version of the mostly collapsed older forms of empire three decades before the British and French began to move in that direction. Aside the IMF and the multinational oil-scheme, the Eisenhower administration also turned to the UN in a way that will make it clear that the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Suez Clearance Organization also need to appear in a different role than the first authentic ‘peacekeeping’ operation as it is labelled within the research field on ‘peacekeeping’.⁴⁸⁷

Repairing the Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism - II: The UN

In extension of the Eisenhower administration’s use of its military means, the Petroleum Industry Emergency Group within the OEEC, and the IMF, I argue that the UNEF and UNSCO ought also to be understood as part of the efforts to sustain the frontier of imperial multilateralism within the global imperial system. Neither UNEF nor UNSCO interventions were well-defined plans set in motion, but ad hoc navigation from the outset. Nevertheless, they reflected the continuation of building the frontier of imperial multilateralism in the Mediterranean and the Middle East in much the same way the inter-imperial interventions in Crete and Albania and the Western-led and dominated intervention in Korea were expressions of the frontier of imperial multilateralism.

At the UN, the Eisenhower administration initially took to writing a UN Resolution for the General Assembly to pass to avoid action against its allies, and subsequently the involvement of UN institutions to allow the British and French (as

⁴⁸⁴ “Document 608 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁴⁸⁵ “Document 616 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁴⁸⁶ Venkataramani, “Oil and Us Foreign Policy During the Suez Crisis 1956-7.”

⁴⁸⁷ See for instance Pouligny, *Peace Operations Seen from below*; Higate and Henry, *Insecure Spaces: Peacekeeping, Power and Performance in Haiti, Kosovo and Liberia*; Rubinstein, *Peacekeeping under Fire*.

well as Israeli) forces to withdraw and, finally, to re-open the Suez Canal. As for the resolution, Eisenhower had Dulles write up a resolution for the evening meeting in the General Assembly (of November 2nd) with the “*mildest things we could do*”,⁴⁸⁸ calling for the withdrawal of all military forces and the re-opening of the canal. Indicatively, only the invaders, Australia and New Zealand voted against the American resolution after several hours of General Assembly discussions into the night.

Concerning the formation of a UN force, the US picked up the idea the Canadians launched November 2nd. The suggestion of a UN force came from Lester Pearson, the Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs who had previously been in charge of running the affairs of the Commonwealth and the League of Nations (and who may have been privy to internal memo’s of Bunche’s Department of Special Political Affairs). Already during the expansion of the frontier of imperial multilateralism in Asia in the Korean War, Pearson argued that Canada had to respect American “*leadership...in the conflict against Communist imperialism*.”⁴⁸⁹ He also argued there could “*be times when [Canada] should abandon [its] position if it is more important to maintain unity in the face of the common foe*”.⁴⁹⁰ On basis of his racialised Anglo-Saxonism and his broader take on geopolitics, he wanted to strengthen further Canadian relations to what Canadian historian John Price calls its southern ‘imperial ally’ beyond what had taken place militarily and politically after 1945.⁴⁹¹ Pearson’s idea, however, was not new. As noted by his contemporary, the Canadian political scientist Graham Sprye, he had been a staunch supporter for a UN police force in the Middle East, which he had promoted tirelessly from 1955 in London, Washington, Paris, Tel Aviv and Cairo.⁴⁹² Pearson and Hammarskjöld had initially discussed a UN force that would include the British and French forces, recalls Urquhart, but the moment had passed.⁴⁹³ After the General Assembly passed Dulles’ resolution, Pearson took the opportunity to suggest his much-wanted UN force in the international forum. Dulles seized the moment in the General Assembly to request formally that the Canadians work out a UN force proposal. Closing the day in New York, the Canadian ambassador explained to Dulles that the St. Laurent government and Pearson especially wanted American and Canadian troops to lift the British Empire out of its predicament and bring it closer to the US again.⁴⁹⁴ The next day, however, Washington once again saw its frontier system challenged. First, the British and French started bombing. Second and in response to the bombing, three pipelines in Syria were blown up. Third, Eden sought to turn the UN force of the Canadian-American suggestion into the ‘police action’ he had initiated with Mollet to blur the lines between what the British and French were doing and what the UN was potentially setting out to do, despite the risk that the US

⁴⁸⁸ Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 219.

⁴⁸⁹ Price, *Orienteering Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific*, 229.

⁴⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁹¹ Charbonneau and Cox, “Global Order, US Hegemony and Military Integration.”

⁴⁹² Sprye, “Canada, the United Nations Emergency Force, and the Commonwealth.”

⁴⁹³ Brian Urquhart, *A Life in Peace and War* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 133.

⁴⁹⁴ Maloney, *Canada and UN Peacekeeping*, 63.

would be compelled to use the Sixth Fleet against them on behalf of the UN.⁴⁹⁵ Facing an Indian resolution that suggested a force from Czechoslovakia and an Asian country with US air transport,⁴⁹⁶ the American representative at the UN phoned the Secretary-General, the Swedish diplomat Dag Hammarskjöld, to gain support for its own resolution proposal that was in the making.⁴⁹⁷ By the evening, on November 3rd, Washington had Hammarskjöld's support for a new Canadian resolution proposal and was busy gathering support amongst its allies as well as align the Indian resolution proposal with the Canadian.⁴⁹⁸ American diplomats spent the following day coordinating troop contributions and logistics with Hammarskjöld, disregarding that the Mollet government had informed the Eisenhower administration that they felt that Eisenhower had taken them completely of the canal issue, made them as guilty as Egypt and not least put them under more pressure than the Soviet Union over Hungary.⁴⁹⁹ Ignoring the French, the Eisenhower administration and Hammarskjöld agreed on the US providing the airlift for the emerging UN force. Hammarskjöld also informed the American officials that the foreign ministers of Canada, India, Norway and Colombia, which aside India were all in the orbit of the US, were willing to provide troops. Finally, he added that he was going to talk to more NATO members, Latin American states and states such as Iran and Ethiopia, which were also all parties to the frontier of imperial multilateralism.⁵⁰⁰ Expectedly, the White House not only discussed the composition of the UN force with the Secretary-General in private as it had settled the IMF arrangement for the British. It also spent the day drumming up support from its frontier zones in the form of the members of the regional organisations of the Mediterranean, the Middle East and South East Asia for the vote. From the South East Asia Treaty Organisation, Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines voted in favour.⁵⁰¹ The representatives of the French and British empires abstained as did those of Australia and New Zealand, even if the latter two assigned great importance to their military alliances with the US. Pretoria's representatives not only abstained, South Africa also left the activities of the UN altogether at the end of the month.⁵⁰² Saudi Arabia and all members of the Baghdad Pact aside Turkey voted in

⁴⁹⁵ Edward Johnson, "The Diplomats' Diplomat: Sier Pierson Dixon, Ambassador to the United Nations," in *Whitehall and the Suez Crisis*, ed. Saul Kelly and Anthony Gorst (London: Portland: Frank Cass, 2000), 178–98; Turner, *Suez, 1956: The First Oil War*, 346–67.

⁴⁹⁶ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 213.

⁴⁹⁷ "Document 482 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d., 482.

⁴⁹⁸ "Document 484 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d., 484.

⁴⁹⁹ "Document 487 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d., 487.

⁵⁰⁰ "Document 494 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d., 494.

⁵⁰¹ A/PV.565

⁵⁰² Jitendra Mohan, "South Africa and the Suez Crisis," *International Journal* 16, no. 4 (1961): 327–57; Nöthling, "A Dilemma of Conflicting Interests."

favour of the UN force.⁵⁰³ Turkey abstained, but instead took to limiting the effects of the invasion on the Baghdad Pact of which it was itself a member. The American Ambassador to Iraq saw the Menderes government as having a calm bearing, even if the British were temporarily excluded from the pact meetings.⁵⁰⁴ In West Germany, however, the British acceptance of the ceasefire caused distress due to the sympathies with the invasion. Moreover, Konrad Adenauer, the West-German Chancellor, spent time with Mollet in Paris during the peak of the crisis, the 5th and 6th of November, when the British and French forces were landed in Egypt, showing his sympathy rather than abstaining as Portugal since neither German state could not vote at the UN (until 1973). Until the NATO Council meeting in mid-December, France and West Germany subsequently sought to move ahead with a 'Little Europe' linked to the West European Union, having lost Great Britain to the Anglo-American 'special relationship'. However, as international historian Ralph Dietl argues, the NATO Council left no doubt: Europe as a 'third force' was dead.⁵⁰⁵ However, the European NATO members of Belgium, Denmark, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, and Spain, many of which were either amongst the largest canal users or with their own Mediterranean designs, all voted in favour (on November 4th), as did many of the European countries outside NATO: Austria, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg and Sweden.⁵⁰⁶ Having gained the votes of all 19 Latin American states and most of the non-aligned states,⁵⁰⁷ Washington also ensured that the Soviet criticism that the UN force was illegal never gained track. Indeed, the Soviet representatives, and thus also the rest of the East Bloc (aside Yugoslavia), were forced to abstain.⁵⁰⁸ Moscow's other strategy of threatening the invading states and requesting Washington to join an attack on the invading states should they not respect the UN resolutions also failed.⁵⁰⁹ Washington not only responded with a little veiled threat on behalf of the UN that stated opposition would be met with use of force, including that of the US, and noted that Soviet Union had failed to support the UN force. Washington also began to build up contingency forces in Saudi Arabia, ordered its air force to plan for the potential airlifts of the different UN contingents and place all heavy troop carrier wings on 12-hour alert, put the Sixth Fleet on 'increased readiness' and had the Atlantic and Pacific fleets reinforced. Finally, the Joint Chiefs of Staff ordered the number of aircraft on

⁵⁰³ A/PV.565

⁵⁰⁴ Ayşegül Sever, "A Reluctant Partner of the US over the Suez? Turkey and the Suez Crisis," in *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath* (Aldershot; Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), 123–32.

⁵⁰⁵ Dietl, "Suez 1956."

⁵⁰⁶ A/PV.565

⁵⁰⁷ A/PV.565

⁵⁰⁸ Rosner, *The United Nations Emergency Force.*, 44.

⁵⁰⁹ "Document 503 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 505 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d., 505; "Document 469 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d., 569.

the 5-minute ‘advanced state of alert’ doubled and training halted.⁵¹⁰ Having secured the UN as a means amongst several to stabilise the Western, but American dominated frontier system of imperial multilateralism, Eisenhower called Eden to tell him to, unconditionally, accept the UN arrangements to the extent Eden began to write down what to tell the British parliament.⁵¹¹ Washington, however, still made its anxiety on Soviet ‘volunteers’ clear to Hammarskjold and that it would be best if “(...) *there be no vacuum between time of departure of British-French forces and arrival of UN forces (...)*.”⁵¹² While he was content with the creation of a UN force, Eisenhower complained to Dulles that it was happening too slowly and that if he were (directly) in charge troops would be flown in when they were ready for deployment, even if it would be in groups as small as fifty. This would also have made it clear that, as the White House wanted, the force was not an occupation force.⁵¹³

As for the re-opening of the Suez Canal in light of the unsustainability of the temporary OEEC oil-replacement arrangement, the Eisenhower administration also from November 7th began coordinating privately with Hammarskjold, who—if there were any doubts about his allegiances—requested the US diplomats to convey his deepest appreciation to Eisenhower. They agreed that the British and French offer of technicians for clearing the canal to retain some influence and something to bring home were to be rejected and that the Secretary-General speak to the Danish and Dutch NATO members instead.⁵¹⁴ The same evening, Hammarskjold invited the American representatives and an intelligence representative from the State Department to a meeting that also included his Executive Assistant, the American Andrew Cordier, and his Undersecretary, the American Ralph Bunche.⁵¹⁵ The latter two were significant. In 1944, Cordier was shifted from his post as international security advisor in the State Department to set up the UN, which then hired him, possibly with some nudging, first as Undersecretary of the then Western-dominated

⁵¹⁰ “Document 508 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d., 508; “Document 509 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d., 509; “Document 510 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d., 510; “Document 533 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d., 533.

⁵¹¹ “Document 525 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁵¹² “Document 547 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁵¹³ “Document 570 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 578 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁵¹⁴ “Document 547 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian.”

⁵¹⁵ “Document 553 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

General Assembly, then as Special Representative in the Korean War, and, finally, as Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General. By 1956, he was thus in one of the most privileged positions in the UN. Cordier's meddling in Congo a few years later is well known,⁵¹⁶ but little work appears to have investigated whether or not he had two masters until his role in the UN intervention shaped from 'Suez Crisis'. In any case, before the evening meeting with Hammarskjold, Cordier had already passed on information to the American ambassador at the UN, Henry Cabot Lodge, and would later receive information from the US, most likely as a way to seek to get Hammarskjold's attention or support.⁵¹⁷ For his part, Bunche was no small fish either. Educated in political science with fieldwork in British and Dutch colonies and ties to the Carnegie Foundation, Bunche was first hired by the CIA's predecessor, the Office of Strategic Services, where he executed psychological warfare within the context of colonial affairs in Africa and the Middle East.⁵¹⁸ Then, the State Department recruited him to work on the so-called 'Dependent Areas' until he was seconded to the American UN delegation. There, he, not surprisingly, took part in making the UN trusteeship system to then become part of the UN where he eventually, after being involved in the establishment of Israel, ended up Undersecretary, thus also a privileged position. While Cordier and Bunche appear to have been in the background at the meeting, it is not unimportant that they were present when the Eisenhower administration officials briefed the Secretary-General on its priorities, including the Suez Canal, by the State Department intelligence representative. It was made clear that the US saw it as urgent to commence operations to clear the canal and have the clearance done under 'optimum effort'.⁵¹⁹ Indeed, the following day, Eisenhower wrote a memorandum in which he noted the "*Rapid restoration of pipe line and Canal operation*"⁵²⁰ first and that this work would require US personnel and perhaps Germans and Italians. However, Hammarskjold requested that nothing be done while he was in the Middle East, which Eisenhower found useful and hence demanded respected.⁵²¹ Expectedly, however, Eden had his Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd, use Hammarskjold's trip to suggest to the American UN Ambassador that British experts were the most suited for the clearance job and a fleet was already convening

⁵¹⁶ Gibbs, "The United Nations, International Peacekeeping and the Question of Impartiality: Revisiting the Congo Operation of 1960."

⁵¹⁷ "Document 71 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 547 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian"; "Document 604 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁵¹⁸ http://media.nara.gov/oss/Bunche_Ralph.pdf (25.08.2015)

⁵¹⁹ "Document 553 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," 553.

⁵²⁰ "Document 556 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁵²¹ "Document 573 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

to go to work, under UN auspices or not.⁵²² However, in the General Assembly on the 20th of November, Hammarskjold noted that he had spoken with the Egyptian President, who (thus) also saw the clearing of the canal best undertaken with the utmost speed and efficiency and requested the General Assembly to authorise him to enter “(...) *the financial commitments that are unavoidable, although he is not now in a position to indicate the size of those initial commitments*”⁵²³, as suggested by the Advisory Committee established on November 7th. Although Eisenhower did not get his all-American staff, Hammarskjold did not disappoint. To run the operation, he got the World Bank’s senior engineering consultant Raymond A. Wheeler, who, as Bunche and Cordier, had also been intimately involved in the American international expansion. Wheeler had served three tours as an engineer—prior to the First World War, in the late 1920’s and prior to the American entrance into the Second World War—at the Panama Canal, the ‘American Suez Canal of Latin America’, which Panama Canal historians have argued allowed the US not only to transfer soldiers, but also oil to the extent that “(...) *the lion’s share of the benefits originated from the transportation of petroleum products from California to the East Coast.*”⁵²⁴ Wheeler advanced to the position of Assistant Chief of Staff in the War Department, where he stayed until he ‘retired’ to the World Bank, from where Hammarskjold enlisted him. Hammarskjold also hired the aforementioned John McCloy. Having worked his way up to lead the World Bank to then ‘retire’ to the position of Chairman of the Executive Board of the Chase Manhattan Bank (and then been involved in the Suez Crisis all along), McCloy knew the inner workings of capitalism as well as Wheeler knew it from the perspective of the imperial ‘arteries’. Hammarskjold could not have found anyone more suited in the eyes of Eisenhower. As his UN anchor, UN, Hammarskjold chose Colonel Alfred Katzin, a former South African imperial subject, industrialist and military officer who had fought as part of the UN military alliance for the British during the Second World War and later served as Special-Representative of the Secretary-General in Korea.⁵²⁵ The British foreign minister was also ‘most pleased’ when informed by the American UN ambassador. Within the UN, Hammarskjold kept Cordier and Bunche close and informally brought in the American General Lucius Clay, a former army colleague of Eisenhower and his successor as the overall military governor of occupied Germany, most probably to reflect quietly on the likely internationalisation of the Gaza Strip.⁵²⁶ The following week, Hammarskjold also informed the US that McCloy would draw up contracts for the clearance and, more

⁵²² “Document 575 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁵²³ A/3376

⁵²⁴ Noel Maurer and Carlos Yu, “What T. R. Took: The Economic Impact of the Panama Canal, 1903–1937,” *The Journal of Economic History* 68, no. 3 (2008): 688.

⁵²⁵ *International Who’s Who 1966-67*. (London: Europa Publications, 1966).

⁵²⁶ “Document 603 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d., 603.

importantly, that Egyptian consent was not required as the UN had taken over responsibility to clear the canal.⁵²⁷

With the British and French vessels' 'undercover' clearance work in November as the opening phase of what was to be named the United Nations Suez Clearance Organization and the takeover of responsibility to re-establish Western oil flows, Hammarskjold, strongly helped by the Eisenhower administration, placed the UN even more solidly within the frontier of imperial multilateralism than had the formation of the UN force.

⁵²⁷ "Document 620 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

Summary of Part 1: The Making of ‘Imperial Multilateralism’ and its Frontier in The Mediterranean and the Middle East

Altogether, it can be said that the ‘Suez Crisis’ was the result of a transformative process of diverging ideas and colliding political projects on the part of governments and to a lesser extent the populations of Europe, Egypt and the US in much the same way the Hungarian revolution was the outcome of an transformative process of diverging ideas and colliding political projects on the part of governments and to a lesser extent the populations Hungary, the Eastern Bloc and the Soviet Union.⁵²⁸ That is not to say that the situations were identical and therefore fashioned identical strategies. The Soviet Politbureau and the British and French governments favoured direct intervention due to what they perceived to be the stakes (even if their military forces at various levels had doubts as to what was going on and what the actual aims were). In contrast, the Eisenhower administration sought order on basis of initially multilateral and later international negotiations in recognition of its and its allies dependency of both Middle Eastern oil and the Suez Canal, even if most officials, including Eisenhower himself, were as frustrated with the Egyptian government as the British and French.

The approach of the Eisenhower administration reflected not only how the US had developed growing strategic and economic interests in Mediterranean and Middle East from 1945 to the extent the region had become, in the words of scholar of American foreign policy and culture Melani McAlister, a moral geography to the broader American public that oscillated between distance and othering and appropriation and co-optation.⁵²⁹ The way in which Eisenhower’s administration sought to draft, if in an aggressive manner, the UN, the European, Latin American, Asian and Arab governments, especially those in the latter group who governed oil-producing countries, to co-produce order also reflected how the global imperial system at a deeper level and the role of the US therein had shifted. Over the 19th and 20th centuries, several ‘national’ imperial frontiers had merged into both a global European and a regional American frontier in the interwar years and then into two globally opposing frontiers of imperial multilateralism during and after the Second World War. This had manifested itself in a shift from mainly direct intra-imperial

⁵²⁸ For more on the proces in which the Soviet Union under Yosef Stalin’s leadership from 1939 to 1956 sought to violently turn the frontier states of the Soviet Union and Central Europe into one homogenous region with uniform political systems.. Anna Applebaum-Sikorska and Penguin, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe 1944-1956* (London: Penguin Books, 2013).

⁵²⁹ Melani McAlister, *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, and U.S. Interests in the Middle East since 1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

military intervention towards mainly intra-imperial policing, intra-imperial autonomy and inter-imperial cooperation. Not that the imperial powers did not struggle amongst themselves; the two world wars and the Korean War are more than ample evidence of this as well as a continuation of the racialisation of imperialism. That the latter two wars of which the UN fought had the US come out as the dominant power was only the manifestation of the expansion of the US through this new frontier system.

Due to Washington's turn to multilateral and economic diplomacy, promotion of economic interdependence and, if needed, military campaigns in the inter-war years, the American rise to global dominance through and after the Second World War and the making of imperial multilateralism in the form of the UN military alliance (and the Middle East Supply Center), thus connected well with the earlier shift in the Mediterranean to multinational imperialism in the form of disease regulation (i.e. the annual sanitation conferences), communication (i.e. the Suez Canal), interventions (i.e. Crete in 1900 and in Albania 1913) over the formally institutionalised mandates of the League. In other words, the US became part of and globalised the frontier system in which the Soviet Union and its predecessor in the form of the Russian Empire had already been involved. What changed was not only the American presence, but also the region's global importance to the building of imperial frontiers due to oil, oil logistics and the Suez Canal, which in itself was important for troop transports for the colonies of Washington's allies. While less explicit than in the regulations and broader matrixes of the European colonial systems in Africa and Asia, the emerging system was also deeply saturated with racialised images of the Arabian and Muslim 'other' as a consequence of the adaption of the European orientalist discourses, something that was clear in both the making of the 'Suez Crisis' and the crisis itself.

With the 'Suez Crisis', therefore, it was not only the immediate workings of the overall frontier system at risk, it was the future of American global influence. The Eisenhower administration not surprisingly used all disposable means to gain the upper hand. The UN was therefore appropriated to get a benevolent force into the canal area, which the US had previously found so important it would itself occupy it, and to clear the canal, which Egypt had closed it down with sunken vessels loaded with cement. The UN interventions thus reflected the continued change from emphasis on territorial control to multilateralism and the support of proxy regimes in the global imperial system, some ways thus a deeper (re)turn to the dynamics of the Ottoman, Russian and Chinese empires updated with oil, hangar carriers with jet planes, and, not least, nuclear technology. That the Eisenhower administration could not act unilaterally but had to seek to co-opt both the members of the UN and the UN itself to restore what the British, French and Israeli government had undone by way of their 'old-fashioned' invasion also showed that the process of maintaining and integrating frontier zones had changed. The change reflected the growing number of actors and their gradually narrower space for strategic navigation within the global imperial system not in a zero-sum sense, but rather that their increasing economic, military and financial interdependence, faster and more readily available means of

communications, post-colonial nationalisms and more destructive weapons both raised the stakes and put far more emphasis on formal consultative procedure.

As for its allies, Washington had little problem leaving them suspended in their mess of their own making until they came crawling. Two days after getting on the safe side with the UN troops landing in Egypt from November 15th, Eisenhower even spoke to two British generals that had informed him that they perceived “(...) *an increasing lack of confidence in the British Prime Minister*”,⁵³⁰ which Nichols argues “(...) *perilously close to meddling in British politics*”.⁵³¹ Once the Party Leader of the Conservatives in the House of Commons, R. B. Butler, and the exchequer, Harold Macmillan, effectively also took over from Eden, however, the Eisenhower administration did meddle by aiding economically via the IMF and by debt cancellation. Had Washington not done so, the British Empire may well have imploded on economic grounds. Not surprisingly, Macmillan approached Dulles at the NATO Council in December to distance himself from Eden and make up with the Eisenhower administration. In the same vein, Eisenhower decided against joining the Baghdad Pact, which had both become linked to the British and failed to gain the appreciation of both King Said and Nasser.⁵³² That is not to say that the Americans wanted the British out of the region altogether. Their bases and ports in Cyprus, port in Yemen, and firm grip on the Gulf States were both useful and desired.⁵³³ As the State Department noted, “*It is impossible, for political reasons, for the US to assume all former UK commitments.*”⁵³⁴

As for Egypt, Nasser survived, contrary to both Anglo-French and American desires. He was, however, forced to accept the UN force, which he despite its composition he presented to the Egyptians as a victory, and the demands on letting the UN take charge of re-opening the canal, relying initially and secretly on the British and French vessels already present and subsequently vessels from other NATO countries. Not being rid of Nasser, the Eisenhower administration decided to use that he saw the involvement of the UN as beneficial, or at least presented it so, to get on his better side. The day after the UN force had been agreed upon at the UN, the US consequently offered Egypt—that was on its way to come a frontier zone despite its relations with the Soviet Union and later negotiations on Soviet access to ports—a 75 million Dollar loan to finance the Aswan Dam as well as a willingness to allow US private capital to take part.⁵³⁵ Eisenhower also paid attention to other regional actors so as not to put all eggs in the same basket. As the negotiations on the canal and the

⁵³⁰ Nichols, *Eisenhower 1956*, 268.

⁵³¹ *Ibid.*

⁵³² Kunz, *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis*, 1991, 156–58.

⁵³³ Lefebvre, “The United States and Egypt”; Panagiotis Dimitrakis, “The Value to CENTO of UK Bases on Cyprus,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 45, no. 4 (2009): 611–24; Takeyh, *The Origins of the Eisenhower Doctrine the US, Britain, and Nasser’s Egypt, 1953-57*.

⁵³⁴ Quoted in Takeyh, *The Origins of the Eisenhower Doctrine the US, Britain, and Nasser’s Egypt, 1953-57*, 145.

⁵³⁵ “Document 558 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

UN force were nearing an end, the State Department sent out a circular telegram to an unlisted number of diplomatic missions and consular offices stating that “*No opportunity should be lost in playing up US peace role*”,⁵³⁶ and that “*It should be made clear that our concern is not only for Western Europe but also for Afro-Asian countries which are directly affected by resent situation.*”⁵³⁷ Specifically, this meant that “*In oil producing countries of Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Iran special emphasis might be placed upon their obvious interest in moving the greatest quantity of Near Eastern oil and thus avoiding insofar as possible institution of any new supply patterns which would have not only short term but long term effect upon their oil income.*”⁵³⁸ Indeed, it was advised, “*Maximum effort should be made to play up their self interest and to demonstrate that the US is continuing to do everything possible to minimize financial impact upon them.*”⁵³⁹ Eisenhower also approved a new plan for Ethiopia, which previously had been used against Egypt. Providing a new level of military assistance to the Ethiopian regime under the Emperor Haile Selassie, Washington not only outmanoeuvred Egypt and retained its rights to Kagnew, its intelligence and communications base in Ethiopia, but also secured extended base rights.⁵⁴⁰ Finally, as historians Takeyh, Yaqub and Kunz argue, the Eisenhower administration launched what has since been known as the Eisenhower doctrine as a means to counter any future Soviet or nationalist contestation of the Western frontier of imperial multilateralism in the Mediterranean.⁵⁴¹

Viewing the ‘Suez Crisis’ in this perspective changes what the UN interventions in Egypt and subsequently the Gaza Strip symbolised and therefore symbolise today altogether. It is thus clear, that they must be understood, as is the case in the research field on interventions, not as ‘peacekeeping’. Rather, they must be seen, I argue, as ad hoc and temporary expansions of the Western frontier of imperial multilateralism as it evolved via the Middle East Supply Center, the first failed Middle East Defence Organization that was to have included Egypt and Palestine, the establishment of NATO’s southern flanks and its multiplane land and sea-based commands, and the MEDO’s replacement in the form of the Baghdad pact, which was nearly undone by the invasion had it not been for the domestic sacrifices of the Pakistani and Iraqi governments in particular. Their support of the Western overall control with the globally strategically important area and its resources and Western wish to keep the Soviet Union out were not unlike when the European powers in the Ottoman era sought to keep the Russian Empire rather than the Soviet Union from gaining access to the region. That the UNEF and UNSCO have not yet been understood in this way,

⁵³⁶ “Document 608 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian.”

⁵³⁷ Ibid.

⁵³⁸ Ibid.

⁵³⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁰ Lefebvre, “The United States and Egypt.”

⁵⁴¹ Kunz, *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis*, 1991; Takeyh, *The Origins of the Eisenhower Doctrine the US, Britain, and Nasser’s Egypt, 1953-57*; Yaqub, *Containing Arab Nationalism*.

it must be added, is caused by several factors. First, there were no American troops ‘on the ground’ as in the case of Korea. Second, the subsequent clever use of the press by the UN, which was part of creating the myth of ‘peacekeeping’ (as will be shown later), must also be taken into account. Thirdly, that the Egyptian President managed to not only save face outwardly but also gain massive regional popularity by ‘standing up’ the European imperial powers and establishing the Egyptian-run Suez Canal Authority, was discursively influential. Finally, it must be remembered that the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip had experienced massacres at the hands of Israeli forces during the occupation prior to the arrival of the UN force just as they would experience an Israeli occupation from 1967 lasting decades, thereby leaving only horrible memories to compare with. Moreover, the UN force and the clearance of the canal must also be seen in relation to the American role in the Central-American region, where it dominated, and had for long, the Panama Canal, which along with the broader Panama Canal Zone, if anything, as Cold War historian Thomas Borstelmann notes, was “*Perhaps the most revealing demonstration of U.S racial policies and practices.*”⁵⁴² Although, the racialisation of the Arab and ‘Muslim’ other would be subtler in both Egypt and the Gaza Strip, the ‘white’ UN soldiers, as will be clear, tapped into the already well-established tropes of cultural imperialism associated with both the frontier of European multinational imperialism, the frontier of imperial multilateralism and not least those of Hollywood.

⁵⁴² Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line*, 80.

Part 2

Negotiating Authority and Life in a Frontier Zone of Western Imperial Multilateralism

Chapter 6: Forming UNEF and UNSCO in Egypt, 1956

In 1945, the military webs of the war-time UN that had linked civilian and military institutions with theatres of war were dismantled in favour of a continuation of the path emphasising decolonisation, multilateral (inter-imperial) cooperation and control via externalised administrations. Especially the US and the Soviet Union, the post-war power-houses, promoted this process. In the following, I will argue that the UN force and the clearance of the Suez Canal re-actualised the military webs of the war-time UN alliance and the UN in the Korean War firstly in the form of a network of bases and infrastructure and secondly in the transfer of the military cultures of parts of NATO and the Commonwealth. It is necessary to note here, however, that the operation was not only put together “(...) *mostly by improvisation* (...)”⁵⁴³ as recalled by the British former soldier Brian Urquhart who served as one of the UN Secretary-General’s main advisors. The ‘white’ Commonwealth members of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa were also deliberately kept out (in contrast to Korea), just as the intervention recognised third world interests and concerns as legitimate, and generally used co-optation rather than direct force.

In extension of the overall approach revolving around the anchoring of Cunliffe’s ‘imperial multilateralism’ in imperial historiography, I therefore instead seek to place emphasis on the role of Western and Commonwealth military infrastructure and supply and knowledge systems in the formation, building of, logistics of, supply of, and staff of the UN force, the clearance of the canal and deployment into Egypt and the Gaza Strip. The way in which I seek to do so, entails not only an attentive relationship with the existing research and public UN documents with the aim of going beyond the standardised accounts that dominate the research, old as new. This also entails a re-reading of the recollections of the first Force Commander Eedson Burns from 1962 and the distant memoirs of the British advisor Urquhart and Urquhart’s biography of Ralph Bunche (which was to some extent also about Urquhart’s experiences and views), paying attention to atmospheres, placement of roles and responsibilities amongst the members of the highest UN echelon, and their views with regard to certain states, politicians, diplomats and so on. However, going beyond the standardised accounts also requires that I consult further material from the US, more specifically the already-utilised document series made available by the US State, the ‘Foreign Relations of the United States’ series Department. Even if it is difficult to know what materials have not been made available, the more than 600 documents of this series on the ‘Suez Crisis’ from embassies, the State Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the White House offers insights into the Eisenhower administration’s thinking and policy-making dynamics, as well as the degree of American involvement in the formation, logistics and supplies of the UN force and coordination with the

⁵⁴³ Brian Urquhart, *Ralph Bunche: An American Life* (New-York; London: W.W. Norton, 1993), 269.

higher UN echelon. For all but ‘technical’ details on supplies, equipment, travel routes and maps, I also turn to the records of the UN Field Service and its General Division (and its American leadership) that was also involved in establishing communications for the UN force immediate and in furnishing the force in the medium to long run. Regarding sources that allows for an analysis of the canal clearance, I have again included material from the Danish Shipowners’ Association and Suez Canal User Association, both which I have accessed by way of the Danish Shipowners’ Association, as the first two General-Secretaries of the Suez Canal User Association were Danish diplomats that were in relative frequent consultation with the Danish Shipowners Association and the Danish Foreign Ministry. As for the UNSCO clearance operations, I draw upon UN reports and other records from both UNSCO and the UN Field Service sent to the UN Headquarters and the Office of Special Political Affairs in New York. While not included here, both the personal records of Raymond Wheeler who was seconded by the World Bank and records of the World Bank pertaining to the clearance of the canal may have been useful in adding supplementary details. To supplement Burns’ recollections from 1962 and existing research on the deployment of the UN force from Port Said to Sharm-el-Sheikh and into the Gaza Strip, I finally turn to a handful of published excerpts of diaries and letters by Danish UN soldiers, which to my knowledge are amongst the only ones published pertaining to the late 1956–early 1957 deployment phase.

Building UNEF in Naples: ‘Dotting the Map’ and ‘Connecting the Dots’ of the Web of Imperial Multilateralism

As noted in the previous chapter, the General Assembly decided upon the formation of an organisation to oversee the clearance of the canal and a UN force—for which Canada, India, Norway and Colombia had offered troops—in the night between the 4th and 5th of November. However, the subsequent process of both forming the force and bringing it to Egypt was not without political tension, even if complications would not arise between Hammarskjöld and Eisenhower who already saw eye to eye on most matters and would do so on the composition, logistics and function of the force. Before the vote in the evening on the 4th, Hammarskjöld had let the American representatives at the UN know that he intended to acquire Egypt’s consent as to the composition and its presence so as to avoid any claims of occupation. At the same time, he also wanted to keep out the veto-wielding members of the Security Council, to keep out forces not only from Great Britain and France, but also the Soviet Union. In agreement with this approach, Eisenhower not only told Eden that neither of the veto-wielding members of the Security Council could take part by both phone and message the following day.⁵⁴⁴ He would also tell his Chiefs of Staff that he wanted Colombia in the force and

⁵⁴⁴ “Document 494 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian”;

get logistical planning going, which led to two meetings between defence officials on bringing Canadian forces from bases in Germany, Norwegian forces from Norway and 3 more battalions to the naval facility on the Greek island of Crete and from there to vessels of the 6th fleet and the Egyptian canal zone.⁵⁴⁵

The first complication came when the British and French began landing troops, despite the agreement to form a UN force and a UN clearance organisation and the Egyptian ambassador meeting with State Department officials in Washington about requesting American help.⁵⁴⁶ Consequently, Eisenhower wrote a personal letter to the Indian Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, most probably with the aim of appealing to the Egyptian President's interest in admitting a UN force by way of Indian participation. He also had his senior officials led by Undersecretary of State Herbert Hoover Jr. assure that the US military would provide the UN with an officer for liaison purposes so the US military would not deal with national delegations and governments directly.⁵⁴⁷ The Czechoslovakian and Romanian offers to provide troops were the second difficulty facing the Secretary-General and the US following the invasion. In line with Eisenhower's wish, this was left for Hammarskjold and his officials to deal with. Although the Czechoslovakian offer was made public in a press release,⁵⁴⁸ it appears that the American Under-Secretary-General Bunche, who Hammarskjold had given the order "*Now, corporal, go and get me a force*",⁵⁴⁹ as recalled by Urquhart, singlehandedly decided against their offers, most probably seeing them as proxies for the Soviet Union. Additionally, Egypt would also prove uncertain and hesitant of the UN force. After the Secretary-General and Lodge, the Permanent Representative of the US to the UN, had exchanged views on the ideal way to bring the force to Egypt, Hammarskjold informed the Egyptian ambassador to the UN that he considered a UN force of Indian, Colombian and Scandinavian troops ideal, although he withheld the details on using the American air force, the sixth fleet and NATO infrastructure on

"Document 497 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 525 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian"; "Document 527 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁵⁴⁵ "Document 508 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian"; "Document 510 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian."

⁵⁴⁶ "Document 523 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁵⁴⁷ "Document 529 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 547 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," 547.

⁵⁴⁸ A/3302/ ADD. 6, 7 & 19 and PM/3259

⁵⁴⁹ Urquhart, *Ralph Bunche*, 267.

Crete and near Rome.⁵⁵⁰ Probably expecting American influence at the UN behind the curtain, the Egyptian President had his advisor, Mohamed Heikal, speak to the American Ambassador in Cairo to pass on to Eisenhower that he chose ‘the course of full cooperation with the US’ and that there was no need to worry about Soviet moves in Egypt as his first response.⁵⁵¹ Concerned that the UN might install an international control at Port Said in tune with British and French designs (since the first contingent to be promoted was from another NATO member with strong ties to the British), Nasser had his Foreign Minister, Mahmoud Fawzi, speak to Eedson Burns, the Canadian General and future UN force commander, who was passing through Cairo on his way from his post as the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization to New York on Hammarskjold’s orders the following day. As Burns recalled in his memoirs, Fawzi first rejected Canadian participation and then returned to speak to Nasser. The following day, Fawzi asked for more information: which functions was the force to have; how its area of operation near the Armistice Demarcation Line would be decided upon; how long the force would remain after the Anglo-French force had been withdrawn; and finally how long the force was expected to remain in Port Said. Dismissing the UN force commanders’ assurances, Nasser wanted the Secretary-General to clarify these issues just as his resistance to Canadian troops was adamant.⁵⁵² Moreover, Burns received enquiries from the Advisory Committee for the UN force and clearance organisation that Hammarskjold had set up on November 7th, with several but not all of the expected countries contributing troops in the form of Canada, Norway, Colombia, and India, and also Brazil, Ceylon and Pakistan (despite Egypt’s rejection of the latter due to their hostile relations with Egypt (and India) partly on the grounds of being a member of the (in Cairo and New Delhi much-hated) Baghdad Pact).⁵⁵³

Despite these complications, the US Air Force began bringing the first Danish, Norwegian, Colombian, and Indian forces to Italy, tellingly with post-Second World Warplanes of the US Strategic Air Service known as ‘Globemasters’, from November 10th.⁵⁵⁴ In other words, the build-up of the supposedly least controversial force was not only initiated before Egypt had formally accepted the composition of the force, it also took the form of one NATO member (the US) flying the UN contingents of two other NATO members (Norway and Denmark) to the territory of a fourth NATO member (Italy), indicative of the logistical web that would come to build and support the frontier zone. As Burns recalled, “(...) *it was very urgent at that time, Mr.*

⁵⁵⁰ “Document 547 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian.”

⁵⁵¹ “Document 555 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 561 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁵⁵² E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 198–201.

⁵⁵³ A/3302/Add. 6 & 18, *ibid.*, 201, 234–35; Hashmi, ““Zero Plus Zero Plus Zero””; Jitendra Mohan, “India, Pakistan, Suez and The Commonwealth,” *International Journal* 15, no. 3 (July 1, 1960): 185–99.

⁵⁵⁴ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 201.

Hammar skjold and his advisers believed, to get some United Nations into Egypt at once. It was felt that it would be a race between the UNEF's getting established on the ground and 'volunteers' from Russia, Communist China, and other similarly oriented countries arriving in Egypt to assist the Egyptian forces to expel the invaders."⁵⁵⁵ Offering thus an insight into the highest echelon of the UN, consisting not only of the Secretary-General but also the Americans Bunche and Cordier who grew increasingly concerned with the frequent Soviet visits to the Egyptian government, the force commander continued, "*It was thought quite possible that such volunteers might be sent, and that the Middle East might develop into another Korea, with the forces of the West, nominally under the aegis of the United Nations, ranged against the forces of the Communist countries and deployed in Egypt and possible other Arab countries.*"⁵⁵⁶ His civilian UN colleague, Brian Urquhart, recalls a similar anti-Soviet fear.⁵⁵⁷ Not surprisingly, therefore, the Hammarskjold contacted the Egyptian government directly to secure the acceptance of the force as a first step. He not only rebutted the Egyptian President's refusal to permit Danish and Norwegian troops, saying that the governments of Finland and Sweden, whose contingents Nasser had accepted because they were not in military pacts with the British and French, would not contribute without their fellow Scandinavians, and that this might mean the end of the UN force. He also told the Egyptian President that he would come to Cairo to discuss the Egyptian government's question about its right to withdraw its consent to the UN presence and the entry of the troops of 'certain' countries,⁵⁵⁸ meaning Canada that already had a troop agreement predating the formation of the force.⁵⁵⁹

As noted, the US Air Force began flying the first units to Naples. The Danish and Norwegian contingents were flown directly, while the Indian forces were flown in probably with a stopover in Turkey as the Turkish government had already granted the US access to Saudi Arabia where the US operated an air force base.⁵⁶⁰ Relying on the global reach of the American Air Force, the first Colombian units were flown from Bogota via Puerto Rico, an American colonial territory, to the Azores, an Atlantic island group under Portuguese control that the US had rights to use under a bilateral agreement (that also linked American usage to NATO), to Naples on November

⁵⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 202–3.

⁵⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 203.

⁵⁵⁷ Urquhart, *A Life in Peace and War*, 133.

⁵⁵⁸ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 203–4.

⁵⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 214.

⁵⁶⁰ "United States Airlift for the United Nations Emergency Force" undated, Brazil Folder, Field Operations Division, S-0530-0271, UNA

10th,⁵⁶¹ (even if Portugal would only formally grant the UN (and its Canadian aircraft) permission to use the Lagens airport in the Azores on November 30th).⁵⁶²

When Burns came to Cairo on November 11th on the day after the airlifts to Naples were started, the Egyptian government thus accepted troops from Finland, Yugoslavia, Sweden, India, Colombia, Denmark, and Norway. The Egyptian President, recalled his advisor, had insisted on contingents from the non-aligned states India and Yugoslavia.⁵⁶³ Although no troops had yet landed (as Eisenhower impatiently noted the following day) and Canadian forces remained unwelcome,⁵⁶⁴ the efforts of both the Eisenhower administration in rallying support and the Secretary-General and his advisors were largely paying off in terms of the force composition: the Soviet Union got neither proxies nor allies into the UN force. Despite receiving Soviet fighter jets and massive loans and having several large commercial and cooperation agreements with the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, the only Communist state contributing troops, was not only moving in a direction of non-alignment, the brutal soviet crushing of the Hungarian revolution also soured Belgrade's relations with Moscow over November, leaving them in bitter confrontation.⁵⁶⁵ While the West was courting Finland discretely through trade, it was not a member of NATO, just as it was not a Soviet proxy despite treaties with the Soviet Union.⁵⁶⁶ Although seen as taking Soviet propaganda at face value by the Eisenhower administration and also in the non-aligned camp with Egypt (and Yugoslavia),⁵⁶⁷ India was not, as the Indian Prime Minister had informed the Egyptian President and political ally after Nasser's nationalisation of the canal in July (only a week after they had met in Yugoslavia), "(...) *a disinterested party. She is a principal user of this waterway, and her economic life and development is not unaffected by the dispute, not to speak of worse*

⁵⁶¹ "United States Airlift for the United Nations Emergency Force" undated, Brazil Folder, Field Operations Division, S-0530-0271, UNA, "Document 153 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 154 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁵⁶² "United States Airlift for the United Nations Emergency Force" undated, Brazil Folder, Field Operations Division, S-0530-0271, UNA

⁵⁶³ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 222.

⁵⁶⁴ "Document 570 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," 570.

⁵⁶⁵ Svetozar Rajak, *Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union in the Early Cold War: Reconciliation, Comradeship, Confrontation, 1953-57* (Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge, 2011), 66-200.

⁵⁶⁶ Juhana Aunesluoma, "A Nordic Country with East European Problems: British Views on Post-War Finland, 1944-1948," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 37, no. 2 (2012): 230-45; Jussi Hanhimäki, "Self-Restraint as Containment: United States' Economic Policy, Finland, and the Soviet Union, 1945-1953," *The International History Review* 17, no. 2 (1995): 287-305.

⁵⁶⁷ "Document 577 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d., 577.

*developments, in regard to it.*⁵⁶⁸ Indeed, due to its embedded position in the Commonwealth economic web, approximately 60% of the Indian trade went through the canal.⁵⁶⁹ Besides the Soviet Union thus not having any proxies, formal allies or strong friends on the force, several of the remaining members were either Western-leaning or members of NATO. For example, Sweden was neutral, but Western-oriented, receiving American arms and nuclear technology and adapting NATO standards.⁵⁷⁰ It happened on a discrete basis, however, as the American ambassadors in the Nordic countries had agreed that the “(...) *Swedish military strength is important and favourable factor in area (...)*”⁵⁷¹ and that it was therefore necessary to support rather than embarrass the Swedish alliance-free policy. On its part, the Colombian government and military, whose offer Hammarskjöld, or rather Bunche, had accepted prior to Egyptian approval (with Eisenhower’s endorsements), was under strong American regional influence not only due to the Panama Canal (which had been carved out of Colombia), but also via the Rio Treaty of 1947, which had previously both ensured that Colombia had deployed a force trained by American officers to Korea under direct US command within the UN forces and that American arms and equipment had become the standard in the Colombian military by way of standardisation agreements on training, logistics, administration and doctrine.⁵⁷² Another member of the UN force also adopting arms, weapons systems, aircraft and naval vessels from the US (and to a lesser extent Canada), Denmark had initially been rejected by the Egyptian President for the UN force on the grounds of being a member of NATO. Having previously adopted British arms and equipment, sent officers and soldiers to Great Britain for training, and not least shared both military information and confidential intelligence with the British after the Second World War,⁵⁷³ it was well in the process of also turning to the US. Accepting the link to the global American military infrastructure of airbases stretching from Korea and Japan to the US and Canada to Western Europe Denmark had also allowed Washington to expand its

⁵⁶⁸ Nehru quoted from Mudiam, *India and the Middle East*, 54.

⁵⁶⁹ Mohan, “India, Pakistan, Suez and The Commonwealth.”

⁵⁷⁰ See for instance Nilsson, “Aligning the Non-Aligned”; Mikael Nilsson, “American Propaganda, Swedish Labor, and the Swedish Press in the Cold War: The United States Information Agency (USIA) and Co-Production of U.S. Hegemony in Sweden during the 1950s and 1960s.,” *The International History Review* 34, no. 2 (June 1, 2012): 315–45.

⁵⁷¹ “Document 168 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁵⁷² Brands, *Latin America’s Cold War*, 14–15; Coleman, “The Colombian Army in Korea, 1950-1954”; Hal Klepak, “Power Multiplied or Power Restrained? The United States and Multilateral Institutions in the Americas,” in *US Hegemony and International Organizations: The United States and Multilateral Institutions*, ed. Rosemary Foot, S. Neil MacFarlane, and Michael Mastanduno (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 240–64.

⁵⁷³ Rasmus Mariager, *I tillid og varm sympati: Dansk-britiske forbindelser og USA under den tidlige kolde krig* (Copenhagen: Musculanums forlag : Købehavns universitet, 2006); Rasmus Mariager, “‘British Leadership Is Experienced, Cool-Headed and Predictable’: Anglo-Danish Relations and the United States from the End of the Second World War to the Cold War,” *Scandinavian Journal of History* 37, no. 2 (2012): 246–60.

Greenlandic facilities from the Second World War to operate long-range bombers,⁵⁷⁴ which moreover saw increased activity during the ‘Suez Crisis’.⁵⁷⁵ Finally, the other Scandinavian NATO member Nasser sought to reject but was forced to accept was Norway that had also become central to American strategic planning for Northern Europe, both as US diplomats judged that both Iceland and Denmark would to take Norwegian advice on strategic matters and because the Soviet Union had built a naval complex on the Kola Peninsula. Over the 1950s, Oslo thus accepted Washington’s help to build both a military industry (as elsewhere in Western Europe in the early 1950s),⁵⁷⁶ and a complex of air force bases and submarine facilities in the north of Norway.⁵⁷⁷ As argued by the Norwegian historian Mats Berdal, Norway (as Denmark) came to provide the US with political support, access, and capabilities enabling the US to project military power more effectively at an operational level while the US in return gradually replaced Great Britain in providing Norway’s security platform.⁵⁷⁸ Altogether, the UN force might thus be considered both a highly improvised rescue operation, and, amongst UN top officials and the Eisenhower administration, a manoeuvre to keep Soviet influence in the Middle East to a minimum, and, thus, within my analytical framework, came to serve a Western frontier of imperial multilateralism.

Bringing UNEF to Abu Sueir: The First Step in Building the Frontier Zone

Before leaving New York for Cairo to see the Egyptian President, the Secretary-General met with the Advisory Committee in his conference room. At the meeting, he made clear that speed was of the essence. Along the lines of Eisenhower, he called for

⁵⁷⁴ Thorsten Borring Olesen et al., *Dansk udenrigspolitik historie 5, 5*, (København: Danmarks Nationalleksikon, 2005); Nikolaj Petersen, “SAC at Thule: Greenland in the U.S. Polar Strategy,” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 13, no. 2 (2011): 90–115; Poul Villaume, *Allieret med forbehold: Danmark, NATO og den kolde krig: en studie i dansk sikkerhedspolitik 1949-1961* (København: Eirene, 1995).

⁵⁷⁵ Petersen, “SAC at Thule,” 109.

⁵⁷⁶ “Document 162 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 167 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 168 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 170 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁵⁷⁷ “Document 163 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁵⁷⁸ Mats R Berdal, *The United States, Norway and the Cold War, 1954-60* (New York, N.Y.: St. Martin’s Press in association with St. Anthony’s College, Oxford, 1997).

'boots on the ground' first and then to build up the force. He also argued that the force, if its presence was conditional to the Egyptian government's consent, was to stay until its task were complete subject to the assessment of the General Assembly. Sceptical of the phrasing of both Hammarskjold and the Canadian Foreign Minister, Pearson (who had supported the Secretary-General straight away), Lall, the Indian representative first noted that this force was not a permanent UN force, and then that he found it difficult to see "(...) *how the United Nations would wish to impose conditions on a country which has been aggressed against—which has been the victim of aggression. That would be a very difficult principle for the United Nations to take up.*"⁵⁷⁹ Supporting Hammarskjold, both Pearson and Prettas-Valle, the Brazilian representative, argued that the UN was in fact rescuing Egypt from a difficult position. Seeking to accommodate Lall, the representative from Ceylon, Gunewardene, agreed that it was only an *ad hoc* force. However, dead set on both getting a force and getting Canadian troops into it, Pearson also argued, "(...) *we cannot make it too easy for Egypt to withdraw, with our help, and then say she intend to change her policy.*"⁵⁸⁰ Although it appeared that especially Lall had more to discuss, Hammarskjold tellingly had Bunche end the meeting with an overview of the build-up in Naples and the preparations in Egypt.

When the Hammarskjold landed in Cairo on November 14th and the UN staff in New York were scrambling to learn to organise a military force as Urquhart was the only UN official with military experience (aside two American liaison officers), the Egyptian host had not agreed upon all aspects of the UN force. Nevertheless, aircraft from the American and Italian air forces as well as the Swiss commercial airline Swissair began flying UN units to the Egyptian air base Abu Sueir, a former British air base and the air base closest to both the canal and Port Said.⁵⁸¹ To Hammarskjold (and his American officials as well as the Eisenhower administration), speed was of the essence: 'details' such as a status-of-forces-agreement concerning the legal matters could be settled consequently (and was so only in February 1957).⁵⁸² Haste (and the American influence) also meant that the US Navy in Italy provided the UN troops with helmets that were painted light blue for anti-sniping purposes.⁵⁸³ According to a Danish officer, it also meant that many of soldiers of the different UN contingents arrived confused and thus viewed everything through a prism of uncertainty.⁵⁸⁴ Additionally, several members of the UN contingents arrived with predisposed ideas of who were allies and who weren't. Many of the Danish young and

⁵⁷⁹ "Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF" 14 November 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁵⁸⁰ "Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF" 14 November 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁵⁸¹ Urquhart, *A Life in Peace and War*, 134–35.

⁵⁸² Zeidan, *The United Nations emergency force*, 164.

⁵⁸³ Urquhart, *Ralph Bunche*, 269.

⁵⁸⁴ Niels Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater* (Copenhagen: Hjemmevaernsfonden, 1958), 9.

often rural conscripted soldiers,⁵⁸⁵ for instance, were exposed to lectures from senior officers or academics that appear to have had an orientalist under-current when laying out the situation in the supposedly inherently violent and dangerous Middle East region or in the case of one of the three infantry companies an obviously racist lecture from a British former colonial military officer on “(...) *Egyptian characteristics and how to engage the local population*” such as walking on the footpath while forcing the Egyptians into the gutter.⁵⁸⁶ Upon arriving in Egypt, recalls a Danish soldier, the young and inexperienced Danish soldiers disembarked the American aircraft nervous, with loaded weapons (with a bullet in the chamber and thus ready to shoot) and their fingers on the triggers, weary of all Egyptians with arms.⁵⁸⁷ The (fellow ‘white’ and) older Canadian soldiers that had arrived and many of whom had served in the Second World War thus calmed the young and nervous Danes.⁵⁸⁸ To the Danish officer, many Norwegian and Swedish (who appear also to have been young conscripts), displayed similar feelings. Drilling, physical exercise and both national and shared Scandinavian religious services, however, were used to let them regain their postures.⁵⁸⁹

Also in Egypt, Hammarskjöld—who was still just as nervous about Soviet ‘volunteers’ as the Eisenhower administration according to the UNEF Commander and the UN official Urquhart⁵⁹⁰—requested the American representatives in New York to keep the administration from pressing ahead in the General Assembly before his return. In return and well aware of what was still at stake, the Eisenhower administration requested that the Secretary-General observe and ‘promptly’ report if he saw any acts of non-compliance with the resolution. During Hammarskjöld’s visit to the Egyptian President from November 16th to 19th, the State Department also ordered the Ambassador in Cairo to pass on to the Secretary-General concerns about Soviet volunteers if the ceasefire broke, and if so that it might be useful and within his rights to station UN representatives in seaports and airports to ascertain whether resolutions were being respected and complied with.⁵⁹¹ The US ambassador was less than encouraged despite the Egyptian President’s assurances that he had only requested help from the US and had no intention for Egypt to become a second Korea or the reason for a third world war and Hammarskjöld’s progress on including the

⁵⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁵⁸⁶ Ole Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen: Vordingborg - Ægypten Tur-Retur November 1956 - Maj 1957* (Lyngby: private publication, 2005), 3.

⁵⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁵⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁵⁸⁹ Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 12.

⁵⁹⁰ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 202–3.

⁵⁹¹ “Document 573 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian”; “Document 576 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 577 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian.”

Canadian contingent before he returned to New York.⁵⁹² The discussion on Canada had not only revolved around its membership of NATO (as with Denmark and Norway), but also its relationship to Great Britain. As in the case of Copenhagen and Oslo, however, Ottawa had also begun to re-orient its foreign policy towards the US both as part of NATO and as a neighbour of the US via trade and oil (to the extent the British government became vocal on the matter) and strategic relations.⁵⁹³ Within the sphere of the latter, Canada and the US had grown closer with joint officer's training (between 1946 and 1950),⁵⁹⁴ the joint war efforts in Korea with Canada providing one of the largest contributions,⁵⁹⁵ and not least the joint radar warning and control line system, to which the Canadian Minister to the US George Glazebrook noted in spring 1956, "(...) *the existence of a border between the two countries will have to be progressively discarded*".⁵⁹⁶ In any case, Hammarskjold used the threat of walking out and cancelling the force three times in a seven-hour negotiation with the Egyptian President. Eventually, Hammarskjold managed to convince Nasser that Canadian units should be included.⁵⁹⁷ This, noted contemporary political scientist Sprye, made the UN intervention "(...) *very largely a Commonwealth operation*";⁵⁹⁸ as Bunche and Hammarskjold had India and Canada provide the backbone of the force, contributing close to half of the force and most of the support units. At the same time, the Eisenhower administration officials were trying to convince the British Foreign Secretary and UN Ambassador and the French Foreign Minister and Ambassador in Washington both that oil would be provided,⁵⁹⁹ and that the UN force, even if small, was adequate in allowing them to pull their forces out of Port Said with what Harold Macmillan, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, called "(...) *a fig leaf to cover*

⁵⁹² "Document 587 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁵⁹³ "Document 341 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 350 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 362 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 363 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 373 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 379 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁵⁹⁴ "Document 362 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian."

⁵⁹⁵ Edwards, *United Nations Participants in the Korean War*, 75–79.

⁵⁹⁶ "Document 350 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western Europe and Canada, Volume XXVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian."

⁵⁹⁷ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 214.

⁵⁹⁸ Sprye, "Canada, the United Nations Emergency Force, and the Commonwealth," 300.

⁵⁹⁹ "Document 581 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian."

our nakedness (...).⁶⁰⁰ In the meantime, the UN force began to receive both British material and national and American equipment flown into the former British airbase of Abu Sueir by Italian military aircraft (that were provided by the US) and to come to terms with the, for many, hot climate and the other contingents.⁶⁰¹

When Hammarskjold returned to New York on November 18th, he immediately consulted Lodge, the American Permanent Representative at the UN. The Secretary-General, it turned out, was as sceptic as the American Ambassador to Egypt. However, his concerns no longer revolved around the Soviet involvement in Egypt of which he seen none (and had confirmed by Nasser), but rather the Anglo-French resistance to pull out of Port Said unconditionally. Rioting would, if it materialised, then provide Great Britain and France with further cause for intervention in which case the Soviet Union may intervene in Syria and Jordan. Mirroring Eisenhower and once again placing himself firmly as a fellow steward of the Western frontier of imperial multilateralism, the Secretary-General argued it necessary to bring in the UN force and get the clearance operations started immediately.⁶⁰² On the same day, the Secretary-General also convened the Advisory Committee to inform them of the Egyptian acceptance of the force and stress that it was necessary to bring in the UN force and get the clearance operations started immediately. While the Indian representative expressed surprise with Egypt's largely unreserved acceptance, Pearson also stressed the situation's urgency, supporting again Hammarskjold (to whom he had promoted a UN canal force for several years).⁶⁰³ Much to Hammarskjold's irritation the following day, the 20th of November, Lall kept raising issues just as Khan, the Pakistani representative, repeated his government's offer of an infantry battalion,⁶⁰⁴ reflecting an interest in using both the Baghdad Pact and the UN to get things moving as the canal closure was increasing price levels and thus pressure on the Pakistani government.⁶⁰⁵ Returning to the Secretary-General's agenda, Lange, the Norwegian Foreign Minister, raised concerns with the Egyptian forces guarding the UN force in Abu Sueir. Concluding the discussion (once again), Hammarskjold not only dismissed these concerns, but also argued that Egypt was not agreeing but (merely) consenting, again *de facto* placing the UN authority above

⁶⁰⁰ "Document 593 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁶⁰¹ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 36-37.

⁶⁰² "Document 590 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁶⁰³ "Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF" 19 November 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁶⁰⁴ "Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF" 20 November 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁶⁰⁵ Hashmi, "'Zero Plus Zero Plus Zero'"; Mohan, "India, Pakistan, Suez and The Commonwealth."

Egyptian sovereignty.⁶⁰⁶ On the same day, Eisenhower made it clear to the US officials that were speaking to the British that his pre-condition for help was their withdrawal and to those talking to ‘the Arabs’ that they should let them know that pressure was being applied, but also that going against the UN would turn the world against Egypt just as the Suez Canal should not just be opened but done so with confidence in future operation.⁶⁰⁷

As it were, the patching-up of the Western frontier of imperial multilateralism was well under-way. With the UN forces arriving in Egypt, the situation had passed the point where both the Soviet Union and Egypt could make further use of the ‘Suez Crisis’, having been gradually if only just outmanoeuvred.

Bringing UNEF to Port Said: Expanding the Frontier Zone on the Back of NATO

With the UN commander’s redeployment of the UN force from Abu Sueir towards Port Said beginning on November 21st (as the US Air Force flew in most of the remaining contingents), the frontier zone once again expanded. Perhaps less indicative of the number of units available and a personal choice than the global colour line’s deeper path dependency in the international system with its roots in the global imperial system, the Canadian commander deployed first ‘white’ (NATO) Norwegian and Danish units and eventually Swedish and Columbian forces and ‘brown’ Indians units as the last, even if the popularity with the locals not to mention the combat merits of the Indian forces would have made the Indians the more sensible choice.⁶⁰⁸ In the same vein, the recollections of one of the Danish officers of the passage in trains on the old British railway along the Suez Canal also makes very clear the function of the international system in relation to the ‘Suez Crisis’: “*The journey north along the Suez Canal also imprinted each and every one the importance of the canal. One tanker after the other were ‘frozen’ in the middle of the desert stretch, towering over the yellow surface as the signs of the disunity of the civilised world.*”⁶⁰⁹ The overall situation appears also to have spilled over into the understanding of the soldiers. Despite being received with open joy by several of the Egyptian military units they passed, several of the Danish (and probably also Norwegian) troops felt a sense of pleasure when seeing destroyed Soviet-supplied material in light of their overall identification with the West, once again confirming how the imperial confrontation of

⁶⁰⁶ “Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF” 20 November 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁶⁰⁷ “Document 596 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” 596.

⁶⁰⁸ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 223–24; Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 38–40.

⁶⁰⁹ Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 14.

the Cold War was very present. Similarly, the young Danes could not help but identify with the British invading force, cheerfully engaging in small talk and in awe of the older, professional and frequently tattooed British soldiers when taking over their dug-in positions in Ismailia (a canal town).⁶¹⁰ While this most likely tied in with the Danish armed forces' turn to the British (rather than Germany) military after the Second World War,⁶¹¹ Burns' 'marriage' of the Danish and Norwegian infantry companies into a single ('white') battalion just before entering Ismailia may also have reinforced the idea of a 'Western whiteness' that merged the Scandinavian soldiers' political-racialised imaginaries of a Nordic 'whiteness' with those of the older Commonwealth and new trans-Atlantic (NATO) parallels.

After taking over Ismailia from the British, Burns would also continue to use the new DANOR battalion as his primary force for what he deemed most important or to crack open a task before passing it on to another battalion, thus reinforcing these ideas. Indeed, even the new battalion's rank and file soldiers began to take notice of and speak about of how they had Burns' favourites.⁶¹² When Burns had the force move into Port Said, he thus not only had the 'white' Nordic UN soldiers seize several smaller military camps and a school for headquarters, he also let the British and Danish forces once again link up on very friendly terms under Egyptian overview. Whether linked to fears of incidents with British units or not (which Burns himself did not reflect on), he only put the (professional) Indian troops to use as relief for the 'white' Scandinavian that had only months before been conscripts.⁶¹³ In partially taking over Port Said from the British (and eventually French) forces and continuing to build up the force with an emphasis on the primacy of 'white' forces and the supportive role of the Indian forces, the situation resembled how the town, according to Valeska Huber, had been established by imperial, commercial and international actors that had pushed through an 'international colonisation' following the formation of the Suez Canal and the subsequent transformation of the Mediterranean from an imperial lake to an imperial lane.⁶¹⁴ In other words, the UN began the *ad hoc* and temporary 'international re-colonisation' of Port Said in a way that in several ways reminded of both the 'traditional' British imperial expansion and the frontier-building of multinational imperialism.

At the same time, however, the Anglo-French forces in Port Said did not withdraw. Back in New York, Hammarskjöld began consulting the American UN diplomats on the Anglo-French withdrawal schedule which the British Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd, had informed to the Secretary-General about earlier in the day. That the British would only begin to withdraw after a four-week period that would allow the clearance to begin and the UNEF to be established and thus withdraw under a diplomatic cover,

⁶¹⁰ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 40–42.

⁶¹¹ Mariager, *I tillid og varm sympati*; Mariager, "British Leadership Is Experienced, Cool-Headed and Predictable."

⁶¹² Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 40–42.

⁶¹³ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 208, 213 & 220; Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 42–47; Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 16.

⁶¹⁴ Huber, "Connecting Colonial Seas."

impressed neither Hammarskjöld nor the American diplomats. Although the Secretary-General had initially taken London's bait of anti-Communist rhetoric and expressed a strong dislike of Nasser (which it was recognised only the US could promote in the Middle East),⁶¹⁵ he had grown less concerned with a potential influx of Soviet 'volunteers'. Focused mainly on the canal, his attention turned to managing Nasser, which Hammarskjöld admitted to Lloyd that there was no one he liked to deal less with. Aware of the situation, however, he argued that "(...) *we must play Arabs down, but play them down by fair means.*"⁶¹⁶ Acknowledging that Egypt would not negotiate the clearance of the canal as long as London and Paris were using their military presence to pressure Cairo, Hammarskjöld suggested three dates for having built up UNEF to a certain strength, in order to have the British and French withdraw their forces and begin the clearance of the canal, to the American UN representative. As the list of installations the UN force was expected to protect in both Port Said and its twin (canal-)town of Port Fouad kept growing, Burns therefore received the message from New York to keep building the force as fast as possible.⁶¹⁷

Aside the use of Danish and Norwegian 'white' NATO bodies before 'brown' Colombian and Indian bodies first in both Ismailia and Port Said (despite Nasser's earlier resistance to NATO troops from Canada), Burns appears not to have thought twice about letting the British vessels continue their clearance work, despite Nasser's refusal to permit such work and his agreement with the UN Secretary-General.⁶¹⁸ Not surprisingly, therefore, "(...) *the attitude of the commanders and staff of the Allied forces [sic] was entirely cooperative,*"⁶¹⁹ as Burns put it. The UN commander not only had jovial relations with the commanders of the occupying power on several occasions. He also consulted with the Canadian ambassador to Egypt in Cairo on the nature of the Canadian contingent on his own initiative, thus adding a reconnaissance squadron apparently before receiving clearance from either the Secretary-General or Bunche, who had hitherto had the main responsibility for the force.⁶²⁰ Additionally, the Commander of the Danish UN contingency requested the Governor of Port Said Egyptian to bring extra police into Port Said, but only allowed them in once the UN military observers had vetted the 350 police officers to ensure they were not Palestinian militants, *fedayeen*, and had only their normal weapons⁶²¹ thus initiating another transgression of Egyptian sovereignty in the series of infringements the UN

⁶¹⁵ "Document 575 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian"; "Document 576 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," 576; "Document 620 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian."

⁶¹⁶ "Document 620 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian."

⁶¹⁷ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 226.

⁶¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 223-24.

⁶¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 224.

⁶²⁰ *Ibid.*, 234.

⁶²¹ *Ibid.*, 220 & 228.

force would be responsible for. It was only by the 25th of November the Yugoslavian contingent would arrive on Yugoslavian ships and thus add another friend of Egypt aside India to the force that was discretely but strongly tied to NATO.⁶²²

In the last days of November, the visible involvement of NATO assets expanded beyond the use of American and Italian NATO military infrastructure and the force commander's logistical coordination with NATO's Commander-in-Chief of the Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean. While the UN built its own communication system first via the UN radio transmitters of the UN field Service in Geneva and UNTSO in Jerusalem and then in Naples and Abu Sueir and Port Said (and later the Gaza Strip),⁶²³ the UN force relied completely on the US and the British for equipment and the supplies. For example, the British invasion force not only sold the UN force vehicles to supply both the entire Indian infantry battalion and the Norwegian medical company, which Burns admits "(...) *the force would have been in great difficulties without (...)*."⁶²⁴ The British invasion force sold the UN force petrol, oil, lubricants, medical supplies, and rations.⁶²⁵ Moreover, two weeks after buying several hundred British vehicles, the UN Secretary-General had his staff approach the British UN diplomats for spare parts.⁶²⁶ After meeting the Executive Vice-President of the American-Saudi oil company Aramco, the American Director of the UN Field Operations Service, David B. Vaughan, also got both supplies and refined oil from a trapped ARAMCO ship moving Saudi refined oil to Rotterdam.⁶²⁷ Reminiscent of the Korean War,⁶²⁸ the US also provided the Colombian contingent with transport, arms and equipment to US standards, and did so at Bunche's direct request to the Director of the American Mission at the UN.⁶²⁹ Washington would also provide more vehicles in December.⁶³⁰ On the overall matter of supplies and logistics, Burns himself noted, "*It is axiomatic that a military force can function only if it is supplied with food, and the fuel and lubricants for the mechanical transport on which it depends for all its movements, plus munitions to replace those used up in operations (...)*".⁶³¹ With this in mind, it is safe to say that UNEF would not have been available as a tool to protect the West and its oil supplies had it not been for the support of the US and NATO.

The dependence of UNEF on the West, and again particularly the US, also extended to its staff, as was the case even at the highest levels of the UN Headquarters

⁶²² Ibid., 223.

⁶²³ Ibid., 119–220.

⁶²⁴ Ibid., 212.

⁶²⁵ Ibid., 212 & 224.

⁶²⁶ "Document only titled appendix" 28 December 1956, Supply Egypt 1956/1957, UN Fields Operations Service, S-0534-0235, UNA

⁶²⁷ "Letter from Director of General Services, Un Field Operations Service to UNEF" 27 December 1956, Supply Egypt 1956/1957, UN Fields Operations Service, S-0534-0235, UNA

⁶²⁸ Coleman, "The Colombian Army in Korea, 1950-1954."

⁶²⁹ "Message on UN/US Assistance" from Undersecretary Bunche to Executive Director of US Mission to the UN 17 November 1956, UNEF – US Assistance /U.S Navy and Army – Italy, Field Operations Service, S0534-0229, UNA

⁶³⁰ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 242.

⁶³¹ Ibid., 207.

in New York, where several of the General-Secretary's advisors such as aforementioned Bunche and Cordier as well as the Director of General Services, David B. Vaughan, and the Chief of the Field Operations Service, George Lansky in 1956 and later Carey Seward, were Americans. As noted, UNSCO was also staffed with Americans in central positions: McCloy and Wheeler being the most prominent and then others such as D. G. Sullivan, who served as Chief Administrative Officer. 'On the ground', several of the UN military observers of the Egyptian-Israeli Military Armistice Commission that had in place since 1948 were also American. In late November 1956, for example, the UN Secretary-General let it be known to the head of UNTSO and UNEF, Burns, who then let pas it downwards within UNTSO to a US Marine Corps Colonial working as a UN military observer in the Gaza Strip, Byron Leary, that the Secretary-General was not keen to replace him once his rotation were to end or even grant him leave for Christmas. His symbolic presence as a UN official was cited, but, as will be clear in the last section of this chapter, Leary was also handy in relation to his capacity as an American military officer to coordinate with the US Sixth Fleet.⁶³² Beyond the observers, the UN force itself also employed many westerners, several of whom, if not most, were Americans with previous military experience. Some had arrived with Burns in November. Others would arrive gradually. Most key staff were, as he called it, 'imported' UN staff.⁶³³ The Chief Administrative Officers were American (until 1967!).⁶³⁴ The first Legal Advisor, Public Relations Officer, and Welfare Officer were all Canadian.⁶³⁵ Altogether, the UN force's outlook and sense of self was defined by, if unintentionally, the views and geopolitical imaginaries and the place of the Middle East therein of these key figures. Also partly steeped in Western ways, or more specifically those of the British Mandate Regime, were many of the Greek and Egyptian "(...) *locally recruited personnel, who had been working for British military and commercial organizations, and were unemployed.*"⁶³⁶ Expectedly, aside a few secretaries, most of these UN staffers were also all males.

⁶³² "Message from Chairman EIMAC to UNMO Gaza Strip" 28 November 1956, Israeli Administration of Gaza, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-006, UNA

⁶³³ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 202.

⁶³⁴ "Letter from Director of General Services, Un Field Operations Service to UNEF" 27 December 1956, Supply Egypt 1956/1957, UN Fields Operations Service, S-0534-0235, UNA, "Letter styled to Chief Administrative Officer UNEF" 22 March 1958, UNEF – US Assistance /U.S Navy and Army – Italy, Field Operations Service, S0534-0229, UNA, "Interoffice Memorandum from Chief of UN Field Operations Service to Director of UN General Services" 11 January 1960, UK Officials in UNEF, UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0254, UNA and Sand Dune September 1966 (internal UNEF journal published by UNEF Public Relations Office)

⁶³⁵ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 222–23.

⁶³⁶ *Ibid.*, 202.

London, Paris, Tel Aviv and More ‘Dots in the Web’: Expanding the UN Force

Despite the ongoing relatively problem free and non-violent ‘international re-colonisation’ of the Suez Canal towns by the UN force (which at least the British had influence on), the governments of Great Britain and France were not budging; they wanted a forced settlement on the canal to their liking. The Israeli government also wanted several requirements fulfilled before withdrawing its forces from both Egypt and the Gaza Strip. Accordingly, they kept working American fears of Soviet ‘penetration’ of the Middle East, of Nasser’s double-scheming and the size of the UN force as a problem for it being ‘effective’ at the UN, in Washington, in Tel Aviv, in Paris and in London in the period from mid-November to early December.⁶³⁷ To some extent, the lobbying consequently gradually intensified existing concerns. Soviet volunteers were often spoken of, even if the Undersecretary of State, Hoover argued that Moscow merely used the rumours of Soviet ‘volunteers’ to label itself the champion of Arab causes during a White House meeting in mid-November. However, the meeting also brought forward concerns on the Gaza Strip as it was learned the Israeli army was ‘having difficulties’ in ‘holding down’ the Palestinians. A concerned Hoover spoke of a “(...) *another immediate problem shaping up in the Gaza Strip.*”⁶³⁸ Joining him, Radford, the Chief of Staff, argued that the UN force was too small to maintain order just as it was noted that the Ambassador to Lebanon suggested that Israel should be allowed to stay in the Gaza Strip until the UN force was ready.⁶³⁹ At a parallel meeting of the US delegation to the UN General Assembly in New York, the American Permanent UN Representative told the rather militant delegation members in favour of helping the US allies more openly, that the US approach was “(...) *to have the UN Force ease itself in, get itself established and build up its strength.*”⁶⁴⁰ A few days later, Eisenhower told Hoover that he wanted a force that was “(...) *of reasonable size—enough to prevent brigandage.*”⁶⁴¹ At a National Security Council meeting on November 30th, concerns with the stability of the British

⁶³⁷ “Document 575 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian”; “Document 576 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian”; “Document 589 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 627 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶³⁸ “Document 577 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian.”

⁶³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴⁰ “Document 578 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” 578.

⁶⁴¹ “Document 589 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian.”

conservative government, the Middle East and NATO were openly expressed: Nixon declared himself scared of the prospect of a new government under Bevan and therefore saw it as necessary to prop up the Conservatives, Hoover noted that Lodge was thinking of a UN force in Syria, and Dulles saw the NATO meeting in mid-December as “(...) *most important one ever held*.”⁶⁴² The irritation with the Egyptian President also came to the fore to the extent that he was seen as engaging in ‘monkey-business’ and a ‘monkey’ on the British back to avoid, a racialisation that linked well with the administration’s roots in the American south.⁶⁴³

Speaking to the British House of Commons (and the White House) on December 2nd, the British Foreign Secretary declared that their and the French forces would be withdrawn immediately, if he made the withdrawal a 14-day process and conditional on the making of an adequate UN force and the proceeding of the canal clearance and so with aid of British and French vessels in place. Content, neither the American Ambassador in London nor Eisenhower and Dulles problematized the plan, thus not only granting the British and French the ‘fig leaf’ requested by Macmillan, but also, as will be clear in the following, substantial influence on the UN force.⁶⁴⁴ It is unclear if, and if so to which extent and how, the Eisenhower administration and the UN Secretary-General and/or his Undersecretary, the American former OSS and State Department official Bunche, coordinated and agreed to expand the force. However, it is clear that Hammarskjold and Bunche asked the Advisory Committee to support an expansion from nearly 4.500 to around 6.000 soldiers two days after Lloyd stated that the withdrawal being dependent on the size of UNEF and the day after Eisenhower and Dulles agreed that this was a satisfactory plan. First, they discussed the logistics of build-up and the problems of getting the last units of the force to Port Said to let the British and French forces withdraw, thus emphasising a need for speed and nudging the idea of more troops. Then, they turned to the task of moving the force through the Sinai to let the Israelis withdraw, noting that the force would be significantly better equipped to handle its task with 3 extra battalions, thus a doubling of the non-technical units.⁶⁴⁵ After Hammarskjold, Bunche and the Legal Advisor to the Secretary-General—the Greek Constantin Stavropoulos who had worked with Bunche when he worked for the UN in Palestine—had (once again) ended Lall’s concerns, it was decided to support the Legal Council’s and military attaches’ work towards securing that Egyptian courts were to have no jurisdiction over the troops

⁶⁴² “Document 626 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶⁴³ See Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line*.

⁶⁴⁴ “Document 633 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 634 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶⁴⁵ “Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF” 4 December 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

“(…) *as a matter of course*”⁶⁴⁶ as the Secretary-General noted. Thereby, the UN force would continue the practice of extra-territoriality of the expansion of the frontier of multinational imperialism. The subsequent meeting elaborated on the agreement. Hammarskjöld started by saying that it dealt mostly with legal details “(…) *which can be of no great interest to you.*”⁶⁴⁷ Stavropoulos then noted that Egypt had no objections, even if the still un-signed agreement, lent the UN more privileges than it had in the US via complete freedom of movement in the areas in which it operated on any means of transport, meaning that the force would be “(…) *to work unhindered by any rule or regulation which, normally, would have to apply.*”⁶⁴⁸ Washington remained content with the withdrawal plan despite a study by senior officials in the State Department with the help of the CIA two days later established that “(…) *collusion and deception did exist [on the side of the British, French and Israeli governments] and that it was directed not only against Egypt but also the US Government*”⁶⁴⁹ Already having contemplated a larger force, Washington was concerned mostly with stabilising its allies, their oil supply and NATO, as was evident in subsequent meetings with the French and British.⁶⁵⁰

In Port Said, where the force kept building up within the original framework, relations between the ‘white’ UN soldiers with the British forces grew increasingly friendly as trucks, equipment, and food rations changed hands, positions were taken over, and soccer matches were arranged. While reports of this as well as of the UN soldiers’ turn in moral with the looting of furniture and other niceties from the villas and public buildings may well have reached Egyptian president,⁶⁵¹ Nasser probably sensed a far larger pressure from both Hammarskjöld who had already forced through an acceptance of a Canadian force during his mid-November visit that was now impossible to reverse and from the Eisenhower administration that via its diplomats in both Washington and New York as well as the American Ambassador in Cairo ‘requested’ “*a constructive attitude*”.⁶⁵² Last, but not least, Nasser had a growing interest in re-opening the canal due to a growing economic pressure, partly related to

⁶⁴⁶ “Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF” 4 December 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁶⁴⁷ “Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF” 8 December 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁶⁴⁸ “Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF” 8 December 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁶⁴⁹ “Document 637 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶⁵⁰ “Document 643 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.;

“Document 644 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶⁵¹ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 48–50; Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 19–20.

⁶⁵² “Document 649 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

missing income and partly related to frozen assets in the US and Great Britain, which had forced Nasser to both make requests for access to both its assets and American aid and argue that aid to the aggressor rather than those aggressed upon was both unfair and unwise in a regional context.⁶⁵³

In any case, the Egyptian President instantly accepted both an enlargement of the UN force and an increase of the Canadian contingent when he met the Canadian UN Force Commander in Cairo, perhaps similar to the way the deposed King Farouk would have ceded to demands from the highest-ranking local British official.⁶⁵⁴ Aside the Canadians, Hammarskjöld and Bunche also wanted to bring in an Indonesian contingent, perhaps to help Nasser to sell the increase of the force to the Egyptians. Nasser quickly accepted an Indonesian battalion, perhaps from seeing an advantage in having soldiers from another non-aligned and ‘brown’ nation that was additionally led by his other friend in international politics, the Indonesian President Sukarno. Having gained independence from a Western colonial power, Indonesia was by late 1956 in a similar place as Egypt, struggling to avoid the conditional embrace of both Washington (which under both Roosevelt and Truman had sought to retain the colonial-era economic influence, had granted the first independent Indonesian government secret US military aid and had pressed for arrests until Eisenhower began losing interest) and Moscow that was seeking influence via an aid and trade agreement in late 1956.⁶⁵⁵

The Egyptian President, however, for the third time refused a Pakistani contingent and had the Egyptian diplomats in New York when the discussion shifted there for a full month, until the idea was given up.⁶⁵⁶ Not only had the distance between Cairo and Islamabad grown beyond Islamabad joining the Baghdad Pact, the warming in Cairo and New Delhi’s relationship from the Bandung Conference in 1955, and the Pakistani government’s participation in the first Suez Canal User Association after the nationalisation of the canal. At this point, Nasser had also grown angry with the Pakistani government when it turned to the Baghdad Pact, and thus the West, after the invasion (even if Islamabad had openly criticised the invasion of Egypt and supported a peaceful solution to the ‘Suez Crisis’), and the attacks of the Pakistani Prime Minister Hussein Suhrawardy (who was facing massive criticism in Pakistan over price increases due to the closure of the canal).⁶⁵⁷

⁶⁵³ “Document 646 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶⁵⁴ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 235.

⁶⁵⁵ Deqi Fortuna Anwar, “The Cold War and Its Impact on Indonesia: Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy,” in *Southeast Asia and the Cold War* (Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2012), 133–50; Ragna Boden, “Cold War Economics: Soviet Aid to Indonesia,” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 10, no. 3 (2008): 110–28; Frances Gouda and Thijs Brocades Zaalberg, *American Visions of the Netherlands East Indies/Indonesia US Foreign Policy and Indonesian Nationalism, 1920-1949* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2002).

⁶⁵⁶ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 235.

⁶⁵⁷ Hashmi, “‘Zero Plus Zero Plus Zero’”; Heikal, *Cutting the Lion’s Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 226–27; Mohan, “India, Pakistan, Suez and The Commonwealth.”

Finally, the Egyptian President only just agreed to a Brazilian contingent “(...) *after a good deal of pressure (...)*”⁶⁵⁸ from the UN Headquarters. According to Burns, the Egyptian hesitation towards Brazil had to do its voting pattern at the UN, which was apparently not closely aligned with that of Egypt.⁶⁵⁹ However, the hesitations of the Egyptian President may have been linked to Brazil’s connection to the West, having dispatched troops both to the Mediterranean theatre in the Second World War as part of the UN military alliance and to Korea as part of the UN coalition in the Korean War.⁶⁶⁰

A few days after the Egyptian President had accepted the doubling of non-technical troops, the heads of governments and diplomats of the NATO members met in the forum of the North Atlantic Council in Paris from the 11th to the 14th of December. Dulles found not only that there were “*no serious fireworks*” and “*every evidence that ranks will be closed*”,⁶⁶¹ but also that several members, such as especially Norway and to a lesser extent also Denmark and the Netherlands, offered outspoken support,⁶⁶² and Greece assured that Egypt was ambivalent as to the Soviet intentions.⁶⁶³ Nevertheless, he messaged Eisenhower that resentments endured.⁶⁶⁴ For example, the British Foreign Minister called UNEF for ‘a great step’, but also argued that Great Britain and France deserved praise for having created new opportunities for both NATO and the UN, and then attempted to put pressure on the US by calling for NATO, meaning Canada, Norway, Denmark and the US, to expand UNEF in size and duration.⁶⁶⁵ When Dulles met Eisenhower the next day, he therefore informed Eisenhower that he had struggled to keep the meeting from giving the appearance of NATO ‘teaming up’.⁶⁶⁶ He noted that he had dismissed a statement on concerting a policy on the Middle East due to its potential impact on world opinion.⁶⁶⁷ In the end, however, the final communique of the council most likely expressed what could be

⁶⁵⁸ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 235.

⁶⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 234–35.

⁶⁶⁰ Edwards, *United Nations Participants in the Korean War*; Klepak, “Power Multiplied or Power Restrained? The United States and Multilateral Institutions in the Americas.”

⁶⁶¹ “Document 45 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western European Security and Integration, Volume IV - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶⁶² “Document 41 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western European Security and Integration, Volume IV - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 43 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western European Security and Integration, Volume IV - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶⁶³ Greece had special links to Egypt due to the presence of approximately 200.000 Greeks in Egypt. “Document 43 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western European Security and Integration, Volume IV - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian.”

⁶⁶⁴ “Document 52 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western European Security and Integration, Volume IV - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶⁶⁵ “Document 41 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western European Security and Integration, Volume IV - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” 41.

⁶⁶⁶ “Document 657 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶⁶⁷ “Document 54 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Western European Security and Integration, Volume IV - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

agreed upon.⁶⁶⁸ On the one hand, the communique thus stated “(...) *shock and revulsion*” with the Soviet Union’s “(...) *brutal suppression of the heroic Hungarian people (...)*”.⁶⁶⁹ On the other, it merely “(...) *emphasized in particular the need for rapid progress in clearing the Suez Canal in conformity with the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly (...)*” and, moreover, “(...) *the urgent need for initiating and pressing to a conclusion negotiations through the good offices of the United Nations with a view to restoring the Canal to full and free operation.*”⁶⁷⁰

Parallel with the diplomatic fence-mending in Paris, the more concrete process of ensuring the conditions for the re-opening of the canal continued with the ‘international colonisation’ of Port Said. However, readings of memoirs and diary excerpts of some of the Danish and Canadian UN soldiers show that the transfer of Port Said was to become tenser as it became clear to the residents of the town that the British and French forces were leaving. As the number and rate of incidents went up, the British responded by intensifying their patrols and putting up barbed wire around the area of the docks they gradually withdrew to. However, they also began conducting area- and neighbourhood-wide raids with tank support. In light of the situation, Burns assigned the overall command of the UN forces in Port Said, which at that point more or less amount to a rather pro-Western or neutral ‘white’ force with approximately 2.000 Danish-Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish and Colombian soldiers, to the Danish commander of the DANOR battalion. Interestingly, the UN Commander sent the Colombians to Port Said rather than the already acclimatised and locally well-liked Indian battalion, which was holding positions outside Port Said that it had taken over from the Danish-Norwegian battalion. As the British-French force gradually withdrew and the UN force took over their positions, the Danish commander also had UNEF form an external perimeter of several hundred meters around the barbed wired area that the ‘Allied forces’, as Burns called them, had set up. This zone, which shielded the withdrawing invasion force from reprisals of angry Egyptians, may have seemed as logic for the UN force, as the docks bordered the town’s ‘Arab quarter’. However, it may also be considered a step beyond joint patrols with the British and French forces that the Secretary-General specifically did not permit, as the buffer area shielded the invasion force from reprisals.⁶⁷¹

The UN force may well have been seen both as linked to the partially suspended Egyptian sovereignty and in part a re-actualisation of imperial forms of ‘whiteness’ and authority.⁶⁷² While the first days after the NATO meeting saw exchanges between Egyptian paramilitaries and British forces that increasingly filled the nights of Port Said with the sounds of automatic weapons fire and exploding hand grenades, the UN

⁶⁶⁸ For more on this, see Dietl, “Suez 1956.”

⁶⁶⁹ “NATO Mini. Comm. Paris 11th-14th December 1956,” n.d., <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c561214a.htm>. (25.05.2016)

⁶⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁶⁷¹ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 228; Carl Engholm, *Fremmedlegionær og dansk oberst: Carl Engholms erindringer i krig og fred 1913-1979* (Lyngby: Dansk historisk håndbogsforlag, 1996), 204–11.

⁶⁷² E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 231.

soldiers also felt how the withdrawal and the confrontations also changed their own situation. Worried about being caught in the middle in some parts of the canal town and their oversight of others, several of the companies of Danish-Norwegian battalion began training hand-to-hand combat as well as conducting shooting exercises on the edge of town. Minor situations also began to escalate towards incidents, perhaps an indicator of the legacy of the British influence on the Danish military culture from the aforementioned cooperation in the late 1940s and early 1950s. The Danish-Norwegian UN soldiers also increasingly resorted to warning shots. Additionally, the UN force also declared the 'Arab' part of town 'out of bounds'. Whether related or not, the Danish UN soldiers who managed to get lost there were attacked by groups of young local angry men were only able to escape without shooting their way out through interventions of older local men, who perhaps knew what this type of attacks had previously led to. A few days before the British-French withdrawal, an entire Danish company was also deployed after a squad had been fired upon. In another ambush, a patrolling Norwegian squad had to ask a nearby British squad for help. Consequently, the UNEF also began to conduct house- and minor area-searches for weapons as well as propaganda, for led to minor incidents of sabotage in response.⁶⁷³ As the UN task force took over more areas of the town, the Danish commander realised that he needed more boots on the ground. Thus, he requested that Egyptian police units take over security and the dusk-to-dawn curfew in some neighbourhoods. Reflecting the continued partial suspension of Egyptian sovereignty by the UN force (alongside the British, French and Israeli forces), however, the Egyptian police units had to be vetted by the UN force to ensure that only police officers with their normal weapons and equipment were allowed into town to patrol. Additionally, UNEF held on to the sites connected to the delivery of electricity, gas, sewage and public health, and, perhaps even more tellingly, also established its own headquarters in the main building of the Suez Canal Company.⁶⁷⁴ Not surprisingly, the diaries and memoirs show that these young, 'white' and Western soldiers not only (like the British) felt more relaxed in Port Said's colonial era neighbourhoods than in the 'Arab quarter', but that they (like the British) called the latter 'the shantytown'. On and off, they also professed both 'professional' respect for the forceful British (such as the removal of the 4.000 villagers from the little fishing village of El Qutabi outside Port Said) and a parallel disdain for the Egyptian civilians, thus identifying themselves with the 'white' occupation soldiers much in the same way as the UN Commander who (even in his memories) called the British and French forces as 'allied forces'.⁶⁷⁵

⁶⁷³ Ibid., 228–31; Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 49–68; Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 7–40; Preben Kristiansen, *Danske soldater i Gaza og Congo*; ([København: Forlaget Fremad, 1962), 22–23.

⁶⁷⁴ "Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF" 18 December 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA and Engholm, *Fremmedlegionær og dansk oberst*, 211.

⁶⁷⁵ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 228–31; Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 49–68; Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 7–40; Kristiansen, *Danske soldater i Gaza og Congo*; 22–23.

On the 22nd of December, the UN force escorted the ‘allied forces’ out as British jets soared above Port Said. Predictably, the British officers thanked the Canadian UN Commander, who had fought with the British in the Second World War, for the “(...) *harmonious ways* (...)”⁶⁷⁶ in which ‘cooperation’ had found place and also warmly praised the Danish Colonel in charge of the UN force in Port Said. Personifying the bigger picture, the Danish Colonel was connected not only to the faded Danish empire by way of relatives who had served in the Danish West Indies, but also the then still active British and French empires to which he had been socialised through relatives that had served in the British colony of Hong Kong; his time in the British-inspired paramilitary scout movement in his youth years; his teen interest in the British archaeology in Egypt; his time in the French Foreign Legion in Algeria and Morocco; and, not least, his service as a UN observer in Kashmir that introduced him to the lifestyle, the sense of superiority towards ‘Oriental’ peoples and the officers clubs of British colonial officers.⁶⁷⁷

The Clearing of the Suez Canal: UNSCO and The Re-establishment of the Western Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism

Before his trip to Egypt in the middle of November to speak with the Egyptian President, the Secretary-General met the Advisory Committee to discuss not only the UN force, but also the clearance of the Suez Canal. As with the force, Hammarskjöld wanted speed to be the main priority, emphasizing that the members should link their views and advice to “(...) *the steps to be taken now as quickly as possible.*”⁶⁷⁸ As he arrived in Cairo and the UN force started to arrive in Port Said at the northern end of the Suez Canal, several NATO members also began requesting US diplomats in their capitals to have the Eisenhower administration activate the London Oil emergency Advisory Committee.⁶⁷⁹ Amongst these were Denmark and Norway, which were not only NATO members providing troops for the UN force, but also representing some of the largest canal users. Especially Norway’s request was important, as it was both the largest user after the Great Britain and the largest transporter of oil to Great Britain by 1955. Indeed, at the time when Egypt nationalised the canal, nearly 80% of the Norwegian ships passing through were time chartered for British as well as American oil companies set for British ports.⁶⁸⁰ As Hammarskjöld was flying back from Cairo

⁶⁷⁶ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 238.

⁶⁷⁷ Engholm, *Fremmedlegionær og dansk oberst*.

⁶⁷⁸ “Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF” 14 November 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁶⁷⁹ “Document 585 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian.”

⁶⁸⁰ Letter to Norwegian Shipping Association to Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs titled “Suez Canal” 9 August 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra

on the 18th of November, Macmillan, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer who was taking the reins in Whitehall, also expressed the partly genuine and partly overstated desperation of the British cabinet on the issue of the free operation of the canal to the American Ambassador in London.⁶⁸¹

Consequently, Hammarskjold and his canal clearance group of Wheeler, McCloy and Katzin set a high pace after his return from Egypt on the 18th of November. They were aware of Western concerns with the long term prospects of the operations of the canal, that the consumption (and thus transport) of Middle Eastern oil was expected to at least double over next decade and that major business papers in the US and London had debated the issue of expanding the Suez Canal as well as early designs for several weeks (and would continue to do so for months).⁶⁸² That the British Foreign Secretary had begun to call on both the members of Commonwealth and the Advisory Committee to rally behind the British move to de-link the canal clearance and their withdrawal and then informed the US of doing so did probably not reduce the Secretary-General's sense of urgency.⁶⁸³ Nevertheless, at the meeting with the Advisory Committee later on the 18th of November, the Secretary-General, however, disregarded Lall's and thus India's argument that it was the British and French that should pay for the clearance of the canal despite his aversion towards the British and French invasion.⁶⁸⁴ Despite India being what Nehru had called "(...) *a principal user* (...)"⁶⁸⁵ of the canal with approximately 60% of its trade going through the canal, New Delhi appears to have been concerned not only with clearing the canal, but also dealing with issues that India as a recently independent state could also come to face due to imbalances in the international system.⁶⁸⁶

Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, the DNBA and "Statistical Tables for the first six months of 1956" sent by General-Secretary of Suez Canal User Association to all members" 4 March 1957, Indgående korrespondance vedr. Suez-kanalen til Dir. J. Chr. Aschengreen, jan-marts 1957, Danmarks Rederiforening-ØK, DNBA. Moreover, from 1952 onwards to 1954, the guerrilla war for the Suez Canal between Great Britain and Egypt also led to a strong Danish and Norwegian wish for the UN take over the canal with the British Empire as the political mandate holder and the Suez Canal Company as the economic mandate holder. Chairman of the Danish Steamship-owners Association to the Danish Foreign Ministry 15 February 1952, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, the Danish National Business Archives

⁶⁸¹ "Document 588 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁶⁸² "Message on Western oil supplies and Suez Crisis from Danish General Consulate in London to Danish Foreign Ministry no. 1968" 16 August 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

⁶⁸³ "Document 603 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian."

⁶⁸⁴ "Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF" 20 November 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁶⁸⁵ Nehru quoted from Mudiam, *India and the Middle East*, 54.

⁶⁸⁶ Mohan, "India, Pakistan, Suez and The Commonwealth."

Within a week, McCloy, Wheeler (and John Connor, his World Bank assistant) and Katzin had subsequently found Hammarskjold an American engineering company that could dispatch a team of engineers to the Suez Canal.⁶⁸⁷ The company, the Ralph M. Parsons Company, was predictably conducting business not only with the oil industry (in the form of Standard Oil and Shell) and other chemical industries, but also with the US military building air force bases and missile test sites and NATO governments through construction projects in their metropolitan territories.⁶⁸⁸ In other words, the company was a post-war version of the politically well-connected construction (and oil) corporations that had been involved in expanding the American imperial frontier in both Latin America and the Middle East before the Second World War.⁶⁸⁹ As he had promised the Eisenhower administration earlier, Hammarskjold also hired companies for a clearance fleet from the NATO members of the Netherlands and Denmark on November 26th.⁶⁹⁰ He also provided an interim permission, using here the aforementioned General Assembly's permission for him to make hasty clearance arrangements, as the contract would need to be worked out by McCloy.⁶⁹¹ At the same time London and Paris were assembling a clearance fleet of their own, Stavropoulos, the Legal Advisor to the Secretary-General, was thus dispatched to Cairo to explore the legal details of both the force and the canal clearance.

After having discussed the UN force on the meeting of the Advisory Committee on the 4th of December, Hammarskjold opened the topic of the canal clearance by putting himself in charge of it, "(...) *there is no question that all decisions on implementation are taken by the Secretary-General; that is to say, it is a pending United Nations operation.*"⁶⁹² The only point of discussion with Egypt was the freedom of use of equipment as Egypt was seeking to prevent the British and French vessels from being used, but once again the Secretary-General drove the point home,

⁶⁸⁷ "Contract November 1956 Between the United Nations and the Ralph M. Parsons Company", United Nations Suez Canal Operation, the Ralph M. Parsons Company, UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0151, UNA

⁶⁸⁸ "History/Timeline," accessed October 14, 2015, <http://www.parsons.com/about-parsons/Pages/history-timeline.aspx>.

⁶⁸⁹ M. L. Conniff, "The Canal Builders: Making America's Empire at the Panama Canal," *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas* 7, no. 2 (2010): 97–98; Edward Peter Fitzgerald, "Business Diplomacy: Walter Teagle, Jersey Standard, and the Anglo-French Pipeline Conflict in the Middle East, 1930-1931," *Business History Review* 67, no. 2 (1993): 207–45.

⁶⁹⁰ "Annex A to the Agreement relating to the clearance of the Suez Canal by and between the United Nations and L. Smit en Co.'s Internationale Sleepdienst, Rotterdam and A/S Em. Z. Svitzers Bjerignings-Enterprise, Copenhagen" 28 January 1957, United Nations Suez Canal Operation, Smit/Svitzer, UN Fields Operations Service, S-0534-0151, UNA

⁶⁹¹ "Pre-contractual permission from the Secretary-General to Smit and Svitzer" undated (but located amongst late November documents such as Parsons' contract), United Nations Suez Canal Operation, Smit/Svitzer, UN Fields Operations Service, S-0534-0151, UNA

⁶⁹² "Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF" 4 December 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

“(...) *we put it up the way we want.*”⁶⁹³ The rest of the meeting appears to have been intended to be a walkthrough of the UN Suez Clearance Organization, at the time named UN Suez Canal Operation, by Katzin. He set out by stating that the canal was blocked by 51 obstructions, two of which were bridges and the rest ships partly in the Port Said area at the mouth of the canal and the rest further south. He then noted that the British-French salvage teams had surveyed most of the obstructions and that the “(...) *first plan of operation is the same which the British-French salvage teams are following (...)*”.⁶⁹⁴ This entailed that the UN fleet, which making was on its way from Denmark and the Netherlands, would both be the same size as the British-French fleet and clear the path outlined by the British to allow 65-70% of the ships to pass through before removing the obstructions from the canal. After stating that the UNSCO would follow the British-French plan and there was an agreed option of taking over six British and French vessels, Katzin more importantly noted that it would not set up its own administration team. Appearing to be interested in avoiding that the committee took an interest in the agreement Wheeler was to negotiate with Egypt, the Secretary-General added that he thought it was “(...) *not a thing the which this Committee is likely to wish to go into in any kind of detail. It is a matter of information.*”⁶⁹⁵ Sensitive due to the making of the Panama Canal by the US by way of, the Colombian representative, Urrutia, however, asked Hammarskjold if Egypt had actually agreed to the British-French salvage operation. Hammarskjold was unclear in his response, making Urrutia repeat his question. As the Secretary-General admitted that they were working in Port Said and that the UN would take over only when it was ready, Katzin intervened, arguing that their work should not be dropped. After regaining his footing and a minor discussion with Lall, Hammarskjold ended the meeting stating, “*Gentlemen, you will certainly be called again very soon. This was just for information purposes. We have no real questions to ask you. The next time I guess there will be questions.*”⁶⁹⁶

Two days after the meeting, the Canadian UN representative not surprisingly told his American counterpart that Canada was impressed with Hammarskjold and his ability to handle the situation.⁶⁹⁷ The Canadian enthusiasm can only have grown when Hammarskjold a few days later informed the Advisory Committee that the General Assembly did not need to be privy to the canal clearance agreement with Egypt.⁶⁹⁸ With vessels at work near Port Said, the French likewise expressed content with Hammarskjold to the Eisenhower administration’s officials at the first day of the

⁶⁹³ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁷ “Document 638 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁶⁹⁸ “Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF” 8 December 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

NATO meeting in Paris.⁶⁹⁹ On the same day, the State Department ordered the Egyptian ambassador in Cairo to instruct Nasser that the US expected to Egypt to both “*Offer full cooperation in urgent clearance of Canal*” and “*Offer full cooperation in renewal of negotiations on future Canal regime*”.⁷⁰⁰ To make sure the message was received, the Secretary of State also conveyed the same meaning to Mahmud Fawzi, the Egyptian Foreign Minister, and the Egyptian Ambassador to the US in Washington on the last day of the NATO meeting.⁷⁰¹ As the British-French fleet was clearing the first obstructions near Port Said and the NATO council was convened in Paris, Wheeler began surveying the canal with his American team of corporate surveyors and divers and the first UN-chartered vessels from not only the Netherlands and Denmark as originally planned, but also from Belgium and Western Germany, two other NATO members, began arriving to Port Said.⁷⁰²

While this was taking place, however, complications arose (once again). First, the Egyptian government not surprisingly began protesting that part of the British salvage fleet was becoming part of the UN fleet when British and French forces were still occupying parts of Port Said (and UN troops from three NATO allies were either patrolling or growing in numbers). At the Advisory Committee meeting, the UN Secretary-General presented this and his botched attempt to persuade Egypt that the UN salvage teams would “(...) *need some guidance* (...)”⁷⁰³ when taking over some of the British-French vessels. He moved to state his hope for a result close to his ‘pragmatist’ approach, “(...) *for it would really be an absurdity if it were to interfere*”, again placing Egyptian sovereignty below UN authority and the Western Bloc’s oil needs.⁷⁰⁴ Moreover, the Secretary-General was faced another challenge with the preliminary costs that would make it “(...) *necessary to make extraordinary tidging-over arrangements*.”⁷⁰⁵ Two days later, another hurdle surfaced. McCloy had become aware of an agreement between the American Secretary of State and his British and French counterparts that the six British vessels the UN was incorporating were to retain their British crews, which according to the US Permanent Representative at the UN left Hammarskjöld in a grim mood.⁷⁰⁶ Additionally, the shipping companies of the main canal using countries also began to contact ‘their’ foreign ministries to have them ask around in both Washington and New York, adding more pressure on both

⁶⁹⁹ “Document 647 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁷⁰⁰ “Document 649 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” 649.

⁷⁰¹ “Document 656 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁷⁰² *Ibid.*

⁷⁰³ “Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF” 13 December 1956, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁷⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰⁶ “Document 658 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

the US and the UN to resolve the oil crisis not only via temporary alternative supply networks, but also opening the canal.⁷⁰⁷ Finally, it appeared that Egypt also withheld its permission for the UN to begin clearance operations until the Israeli government had withdrawn from the Sinai Peninsula.⁷⁰⁸

As earlier, however, most matters were resolved. This reflected mainly how the Eisenhower administration had regained an interest in the UN to rebalance its approach to the situation after having turned to NATO as most strongly manifested in the agreement to let British crews stay on board the vessels that were to be incorporated into the UN fleet without consulting the UN Secretary-General. The American Secretary of State therefore had Lodge speak to Hammarskjold about helping each other rather than risk ‘crossing wires’ on the 24th of December.⁷⁰⁹ Moreover, Cairo’s refusal to allow the beginning of the clearance operation appears to have been an Israeli construction to connect their withdrawal to the opening of the Suez Canal to Israeli vessels as far as Washington was able to learn.⁷¹⁰ With Wheeler’s help, Egypt was also persuaded to accept the incorporation of the British-French crews into the UN fleet.⁷¹¹ Additionally, Washington took upon itself to assure the finances. Indeed, the Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey intensified the already close cooperation with McCloy.⁷¹² While the administration was ready to use the Special Fund available to the President for matters deemed important to US national security either as an advance or as aid, it wanted to bring on as many other nations as soon as possible. Washington also preferred the World Bank as the fiscal agent, as it was believed it could increase confidence in the fiscal aspects of the operation, enhance the operation’s international character (in comparison to the Suez Canal User Association), lead more effective negotiations, and offer a logical avenue for transferring the compensation to the shareholders in old canal company. The State Department also wanted London, Paris and Cairo to offer assurances on the clearance, offer cooperation with the Secretary-General, and seek a new overall agreement under UN auspices. The first step, the Undersecretary of State noted to the Secretary of State, was to have Hammarskjold write a letter to all parties and potential donors. He added

⁷⁰⁷ “Telegram from the Danish Representative at the UN to the Danish Foreign Ministry” 20 December 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA and ”Message from the Director of Danish Foreign Ministry to the Director of Association of Danish Steamship Owners” 21 December 1956, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

⁷⁰⁸ “Document 665 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁷⁰⁹ Ibid.

⁷¹⁰ “Document 662 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 666 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁷¹¹ A/3719

⁷¹² “Document 664 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

not only, “*we expect to receive, informally and confidentially, a rough draft of the letter within the next few days*”,⁷¹³ but also that the Legal Advisers’ office was already working on a reply to the letter, indicative of what Washington expected from the relationship with Hammarskjold. While it is uncertain if he passed the letter by the administration first, he did send it the following day, the 25th of December. Several countries responded. For example, Ceylon, both a member of Commonwealth and the Advisory Committee, offered a contribution.⁷¹⁴ However, the largest contributors were either members of NATO, ANZUS or Commonwealth and not least canal users, and in two cases either troop contributor or troop contributor and Advisory Committee member: Norway, Denmark, Italy, West Germany, the Netherlands, Canada, Australia and the US.⁷¹⁵ The finances were necessary to sort out as costs were running up for the hiring of vessels and crew (several of which were working overtime) for the UN fleet, insurance coverage, the American surveyors (from Parsons), engineers (from International General Electric Company), and auditors (from Howell & Company), not to mention the expenses the British ignobly reclaimed for their vessels in the UN fleet.⁷¹⁶ In the end, these countries would pay 99.93% of the first loan to the UN to get the canal reopened while the rest would be covered via a 3% levy on Canal tolls over three years.⁷¹⁷

As the UN started in the canal on the following day, the 26th of December, Hammarskjold approached Lodge, the American Permanent Representative at the UN, to share, according to Lodge, his “*innermost thoughts on the long-range canal settlement, which he had not given to anybody*”.⁷¹⁸ On the one hand, he informally

⁷¹³ Ibid.

⁷¹⁴ “Letter from UN Secretary-General to Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Ceylon” 10 January 1957, Cables 2/3, Clearance, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0005, UNA

⁷¹⁵ “Letter from UN Secretary-General to Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Germany” 10 January 1957, Cables 2/3, Clearance, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0005, UNA and “Letter from UN Secretary-General to Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Sweden” 10 January 1957, Cables 2/3, Clearance, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0005, UNA

⁷¹⁶ “Letter from Howell & company to the Office of the Secretariat” 15 December 1956, Howell and Company, United Nations Suez Canal Operation, UN Field Operation Service, S-0534-0151, UNA, “Letter from Howell & company to the Office of the Secretariat” 14 January 1957, Howell and Company, United Nations Suez Canal Operation, UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0151, UNA, “Annex A to the Agreement relating to the clearance of the Suez Canal by and between the United Nations and L. Smit en Co.’s Internationale Sleepdienst and A/S Em. Z. Svitzers Bjergnings-Enterprise” 28 January 1957, United Nations Suez Canal Operation, Smit/Svitzer, UN Fields Operations Service, S-0534-0151, UNA, “Memorandum of agreement between United Nations and International Electric Company” 14 February 1957, Howell and Company, United Nations Suez Canal Operation, UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0151, UNA, “Letter from British Delegation to the UN” 30 August 1957, Middle East, Dag Hammarskjold Original Papers 1956-1959, S-0370-0025-0010, UNA

⁷¹⁷ A/3719

⁷¹⁸ “Document 666 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” 666.

requested that the US either pressure Egypt or offer aid as incentive for a long-term agreement once clearance operations were well on their way, and that he needed to learn the British-French ideas on arbitration on the other.⁷¹⁹

All at the same time, the UN fleet set in motion Wheeler's plan to have the canal open by April. The engineers from the International General Electric Company and Parsons took care of the out-of-water work on telecommunications, workshops, and lighting systems in cooperation with Egyptians. While the UN fleet also had minor Egyptian help, it more importantly incorporated British and French vessels. This entailed not only that these vessels were operated by their own crews, but also that these were accorded the same immunities and privileges as the UN crews.⁷²⁰ Blurring the already muddy lines further, Burns also provided the British and French crews with 80 Swedish and Finnish soldiers, or rather fellow 'white' soldiers, dressed in civilian clothes only marked by their blue berets.⁷²¹ Cairo accepted this, most probably due to the domestic pressure of a partially collapsed economy and growing unemployment (especially in the canal zone) and the pressure from Washington that had still not granted Egypt access to its frozen assets in the US and also halted its aid. Although Nasser did not link the clearance of the canal and Israeli withdrawal,⁷²² he unofficially linked the settlement with Israel's withdrawal to have Washington and New York put pressure on Tel Aviv. He therefore delayed the clearance with demands for shorter working hours for the Egyptian workers, causing frustration with the clearance companies managers and the crews on the private clearance vessels many of which were operating on piecework contracts.⁷²³ Washington and New York were also still under pressure due to the inability of the alternative oil supply network to provide more than 75% of Western Europe's oil needs, SCUA's lack of direct influence, and the rising freight rates.⁷²⁴ In return, the US put economic and political pressure on Egypt and offered assurances to its allies behind the curtain. Free to offer its assurances in public, the UN had every press release turn each bridge and sunk ship into epic obstacles that the Western world overcame; cast Wheeler as the saviour with

⁷¹⁹ Ibid.

⁷²⁰ A/3719

⁷²¹ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 236.

⁷²² "Document 61 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 206 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁷²³ "Memo from Meeting in Danish Steamship Owners' Association with attendance of CEO of Danish Clearance Company Svitzer" 15 February 1957, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

⁷²⁴ "SCUA Report" 19 February 1957, J. Ch. Aschgreen 1956 m. fl, 1956-1958, Korrespondance fra Rederiforeningen vedr. Suezkanalen, DNBA

a great authority;⁷²⁵ brought tales of a glorious day and night work ethic;⁷²⁶ and continuously spoke of a ‘satisfactory’ progress that was going ‘according to plan’.⁷²⁷ As the UN fleet cleared the narrow path over January, a long term settlement also became an issue of growing concern. The US thus sought to pressure Egypt (as well as Great Britain and France) towards a settlement and have the Secretary-General follow its lead.⁷²⁸ Hammarskjöld also had the Advisory Committee let the representatives of India and Norway, the two largest canal users in the committee and members of NATO on the one hand and the Commonwealth and non-aligned camp on the other, to work Egypt, Great Britain and France.⁷²⁹ Although canal was cleared opened in April, the issues of compensation, toll and UN loans took both spring and summer to be sorted out via the World Bank and a new Suez Canal Authority before the matter could be closed at the autumn session of the General Assembly, as the Egyptian government hunted the best outcome by seeking to negotiate from a position of strength.⁷³⁰

⁷²⁵ “UN Press Release EMF/71: UN Salvage Fleet Clear Major Obstacle in Suez Canal” 4 January 1957, Cables 2/3, Clearance, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0005, UNA, “UN Press Release EMF/81: UN Salvage Fleet Complete Removal of Damaged Bridge: Clearance Work Proceeding Normally, Says General Wheeler” 14 January 1957, Cables 2/3, Clearance, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0005, UNA and “UN Press Release EMF/89: General Wheeler Inspects Salvage Work Along Full Length of Canal” 23 January 1957, Cables 2/3, Clearance, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0005, UNA

⁷²⁶ “UN Press Release EMF/96: Preparatory Work Starts for Stage Two of Canal Clearance: General Wheeler Cites Efforts to ‘Beat Estimate for Completion of Stage One’” 31 January 1957, Cables 2/3, Clearance, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0005, UNA

⁷²⁷ “UN Press Release EMF/103 Preparatory Work Starts for Stage Two of Canal Clearance: General Wheeler Cites Efforts to ‘Beat Estimate for Completion of Stage One’” 6 February 1957, Cables 2/3, Clearance, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0005, UNA

⁷²⁸ “Document 34 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 36 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 93 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 206 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian.”

⁷²⁹ “Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF” 31 January 1957, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁷³⁰ “UN Press Release EMF/103 Preparatory Work Starts for Stage Two of Canal Clearance: General Wheeler Cites Efforts to ‘Beat Estimate for Completion of Stage One’” 6 February 1957, Cables 2/3, Clearance, Suez Canal, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0001-0005, UNA, “Incoming code cable from Special-Representative to Secretary-General” 1 July 1957, Status of the Company 1957, Suez Canal Co., Office of the Secretary-General, S-0378-0010-007, UNA and A/3719

Altogether, several aspects of the UN force and the public/private hybrid partnership of UNSCO and the World Bank have been overlooked. First, it is necessary to recognise that the ‘Suez Crisis’ and the hybrid UN intervention was the most visible manifestation both of how the late 19th century form of imperialism was becoming increasingly untenable and ‘counter-productive’ and consequently how Western and linked thereto Commonwealth economic interests were increasingly best maintained through the frontier of imperial multilateralism. It is also crucial to recognise that intervention preserved the frontier of imperial multilateralism in extension of the path laid out in the late 19th century and the early 20th century by the frontier of European multinational imperialism in the Mediterranean. Additionally, the intervention demonstrates how the negotiated re-incorporation in practice resulted in a non-violent but nevertheless penetrating authority in the frontier zone that would continue beyond the existence of the UNSCO. Indeed, Wheeler returned to Egypt as a World Bank consultant two years later to discuss with the new Suez Canal Authority the older plans of widening the canal to service a growing number of ships that were also growing in size, resulting in an Egyptian World Bank loan.⁷³¹ At the same time, the Eisenhower administration also came to establish what Cold War historian Roland Popp has called “‘*a working relationship*’ with Nasserite Arab nationalism”,⁷³² just as Nasser also felt compelled to accept the building of a pipeline from Suez to the Mediterranean in 1967.⁷³³ Moreover, the precedent of the World Bank’s involvement in UN interventions both during and after the Cold War has been passed over in much the same way the links between UNSCO’s re-establishment of the Suez Canal and UNEF’s role therein. Most research on the interventions both during and after the twin-operation of UNSCO and UNEF has not involved a similar maritime component and focused, consequently, only on the Israeli-Egyptian state-level relations against the backdrop of the deployment of UNEF in the Gaza Strip. The next chapter will examine these, but in a way brings places the dynamics ‘on the ground’ to the fore.

⁷³¹ Ragaei El Mallakh and Carl McGuire, “The Economics of the Suez Canal under UAR Management,” *The Middle East Journal* 14, no. 2 (1960): 125–40.

⁷³² Popp, “Accommodating to a Working Relationship,” 399.

⁷³³ El Mallakh and McGuire, “The Economics of the Suez Canal.”

Chapter 7: Re-establishing the Suez Oil Artery, Mission Creep in the Gaza Strip: Mission Creep and UN-Israeli Relations

With the onset of the canal clearing and the re-deployment of the force east-wards across the Sinai, I turn from the making and the practice of the frontier zone in Egypt proper to that part of the frontier zone encompassing the Egyptian-Israeli border and the Armistice Demarcation Line between the Gaza Strip and Israel, or thus a frontier region in more literal sense. Thus, Israel and its importance to the Western frontier of imperial multilateralism gain primacy to Great Britain and France.

Initially, I examine the deployment of the UN force into the Sinai Peninsula and eventually the Gaza Strip following the reluctant and protracted Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai Peninsula in the period from the middle of December 1956 to the end of February 1957 and lastly the Gaza Strip in early March 1957. Until mid-February, the UN leadership and the Eisenhower Administration were uncertain about what to do with the Gaza Strip once Israel withdrew. The decision to ultimately enter the Gaza Strip was connected to how, as mentioned above, Egypt linked the canal clearance with the Israeli withdrawal from both the Egyptian sovereign territory of the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip, which Egypt administrated according to the 1949 armistice. In other words, the UN leadership and the Eisenhower administration did not initially see the phase involving the Gaza Strip as the main aspect of the UN intervention. Rather, the UN involvement in the Gaza Strips followed as a condition after the initially securing the withdrawal of the British and French forces to ensure not only the clearance and re-opening of the Suez Canal and its continued operations, but also the salvaging of Western unity, here termed the frontier of imperial multilateralism.

In this section, I link documents from the American foreign policy establishment from the online series of foreign policy related documents (FRUS) with unpublished cables and reports of the UN-employed military observers of the Egyptian-Israeli Military Armistice Commission (EIMAC) that was connected to the military observer organisation UNTSO (and thus already in the Gaza Strip when the ‘Suez Crisis’ broke out) as well as published memoirs of UN soldiers. Combined, these material allow for a new, and perhaps controversial, reading of the entry of the UN force into the Gaza Strip.

Subsequently, I examine the first week of the UN force in the Gaza Strip and how the inability of the UN to (fully) internationalise the area initially led to strain in the relationship with Israel, who was already critical of the UN. Although the Gaza Strip did not become a full-fledged UN governed territory, the UN was already engaged in the ad hoc governance of the area in the form of the relief, social and educational activities of the UN Relief and Works Agency. The deployment of the UN force in the Gaza Strip may accordingly be understood as another phase in the process of the simultaneously broadening of the frontier and deepening of imperial multilateralism

in the area that had already been part of the frontier multinational imperialism as Mandate Palestine under the British. Here, I link in the records of the EIMAC observers, various departments of the UN force itself as well as a few published documents from both the UN and Israel on the one hand, the memoirs of UN soldiers and the Israeli, Palestinian, British and broader Middle East historiographies on the other.

The last two sections turn attention to the period from mid-March 1957 to June 1967 (when the UN force was withdrawn). While UNEF was never stationed in Israel, the Israeli government (and in extension thereof the Israeli settlers) would come to find the UN force useful in much the same way as the Jewish settlers had benefitted from the British mandate regime and especially its security component before the establishment of Israel. In short, I show how UNEF came to serve as a de facto extra layer of Israeli border regulation on Egyptian-controlled territory when the Israeli border forces were draining funds from a society whose political elite had to deal with a growing middle class interested in welfare rather than warfare. In these two sections I also put to use EIMAC and UNEF documents as well as existing research literature on various aspects of Israeli society, military and defence policy.

Redeploying through the Sinai Peninsula: Expanding the Frontier Zone

Although the early November resolutions passed by the General Assembly had demanded the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces, Tel Aviv had kept them in the Gaza Strip. It was obvious to Tel Aviv that the Israeli occupation of the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip were considered less important than the clearance and re-opening of the Suez Canal in New York and Washington. While neither New York nor Washington were sure what to do with the Gaza Strip, the informal consultation of the American General Lucius Clay, the aforementioned overall military governor of occupied Germany, may well have pointed to reflections of internationalising the Gaza Strip (whereas there was no doubt about the Sinai Peninsula being a part of Egyptian sovereign territory). So too did the suggestion of UN officials with the Egyptian Israeli Armistice Commission in the Gaza Strip to their superiors on November 1st to turn the Gaza Strip into a trusteeship with no Egyptian presence until the General Assembly could settle its fate.⁷³⁴ On the other hand, the head of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, the Canadian General Burns (a few days from becoming the commander of the to-be-made UN force), was informed by Secretary-General's American Executive Assistant Andrew Cordier that "*Secretary-General wishes you to be informed that if situation in Gaza should get out of hand he*

⁷³⁴ "Cable from Chairman EIMAC to Chief of Staff UNTSO" 1 November 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA

has asked the United States to act as UN agent to come into the area to administer it."⁷³⁵ As the Israeli forces began bombing Egyptian positions in the Gaza Strip, the UN officials also saw the US as the natural place to turn, having the help of a small force of US Marines evacuate most of their personal to the vessels of the Sixth Fleet that were still sailing amongst the British and French vessels.⁷³⁶ However, a clear course on the Gaza Strip did not materialise early on. It would be granted only granted minor attention until the UN force had taken over Port Said from the British-French forces on the 22nd of December and the UN fleet begun its work in the canal on the 26th of December.

In any case, the Israeli occupation of the Gaza Strip on the 2nd of November ended any speculations with a brutality that reflected Ben-Gurion and Dayan's aggressive rhetoric, terrifying many of the Palestinians living in the area's towns and the eight old British bases turned into refugee camps.⁷³⁷ The Israeli soldiers were also "(...) *unwarrantly rough (...)*",⁷³⁸ noted the American Chairman of the EIMAC in the Gaza Strip, who gathered the reports from UNRWA personnel and EIMAC observers. He also added that "(...) *a good number of people have been shot down in cold blood for no apparent reason.*"⁷³⁹ Moreover, many (...) "*key UNRWA personnel are missing from the camps and are believed to have been executed by the Israelis.*"⁷⁴⁰ In addition to violently demanding authority and preventing potential key potential Palestinian troublemakers from mobilising, the Israeli forces also installed a curfew and searched the bigger towns and the refugee camps for Egyptian and Palestinian *Fedayeen*, the paramilitary groups that had both fought in the Suez Canal guerrilla war against the British until 1954 and attacked Israeli settlements near the Gaza Strip since.⁷⁴¹ As part thereof, Israeli military units massacred hundreds of Palestinians in the refugee camps, the largest massacres killing 275 people several of whom were women and children. Hundreds of Palestinians additionally also had to be treated in hospital.⁷⁴² The attempt

⁷³⁵ "Message to COS UNTSO from Cordier" 2 November 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA

⁷³⁶ "Report on Main Developments in the Gaza Strip from 29 October to 2 November 1956" undated, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA and 'Memorandum by COS UNTSO' 2 November 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA

⁷³⁷ Ibid.

⁷³⁸ "Chairman EIMAC to Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO" 13 November 1956, Seizure of Gaza 'Land Registry' Records by the Israelis in Nov. 1956, UNCCP Related Matter, UNCCP, S-0378-0026-0005, UNA

⁷³⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁷⁴¹ "Cable from Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO to UN Secretary-General" 12 November 1956, Israeli Administration of Gaza 1956, Gaza Strip Case File, Area File, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA

⁷⁴² Nur Masalha, "The 1956–57 Occupation of the Gaza Strip: Israeli Proposals to Resettle the Palestinian Refugees," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 23, no. 1 (1996): 55–68.

of a UNRWA convoy to bring supplies to Gaza City was also dismissed.⁷⁴³ The Israeli soldiers also started to plunder. They “(...) *robbed civilians, taking watches, rings, fountain pens etc. away from the Arabs either in their homes or on the streets. Every vehicle and every bicycle has been confiscated. Private workshops and machineshops have been stripped of all mechanical tools. Many mules and horses have been taken from the stores.*”⁷⁴⁴ Israel did not re-instate the police force in Gaza until the end of the month, at which point it was incorporated into the Israeli Police that sent hundreds of officers and constables to take over the four police stations in the four main towns of the Gaza Strip.⁷⁴⁵

However, the brutality and plundering may well have been steps to annex the Gaza Strip and perhaps a part of the Sinai. As the Palestinian historian Nur Masalha has shown, Ben-Gurion and the members of his secret committee of high-ranking labour, agriculture, settlement and foreign policy officials were disappointed that ‘only’ a few thousand Palestinians had sought to escape in contrast to 1948⁷⁴⁶ and that many Palestinians believed that the massacres, some of which took place weeks after the occupation, were attempts to scare more people to flee.⁷⁴⁷ Israeli historians have also shown that the Israeli Army’s Planning Department and the Israeli Prime Minister had wanted the strategic hills in the northern part of the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula for some time.⁷⁴⁸ By 1956, these ideas converged with the Soviet termination of oil deliveries to Israel, the little known discovery of oil near the Gaza Strip (if indeed correct), and the knowledge that the Egyptian military was structured defensively and had not yet incorporated the Soviet arms from 1955.⁷⁴⁹

Tel Aviv thus challenged Washington, New York, and the UN officials in the Gaza Strip. Indeed, the Israelis not only shut down the UN observers’ means of local communications and confined them to their quarters from the 4th of November. After having declared the Gaza Strip under a military governor on the 7th of November, they also seized the Gaza land registry, listed Palestinians owning land in both the Gaza Strip and Israel and sought to expel the UN observers to Jerusalem, Israel’s politicised

⁷⁴³ “Summary of main events in Gaza Strip” undated, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA

⁷⁴⁴ “Chairman EIMAC to Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO” 13 November 1956, Seizure of Gaza ‘Land Registry’ Records by the Israelis in Nov. 1956, UNCCP Related Matter, UNCCP, S-0378-0026-0005, UNA

⁷⁴⁵ “Gaza Bulletin” from Israeli Foreign Ministry, 26 November 1956, Israeli Administration of Gaza 1956, Gaza Strip Case File, Area File, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁷⁴⁶ Correspondence between the UNTSO and UNRWA suggests that 6.500 Palestinians fled to Egypt. “Cable from UNTSO to UNRWA Beirut” 16 January 1957, Israeli Administration of Gaza 1956, Gaza Strip Case File, Area File, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁷⁴⁷ Masalha, “The 1956–57 Occupation of the Gaza Strip.”

⁷⁴⁸ Laron, ““Logic Dictates That They May Attack When They Feel They Can Win””; Laron, “The Domestic Sources of Israel’s Decision to Launch the 1956 Sinai Campaign” See also; Golani, *Israel in Search of a War*.

⁷⁴⁹ Kunz, *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis*, 1991, 166; Laron, ““Logic Dictates That They May Attack When They Feel They Can Win.””

non-capital. When that failed due to the Secretary-General directly ordering the remaining military observers to stay, the Israeli forces returned the UN radios but turned to control the movement and thus knowledge of the remaining handful of international military observers forcing them to use Israeli vehicles with Israeli military drivers.⁷⁵⁰

In Cairo, Nasser grew concerned with the reports of the Israeli atrocities his government was receiving and therefore asked Fawzi, his Foreign Minister, to speak to the UN to have the UN force move into the Gaza Strip, if to no immediate avail.⁷⁵¹ While it is uncertain if Nasser and Hammarskjold discussed the reports during the latter's visit, it is certain that it, along with the information Hammarskjold was receiving from the military observers in the Gaza Strip, was not presented to the Advisory Committee. This suggests that Hammarskjold may well have found it important, but not immediately actionable or as important as the British-French invasion and canal closure. In Washington, on the day of Hammarskjold's return and unaware of the Israeli strategic goals with obtaining the Gaza Strip, Eisenhower admitted that he failed to see why Israel wanted the area, especially as it had no sustainable water supply.⁷⁵²

Knowing that Israel could not retain the Gaza Strip without US support, Abba Eban, the Israeli Ambassador to the UN and the US, sought but failed to both justify Israel's attack and lure Washington to commit militarily to Israel.⁷⁵³ Golda Meir, the Israeli foreign minister, also sought to have Hammarskjold send a UN representative to the Gaza Strip so the annexation policies could be shown off as an improvement of social and political conditions while making Egypt appear to be turning the Palestinians into an unruly mob.⁷⁵⁴ After several Arab states brought up the rumours of the Israeli violence in the Gaza Strip at the General Assembly, Eban once again sought to gain US support for a non-Egyptian solution in the Gaza Strip, for the use of the UN force to safeguard the coming Israeli an oil pipeline from Eilat in the Gulf

⁷⁵⁰ "Cable from Acting Chief of UNTSO to UN General Secretary-General" 12 November 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, "Chairman EIMAC to Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO" 13 November 1956, Seizure of Gaza 'Land Registry' Records by the Israelis in Nov. 1956, UNCCP Related Matter, UNCCP, S-0378-0026-0005, UNA, "Cable from UN General Secretary-General Special Representative to Acting Chief of UNTSO" 27 November 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA and "Summary of main events in Gaza Strip" undated, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA

⁷⁵¹ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 220.

⁷⁵² "Document 577 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian."

⁷⁵³ "Document 591 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁷⁵⁴ "Letter from Israeli Minister of Foreign Affairs Special Representative to Secretary-General" 21 November 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA

of Aqaba, and for the security of Israel in light of the Soviet threat.⁷⁵⁵ While Eisenhower was not as interested in the votes of American Jews or sympathetic to Israel as Truman and thus dismissed the Israeli proposals, the initial idea of sanctions against Tel Aviv was also dropped, as they would have had to be enforced against London and Paris.⁷⁵⁶

Nevertheless, the hesitation and focus on the Suez Canal of both the Eisenhower administration and the UN General-Secretary and his closest advisors gave Israel leeway to pursue its plans for the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula. As Masalha has shown, the Israeli government had several ideas for the repatriation of Palestinian refugees from the Gaza Strip to Libya, the US and several Latin American countries.⁷⁵⁷ Even more indicative of its annexation plans were the Israeli military governor's eagerness to make it 'facts on the ground' to make it harder for the UN to expel Israel. This involved the appointment of new local councils of agreeable notables, the initiation of the renovation of the old railway between Haifa and the Gaza Strip, the import of Gaza citrus fruits, and, the introduction of state-signifying markers as Israeli stamps, currency and licence plates. Until the visit of the Secretary-General's Special Representative on the 27th of November, the UN observers could do little more than inform either the Secretary-General, Cordier, or UNTSO's Acting Chief of Staff of the vetting and missing people, excursions by Israeli mining and water company engineers into the Sinai Peninsula, and the interest of several Western companies in building of the Israeli pipeline.⁷⁵⁸ Upon his three day-visit, the Special Representative reported to the Secretary-General he noted there was "(...) *evidence of a masterplan for the administration of the whole Gaza Area and economic as well as political union with the State of Israel*"⁷⁵⁹ and that people therefore seemed reassured that the eyes of the international community were on the Gaza Strip. A week later, the (American) chairman of the Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Commission, learned of an Israeli plan to use the confiscated land ownership records to push people in the Gaza Strip with land in what had become Israel to sell these and migrate from the

⁷⁵⁵ "Document 627 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," 627.

⁷⁵⁶ Kunz, *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis*, 1991, 162-66.

⁷⁵⁷ Masalha, "The 1956-57 Occupation of the Gaza Strip."

⁷⁵⁸ "Cable from UN General Secretary-General Special Representative to Secretary-General" 20 November 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA and "Cable from Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO to Executive Assistant of Secretary-General" 25 November 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA, "Cable from Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO to Chairman EIMAC" 25 November 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA and "Cable from Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO to Executive Assistant of Secretary-General" 27 November 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA

⁷⁵⁹ "Cable from UN General Secretary-General Special Representative to Secretary-General" 1 December 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA

Gaza Strip, thereby seeking to pre-empt land claims contesting not only the legitimacy of the Israeli annexation of the Gaza Strip but of the state of Israel itself. He also informed his (American) UNTSO superior that it was necessary that the troops arrive before the Israeli departure as “(...) *all hell will break loose* (...)”⁷⁶⁰ if plans “(...) *called for the occupation of the Strip by UN troops* (...)”⁷⁶¹

Feeling the lack of support for the annexation plan from both Washington and New York, Tel Aviv eventually sanctioned a phased withdrawal of only 100 kilometres a month by the beginning of December, thus using the Sinai Peninsula as a means to make time to ‘create facts on the ground’ in the Gaza Strip to retain it. Ben-Gurion thus ordered the Israeli commander, Moshe Dayan, to meet with Burns, the UN Commander, to settle the details for the phased withdrawal.⁷⁶² However, while appearing to comply and also providing maps of the mine fields in the areas they were withdrawing from, the Israelis also destroyed all roads, the railway, and the telegraph line to buy time to create ‘facts on the ground’ in the Gaza Strip as well as to complicate the Egyptian return.⁷⁶³ Despite protests from the Secretary-General, the Israelis continued this practice along the three roads to the north, centre and south of the peninsula throughout the withdrawal.

As the Scandinavian contingents whom Burns had come to favour were without vehicles to leave Port Said, he used the EIMAC military observers and the Yugoslavian reconnaissance unit that had just arrived by ship to follow the Israelis eastwards.⁷⁶⁴ Due to the relations between Nasser and Tito, Burns noted, the Yugoslavian UN unit enjoyed a warm welcome from the population of the town of El-Arish in the northern part of the Sinai.⁷⁶⁵ This, however, appear to be the last time the UN Force Commander used a contingent of India or Indonesia, Egypt’s international political allies, as the ‘spearhead’ or for taking positions of strategic importance. While it may well be connected to the ‘white’ UN contingents arriving as the first, the UN commander once again refrained from putting the contingents of Nasser’s political friends on the international scene in important or populated areas, using instead the ‘white’ units. Indeed, the Indian forces that had been deployed outside Port Said were sent to El Tor, a rather insignificant port town south of the Bay of Suez while the latest arrivals were kept in Abu Sueir.⁷⁶⁶ Whether connected to its only recent arrival to Egypt with American ‘globemasters’ or not,⁷⁶⁷ the battalion of

⁷⁶⁰ “Message from Chairman EIMAC to Acting Chairman UNTSO” 10 December 1956, 1956 War, Israeli Occupation of the Gaza Strip 1/3, Office of Special Political Affairs, S-0164-0002-0006, UNA

⁷⁶¹ Ibid.

⁷⁶² “Minutes of Meeting between UNEF Commander and IDF Commander” 16 December 1956, Israel Administration of GAZA, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0004, UNA

⁷⁶³ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 243.

⁷⁶⁴ Ibid., 240–42.

⁷⁶⁵ Ibid., 244–45.

⁷⁶⁶ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 66 & 73.

⁷⁶⁷ “United States Airlift for the United Nations Emergency Force” undated, Brazil Folder, Field Operations Division, S-0530-0271, UNA

Indonesia, the other ‘brown’ friend of Egypt in the force, was also deployed to a less significant location in the southeastern part of the Sinai.⁷⁶⁸ The UN force commander also kept the Brazilian battalion in the Suez Canal Area, near UNEF HQ, although the battalion appear to have been in a similar situation with regards to vehicles as the Indonesians after arriving as part of the expansion that also included Indonesia (and Canada) partly on American ‘globemasters’ and partly on a Brazilian warship.⁷⁶⁹ However, Finnish units were sent to serve as guards for the British clearance vessels in Port Said and towards Sharm El Sheik, at the entrance of the to the Israelis strategically important Straits of Tiran. Swedish units were deployed to El Qantara, another town part of the broader Suez Canal Area. He also kept the Canadian technical units and the still amassing Canadian reconnaissance unit, approximately 1.000 troops, in the Suez Canal Area. After eventually being supplied with British and American trucks, the Danish-Norwegian unit was also ordered to trail the Israelis through an area that had seen heavy Egyptian-Israeli fighting. Several of the Danish soldiers already viewed the Egyptians with a distance if not occasional hostility close to that of the British soldiers they had met in Port Said: some of the Danes had even been estranged by leaving their posts due to a combination of having taken to its strategic importance and the bonding with the British units.⁷⁷⁰ According to published memoirs, the desert trek, however, took this further. Several indulged in necromantic practices with dead Egyptian soldiers once away from their commanders’ gaze on patrols, insulting in a very embodied way Egyptian sovereignty via the bodies of the soldiers. Some would kick the corpses. Others would pose for their friends’ camera: Playing cards across the chest of a corpse or laying in the sand holding a skull appear to have been amongst the more popular motifs. Several Danish soldiers also entertained themselves with detonating hand grenades found in Egyptian positions.⁷⁷¹

What of the Gaza Strip? Mission Creep as a Condition to re-open the Canal

Far away from the ending of the temporary ‘international (re)-colonisation’ of Port Said (and the Sinai Peninsula), the Secretary-General and the American diplomats met and agreed that it would be unwise to push the General Assembly in New York towards a broader settlement on Israel and Palestine given the tension caused by the Israeli destruction in the Sinai Peninsula. However, they did agree that it was necessary to use the General Assembly to force Israel to leave the Gaza Strip even if

⁷⁶⁸ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 73.

⁷⁶⁹ “United States Airlift for the United Nations Emergency Force” undated, Brazil Folder, Field Operations Division, S-0530-0271, UNA

⁷⁷⁰ Kristiansen, *Danske soldater i Gaza og Congo*;, 22.

⁷⁷¹ Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 7–40; Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 49–68.

it remained unsettled if the UN were to administrate the area.⁷⁷² As late December became early January and the UN force followed the Israeli forces across the Sinai Peninsula, Israeli diplomats again sought to garner support in both Washington and via the embassy in Tel Aviv for their ideas of letting Israeli security forces and police units stay in the Gaza Strip.⁷⁷³ However, neither Washington nor New York ceded much to Tel Aviv. For one, Egypt was linking the Israeli withdrawal to the clearance of the canal. Additionally, several members of the advisory committee had brought up the topic of their own interests relating to oil deliveries to Western Europe and Commonwealth trade.⁷⁷⁴ Another attempt to promote the Eilat-Haifa pipeline and a joint Israeli-UN administration and security apparatus in the Gaza Strip was thus made.⁷⁷⁵ Neither taking the Israeli bait nor enjoying the most likely outcome in the form of an Egyptian return but needing the canal open, Eisenhower began to wonder if the Gaza Strip should be turned into a UN protectorate in a phone conversation with his Secretary of State on the 12th of January.⁷⁷⁶ At this point in time, Hammarskjold appears to have been uncertain how to deal with the Gaza Strip, even if he had wanted to bring Clay on-board. Once in a stronger position after the UN force had reached the international frontier (as the still unsettled Egyptian-Israeli border was called) on the 21st of January, however, Hammarskjold mirrored Eisenhower's idea and told US diplomats that the Israelis had nothing to do in the Gaza Strip, although he conceded that some UN units should deploy to the Gulf of Aqaba to safeguard Israeli passage, and that he wanted the UN force both in the Gaza Strip and in Israel in extension of the Truce Supervision Organization framework from 1949.⁷⁷⁷ At the next day's Advisory Committee meeting, Hammarskjold also indirectly linked the administration of the Gaza Strip to the UN, stating "(...) *that the armistice agreement provides for Egyptian administration and does not leave any leeway either for Israeli*

⁷⁷² "Document 642 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 645 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 662 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian"; "Document 663 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Suez Crisis, July 26-December 31, 1956, Volume XVI - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁷⁷³ "Document 9 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁷⁷⁴ "Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF" 4 January 1957, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁷⁷⁵ "Document 23 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 30 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁷⁷⁶ "Document 19 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁷⁷⁷ "Document 32 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

administration or for United Nations administration without the consent of the controlling party".⁷⁷⁸ In other words, while Egypt was to run the Gaza Strip according to the armistice, it could be run by the UN if Egypt consented. None of the committee members spoke against this or supported the Israeli goals,⁷⁷⁹ indicating that the committee—or a majority strong enough to suggest that speaking against it was useless—found the notion of using the UN in an administrative capacity to ensure the re-opening of the canal and the protection of Commonwealth trade (as called for 3 weeks earlier) uncontroversial. Even if the British and the French forces had been withdrawn weeks earlier and Israel thus stood alone, Hammarskjold was unable to pressure Israel further alone. Consequently, he warned the US that Egypt may delay the canal clearance unless every type of pressure was put on Israel, indirectly asking the Eisenhower administration to do so, as well as suggesting that some of the committee members should propose a resolution that the US could back.⁷⁸⁰ Standing before the General Assembly the next day, Hammarskjold therefore not only rejected the Israeli plan for the Gaza Strip, but also for the first time in public hinted that a UN administration of the Gaza Strip might be necessary by noting that any change in the armistice such as an UN administration would require an agreement with Egypt and that the UN force should be stationed on both sides of the Armistice Demarcation Line (ADL). After the GA meeting, he met with US diplomats as well as Pearson to work out the resolution details.⁷⁸¹ Whilst speaking with the Eisenhower administration on how the two issues were in fact connected, the Secretary-General, in other words, both kept the canal clearance and the Gaza Strip separate in public and avoided the mention of turning the Gaza Strip into a trusteeship (as suggested by some of the American UN observers). Taking over the area in some UN administered form seemed inevitable if the canal were to open again and thus reopen the oil supply to Western Europe.

While the UN force began to amass a few kilometres west of Rafah, one of the larger towns in the Gaza Strip, from the end of January, the UN military observers inside the Gaza Strip also began coordinating with the UN Relief and Works Agency under the American Henry Labouisse, who Hammarskjold had recruited from the American-led Economic Cooperation Administration and the Mutual Security Administration to take over the UNRWA in 1954, about which UNRWA sites needed UN guards.⁷⁸² The remaining military observers, who were from New Zealand and

⁷⁷⁸ "Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF" 24 January 1957, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁷⁷⁹ "Verbatim Minutes of meeting of the Advisory Committee of UNEF" 24 January 1957, Advisory Committee Verbatim Records, Microfilm of Andrew Cordier Papers, United Nations Commissions, Committees, Conference Files, S-0848-0001-0001, UNA

⁷⁸⁰ "Document 37 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁷⁸¹ "Document 39 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁷⁸² "Cable from Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO to Acting Chairman EIMAC" 25 January 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

the US, also began analysing how UN could occupy the Gaza Strip as a trusteeship or something else. Tapping into the lesser violent parts of the European and American colonial and imperial military cultures and ways of monitoring and regulating people, they quickly and with eagerness offered (very) concrete thoughts on which sites were suitable for a UN HQ, contingent headquarters, camps and observation posts;⁷⁸³ how to garner the support of the local notables and other “(...) *proper people* (...)” as their backing would mean cooperation rather than conflict;⁷⁸⁴ how to “(...) *control the population* (...)” via outposts, traffic control points, patrols, observation posts and loudspeakers to relay UN messages;⁷⁸⁵ how to man, patrol and police the Armistice Demarcation Line (ADL) night and day;⁷⁸⁶ which buildings of the former British mandate power and buildings that had housed Australian and other British imperial forces during the First World War to use, and, not least, where to place certain contingents such as the Indian due to the “(...) *Hindu Moslem traditional rivalry* (...)”.⁷⁸⁷ They also sent lists of the Palestinians and Egyptians that had worked in the civilian Egyptian administration, effectively providing the UN with what can only be seen as both military and political intelligence.⁷⁸⁸

All at the same time, hundreds of refugees began leaving the Gaza Strip for El Arish, not prevented from doing so by the Israelis that were presumably keen to see them leave. However, once the fleeing Palestinians realised that there was no water, rations and tents they turned back to the Gaza Strip. Not sure what to do or keen to avoid a (very) public human disaster (also) of their own making, the Israeli forces allowed them to re-enter the Gaza Strip. Passing closely by the soldiers of the Danish, Norwegian, Swedish and Colombian UN contingents to be searched for weapons, the Palestinians exposed to the UN soldiers to the misery of the refugee life.⁷⁸⁹ According to a Swedish officer, several of the soldiers in the Swedish units, who had met and come to respect Bedouins for their hard lives in their crossing of the Sinai, became sympathetic towards these people, if still unfamiliar with more details of both their

⁷⁸³ “Letter from UNEF Commander and Chief of Staff UNTSO to Acting Chairman EIMAC” 30 January 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁷⁸⁴ “Memorandum from Chairman EIMAC to UNSG Executive Assistant (Cordier)” 31 January 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁷⁸⁵ “Letter from Acting Chairman EIMAC to UNEF Commander and Chief of Staff UNTSO” 23 January 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁷⁸⁶ “Scheme to man, patrol and police the D/L in the Gaza Strip and the I/F between Egypt-Israel and Egypt-Gaza” undated, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁷⁸⁷ “Cable from Acting Chairman EIMAC to Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO”, 3 February 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁷⁸⁸ “Letter from Acting Chairman EIMAC to UNEF Commander and Chief of Staff UNTSO” 23 January 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁷⁸⁹ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 257–58.

histories and those of the people in the Gaza Strip.⁷⁹⁰ Nevertheless, Swedish units patrolling near the International Frontier in the vicinity of Israeli units were fired upon by what was assumed to be the paramilitary Fedayeen units.⁷⁹¹ Similarly, Danish soldiers managed to get into heated arguments with Palestinian students caught there, most probably on account of their still somewhat banal pro-Israeli/Orientalist views, mounting cynicism and the combination of the waiting time and the town's atmosphere that was characterised by the lack of a villa neighbourhood and a broad non-Egyptian presence. In contrast but perhaps less surprising, they connected better with unarmed Egyptian soldiers and those from whom they bought services such as café-owners and market vendors. A Norwegian infantry company's shooting night-time shooting exercise near the town also led to a massive exodus of Egyptian that feared the Israeli army had come back.⁷⁹²

In Washington (and Tel Aviv), the Eisenhower administration took up Hammarskjöld on his request to lean on Ben-Gurion's government. Although Washington eventually cancelled only the aid for the fiscal year of 1957, leaving ongoing projects, aid in transit, and Israeli economic assets in the US untouched (in contrast to the Egyptian assets), it let the Israeli government realise not only that it would only survive with US support (as the Soviet Union saw other countries as regional assets) and that its insistence on retaining some element of military or civilian control in the Gaza Strip was untenable.⁷⁹³ Over February, the Secretary-General and the Eisenhower administration continued to coordinate the Israeli withdrawal, exchanging informal memos and holding, by then 'standard', meetings involving only US diplomats, Hammarskjöld, Bunche and Cordier at the UN building.⁷⁹⁴ By the middle of the month, Hammarskjöld began to discuss openly his aim of internationalising the Gaza Strip with the American diplomats after having come to view it as necessary and turned it over with the Egyptian Foreign Minister who did not object as long as the UN administration kept "(...) *an Egyptian face on it*."⁷⁹⁵ Having deliberated with Henry Labouisse who had at least two years of experience with the Gaza Strip as the head of the UNRWA, Hammarskjöld was settling for the idea of an Egyptian Military Governor alongside a UN High Commissioner, thus opting for a structure that tapped into British imperial configurations of sovereignty, space, and governance. Well aware that the issues at hand—such as financial and

⁷⁹⁰ Nils Sköld, *I fredens tjänst: Sveriges medverkan i Förenta nationernas fredsbevarande styrka i Mellanöstern 1956-67* ([Stockholm]: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990), 78.

⁷⁹¹ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 78.

⁷⁹² *Ibid.*, 74–76; Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 44–49.

⁷⁹³ Kunz, *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis*, 1991, 162–77.

⁷⁹⁴ "Document 76 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 85 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.; "Document 86 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁷⁹⁵ "Document 90 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

administrative issues that included questions of credits, assets, sales of citrus fruits, education and health—were normally the realms of sovereign states, Hammarskjöld did not want a full trusteeship, testimony to Hammarskjöld’s ability to evade the pitfalls of international politics. He also informed Lodge that he wanted Lucius Clay to make the plans for the UN administration of Gaza, given his experience from governing occupied Germany. The post, much like that of McCloy, he argued that it was not to be a long term field job, but a short-term position with Secretariat assistance. This was due to, as Lodge telegraphed the Department of State, the fact that “(...) *an American operation in field would not be feasible*”.⁷⁹⁶ Telling of Hammarskjöld’s equally acute skill of getting things moving with as little friction as possible by co-opting the Commonwealth (and former colonies), he wanted the Indian General Kodandera Thimayya to serve as High Commissioner. As Clay, Thimayya was also an emerging international heavyweight with roots in a Western imperial project. He had not only served with British Indian Army in Burma during the Second World War and the British Commonwealth Occupation Force in Japan afterwards, he had also handled ‘unruly’ Chinese and North Korean prisoners of war for the UN in Korea. As an ‘international celebrity’ and ‘soldier-statesman’, he was liked by the American, British and Indian foreign policy and military establishments as well as the medias and would thus represent a scoop for Hammarskjöld, Nehru and Nasser.⁷⁹⁷ By the time Hammarskjöld wanted him in the Gaza Strip, Thimayya had just left his command in the Indian Pune military region, where he dispensed with a small Pakistani incursion force without letting the conflict escalate to war, for a post in the east, where he also quickly managed to peacefully stand down a local rebellion that also had roots in the British Empire’s politics and had received arms from both Pakistan and several Communist parties in the region.⁷⁹⁸ He was thus well suited for a complex post-imperial conflict-strife area with multiple armed and frustrated factions. Keenly aware of the need to get the support of the Arab states as well, the Eisenhower administration was having both informal talks with Arab diplomats at the UN in New York and formal group meetings with Arab Ambassadors at the State Department in Washington.⁷⁹⁹ On the edge of the Gaza Strip, Burns also began to think of the administrative functions the UN was to take over. He was only informed that it would be a matter of some weeks necessary to negotiate a more permanent arrangement with Egypt.⁸⁰⁰

Over the month of February, the Eisenhower administration kept the pressure on Israel, having the State Department legal experts do legal battle against their Israeli

⁷⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁹⁷ Chandra B Khanduri and Centre for Armed Forces Historical Research, *Thimayya: An Amazing Life* (New Delhi: Knowledge World, 2006), 181–85.

⁷⁹⁸ Ibid., 189–99.

⁷⁹⁹ “Document 120 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.; “Document 177 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d.

⁸⁰⁰ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 257.

counterparts. In the last week of February, Israel eventually softened its stand on in the Gaza Strip, although it refused to let the UN force deploy on the Israeli side of the ADL, arguing that it had nothing to do on Israel sovereign soil. Both Washington and Hammarskjöld had at this point accepted that it was necessary to safeguard Israel's right to use both the Suez Canal, which Egypt had prevented on and off since 1948, and the Gulf of Aqaba, and that the UN was needed to do so. However, they needed someone to put that, as well as the Israeli right to intervene if the UN arrangement were to break down, into a UN resolution. The French government fit the bill and did so when 'asked' by the Eisenhower administration. In doing so, France returned to the fold of the Western alliance.⁸⁰¹ On the 1st of March, the US embassy in Tel Aviv received a phone call from the Israeli Foreign Ministry declaring that Ben-Gurion had decided to withdraw and instructed Moshe Dayan, the Commander of the IDF, to meet the UN Commander who was waiting outside Gaza Strip with the UN force composed of 6.000 soldiers primarily from NATO and Commonwealth member states.⁸⁰² On the 4th of March, Burns cabled Cordier, who, rather instantly it seems, cabled the US State Department that the Israeli forces and civilian administrators would be out of Gaza by the 4th in the afternoon.⁸⁰³

Riots and Redeployment in the Frontier Zone: A Failed Internationalisation?

The UN Force Commander had been unsure what exactly his response was to be if the Egyptians demanded that their administrative officials and police be allowed to return (as they had done in El Tor and El Arish again after the UN had let them back into Port Said). In contrast, both the Eisenhower Administration and the Secretary-General with his higher echelon of mainly American UN officials had both acknowledged and accepted that it was necessary that the UN provided "(...) a *UN administration in Gaza, not of Gaza* (...)"⁸⁰⁴ in the form of a "(...) '*marriage*' of *UNEF and UNRWA* (...)"⁸⁰⁵ within the Armistice framework so as to allow Egyptian consent. However, Burns felt under-informed. In the days prior to the notification by the Israeli forces, he tellingly not only requested the UNRWA to send experts on

⁸⁰¹ For more on the French role, see Mordechai Gazit, "The 1956 Sinai Campaign: David Ben-Gurion's Policy on Gaza, the Armistice Agreement and French Mediation," *Israel Affairs* 6, no. 3-4 (2000): 43-67.

⁸⁰² "Document 189 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁸⁰³ "Document 191 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁸⁰⁴ "Document 194 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian," n.d.

⁸⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

judicial and police matters, public health, and finance,⁸⁰⁶ but also sought and failed to obtain American and British manuals on military government of occupied enemy territories from the end of the Second World War, a fact of which he did not find problematic and therefore noted in his memoirs.⁸⁰⁷ Making policy ‘on-the-go’ having focused on the Suez Canal rather than the Gaza Strip, Hammarskjold and the Eisenhower administration agreed that Israel had to accept the deployment of the UN force on the Israeli side the of ADL. This idea would become impossible to realise. Moreover, as the Israelis began to prepare their departure (despite having Israeli tourists visiting, presumably to link the land to Israel mentally)⁸⁰⁸ the Palestinians began to provoke and in a few cases attack the Israeli forces with homemade bombs, hand grenades, and small arms in public places, to which the Israeli forces responded with more than 200 arrests just before the withdrawal.⁸⁰⁹ However, much to the frustration of Hammarskjold and the Eisenhower administration, Israel also caused trouble in the sphere of finances. Tel Aviv was not only contesting Burns’ instructions to exchange Israeli pounds for Egyptian ones, but also refusing to hand over the money the Israeli forces had seized in the Arab Bank of Gaza, in other words, a large part of the holdings of the Palestinian locals and refugees.⁸¹⁰ Complicating matters for the UN force Commander further, they came to disagree on how long the UN was to stay in the Gaza Strip. The Secretary-General foresaw only a two-month operation in the Gaza Strip due to the lack of Israeli willingness to let forces deploy to the Israeli side of the ADL whereas the Eisenhower administration favoured a longer-term UN presence.⁸¹¹ Southwest of Rafah on the edge of the Gaza Strip, Burns also added to the confusion of what was to happen politically. Having been told to expect a few weeks, he spoke merely of an un-defined ‘period’ when he requested a meeting with

⁸⁰⁶ Letter from UNEF Commander to UNRWA” 4 March 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁸⁰⁷ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 256–57.

⁸⁰⁸ “Cable from Chairman EIMAC to Acting Chief of Staff” UNTSO 2 March 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁸⁰⁹ “Cable from Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO to UNSG Executive Assistant (Cordier)” 3 March 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA, “Cable from Chairman EIMAC to Acting Chief of Staff” UNTSO 4 March 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA, “Cable from Chairman EIMAC to Acting Chief of Staff” UNTSO 6 March 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁸¹⁰ “Document 197 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,” n.d. and “Letter from Manager of the Arab Bank to the Chairman EIMAC and the Commander of the Israeli Forces in the Gaza Strip” 3 March 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA.

⁸¹¹ “Document 194 - Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1957, Volume XVII - Historical Documents - Office of the Historian.”

the UNRWA leadership in Beirut to discuss further how to deal with the envisaged responsibility of the civil administration of the Gaza Strip.⁸¹² Whether or not due to the input of his military observers that had fed him both political and military intelligence on the Gaza Strip since the end of January, Burns was more certain of what to do in the military sphere. While he does not offer any things in his memoirs, those of a Danish soldier do in noting how the UN force was to occupy the Gaza Strip. Once again, the battalions of Yugoslavia and India, the political friends of Egypt, were to operate in unpopulated areas along the International Frontier or small villages such as Deir El Ballah. Again being placed somewhere in the middle, the Brazilian and Columbian battalions were to take more important areas around the medium-sized town of Khan Yunis. Finally, the battalion of the two Scandinavian NATO-members, some of whom at this point had come to adopt the Orientalist view of the ‘Arabs’ as primitive, lazy and untrustworthy (as admitted by one of the soldiers writing a memoir), took the most important and populated areas around Gaza City to the north while the Canadian technical units remained in the also relatively large town of Rafah to the South along with the Swedish Battalion, once again promoting the ambiguity of a ‘white’ colour line.⁸¹³

Regardless of the lack of complete agreement (and accordingly a single overall plan), it became time for UNEF to take over the control of the Gaza Strip. It had been agreed that this was to take place on the evening and night between the 6th and 7th of March under the Israeli curfew to avoid conflicts. Consequently, the UN observers could report how the Israelis extended their tank patrols in Gaza City just as the US Sixth Fleet moved closer to the beaches, most probably in case US support of UNEF began entering the Gaza Strip a few hours before midnight with a massive presence of journalists was needed.⁸¹⁴ Having no maps of the Gaza Strip let alone a larger plan beyond moving into the Gaza Strip, the Danish commander of the joint Danish-Norwegian battalion, who once again had been put at the front with his ‘white’ battalion, felt his force was literally scrambling in the dark when the initial Israeli police officers left them on their own to search for the buildings Burns considered necessary to control the Gaza Strip such as those of the UNRWA, the city halls, the Gaza train station, the police stations and the telegraph station. Moreover, the Israeli forces were not very helpful until Dayan showed up in person, presumably to avoid further loss of goodwill in Washington and New York. By the morning of the 7th of March, the Israeli forces had withdrawn and the UN forces had begun to move towards Sharm El Sheik and into all the towns of the Gaza Strip (and thus expand the frontier

⁸¹² ”Cable from UNEF Commander to UNRWA Beirut” 6 March 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁸¹³ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 83–84.

⁸¹⁴ “Cable from Chairman EIMAC to Acting Chief of Staff” UNTSO 6 March 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA and *ibid.*, 86.

zone), using only what little knowledge the Israeli forces had passed on during the night-time deployment.⁸¹⁵

As the UN force moved into the different parts of the Gaza Strip, the UN soldiers were forced to process another Middle Eastern location both different and similar from the others they had seen. Some noticed the small villages and others the villa neighbourhoods in the larger towns, others the refugee camps. However, some of the Danish soldiers were puzzled with the anger they had previously met from Palestinians students from the Gaza Strip in El Arish as the aid provided by the UNRWA granted the Palestinian refugees with what the Danes saw as decent housing, better clothes and free schooling. Rather than finding sympathy for the Palestinian refugees, they appear to initially have taken a hostile view. This sense of confusion was not helped insofar as a few Palestinians fired some shots and threw some hand grenades at some UNRWA depot buildings to see if they would be able to get materials and foodstuffs for themselves.⁸¹⁶ More important for the relations between the people of the Gaza Strip, whether refugees or original residents, and the UN Force, however, the UN units distributed an Arab translation of a proclamation from Burns that had been approved from UN HQ in New York. Firm and unforthcoming, it declared to the Palestinians that not only that “(...) *maintaining quiet* (...)” and the “(...) *responsibility for civil affairs in the Gaza Strip* (...)” was the mandate of the UN force, but also that they should “(...) *remain quiet* (...)”, “(...) *remain law-abiding and orderly* (...)”, and “(...) *not carry arms or explosives* (...)”.⁸¹⁷ Additionally, the declaration also ordered the Palestinians to refer their needs to their camp leaders, mayors, and village elders, the Mukhtars, rather than the UN. Perhaps telling of the views in the US, the military takeover, argued Hamilton Fish Armstrong, the Washington-insider and editor of the American Foreign Affairs, who was to be found amongst the internationals waiting at the edge of the Gaza Strip, was “(...) *admirably executed* (...)”.⁸¹⁸

However, the UN’s attempt to simultaneously fully internationalise the Gaza Strip would prove impossible. Unsurprisingly, the lack of a plan of how to more specifically take over the responsibility of civil affairs in the Gaza Strip (besides having Israel withdraw) would mark the first few days. With Ralph Bunche scheduled to arrive to discuss the further process with the Egyptian government, the UN force had arrived with only a minor ‘entourage’ of UNRWA experts and UN technical assistance experts, the latter from US sponsored projects in Egypt and no formal guidelines to go by.⁸¹⁹ The UN force was accordingly from the outset insufficiently equipped for a civilian administration and thus forced to install a number of military governors in the different towns. These governors were ordered to ‘normalise’ the situation in part by promoting the formation of new councils with other political representatives than those endorsed by the Israeli occupation regime and sharing authority for security with

⁸¹⁵ Engholm, *Fremmedlegionær og dansk oberst*, 223–28.

⁸¹⁶ Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 52–53.

⁸¹⁷ UN proclamation quoted from fulltext in E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 261.

⁸¹⁸ Armstrong, “The U. N. Experience in Gaza,” 614.

⁸¹⁹ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 260.

the police.⁸²⁰ As part of this process, the UN Force Commander made the police station in Gaza City the headquarters of the UN force. Tellingly, the police station was heavily fortified, strategically located and mostly self-contained and had small windows and gun slits, as it had been built as one of the 60 forts the British mandate regime had built all over Palestine following the Palestinian Revolt from 1936 to 1939.⁸²¹ The prisoners in the prison attached to the police station rioted the same night, as the UN had failed to initiate the scheduled release of approximately 300 of the nearly 350 prisoners as these were believed to be political prisoners from the Israeli occupation. The UNEF reacted the only way it knew how to. Having been designated to several locations in Gaza City including the police station/prison by the UN Commander, the Danish soldiers took centre-stage once again. On the first day the UN ruled the Gaza Strip, used warning shots, tear gas and batons. The prisoners most probably thought that the UN soldiers had merely picked up where the Israeli soldiers left and that they were to remain locked up, given that the combined police station and prison had been the strongest symbol of both the British presence in the area from 1920 to 1948 and the Israeli presence from November 1956 to March 1957.⁸²²

The UN force fared little better outside the prison/police station/UNEF HQ. As the Danish Military Governor recalls, the work of the new councils instantly came to a halt, allegedly since at least one Mayor had taken to Egypt for instructions. Due to the words of his informants, who may have exaggerated to ensure payment, the UNEF governor dismissed any other explanation than Egyptian influence.⁸²³ The Canadian UN Force Commander, his Swedish Chief of Staff and the Danish Battalion Commander, another Swedish UN officer and the American foreign policy pundit Armstrong all, whether true or not, suggest that Egypt sent in subversive agents with the sole aim of countering the return of the Gaza Strip to Egyptian control.⁸²⁴ Predictably, the advisor to the Egyptian President, Muhammad Heikal, made no mention of Egyptian influence.⁸²⁵ Regardless of Egyptian influence or not, people gathered to demonstrate the morning after the prison riot. However, rather than amassing in front of the former British police station/priso, people gathered in front of one of the other Danish quarters, a former Palestinian school. Accordingly, the soldiers removed most of the furniture from the classrooms to make a barricade in the courtyard. By midday, the soldiers of the infantry company holding the school felt that the crowd soon counted more than a thousand people. The demonstration, however, passed without only a few minor shootings in joy and one incident of a

⁸²⁰ Engholm, *Fremmedlegionær og dansk oberst*, 228–31.

⁸²¹ Gad Kroizer, “From Dowbiggin to Tegart: Revolutionary Change in the Colonial Police in Palestine during the 1930s,” *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 32, no. 4 (2004): 115–33.

⁸²² E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 231; Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 89; Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 54; Sköld, *I fredens tjänst*, 81.

⁸²³ Engholm, *Fremmedlegionær og dansk oberst*, 231.

⁸²⁴ Armstrong, “The U. N. Experience in Gaza”; E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 261; Engholm, *Fremmedlegionær og dansk oberst*, 232.

⁸²⁵ Heikal, *Cutting the Lion’s Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*, 221.

Danish soldier nearly being robbed of his rifle. Expecting the worst, the Danish infantry companies nevertheless fortified their sites with sandbag positions and barbed wire and, perhaps more indicatively of how they viewed the situation and their own role, placed heavy machineguns on the roof of the school and adopted a posture of combat readiness, meaning that all soldiers walked around with all personal weapons, all of their ammunition as well as additional tear gas grenades. When one of these locations was fired upon both during the night and the following day, the 8th of March, the Danish military governor of Gaza City consequently outlawed weapons held without permit, again drawing attention to the Danish-Norwegian battalion. During the day, another demonstration took place. While it didn't escalate into violent encounters, the day would see tension escalate. At the demonstration, several young Palestinians taunted the (also mostly young) Danish soldiers by pressing their chests into the rifle barrels of the Danes. Additionally, Yugoslavian soldiers cheered the Egyptian-Yugoslavian leaders with the demonstrators, which prompted the UN Force Commander to redeploy the unit to El Arish, effectively keeping predominantly pro-Western 'white' units to control the strategic and heavily populated areas of the Gaza Strip. In the evening, paramilitaries also fired upon the Coptic neighbourhood in Gaza City, most probably a response to actual or imagined collaboration with the Israelis. As an even stronger signal to the UN, the villa of UN Force Commander was also fired upon. Neither group of shooters were apprehended, leaving the UN force with little actual evidence.⁸²⁶ While Egypt may well have had political operatives or *Fedayeen* units acting on orders, it seems far more likely that the Egyptian presence at this point was aimed at monitoring the situation. Instigating incidents that could have caused a broader Palestinian revolt against the joint UNEF and UNRWA rule of the Gaza Strip would most probably have resulted in a second Israeli occupation by the forces that at least the Danish soldiers heard rumours of being amassed (or rather not dispersed).⁸²⁷ At this point, Egypt was not ready for another war with Israel. Not surprisingly, the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee came to agree that the operation best not discussed in the General Assembly as it was “(...) *on thin ice* (...)”⁸²⁸ as Hammarskjold put it, since UNEF could be seen as having started to operate beyond what had been authorised.

The morning, the Swedish Chief of Staff banned both demonstrations in any form and all larger meetings.⁸²⁹ This, however did not reduce tension. If the memoirs of a Danish soldiers is anything to go by, the situation grew more futile. A demonstration that the Danish Military Governor approved as an exemption soon escalated out of control. Consequently, the Danish units were ordered to put on helmets, use tear gas grenades, and fire warning shots, before finally attaching bayonets. After a Palestinian was hit by (and eventually died from) a ricocheting

⁸²⁶ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 91; Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 58–59.

⁸²⁷ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 89.

⁸²⁸ Minutes of Advisory Committee on 7 March 1957, Notes on early meetings 1956-1959, UNEF Advisory Committee, UNEF Advisory Committee, Middle East, Urquhart, S-1078-0060-0001, UNA

⁸²⁹ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 261.

warning shot, others began to throw stones and the Danes arresting people, using their boots, elbows, rifle barrels and even rifle butts. Even the UN company officers had their pistols drawn. Eventually, the Danish Company Commander had a platoon advance in a line, combining bayonets thrusts and waves of warning shots over the crowd. At this point, even the soldiers on kitchen duty and off duty joined the ranks in helmets and kitchen clothes or underwear. A steel-helmeted Norwegian platoon also joined in while a Brazilian battalion was also called on. As the riot was put down, UN guards were placed all over the area to show that the UN remained in control.⁸³⁰ Whether or not a form of path dependency from the British and Israeli eras clashing with the Egyptian attempt of re-asserting its influence, the opening of a relationship between a new regime-in-the-making and its new host population was not ideal. Once again, the Gaza Strip inhabitants, original residents and refugees alike—whom had all already been severely tested by the three months of Israeli occupation with massacres, camp screenings and mass arrests—experienced what appeared to be another mainly ‘white’ power take over where the Israelis had left and begin to regulate how they could act and organise themselves publicly. The reactions of the local population and Egypt were as predictable as they were defining of the situation.

Realising that a Palestinian revolt in the Gaza Strip could potentially cause another war with Israel at this point, the Egyptian president had little choice but to send back an Egyptian Administrative Governor and disregard Bunche who, upon arriving in the afternoon on the day of the riot, insisted the UN keep control. Bunche accepted.⁸³¹ As the Governor had an administrative role with undefined duties, Hammarskjold saw Egypt leaving a margin for negotiation with the UN. Yet, as Hammarskjold recognised, the UN could not challenge the Armistice Agreement, as Egypt was entitled to administrate the area as it saw fit.⁸³² However, he maintained that the force had and was still within the limits of international law.⁸³³ Nasser did, however, agree to Bunche’s demands that neither Fedayeen nor Egyptian military units would operate in Gaza Strip before the Egyptian Governor-General arrived on the 14th of March, marking after only a week of UN rule the end to any UN interim rule and all Israeli hopes for a ‘non-Egyptian’ solution.⁸³⁴

⁸³⁰ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 91–94.

⁸³¹ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 267.

⁸³² Minutes of Advisory Committee on 11 March 1957, Notes on early meetings 1956-1959, UNEF Advisory Committee, UNEF Advisory Committee, Middle East, Urquhart, S-1078-0060-0001, UNA

⁸³³ Minutes of Advisory Committee on 12 March 1957, Notes on early meetings 1956-1959, UNEF Advisory Committee, UNEF Advisory Committee, Middle East, Urquhart, S-1078-0060-0001, UNA

⁸³⁴ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 267.

Becoming a Frontier-Regime: ‘Connecting Dots across Time and Space at the ADL

In its first week in the Gaza Strip, UNEF had failed to convince both the Egyptian government and the Palestinians that it would act as ‘welcome visitors rather than rulers’ as banners had read the first day in the Gaza Strip.⁸³⁵ By the time the Egyptian Governor arrived, the local media in the Gaza Strip was, not surprisingly, reporting that the UN’s abuse of power had led Nasser to demand that the force be withdrawn, whether this was so or not. Residents also paraded with that message at the Governor’s arrival until he told the crowd that the UN force was to be considered a friendly force in full cooperation with the Egyptian administration. Additionally, the Yugoslavian battalion refused to serve in the Gaza Strip without the Egyptian government renewing its permission. In agreement with UN HQ in New York, the UN Force Commander accordingly sent the unit back to El Arish.⁸³⁶ From un-specified sources, Burns also learnt that the Egyptian President may not have agreed to the part of the agreement with the UN that laid out the UN’s functions in the Gaza Strip were to be exclusive in the first instance and that this had not reached the Secretary-General.⁸³⁷ This may well have been the case and thus supportive of the claims of these memoirs of UNEF officers and soldiers that the first demonstrations had felt rigged and been well supplied with Egyptian flags and posters of Nasser. However, it should also be clear that the Gaza Strip Palestinians, at least in part, marked their discontent with the actions of UNEF that probably appeared to them as similar to the British mandate regime and partly also the Israeli regime. Had the majority of the Palestinians wanted a UN administration, which Burns claims at least a little minority wanted,⁸³⁸ Egypt would also have faced a revolt at some point. The Palestinians, especially the refugees, had been exposed to a genocide that had led to expulsion from their villages, an 8-year long state of dislocation, widespread trauma combined with overcrowding and poverty, and the humiliation of depending on external support systems for survival and education. While many were not yet organised in ways that could support a sustained political campaign or revolt, the potential was there. Despite being mostly poor dependents individually, the combined mass of the approximately 300.000 Palestinians of the Gaza Strip was a political force in its own right to be reckoned with.

With the Suez Canal clearance at stake, the Secretary-General had to go to Egypt. Before he left for Cairo to meet with the Egyptian President, he therefore held a meeting with the Advisory Committee. For once disagreeing with the Canadian representative at the meeting—which the Brazilian member called a “(...) *special*

⁸³⁵ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 96–97.

⁸³⁶ *Ibid.*, 95.

⁸³⁷ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 269–70.

⁸³⁸ *Ibid.*, 270.

*session of disagreements (...)*⁸³⁹—Hammarskjöld explained that he was keen to get the force to the ADL, away from the task of internal security. To the amazement of the Committee (and not hitherto noted in any research), the Secretary-General nevertheless also made it clear that he saw the UN entitled to take enforcement action through the Security Council and all means available in Chapter 7 of the UN Charter such as placing additional military forces in the Gaza Strip, if Egypt continued to sanction raids and incursions into Israel. He, however, also recognised they had yet to deal with issues such as the question of whether UNEF would be able to use force in a military or police capacity and how UNEF was to deal with the security of the UNRWA staff, which the head of the UNRWA, the American Labouisse, had noted UNEF should be concerned with.⁸⁴⁰

In the Gaza Strip, the UN Commander took to reorganising the force in the days following the Egyptian Governors' arrival. He had already sent the Yugoslavian battalion back to Egypt to have them patrol the still not yet fully settled Egyptian-Israeli border, the International Frontier, instead of the Swedish battalion. He also redeployed the Danish infantry companies from downtown Gaza City to the edges of the city and Beit Hanun further to the north, probably realising that not doing so would overstay their welcome and potentially lead to new riots. As the Egyptian controlled police began to take over the maintenance of order and three quarters of the force had been designated for guarding 'vulnerable points' (such as police stations, water pumping installations and power stations) within the Gaza Strip, additional forces were also redeployed to the edge of the Gaza Strip.⁸⁴¹

Here, two things are worth noting. First, Burns still managed to ensure support from both New York and Cairo to bring in the Canadian reconnaissance squadron (whose deployment he had previously negotiated only with Canadian diplomatic personnel in Cairo). This was no small feat considering what had already happened in the Gaza Strip.⁸⁴² Second, the return of the Egyptian governor and Egyptian-controlled police and the redeployment of the force did not fundamentally change the primary task of policing the Armistice Demarcation Line. There had been a focus on the UN running the Gaza Strip for an interim phase earlier: what changed was merely a cancelation of the interim UN administration and an earlier turn to cooperation with the Egyptian-controlled police than imagined. In late January, for example, Burns' ADL policing plans had revolved around four infantry battalion areas near the towns of Gaza, Khan Yunis, Rafah and Deir El Ballah.⁸⁴³ In February (and thus still before

⁸³⁹ Minutes of Advisory Committee on 16 March 1957, Notes on early meetings 1956-1959, UNEF Advisory Committee, UNEF Advisory Committee, Middle East, Urquhart, S-1078-0060-0001, UNA

⁸⁴⁰ Minutes of Advisory Committee on 16 March 1957, Notes on early meetings 1956-1959, UNEF Advisory Committee, UNEF Advisory Committee, Middle East, Urquhart, S-1078-0060-0001, UNA

⁸⁴¹ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 270–71.

⁸⁴² *Ibid.*

⁸⁴³ "Cable from UNEF Force Commander to Acting Chief of Staff" UNTSO 30 January 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

UNEF entered the Gaza Strip), his plans had been elaborated by a proposal from two EIMAC military observers from New Zealand and the US. They suggested several methods that, when combined, would reduce crossings between the Gaza Strip and Israel. First was a proposal of a series of permanent or semi-permanent barbed-wired watch towers with living accommodations and underground defensive positions along the ADL. Then followed a call for the ADL to be marked by a full-length fence, fences in trouble-areas, a full-length bull-dosed trench, or a series of dispersed concrete markers. Additionally, the scheme suggested a 100-yard zone on both sides of the ADL that no Palestinian, Egyptian or Israeli units or individuals would have the right to access. A road should also cut through this zone to allow the UNEF to conduct motorised, mounted and foot patrols (with automatic weapons and dogs) both day and night. Finally, the force was suggested to have an aerial reconnaissance component.⁸⁴⁴ Already upon receiving the scheme, Burns appears to have seen it as a ‘maximum’ regime. He declined to adopt the proposal in full, finding that not all, but “(...) *some of Colonel Brown’s suggestions may be quite useful.*”⁸⁴⁵ As Burns noted in his memoirs (in 1962), his concerns had mostly revolved around credibility, or the right to fire rather than only challenge.”⁸⁴⁶ Accordingly, he settled for rotating units between battalion camps not in but near Gaza City, Khan Yunis, Rafah and Deir El Bellah and smaller company and platoon-sized operational camps near the ADL. Not sure how to balance concretely credibility and the rules of engagement on the ADL, however, he informed Hammarskjold of his concerns when the latter came to Egypt. Hammarskjold (and Burns) subsequently met Nasser and his foreign policy officials.⁸⁴⁷ According to the proposal Burns had received from the UN military observers, the entire General Armistice Agreement would have had to be renegotiated had they come to a written agreement making fundamental jurisdictional changes in the Gaza Strip (or in Israel).⁸⁴⁸ Once Burns had rejected an Egyptian idea for joint patrols between the Egyptian-controlled police and UNEF, a verbal agreement on ‘cooperation’ was therefore reached. Reflecting the Gaza Strip’s suspended sovereignty, the arrangement allowed UNEF to control a zone between the Gaza Strip and Israel on the Gaza side of the ADL of 100 meters during the day and 500 meters during the night in which it would be allowed to defend itself against hostile action by firing, if necessary, and to take into custody people to promptly turn them over to the local police. For their part, the Egyptian authorities were to prevent people from entering the zone and Israel, reinstate penalties for crossing into the latter, and have

⁸⁴⁴ “Cable from Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO to UNEF Force Commander” 20 February 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁸⁴⁵ “Cable from UNEF Force Commander to Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO” 26 February 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁸⁴⁶ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 272.

⁸⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 274–75.

⁸⁴⁸ “Cable from Acting Chief of Staff UNTSO to UNEF Force Commander” 20 February 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

the police cooperate closely with UNEF. Although no formal publication would take place, both parties would inform the Gaza population.⁸⁴⁹

However, the agreement between the Secretary-General and the Egyptian government not only dictated how the Egyptian-controlled police, the UN force and the UNRWA were to order and regulate the space of the Gaza Strip and the mobilities of the people in it. Unknowingly and unintentionally, it strengthened the link between UNEF, its functions and setup (and thus also the UN) and those of the British mandate (and thereby also the British Empire) beyond the existing ties. The UNEF concept—which by then had come to consist of nearly 6,000-man strong force with light infantry units, armoured reconnaissance units, light aircraft and the EIMAC observers mostly living separately from the society it was to take part in regulating—also closely resembled that which recent research shows the British Colonial Office and Mandate regime were headed towards by the late 1940s: A growing militarisation in terms of the origin and training of the force, the use of aircraft and armoured vehicles, larger units with increasingly younger men, the growing separation from society and the challenge of building up knowledge. Upon taking over Palestine, the British mandate disbanded the municipal police and gendarmerie manned mostly by Palestinians, instead installing a force of British soldiers who had fought both in the First World War and the Irish war for independence. Over the 1920s, this force was turned into the (more) regular Palestine Police Force with Jewish settlers and Palestinians and—reflecting British thinking on imperial policing—support from two squadrons of armoured cars and an Airforce squadron of aircraft. However, the Palestinian revolt in 1929 led to a temporary enlargement of the 2,000-man force with approx. 20,000 soldiers, some of which stayed on as police reserves after the revolt. The Palestinian revolt from 1936 to 1939 further militarised both Palestine and the force. Palestine became a military geography with the aforementioned series of police forts while the force began to recruit soldiers, dress them in khaki and give them military weapons, equipment, vehicles, and tasks as manning roadblocks, searching for weapons and making arrests. During the Second World War, the force became an army-equipped mobile strike force. The post-war Jewish settler terrorism forced about a concept of a larger force with improved intelligence-gathering capacities and engaged in police-military cooperation, which was spread to other rebelling British colonies.⁸⁵⁰ Thus, when UNEF was formed 8 years after the dismemberment of the Gaza Strip from the rest of Palestine (that the new Jewish settler colonial state of Israel for the most part

⁸⁴⁹ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 274–75.

⁸⁵⁰ Bruce Hoffman, “The Palestine Police Force and the Challenges of Gathering Counterterrorism Intelligence, 1939–1947,” *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 24, no. 4 (2013): 609–47; Matthew Hughes, “A British ‘Foreign Legion’? The British Police in Mandate Palestine,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 49, no. 5 (2013): 696–711; Robert Johnson, “Command of the Army, Charles Gwynn and Imperial Policing: The British Doctrinal Approach to Internal Security in Palestine, 1919–29,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 43, no. 4 (2015): 570–89; Kroizer, “From Dowbiggin to Tegart: Revolutionary Change in the Colonial Police in Palestine during the 1930s”; Georgina Sinclair, “‘Get into a Crack Force and Earn £20 a Month and All Found...’: The Influence of the Palestine Police upon Colonial Policing 1922–1948,” *European Review of History* 13, no. 1 (2009): 49–65; Thomas, *Empires of Intelligence*.

took over), the concept—of a cooperative, militarily trained and equipped force of young men living separately from society split in stationary and mobile strike forces in self-contained bases—was clearly not a novel new UN formula, but rather a tried and tested British imperial method. The main difference was that it was now the UN and the Egyptian government that had to ‘rule’ the Palestinians.

As is broadly accepted amongst imperial historians, imperial formations, whether American or British and otherwise, depend(ed) on systems of both destruction and knowledge.⁸⁵¹ A frontier-regime linked to the British model of imperial policing, the UN force was obviously no different in that it also needed to engage in gaining, building, storing and using knowledge. Although the UN force failed to have such a system in place in March, the proposal the UN military observers with the EIMAC had sent the Force Commander in late January 1957 emphasized the need to build a system that were to combine maps, aircraft, the EIMAC military observers, the patrol regime at the ADL and as part thereof the chain of observation towers.

As for maps, Burns had had the military advisor to the UN Secretary-General, the Finnish General Martola, and the military observers in the Gaza Strip search not only the UK, the former mandate power, but also its colony of Cyprus, Israel and the US for at least 50 (strategic/operational level) for maps scaled 1:100.000 and at least 100 (tactical level) maps scaled 1:25.000 from late January.⁸⁵² In Mid-February, UNEF staff picked up 150 map sets with 1.800 sheets at the British Army Headquarters in Nicosia in Cyprus with a UNEF aircraft, thus tapping directly into the knowledge base of British Empire to build its own.⁸⁵³ Indeed, the British smaller-scale maps had their origins in the Palestinian revolt in the 1930s.⁸⁵⁴ Indeed, as argued by the historian of imperial knowledge systems James Hevia, military maps emerged to serve both as

⁸⁵¹ Hevia, *The Imperial Security State*; Hoffman, “The Palestine Police Force and the Challenges of Gathering Counterterrorism Intelligence, 1939–1947”; Stoler, “Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance”; Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power*; Thomas, *Empires of Intelligence*.

⁸⁵² “Cable from UNEF Force Commander via UNTSO in Jerusalem to UN HQ New York” 28 January 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA and “Cable from UNEF Force Commander via UNTSO in Jerusalem to UN HQ New York” 29 January 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA,

⁸⁵³ “Cable from UNTSO Jerusalem to UNEF” 30 January 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA, “Cable from UNTSO to EIMAC” 6 February 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA and “Cable from Acting COS UNTSO to British Consulate in Jerusalem” 6 February 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA

⁸⁵⁴ Michael Heffernan, “Geography, Cartography and Military Intelligence: The Royal Geographical Society and the First World War,” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21, no. 3 (1996): 504–33; Noam Levin, Ruth Kark, and Emir Galilee, “Maps and the Settlement of Southern Palestine, 1799–1948: An historical/GIS Analysis,” *Journal of Historical Geography* 36 (2010): 1–18.

strategic information displays and as tactical support for the imperial regulatory and disciplinary regimes as a result of the evolving imperial knowledge system's union of science, management and information storage over the 19th century.⁸⁵⁵ Although the maps in extension thereof were tools intended to assist the UN force in taking over the Gaza Strip initially and then build an ADL regime, the UN force never got the maps to the people that needed them in time for the take-over of the Gaza Strip, leaving the leading Danish-Norwegian battalion 'blind' and forced to rely on inadequate Israeli information. If anything, the lack of maps made clear that UNEF was in desperate need of its own knowledge system.

Initially used to transport Burns between Egypt and the Gaza Strip to meet Israeli military officials to coordinate the takeover of the Gaza-Strip and supplies (as well as maps), the light (Canadian) aircraft of the UN force were later used to supplement the Canadian battalion that Burns tasked with patrolling the International Frontier between Egypt and Israel and later also the Yugoslavian battalion following its refusal to serve in the Gaza Strip not long after the riots. As were the cases with the structure and composition of the force and the maps, the use of reconnaissance aircraft in the Middle East had, as mentioned briefly above, also evolved out of the need to police nomad populations to curb their capacities to defy authority in both the British and French mandates.⁸⁵⁶

The military observers of the Egyptian-Israeli Military Armistice Commission had since 1948 been part of the General Armistice Agreement (with equivalents along the other Israeli borders). Still, the integration of the 8 Western and 'white' EIMAC military observers that had been in the Gaza Strip during the Israeli occupation and the new team after Burns had suggested the Secretary-General to do so upon UNEF entering the Gaza Strip, can also be seen as a parallel to the Mandate regime's investigative branch, the Criminal Investigation Department (that Egypt kept active in both Egypt and the Gaza Strip). Indeed, these observers would serve as UNEF's investigators of incident in the no-movement zone, writing up incidents reports that would gradually become a repository of knowledge for the force, providing micro-insights into the dynamics of the Gaza Strip.⁸⁵⁷

As for the last element of the UNEF knowledge system, the patrol and observation tower regime with 72 observation posts on the 59-kilometre-long ADL and the aerial and motorised patrol regime on the 200-kilometre-long IF was in place by early April. Interestingly, this dimension of the UNEF knowledge system resembled not only the British mandate regime in its wish to gather information to generate intelligence, but

⁸⁵⁵ Hevia, *The Imperial Security State*.

⁸⁵⁶ Kroizer, "From Dowbiggin to Tegar: Revolutionary Change in the Colonial Police in Palestine during the 1930s"; Thomas, *Empires of Intelligence*, 173-200-260.

⁸⁵⁷ "Cable from UNEF Force Commander to UN Sec Gen" 7 March 1957, Israel Administration of GAZA January to March 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0069-0005, UNA, Hoffman, "The Palestine Police Force and the Challenges of Gathering Counterterrorism Intelligence, 1939-1947"; Owen L. Sirrs, *A History of the Egyptian Intelligence Service: A History of the Mukhabarat, 1909-2009* (Milton Park, New York: Routledge, 2010).

also a more intense version of the Jewish pre-Israeli colonial settlements in that observation towers as means to monitor and dominate surrounding territory had been hallmarks of these (and partly so after 1948). Compared to the thinly dispersed and only just connected pre-Israeli settlements, the UN towers, albeit smaller than settlements, surrounded the entire Gaza Strip, leaving in theory no part of the ADL unwatched with an average distance of 300-500 meters between them and overlapping lines of sight.⁸⁵⁸ In extension of argument that the redeployment to the ADL from mid-March made little to no difference, Burns made only minor changes to the contingents' (area of) responsibilities in the establishment phase. Parts of the Brazilian and Swedish battalions, for example, switched places, letting the Brazilians take over a part of the ADL and the no-movement zone and the Swedes take over as guards for the UNEF depot in Rafah and the UN HQ, the residence of the civilian female UNEF staff, and the Commander's villa in Gaza City. However, the Swedes were also to guard the UNRWA hospital in Rafah and several UNRWA stores all over the Gaza Strip in a capacity as 'aid to civil power' using the same system (and phrase) the British mandate had used to provide guards and/or help maintain order.⁸⁵⁹

Once in place, the units of the real-time UN monitoring and regulatory system began reporting the incidents on their day and night patrols or near their observation posts in the form of coded signals or report codes via the UNEF field telephone network, most probably generating more information than the EIMAC observers and the civilian UNEF administration even if they would often fail to catch and altogether miss people crossing the ADL (leaving footprints).⁸⁶⁰ As will be clear in both the following section (and chapter), however, the UNEF regime was not only similar to—and troubled like—the British Mandate regime, it would also (unintentionally) come to favour the Israel state as the British Mandate had (intentionally) favoured the Jewish colonial settlements.

⁸⁵⁸ See for instance the towers in Sköld, *I fredens tjänst*, 122 and 129; Sharon Rotbard, "Wall and Tower (Homa Umigdal): The Mold of Israeli Architecture," in *A Civilian Occupation: The Politics of Israeli Architecture*, ed. Rafi Segal and Eyal Weisman (Tel Aviv-Jaffa; New York: Baberl; Verso, 2003), 38, 44–45, 48 and 49.

⁸⁵⁹ "Relocation plan from COS UNEF to SWEBAT" 2 April 1957, Protective Duties, Security UNRWA Installations, Aid to Civil Power, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, UNEF, S-1775-0000-0066, UNA and "Order on Aid to Civil Authorities – Security of UNRWA Installations" 10 April 1957, Protective Duties, Security UNRWA Installations, Aid to Civil Power, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, UNEF, S-1775-0000-0066, UNA

⁸⁶⁰ "EIMAC Incident Report" 4 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, "EIMAC Incident Report" 14 May 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

The Relationships between UNEF and Israel, the IDF and the Israeli Settlers, 1957-1967

Mirroring the simultaneous resentment of the British and need for them to expand the colonial settlements during the Mandate era and provide military training,⁸⁶¹ many Israelis disliked the UN from 1948 despite the fact that Israel in part owed its establishment to the UN and had benefitted from the General Armistice Agreement. Until 1956, this feeling stemmed not only from the fact that the UN didn't condemn the attack on Israel in 1948 and the sense that the Military Armistice Commissions violated Israeli sovereignty. It was also rooted in the growing tension between the Secretary-General-General since 1952, Dag Hammarskjöld, and the Israeli Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion, due to the founding of what was probably a disguised military settlement in the demilitarised zone in the Sinai and the inability of the Security Council to intervene on Israel's behalf in relation to the use of the Suez Canal; the *Fedayeen* attacks; and the deadly exchanges between Israeli and Egyptian forces in the mid-1950s. From early November 1956, the UN and the Eisenhower administration also put pressure on Israel to withdraw from the Sinai and the Gaza Strip.⁸⁶² Many had also seen the redeployments to ADL after the march-riots in Gaza City as UNEF's defeat. Against this backdrop, it is no surprise that the Israelis did not treasure the UN soldiers at first. Indeed, they were disappointed with UNEF from mid-March, as many of the Gaza Strip Palestinians were able to return to their former villages, visit family and friends, reclaim or steal equipment and so on in Israel.⁸⁶³

However, it appears that the hostility was less intense in the part of the Gaza Strip patrolled by the Danish and Norwegian units, as the Danish and Norwegian soldiers gained sympathy for the Israelis and vice versa already from mid-March. A Danish officer noted in his published diary how their skills in English or German and forthcoming manner led to greetings and soon chatting. It probably also helped that the Israeli units sported female soldiers. By late March, the UN Force Commander found soldiers from the Danish-Norwegian battalion playing soccer with Israeli soldiers near the ADL, a breach of UNEF regulations. Nevertheless, the interactions continued, if not intensified with regular friendly conversations and exchanges of coffee, much to the concern of UNEF HQ, as Egypt could require the hard fought for Danish contingent changed for fraternisation.⁸⁶⁴ The ties between the soldiers,

⁸⁶¹ Matthew Hughes, "Terror in Galilee: British-Jewish Collaboration and the Special Night Squads in Palestine during the Arab Revolt, 1938–39," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 43, no. 4 (2015): 590–610; John Knight, "Securing Zion? Policing in British Palestine, 1917–39," *European Review of History* 18, no. 4 (2011): 523–43.

⁸⁶² Oren, "Ambivalent Adversaries"; Oren, Barak, and Shapira, "How the Mouse Got His Roar"; Palle Roslyng-Jensen, "Til Kamp Mod Arabisk Nationalisme," in *Nye Fronter I Den Kolde Krig* (Gyldendal, 2010).

⁸⁶³ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 276; Korn, "From Refugees to Infiltrators: Constructing Political Crime in Israel in the 1950s."

⁸⁶⁴ Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 65–70.

however, went beyond shared languages and military experience. There were also ties through the expansion and modernisation of Israeli agriculture, which the Israeli adaption of tractors in the longer history of the use of colonial experts, DDT and swamp-draining were the most visible signifier of at the ADL. This link was probably most obvious to the Danish soldiers, as they came from a country with a large agricultural sector also being modernised.⁸⁶⁵ However, the Danish and Norwegian soldiers also came from countries in which Israel stood as a ‘beacon of democracy’, and whose governments had supported Israel politically at the UN, labour unions had developed close ties, and not least, former Second World War resistance members had sent their weapons to the new state in 1948.⁸⁶⁶ In any case, the ties between the ‘DANOR’ soldiers and the Israeli soldiers and settlers strengthened. One of the Danish units went from greets, occasional soccer games and frequent chats and coffees to accepting invitations to visit a nearby kibbutz and receiving tips from the Israeli soldiers on the ways Palestinians crossed the ADL, thus expanding the spectrum of fraternisation.⁸⁶⁷

Despite this warming in relations between the DANOR units and the Israelis, the Israeli government complained to the UN that Palestinians were still entering Israel, or ‘infiltrating’ as it was termed in Israel. Upon receiving the Israeli complaint and still clearing the Suez Canal, the UN suggested both the Israelis and the Egyptians to construct “(...) *an effective obstacle of barbed wire and possibly mines along the ADL* (...)”,⁸⁶⁸ as the EIMAC observers had suggested to Burns. The Egyptians offered a tepid response, as the Egyptian administration would feel the heat from the Palestinians. The Israelis liked the idea until it was realised a barbed wire fence would have to be placed on both sides of the ADL, something the Israeli government had flatly rejected earlier. The Israeli refusal thus gave the Egyptians some breathing space, but at the same time also left the ADL problem unsolved.⁸⁶⁹ This led to incidents that challenged not least the Danish soldiers’ naivety. In early April, some Danish soldiers witnessed two soldiers from an Israeli border unit take their jeep across the ADL ditch and shoot to scare the Palestinian shepherds that were attending their flocks on the Gaza Strip side. The disrespect the Israelis showed the Danish UNEF soldiers temporarily weakened their relationship. A week later, another Israeli border unit wounded a Palestinian trying to cross the ADL in front of the Danish soldiers.⁸⁷⁰

Nonetheless, the Israeli soldiers and settlers near the ADL as well as the government came to appreciate the UN force as its abilities increased. A few days after

⁸⁶⁵ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 99; Sandra M Sufian, *Healing the Land and the Nation: Malaria and the Zionist Project in Palestine, 1920-1947* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

⁸⁶⁶ Arthur Arnheim and Dov Levitan, *Politik, diplomati og den hjælpende hånd: Danmark og oprettelsen af staten Israel* (Kbh.: Museum Tusulanum, 2011); Hilde Henriksen Waage, “How Norway Became One of Israel’s Best Friends,” *Journal of Peace Research* 37, no. 2 (2000): 189–211.

⁸⁶⁷ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 99–100.

⁸⁶⁸ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*, 276.

⁸⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷⁰ Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 70–72.

the cooling in relations, Danish soldiers aided by an Indian observation post detained a Palestinian stealing irrigation pipes from an Israeli settlement.⁸⁷¹ Soon after, an Egyptian journal also displayed pictures of Danish soldiers meeting with Israeli soldiers for coffee, music and dancing inside the Gaza Strip, a stamp of approval of sorts. If the officer's diary didn't exaggerate, most Danish soldiers on the first Danish contingent also went to visit a kibbutz before they were exchanged over April, as an emerging ethos belittled those who didn't.⁸⁷² Since 1948, Israeli units had faced Palestinians using Egyptian and Israeli anti-vehicle and anti-tank mines as asymmetric retaliation rather than direct confrontation. Seeing Brazilians attacked this way, could therefore have suggested the Israelis that the Brazilians—also soldiers at the centre of another racialised post-imperial modernisation and state-building project—were to be appreciated: Clearly, they were not friends of the Palestinians.⁸⁷³ Two weeks later, another Brazilian unit prevented a small group of Bedouin from bringing weapons into the Gaza Strip, probably improving their standing with the Israelis.⁸⁷⁴ In mid-April and early May, two Indonesian soldiers killed two Palestinians, perhaps letting the Israelis see the Indonesian units as useful, despite being Muslims.⁸⁷⁵ In mid-May, Colombian units also caught a Palestinian fleeing from an Israeli unit and a group of armed Palestinians crossing the ADL.⁸⁷⁶ In mid-June, two Danish patrols (from the new contingent) joined the Indonesian battalion in killing another unarmed Palestinian, which prompted an Israeli unit to hand over fresh strawberries to the specific Danish unit in approval. Three days later, another Danish unit not only caught another Palestinian, but also killed two others. Another Israeli unit appeared and noted to the Danes that the new turn in the Danish ADL regime was most welcome.⁸⁷⁷

⁸⁷¹ "EIMAC Incident Report" 6 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁸⁷² Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 80.

⁸⁷³ "EIMAC Incident Report" 4 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, Peter M. Beattie, *The Tribute of Blood: Army, Honor, Race, and Nation in Brazil, 1864-1945* (Durham, London: Duke University Press, 2001); Seth Garfield, "The Roots of a Plant That Today Is Brazil: Indians and the Nation-State under the Brazilian Estado Novo," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 29, no. 3 (1997): 747–68; Seth Garfield, "Where the Earth Touches the Sky: The Xavante Indians' Struggle for Land in Brazil, 1951-1979," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 80, no. 3 (2000): 537–63; Garfield, *In Search of the Amazon*.

⁸⁷⁴ "EIMAC Incident Report" 15 May 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁸⁷⁵ "EIMAC Incident Report" 18 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA and "EIMAC Incident Report" 5 May 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁸⁷⁶ "EIMAC Incident Report" 12 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA and "EIMAC Incident Report" 12 May 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁸⁷⁷ Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 94–97.

By mid-June, these incidents were no longer isolated. Rather, they constituted a pattern. In much the same way some of the ‘white’ UNEF soldiers had identified with the British in El-Arish, many UN rank and file, NCO’s and officers from most if not all contingents to the IEMAC observers to the Force Commander himself, and thus UNEF at a broader level, not only saw the Palestinians as disorderly after the March 1957-riots against the backdrop of the British discourses from the 1920s and 1930s. Many UNEF members in daily conversations, diaries, incident reports, and eventually memoirs also adopted the Israeli classification of Palestinians in- and outside Israel as ‘Arabs’ and also those crossing into Israel as ‘Infiltrators’.⁸⁷⁸ Clearly, this was not just an issue of distancing the Palestinians by labelling them differently from the way they self-identified. In essence, these phrases echoed the pre-Israeli and Israeli Zionist settler colonial narratives. Israeli historian Ilan Pappé has shown these interwoven narratives as framing the Palestinians as alien bodies in the wrong places within the context of the Zionist plans to ‘heal the land’ by clearing out the ‘Arabs’; unruly pests resisting the Zionist plans; and as ‘infiltrators’ once they began to return to their former homes and villages no longer in Palestine, but the Zionist state settler colonial state of Israel.⁸⁷⁹ The Holocaust may also partly have led to a pro-Israeli current in the Nordic and Canadian contingents, but probably less so in, for example, the Indian contingent whose government could not reconcile with the Jewish dependency on the British Empire as well as the treatment of the Palestinians since the Mandate.⁸⁸⁰ Whether the Holocaust was a factor or not, the underlying narratives had clearly gained significance by mid-June insofar discourse translated into practice all along the ADL. Although the killings of Palestinians led to the enforcement of the Egyptian clause in the verbal agreement with the UN Secretary-General and the UN Commander that UN units should only fire when threatened, EIMAC investigators would be called out for incidents in which UN soldiers had fired whether threatened or not.⁸⁸¹

This practice, moreover, also manifested itself in the treatment of Israelis. Were Israelis to enter to no-movement zone, UNEF were to hand them over to the Egyptian-

⁸⁷⁸ “EIMAC Incident Report” 4 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, “EIMAC Incident Report” 18 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, “EIMAC Incident Report” 2 May 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*; Engholm, *Fremmedlegionær og dansk oberst*; Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*; Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*; Sköld, *I fredens tjänst*.

⁸⁷⁹ Ilan Pappé, *The Idea of Israel: A History of Power and Knowledge* (London; New York: Verso, 2014), 27–37.

⁸⁸⁰ Arnheim and Levitan, *Politik, diplomati og den hjælpende hånd*; Hassan Husseini, “A ‘MIDDLE POWER’ IN ACTION: CANADA AND THE PARTITION OF PALESTINE,” *Arab Studies Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (2008): 41–55; Antero Holmila, “The Holocaust and the Birth of Israel in British, Swedish and Finnish Press Discourse, 1947–1948,” *European Review of History* 16, no. 2 (2009): 183–200; Kumaraswamy, *India’s Israel Policy*, 26–200.

⁸⁸¹ “EIMAC Incident Report” 27 August 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

controlled police as they were to hand over Palestinians. Yet, the first Israeli held by UNEF in April was kept in a Danish camp for three weeks, until he escaped.⁸⁸² In early June, Indonesian soldiers also entered Israel to help an Israeli squad that had hit a mine.⁸⁸³ A few weeks later, Danish and Norwegian soldiers unintentionally let either an Israeli soldier or settler, judging by the military-style approach and boot prints left in the sand, pass the ADL near a village with the result that a Palestinian boy was nearly killed by the hand grenade the Israeli ‘infiltrator’ threw into his room.⁸⁸⁴ More broadly, the influence of UNEF can perhaps be gaged by how Israel’s number of registered confrontations between Israeli border units and ‘infiltrators’— mostly Palestinians returning to their former homes in other words—had dropped by nearly 16% from 5.713 to 4.801 a year after UNEF had established itself at the ADL.⁸⁸⁵ While the drop took place on all Israeli borders rather than only along the ADL that separated Israel and the Gaza Strip on the one hand, and Egypt, as noted, had promised to control the *Fedayeen* on the other, it seems sound to link the drop, at least in part, to the UN in the form of both the gradually more ‘efficient’ UNEF and UNRWA that was shifting from repatriation to improving camp conditions, providing schooling and channelling energy into inward-oriented political debates (rather than outward-oriented *Fedayeen* activity) under Labouisse, the American Hammarskjold, as mentioned before, had handpicked.⁸⁸⁶

The compliments from Israeli units in the early phase of UNEF’s establishment at the ADL may well have been instances of local initiative. Indeed, Ben-Gurion’s retaliation raids in the early and mid-1950s had resulted in a military culture that not only encouraged ‘self-authorisation’ for action and disobedience in all unit across sizes and across all ranks after these skirmishes, but also during the war of 1956.⁸⁸⁷ This military culture was additionally reinforced by the extreme links scholars have shown between state, society and individual partly forged in the Mandate and partly after 1948. Israeli children grew up in a militarised society on constant military alertness and were indoctrinated by Zionist parents, teachers, games, children’s books

⁸⁸² “EIMAC Incident Report” 17 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA and “EIMAC Incident Report” 9 May 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁸⁸³ “EIMAC Incident Report” 3 June 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁸⁸⁴ EIMAC Incident Report” 27 June 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Political Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁸⁸⁵ Korn, “From Refugees to Infiltrators: Constructing Political Crime in Israel in the 1950s.”

⁸⁸⁶ Jalal al-Husseini, “UNRWA and the Palestinian Nation-Building Process,” *Journal of Palestine Studies* 29, no. 2 (2000): 51–64; Rosenfeld, “From Emergency Relief Assistance to Human Development and Back: UNRWA and the Palestinian Refugees, 1950-2009,” *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 28, no. 2–3 (2009): 286–317; Ghassan Shabaneh, “Education and Identity: The Role of UNRWA’s Education Programmes in the Reconstruction of Palestinian Nationalism,” *Journal of Refugee Studies* 25, no. 4 (2012): 491–513.

⁸⁸⁷ Gil-li Vardi, “‘Pounding Their Feet’: Israeli Military Culture as Reflected in Early IDF Combat History,” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 31, no. 2 (2008): 295–324.

and media to put the state before themselves, to think Palestinians as primitive and criminal, to dream of conscription and see war as a rite of passage, and to join the youth pioneer movement building paramilitary and migrant camps near the borders.⁸⁸⁸ Against the combination of militarisation from childhood, the similar tasks of keeping the ‘unruly’ Palestinians under control, and increasing personal relations, some Israeli soldiers and settlers may well have seen the UN soldiers in some sort of mirror image.

However, other considerations make it likely that the UN ‘efficiency’ increased and that Ben-Gurion’s government was aware thereof. As Israeli scholar Eitan Barak has noted, Israel initially saw UNEF as “(...) *a factor which would prevent military attacks, especially surprise ones.*”⁸⁸⁹ Additionally, the first kibbutz visit by UNEF soldiers in March 1957 was, if one of the participating Danish soldier’s information was correct, cleared with the local Israel military authority.⁸⁹⁰ Again, this could be a local initiative. If the drop on confrontations were link to an increasingly ‘efficient’ UN regime (and the changing course of UNRWA), the UN gave Ben-Gurion what appears to be an internationally paid extra layer of border security after, as Israeli historian Guy Laron has shown, the Israeli middle class had been demanding better conditions at the expense of the standards in the migrant settlements near the borders and military spending for some time and the annexation of the Gaza Strip and the Sinai failed.⁸⁹¹ In what can hardly be seen as a coincidence given the Israeli military’s censorship of the media, the Danish killings in June 1957 were mentioned in not one but several notices in the influential newspaper, the Jerusalem Post. One of the Danish camps even began to receive the newspaper when they caught (or killed) Palestinians on the ADL.⁸⁹² Other contingents may have had similar experiences. Considering also the importance assigned to the un-armed and thinly manned armistice commissions from 1948 onwards, it appears that Ben-Gurion’s cabinet, as a minimum, followed UNEF closely, if not letting the local Israeli units interact with the force. The Israeli scholar Eitan Barak partially confirms this noting that Egypt launched a formal

⁸⁸⁸ Uri Ben-Elizer, “A Nation-in-Arms: State, Nation, and Militarism in Israel’s First Years,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37, no. 2 (1995): 264–85; Uri Ben-Elizer, “State Versus Civil Society? A Non-Binary Model of Domination Through the Example of Israel,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 11, no. 3 (1998): 370–96; Yael Darr, “Nation Building and War Narratives for Children: War and Militarism in Hebrew 1940’s and 1950’s Children’s Literature,” *Paedagogica Historica* 48, no. 4 (2012): 601–13; Chazan Meir, “A Fighting Press: Reflections of Israel’s War of Independence in Children’s Newspapers,” *Journal of Israeli Politics, Society and Culture* 24, no. 1 (2005); Dan A. Porat, “Between Nation and Land in Zionist Teaching of Jewish History, 1920-1954,” *Journal of Israeli Politics, Society and Culture* 27, no. 2 (2008): 253–68.

⁸⁸⁹ Eitan Barak, “Caught in the Middle: The United Nations Emergency Force, Israel and the 1960 ‘Rotem Crisis,’” *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 17, no. 2 (2006): 407.

⁸⁹⁰ Jensen, *Kompagni Larsen*, 99.

⁸⁹¹ Laron, “The Domestic Sources of Israel’s Decision to Launch the 1956 Sinai Campaign.”

⁸⁹² Kjeldsen, *Fredens soldater*, 94–97.

complaint against UNEF for fraternising with Israeli units in 1958 and the apparent Israeli success of getting intelligence from a high-ranking UNEF in 1960.⁸⁹³

As his predecessors in the Mandate had used the British, Ben-Gurion also sought to use the UN involvement when possible. The conflict between Israel, Egypt and Saudi Arabia about Israeli ships passing through the Straits of Tiran from 1951 was one such matter after 1956. Although Nasser promised Israeli ships *de facto* passage when Hammarskjold went in Cairo in mid-March 1957 (to discuss the Gaza Strip), he had Burns deploy an infantry company to the area, fearing another war between Israel and Egypt. Israel first let a Danish ship sail to Eilat with commercial goods and then an American vessel to transport Iranian crude to Eilat, which meant both using the Suez Canal and potentially provoking the US navy patrol in the area into action if Egypt, or Saudi Arabia, were to engage the tanker. Despite Saudi and Egyptian sabre-rattling, Israel gained *de facto* passage rights that lasted a decade on basis of the UN-facilitated understanding and the involvement of the UN, Hammarskjold and UNEF's Sharm-el-Sheik contingent several times.⁸⁹⁴

Israel also benefitted from UN involvement without knowing. As a response to Egypt and Syria's formation of the United Arab Republic, Israel initiated military manoeuvres in the Negev Desert in late 1958. Egypt reacted by sending forces from El-Arish to the IF without notifying UNEF. Once UNEF encountered these, the (then Indian) Chief of Staff was sent to argue that UNEF was responsible for patrolling the IF with its aircraft and (Yugoslavian and Canadian) reconnaissance units. Egypt ceded an exclusive patrol zone 5 kilometres wide by day and 2 kilometres by night. A few months later, in early 1959, the UN once again intervened to Israel's benefits. Since the formation of the UAR in 1958, the Israeli air force had increased its aerial patrols as deterrence, reconnaissance, and perhaps also intimidation of the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip, something the UNEF could do little about. Sensibly, Egypt deployed fighter jets to El-Arish. Fearing that UNEF would be caught in an arms race on both sides of the ADL/IF, Hammarskjold spoke to Nasser.⁸⁹⁵ Yet, estimates from the Danish-Norwegian battalion alone still put 477 of the 1.157 sightings of Israeli fighters, or around 41%, as illegally entering Egypt and the Gaza Strip between April 1959 and April 1961.⁸⁹⁶ Over February 1960, Israeli forces also engaged UAR forces in the Syrian part. Logically, the UAR sent about 50.000 soldiers and about 500 tanks and tank destroyers towards the Egyptian-Israeli IF. Caught by surprise, Israel sought Hammarskjold's help. He declined, having already restrained Cairo—a government he, as noted earlier, strongly disliked—from reasonable defensive measures with

⁸⁹³ Barak, "Caught in the Middle: The United Nations Emergency Force, Israel and the 1960 'Rotem Crisis.'"

⁸⁹⁴ Barak, "On the Power of Tacit Understandings--Israel, Egypt and Freedom of Passage through the Suez Canal, 1957-1960"; Eitan Barak, "Between Reality and Secrecy: Israel's Freedom of Navigation through the Straits of Tiran, 1956-1967," *The Middle East Journal* 61, no. 4 (2007): 657-.

⁸⁹⁵ Barak, "Caught in the Middle: The United Nations Emergency Force, Israel and the 1960 'Rotem Crisis,'" 405-6.

⁸⁹⁶ DANOR BN, "Final Reports from DANOR BN VI-IX", 1959-1961

Soviet equipment after it had been not only attacked by Israel, France and Great Britain recently, but also denied weapons and loans by the West since the 1952-coup. That Israel had attempted to manipulate him into thwarting the Egyptian World Bank negotiations for a loan to expand the Suez Canal by Israel in 1959 only ensured that he spoke to the US, Great Britain and Egypt but not Israel to avert the crisis.⁸⁹⁷

Until the war in 1967 (we now know as the Six Day War) broke out, the years from 1961 appear to have brought no other crises on the Armistice Demarcation Line or the International Frontier significant enough to require the involvement of either the UN General Secretary in New York (and the US) or UNEF. Certainly, the UN took part in keeping the ‘unruly’ Palestinians inside the Gaza Strip and was ready to keep things from heating up on the IF. However, it appears to have been a question of the Egyptian and Israeli energies turning inwards in the name of modernisation and partly away from their borders to the broader region of the eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf, most discernibly in the proxy-war Yemen, and to a smaller degree various central and north-eastern African states (and in Israel’s case also Iran, Syria after the collapse of the UAR in 1961, and the emerging European trade bloc). The energies of both governments were simply not tied to the Palestinians and each other (locally), as much as the problems and openings the Soviet Union and the US created via their military, political and economic aid that reflected their own regional designs. Moscow sought Egyptian (and later also Syrian) maintenance and supply areas in the short term and base rights in the long term to increase its Mediterranean power projection capabilities. On its part, Washington sought to keep the Soviet Union out of the region, maintain its grip on the regional oil supplying states, and finally ensure that both the British ally and the regional defence pact remained stable.⁸⁹⁸

Most literature has, as shown, argued that UNEF was either the first (and successful) peacekeeping operation in the history of the UN, or, in the case of a few scholars from or residing in Israel, a failure to protect Israeli interests. Going beyond these—from the viewpoint of imperial and global history—cursory glances or deeply

⁸⁹⁷ Barak, “Caught in the Middle: The United Nations Emergency Force, Israel and the 1960 ‘Rotem Crisis.’”

⁸⁹⁸ Cohen and Freedman, “Light and Shadows in the US-Israeli Military Ties, 1948-2010”; El Hussini, *Soviet-Egyptian Relations, 1945-85*; Jesse Ferris, “Soviet Support for Egypt’s Intervention in Yemen, 1962-1963,” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 10, no. 4 (2008): 5–36; Ferris, “Guns for Cotton? Aid, Trade, and the Soviet Quest for Base Rights in Egypt, 1964–1966”; Ami Gluska, *The Israeli Military and the Origins of the 1967 War: Government, Armed Forces and Defence Policy 1963-1967* (London: Routledge, an imprint of Taylor & Francis Books Ltd, 2007); Clive Jones, *Britain and the Yemen Civil War, 1962-1965: Ministers, Mercenaries and Mandarins: Foreign Policy and the Limits of Covert Action* (Eastbourne; Portland, Or.: Sussex Academic Press, 2010); Clive Jones, Tore T Petersen, and Clive Jones, *Israel’s Clandestine Diplomacies*, 2013; John J Mearsheimer and Stephen M Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007); Nathanson and Mandelbaum, “Aid and Trade: Economic Relations between the United States and Israel, 1948-2010”; David Tal, “Symbol Not Substance? Israel’s Campaign to Acquire Hawk Missiles, 1960–1962,” *The International History Review* 22, no. 2 (2000): 304–17; Eitan Barak, “The Freedom That Never Was: Israel’s Freedom of Overflight over the Straits of Tiran Prior to the Six Day War,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 43, no. 1 (2008): 75–91.

embedded perspectives, I have in this chapter instead reviewed the UN intervention with a sensitivity to the deeper history of the region as well as the international system. In short, I argue that UNEF can be seen as a frontier zone of Western imperial multilateralism on basis of what can be summed up as three separate processes with their own dynamics that from late 1956 began to increasingly overlap. First, the broader process of Washington and Moscow vying for regional hegemony to either safeguard the Western European oil supply or to gain access to the Mediterranean furthered the UN down the path of mainly looking after Western interests it been on since 1942. Second, the UN got caught up into the highly volatile Israeli-Egyptian state of affairs between war and the absence of war, which tied the interests of both local actors to the those of the US and the USSR and thus also the UN. Thirdly, and an aspect that the following chapter will examine in further detail, the practice 'on the ground' of the UN intervention turned it into an *ad hoc* hybrid post-1945 extension of the British Mandate. This was not only a consequence of the expanding area of operations and jurisdiction from the Canal Area via the Sinai to the Gaza Strip, the ADL and IF. Practice also reflected deeper structural legacies from especially British configurations of imperial sovereignty, governance, and space. If unintentionally, the joint UN-regime of UNEF and UNRWA linked to the British Mandate regime and its technologies of power, being rooted in sovereignties in flux; an externally controlled social regime; the re-actualisation of certain ideas of gender and race; turning to the tested concept of a militarized police force of young men recruited from other parts of the frontier of imperial multilateralism whose struggle for control and authority shaped of shifting sensations of security and insecurity, in part linked to the military cultures of the contributing countries' militaries, colonial militaries or intra-Western military cooperation.

Chapter 8: Postcoloniality? The UN and The Militarisation of Life in The Frontier Zone of Imperial Multilateralism, 1957-1967

Suggesting that both the structuralising dynamics and the everyday practice of the frontier of imperial multilateralism are best understood from ‘within’, I examine here the UN regime’s links to everyday life in the Gaza Strip, both in its own right from March 1957 to June 1967 and against the backdrop of the British configurations of imperial sovereignty, governance, and space. In other words, I explore and historicise how the UN tied into what the political geographers Richelle Bernazzolli and Colin Flint see as the ‘everydayness’ of the practice of military power in specific places.⁸⁹⁹ Inseparable from this, I also explore how young and old and male and female Palestinians—refugees and ‘natives’ alike—and Bedouin that traditionally moved between the Sinai and the Negev deserts sought to negotiate the practice of UNEF and its structural legacies in its regime of control and authority and ideas of gender and race in the spaces and practices of their everyday lives. To explore these mostly unmapped realities with more weight on the ‘negotiatedness’ of the UN presence ‘on the ground’ and the actors involved than in existing research⁹⁰⁰ (and the previous chapter in that it focused on the force itself and its relations to Israel), I examine three different spheres of life linking my theoretical framework of the frontier zone of imperial multilateralism, the Gaza Strip population and the UN contingents: 1) Land, 2) (In)Security and 3) Labour and economic relations. Rather than seeing gender, race and age as only intersecting technologies of power and social categories, I see them as integral parts to everyday practice ‘on the ground’ more visible on certain occasions and places than others.⁹⁰¹

⁸⁹⁹ Richelle Bernazzolli and Colin Flint, “Power, Place, and Militarism: Toward a Comparative Geographic Analysis of Militarization,” *Geography Compass* 3, no. 1 (2009): 493–411.

⁹⁰⁰ Aside the military historian Michael Carroll (who offers a glorified national peacekeeping narrative on basis of interviews with Canadian soldiers), the anthropologist Ilana Feldman is the only scholar to have taken a marginal interest in the practices of UNEF. Despite also working on the Mandate era elsewhere, she fails, however, to historicise the UN intervention. Moreover, separating the UN intervention from the UNRWA regime, she sees the UN force only marginally involved in Gaza Strip everyday life; an interpretation (that despite being shared by Jean-Pierre Filiu, a historian of the Gaza Strip whom I also use), I cannot, as will be shown, agree with. Feldman, “Ad Hoc Humanity.”

⁹⁰¹ For more on race and gender, see also Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico*; Green, *Black Yanks in the Pacific*; Kramer, *The Blood of Government*; Levine, *Prostitution, Race & Politics – Policing Venereal Disease in the British Empire*; Philippa Levine, *Gender and Empire* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Price, *Oriental Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific*; Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power*.

This approach (and structure of the chapter), however, is also related to how it is currently not possible to gain a full overview of all incidents in the ADL area that either led to detention or in some cases also death, and thus their seriousness, frequency and, not least, significance in relation to the emerging militant nationalism (as viewed from the Force). Additionally, the communication between the UN Secretary-General and his deputies and the Force Commander on the one hand and UNEF records produced after serious encounters between UN soldiers and residents of the Gaza Strip on the other, remain classified. In other words, an important part of the material from both the upper layer 'on the ground' and the UN HQ in New York is currently not available either. Nevertheless, the set of records that I do have access to is still a broad set of sources. The majority of the records of the Egyptian-Israeli Military Armistice Commission (EIMAC) and UNEF that remain in the UN archive are not only available, they also allow for the different types of relations and conflicts the UN regime entailed to be explored since the reports do not record mere random incidents but investigations when the regime and its practices caused harm, were challenged or failed to work. The material is thus in many ways generous enough to build a qualified and broad insight into everyday life and the negotiation of the regime of the UN force. For example, I consult unpublished and unused incident reports, statistics and cables of EIMAC observers who were added to UNEF; mostly hitherto unused internal communication, accident reports, labour documents and administrative materials from the UNEF Chief Administrative Officer, the Legal Advisor, and the Force Commander to mention just some; and the already consulted published memoirs of members of the UN force. Independently, these records provide glimpses of Gaza Strip everyday life. Combined, they allow for a critical appraisal of the UN regime from 1957 to 1967 when unpacked by way of contextual literature on the Mandate regime; Palestinian nationalism; Israel; the imperial struggle for regional hegemony in Cold War Middle East; and the troop contributing states.

As Before (I)? Land Ownership and Usage as a Prism to understand the Negotiation of the UN Regime in the Gaza Strip

In this section, I use land ownership and land usage as a prism to understand what the UN regime meant 'on the ground' and consequently how the different population groups of the Gaza Strip sought to negotiate its practices and impact(s) on their lives.

As noted in the previous chapter, the Egyptian President and the UN Secretary-General bypassed the existing Armistice framework, making instead a verbal agreement on the area of operations, functions and authority of the UN force in addition to the Status of Forces Agreement from February, which covered other aspects not only but mostly related to Egypt. As part of the verbal agreement UNEF was, as mentioned, to operate a 100-meter-wide zone of no-man's-land on the Gaza Strip side of the ADL, which expanded to a 500-meter zone by night. Without making an announcement of officially dabbling into land management both 'inside' the Gaza

Strip and on the ADL, the UN effectively not only continued its own meddling with regard to land use and ownership in Palestine, it also connected to a deeper history of externalising land management. This was not due to a covert conspiracy, but a consequence of the legal and financial aspects not having been settled in the verbal ADL arrangement and the UN's longer involvement in the unmaking of Palestine and its own history and roots in the American and British imperial projects.

As the cultivation season came to its peak (some months UNEF had arrived), many Palestinians grew frustrated with UN units both near the ADL and inside the Gaza Strip obstructing access to their land and crops. If failing to come to personal arrangements with the UN units, they shrewdly began making legal claims to the Egyptian Governor-General. Most claimants were probably peasants with little land. Not only had many Palestinians peasants lost land as a consequence of Jewish and Palestinian elite purchases, British agricultural and economic policies, and the traditional division of land amongst sons in Mandate Palestine,⁹⁰² nearly 4.000 people in the Gaza Strip had also lost some or all of their land when the Jewish settlers established the state of Israel in 1948.⁹⁰³ Most involved in agriculture in the Gaza Strip were thus small-scale peasants or land tenants. The expulsion of some 200.000 Palestinians from the villages and towns north-east of the Southern District that became the Gaza Strip only increased the pressure on the land. Unsurprisingly, opportunists and friends of the regime also made claims, adding to the pressure on the Egyptian regime, which had already made the Gaza Strip tax-free and supported citrus plantation start-ups. As claims began mounting, the much beleaguered Egyptian Governor-General had the liaison officers to UNEF present these to the UN force. By mid-summer, the UNEF worried about the “(...) *considerable number of claims of landowners in the area (...)*”⁹⁰⁴ that “(...) *varied in nature and covered demands for the payment by UNEF of arbitrary rentals for the use of land, not based on any actual loss suffered by the owner; assertions that parcels of uncultivable land in use by UNEF would have been tilled if the Force was not there; or claims for loss of crops or alleged damage to planted fields.*”⁹⁰⁵ Knowing that the elite of the Gaza Strip had grown close to the Egyptians (if not closer than it had been to the British)—on account of the severance from Palestine and dependence on its goodwill and allowance for middle-class Egyptians to purchase imported luxury goods—it seems fair to assume that at least some of the first claims may well have been friendly services to political allies, trials to see if compensation would be paid either sparingly or the opposite or both. The Under-Secretary, Ralph Bunche, also thought so, noting to the UNEF Force Commander that there was “(...) *an apparent tendency on the part of Egyptian Liaison*

⁹⁰² Issa Khalaf, “The Effect of Socioeconomic Change on Arab Societal Collapse in Mandate Palestine,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 29, no. 1 (1997): 93–112.

⁹⁰³ Jean-Pierre Filiu and John King, *Gaza: A History* (London: Hurst & Company, 2014), 106.

⁹⁰⁴ Message “Claims against UNEF for use of land” from Under-Secretary Ralph Bunche to UNEF Force Commander E. L. M. Burns, 23 October 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

officers to act as something more than intermediaries with UNEF and rather the advocates of local claimants (...)”⁹⁰⁶ He continued that “(...) *it has been the experience of UNEF that these officers have put forward even the most exaggerated claims at their face value, and often for high payments, to the point either of encouraging the submission of claims or of entering them on their own initiative without a request from the claimant.*”⁹⁰⁷ Rather than facing unrelenting Palestinian claims ad hoc, UNEF HQ and the UN HQ in New York held back not on all but on most of the claims for compensation in order to seek a broader negotiated policy with the Egyptians. This unsurprisingly led the number of claims to rise. By October, some 40-50 claims were pending with no policy in sight.⁹⁰⁸

Naturally, the Egyptians were keen to let the UN pay to score points with the Palestinians while the UN was keen to keep costs low. Although the Under-Secretary informed the Force Commander that he accepted compensation for damages caused by UNEF beyond the few arrangements already made in the most obvious cases of damage in non-operational areas, he made some reservations. First, he argued that private law could not be used against military use. Secondly, he also contended that the land occupied by UNEF—which amounted to that of the large maintenance area near Rafah (due to the concentration of ex-British facilities and skilled labourers trained by the British and its proximity to its supply point in El-Arish Airstrip), six or seven battalion headquarters, 13 company headquarters, 27 platoon headquarters, approximately 70 observation posts and the roads and tracks linking platoon camps and observation posts as well as the bulldozed ADL—constituted a minimalist approach to military land use.⁹⁰⁹ In doing so, however, he ignored that the Gaza Strip was overpopulated in relation to its size (5-8 kilometres wide and a little more than 40 kilometres long) as well as unable to sustain itself, which meant that even a

⁹⁰⁶ Message “Claims against UNEF for use of land” from Under-Secretary Ralph Bunche to UNEF Force Commander E. L. M. Burns, 23 October 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA.

⁹⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁰⁸ Letter on “Claims re. Land adjacent to ADL” from UN Legal Adviser (New York) to Legal Officer at Egyptian Liaison Headquarters, 26 June, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA, Message “Land for Erections of Radio Pilots” from UNEF Accommodation Officer to UNEF Legal Adviser, 8 August 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA and Letter on Land Claims from UNEF Force Commander E. L. M. Burns to Brigadier-General Amin Hilmy at Egyptian Liaison Staff Headquarters, 17 September 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹⁰⁹ Message “Claims against UNEF for use of land” from Under-Secretary Ralph Bunche to UNEF Force Commander E. L. M. Burns, 23 October 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA.

minimalist approach took away land (at night time the 500 meter ADL zone alone amounted to 10% of the width of the Gaza Strip).⁹¹⁰ Thirdly, he also (rightly) argued that most of the land UNEF used in one capacity or another had been uncultivable before the arrival of UNEF. Finally, he noted that UNEF's land use remained within the Status of Forces Agreement entered with Egypt that—as the possessor of the rights of the sovereign State—had previously held the ADL itself. Writing the Force Commander six months after the arrival of the force, it was nevertheless clear that the Under-Secretary, despite his unwillingness to let the Egyptians take him hostage, did not hold the reins of the situation. Showing that political matters were decided in New York, he let the Force Commander know that the Legal Advisor was instructed not only to search for people “(...) *both sufficiently neutral and sufficiently competent in administrative procedures* (...)”,⁹¹¹ but also to negotiate with the Egyptians about the making of a neutral “(...) *joint indemnification procedure* (...)”⁹¹² that was to involve both Egyptian and UN representatives, balance between Egyptian practices of and UN ideas and offer joint compensation with a larger Egyptian share.⁹¹³

However, this was easier said than done. In the Gaza Strip, peasants (and others interested in what else was possible) continued to pressure the Egyptians to get compensation, leaving the Egyptians unable to budge much. For its part, the UN made little internal progress despite the Secretary-General becoming part of the process (once again);⁹¹⁴ despite several clarifying aide-memoires were exchanged between UNEF, UN and the Egyptians;⁹¹⁵ and despite the Force Commander recommending

⁹¹⁰ Following surveys in 1951, UNRWA estimated that as much as a third of the Gaza Strip was uncultivable, being sand dunes. John B. Blandford and United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, “Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East to the United Nations General Assembly” (New York: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, September 1951). Among those recognising that the Gaza Strip was unsustainable was also UNRWA. A former UNRWA economic advisor also made this point public, see James Baster, “Economic Problems in the Gaza Strip,” *The Middle East Journal* 9, no. 3 (1955): 323–27.

⁹¹¹ Message “Claims against UNEF for use of land” from Under-Secretary Ralph Bunche to UNEF Force Commander E. L. M. Burns, 23 October 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA.

⁹¹² *Ibid.*

⁹¹³ As for the share of compensation, the UN Under-Secretary made reference to NATO's status of forces agreement, which suggested the sending state pay 25% and the receiving state 75%.

⁹¹⁴ “Claims against UNEF for use of Land” from Constantin Stavropoulos, UN Legal Counsel, to Dag Hammarskjöld, UN General-Secretary, 8 November 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA.

⁹¹⁵ Letter on Land Claims from Brigadier-General Amin Hilmy at Egyptian Liaison Staff Headquarters to UNEF Force Commander E. L. M. Burns, 17 November 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA and Letter on Land Claims from UNEF Force Commander E. L. M. Burns to Brigadier-General Amin Hilmy at Egyptian Liaison Staff Headquarters, 18 November 1957, Land Claims, Claims

the Legal Counsel to the Secretary-General that it would be wise to make some small measures of payments to “(...) *consolidate the appeal which the presence of UNEF could have for the local population (...)*”,⁹¹⁶ most probably aware that at least some and increasingly a growing number of the claims were from struggling Palestinian peasants that had suffered damage to their trees, lost access to vital land or seen crops destroyed by UN vehicles.⁹¹⁷ By December 1957, the UN Legal Adviser and the Egyptian Liaison Officer were still navigating the issues of how the Egyptian obligation to provide land for operational uses linked to whether or not to compensate the owners against the backdrop of established Egyptian practices (of doing so or not) and UNEF seeing compensation as an mostly Egyptian matter and vice versa.⁹¹⁸

By mid-May 1958, however, Egypt and the UN appear to have found both a joint procedure grounded in the Status of Forces Agreement and assessors that they could agree upon. If only some of the claims of peasants owning land that the UN used for `comfort` and `convenience` (i.e. football fields and shooting ranges) had been handled (as they did avoided the Egypt obligation to provide land), Palestinians with claims related to operational use would soon have their complaints considered.⁹¹⁹ In early June, 17 of them received an offer for settlement from UNEF by way of the Egyptian Liaison staff, making note of having considered the assessments made by the agricultural expert of the Egyptian administration.⁹²⁰ Soon after, more Palestinians began filing claims for compensation about destroyed buildings and walls, crops such as barley destroyed by vehicles, and damaged or wholly destroyed trees (olive, lemon, almond and eucalyptus), date palms, cactus hedges and vines with the Egyptians in a steady stream.⁹²¹ Aside a minor spat between the Egyptian regime and UNEF about

outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹¹⁶ “Claims against UNEF for use of Land” from Constantin Stavropoulos, UN Legal Counsel, to Dag Hammarskjöld, UN General-Secretary, 8 November 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹¹⁷ Internal UNEF “Special Report”, undated May 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA.

⁹¹⁸ “Letter” regarding Land use and compensation from UNEF Legal Adviser to Egyptian Liaison Officer, 11 December 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹¹⁹ Letter “Claims for land” from UNEF Legal and Political Adviser to UNEF Chief Administrative Officer, 15 May 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹²⁰ “Letter” regarding Land use and compensation from UNEF Legal Adviser to Egyptian Liaison Officer, 9 June 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹²¹ “Letter” regarding compensation from UNEF Legal Adviser to Egyptian Liaison Officer, 20 June 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims,

what constituted ‘operational’ needs (and who could make the decisions) and the occasional case that had two Palestinians claim ownership and compensation for the same land (made possible by Israel taking part of the land registry in 1956), claims were soon dealt with at a rate of 15 cases per week, a pace telling of the importance UNEF granted the Palestinians’ feelings towards the force.⁹²² It is uncertain how often UNEF requested reimbursement from Egypt (although it reserved the right to do so), but UNEF and the Egyptians settled 117 cases (of which 93 related to damage from operational use such as storage areas, parking lots, transport and patrol roads etc.). While this left 80 claims unsettled on the one hand, it also provided some average amounts to go by as standards on the other.⁹²³ Additionally, the fact that the land area in the compensation claims had been reduced by nearly 70% after being jointly surveyed pleased the Legal and Political Adviser who informed the Force Commander and Chief Administrative Officer that “(...) *the joint machinery for the surveying of land claims works smoothly*”.⁹²⁴ Aside some minor hitches, such as UNEF shifting to direct payments for the majority of the settlements in the spring of 1960 (which the

Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA and “Letter” regarding compensation from UNEF Legal Adviser to Egyptian Liaison Officer, 27 June 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹²² “Letter” regarding operational claims from UNEF Legal Adviser to Egyptian Liaison Officer, 7 July 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA, “Letter” on Land Claims from UNEF Force Commander E. L. M. Burns to Brigadier-General Amin Hilmy at Egyptian Liaison Staff Headquarters, 7 July 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA, “Letter” on Land Claims from Brigadier-General Amin Hilmy at Egyptian Liaison Staff Headquarters to UNEF Force Commander E. L. M. Burns, 5 August 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA, “Letter” on Land Claims from UNEF Force Commander E. L. M. Burns to Brigadier-General Amin Hilmy at Egyptian Liaison Staff Headquarters, 7 August 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA and “Letter” regarding operational claims from UNEF Legal Adviser to Egyptian Liaison Officer, 23 September 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹²³ Memo “Average cost of Land Claims” to UNEF Force Commander and Chief Administrative Officer, 29 September 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹²⁴ Letter “Land Claims” from UNEF Legal and Political Adviser to UNEF Force Commander and Chief Administrative Officer, 8 October 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

Egyptian administration was not pleased with perhaps considering it a means to gain goodwill),⁹²⁵ the joint system for managing and compensating the claims found worthy had found its footing.

However, that is not to say that the claims, or rather the problems causing them, went away. By 1963, more than 350 Palestinians—most of whom appear to have been illiterate peasants with small pieces of land (making their mark with a finger dipped in ink) rather than owners of multiple properties or large-scale landowners—had made claims for compensations against UNEF roads on their lands (some of which were kept in operation for 7 years), the destruction of crops, trees and property by UNEF and the loss of access to land due to UNEF operations. While the UNEF records do not shed light neither on how many peasants and landowners remained in the Gaza Strip, nor the total number of claims filed (and compensations made), it seems fair to assume that the claimants probably made up only a minor part of the peasant population. Nevertheless, their claims not only stood as very clear counter-arguments to the moderate claim of the UN Under-Secretary, they also caused UNEF some worries over the years. Not only was the joint claims system set up. UNEF also appears to have recognised that most claimants on whose land the force operated were probably for the most part struggling peasants and that careless behaviour would be counterproductive and thus to be avoided. Emphasising the need for maintaining good relations with the local population, the Egyptian Governor-General's administration and the Egyptian government in Cairo, orders to avoid damages on land, crops, hedges and property were accordingly given recurrently by both contingent officers and the Force Commander until the withdrawal of the force in 1967.⁹²⁶ As noted, however,

⁹²⁵ Letter "Payment of Land Claims" from UNEF Legal Adviser to UNEF Chief Finance Officer Officer, 23 May 1960, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹²⁶ "Letter" regarding operational claims from UNEF Legal Adviser to Egyptian Liaison Officer, 16 December 1958, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA, "Land Claim Roster March 1962 to March 1963", Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA, Letter "Claim for Compensation" to Administrative Governor of Rafah from Civilian Claimant, 26 September 1964, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA, Letter "Increasing of Rent", from UNEF Chief Logistics Officer to URA Liaison Staff, 17 October 1964, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA, Letter "Claim for Compensation" to Administrative Governor of Rafah from Civilian Claimant, undated December 1964, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA, Message "Damages to Civilian Property" from UNEF Force Commander, 20 January 1965, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator

the UN force also connected to Palestine's deeper history of externalisation due to its entanglement with the intersecting American and British imperial projects and the unmaking of Palestine.

When the League of Nations sanctioned the British takeover following the First World War, Palestinian peasants had not only faced uneven Ottoman policies, which had empowered and enlarged the urban landowning class and established oppressive tax systems and land-tenure systems to gain local support.⁹²⁷ They had also had to put up with the hardships of war: large-scale forced labour, deforestation, seizure of food and livestock as well as military units being quartered in villages. Yet, the British would offer little respite. Instead, they implemented a racialised regime manned it with colonial administrators, experts and security forces with the aim of providing strategic imperial linkage and integrating the mandate into the imperial and global economies. This entailed the monetization of the agrarian economy (and push towards landlords and large-scale landowners); the entrance to world market and subsequent commodification of land, labour and time; increased competition; and mechanization (which favoured the more organized Jewish settlers that also increased in numbers). Unsurprisingly, the Palestinian rioted, but gained only some tariff protection. The depression further intensified competition with the Jewish colonial settlers, Palestinian communal disharmony and made the landless rural population dependent on wage labour (with lower wages than their Jewish counterparts who especially after 1933 were also allowed to immigrate in ever larger numbers). Altogether, these factors led to a Palestinian revolt that brought about both the enlargement and militarisation of the British security forces as well as turned Palestine into a militarised geography. The following years were even more marked by the British economic and agricultural policies, which had reduced the resilience of the Palestinian rural communities to poor harvests, droughts, cattle diseases, plagues of locusts and mice, and launched citrus fruits as the main export product in direct competition with Spain and South Africa. Neither the ensuing overcrowded and over-used lands and increase in unskilled wage labour, nor Palestinian-Jewish relations improved with the Second World War. By 1945, around 10% of the Palestinian population had to make do with unskilled wage labour, urban slum was spreading, and the Jewish settlers and the Palestinian elite were buying up land at a growing pace while peasant families, following traditions of heritage, divided their lands into smaller plots for their sons, leaving a growing number of peasants with less than sustainable lands. At the same time, the Jewish colonial settlers staged their insurgency against the British Mandate

Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA, Message "Planting of Trees" from UNEF Chief Operations Officer, 11 June 1965, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA and "Complaint" from Civilian Claimant to UNEF, 24 May 1967, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer's Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

⁹²⁷ For more on the general imperial structure and dynamics of the Ottoman Empire, see Barkey, *Empire of Difference*.

administration with the aim of setting up a Jewish state, forcing the British to deploy almost 100.000 troops.⁹²⁸

Enter the UN, which—on British request—took it upon itself to deal with the collapsing British Mandate. At that point, London had already thought about the partition of Palestine into a Jewish and an ‘Arab’ state for more than a decade, knowing well that the division of land was a major if not the largest issue.⁹²⁹ Echoing the British, the UN Special Committee On Palestine, established by a special General Assembly session in May 1947, recommended partition and thus the making of two states by the end of August 1947 against the backdrop of: the Palestinian lack of organisation and rejection of anything but a state of their own; the Jewish territorially aspiring web of armed state-like institutions; the British lack of recommendations; the US and Soviet silences due to institutional disagreement on policy or strategy;⁹³⁰ and finally the Jordanian King’s wish to annex the West Bank.⁹³¹ According to historian Elad Ben-Dror, the secretariat staff (including Ralph Bunche and Constantin Stavropoulos) that were to service the UN’s Palestine Commission—the UN organisation that was to act as a provisional government while partitioning Palestine—thus left the idea of an Arab state and instead focused only on making a Jewish state.⁹³² Unquestionably, the UN thus had a share of responsibility in the unmaking of Palestine, finalised with the Jewish settlers’ establishment of Israel in the Middle Eastern war in 1948. In extension thereof, the unmaking of Palestine linked directly to the making of the Gaza Strip hybrid geography, in which the UN came to provide initially relief and later social welfare via UNRWA.⁹³³ In doing so, the UN took on state-like responsibilities along Egypt. As UNRWA recognised that “(...)

⁹²⁸ Khalaf, “The Effect of Socioeconomic Change on Arab Societal Collapse in Mandate Palestine”; El-Eini, Roza I.M., “Trade Agreements and the Continuation of Tariff Protection Policy in Mandate Palestine in the 1930s,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 34, no. 1 (1998): 164–91; Ilan Pappé, *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

⁹²⁹ Penny Sinanoglou, “British Plans for the Partition of Palestine, 1929–1938,” *Historical Journal* 52, no. 1 (2009): 131–52.

⁹³⁰ For more on the diverging ideas of the different American institutions Thomas W. Lippman, “The View from 1947: The CIA and the Partition of Palestine.,” *The Middle East Journal* 61, no. 1 (2007): 17-.

⁹³¹ Elad Ben-Dror, “The Success of the Zionist Strategy Vis-À-Vis UNSCOP,” *Israel Affairs* 20, no. 1 (2014): 19–39.

⁹³² Elad Ben-Dror, “How the United Nations Intended to Implement the Partition Plan: The Handbook Drawn up by the Secretariat for the Members of the United Nations Palestine Commission,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 43, no. 6 (2007): 997–1008.

⁹³³ For more on the unmaking of Palestine and the ethnic cleansing this involved, see Ilan Pappé, *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine* (Oxford: OneWorld Publications Limited, 2006). For more on the establishment of UNRWA, its initial relief activities and its re-orientation towards social welfare, see Ilana Feldman, “The Quaker Way: Ethical Labor and Humanitarian Relief,” *American Anthropologist* 34, no. 4 (2007): 689–705; Rosenfeld, “From Emergency Relief Assistance to Human Development and Back: UNRWA and the Palestinian Refugees, 1950–2009.”

*about one-third of the area consists of sand dunes and is entirely unproductive (...)*⁹³⁴ and the population density of the Gaza Strip high, it started both an afforestation project to turn refugees into ‘self-supporting farmers’ and an agricultural training centre with American cattle. The centre was to serve as a model for others, but the Israelis closed it in November 1956.⁹³⁵

Once the Israel withdrew, UNRWA was able to restore its developmentalist operations in the agricultural (and educational) sphere. More importantly, however, the UN force arrived to the Gaza Strip as part of the process of reopening the Suez Canal. Not only was this goal achieved. Incidentally, the UN (force) also both created a military geography of its own in the form of observations posts, camps ranging from platoon to battalion size, military roads, maintenance areas, communication sites, storage facilities, officers’ villas as well as beach and sports clubs that in no small way resembled the military geography of the British Mandate (forces) on the one hand and enlarged its own role in the management of land in the Gaza Strip in a way that built on and in part continued the overall British militarised geography in the post-Mandate Gaza Strip on the other. While this continuation of the militarisation (of land, space and everyday life) and state of permanent but unstable exception brought tension, it is by no means enough to explore the practice of UNEF only through the prism of land: The practice of the UN force also needs to be examined through the eyes of the Palestinians and Bedouin who may have seen the security arrangements of UNEF generating as much insecurity as security.

As Before (II)? Security and Insecurity as a Prism to understand the Negotiation of the UN Regime in the Gaza Strip

In this section, I examine how the practice of UNEF was negotiated through the prism of security and insecurity not only because scholars on imperial and colonial expansion and the Mandate regimes centre security.⁹³⁶ Scholarship on contemporary

⁹³⁴ Baster, “Economic Problems in the Gaza Strip.”

⁹³⁵ Henry Labouisse and UNRWA, “Special Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East” (New York; Beirut: UNRWA and UN General Assembly, June 30, 1954); Henry Labouisse and UNRWA, “Special Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East” (New York; Beirut: UNRWA and UN General Assembly, December 15, 1956); Henry Labouisse and UNRWA, “Annual Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East” (New York; Beirut: UNRWA and UN General Assembly, June 30, 1957).

⁹³⁶ See for instance Hevia, *The Imperial Security State*; Susanne Kuss, “Co-Operation between German and French Troops During the Boxer War in China, 1900/1: The Punitive Expedition to Baoding,” in *Imperial Cooperation and Transfer, 1870-1930* (New York; London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015), 197–218; Georgina Sinclair, *At the End of the Line: Colonial Policing and the Imperial Endgame, 1945-80* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006); Gerke Teitler, “The Mixed Company: Fighting Power and Ethnic Relations in the Dutch

interventions also link security and insecurity. Notably, military sociologist Paul Higate and gender and developmental scholar Marsha Henry contend that “(...) *peacekeeping is about space, how it is seen, the way it is reconfigured by peacekeeping going about their security work, and crucially, the impact these spatial-security practices have (...)*.”⁹³⁷ In the context of peacekeeping, the spatial practice of security, according to Higate and Henry, “*shapes how space is experienced, and to the extent to which it is considered secure or insecure.*”⁹³⁸ Within the Gaza Strip, the (in)security prism therefore covers not only military aspects, but also various everyday life encounters: 1) the ADL regime; 2) UNEF traffic in the Gaza Strip and off duty encounters in the Gaza Strip and 3) Israeli crossings into the Gaza Strip.

Shortly after the UN force arrived in March 1957, it began to provide grounds for the Gaza Strip ‘natives’, refugees and Bedouin to view it with less relief than when it had replaced the Israeli forces. UNEF units not only met the Gaza City demonstrations and riots with armed soldiers, warning shots and clubs (as showed in chapter 7) and continued the militarisation of the land, putting further pressure on the remaining peasants (as touched upon previously in this chapter). The different UNEF units on the ADL would also—more or less right after setting up their more than 70 observation posts and camps there in late March 1957—generate tension (sometimes of a fleeting character and occasionally leading to premeditated attempted murder) in their encounters and relations with people living near the ADL on account of their racialised, gendered and often rigid ways of monitoring and regulating their assigned sectors. Spatialised intersecting moments of diachronic and synchronic factors, these various encounters reflected the tasks of the UNEF units in the respective areas in which they served, their experiences following their redeployment from El- Arish and the deeper logics, norms and practices of their national military cultures on the one hand, and the precarity of everyday life for the Gaza strip population and their experiences from the Mandate era on the other.

Although the UNEF reports on ADL incidents and the correspondence between the Force Commander and the UN General-Secretary and Under-Secretary on these remain inaccessible, the EIMAC records suggest that the first six to ten months in the decade UNEF operated on the ADL were particularly agitated. Most incidents were minor and did not lead to violence: In early April, for example, Danish soldiers detained two peasants by on suspicion of stealing grass in Israel, perhaps on account of the aforementioned racialised pro-Israeli views dominating the joint Danish-Norwegian battalion that cast Palestinians (and Egyptians) as primitive in contrast to Israelis that were seen as fellow and ‘civilised’ people, being ‘white’, using tractors and speaking both English and German.⁹³⁹ However, fewer but more serious incidents

Colonial Army 1890-1920,” in *Colonial Armies in South East Asia*, ed. Tobias Rettig and Karl Hack (Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2009), 154–68; Thomas, *Empires of Intelligence*.

⁹³⁷ Higate and Henry, *Insecure Spaces: Peacekeeping, Power and Performance in Haiti, Kosovo and Liberia*, 3.

⁹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁹³⁹ “Incident Report” 2 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

led to both killings of Palestinians and attacks on UNEF units. Also in early April, a Brazilian unit was attacked with redeployed Egyptian or Israeli mines, a Palestinian and Bedouin asymmetric tactic used against both British and Israeli forces.⁹⁴⁰ Here it is worth noting that the Brazilian army had grown out of the Portuguese colonial army and been used to both populate and colonise strategically the ‘primitive’ Amazon interior and regulate the mobilities of the free poor. Despite reforms, it remained governed by ideas of violent ‘white’ masculine honour and engaged in frontier violence in the 1950s.⁹⁴¹ In another April incident perhaps re-actualising the patronising and distrustful nature of the Dutch colonial military and state that both the Indonesian military and state had partially inherited, an Indonesian soldier shot and wounded a Palestinian male refugee standing in a crowd of nearly 60 people near the Indonesian camp, perceiving the group as threatening.⁹⁴² Three weeks later several Palestinian men seeking day labour were beaten with rifle butts and one killed by Indonesian soldiers after a guard mistakenly let the group enter the camp alongside a truck.⁹⁴³ On the following day, the UN Commander requested the Military Advisor to the Secretary-General that the Colombian battalion—which was placed on the ADL off Khan Younis that housed both a camp of more than 25,000 refugees and a camp of 31,000 Bedouin—be issued machine guns and mortars, which all other ADL contingents already had.⁹⁴⁴ However, both on the very day the US (the Colombian arms supplier) rejected the request for heavy weapons and some days later, Danish units killed two Palestinians.⁹⁴⁵ A week and several detentions later, the UN Commander issued an order on how to act should civil disorder erupt, echoing the British ‘Aid to Civil Power’ function. He charted seemingly sound principles of acting correct, not using physical coercion, and not resorting to punitive actions. Yet, he also

⁹⁴⁰ “Incident Report” 4 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁹⁴¹ Peter M. Beattie, *The Tribute of Blood: Army, Honor, Race, and Nation in Brazil, 1864-1945* (Durham, London: Duke University Press, 2001); Shawn C. Smallman, “Military Terror and Silence in B55cfrazil, 1910–1945,” *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 24, no. 1 (1999): 5–27; Shawn C. Smallman, “The Professionalization of Military Terror in Brazil, 1945-1964,” *Luso-Brazilian Review* 37, no. 1 (2000): 117–28.

⁹⁴² “Incident Report” 18 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁹⁴³ “Incident Report” 5 May 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁹⁴⁴ Letter from the UN Force Commander to UN SEC-GEN military Advisor “Equipment for the Colombian Battalion” 4 May 1957, Correspondence, Colombia, Field Operations Division, S- S-1721-0000-0019, UNA

⁹⁴⁵ “Letter from US Delegation to the UN to Director of Field Operations Division” 5 June 1957, Correspondence, Colombia, Field Operations Division, S- S-1721-0000-0019, UNA, “Incident Report” 5 June 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, “Incident Report” 8 June 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, and “Incident Report” 14 June 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

ordered armoured vehicles be used sparingly to avoid losing their ‘moral effect’ on the locals and that “*As a rule, the dispersal of rioters and the taking into custody of the ring-leaders are sufficient to restore order,*”⁹⁴⁶ revealing that he was ready to take over internal security and thereby breach the verbal agreement with Nasser, the Status of Forces Agreement, and the 1949 Armistice Agreement. While no riot or revolt broke out, a Danish unit was fired upon two weeks later.⁹⁴⁷ From late May to late July, several Bedouin also attacked UN units all along the ADL with guns (leaving one Bedouin dead) and mines (leaving two Palestinian farmers dead).⁹⁴⁸ In July, Palestinian villagers from the Finnish sector also first fired upon two Finnish units and later attacked an outpost after two drunk Finnish soldiers had rummaged their village for women for sex,⁹⁴⁹ an insult as the Palestinian female body had emerged as the symbol of the nation in the Mandate era.⁹⁵⁰ Indonesian and Colombian units were also attacked with guns and mines in their sectors.⁹⁵¹ In mid-July, a Palestinian teenager was shot and wounded by a Brazilian soldier in the Brazilian sector. Emphasizing the soldier’s rough behaviour, an eleven-year-old Palestinian boy who had witnessed the shooting of his friend told the EIMAC observer with all the anger he could muster that he “(…) *will take the police to these people.*”⁹⁵² In August, more than 25 rounds were fired upon a Danish unit with an automatic weapon using the ammunition of the Egyptian-controlled but Palestinian-manned police militia’s

⁹⁴⁶ “Instructions for Guidance of Troops Acting in Protection of UN Personnel and Property” 25 June 1957, Org. and Adm. Civil Affairs Gaza, Registry Files, Military Personnel, Office of the Force Commander, UNEF, S-0530-0211-0003, UNA

⁹⁴⁷ “Incident Report” 1 July 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁹⁴⁸ “Incident Report” 15 May 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, “Incident Report” 18 June 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, “Incident Report” 26 June 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, “Incident Report” 29 July 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA and “Incident Report” 30 July 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA

⁹⁴⁹ “Incident Report” 3 July 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA, “Incident Report” 15 July 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA and “Incident Report” 27 July 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁹⁵⁰ Ela Greenberg, *Preparing the Mothers of Tomorrow Education and Islam in Mandate Palestine* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010).

⁹⁵¹ “Incident Report” 29 July 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA and “Incident Report” 30 July 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

⁹⁵² “Incident Report” 14 July 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA

automatic weapon, suggesting that members of the unit—which the Governor-General had ordered to cooperate with UNEF—now also took part in attacks on UNEF.⁹⁵³ As autumn became winter, UNEF still faced additional attacks as the reduced availability of vegetables and fruits raised the stakes of crossing.⁹⁵⁴ Against this backdrop, it seems to fair to suggest that the Gaza Strip residents may have seen UNEF as engendering both fleeting sensations and longer experiences of ‘insecurity’.

However, the year of 1958 appears to have brought less tension. Despite noting more than 30 cases of UNEF detaining men, women and children from January to June 1958, the EIMAC reports make mention of ‘only’ 4 attacks on UNEF—one involving a young Palestinian woman who wounded a Colombian soldier with a knife after he confronted her near the ADL, thus perhaps reacting to what she saw as an aggression—and no killings of Palestinians and Bedouin between early January and May.⁹⁵⁵ A battalion report from the Danish-Norwegian, however, notes 8 separate incidents from April to October in which its units were targeted with gun fire, challenging at least somewhat the number of only four incidents overall.⁹⁵⁶ As mentioned before, the UNEF records concerning ADL incidents may also show a different picture even if protocol was to dispatch the EIMAC observers to the incidents, as they had been the attacks and killings from April 1957 to December 1957, some of which were corroborated by a few memoirs.⁹⁵⁷ However, the EIMAC reports do not stand alone in noting a change. Using statistics from the Israeli security and military forces on ‘infiltrations’, Alina Korn, an Israeli sociologist focusing on

⁹⁵³ “Incident Report” 27 August 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA

⁹⁵⁴ “Incident Report” 1 October 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA, “Incident Report” 9 October 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA, “Incident Report” 22 October 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA, “Incident Report” 24 November 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA, “Incident Report” 29 November 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA, “Incident Report” 30 November 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA and “Incident Report” 9 December 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA

⁹⁵⁵ “Incident Report” 3 January 1958, Complaints and Investigations January 1958-June 1958, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0002, UNA, “Incident Report” 9 January 1958, Complaints and Investigations January 1958-June 1958, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0002, UNA, “Incident Report” 15 April 1958, Complaints and Investigations January 1958-June 1958, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0002, UNA and “Incident Report” 23 April 1958, Complaints and Investigations January 1958-June 1958, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0002, UNA

⁹⁵⁶ DANOR BN IV, “DANOR BN IV - April-October 1958” (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1958).

⁹⁵⁷ See chapter 7.

political crime and legal sociology, also notes that the number of Palestinians crossing into Israel dropped noticeably throughout 1957 and 1958 compared to the previous years.⁹⁵⁸ A range of different influences linked to both Egypt and the UN relieved tension.

Foremost, the Egyptian government contributed, even if it was more concerned with avoiding a war with Israel than helping the Palestinians. First, the Egyptian President secured a working relationship with the US from 1958, selling itself as a stabilising force of Arab nationalism,⁹⁵⁹ to put, as Salim Yaqub, historian of Egypt-Israeli relations, noted, “(...) *the Arab-Israeli issue ‘in the icebox’, insulated alike from war and diplomacy.*”⁹⁶⁰ Subsequently, Cairo allowed the Gaza Strip’s political elite to establish a ‘Legislative Council’ in 1958 after rejecting their suggestion of joining the United Arab Republic, a joint Egyptian-Syrian republic under Egyptian dominance. Soon after, Cairo also let the last of the two Palestinian battalion of frontier guards—which had been created in the early 1950s to guide Palestinian militancy away from Israel (even if that failed and was part of the Israeli motivations for the invasion in late 1956) return. This doubling of Palestinian security forces was a weighty concession, as it increased the visibility of Palestinian involvement in policing, and thus governing, the Gaza Strip, not least because it was to be followed of the formation of Fatah, a militant nationalist organisation.⁹⁶¹ Moreover, Cairo also set up a scheme that allowed (especially the nationalist or leftist) teachers and unskilled workers to travel to the Gulf States. Egyptian loans and Egyptian access to the markets of especially Yugoslavia (that had troops in the Gaza Strip) and Czechoslovakia also facilitated a growing number of citrus plantations, offering some income opportunities (by the mid-1960s, nearly half of the Gaza Strip’s workforce had found work on these plantations). Nevertheless, the Palestinians workers went underpaid as unions were illegal and the readily available supply of labour kept wages low just as the thirty richest Gazan families who owned the plantations expanded their lands ten-fold (to a third of the Gaza Strip’s fertile land by the mid-1960s) at the peasants’ expense.⁹⁶² Egypt, rather than the UN, thus continued the British line of simultaneous economic inclusion and exclusion.

As noted, the UN force also contributed to a less edgy atmosphere. For example, the abovementioned joint compensation procedure may have been of influence. That UNEF detonated several personnel and anti-armour mines in unmarked minefields on the edge of the Gaza strip, released the agricultural centre to let it reopen, and held information sessions on the population of the Gaza Strip and Islam for at least some contingents may also have eased relations.⁹⁶³ Additionally, UNEF’s shift from

⁹⁵⁸ Korn, “From Refugees to Infiltrators: Constructing Political Crime in Israel in the 1950s.”

⁹⁵⁹ Popp, “Accommodating to a Working Relationship.”

⁹⁶⁰ Salim Yaqub, “No War, No Peace: Egypt and the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1952-1973,” *Zeitgeschichte* 31, no. 2 (2004): 70.

⁹⁶¹ Filiu and King, *Gaza*, 111–13.

⁹⁶² Paul Cossali and Clive Robson, *Stateless in Gaza* (London: Zed Books, 1986), 20; Filiu and King, *Gaza*, 119.

⁹⁶³ DANOR BN IV, “DANOR BN IV - April-October 1958.”

ignoring to reinforcing its no-fraternisation policy following the creation of United Arab Republic may also have reduced irritation by preventing ‘political eyesores’.⁹⁶⁴ Additionally, the (pre-arranged) departure of the Indonesian and the Finnish contingents, which had been involved in hostilities, may also have been a factor. Visits to the refugee camps may also have reduced the distance between ‘locals’ and UN soldiers: By 1966, UN soldiers made contributions for a house for a 71-year old Palestinian widower and medical treatment for a young Palestinian girl as well as arranging Christmas parties for Palestinian children (ignoring the religious dimension).⁹⁶⁵

However, this is not to say that everything completely changed, far from it. Albeit much less frequently compared to the first year UNEF was operational, the UN units were still shot at until it was withdrawn. In September 1958, for example, a member of the Palestinian paramilitary police/national guard that had just been allowed to redeploy from Egypt, sought to kill a Colombian soldier with his machinegun.⁹⁶⁶ In another attack on UNEF with an even clearer message, a Swedish company-size camp was fired upon in November 1959.⁹⁶⁷ This may have been linked to how a Swedish unit earlier had put several cacti-fruits under the shirt of some teenagers that had been rough to a younger boy mending his family’s sheep, an act that had result in the village in which the teenagers lived to throw rocks at Swedish units when they passed through.⁹⁶⁸ In the 1960s, attacks appear to have been much less common (or less reported on and investigated), but still occurring, in some cases with arms and in others with pickaxes or other tools turned into weapons as situations went out of hand.⁹⁶⁹

Aside keeping the UN visible, the mere presence of the ADL regime probably also fed frustrations, leading attacks to continue albeit at a smaller scale. For example, the Danish-Norwegian battalion alone conducted 4.180 patrols from October 1960 to April 1961, equating roughly one patrol pr. hour. This may not sound like much as a 24-hour average, but most patrols were night-time additions to the daytime operation

⁹⁶⁴ E. L. M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli*; DANOR BN IV, “DANOR BN IV - April-October 1958”. In a case illustrative of the shift during the life of the United Arab Republic, 6 Brazilian soldiers were taken into custody by the UNEF military police after having been detained by Israeli forces in Israel. DANOR BN X, “DANOR BN X - April-October 1961” (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1961).

⁹⁶⁵ DANOR BN VI, “DANOR BN VI - April 1959-October 1959” (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1959); DANOR BN XIX, *Minnebok* (Byens Bogtrykkeri, 1966).

⁹⁶⁶ “Incident Report” 4 September 1958, Complaints and Investigations July 1958-April 1959, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0003, UNA

⁹⁶⁷ “Incident Report” 29 November 1959, Complaints and Investigations May-December 1959, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0004, UNA

⁹⁶⁸ Sköld, *Ifredens tjänst*, 161.

⁹⁶⁹ DANOR BN VII, “DANOR BN VII - October 1959-April 1960” (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1960); DANOR BN VIII, “DANOR BN VIII - April-October 1960” (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1960); DANOR BN IX, “DANOR BN IX - October 1960-April 1961” (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1961); DANOR BN X, “DANOR BN X - April-October 1961.”

of the battalion's more than 20 observation posts.⁹⁷⁰ Factoring in the patrols and the other 50 observations posts of the entire UN force, UNEF, in fact, took part in making the Gaza Strip a highly monitored and regulated militarised geography. Although detentions also appear to have become less frequent, they did not change in character. Brazilian, Columbian and Scandinavian soldiers continued to detain Palestinians and Bedouin for picking grass near the ADL. In some cases, teenage girls and younger women were also deemed so vital' to the ADL regime that they had to be pursued for more than a kilometre. In many cases, they had not even crossed the ADL, let alone been closer than the 100 meters allowed in daytime.⁹⁷¹ 'White' UN soldiers, Canadian (or Scandinavian for that matter), also kept causing incidents on account of what could be seen as racist provocations and displays of authority, occasionally leading to violent responses.⁹⁷²

That life changed little for the majority of the population of the Gaza Strip was probably another factor contributing to incidents. Thousands may have found work in plantations or left for the Gulf States, but most refugees continued to face unemployment and squalid conditions in either Gaza City and Khan Younis, the two largest towns, or the 8 refugee camps, each holding between 8.000 and 35.000 people. Regardless of gender and dwelling, all had an insufficient dietary intake, little space for their families, no privacy, nowhere to go, and no prospect of realising their UN-backed rights to return home and compensation.⁹⁷³ As most refugees had been amongst those most dispossessed by the Mandate policies, UNRWA's aid was hardly a match for the pressure on family networks due to the loss of the markets and resources of Palestine; the rising rents due to the lack of housing; the wage drop due to the abundance of unskilled labour; the contracted economy; and the lack of soil to

⁹⁷⁰ DANOR BN IX, "DANOR BN IX - October 1960-April 1961."

⁹⁷¹ "Incident Report" 18 February 1958, Complaints and Investigations January 1958-June 1958, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0002, UNA, "Incident Report" 27 April 1959, Complaints and Investigations July 1958-April 1959, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0003, UNA, "Incident Report" 29 April 1959, Complaints and Investigations July 1958-April 1959, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0003, UNA, "Annex 2: List of UNEF Incident Reports for May", undated 1965, Summary of UNEF Reports, Complaints and Investigations July 1958-April 1959, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0022-0005, UNA and "Annex 2: List of UNEF Incident Reports for May", undated 1965, Summary of UNEF Reports, Complaints and Investigations July 1958-April 1959, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0022-0005, UNA

⁹⁷² "Incident Report" 23 December 1959, Complaints and Investigations May-December 1959, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0004, UNA

⁹⁷³ Filiu and King, *Gaza*, 74–79; For more on Palestinian memory in relation to refugee status and displacement, see Ilana Feldman, "Home as a Refrain: Remembering and Living Displacement in Gaza," *History and Memory* 18, no. 2 (2000): 10–47; Ilana Feldman, "The Challenge of Categories: UNRWA and the Definition of a 'Palestine Refugee,'" *Journal of Refugee Studies* 25, no. 3 (2012): 387–406; Masalha, *The Palestine Nakba*; Ted Swedenburg, *Memories of Revolt: The 1936-1939 Rebellion and the Palestinian National Past* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas press, 2003).

grow food.⁹⁷⁴ In a particularly depressing case, a 20-year old Palestinian woman married to a poor and unemployed 50-year old man against her will sought to kill herself by way of either Israeli units or UNEF by crossing into Israel. When interrogated after being transferred to a Brazilian unit by an Israeli unit, she explained: “*I crossed the ADL because I am angry with this life and wanted to be killed.*”⁹⁷⁵ When asked if she wanted to return to Gaza, she repeated: “*I don’t want this life, and want to be killed.*” Unquestionably, this incident elucidates the intersections between the miserable situation of women (young women in particular) in the Gaza Strip; the lives of Palestinian refugees; the lack of a horizon offering change; and the militarisation of life on both sides of the ADL.

Despite its considerable monitory and regulatory extent, UNEF’s ADL regime was ‘porous’. The force not only failed to prevent Palestinians from crossing into Israel. In several cases, it also failed to prevent Israeli settlers and soldiers from crossing the ADL, giving cause for fear, frustrations, anger and hate. This had been a problem already before 1958. For example, a Bedouin boy (and his father’s 80 sheep that he depended on for his livelihood) had been kidnapped near the ADL on the Gaza Strip side by Israeli soldiers who also shot at a young Bedouin girl when taking him. In another illuminating case, a Palestinian boy from a village near the ADL on the Gaza Strip side only just survived a hand grenade exploding in his room that the EIMAC observer suspected an Israeli settler from the nearby and ill-reputed settlement for throwing.⁹⁷⁶ After 1958, however, the UN force kept failing at preventing Israeli attacks and kidnappings both inside the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Desert of Egypt. Entering Egypt proper, for example, an Israeli unit killed a Bedouin woman and child as well as wounded another woman on February 1959.⁹⁷⁷ In September 1959, Israeli forces also killed several Bedouin in Israel and expelled nearly 350 others to Egypt, depriving them of their property and tents to finally kill a Bedouin on Egyptian territory to ensure that no one returned.⁹⁷⁸ On their own, these incidents may be seen as separate. Seen together (and with others), however, they may well be taken as a continuation of the systemic Israeli violence and dispossession of more than 6.000 Bedouin, ongoing since 1948 and part of the militarised Jewish settler state’s legacy from the British Mandate regime.⁹⁷⁹ Instances of Israeli military units handing over

⁹⁷⁴ For more on the economic problems, see Baster, “Economic Problems in the Gaza Strip” While Baster’s analysis of the economic problems is from 1955, many of the structural problems remained exactly the same. Khalaf, “The Effect of Socioeconomic Change on Arab Societal Collapse in Mandate Palestine.”

⁹⁷⁵ ⁹⁷⁵ “Incident Report” 7 March 1958, Complaints and Investigations January 1958-June 1958, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0002, UNA

⁹⁷⁶ “Incident Report” 27 June 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA and “Incident Report” 19 December 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA

⁹⁷⁷ “Incident Report” 4 February 1959, Complaints and Investigations July 1958-April 1959, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0003, UNA,

⁹⁷⁸ “Minutes of 93rd EIMAC Emergency Meeting”, 6 October 1959,

⁹⁷⁹ Thomas, *Empires of Intelligence*, 173–200.

captured or killed Palestinian farmers with assurances that they had been captured or killed in Israel also continued and remained equally impossible to challenge, UNEF having no jurisdiction in Israel.⁹⁸⁰ Israeli units also continued to detain children picking grass for their families' livestock; doing their homework away from the overcrowded refugee camps; or playing near the ADL. In some instances, Israeli units also crossed the ADL to abduct Bedouin and Palestinian children,⁹⁸¹ which in some cases may have been cause for Palestinian boys to set Israeli fields on fire.⁹⁸² Not only linked to the UNEF's inability to prevent these types of Israeli attacks, the detentions and incursions (beyond Israeli territory in particular) probably also reflected how the reduced funds for the border forces—a consequence of the growing pressure from the Israeli middle-class that wanted services rather than threats⁹⁸³—had the Israeli forces to turn, once again, to aggressive measures to deter Palestinians from returning to their former villages now in Israel.

Additionally, Israel also began to enforce a more aggressive aerial patrol regime. Certainly, French-made Israeli jets had occasionally crossed the Egyptian-Israeli International Frontier as well as the ADL before 1958. Right after the UN force had moved into the Gaza Strip, for example, Israeli fighter jets made overflights.⁹⁸⁴ After the formation of the United Arab Republic (and the reduced border forces), however, Israel not only initiated more flights at low altitude, but also sent more of its jetfighters over non-Israeli territory. On May 19th 1958, for example, 21 Israeli fighter jets flew over the Gaza Strip.⁹⁸⁵ Subsequently, the Danish-Norwegian unit also reported 219 overflights from April to October 1958 of its area alone.⁹⁸⁶ Although Israel seems to have scaled down after the end of the UAR in 1961, the Danish-Norwegian unit nevertheless kept noting on average 1 and 2 daily overflights of 'their' area alone.⁹⁸⁷

⁹⁸⁰ "Weekly Report" 7 October 1961, Weekly Reports 1961, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0029-0003, UNA, "Weekly Report" 6 June 1964, Weekly Reports 1964, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0028-0007, UNA, "Weekly Report" 18 March 1966, Weekly Reports 1966, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0029-0005, UNA and "Weekly Report" 11 May 1966, Weekly Reports 1966, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0029-0005, UNA
⁹⁸¹ "Weekly Report" 25 May 1964, Weekly Reports 1964, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0028-0007, UNA, "Weekly Report" 11 July 1964, Weekly Reports 1964, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0028-0007, UNA and "Weekly Report" 11 March 1966, Weekly Reports 1966, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0029-0005, UNA

⁹⁸² DANOR BN X, "DANOR BN X - April-October 1961."

⁹⁸³ Laron, "The Domestic Sources of Israel's Decision to Launch the 1956 Sinai Campaign."

⁹⁸⁴ "Summary of events for the period 16-22 March 1957" from Chairman EIMAC to Chief of Staff UNTSO, 26 March 1957, Weekly Reports 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0028-0003, UNA

⁹⁸⁵ "Summary of events for the period 10-16 May 1958" from Chairman EIMAC to Chief of Staff UNTSO, 19 May 1958, misplaced in Weekly Reports 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0028-0003, UNA

⁹⁸⁶ DANOR BN IV, "DANOR BN IV - April-October 1958."

⁹⁸⁷ DANOR BN VII, "DANOR BN VII - October 1959-April 1960"; DANOR BN VIII, "DANOR BN VIII - April-October 1960"; DANOR BN IX, "DANOR BN IX - October 1960-

The EIMAC records also suggest that overflights also occasionally occurred at altitudes as low as 50-200 meters, most likely an intimidation tactic along the lines of the Israeli ground incursions into the Gaza Strip.⁹⁸⁸ Moreover, Israeli naval units detained Palestinian fishing crews just as larger Israeli fishing vessels entered the Gaza 'territorial' waters, reminding the Palestinians that they were not only hemmed in, but also that the UN was unable to alter that situation.⁹⁸⁹

When seen within a broader sphere security going beyond only encounters at the ADL, UNEF traffic also proved a continuous problem in the relations with the population of the Gaza Strip. For perhaps half of the Mandate era, the British security forces had rarely numbered more than 2,000 all over Palestine.⁹⁹⁰ From 1957 to 1967, the UN deployed UNEF that varied in size from 6,000 in 1957 to approximately 3,500 in 1967 in the small territory of the Gaza Strip alone. Once in place in Egypt, the force began amassing a high number of British and American vehicles. Not surprisingly, accidents amassed quickly. Already after six months, the UN units had caused 77 traffic accidents, some of which were fatal.⁹⁹¹ In some cases compensations were made in accordance to British Mandate law that Egypt kept in place and Sharia law in others, thus balancing claims and fears of feuds with accommodating the Muslim population when it came to compensation, 'blood money', in family matters.⁹⁹²

April 1961"; DANOR BN X, "DANOR BN X - April-October 1961"; DANOR BN XII, "DANOR BN XII - April-October 1962" (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1962); DANOR BN XV, "DANOR BN XV - October 1963-April 1964" (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1964); DANOR BN XVII, "DANOR BN XVII" (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1965); DANOR BN XX, "DANOR BN XX - April-October 1966" (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1966); DANOR BN XXI, "DANOR BN XXI - October 1966-April 1967" (DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1967); DANOR BN XIX, *Minnebok*.

⁹⁸⁸ "Summary of UNEF Reports for 27-31 March 1965", Summary of UNEF Reports, Complaints and Investigations, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, S-0373-0027-0005, UNA and "Summary of Complaints for 4-10 February 1967", Summary of Complaints 1966, Complaints and Investigations, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0022-0001, UNA

⁹⁸⁹ "Incident Report" to Chairman EIMAC from UN Military Observer", 12 April 1957, Overflights, Complaints & Investigations, General Subject Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, S-0375-0060-0007, UNA, "Weekly Report for period 16 to 22 April 1960" from Chairman EIMAC to Chief of Staff UNTSO, 22 April 1960, Weekly Reports 1960, Reports, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, S-375-0028-0006, UNA and "List of weekly correspondence EIMAC for the period 26 September - 2 October 1964", Summary of UNEF Reports, Complaints and Investigations, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, S-0373-0027-0005

⁹⁹⁰ Hughes, "A British 'Foreign Legion'? The British Police in Mandate Palestine"; Knight, "Securing Zion? Policing in British Palestine, 1917-39"; Sinclair, "'Get into a Crack Force and Earn £20 a Month and All Found...': The Influence of the Palestine Police upon Colonial Policing 1922-1948."

⁹⁹¹ "Summary Roll of Traffic accidents 1956-1960", undated 1960, Series II: Traffic Accidents, Non-fatal Injuries, Property Damage (156-1960), UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0228, UNA

⁹⁹² "Memorandum on bill for local legal services" from UN Legal Officer to Chief Administrative Officer and Chief Finance Officer, 5 September 1957, Compensation for Death,

Indeed, the UN took traffic accidents serious. By February 1958, accidents were raised as a topic at the weekly conference of the commanders of the different UN contingents. Especially speed and drunk driving were noted as problems.⁹⁹³ In April 1960, the UNEF Commander further expressed the need to drastically reduce the number of traffic accidents against the backdrop of 23 UNEF-related in March.⁹⁹⁴ By September 1960, the number of accidents had nevertheless risen to 449, thus averaging 10 accidents a month, typically involving young UNEF truck drivers either driving too fast or paying little attention to traffic combined with children running across the street or, less frequently, drunk military and civilian UN staff returning from staff villa parties.⁹⁹⁵ Although the number of accidents waned—most probably reflecting the gradual reduction of the force—the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs in New York, Ralph Bunche, personally kept tabs on the situation.⁹⁹⁶ However, the UN force also caused tension in the relations with the population of the Gaza Strip by way of their off-duty encounters.

Another way the UN soldiers had UNEF associated with insecurity was through off-duty encounters. Visiting cultural and historical sites (linked to the Western understanding of the ‘Orient’ and ‘Middle East’) and the market of Gaza City in most cases probably fall outside this category. However, the involvement of UN soldiers in public drunkenness, street fights, use of private brothels, black market trade, and narcotics trafficking in Gaza City, Rafah and Khan Younis as well as UN beach locations does not. Already in June, one of the officers’ villas of the Brazilian contingent, which was located on the beach front, had grown to be so problematic that the Egyptian Chief of the Palestine Police, which had become the Egyptian-controlled but Palestinian-manned paramilitary militia, wanted to seize the villa.⁹⁹⁷ From July 1957, the UN force and the Egyptian regime were also forced to cooperate on the involvement of Brazilian, Canadian, Columbian and Indian UN soldiers in smuggling

Injury and Illness June 1957 to March 1958, Social Security, Privileges, Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, UNEF, S-0530-0102-0010, UNA

⁹⁹³ “Aide memoire from Commanders Weekly Conference”, 18 February 1958, Commanders’ Conferences, Registry Files, Military Personnel, Office of the Commander, S-0530-0210-0006, UNA

⁹⁹⁴ “Message on Motor Accident Rate in UNEF” from Force Commander to all contingents, 8 April 1960, Accidents 1959-1962, UNEF, UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0245, UNA

⁹⁹⁵ “Summary Roll of Traffic accidents 1956-1960”, undated 1960, Series II: Traffic Accidents, Non-fatal Injuries, Property Damage (156-1960), UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0228, UNA

⁹⁹⁶ “UNEF Commander to Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs Ralph Bunche”, 18 November 1964, UNEF Accidents 1963, UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0228, UNA

⁹⁹⁷ “Memo: Egyptian Demand on UNEF Accommodation” from Accommodation Officer to Brazilian Contingent Commander, 12 June 1957, Land Claims, Claims outside Contracts, Contracts, Leases, Insurance and Claims, Privileges and Immunities of UNEF, Legal Affairs, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

and distributing narcotics.⁹⁹⁸ In August 1957, the Egyptian liaison staff, under pressure from the Governor-general, also informed UNEF that UN soldiers took part in promoting theft and robbery by frequenting ‘houses of ill repute’ in Gaza City that were not regulated (as brothels since no formal ‘Red Light District’ existed).⁹⁹⁹ Most common, however, were drunkenness and altercations. Perhaps not to lose the favour of the ‘business classes’—that included owners of bars, casinos, restaurants as well as taxis—on account of soldiers causing trouble and to create off-duty venting options away from the local population, UNEF approved the establishments of contingent bars with Palestinian barmen (if these mostly worked in the officers’ clubs), and the purchase of alcohol in bulk (1.800 bottles of rum at a time).¹⁰⁰⁰ Not surprisingly, however, UN soldiers still caused trouble in the Gaza Strip throughout the operational period. While the UNEF Military Police records, which to a large extent are the central records for which to search for off-duty incidents, are still inaccessible, both internal records from the Danish-Norwegian Battalion and UNEF records that were sent to the Danish UN Department in the Danish Ministry of Defence are both accessible and illuminate the Danish soldiers’ off-duty behaviour. For example, it appears to have been common to combine souvenir shopping with lunches mostly consisting of a lot of beer, wine and liquor in the British era and beach neighbourhoods in Gaza City: a combination that occasionally ended in disturbances, altercations, fights, or stabbings. Taxi drivers, and bypassing women, merchants and young men typically appear to have been dragged into the brawling, which in some cases led to the repatriation of the UN soldiers.¹⁰⁰¹

Altogether, it seems fair to say that the shift towards less violent relations between UNEF and the Palestinians and Bedouin from 1958 did not reflect a fundamental change in the ADL regime and the types of encounters. Rather, the cooperation

⁹⁹⁸ “Message on Alleged smuggling of narcotics” from UNEF Military Police to UNEF Commander, 24 July 1957, Confidential Documents 1956-1960, UNEF, UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0246, UNA

⁹⁹⁹ “Minutes of meeting” between UNEF and Egyptian Liaison Staff, 7 August 1957, Gaza Administration Reports Nos 23 thru to 53, UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0252, UNA

¹⁰⁰⁰ “Audit Report no. 49” 20 May 1958, Audit Reports, UNEF, UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0245, UNA and “Administrative Report no. 19”, 14 February 1961, misplaced in Confidential Documents 1956-1960, UNEF, UN Field Operations Service, S-0534-0246, UNA

¹⁰⁰¹ “UNEF Military Police Report” to UNEF Chief of Military Personnel and DANOR Battalion, 22 November 1963, Militærpolitiets rapporter 1965 nr. 13, V. Rapporter 1957-1965, Den danske Forbindelsesofficer til United Nations Emergency Force, FN-Afdelingen, DNA, “Afhøringsrapport nr. 14”, 10 December 1963, F. Afhøringsrapporter 1963-1965, Den dansk-norske Bataljon i Gaza, F-1, FN-Afdelingen, DNA, ”Indberetning om beruselse i uniform paa offentlig sted, samt forsøg paa kontakt med arabisk kvinde”, Militærpolitiets rapporter 1965 nr. 13, V. Rapporter 1957-1965, Den danske Forbindelsesofficer til United Nations Emergency Force, FN-Afdelingen, DNA, ”UNEF Offence Report”, 27 April 1965, Militærpolitiets rapporter 1965 nr. 13, V. Rapporter 1957-1965, Den danske Forbindelsesofficer til United Nations Emergency Force, FN-Afdelingen, DNA, ”Afhøringsrapport”, 3 December 1965, F. Afhøringsrapporter 1963-1965, Den dansk-norske Bataljon i Gaza, F-1, FN-Afdelingen, DNA and ”Afhøringsrapport nr. 3”, 14 December 1965, F. Afhøringsrapporter 1963-1965, Den dansk-norske Bataljon i Gaza, F-1, FN-Afdelingen, DNA

between Egypt and the Gaza elite (against the backdrop of the tacit agreement between Cairo and Washington) appear to have been what released tension from the Gaza Strip and thus what made the shift possible. Indeed, what may have appeared as a regime of ‘security’ when seen from the headquarters of UNEF may well have appeared as both fleeting moments of and enduring senses of ‘insecurity’ when seen from the fields near the ADL, the villages on the outskirts of the Gaza Strip, the areas around the UN camps and ‘watering holes’ and beach camps. Broadly, the dynamics of UNEF not only indirectly linked to the British structural support of the Jewish settlers in the Mandate period,¹⁰⁰² the pattern may well also have appeared at least partly familiar to Palestinians old enough to remember the British era.

As Before (III)? Labour and Economic Relations as a Prism to understand the Negotiation of the UN Regime

As shown in both the previous chapter and the previous sections of this chapter, the UN force did not entertain uncomplicated relations with the Gaza Strip population. However, as the Gaza Strip had become and remained a geography of precarity (to say the least), and as precarity links to risk, uncertainty, vulnerability and security, the UN force quickly came to be attractive as a means of income for people that found employment or as a means of gaining direct and indirect revenue due to the patronage of the UN soldiers and the impact of the UN force on the economic webs the Gaza Strip was part of. This was linked to how prices, and thus the cost of living, instantly began increasing with the arrival of the UN force. Indeed, five weeks after its arrival in the Gaza Strip, the Chairman of the EIMAC informed his superior in Jerusalem, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, that “*The cost of living in Gaza continues to rise as more UNEF funds are spent in the area. Many locals are complaining that there is no rent or price control as formerly.*”¹⁰⁰³ Yet, some also stood to gain from these changes.

Within weeks of UNEF arriving, the established families, merchants, managers/owners of plantations, restaurants, hotels and companies (built on the skills of craftsmen turned unskilled labour) as well as bankers would begin to profit from the presence of the UN force.¹⁰⁰⁴ Indeed, as the EIMAC chairman noted, “*(...) the business classes are feeling the beneficial effect of the increased spending (...).*”¹⁰⁰⁵ Logically, the ‘business classes’ made up only a small minority in an area as small as the Gaza Strip—5-8 kilometres wide and a little more than 40 kilometres long—that

¹⁰⁰² Hughes, “Terror in Galilee”; Knight, “Securing Zion? Policing in British Palestine, 1917–39.”

¹⁰⁰³ “Summary of General Situation” from Chairman EIMAC to Chief of Staff UNTSO, 22 April 1957, Weekly Reports 1957, Reports, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0028-0003, UNA

¹⁰⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰⁵ “Summary of General Situation” from Chairman EIMAC to Chief of Staff UNTSO, 22 April 1957, Weekly Reports 1957, Reports, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0028-0003, UNA

had also seen the influx of more than 200,000 people carrying few possessions with them. As scholars of the Mandate have shown, this segment owed its rise to prominence to the British modernisation policies that had aimed to only gradually modernise the agricultural economy of Palestine to avoid the rise of nationalism (as had been the cases in both Egypt and India) on the one hand, and integrate Palestine into the economies of the region and of the British empire on the other. Decided in the Colonial Office and in Jerusalem, the British policies not only created a growing gap between the towns and villages (that saw their autonomy fade), but also enlarged what the EIMAC chairman called ‘the business classes’, as Palestine gradually saw the effects of the commodification of land, labour and materials.¹⁰⁰⁶ While these changes were slower to manifest themselves in the southern Gaza District (which Mandate officials considered a backwater), the Mandate policies nevertheless strengthened the ‘businesses classes’ of the Gaza Strip. Building directly on the organisation and practices of the Mandate administration and that of the British in Egypt, the Egyptians, Nathan Shachar, historian of the Gaza Strip, argues, “(...) *sometimes in tandem with old rich Gazan families, really functioned as a superior caste, controlling and taxing every economic initiative, from prostitution—the cheap brothels of Gaza were well known in Cairo and drew many visitors—to valuable and beneficial projects.*”¹⁰⁰⁷ The merchants who had gained permission to import luxury goods from Lebanon that thousands of visiting Egyptians could purchase at low costs to let the Egyptian regime gain foreign currency,¹⁰⁰⁸ most probably also benefitted from UNEF, which already from June 1957 began keeping Israeli naval vessels from boarding Palestinian fishing boats and boats importing Lebanese luxury goods, as the ADL continued into the waters of the Gaza Strip.¹⁰⁰⁹ Although many UN soldiers probably spent part of their salaries on nightclubs and brothels in both Beirut and Cairo once leave trips were initiated in April 1957,¹⁰¹⁰ many also offered the hotels (some of which were built, owned and run by wealthy Egyptians), restaurants, bars and taxi companies of the

¹⁰⁰⁶ Ilana Feldman, *Governing Gaza: Bureaucracy, Authority and the Work of Rule, 1917-1967* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), 22; Filii and King, *Gaza*, 35–53; Ilan Pappé, *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples*, 77–102. See also El-Eini, Roza I.M., “Trade Agreements and the Continuation of Tariff Protection Policy in Mandate Palestine in the 1930s”; Roza I.M. El-Eini, “Government Fiscal Policy in Mandatory Palestine in the 1930s,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 33, no. 3 (1997): 570–96.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Nathan Shachar, *The Gaza Strip: Its History and Politics* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2010), 67.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Cossali and Robson, *Stateless in Gaza*; Ilana Feldman, *Governing Gaza: Bureaucracy, Authority and the Work of Rule, 1917-1967*, 7; Filii and King, *Gaza*, 77.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Two detained Palestinian fishermen noted the importance of the UN presence in relation to better access to the sea in “Incident Report” 8 June 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

¹⁰¹⁰ “History of Personnel Section”, undated, History of UNEF and Diary, UNEF Agreements, Registry Files, Military Personnel, Officer of the Force Commander, S-0530-0211-003, UNA

larger towns of Gaza City and Khan Younis their patronage over the years.¹⁰¹¹ Already in late April, the UN officer observed (as noted above), the attitude of the ‘business classes’ towards the UN force was “(...) *increasingly favourable and friendly* (...)”¹⁰¹² Most of the ‘business classes’ that benefited from the presence of UNEF were men much in the same way that the Palestinians who had worked for the British had been and the Mandate labour market had generally been male-dominated.

Those who found work for UNEF were also not surprisingly predominantly men. This was not only on account of the types of physical labour people were needed for, but also a consequence of the Mandate policy and the Jewish/Israeli expulsion of approximately 200.000 people to what was left of the Southern District of Palestine. Indeed, the hardships of the First World War and the emergence of a widely engaged women’s movement (if mostly active in to the north) over the late 1920s and early 1930s both required and enabled many women in the Southern District of Palestine to work as textile factory workers and fruit pickers as well as nurses and teachers (after taking gendering and depoliticising training in some of the (few) schools and centres for girls and women established by the British), their paths often functions of their family backgrounds. However, the making of the poverty-stricken Gaza Strip in 1948 rolled back most achievements and ensured that men would come to dominate the Gaza Strip labour market. While some women were able to return to nursing and others found low-paid work in what remained of the textile and citrus industries, the majority of women had no places to seek work. Only when the Egyptian regime in 1957 made the Gaza Strip tax-free to promote (any) economic activity did more women find work in the rising number of citrus fruit plantations.¹⁰¹³ Reproducing the British policy of teaching women gendering and depoliticising subjects such as nursing, hygiene, home management skills and sewing, UNRWA soon shifted from only relief to training and education, including women’s centres and schools for girls and boys.¹⁰¹⁴ By 1957, this had allowed some women to work as teachers in the girl’s schools for refugees and some hundreds of refugee mothers and young women to make blankets and table linen for other UNRWA refugee camps and embroidered skirts for visitors in UNRWA non-commercial training centres.¹⁰¹⁵ Once in the Gaza

¹⁰¹¹ “Message” from Assistant Chief Administrative Officer to Chief Administrative Officer, 7 August 1958, General Policy, Local Staff Regulations, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer’s Files, S-0530-0126-0005

¹⁰¹² “Summary of General Situation” from Chairman EIMAC to Chief of Staff UNTSO, 22 April 1957, Weekly Reports 1957, Reports, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0028-0003, UNA

¹⁰¹³ Ramzy Baroud, *My Father Was a Freedom Fighter: Gaza’s Untold Story* (London, New York: Pluto Press, 2010); Greenberg, *Preparing the Mothers of Tomorrow Education and Islam in Mandate Palestine*; Ellen L. Fleischmann, “The Emergence of the Palestinian Women’s Movement”, 1929-1939,” *Journal of Palestine Studies* 29 (2000): 16–32.

¹⁰¹⁴ Kjersti G. Berg, “UNRWA and the Politics of Relief,” in *Interpreting Welfare and Relief in the Middle East*, ed. Nefissa Naguib and Inger Marie Okkerhaug (Leiden: Brill, 2008); Rosenfeld, “From Emergency Relief Assistance to Human Development and Back: UNRWA and the Palestinian Refugees, 1950-2009.”

¹⁰¹⁵ Labouisse and UNRWA, “Annual Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.”

Strip, the UN force began hiring Palestinian workers. Yet, six months later no more than a handful of women, all with Greek names worked in low admin positions.¹⁰¹⁶ From the labour-related material available, which amounts to numerous files and hundreds of documents, it appears that UNEF only began to think about hiring Palestinian women once UNRWA began informing UNEF that they had female commercial course graduates. When women could begin to take the course is unclear, but in 1966 they could still only learn typing in Arabic and English and shorthand while their male counterparts would also be trained in book-keeping and ‘related subjects’,¹⁰¹⁷ thereby leaving UNEF (and UNRWA) with similar policies as the Mandate and a character resembling a scaled down version of the Gaza Strip that left Palestinian women with few options.

As had also been the case in the Mandate era and the Egyptian period from 1948 to 1956, some skilled and educated Palestinian men found full- or part-time employment with the power that be: some with the Egyptian administration that placed several Palestinians in senior positions previously held by Egyptians and some with the UN force even if the April 1957 riots had left it unpopular. According to the Chairman of the EIMAC, especially “(...) *the middle and lower classes and particularly those in governmental departments and on fixed salaries (...)*”¹⁰¹⁸ were affected by the rising costs of living the spending of UNEF caused. If the typical Greek and Armenian names on the lists of locally recruited staff are anything to go by, the UN force nevertheless hired mostly non-Arabic male expats as administrative assistants, secretaries, and engineers while it hired some Palestinians in lower functions as mechanics, phone operators, typists and procurement, logistics, and finance clerks, thereby in some instances recruiting people who had previously worked for the British in either Egypt or Palestine, especially Rafah where the UN maintenance area was coincidentally placed.¹⁰¹⁹ In contrast to the British soldiers and policemen that were expected to have at least a basic command of Arabic soon after arriving to Palestine to enter the security forces,¹⁰²⁰ each UN contingent operating on the ADL also received one or more Arabic-English interpreters. Being Palestinians,

¹⁰¹⁶ “List of locally recruited staff”, 7 August 1957, General Policy, Local Staff Regulations, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer’s Files, S-0530-0126-0008

¹⁰¹⁷ “Message on Placement of refugees with UNEF” from Field Operations Officer UNRWA Gaza to UNEF Chief of Civilian Personnel, 2 August 1966, Costs 1957-1967, Staff International and Local, Local Staff Administration, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-7773-0000-0192, UNA

¹⁰¹⁸ “Summary of General Situation” from Chairman EIMAC to Chief of Staff UNTSO, 22 April 1957, Weekly Reports 1957, Reports, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0028-0003, UNA

¹⁰¹⁹ “List of locally recruited staff”, 7 August 1957, General Policy, Local Staff Regulations, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer’s Files, S-0530-0126-0008 and Khalaf, “The Effect of Socioeconomic Change on Arab Societal Collapse in Mandate Palestine,” 101.

¹⁰²⁰ Hoffman, “The Palestine Police Force and the Challenges of Gathering Counterterrorism Intelligence, 1939–1947”; Kroizer, “From Dowbiggin to Tegart: Revolutionary Change in the Colonial Police in Palestine during the 1930s”; Sinclair, “‘Get into a Crack Force and Earn £20 a Month and All Found...’: The Influence of the Palestine Police upon Colonial Policing 1922–1948.”

they were expected to have agendas of their own. Hence, UNEF hired only those UNRWA or EIMAC recommended or UNRWA lent to UNEF, suggesting a careful vetting process.¹⁰²¹ Possibly repeating another British (and Egyptian) practice, the UN units began to use their interpreters as informers: a tactic that UNEF HQ quickly criticised as unfitting.¹⁰²² However, some contingents were indifferent. The Brazilian battalion, for example, would use their soldiers with Lebanese heritage while the Indonesian battalion would use its laundry workers if in need.¹⁰²³ Custodians of the British legal system along with the Egyptian Military Governor-General by way of running the Gaza Strip in cooperation, both UNEF and UNRWA also contracted Palestinians trained in legal matters by the British for occasional legal counsel on issues related to land and labour and perhaps most frequently compensation following labour or traffic incidents.¹⁰²⁴

As had been the case under the Mandate,¹⁰²⁵ the larger part of the Palestinians in employment with UNEF, however, were manual labourers, many of whom had worked for the British. There was plenty of labour available not only due to the Israeli expulsion of Palestinians into what became the Gaza Strip. The Mandate policies had also gradually undermined the fabric of Palestine's agrarian social economy to the extent that calculations from five villages extrapolated to the entire Mandate had almost half the rural population live with less land than what was required for subsistence needs and thousands of landless peasants had been forced into wage labour. Not surprisingly, they came to make up of the bulk of the refugees.¹⁰²⁶ Equally unsurprising perhaps, UNEF was still recruiting amongst people that had worked for

¹⁰²¹ "Message from UNEF Chief Administrative Officer to UNEF Administrative Assistant", 18 May 1957, Employment of Local Civilian Personnel, Non-Registry Files, Office of the Force Commander, S-0530-0198, UNA and "Incident Report" from EIMAC UNMO to Chairman EIMAC, 17 April 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA

¹⁰²² "Memo on Interpreters" from UNEF Chief Operations Officer to all Contingent Commanders, 15 June 1957, Employment of Local Civilian Personnel, Non-Registry Files, Office of the Force Commander, S-0530-0198, UNA

¹⁰²³ "Incident Report" from EIMAC UNMO to Chairman EIMAC, 20 November 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA, "Incident Report" from EIMAC UNMO to Chairman EIMAC, 16 December 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957- December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA, and "Incident Report" from EIMAC UNMO to Chairman EIMAC, 18 February 1958, Complaints and Investigations January 1958- June 1958, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0067-0001, UNA

¹⁰²⁴ "Bill for local legal services" from UN Legal Adviser to UN Chief Administrative Officer and Chief Finance Officer, 5 September 1957, Compensation for Death, Injury and Illness, Social Security, Privileges, Immunities of UNEF, Legal, S-0530-0102-0010, UNA

¹⁰²⁵ Khalaf, "The Effect of Socioeconomic Change on Arab Societal Collapse in Mandate Palestine."

¹⁰²⁶ *Ibid.*; Ilan Pappé, *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples*; Ilan Pappé, *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*.

the British in 1965.¹⁰²⁷ After the UN force had terminated its operations in Egypt (aside operating a supply route out of El-Arish by plane, observing the Straits of Tiran and patrolling the International Frontier between Israel and Egypt), the Egyptian government, no doubt by way of a request from the reinstated Egyptian governor, requested that the Egyptians that had been hired as cooks, barbers, batmen (civilian security staff for villas, messes and non-military areas), and other labourers be laid off in favour of Palestinians.¹⁰²⁸ The UN force did so, and by September 1958 this mostly male labour force counted 1.025 Palestinian employees, predominantly ‘blue collar’ workers as waiters, kitchen boys, sign writers, gardeners, drivers and construction day labour working in and between the UNEF camps and officer villas.¹⁰²⁹ Although this number was a lot higher than the 87 traineeships as plumbers, carpenters, electricians etc. UNRWA offered, it was not very high in comparison neither with the roughly 7.000 jobs UNWRA offered refugees and Gaza Strip ‘natives’ as teachers, textile workers and camp workers,¹⁰³⁰ nor with the Gaza Strip refugee population above 15 years of age, which UNRWA—in what can be seen as a continuation of the British Mandate population monitoring regime—counted to 117.270 in mid-1957.¹⁰³¹ A particularly gruelling case at that moment stressed the lack of work and the subsequent importance of gaining any work a few months after the UN force had arrived. Frantically seeking work, a group of several Palestinian men pressed at the gates of the Indonesian camp and were mistakenly let in alongside a truck. In response, and perhaps in an instance of re-actualised colonial military culture, several Palestinians were beaten with rifle butts and one killed by Indonesian soldiers.¹⁰³² While many labour-related files have been disposed of as part of UNEF’s

¹⁰²⁷ “Message on employment as IC labourer” from Civilian Personnel Assistant to Commanding Officer Canadian HQ and HQ UNEF, undated 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA and “Memo”, undated 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA

¹⁰²⁸ “Cable from Chief of Personnel Section to all UNEF contingents”, undated 1957, Employment of Local Civilian Personnel, Non-Registry Files, Office of the Force Commander, S-0530-0198, UNA

¹⁰²⁹ “UNEF HQ Analysis of locally recruited civilian staff” 23 September 1958, Estimates 1958, Local Staff, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0004, UNA

¹⁰³⁰ UNRWA had also begun to negotiate with the Persian Gulf states about sending Palestinians there as labour. In 1957, this started with 700 people. Labouisse and UNRWA, “Annual Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.”

¹⁰³¹ *Ibid.*; For more on population counts of Palestinians as demographic surveillance, see Elia Zureik, “Constructing Palestine through Surveillance Practices,” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 28, no. 2 (2001): 205–27.

¹⁰³² “Incident Report” 5 May 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957- June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, EIMAC, Pol. Affairs, EIMAC, S-0375-0073-0003, UNA. For more on the issue of colonial continuities in both the Indonesian state and army, see for example Mark T. Berger, “Old State and New Empire in Indonesia: Debating the Rise and Decline of Suharto’s New Order,” *Third World Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (1997): 321–61; Henk Schulte Nordholt, “Indonesia in the 1950s: Nation, Modernity, and the Post-Colonial State.,” *Bijdragen Tot de*

appraisal process and subsequently also the UN Archive in New York, the records available suggest that such labour related violence did not occur again. However, this is not to say that UNEF workers had no problems. Indeed, neither the UNEF part-time nor the full-time manual labourers had any external outlets for their frustrations. Egypt had outlawed unions (and political parties) in comparison to the British that had both allowed unions and even promoted them during the Second World War.¹⁰³³ Instead, the local UNEF employees—some of whom may have had experience with the union for unskilled labour (Palestine Arab Workers Society) or that for skilled labour (Federation of Arab Trade Unions) that also operated in the Southern District of Palestine¹⁰³⁴—sought to make do on their own. Many sought to negotiate with their superiors to get help with rations, lodging and transport to make ends meet, to the extent the staff of the Chief Administrative Officer’s office grew concerned by the degree to which it had become necessary to help not international employees with these things (as was UN custom much like the British), but locally recruited employees.¹⁰³⁵ The Gaza Strip was not an easy place to live in with an unemployment rate at nearly 90% in 1959.¹⁰³⁶ By 1960, a clearer set of rules had come into existence.¹⁰³⁷ However, a new set of disciplinary measures against employees in 1961 suggested that little changed for those Palestinian manual workers who struggled to sustain their families with a part-time income and refugee rations whilst given no leave, no sick leave and only first aid in case of work-related accidents.¹⁰³⁸ Not surprisingly, thefts of bread, tea and petrol—that could either be used or sold in smaller quantities or bulk by workers—continued.¹⁰³⁹ Moreover, requests for fulltime

Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde 167, no. 4 (2011): 386-; Teitler, “The Mixed Company: Fighting Power and Ethnic Relations in the Dutch Colonial Army 1890-1920.”

¹⁰³³ Jane Power, “‘Real Unions’: Arab Organised Labor in British Palestine,” *Arab Studies Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1998): 13–28.

¹⁰³⁴ Khalaf, “The Effect of Socioeconomic Change on Arab Societal Collapse in Mandate Palestine.”

¹⁰³⁵ “Rations and Quarters – Locally recruited personnel” to Chief Administrative Officer 5 August 1958, General Policy, Local Staff Regulations, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer’s Files, S-0530-0126-0005

¹⁰³⁶ Ilana Feldman, *Governing Gaza: Bureaucracy, Authority and the Work of Rule, 1917-1967*, 24.

¹⁰³⁷ “Administrative Instructions on UNEF staff regulations” 1 February 1960, General Policy, Local Staff Regulations, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer’s Files, S-0530-0126-0005

¹⁰³⁸ “Warning” from Civilian Personnel Assistant to Commanding Officer of Indian Signal Section 2 August 1961, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1957-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0190, UNA

¹⁰³⁹ “Message on robbery” from Civilian Personnel Assistant to Commanding Officer of Indian Signal Section 1 November 1958, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1957-1965, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0190, UNA, “UNEF Military Police Report” 24 April 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA, “Summary Dismissal” from Chief of Civilian Personnel to UNEF labourer 4 May 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA, “UNEF Military Police Report” 11 October 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA and “Summary Dismissal” from Chief of

work and promotions and formal complaints over foremen and supervisors, conduct, shifts, dismissals and racial discrimination became regular,¹⁰⁴⁰ as they had been under the Mandate.¹⁰⁴¹ Others sought to cope by requesting salary reductions to be able to keep the UNRWA rations, yet another testimony to the Gaza Strip hardships.¹⁰⁴² Arguably, the frustrations of the UNEF workers, as they expressed and dealt with them on their own, were thus both as restricted as those of the broader population of the Gaza Strip and very particularised expressions of these as gradually expressed over the late 1950s and early 1960s with the formation of the militant nationalist organisation Fatah in 1959, the Egyptian proclamation of a constitution for the Gaza Strip in 1962 and the Palestinian Liberation Army in 1964.¹⁰⁴³ Whether the result of the Palestinian workers' negotiations or one or more decisions on the part of UNEF, the UN force gradually reduced the share of part-time workers from around half of its labour force in 1958 (544 of the 1.025 employees) to around a third in 1965 (582 of 1.481 Palestinian employees), as the force was gradually reduced from 6.615 in 1957 to 3.984 in 1966 due to other interventions launched into Congo, West Irian and

Civilian Personnel to UNEF labourer 18 November 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA

¹⁰⁴⁰ "Message on promotions of local staff" from Chief of Civilian Personnel to Civilian Personnel Assistant 29 January 1960, General Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1957-1965, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0190, UNA, "Summary Dismissal" from Chief of Civilian Personnel to UNEF kitchen boy 5 June 1964, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA, "Complaint against Labor Foreman" from Chief of Civilian Personnel to Commanding Officer Canadian Transport Unit", 14 November 1964, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0189, UNA, "Complaint on discrimination" to Chief of Civilian Personnel from three UNEF office clerks, 26 March 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA, "Request for promotion" from UNEF driver, 27 October 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA, "Notice of Termination" from Chief of Personnel Section to Clerk, 1 June 1966, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA, and "Message on unrest amongst civilian employees" from HQ UNEF Support Group to UNEF HQ, 29 October 1966, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA

¹⁰⁴¹ Ilana Feldman, *Governing Gaza: Bureaucracy, Authority and the Work of Rule, 1917-1967*, 42–45.

¹⁰⁴² "Request to lower salary" from UNEF Mechanic to Civilian Personnel Assistant Rafah, 16 March 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA and "Message on lower salaries" from UNEF Chief Administrative Officer to UNRWA Director of Operations Gaza", 20 May 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1957-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0190, UNA

¹⁰⁴³ Filiu and King, *Gaza*, 108–9; Yazid Sayigh, *Armed Struggle and the Search for State: The Palestinian National Movement, 1949-1993* (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1997), 60–66; For more on the emergence of the Palestinian militants and commandos that worked under Egyptian command, see also Bartal, *The Fedayeen Emerge*.

Cyprus and UNEF correspondingly raised the number of Palestinian (male) workers.¹⁰⁴⁴

While some factors and conditions were linked entirely to or decided by Israel and/or Egypt, UNEF all in all in various forms built on, connected to and replicated some of the logics and practices of the British Mandate in the sphere of labour and economic relations whilst at the same time being part of a new assemblage of authority in the Gaza Strip.¹⁰⁴⁵

As both the previous and this chapter should have made clear, the joint rule of the Gaza Strip by the UN and Egypt effectively turned it into a territory consisting both of what military geographer Rachel Woodward sees as geographies of military activities, which she defined as “(...) *the patterning of material entities and social relations across space shaped by the production and reproduction of military capabilities*”,¹⁰⁴⁶ on the one hand, and geographies of militarism, which she defined as “(...) *the shaping of civilian space and social relations by military objectives, rationales, and structures, either as part of the deliberate extension of military influence into civilian spheres of life and the prioritisation of military institutions, or as a product of these processes (...)*“, on the other.¹⁰⁴⁷ That everyday life otherwise gradually appeared less unstable and incidents appeared as ‘peaks’ linked to this new assemblage of authority—in which Egyptian-controlled police and the Egyptian intelligence service patrolled and monitored the urban areas and political groupings,¹⁰⁴⁸ and the UN force patrolled and regulated the space near the ADL—rather than new affectionate relations or a new agreeable stability, again also in the context of the previous British Mandate regime. Yet, the establishment of this joint regime affected people of different social standing and age, and the places in which they lived, differently, resulting in different interactions and tactics for these.

¹⁰⁴⁴ “Cost estimates” from Chief Administrative Officer to Acting Chief of Field Operations Service, 7 May 1965, Costs 1957-1967, Staff International and Local, Local Staff Administration, Chief Administrator Officer’s Files, S-1773-0000-0192, UNA, “Statistics of local employees employed by UNEF Maintenance Area, Rafah and El Arish”, undated 1965, Gen. Admin./Discipline (Local Staff) 1964-1967, Local Staff Admin., S-1773-0000-0188, UNA, and “Authorized strength of UNEF since its inception”, undated 1966, Re-organization of UNEF, Legal and Political Adviser, S-0530-0004-0007, UNA

¹⁰⁴⁵ Ilana Feldman, “Observing the Everyday,” *Interventions* 9, no. 3 (2011): 414–33; Sirrs, *A History of the Egyptian Intelligence Service: A History of the Mukhabarat, 1909-2009*, 32–50.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Rachel Woodward, “From Military Geography to Militarism’s Geographies: Disciplinary Engagements with the Geographies of Militarism and Military Activities,” *Progress in Human Geography* 29, no. 6 (2005): 721.

¹⁰⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁴⁸ Feldman, “Observing the Everyday”; Sirrs, *A History of the Egyptian Intelligence Service: A History of the Mukhabarat, 1909-2009*, 32–50.

Summary of Part 2: Negotiating Life and Authority in a Frontier Zone of Imperial Multilateralism

In the first part of the analysis, I argued that the UN intervention in the form of both the Suez Clearance Organization and the United Nations Emergency Force represented not only one possible instrument that the Eisenhower Administration realised by way of the UN and a willing UN leadership against the backdrop of fearing for the survival of the British Empire and NATO as the quintessential expression of and means to secure the alliance between the Western imperial and colonial powers, medium and smaller states. It was also, I argued, in different ways not as much a break with the past, and thus something ‘new’, as it was (a non-destined yet still) path-dependent expression of the global imperial system as it was evolving. If anything, the gendered and racialised top-down dynamics pointed as much ‘backwards’ to the different imperial systems and inter-imperial projects as they did ‘forward’.

In the second part of the analysis, I turned to interrogate how matters ‘on the ground’ in what became the UN ‘mission area’ of north-eastern Egypt and the Gaza Strip, or what I theorised as a ‘frontier zone of imperial multilateralism’, appeared within that context.

‘Connecting the dots’ of the web of the UN force from its conception to its arrival, showed how the context of the operation also spilled over into its composition. Initially, NATO-members and Commonwealth-members, several of which had economic and strategic interests in the functioning of the Suez Canal, provided the bulk of the units. When expanded, it saw the addition of units from states that had previously either supported the US in the Korean War militarily or received US arms and funding. Not insignificantly, it also emerged that had been assembled to a large extent by way of the American Airforce via NATO bases in Portugal and Italy as well as bases in either Turkey or Iran, which although not a member of NATO was a member of CENTO, the Middle Eastern military alliance that Egypt and Syria had not become part of. Additionally, the UN force acquired a great deal of the supplies and vehicles from initially the British invasion force and later the US. Parallel to the build-up of the force, Western companies also began the clearance operation of the Suez Canal, initially even including French and British vessels. At this point, everything still very much pointed to the immediate context of the Suez Crisis against the backdrop of a regime of international organisations under the UN umbrella attending Western interests in subtler ways than hitherto.

Analysing the deployment of the UN force to the Suez Canal Area where it was to escort out the British and French invasion forces and offer them what they themselves had called a ‘fig leaf’, it emerged that the force may well have prevented incidents, wider skirmishes and hostilities or a return to downright fighting with the civilian Egyptian population in the area near Port Said and Suez and the returning Egyptian security and military forces. However, it also appears that at least the Scandinavian

and Canadian units sympathised and identified with the invasion forces more than they did the Egyptians. It may have been for that reason that the UN Commander frequently deployed these as the vanguard units and the Latin American units when he needed more units. However, given the warm relations between the Canadian commander of the UN force and the higher echelons of the invading forces, some of whom he may even have known personally, and the different contingents' ties with and mimicking of the British and multiple shoot-outs with Egyptians, it appeared as likely that the systemic predisposition 'backwards' often also translated into similar dynamics 'on the ground, when filtered through the military cultures of the various units and their concrete situations. Further research on the Indian and Yugoslavian units may well, however, point in the opposite direction in their cases.

When examining the redeployment of the UN force into the Gaza Strip to take over control from the Israeli occupation force, it again appeared to be the case that it continued along a similar path. First was the handling of the riot in Gaza City, the ban on demonstrations and public gatherings soon after, and the subsequent failure of the UN to realise the emerging joint-US-UN plan of internationalising further the Gaza Strip in cooperation with Egypt, which forced the UN to have the force maintain an operational area along the ADL rather than also maintain internal security. The first months of establishing the frontier regime also suggested an orientation to something familiar with shootings, retaliatory assaults and detentions. Moreover, the relationship between the UN and Israel and the relations between the UN force and Israeli military units and settlers also began to appear similar to the relationship between the British Mandate and the British security forces on the one hand and the Jewish settler colonial communities on the other.

Interrogating the relations between the UN force and the different population segments of the Gaza Strip also pointed towards both problematic issues and practices in many ways similar to those of the British Mandate. With regard to military land usage, the pressure from Palestinian peasants on the Egyptian administration eventually got to the UN, which led to the formation of a compensatory scheme. The broader prism of insecurity captured not only what the UN units and soldiers did and did not do on the ADL in terms of detentions, ambushes and letting Israeli units and settlers into the Gaza Strip, but also how the force engendered insecurity on account of traffic accidents, drunk soldiers getting into and so on. Finally, it emerged that the presence of the UN force not only quickly led to rising price levels in the Gaza Strip to the detriment of the bulk of the residents who were both unemployed or refugees (or both) and poor, but also in the long run supported the Egyptian policy of aiding an economic Palestinian elite to maintain control, thus again, if unintentionally, building on and replicating in some ways the policies of the British Mandate.

Altogether, the issue of continuity from inter-imperial cooperation and the first phases of imperial multilateralism in policy and, practice appears to become even more pronounced when the analytical focus is shifted to how matters unfold 'on the ground'. If anything, it would seem evident that policymakers, UN staffers' and researchers' characterisation of the first UN intervention of 'classis' and 'successful' need to be reconsidered.

Summary and Conclusion

The previous chapters have covered a lot of ground and sought to make many connections. To be able to provide any measured reflections of my endeavour, I must return to my point of departure. Accordingly, this chapter first recaps the challenges of the research field as I see them and my aims and research questions. Then, I move on to present my findings. I do so in the ‘reverse’ order, initially focusing on matters ‘on the ground’ (or the second part of the analysis and the frontier zone of Egypt and the Gaza Strip), before adjusting the lens to the overall system (or the first part of the analysis and the frontier system). Accordingly, I reflect on how my findings contribute to the research field on international interventions before, finally reflecting on excavating the archives as a means to ‘keep the door open’ for subsequent research.

The Challenges of the Research Context, the Aims and the Research Questions

As noted in both the introduction and the methodological chapter, the early research on the UN interventions and their state-building components was largely published in Western journals and monographs from Western publishing houses by Western scholars rooted in Western academic institutions or think-tanks close to the Western centres of power. Since the end of the Cold War and the advent of especially feminist and post-structuralist (and only marginally postcolonial) scholarship within the research field, the publishing channels, the disciplines and the scholars themselves have thankfully come a long way. Indeed, an upward number of scholars representing an ever-growing range of disciplines, approaches and aims have called attention to how the international interventions and state-building project result in systems of governance that cannot be held accountable, externalise the local administrations, create dependence and often also lead to gendered insecurity in everyday life. It is, thus, safe to say that the claim of Brian Urquhart—a former British military officer and UN Under-Secretary-General involved in several Cold War interventions—that a UN intervention was “(...) *like a family friend who has moved into the household stricken by disaster* (...)”¹⁰⁴⁹ no longer stands unopposed. However, seeing how the scholarly critique linked to the Western hegemony after the Cold War and the associated neoliberal turn in the international system, a group of scholars—whom I clustered together as the ‘imperial segment’—began to characterise the structural logics, the ways of organising and the practices of the interventions as imperial in nature. In different ways, this cluster of scholars began to add a diachronic (or historical) dimension to the overall critique: a task that is still ongoing.

¹⁰⁴⁹ B. Urquhart, *A Life in Peace and War*, New York, 1987, 248.

As a historian attempting to link imperial and colonial history, international history and Cold War history, I suggested that the overall research field, in all its synchronic contemporaneity, and the ‘imperial segment’ subsequently faced three overall challenges. The first challenge, as I saw it, linked to the legacies of the rather intimate links between most academic disciplines involved in ‘peacekeeping’ research and the imperial as well as the colonial projects from the late 19th century onwards, and how, consequently, the histories of the ‘mission areas’ and their residents and the deeper history of our international system still are overlooked. Instead, I suggested, these histories need to be seen as fundamental to the workings of our international system, much in the same way that the histories of colonies and their residents have become integral to the histories of imperialism. A second challenge, I argued, was not only how to engage the mainstream against this backdrop, but also to both seek and expand the common ground whilst promoting what Marcovich and Shinn called ‘disciplinary elasticity’.¹⁰⁵⁰ Considering the links between the situation within the research field and ‘mission areas’ on the one hand and the two first challenges on the other, I finally saw the third challenge as the need to historicise the international system, the troop contributing states and the ‘mission areas’ and to do in a way that speaks to the common ground rather than the disciplinary differences of the research field. Altogether, I contended that these three challenges pointed towards the need for a counter-narrative, or, even better, a new narrative that could provide a platform for historicising the interventions and the overall system of governance they reflect in way that would offer forward social relevance. Consequently, I saw taking the first step towards creating this narrative as the best way to handle these challenges. My first aim, thus, was to promote interdisciplinary dialogue on the links between the imperial, the inter-imperial and the international. The means with which to do so, my second aim was accordingly two-fold: to introduce a new analytical-theoretical framework and to provide an analysis based on it. To realise these aims, the theoretical framework was accordingly not only to be rooted in the discussion amongst imperial historians, but was also to wed systemic and everyday perspectives (or insist on a global-local orientation if you will).

On the basis of this framework, I thus set out to examine 1) how the post-1945 regime of international organisations under the umbrella of the United Nations emerged from inter-imperial cooperation and the systemic significance thereof; 2) and, in this context, the forms of civilian and military regimes of regulation and governance the interventions of the United Nations, intentionally and unintentionally, transferred to—and engendered—‘on the ground’ in the ‘mission areas’; and 3) accordingly within this context, how different population groups ‘on the ground’ in the ‘mission areas’ related to and/or resisted these forms of civilian and military regimes.

Linked to the interventions of the UN more broadly, these questions were too large to answer in a single dissertation. Instead, I chose to focus on the themes in the questions but through the ‘looking glass’ of the first UN intervention that came to be

¹⁰⁵⁰ Marcovich and Shinn, “Where Is Disciplinary Going?”

labelled a ‘peacekeeping’ operation. This intervention, which took place first in Egypt and subsequently in the Gaza Strip and lasted from 1956 to 1967, was relevant not only because it set a precedent for later interventions with regard to policy making, doctrine, and organisation. Despite being a site for much research since 1957, the intervention also offered, I suggested, a much understudied oil and shipping dimension in the context of a militarised region at the forefront of the imperial Cold War conflict. The intervention, in other words, appeared, I suggested, a good, if not the best, place to start the unravelling of the established peacekeeping narrative and start a new counter-narrative rooted in imperial historiography.

My Findings: On The ‘Frontier Zone of Imperial Multilateralism’ (Part 2)

Within the setting of the first ‘peacekeeping’ operation of the United Nations, the second part of the analysis examined the civilian and military regimes of regulation and governance of the UN in the ‘mission area’ and how different population groups living in the ‘mission area’ related to and/or resisted these.

Concretely, I linked research on British Mandate Palestine and the Middle East in the Cold War, with published materials from the US and UN soldiers, and records from the UN force itself and its corps of EIMAC observers against the backdrop of my space-, network- and people-centred theoretical framework. This method allowed a fundamentally different understanding of the UN intervention to appear, unlocking hitherto overlooked dynamics, practices, and conflicts (between the UN force and the Gaza Strip residents, the UN and Egypt and Egypt and the Gaza Strip residents) that should be familiar to the scholars of both the British Mandate and the current interventions. Indeed, it appeared that the UN failed to build a joint UN-Egyptian administrative regime, which would have created a situation much more familiar to most scholars of today’s ‘mission areas’. That this not so minor detail of a botched administration fell under the radar, and thus out of the narrative, enabled the intervention to instead be presented as a narrow and impartial ‘buffer’ operation, something I suggest it was clearly not alone on account of the failure to build rapport with the Gaza Strip residents in the first weeks.

However, as I showed, the tensions, conflicts and insecurities the first weeks of the UN presence engendered did not end as most UNEF units were relocated to operate only on the Armistice Demarcation Line (ADL) due to direct Egyptian and indirect Palestinian pressure. Rather, this negotiated process was also relatively violent with months of incidents claiming the lives of several Palestinians, Bedouin and UN soldiers. While it appeared the relations stabilised gradually, at least in the sense of fewer examples of ‘negotiations by rifle and mines’ and killings taking place, the formal security apparatus of the UN continued to frequently create atmospheres of insecurity. On and near the ADL, insecurity came primarily in the form of the omnipresent surveillance and regulatory regime on the ADL; the endless thereof

derived wrongful detentions of not only but especially Palestinian and Bedouin children and women; the repeated failures to prevent Israeli soldiers and settlers from occasionally carrying out attacks with impunity; and the inability to challenge both the frequent low-altitude overflights of Israeli fighter jets and the Israeli naval and fishing vessels that challenged Palestinian fishing boats in the territorial waters of the Gaza Strip. Inside the Gaza Strip, the UN force (also) created atmospheres and situations of insecurity near their bases (which only in the case of platoon camps were placed near the ADL); in relation to labour conflicts or overly aggressive reactions to theft; endless traffic incidents that regularly killed small children on account of drunk driving, speeding and the congestion of the Gaza Strip and the refugee camps in particular which left the children with few places to play; and in the towns when UN soldiers, often drunk, engaged in arguments or occasionally fights with restaurant owners, taxi drivers, and bypassing Palestinians, men and women alike.

The insecurity, it became evident, also extended into the economic sphere, as the loose regime the UN and Egypt established piecemeal with regard to both labour and economic dimension tended to the interests of the minor Palestinian merchant and landed elite as well as the Egyptians who had joined in with building new orange plantations, hotels and so on, whilst the unemployment rate for Palestinians, refugees and Gaza residents alike, skyrocketed. Eventually, the overall pressure on the Egyptian administration and the emerging threat of militant Palestinian environments in the larger towns and refugee camps led to the facilitation of the labour migration of tens of thousands of young Palestinians, mainly disenfranchised or politically aware men, to the Gulf States. The few thousand Palestinians that worked for the UN force or its 'development' sibling, UNRWA, also appear not to have done so out of affectionate feelings for the UN, but as a means to handle the insecurity of everyday life that went beyond the daily struggle on the insufficient UN food rations. Perhaps unsurprisingly given the Egyptian prohibition of labour unions, the records also show numerous attempts of UN-employed Palestinians to complain, gain benefits, increase their salaries and so on, on an individual basis.

It also materialised that the UN force caused land problems for numerous Palestinian peasant. Many peasants had lost land (but not all as was the case for many of the people congested in the refugee camps) with the creation of the Israeli settler colonial state in 1948, and thus needed to put every last piece of land to use. Again, pressure led the Egyptian administration and subsequently the UN to act, here in the form of a system of compensation for land being used for military purposes. Despite being compensated or in a few cases granted permission to use the land near the ADL, members of the peasant families, whether male or female and young and old, were frequently detained, thus tying the land issue to the problems and insecurities created by the ADL regime.

However, the intervention not only appears similar to current interventions in that it was an externalising system of governance (organising its matters with the UN higher echelons and the troop contributing and funding states via New York on the one hand and Egypt and its Gaza Strip administration on the other); offered the Palestinians in the 'mission area' very little with regard to formal mechanisms of

influence and accountability (the land compensation scheme perhaps being the exception); and turned the area of the Gaza Strip into a militarised geography (with the Israelis on the ‘outside’ and the Egyptian intelligence service and Palestinian-manned but Egyptian controlled police unit on the ‘inside’). In doing so, UNEF also very much continued in the path laid out of by the British Mandate. More than anything, it militarised everyday life and its spaces as had the British from the late 1920s onwards only in a much reduced and thus overcrowded area. Just as the British had favoured the Jewish settler communities and used the Egyptian monarchy to their own ends, the UN similarly favoured the state of Israel, which it had had a rather large role in making, at the expense of the Palestinians, and negotiated its aims in the Gaza Strip with the military regime in Cairo. The joint UN-Egyptian regime, if more ad hoc and ‘loose’ than initially anticipated following the realisation that it was necessary to enter the Gaza Strip to reopen and stabilise the Suez Canal to secure Western European oil supplies, also reinforced a process of socio-economic and political disenfranchisement and externalisation that also connected to the British Mandate. Often, and this needs further attention and unpacking by future research, it also seemed that many of the interactions between UN units and Gaza Strip residents (whether Palestinians or Bedouin) as well as Israelis took place in racialised spaces that tied national military cultures into the deeper fusion of imperial identities and into the sense of global ‘whiteness’, which by both inter-imperial cooperation and projects the UN itself carried forward well until the mid-1960s (and perhaps beyond).

In the process of relocating from Egypt, the Scandinavian and Canadian contingents of the UN force seemed not only to tie into the idea of a global ‘whiteness’, but also to relate sympathetically to both the British and Israelis (more than the French) units and their goals, which subsequently formed their practices. However, the underlying global power structure of the UN and its markers of identity, here theorised as the frontier of imperial multilateralism, were made visible already in the examination of the build-up of the force. ‘Connecting the dots’ of the geopolitical infrastructure of the intervention, it became clear that most of the states that provided contingents for the UN force and logistical sites were, to various degrees, linked to the either the British or the American imperial frontiers.

My Findings: On the ‘Frontier of Imperial Multilateralism’ (Part 1)

Turning to the broader picture of how the post-1945 regime of international organisations under the umbrella of the United Nations emerged from inter-imperial cooperation and the systemic significance thereof (in what can perhaps be called the ‘frontier region’), entails a bit of a shift in scale, emphasising the systemic aspects more than the matters ‘on the ground’.

Concretely, I linked research—on the British, American, and Soviet Union’s early Cold War Middle East policies relating to trade, energy, naval strategy and geopolitics and research on Israeli and Egyptian foreign policy and strategy—with published

materials not only but especially from the American online series of records from the State Department (FRUS) as well as unpublished records from the Danish Steamship Owners Association (which was close to the use of the Suez Canal and the negotiations up to the joint British, French and Israeli invasion as Denmark was amongst the ten most regular canal users) against the backdrop of my theoretical framework. Earlier works on the intervention have discussed the part of the context of the UN intervention that relates to the joint British, French and Israeli invasion of both Egypt and the Gaza Strip (against the backdrop of the Egyptian, American and British conflict about financing the Aswan Dam). However, the combination of the theoretical framework on the one hand, and the FRUS-series, the shipping records and the diverse research literature on the other, allowed a deeper—and both fundamentally different and bleaker—understanding of the UN intervention to materialise.

Although officials from the UK, Canada and the highest echelon of the UN Secretariat had held talks on internationalising the Suez Canal with a military force and American think-tanks had made similar suggestions to the American administration in the early 1950s, the intervention was not a planned means for the West to re-secure direct control of the Suez Canal after the British had to withdraw their last forces from the canal area in 1954 (or prevent another war between Israel and Egypt). As for the immediate context of the intervention, it is necessary, I argue, to think beyond the crisis (the invasion of Egypt and the Gaza Strip, which to some extent was supported in Western Europe as way to gain a larger space for Western Europe to manoeuvre globally) by also including the oil dimension (which Cold War economic historians has researched but no peacekeeping scholars considered). Seen against this backdrop, the US engagement and close partnership with the UN Secretary-General—in criticising the invasion and the Soviet threats, supporting the intervention at the UN General Assembly and in the corridors and finally assisting with finances, logistics and arms—connected directly to two problems with potentially global ramifications. Firstly, the intervention, I argued, was a joint response between the Eisenhower Administration and the highest UN echelon to the urgent need to reopen and stabilise the Suez Canal to secure Western European oil supplies. Secondly, the intervention also linked to the Eisenhower Administration's wish to avoid no less than what it feared to be the implosion of the British Empire (on account of its deteriorating economic situation) that would not only have regional repercussions with regard to a military presence to secure the oil supply of Western Europe, but also affect both NATO's credibility and capability and the already globalised Cold War in which the US relied on the British and French. Consequently, the Eisenhower Administration not only supported the intervention as directly as it could, it also launched two oil supplement schemes and the economic aid to the British by way of the international financial organisations.

However, both the Suez Crisis and the UN intervention, I found, had several deeper layers other than 'only' the oil supply problem from late 1956 and the increasing hostility between Cairo, London and Washington from 1954 onwards. Firstly, the period from 1950 to 1955 saw Anglo-American influence wane and thus their imperial frontiers weaken, as neither fully realised the extent to which the pro-

Western post-Mandate regional regimes depended on autonomy to remain stable domestically. In other words, I argue that the Anglo-American alliance made volatile rather than stabilise the region over the 1950s, giving thus the Soviet Union several openings to seek naval, maritime and commercial influence in the medium term so as to build rapport with strategically opportune regional regimes in the longer run.

Secondly, I argued that the intervention also reflected the shifting regional frontier dynamics, as the wartime and early Cold War Anglo-American cooperation in the Mediterranean and the Middle East—in the form of the regional dimension of the United Nations military alliance, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the Middle East Supply Center—reflected the American expansion into the Mediterranean and the Middle East both in cooperation with and at the expense of both the weakening British Empire British as well as the still embryonic post-Mandate states and in hostile competition with the Soviet Union.

Thirdly, I found that these organisations—and also the UN (both as a military alliance and organisation) and eventually the UN intervention in extension thereof — also very much built on the inter-imperial cooperation after the First World War and the regional expressions thereof. As the formal instrument promoting inter-imperial cooperation (or ‘multinational imperialism’), the League of Nations had begun to shift the international *modus operandi* further away from direct and violent imperial occupation towards internationally sanctioned systems of imperial governance in the form of the Mandates: A shift that coincided with the American ascendancy to a position of global influence in the global imperial system as its relative strength versus the other imperial systems and colonial powers increased with First World War and the promotion of American belief that endless direct interventions and occupations would not yield stable influence but unending resistance and instability (after a decade of interventions and occupations in Latin and Central America). However, riots and revolts, especially in the post-Ottoman Middle East, on the one hand, and the still dominant agendas and repertoires of power of the larger imperial-systems and colonial powers on the, other eventually led to the militarisation of the Mandates, the alienation of Japan and Germany (and in part the Soviet Union) and the collapse of the League.

Finally, I argued that the UN intervention in Egypt and the Gaza Strip, the UN security organisation and alliance, and the emerging competitive and cooperative inter-imperial blocs of the inter-war also linked to the regional expressions of the pre-First World War phase of multinational imperialism in two ways. Not only had European inter-imperial cooperation since the 1850s revolved around the exclusion or at least reduction of Russian imperial influence in the region as the Ottoman Empire increasingly struggled to control its imperial territories and spheres of influence, to build a stronger and modern state apparatus and economy, and to control its various populations. The numerous inter-imperial interventions against the Ottoman Empire (that saw the British and French growing influence and takeovers of Cyprus and Lebanon, the ‘internationalisation of Crete’, and the making of Albania) on the one hand and the form of racialising and system-supportive agreements on inter-imperial trade, communications, law, hygiene, and mobilities on the other also provided a deeper legacy to draw upon.

What do my Research Findings contribute to the Research Field on International Interventions?

Unquestionably, the lens of my theoretical framework and my findings altogether paint a picture of the first UN intervention that is both fundamentally different and much, much bleaker than existing research. Indeed, it is quite a step to rearticulate the intervention from *the* ‘classic’ buffer (and successful) operation to a ‘frontier zone of imperial multilateralism’ that in many ways built on, continued and replicated the logics and the practices of the British Mandate and thus also held similar influences locally (in the ‘partnership with Egypt). That is not, however, to say that more research could not yield new insights. Obviously, one’s scholarly background and theoretical framework help decide where one look, what one looks after and what eventually recognises more specifically. Beyond these factors of differentiation, more region-specific research and records from the UN force and the higher echelons (that are still classified from top secret to strictly confidential), the Israel border units, the Israeli Foreign Ministry, the Egyptian Governor-General’s administration as well as the military archives of all the troop contributing states could all potentially be very useful in adding further or changing the fundamental perspective. Altogether, however, the combination of records, published materials and research literature on the British Mandate, the American, British and Soviet Cold War Middle East-policies, Palestinian nationalism and militancy and Israeli nationalism and militarism presented here, to the best of my knowledge, represents the hitherto the largest collection of sources connected to the realities of everyday life ‘on the ground’ and literature connected to the dynamics of the ‘mission area’.

If this work thus stands up to the scrutiny of colleagues, the first United Nations ‘peacekeeping’ operation, as it came to be labelled, should be recognised as anything but such in that it had both diachronic and synchronic dimensions tying it directly to deeper modes of imperial cooperation. It must, however, also be recognised that UNEF/UNSCO was not only an expression of ‘merely’ a coming together of the regimes and practices of especially but not only the British and American imperial systems and their systems of governance. As is hopefully painstakingly clear, it was also the expression of a system that, if tied both to the British and American British imperial frontiers, expanded in its own right. Here conceptualised as a frontier, it was a system that expanded in both breadth—by way of its growing membership, how it organised international space and relations in a self-referential manner, its organisational bureaucracy steeped in Western ways and its gradually emerging military web of bases, ports and supply systems—and in depth (in this case) on account of ever-intensifying links with the frontier zone in the form of the political-geographical palimpsests of the various overlapping regimes of governance in the former British Mandate by way of the intervention and the linkups to the broader system of the United Nations.

That is not, however, to say that the process of expansion (of the frontier) and incorporation (of the frontier zone) the joint UNEF/UNSCO intervention thus

expressed should be seen as having been only imposed on the ‘mission area’ without a process of negotiation, externalising, militarising in nature, and disenfranchising. As scholars of imperial and colonial history have reminded us for some time now to be the case within the imperial state-systems, the colonial powers and colonial state powers all around the world (and also peacekeeping researcher concerned with current interventions), I contend the opposite. All actors, whether individuals, families, communities, organisations or states, sought to—and with various degrees of success—negotiated their own interests within the broader framework of the expanding frontier on basis of what they could muster of resources and alliances, in turn often making the spaces—such as roads, check points, observation posts, nearby villages and other sites of contact—of the frontier zone fluid and negotiated, if most probably often contested and informed by race- and gender-dynamics.

It is here emphasis should be placed: The system(s) of governance the first UN intervention in Egypt and the Gaza Strip was shaped by and shaped and brought to the ‘mission area’ were certainly globally structuralising processes, but they were not unchangeable or linear. Rather, they were the results of human choices in extension of previous human choices, and thus human practices that can be—and to some extent were—challenged and subsequently transformed ‘on the ground’, and, thus, expressions of something that we can understand and problematise.

Against this backdrop, the analysis of UNEF/UNSCO and theoretical manoeuvres have hopefully both pointed towards ways in which to analyse other UN interventions that allows such work to be both historically informed—and thus gender-, race-, and class-sensitive—and grounded in the dynamics of their own synchronic/contemporary contexts on the one hand, and emphasised the urgent need to do so on the other.

More research along these lines will hopefully also demonstrate the relevance, if not timeliness, of not only engaging in the promotion of ‘disciplinary elasticity’ and firmly placing research within the context of interdisciplinary dialogue on the imperial in the international, but also to historicise both the interventions and our international system and our own research fields, methodologies and strategies, given the intimate links between most social sciences and the imperial, inter-imperial and international systems of governance from the late 19th century onwards. No scholar operates in a vacuum.

Some Thoughts on Myth-busting and Levelling the Playing Field Between Otherwise Loud Old ‘white’ Men, Noisy Soldiers, Audible Brown Men, and Inaudible Brown Children and Women

While research on current interventions will not likely get access to internal and still active records, and perhaps—depending on the dangers affiliated with field work—engage in field work, I will here briefly engage in some further reflections on what challenges, opportunities and resources the holdings of the UN archive offer on basis

on my experiences. As it is, many scholars leave little with which to engage. Similarly, many archivists reject the that they hold power over social, public and political memories, just as many historians and historically interested scholars of international relations see archives as merely physical repositories.¹⁰⁵¹ It has been, and is, thus a case of what the archive scholars Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook call ‘the blind leading the blind’. In other words, “(...) *scholars using archives without realizing the heavy layers of intervention and meaning coded into the records by their creators and by archivists long before any box is opened in the research room, and archivists treating their archives without much sensitivity to the larger footprints they themselves are leaving on the archival record.*”¹⁰⁵²

However, as said by anthropologist and colonial historian Laura Ann Stoler, information systems and archival production go far beyond merely generating orders, weekly reports to superiors, summaries of reports and so on via circuits of communication such as shipping lines, courier services, and telegraphs.¹⁰⁵³ Rather, “*The archive was the supreme technology of the late 19th century imperial state (...).*”¹⁰⁵⁴ Similarly, I learnt that UNEF depended on its ability to gather, organise and distribute information from its observation towers and day and night patrols to the battalion camps that sent them to UNEF HQ that then send them New York that sent orders the other way. The records and archival practices of the UN and UNEF, in other words, were as integral to the regime in the ‘mission area’ as the imperial and colonial practices of gathering and storing information were to the degree of success of implementing imperial and colonial policies. It is thus necessary to understand firstly, the chain of how something becomes a record in relation to the visible and invisible exercise of the regimes in the ‘mission areas’ and is then subsequently handled by the records management before it ends up in the archival system; secondly, how these chains from each ‘mission area’ are part of the overall system of governance on a global scale; and thirdly, what this means for archive-based research.

Regarding the production of records, historian of Haiti Michel-Rolph Trouillot notes, “*Silences are inherent in history because any single event enters history with some of its constituting parts missing. Something is always left out while something else is recorded.*”¹⁰⁵⁵ He continues, “In other words, *the very mechanisms that make any historical recording possible also ensure that historical facts are not created equal. They reflect differential control of the means of historical production at the*

¹⁰⁵¹ Terry Cook, “The Archive(s) Is a Foreign Country: Historians, Archivists, and the Changing Archival Landscape,” *The Canadian Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (2009): 514; Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, “Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory,” *Archival Science* 2, no. 1 (2002): 2.

¹⁰⁵² Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, “Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory,” 6.

¹⁰⁵³ Ann Laura Stoler, “Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance,” *Archival Science* 2, no. 1 (2002): 98.

¹⁰⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 87; See also James Hevia, *The Imperial Security State: British Colonial Knowledge and Empire-Building in Asia*, 2012.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1995), 49.

very first engraving that transforms an event into fact.”¹⁰⁵⁶ In the case of the production of UNEF records, it often happened—given the UN(EF) records derived from the exercise of its regime—that the records made invisible/in audible Palestinians and Bedouin and that details would be reduced in significance, such as when, for example, the blast of a hand grenade next to a Palestinian boy in his bedroom was translated literally as ‘noise’,¹⁰⁵⁷ or they became protagonists only when engaging in ‘infiltration’ into Israel or ‘barbaric’ feuds etc.¹⁰⁵⁸

From 1960, the UNEF central registry, which was set up in May 1957,¹⁰⁵⁹ began sending continuously its sensitive records both to and by way of the United Nations Field Service, in much the same way the colonial registries continuously—and especially at decolonisation—sent many, if not most, of the sensitive records to London.¹⁰⁶⁰ Given my findings, it is perhaps less startling that the records management and archival system of UNEF, resembled in part that of the British Empire, which had gradually introduced a records keeping system revolving around a central registry that collected documents in series, which each contained case files, correspondents files and subject files.¹⁰⁶¹

Regarding using the archive, the reflections of imperial historian Antoinette Burton—another leading voice in the charge against positivist archival thinking—are useful. She notes how “*Historians who visit the Oriental and India Office Collections for the first time are often surprised by how powerfully the archival space itself evokes the Raj.*”¹⁰⁶² When visiting the UN archive I found it hard to ignore how the archive,

¹⁰⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵⁷ “EIMAC Investigation of UNEF Report” from UN Military Observer to Chairman EIMAC 27 June 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957 – June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political, EIMAC, UN Archives (P114-0256)

¹⁰⁵⁸ “EIMAC Investigation of UNEF Report” from UN Military Observer to Chairman EIMAC 15 May 1957, Complaints and Investigations April 1957 – June 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political, EIMAC, UN Archives (P114-355) and ¹⁰⁵⁸ “EIMAC Investigation of UNEF Report” from UN Military Observer to Chairman EIMAC 19 December 1957, Complaints and Investigations July 1957 – December 1957, Gaza Strip, Area Files, Political, EIMAC, UN Archives (P114-397)

¹⁰⁵⁹ “Establishment of UNEF Registry” from Chief of Personnel to Chief Administrative Officer 30 May 1957, Reorganization of Central Registry 1960-1964, UNEF, S-0530-0011-0007 (P-124-0480) and “Memorandum: Staffing, UNEF Registry” by Chief of Registry 28 June 1957, Reorganization of Central Registry 1960-1964, UNEF, S-0530-0011-0007, UN Archives (P124-0483)

¹⁰⁶⁰ <http://search.archives.un.org/united-nations-field-operations-service> (25/05/2016) and Mandy Banton, “Destroy? ‘Migrate’? Conceal? British Strategies for the Disposal of Sensitive Records of Colonial Administrations at Independence,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 40, no. 2 (2012): 321–35.

¹⁰⁶¹ Timothy John Lovering, “British Colonial Administrations’ Registry Systems: A Comparative Study of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland,” *Archival Science* 10, no. 1 (2010): 1–23; Zohar Aloufi, “The Legacy: British Mandate Record Management System in Israel,” *Archival Science* 7, no. 3 (2007): 207–11.

¹⁰⁶² Antoinette Burton, *Empire in Question: Reading, Writing, and Teaching British Imperialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011), 94.

as a mirror of imperial and colonial archives and colonial registries, not least employed mainly ‘white’ Australian, British, Italian, French and American nationals as archivists and consultants and ‘coloured’ or ‘black’ Jamaicans, Sri Lankans and Senegalese as service and maintenance staff. It was thus a very clear reminder to me that the heart of relations between the archive and the institution that created it, revolves around the power to label, in this case ‘peacekeeping’. Similarly, I could not help but note that the archive was not only almost located as far away from ‘mission areas’ as was the British archive from the colonies of the British Empire. It was also difficult to dismiss what the archive’s hold of hundreds of kilometres of documents, classified as Top secret, Secret and Classified, means for the histories of the ‘mission areas’, effectively making peoples’ own history unreachable for them and their descendants. For example, the significance of UNEF archive for Gaza Strip history cannot be overstated. One could perhaps, therefore, go as far as wonder—with regard to the importance of the records for Palestinian cultural memory—if the UN archival practice should not be seen as harmful as the systematic Israeli policy of hiding and scattering of the Palestinian written legacy? The records are not only beyond the reach of most Palestinian historians, but also ‘ordinary’ Palestinians. The circumstances are exacerbated by the fact that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency has made most of the Palestinian post-1948 written legacy in form of birth and death certificates and its own service records from health, education, relief and social services since 1948 and kept it in in Vienna until 1970 and Amman thereafter.¹⁰⁶³

Altogether, this means that the UN archive is an active site as all other archives in which, as Schwartz and Cook contend, “(...) *social power is negotiated, contested, confirmed.*”¹⁰⁶⁴ Thus, as Burton argues, “*The more deliberately we acknowledge the impact of our archival experiences on our research and our teaching, the better we are able to historicize the British Empire, its strategies of containment, its disciplinary mechanisms, and its visible and invisible forms of rule.*”¹⁰⁶⁵ The same argument can be forwarded for research on the UN interventions. This will allow us to, step by step, first contest and later harness the power of the records on the interventions in the archive of the UN. As Schwartz and Cook again contend, “*When power is denied, overlooked, or unchallenged, it is misleading at best and dangerous at worst. Power recognised becomes power that can be questioned, made accountable, and opened to transparent dialogue and enriched understanding.*”¹⁰⁶⁶

¹⁰⁶³ Aloufi, “The Legacy”; Nur Masalha, *The Palestine Nakba: Decolonising History, Narrating the Subaltern, Reclaiming Memory* (London; New York: Zed Books, 2012); Maher Nasser, “Palestine Refugee Records Project” (Stocktaking II Conference on Palestinian Refugee Research, Ottawa, 2003); Salim Tamari and Elia Zureik, “The UNRWA Archives on Palestinian Refugees - A Feasibility Study for Policy and Applied Research - Phase 1” (Jerusalem: The Institute of Palestine Studies, 1996).

¹⁰⁶⁴ Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, “Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory,” 1.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Antoinette M. Burton, *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking with and through the Nation* (Durham [N.C.]: Duke University Press, 2003), 104.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, “Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory,” 2.

Archives

Rederiforeningen (formerly the Danish National Business Archives, now the Danish National Archives in Viborg)

EIMAC

UNEF Advisory Committee on the United Nations Emergency Force

UNEF Office of the Force Commander

UNEF Chief of Staff

UNEF Chief Administrative Officer

UNEF Assistant Administrative Officer

UNEF Liaison Officer Tel Aviv

UNEF Leave Centre, Beirut

UNEF Leave Centre, Cairo

UNEF Legal and Political Advisor

UNEF Personnel Administration

UNEF Public Relations

UN Field Operations Service

UN Office of Special Political Affairs

UN Undersecretary for Special Political Affairs

Bibliography

- Abernethy, David B. *The Dynamics of Global Dominance: European Overseas Empires, 1415-1980*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Abou-El-Fadl, Reem. "Neutralism Made Positive: Egyptian Anti-Colonialism on the Road to Bandung." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 42, no. 2 (2015): 219–40.
- Abulafia, David, and Nora Berend, eds. *Medieval Frontiers: Concepts and Practices*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- Adebajo, Adekeye. *UN Peacekeeping in Africa: From the Suez Crisis to the Sudan Conflicts*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2011.
- Akami, Tomoko. "Beyond Empires' Science: Inter-Imperial Pacific Science Networks in the 1920s." In *Networking the International System: Global Histories of International Organizations*, 97–132. Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer, 2014.
- al-Husseini, Jalal. "UNRWA and the Palestinian Nation-Building Process." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 29, no. 2 (2000): 51–64.
- Alconini, Sonia. "The Southeastern Inka Frontier against the Chiriguano: Structure and Dynamics of the Inka Imperial Borderlands." *Latin American Antiquity* 15, no. 4 (2004): 389–418.
- Aloufi, Zohar. "The Legacy: British Mandate Record Management System in Israel." *Archival Science* 7, no. 3 (2007): 207–11.
- Al-Qaq, Richard Kareem. *Managing World Order: United Nations Peace Operations and the Security Agenda*. London; New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2009.
- Amirie, Abbas. "The United Nations Intervention in the Congo Crisis, 1960-1961: With Special Emphasis on the Political Role of the Late Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld." 1967.
- Anghie, Antony. *Imperialism, Sovereignty, and the Making of International Law*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Aning, Kwesi, Kwesi, and Samuel Atuobi. "Responsibility to Protect in Africa: An Analysis of the African Union's Peace and Security Architecture." *Global Responsibility to Protect* 1, no. 1 (2009): 90–113.
- Ankersmit, Frank. "Manifesto for An Analytical Political History." In *Manifestos for History*, edited by Keith Jenkins, Sue Morgan, and Alan Munslow, 176–96. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Anwar, Deqi Fortuna. "The Cold War and Its Impact on Indonesia: Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy." In *Southeast Asia and the Cold War*, 133–50. Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Applebaum-Sikorska, Anna, and Penguin. *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe 1944-1956*. London: Penguin Books, 2013.

- Arens, Esther Helena. "Multilateral Institution-Building and National Interest: Dutch Development Policy in the 1960s." *Contemporary European History* 12, no. 4 (2003): 457–72.
- Armstrong, Hamilton Fish. "The U. N. Experience in Gaza." *Foreign Affairs* 35, no. 4 (1957): 600–619.
- Arnheim, Arthur, and Dov Levitan. *Politik, diplomati og den hjælpende hånd: Danmark og oprettelsen af staten Israel*. Kbh.: Museum Tusculanum, 2011.
- Ashworth, Lucian M. *A History of International Thought: From the Origins of the Modern State to Academic International Relations*, 2014.
- . "Feminism, War and the Prospects for Peace: Helena Swanwick (1864–1939) and the Lost Feminists of Inter-War International Relations." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13, no. 1 (2011): 25–43.
- . "Interdisciplinarity and International Relations." *European Political Science* 8, no. 1 (2009): 16–25.
- Aunesluoma, Juhana. "A Nordic Country with East European Problems: British Views on Post-War Finland, 1944–1948." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 37, no. 2 (2012): 230–45.
- Aust, Martin. "Writing the Empire: Russia and the Soviet Union in Twentieth-Century Historiography." *European Review of History* 10, no. 2 (2003): 375–91.
- Aytekin, E. Attila. "Tax Revolts During the Tanzimat Period (1839–1876) and Before the Young Turk Revolution (1904–1908): Popular Protest and State Formation in the Late Ottoman Empire." *Journal of Policy History* 25, no. 3 (2013): 308–333.
- Bacevich, Andrew J. *The Long War: A New History of U.S. National Security Policy since World War II*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Banton, Mandy. "Destroy? 'Migrate'? Conceal? British Strategies for the Disposal of Sensitive Records of Colonial Administrations at Independence." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 40, no. 2 (2012): 321–35.
- Barak, Eitan. "Between Reality and Secrecy: Israel's Freedom of Navigation through the Straits of Tiran, 1956–1967." *The Middle East Journal* 61, no. 4 (2007): 657–.
- . "Caught in the Middle: The United Nations Emergency Force, Israel and the 1960 'Rotem Crisis.'" *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 17, no. 2 (2006): 393–414.
- . "On the Power of Tacit Understandings--Israel, Egypt and Freedom of Passage through the Suez Canal, 1957–1960." *The Middle East Journal* 58, no. 3 (2004): 444–68.
- . "The Freedom That Never Was: Israel's Freedom of Overflight over the Straits of Tiran Prior to the Six Day War." *Journal of Contemporary History* 43, no. 1 (2008): 75–91.
- Baranowski, Shelley. *Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

- Barkawi, Tarak. "Peoples, Homelands, and Wars? Ethnicity, the Military, and Battle among British Imperial Forces in the War against Japan." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46, no. 1 (2004): 134–63.
- Barkawi, Tarak, and Mark Laffey. "Retrieving the Imperial: Empire and International Relations." *Millennium* 31, no. 1 (2002): 109–27.
- Barkey, Karen. *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Barlas, Dilek. "Friends of Foes? Diplomatic Relations between Italy and Turkey, 1923–36." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 36, no. 2 (2004): 231–52.
- Barnes, Robert. "Branding an Aggressor: The Commonwealth, the United Nations and Chinese Intervention in the Korean War, November 1950–January 1951." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 33, no. 2 (2010): 231–53.
- . *The US, the UN and the Korean War: Communism in the Far East and the American Struggle for Hegemony in the Cold War*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2014.
- Baroud, Ramzy. *My Father Was a Freedom Fighter: Gaza's Untold Story*. London, New York: Pluto Press, 2010.
- Bartal, Shaul. *The Fedayeen Emerge: The Palestine-Israel Conflict, 1949–1956*. Bloomington: AuthorHouse, 2011.
- Baster, James. "Economic Problems in the Gaza Strip." *The Middle East Journal* 9, no. 3 (1955): 323–27.
- Bastian, Jeannette Allis. "Reading Colonial Records Through an Archival Lens: The Provenance of Place, Space and Creation." *Archival Science* 6, no. 3 (2007): 267–84.
- Baylis, John, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens. *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Beattie, Peter M. *The Tribute of Blood: Army, Honor, Race, and Nation in Brazil, 1864–1945*. Durham, London: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Beck, Peter J. "Britain and the Suez Crisis: The Abadan Dimension." In *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath*, edited by Simon C Smith, 53–65. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Behera, Navnita C. "Re-Imagining IR in India." *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 7, no. 3 (2007): 341–68.
- Békés, Csaba. "The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and the Declaration of Neutrality." *Cold War History* 6, no. 4 (2006): 477–500.
- Belich, James. *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783–1939*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Ben-Dror, Elad. "How the United Nations Intended to Implement the Partition Plan: The Handbook Drawn up by the Secretariat for the Members of the United Nations Palestine Commission." *Middle Eastern Studies* 43, no. 6 (2007): 997–1008.

- . “The Success of the Zionist Strategy Vis-À-Vis UNSCOP.” *Israel Affairs* 20, no. 1 (2014): 19–39.
- Ben-Eliezer, Uri. “State Versus Civil Society? A Non-Binary Model of Domination Through the Example of Israel.” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 11, no. 3 (1998): 370–96.
- Bennett, Brett M, and Joseph Morgan Hodge. *Science and Empire: Knowledge and Networks of Science across the British Empire, 1800-1970*. Houndmills, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Bennett, Ethan R. “Frontier.” *Encyclopedia of Politics of the American West*. Los Angeles: Sage Reference & CQ Press, 2013.
- Berdal, Mats R. *The United States, Norway and the Cold War, 1954-60*. New York, N.Y.: St. Martin’s Press in association with St. Anthony’s College, Oxford, 1997.
- Berger, Mark T. “Old State and New Empire in Indonesia: Debating the Rise and Decline of Suharto’s New Order.” *Third World Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (1997): 321–61.
- Bernazzolli, Richelle, and Colin Flint. “Power, Place, and Militarism: Toward a Comparative Geographic Analysis of Militarization.” *Geography Compass* 3, no. 1 (2009): 493–411.
- Bills, Martha, and D.C.) Center for Strategic and International Studies. *Options for U.S. Military Support to the United Nations*. Washington: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1992.
- Bishop, Peter V. “Canada’s Policy on the Financing of U.N. Peace-Keeping Operations.” *International Journal* 20, no. 4 (1965): 463–83.
- Blandford, John B., and United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. “Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East to the United Nations General Assembly.” New York: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, September 1951.
- Bligh, Alexander. “The United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF), 1956–67: Past Experience, Current Lessons.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 50, no. 5 (2014): 796–809.
- Bloomfield, Lincoln P. “China, the United States, and the United Nations.” *International Organization* 20, no. 4 (1966): 653–76.
- Bobal, R. Thomas. “‘A Puppet, Even Though He Probably Doesn’t Know So’: Racial Identity and the Eisenhower Administration’s Encounter with Gamal Abdel Nasser and the Arab Nationalist Movement.” *The International History Review* 35, no. 5 (2013): 943–74.
- Boden, Ragna. “Cold War Economics: Soviet Aid to Indonesia.” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 10, no. 3 (2008): 110–28.
- Borhi, László. *Hungary in the Cold War, 1945-1956 between the United States and the Soviet Union*. Budapest; New York: Central European University Press, 2004.

- Borring Olesen, Thorsten, Carsten Due-Nielsen, Ole Feldbaek, Nikolaj Petersen, and Poul Villaume. *Dansk udenrigspolitikens historie 5, 5.*. København: Danmarks Nationalleksikon, 2005.
- Borstelmann, Thomas. *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Borutta, Manuel, and Sakis Borutta. "A Colonial Sea: The Mediterranean, 1798–1956." *European Review of History* 19, no. 1 (2012): 1–13.
- Borzutzky, Silvia, and David Berger. "Dammed If You Do, Dammed If You Don't: The Eisenhower Administration and the Aswan Dam." *The Middle East Journal* 64, no. 1 (2010): 84–102.
- Bossuat, Gerard. "French Development Aid and Co-Operation under de Gaulle." *Contemporary European History* 12, no. 4 (2003): 431–56.
- Boughton, James M. "IMF Working Paper: Northwest of the Suez: Crisis and the IMF." International Monetary Fund, 2000.
- Bourantonis, Dimitris, and Konstantinos Magliveras. "Anglo-American Differences over the UN during the Cold War: The Uniting for Peace Resolution." *Contemporary British History* 16, no. 2 (2002): 59–76.
- Bourdagh, M. "The Disease of Nationalism, the Empire of Hygiene." *Positions* 6, no. 3 (1998): 637–73.
- Bowker, Robert. "Playing Second Fiddle in a Dysfunctional Orchestra: Australia, Britain and the Suez Canal 1950–56." *Global Change, Peace & Security* 25, no. 3 (2013): 325–37.
- Bowman, Edward H., and James E. Bowman. "The Logistics Problems of a UN Military Force." *International Organization* 17, no. 2 (1963): 355–76.
- Bowman, Edward H., and James E. Fanning. "The Logistics Problems of a UN Military Force." *International Organization* 17, no. 2 (1963): 355.
- Boyd, James M. *United Nations Peace-Keeping Operations a Military and Political Appraisal*. New York: Praeger, 1972.
- Brands, Hal. *Latin America's Cold War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Bridge, J. W. "The Legal Status of British Troops Forming Part of the United Nations Force in Cyprus." *The Modern Law Review* 34, no. 2 (1971): 121–34.
- Briggs, Laura. *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Brückenhaus, Daniel. "The Origins of Trans-Imperial Policing: British-French Government Cooperation in the Surveillance of Anti-Colonialists in Europe, 1905-25." In *Imperial Cooperation and Transfer, 1870-1930*, 171–96. New York; London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015.
- Buanes, Arild, and Svein Jentoft. "Building Bridges: Institutional Perspectives on Interdisciplinarity." *Futures* 41, no. 7 (2009): 446–54.
- Burbank, Jane, and Frederick Cooper. *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2010.

- . *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Burkman, Thomas W. *Japan and the League of Nations: Empire and World Order*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008.
- Burnett, Christina Duffy. "'They Say I Am Not an American ...': The Noncitizen National and the Law of American Empire." *Virginia Journal of International Law* 48, no. 4 (2008): 659–718.
- Burns, Arthur Lee, and Nina Heathcote. *Peace-Keeping by U.N. Forces, from Suez to the Congo*. New York: Published for the Center of International Studies, Princeton University by Praeger, 1963.
- Burns, E. L. M. "The Withdrawal of UNEF and the Future of Peacekeeping." *International Journal* 23, no. 1 (1967): 1–17.
- Burton, Antoinette. *Empire in Question: Reading, Writing, and Teaching British Imperialism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2011.
- Burton, Antoinette M. *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking with and through the Nation*. Durham [N.C.]: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Calandri, Elena. "Italy's Foreign Assistance Policy, 1959-1969." *Contemporary European History* 12, no. 4 (2003): 509–25.
- Canuel, Hugues. "French Aspirations and Anglo-Saxon Suspicions: France, Signals Intelligence and the UKUSA Agreement at the Dawn of the Cold War." *The Journal of Intelligence History* 12, no. 1 (2013): 76–92.
- Carroll, Michael. "Canada and the Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force, 1957-1963." *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 13, no. 1 (2002): 217–34.
- Carroll, Michael K. *Pearson's Peacekeepers Canada and the United Nations Emergency Force, 1956-67*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009.
- Chandler, David. *Empire in Denial: The Politics of State-Building*. London, Ann Arbor: Pluto Press, 2006.
- Chapman, Dudley H. "International Law: The United Nations Emergency Force: Legal Status." *Michigan Law Review* 57, no. 1 (1958): 56–81.
- Chapman, John. "The Secret Dimensions of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1900-1905." In *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1902-1922*, 82–98. Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Charbonneau, Bruno. "Dreams of Empire: France, Europe, and the New Interventionism in Africa." *Modern & Contemporary France* 16, no. 3 (2008): 279–95.
- Charbonneau, Bruno. *France and the New Imperialism: Security Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate, 2008.
- Charbonneau, Bruno. "Legions of Peace: UN Peacekeepers from the Global South." *International Peacekeeping - London* 21, no. 4 (2014): 539–40.
- . "The Imperial Legacy of International Peacebuilding: The Case of Francophone Africa." *Review of International Studies* 40, no. 3 (2014): 607–30.

- Charbonneau, Bruno, and Wayne S. Cox. "Global Order, US Hegemony and Military Integration: The Canadian-American Defense Relationship." *International Political Sociology* 2, no. 4 (2008): 305–21.
- Chazan Meir. "A Fighting Press: Reflections of Israel's War of Independence in Children's Newspapers." *Journal of Israeli Politics, Society and Culture* 24, no. 1 (2005).
- Cohen, Maxwell. "The Demise of UNEF." *International Journal* 23, no. 1 (1967): 18–51.
- . "The United Nations Emergency Force: A Preliminary View." *International Journal* 12, no. 2 (1957): 109–27.
- Cohen, Michael J. "From 'Cold' to 'Hot' War: Allied Strategic and Military Interests in the Middle East after the Second World War." *Middle Eastern Studies* 43, no. 5 (2007): 725–48.
- Cohen, Stuart A., and Robert O. Freedman. "Light and Shadows in the US-Israeli Military Ties, 1948-2010." In *Israel and the United States: Six Decades of US-Israeli Relations*, 143–64. Boulder: Westview Press, 2012.
- Cohen Hattab, Kobi. "The Attraction of Palestine: Tourism in the Years 1850-1948." *Journal of Historical Geography* 27, no. 2 (2001): 166-.
- Cole, Babalola. "The United Nations Peace-Keeping Operations: The Actions and Policies of the African Nations in the Congo." 1967.
- Coleman, Bradley Lynn. "The Colombian Army in Korea, 1950-1954." *The Journal of Military History* 69, no. 4 (2005): 1137–77.
- Collingham, E. M. *Imperial Bodies: The Physical Experience of the Raj, C. 1800-1947*. Cambridge; Malden: Polity Press ; Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- Comay, Michael. "UN Peacekeeping: The Israeli Experience." In *Peacekeeping: Appraisals and Proposals*, 93–117. New York: Pergamon Press, 1983.
- Combs, James Joseph. "France and United Nations Peacekeeping." *International Organization* 21, no. 2 (1967): 306–25.
- Connelly, Matthew James. *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Conniff, M. L. "The Canal Builders: Making America's Empire at the Panama Canal." *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas* 7, no. 2 (2010): 97–98.
- Conrad, Sebastian. "Rethinking German Colonialism in a Global Age." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 41, no. 4 (2013): 543–66.
- Cook, Terry. "The Archive(s) Is a Foreign Country: Historians, Archivists, and the Changing Archival Landscape." *The Canadian Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (2009): 497-.
- Cooper, Frederick. *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Cooper, Frederick, and Ann Laura Stoler. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

- Coronil, Fernando. "After Empire: Reflections on Imperialism from the Américas." In *Imperial Formations*, 241–71. Santa Fe, Oxford: School for Advanced Research Press & James Currey, 2007.
- Cossali, Paul, and Clive Robson. *Stateless in Gaza*. London: Zed Books, 1986.
- Cottyn, Hanne. "Renegotiating Communal Autonomy. Communal Land Rights and Liberal Land Reform on the Bolivian Altiplano, 1860-1930." University of Ghent, 2014.
- Cox, Wayne, and Kim Nossal. "The 'crimson' World: The Anglo-Core, the Post-Imperial Non-Core, and the Hegemony of American IR." In *International Relations Scholarship around the World*, 287–307. London: Routledge, 2009.
- Cox, Wayne S., and Kim Richard Nossal. "The 'Crimson World': The Anglo Core, the Postimperial Non-Core and the Hegemony of American IR." In *International Relations Scholarship around the World*, 287–307. London: Routledge, 2009.
- Creswell, Michael. "Between the Bear and the Phoenix: The United States and the European Defense Community, 1950-54." *Security Studies* 11, no. 4 (2002): 89–124.
- Cunliffe, Philip. *Legions of Peace: UN Peacekeepers from the Global South*. London: Hurst, 2013.
- . "Still the Spectre at the Feast: Comparisons between Peacekeeping and Imperialism in Peacekeeping Studies Today." *International Peacekeeping* 19, no. 4 (2012): 426–42.
- Dai, Yingcong. *The Sichuan Frontier and Tibet: Imperial Strategy in the Early Qing*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009.
- DANOR BN XIX. Minnebok. Byens Bogtrykkeri, 1966.
- DANOR BN IV. "DANOR BN IV - April-October 1958." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1958.
- DANOR BN IX. "DANOR BN IX - October 1960-April 1961." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1961.
- DANOR BN VI. "DANOR BN VI - April 1959-October 1959." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1959.
- DANOR BN VII. "DANOR BN VII - October 1959-April 1960." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1960.
- DANOR BN VIII. "DANOR BN VIII - April-October 1960." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1960.
- DANOR BN X. "DANOR BN X - April-October 1961." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1961.
- DANOR BN XII. "DANOR BN XII - April-October 1962." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1962.
- DANOR BN XV. "DANOR BN XV - October 1963-April 1964." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1964.
- DANOR BN XVII. "DANOR BN XVII." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1965.

- DANOR BN XX. "DANOR BN XX - April-October 1966." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1966.
- DANOR BN XXI. "DANOR BN XXI - October 1966-April 1967." DANOR BN, United Nations Emergency Force, 1967.
- Darby, Philip. "Rolling Back the Frontiers of Empire: Practising the Postcolonial." *International Peacekeeping* 16, no. 5 (2009): 699–716.
- Darwin, John. *After Tamerlane: The Global History of Empires, 1400-2000*. London: Penguin Books, 2008.
- . "An Undeclared Empire: The British in the Middle East, 1918–39." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 27, no. 2 (1999): 159–76.
- Daugherty, William J. "Truman's Iranian Policy, 1945-1953: The Soviet Calculus." *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 15, no. 4 (2002): 580–93.
- De Vito, Christian Guisepp. "Micro-Spatial History: Towards a New Global History." Leiden, 2014.
- Deguilhem, Randi. "Turning Syrians into Frenchmen: The Cultural Politics of a French Non-Governmental Organization in Mandate Syria (1920-67)--the French Secular Mission Schools." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 13, no. 4 (2002): 449–60.
- Dietl, Ralph. "Suez 1956: A European Intervention?" *Journal of Contemporary History* 43, no. 2 (2008): 259–78.
- . "The WEU: A Europe of the Seven, 1954–1969." *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 7, no. 4 (2009): 431–52.
- Dimier, Véronique. *The Invention of a European Development Aid Bureaucracy: Recycling Empire*, 2014.
- Dimitrakis, Panagiotis. *Military Intelligence in Cyprus From the Great War to Middle East Crises*. London: I.B. Tauris & Co., 2010.
- . "The Value to CENTO of UK Bases on Cyprus." *Middle Eastern Studies* 45, no. 4 (2009): 611–24.
- Dombroski, Kenneth R. *Peacekeeping in the Middle East as an International Regime*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Duara, Prasenjit. "The Cold War as a Historical Period: An Interpretive Essay." *Journal of Global History* 6, no. 3 (2011): 457–80.
- . "The Imperialism of 'Free Nations': Japan, Manchuko and the History of the Present." In *Imperial Formations*, 211–40. Santa Fe, Oxford: School for Advanced Research Press & James Currey, 2007.
- Duffield, Mark. "Development, Territories, and People: Consolidating the External Sovereign Frontier." *Alternatives* 32, no. 2 (2007): 225–46.
- Duffield, Mark, and Vernon Hewitt. "Introduction." In *Empire, Development and Colonialism: The Past in the Present*, 1–15. Woodbridge, Rochester: James Currey, 2013.
- Duffield, Mark, and Vernon M. Hewitt, eds. *Empire, Development & Colonialism: The Past in the Present*. Woodbridge, Rochester: James Currey, 2013.

- Duffield, Mark R. *Development, Security and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples*. Cambridge: Polity, 2007.
- E. L. M. Burns. *Between Arab and Israeli*. New York: George Harrap and Co., 1962.
- Ear, Sopal. "The Political Economy of Aid and Governance in Cambodia." *Asian Journal of Political Science* 15, no. 1 (2007): 68–96.
- Echenberg, Myron. "'Morts Pour La France'; The African Soldier in France during the Second World War." *Journal of African History* 26, no. 4 (1985): 363–80.
- Eckert, Carter J. *Offspring of Empire: The Koch'ang Kims and the Colonial Origins of Korean Capitalism, 1876-1945*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2014.
- Edelstein, David M. "Enforcing the Peace: Learning from the Imperial Past.(Book Review)." *Political Science Quarterly* 120, no. 4 (2005): 679-.
- Edwards, Paul. *Unusual Footnotes to the Korean War*. Osprey Publishing, 2013.
- Edwards, Paul M. *United Nations Participants in the Korean War: The Contributions of 45 Member Countries*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, 2013.
- Eide, Ingrid. "Some Factors Affecting Local Acceptance of a UN Force – A Pilot Project Report from Gaza." *International Problems* 1, no. 2 (1966).
- . "Some Factors Affecting Local Acceptance of a UN Force – A Pilot Project Report from Gaza." In *Peace, War and Defence – Essays in Peace Research*, edited by Johan Galtung, 240–63. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers, 1976.
- El Hussini, Mohrez Mahmoud. *Soviet-Egyptian Relations, 1945-85*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.
- El Mallakh, Ragaai, and Carl McGuire. "The Economics of the Suez Canal under UAR Management." *The Middle East Journal* 14, no. 2 (1960): 125–40.
- Elaraby, Nabil E. "UN Peacekeeping: The Egyptian Experience." In *Peacekeeping: Appraisals and Proposals*, 65–92. New York: Pergamon Press, 1983.
- El-Eini, Roza I.M. "Government Fiscal Policy in Mandatory Palestine in the 1930s." *Middle Eastern Studies* 33, no. 3 (1997): 570–96.
- El-Eini, Roza I.M. "Trade Agreements and the Continuation of Tariff Protection Policy in Mandate Palestine in the 1930s." *Middle Eastern Studies* 34, no. 1 (1998): 164–91.
- Elkordy, Abdul-Hafez M. "The United Nations Peace-Keeping Functions in the Arab World," 1967.
- Engholm, Carl. *Fremmedlegionær og dansk oberst: Carl Engholms erindringer i krig og fred 1913-1979*. Lyngby: Dansk historisk håndbogsforlag, 1996.
- Ergut, F. "Policing the Poor in the Late Ottoman Empire." *Middle Eastern Studies* 38, no. 2 (2002): 149–64.
- Erman, Sam. "Meanings of Citizenship in the U.S. Empire: Puerto Rico, Isabel Gonzalez, and the Supreme Court, 1898 to 1905." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 27, no. 4 (2008): 5–33.

- Feldman, Ilana. "Ad Hoc Humanity: UN Peacekeeping and the Limits of International Community in Gaza." *American Anthropologist* 112, no. 3 (2010): 416–29.
- . "Home as a Refrain: Remembering and Living Displacement in Gaza." *History and Memory* 18, no. 2 (2000): 10–47.
- . "Observing the Everyday." *Interventions* 9, no. 3 (2011): 414–33.
- . "The Challenge of Categories: UNRWA and the Definition of a 'Palestine Refugee.'" *Journal of Refugee Studies* 25, no. 3 (2012): 387–406.
- Ferguson, Niall. *Colossus: The Price of America's Empire*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004.
- Ferris, Jesse. "Guns for Cotton? Aid, Trade, and the Soviet Quest for Base Rights in Egypt, 1964–1966." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 13, no. 2 (2011): 4–38.
- . "Soviet Support for Egypt's Intervention in Yemen, 1962-1963." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 10, no. 4 (2008): 5–36.
- Ferris, John. "Armaments and Allies: The Anglo-Japanese Strategic Relationship, 1911-1921." In *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1902-1922*, 249–63. Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Fieldhouse, David Kenneth. *Western Imperialism in the Middle East 1914-1958*. Oxford university press, 2006.
- Filiu, Jean-Pierre, and John King. *Gaza: A History*. London: Hurst & Company, 2014.
- Fitzgerald, Edward Peter. "Business Diplomacy: Walter Teagle, Jersey Standard, and the Anglo-French Pipeline Conflict in the Middle East, 1930-1931." *Business History Review* 67, no. 2 (1993): 207–45.
- Fitzsimons, Matthew A. "The Suez Crisis and the Containment Policy." *The Review of Politics* 19, no. 4 (1957): 419–45.
- Fleischmann, Ellen L. "The Emergence of the Palestinian Women's Movement", 1929-1939." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 29 (2000): 16–32.
- Frank, Alison. "The Children of the Desert and the Laws of the Sea: Austria, Great Britain, the Ottoman Empire, and the Mediterranean Slave Trade in the Nineteenth Century." *The American Historical Review* 117, no. 2 (2012): 410–44.
- Friedman, Hal M. *Creating an American Lake United States Imperialism and Strategic Security in the Pacific Basin, 1945-1947*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- Galpern, Steven G. *Money, Oil, and Empire in the Middle East: Sterling and Postwar Imperialism, 1944-1971*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Galtung, Johan, and Helge Hveem. "Participants in Peacekeeping Forces." In *Peace, War and Defence – Essays in Peace Research*, 264–81. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen, 1976.
- Ganser, Daniele. *NATO's Top Secret Stay-behind Armies and Terrorism in Western Europe*. New York: Frank Cass, 2005.

- Garfield, S. "Tapping Masculinity: Labor Recruitment to the Brazilian Amazon during World War II." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 86, no. 2 (2006): 275–308.
- Garfield, Seth. "Beholding the Miracle: Xavante Indians and Economic 'Development' Under Brazilian Military Rule." *The Americas* 57, no. 4 (2001): 551–80.
- . *In Search of the Amazon: Brazil, the United States, and the Nature of a Region*, 2013.
- . "The Environment of Wartime Migration: Labor Transfers from the Brazilian Northeast to the Amazon During World War II." *Journal of Social History* 43, no. 4 (2010): 989–1019.
- . "The Roots of a Plant That Today Is Brazil: Indians and the Nation-State under the Brazilian Estado Novo." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 29, no. 3 (1997): 747–68.
- . "Where the Earth Touches the Sky: The Xavante Indians' Struggle for Land in Brazil, 1951-1979." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 80, no. 3 (2000): 537–63.
- Gat, Moshe. "Anatomy of Decline: Anglo-Soviet Competition in the Middle East, 1956–67." *Israel Affairs* 19, no. 4 (2013): 603–22.
- Gazit, Mordechai. "The 1956 Sinai Campaign: David Ben-Gurion's Policy on Gaza, the Armistice Agreement and French Mediation." *Israel Affairs* 6, no. 3–4 (2000): 43–67.
- Geyer, Michael, and Charles Bright. "World History in a Global Age." *American Historical Review* 100, no. 4 (1995): 1034–60.
- Geyikdağı, V. Necla. *Foreign Investment in the Ottoman Empire International Trade and Relations 1854-1914*. London; New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2011.
- Ghali, Mona. "United Nations Emergency Force I." In *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping: Case Studies and Comparative Analysis*, 104–30. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Ghosh, Durba. "Another Set of Imperial Turns?" *The American Historical Review* 117, no. 3 (2012): 772–93.
- Gibbs, David N. *The Political Economy of Third World Intervention: Mines, Money, and U.S. Policy in the Congo Crisis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- . "The United Nations, International Peacekeeping and the Question of Impartiality: Revisiting the Congo Operation of 1960." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 38, no. 3 (2000): 359–82.
- Gluska, Ami. *The Israeli Military and the Origins of the 1967 War: Government, Armed Forces and Defence Policy 1963-1967*. London: Routledge, an imprint of Taylor & Francis Books Ltd, 2007.
- Gnehm, Edward W. "ANZUS: The Alliance through American Eyes." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 55, no. 2 (2001): 161–65.

- Go, Julian. "Chains of Empire, Projects of State: Political Education and U.S. Colonial Rule in Puerto Rico and the Philippines." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42, no. 2 (2000): 333–62.
- . *Patterns of Empire: The British and American Empires, 1688 to the Present*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Goh, Daniel. "Postcolonial Disorientations: Colonial Ethnography and the Vectors of the Philippine Nation in the Imperial Frontier." *Postcolonial Studies* 11, no. 3 (2008): 259–76.
- Golani, Moti. *Israel in Search of a War: The Sinai Campaign, 1955-1956*. Brighton; Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 1998.
- Goodrich, Leland M., and Gabriella Rosner. "The United Nations Emergency Force." *International Organization* 11, no. 3 (1957): 413–30.
- Goodwin, Geoffrey L. "The Political Role of The United Nations: Some British Views." *International Organization* 15, no. 4 (1961): 581–602.
- Gorman, Daniel. "Britain, India, and the United Nations: Colonialism and the Development of International Governance, 1945–1960." *Journal of Global History* 9, no. 3 (2014): 471–90.
- . "Empire, Internationalism and the Campaign against the Traffic in Women and Children in the 1920s." *Twentieth Century British History* 19, no. 2 (2008): 186–216.
- . *Imperial Citizenship: Empire and the Question of Belonging*. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press and Palgrave, 2006.
- . "Liberal Internationalism, The League of Nations Union, and the Mandates System." *Canadian Journal of History* 40, no. 3 (2005): 449–.
- . *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s*, 2012.
- Gouda, Frances, and Thijs Brocades Zaalberg. *American Visions of the Netherlands East Indies/Indonesia US Foreign Policy and Indonesian Nationalism, 1920-1949*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2002.
- Grandin, Greg. *Empire's Workshop: Latin America, the United States, and the Rise of the New Imperialism*. New York: Holt Paperback, 2010.
- Green, Michael Cullen. *Black Yanks in the Pacific: Race in the Making of American Military Empire after World War II*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2010.
- Greenberg, Ela. *Preparing the Mothers of Tomorrow Education and Islam in Mandate Palestine*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010.
- Gregory, Derek. *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, and Iraq*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Grove, Eric. "Who to Fight in 1956, Egypt or Israel? Operation Musketeer versus Operation Cordage." In *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath*, 79–86. Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate, 2008.
- Guettel, Jens-Uwe. *German Expansionism, Imperial Liberalism and the United States, 1776-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

- Hadhri, Mohieddine. "U.S. Foreign Policy Toward North Africa During the Cold War: From Eisenhower to Kennedy (1953–1963)." *The Journal of the Middle East and Africa* 5, no. 2 (2014): 95–110.
- Haim Grossman. "War as Child's Play: Patriotic Games in the British Mandate and Israel." *Israel Studies* 9, no. 1 (2004): 1–30.
- Hall, H. Duncan. *Commonwealth: A History of the British Commonwealth of Nations*. London; New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971.
- Hall, Hessel Duncan. *Commonwealth: A History of the British Commonwealth of Nations*. London; New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971.
- Hanhimäki, Jussi. "Self-Restraint as Containment: United States' Economic Policy, Finland, and the Soviet Union, 1945–1953." *The International History Review* 17, no. 2 (1995): 287–305.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Hashmi, Sohail H. "'Zero Plus Zero Plus Zero': Pakistan, the Baghdad Pact, and the Suez Crisis." *The International History Review* 33, no. 3 (2011): 525–44.
- Hee Kyung, Suh. "Atrocities before and during the Korean War." *Critical Asian Studies* 42, no. 4 (2010): 553–88.
- Heffernan, Michael. "Geography, Cartography and Military Intelligence: The Royal Geographical Society and the First World War." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21, no. 3 (1996): 504–33.
- Heikal, Mohamed. *Cutting the Lion's Tail: Suez Through Egyptian Eyes*. Guernsey: Transworld Publishers, 1988.
- Helmreich, Jonathan E. "U.S. Foreign Policy and the Belgian Congo in the 1950s." *The Historian* 58, no. 2 (1996): 315–28.
- Hevia, James. *The Imperial Security State: British Colonial Knowledge and Empire-Building in Asia*, 2012.
- Hewitt, Vernon. "Empire, International Development & the Concept of Good Government." In *Empire, Development and Colonialism: The Past in the Present*, 30–44. Woodbridge, Rochester: James Currey, 2013.
- Higate, Paul, and Marsha. Henry. *Insecure Spaces: Peacekeeping, Power and Performance in Haiti, Kosovo and Liberia*. London; New York: Zed Books, 2009.
- "History/Timeline." Accessed October 14, 2015. <http://www.parsons.com/about-parsons/Pages/history-timeline.aspx>.
- Hobson, J. M., and George Lawson. "What Is History in International Relations?" *Millennium* 37, no. 2 (2008): 415–35.
- Hocknell, Peter. "Contested Development: A Retrospective of the UN Development Programme in Cyprus." In *The Work of the UN in Cyprus: Promoting Peace and Development*, 157–92. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Hodge, Joseph Morgan. *Triumph of the Expert Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2007.

- Hoffman, Bruce. "The Palestine Police Force and the Challenges of Gathering Counterterrorism Intelligence, 1939–1947." *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 24, no. 4 (2013): 609–47.
- Holmila, Antero. "The Holocaust and the Birth of Israel in British, Swedish and Finnish Press Discourse, 1947–1948." *European Review of History* 16, no. 2 (2009): 183–200.
- Holt, Andrew. "'No More Hoares to Paris': British Foreign Policymaking and the Abyssinian Crisis, 1935." *Review of International Studies* 37, no. 3 (2011): 1383–1401.
- Hom, Stephanie Malia. "Empires of Tourism: Travel and Rhetoric in Italian Colonial Libya and Albania, 1911–1943." *Journal of Tourism History* 4, no. 3 (2012): 281–300.
- Houbert, Jean. "Russia in the Geopolitics of Settler Colonization and Decolonization." *Round Table* 86, no. 344 (1997): 549–61.
- Howe, Stephen. "British Worlds, Settler Worlds, World Systems, and Killing Fields." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 40, no. 4 (2012): 691–725.
- Huber, Valeska. *Channelling Mobilities: Migration and Globalisation in the Suez Canal Region and Beyond, 1869-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- . "Colonial Seas: The 'International' Colonisation of Port Said and the Suez Canal and Beyond, 1869-1914." *European Review of History: Revue Européenne D'histoire* 19, no. 1 (2012): 141–61.
- . "Connecting Colonial Seas: The 'International Colonisation' of Port Said and the Suez Canal During and After the First World War." *European Review of History* 19, no. 1 (2012): 141–61.
- Hughes, Geraint. "Legions of Peace: UN Peacekeepers from the Global South." *Round Table* 103, no. 3 (2014): 353–56.
- Hughes, Matthew. "A British 'Foreign Legion'? The British Police in Mandate Palestine." *Middle Eastern Studies* 49, no. 5 (2013): 696–711.
- . "Terror in Galilee: British-Jewish Collaboration and the Special Night Squads in Palestine during the Arab Revolt, 1938–39." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 43, no. 4 (2015): 590–610.
- Hulbert, Jeff. "Right-Wing Propaganda or Reporting History?: The Newsreels and the Suez Crisis of 1956." *Film History* 14, no. 3/4 (2002): 261–81.
- Hurewitz, J. C. "The UN and Disimperialism in the Middle East." *International Organization* 19, no. 3 (1965): 749–63.
- Husseini, Hassan. "A 'MIDDLE POWER' IN ACTION: CANADA AND THE PARTITION OF PALESTINE." *Arab Studies Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (2008): 41–55.
- Huxley, Margo. "Geographies of Governmentality." In *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*, edited by Jeremy W. Crampton and Stuart Elden, 185–204. Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate, 2007.

- Iandolo, Alessandro. "Imbalance of Power: The Soviet Union and the Congo Crisis, 1960–1961." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 16, no. 2 (2014): 32–55.
- . "The Rise and Fall of the 'Soviet Model of Development' in West Africa, 1957–64." *Cold War History* 12, no. 4 (2012): 683–704.
- Ignatieff, Michael. *Empire Lite: Nation Building in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan*. London: Vintage, 2003.
- Ilana Feldman. *Governing Gaza: Bureaucracy, Authority and the Work of Rule, 1917-1967*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.
- . "The Quaker Way: Ethical Labor and Humanitarian Relief." *American Anthropologist* 34, no. 4 (2007): 689–705.
- Ilan Pappé. *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford: OneWorld Publications Limited, 2006.
- International Who's Who 1966-67. London: Europa Publications, 1966.
- Issawi, Charles. *An Economic History of the Middle East and North Africa*. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Jackson, Robert H, and Georg Sørensen. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, 2013.
- James, Alan. *The Politics of Peace-Keeping*. New York: Published for the Institute for Strategic Studies by Praeger, 1969.
- Jarboe, Andrew Tait, and Richard Standish Fogarty, eds. *Empires in World War I: Shifting Frontiers and Imperial Dynamics in a Global Conflict*. London; New York: I.B. Tauris; Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Jayasuriya, Laksiri, David Walker, and Jan Gothard. *Legacies of White Australia: Race, Culture, and Nation*. Crawley: University of Western Australia Press, 2003.
- Jensen, Ole. *Kompagni Larsen: Vordingborg - Ægypten Tur-Retur November 1956 - Maj 1957*. Lyngby: private publication, 2005.
- Jersild, Austin. "The Soviet State as Imperial Scavenger: 'Catch Up and Surpass' in the Transnational Socialist Bloc, 1950–1960." *The American Historical Review* 116, no. 1 (2011): 109–32.
- Joan M. Schwartz, and Terry Cook. "Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory." *Archival Science* 2, no. 1 (2002): 1–19.
- Johnson, Edward. "A Permanent UN Force: British Thinking after Suez." *Review of International Studies* 17, no. 3 (1991): 251–66.
- . "The Diplomats' Diplomat: Sier Pierson Dixon, Ambassador to the United Nations." In *Whitehall and the Suez Crisis*, edited by Saul Kelly and Anthony Gorst, 178–98. London; Portland: Frank Cass, 2000.
- . "'The Umpire on Whom the Sun Never Sets': Dag Hammarskjöld's Political Role and the British at Suez." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 8, no. 1 (1997): 249–78.
- Johnson, Robert. "Command of the Army, Charles Gwynn and Imperial Policing: The British Doctrinal Approach to Internal Security in Palestine,

- 1919–29.” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 43, no. 4 (2015): 570–89.
- Jones, Clive. *Britain and the Yemen Civil War, 1962-1965: Ministers, Mercenaries and Mandarins : Foreign Policy and the Limits of Covert Action*. Eastbourne; Portland, Or.: Sussex Academic Press, 2010.
- Jones, Clive, Tore T Petersen, and Clive Jones. *Israel’s Clandestine Diplomacies*, 2013.
- Jordheim, Helge, and Iver B. Neumann. “Empire, Imperialism and Conceptual History.” *Journal of International Relations and Development* 14, no. 2 (2011): 153–85.
- Kabalo, Paula. “Dialogues with Young People David Ben-Gurion’s Youth Campaigns, 1939–1954.” *Israel Affairs* 14, no. 2 (2008): 218–36.
- Kagarlitsky, Boris. *Empire of the Periphery: Russia and the World System*. London; Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press, 2008.
- Kahng, Gyoo-hyoung. “Zionism, Israel, and the Soviet Union: A Study in the Rise and Fall of Brief Soviet-Israeli Friendship from 1945 to 1955.” *Global Economic Review* 27, no. 4 (1998): 95–107.
- Karbo, Tony. “Peace-Building in Africa.” In *Peace and Conflict in Africa*, 113–32. London ; New York: Zed Books, 2008.
- Karetny, Eli, and Thomas G. Weiss. “UNRRA’s Operational Genius and Institutional Design.” In *Wartime Origins and the Future of the United Nations*, edited by Dan Plesch and Thomas G. Weiss, 99–120. London; New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Kassimeris, Christos. “United States Intervention in Post-War Greek Elections: From Civil War to Dictatorship.” *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 20, no. 4 (2009): 679–96.
- Kavalski, Emilian. *Encounters with World Affairs: An Introduction to International Relations*, 2015.
- Kent, John. *America, the UN and Decolonisation: Cold War Conflict in the Congo*. London, New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Ker-Lindsay, James. “The Origins of the UN Presence in Cyprus.” In *The Work of the UN in Cyprus: Promoting Peace and Development*, 50–73. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Khalaf, Issa. “The Effect of Socioeconomic Change on Arab Societal Collapse in Mandate Palestine.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 29, no. 1 (1997): 93–112.
- Khalid, Adeeb. “The Soviet Union as an Imperial Formation: A View from Central Asia.” In *Imperial Formations*, 113–40. Santa Fe; Oxford: School for Advanced Research Press & James Currey, 2007.
- Khan, Yasmin. “Sex in an Imperial War Zone: Transnational Encounters in Second World War India.” *History Workshop Journal* 73, no. 1 (2012): 240–58.
- Khanduri, Chandra B, and Centre for Armed Forces Historical Research. *Thimayya: An Amazing Life*. New Delhi: Knowledge World, 2006.

- Khodarkovsky, Michael. *Russia's Steppe Frontier: The Making of a Colonial Empire, 1500-1800: Indiana-Michigan Series in Russian and East European Studies*. Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Kim, Jean J. "Experimental Encounters: Filipino and Hawaiian Bodies in the U.S. Imperial Invention of Odontoclasia, 1928–1946." *American Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2010): 523–46.
- Kim, Taewoo. "Limted War, Limited Targets." *Critical Asian Studies* 44, no. 3 (2012): 467–92.
- Kinloch-Pichat, Stephen. *A UN "Legion": Between Utopia and Reality*. London; New York: Frank Cass, 2004.
- Kjeldsen, Niels. *Fredens soldater*. Copenhagen: Hjemmevaernsfonden, 1958.
- Kjersti G. Berg. "UNRWA and the Politics of Relief." In *Interpreting Welfare and Relief in the Middle East*, edited by Nefissa Naguib and Inger Marie Okkerhaug. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Klepak, Hal. "Power Multiplied or Power Restrained? The United States and Multilateral Institutions in the Americas." In *US Hegemony and International Organizations: The United States and Multilateral Institutions*, edited by Rosemary Foot, S. Neil MacFarlane, and Michael Mastanduno, 240–64. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Klinghoffer, Arthur Jay. "Soviet Oil Politics and the Suez Canal." *The World Today* 31, no. 10 (October 1, 1975): 397–405.
- Knight, John. "Securing Zion? Policing in British Palestine, 1917–39." *European Review of History* 18, no. 4 (2011): 523–43.
- Kolko, Gabriel. *The Politics of War: The World and United States Foreign Policy, 1943-1945*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1990.
- Korn, Alina. "From Refugees to Infiltrators: Constructing Political Crime in Israel in the 1950s." *International Journal of the Sociology of Law* 31, no. 1 (2003): 1–22.
- Kramer, Paul A. "Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between the British and United States Empires, 1880-1910." *The Journal of American History* 88, no. 4 (2002): 1315–53.
- . "Power and Connection: Imperial Histories of the United States in the World." *The American Historical Review* 116, no. 5 (2011): 1348–91.
- . "Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire: The Philippine-American War as Race War*." *Diplomatic History* 30, no. 2 (2006): 169–210.
- . *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Krige, John. *American Hegemony and the Postwar Reconstruction of Science in Europe*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006.
- . "The Peaceful Atom as Political Weapon: Euratom and American Foreign Policy in the Late 1950s." *Historical Studies in the Natural Sciences* 38, no. 1 (2008): 5–44.

- Kristiansen, Preben. *Danske soldater i Gaza og Congo*; [København: Forlaget Fremad, 1962.
- Kroizer, Gad. "From Dowbiggin to Tegart: Revolutionary Change in the Colonial Police in Palestine during the 1930s." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 32, no. 4 (2004): 115–33.
- Kumaraswamy, P. R. *India's Israel Policy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.
- Kunz, Diane B. *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.
- . *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.
- Kushner, Tony. "'Without Intending Any of the Most Undesirable Features of a Colour Bar': Race Science, Europeanness and the British Armed Forces during the Twentieth Century." *Patterns of Prejudice* 46, no. 3–4 (2012): 339–74.
- Kuss, Susanne. "Co-Operation between German and French Troops During the Boxer War in China, 1900/1: The Punitive Expedition to Baoding." In *Imperial Cooperation and Transfer, 1870-1930*, 197–218. New York; London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015.
- Kuzmarov, Jeremy. *Modernizing Repression: Police Training and Nation Building in the American Century*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012.
- Kyle, Keith. *Suez*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991.
- . *Suez Britain's End of Empire in the Middle East*. London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011.
- Labouisse, Henry, and UNRWA. "Annual Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East." New York; Beirut: UNRWA and UN General Assembly, June 30, 1957.
- . "Special Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East." New York; Beirut: UNRWA and UN General Assembly, June 30, 1954.
- . "Special Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East." New York; Beirut: UNRWA and UN General Assembly, December 15, 1956.
- Lal, N. "India and the Withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, 1967." *International Studies* 13, no. 2 (1974): 309–23.
- Lal, Nand. *From Collective Security to Peace-Keeping: A Study of India's Contribution to the United Nations Emergency Force, 1956-67*. Calcutta: Minerva Associates, 1975.
- Laron, Guy. "'Logic Dictates That They May Attack When They Feel They Can Win': the 1955 Czech-Egyptian Arms Deal, the Egyptian Army, and Israeli Intelligence." *The Middle East Journal* 63, no. 1 (2009): 69–84.
- . "Playing with Fire: The Soviet-Syrian-Israeli Triangle, 1965-1967." *Cold War History* 10, no. 2 (2010): 163–84.

- . “The Domestic Sources of Israel’s Decision to Launch the 1956 Sinai Campaign.” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 42, no. 2 (2015): 200–218.
- Lau, Albert. “Introduction: South East Asia and the Cold War.” In *Southeast Asia and the Cold War*, 1–13. Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Lawrence, Mark Atwood. “Explaining the Rise to Global Power: U.S. Policy toward Asia and Africa since 1941.” In *America in the World: The Historiography of American Foreign Relations since 1941*, edited by Frank Costigliola and Michael J. Hogan, 236–59. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Lawson, George. “The Eternal Divide? History and International Relations.” *European Journal of International Relations* 18, no. 2 (2012): 203–26.
- Lee, Na Young. “The Construction of Military Prostitution in South Korea during the U.S. Military Rule, 1945-1948.” *Feminist Studies* 33, no. 3 (2007): 453–81.
- Lee, Steven. “The United States, the United Nations, and the Second Occupation of Korea, 1950-1951.” *Japan Focus* 8, no. 50 (2010).
- Lefebvre, Jeffrey A. “The United States and Egypt: Confrontation and Accommodation in Northeast Africa, 1956–60.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 29, no. 2 (1993): 321–38.
- Lesch, David W. “When the Relationship Went Sour: Syria and the Eisenhower Administration.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 28, no. 1 (1998): 92–107.
- Levey, Zach. “French-Israeli Relations, 1950-1956: The Strategic Dimension.” In *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath*, 87–106. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Levin, Noam, Ruth Kark, and Emir Galilee. “Maps and the Settlement of Southern Palestine, 1799–1948: An historical/GIS Analysis.” *Journal of Historical Geography* 36 (2010): 1–18.
- Levine, Philippa. *Gender and Empire*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . *Prostitution, Race & Politics – Policing Venereal Disease in the British Empire*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Lieven, Dominic. “The Russian Empire and the Soviet Union as Imperial Polities.” *Journal of Contemporary History* 30, no. 4 (October 1, 1995): 607–36.
- Lindner, Ulrike. “New Forms of Knowledge Exchange between Imperial Powers: The Development of Institut Colonial International (ICI) Since the End of the Nineteenth Century.” In *Imperial Cooperation and Transfer, 1870-1930*, 57–78. New York; London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015.
- Lippman, Thomas W. “The View from 1947: The CIA and the Partition of Palestine.” *The Middle East Journal* 61, no. 1 (2007): 17-.
- Little, Douglas. “Cold War and Covert Action: The United States and Syria, 1945-1958.” *The Middle East Journal* 44, no. 1 (1990): 51–75.
- Lobell, Steven E. “Second Face of Security Strategies: Anglo-German and Anglo-Japanese Trade Concessions During the 1930s.” *Security Studies* 17, no. 3 (2008): 438–67.

- Lohr, Eric. *Russian Citizenship : From Empire to Soviet Union*. Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Louis, William Roger, and Roger Owen. *Suez 1956: The Crisis and Its Consequences*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Love, Eric Tyrone Lowery. *Race over Empire Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Lovering, Timothy John. "British Colonial Administrations' Registry Systems: A Comparative Study of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland." *Archival Science* 10, no. 1 (2010): 1–23.
- Lowe, Peter. "The Round Table, the Dominions, and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1911–1922." *Round Table* 86, no. 341 (1997): 81–93.
- . "Waging Limited Conflict: The Impact of the Korean War on Anglo-American Relations, 1950-1953." In *War and Cold War in American Foreign Policy, 1942-62*, edited by Dale Carter and Robin Clifton, 133–55. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
- Luard, Evan. *A History of the United Nations. The Years of Western Domination, 1945-1955*. London: Macmillan, 1982.
- . *The Age of Decolonization, 1955-1965*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989.
- Lucas, Scott. *The Lion's Last Roar: Britain and the Suez Crisis*. Manchester, UK; New York: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- Lucas, Scott, and Morey. "The Hidden 'alliance': The CIA and MI6 before and after Suez." *Intelligence and National Security* 15, no. 2 (2000): 95–120.
- Lucas, W. Scott. *Divided We Stand: Britain, the US, and the Suez Crisis*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1991.
- Lunt, James D. *Imperial Sunset: Frontier Soldiering in the 20th Century*. London: Macdonald Futura, 1981.
- Lutz, Catherine. *The Bases of Empire the Global Struggle against U.S. Military Posts*. London: Pluto Press, 2009.
- Lyons, Gene M. "American Policy and The United Nation's Program For Korean Reconstruction." *International Organization* 12, no. 2 (1958): 180–92.
- Macekura, Stephen. "The Point Four Program and U.S. International Development Policy." *Political Science Quarterly* 128, no. 1 (2013): 127–60.
- MacQueen, Norrie. *Peacekeeping and The International System*. Milton Park, New York: Routledge, 2006.
- . *The United Nations since 1945: Peacekeeping and the Cold War*. Essex, U.K.; New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999.
- Maloney, Sean M. *Canada and UN Peacekeeping: Cold War by Other Means, 1945-1970*. St. Catharines: Vanwell Pub., 2002.
- Manela, R. Gerwarth, and Manela. "The Great War as a Global War: Imperial Conflict and the Reconfiguration of World Order, 1911-1923." *Diplomatic History* 38, no. 4 (2014): 786–800.
- Marcovich, Anne, and Terry Shinn. "Where Is Disciplinaryity Going? Meeting on the Borderland." *Social Science Information* 50, no. 3–4 (2011): 582–606.

- Mariager, Rasmus. "‘British Leadership Is Experienced, Cool-Headed and Predictable’: Anglo-Danish Relations and the United States from the End of the Second World War to the Cold War." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 37, no. 2 (2012): 246–60.
- . *I tillid og varm sympati: Dansk-britiske forbindelser og USA under den tidlige kolde krig*. Copenhagen: Musculanums forlag : Købehavns universitet, 2006.
- Marsh, Steve. "Continuity and Change: Reinterpreting the Policies of the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations toward Iran, 1950-1954." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 7, no. 3 (2005): 79–123.
- . "The United States, Iran and Operation ‘Ajax’: Inverting Interpretative Orthodoxy." *Middle Eastern Studies* 39, no. 3 (2003): 1–38.
- Marten, Kimberly Zisk. *Enforcing the Peace: Learning from The Imperial Past*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Masalha, Nur. "The 1956–57 Occupation of the Gaza Strip: Israeli Proposals to Resettle the Palestinian Refugees." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 23, no. 1 (1996): 55–68.
- . *The Palestine Nakba: Decolonising History, Narrating the Subaltern, Reclaiming Memory*. London; New York: Zed Books, 2012.
- Massey, Doreen. *For Space*. London; Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2005.
- . *Space, Place and Gender*. London: Polity Press, 1994.
- Matray, James I. "Korea’s War at 60: A Survey of the Literature." *Cold War History* 11, no. 1 (2011): 99–129.
- Maurer, Noel, and Carlos Yu. "What T. R. Took: The Economic Impact of the Panama Canal, 1903–1937." *The Journal of Economic History* 68, no. 3 (2008): 686–721.
- Mawby, Spencer. "Britain’s Last Imperial Frontier: The Aden Protectorates, 1952–59." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 29, no. 2 (2001): 75–100.
- Mays, Terry M. *Africa’s First Peacekeeping Operation: The OAU in Chad, 1981-1982*. Westport: Praeger, 2002.
- Mazower, Mark. "An International Civilization? Empire, Internationalism and the Crisis of the Mid-Twentieth Century." *International Affairs* 82, no. 3 (2006): 553–66.
- . *Governing the World: The Rise and Fall of an Idea*. London: Allen Lane, 2012.
- . *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- McAlister, Melani. *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, and U.S. Interests in the Middle East since 1945*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- McGregor, P. M. J. "The History of No 2 Squadron, SAAF, in the Korean War." *Military History Journal* 4, no. 3 (1978): 1–11.
- McPherson, Alan. "World War I and US Empire in the Americas." In *Empires in World War I: Shifting Frontiers and Imperial Dynamics in a Global*

- Conflict, edited by Andrew Tait Jarboe and Richard Stan Fogarty, 328–50. London, New York: I. B. Tauris, 2014.
- Mearsheimer, John J, and Stephen M Walt. *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.
- Mehos, Donna, and Suzanne Moon. “The Uses of Portability: Circulating Experts in the Technopolitics of the Cold War and Decolonization.” In *Entangled Geographies*, edited by Gabrielle Hecht, 43–74. Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2011.
- Mehta, Coleman. “The CIA Confronts the Tito-Stalin Split, 1948–1951.” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 13, no. 1 (2011): 101–45.
- Merridale, Catherine. *Ivan’s War: The Red Army 1939-1945*. London: Faber and Faber, 2005.
- Miles, Steven B. “Imperial Discourse, Regional Elite, and Local Landscape on the South China Frontier, 1577-1722.” *Journal of Early Modern History* 12, no. 2 (2008): 99–136.
- Miller, Clark A. “‘An Effective Instrument of Peace’: Scientific Cooperation as an Instrument of U.S. Foreign Policy, 1938-1950.” In *Global Power Knowledge: Science and Technology in International Affairs*, edited by John Krige and Kai-Henrik Barth, 133–60. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2006.
- Mills, Nigel, ed. *Presenting the Romans: Interpreting the Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site*. Heritage Matters. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013.
- Mills, William C. “The Chamberlain-Grandi Conversations of July–August 1937 and the Appeasement of Italy.” *The International History Review* 19, no. 3 (1997): 594–619.
- Milošević, Nemanja. “Yugoslavia, USA and NATO in the 1950s.” In *How Far Is NATO from the Western Balkans?*, edited by Miroslav Hadžić, Sonja Stojanović, and Filip Ejdus, 64–80. Belgrade: Belgrade Centre for Security Policy, 2007.
- Miskel, James F. “US Post-War Naval Strategies in the Mediterranean Region.” In *Naval Policy and Strategy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, edited by John B. Hattendorf, 147–63. Abingdon; New York: Frank Cass, 2005.
- Mohan, J. “Parliamentary Opinions on the Suez Crisis in Australia and New Zealand.” *International Studies* 2, no. 1 (1960): 60–79.
- Mohan, Jitendra. “India, Pakistan, Suez and The Commonwealth.” *International Journal* 15, no. 3 (July 1, 1960): 185–99.
- . “South Africa and the Suez Crisis.” *International Journal* 16, no. 4 (1961): 327–57.
- Mommsen, Wolfgang J. “Preface.” In *Imperialism and After: Continuities and Discontinuities, IX–XII*. London; Boston; Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1986.

- Mommsen, Wolfgang J., and Jürgen Osterhammel. *Imperialism and After: Continuities and Discontinuities*. London, Boston: German Historical Institute & Allen & Unwin, 1986.
- Monakov, Mikhail. "The Soviet Naval Presence in the Mediterranean at the Time of the Six Day War." In *The Soviet Union and the June 1967 Six Day War*, 144–71. Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press; Stanford University Press, 2008.
- Moon, Seungsook. "Regulating Desire, Managing the Empire: U.S. Military Prostitution in South Korea, 1945-1970." In *Over There: Living with the U.S. Military Empire from World War Two to the Present*, edited by Maria Höhn and Seungsook Moon, 39–77. Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Mordechai Bar-On. *The Gates of Gaza: Israel's Road to Suez and Back*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
- Morewood, Steve. "Prelude to the Suez Crisis: The Rise and Fall of British Dominance over the Suez Canal, 1869-1956." In *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath*, 13–34. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Morgan, William Michael. *Pacific Gibraltar U.S.-Japanese Rivalry over the Annexation of Hawai'i, 1885-1898*. Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press, 2011.
- Morrissey, John. "The Imperial Present: Geography, Imperialism and Its Continued Effects." In *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Cultural Geography*, edited by Noala C. Johnson, Richard H. Schein, and Jamie Winders, 494–507. Somerset: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Mudiam, Prithvi Ram. *India and the Middle East*. London: British Academic Press, 1994.
- Nachmani, Amikam. "Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece: 1946-49." *Journal of Contemporary History* 25, no. 4 (1990): 489–522.
- Nagata, Naomi. "International Control of Epidemic Diseases from a Historical and Cultural Perspective," 73–90. Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer, 2014.
- Naidu, Mumulla Venkat Rao. "United Nations Force: Legal Theory and Political Practice," 1967.
- Nand Lal. *From Collective Security to Peace-Keeping: A Study of India's Contribution to the United Nations Emergency Force, 1956-67*. Calcutta: Minerva Associates, 1975.
- Nasser, Maher. "Palestine Refugee Records Project." Ottawa, 2003.
- Nathanson, Roby, and Ron Mandelbaum. "Aid and Trade: Economic Relations between the United States and Israel, 1948-2010." In *Israel and the United States Six Decades of US-Israeli Relations*, edited by Robert O. Freedman, 124–42. Boulder: Westview Press, 2012.
- National Defense Research Institute (U.S.), ed. *Overseas Basing of U.S. Military Forces : An Assessment of Relative Costs and Strategic Benefits*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2013.

- “NATO Mini. Comm. Paris 11th-14th December 1956,” n.d.
<http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c561214a.htm>.
- Neff, Donald. *Warriors at Suez: Eisenhower Takes America into the Middle East*. New York: Linden Press/Simon and Schuster, 1981.
- Neilson, Keith. “The Anglo-Japanese Alliance and British Strategic Foreign Policy, 1902-1914.” In *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1902-1922*, 48–63. Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Nicholas, Herbert. “UN Peace Forces and the Changing Globe: The Lessons of Suez and Congo.” *International Organization* 17, no. 2 (1963): 320–37.
- Nichols, David A. *Eisenhower 1956: The President’s Year of Crisis : Suez and the Brink of War*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2011.
- Nicosia, Francis. “Arab Nationalism and National Socialist Germany, 1933–1939: Ideological and Strategic Incompatibility.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 12, no. 3 (1980): 351–72.
- Nilsson, Mikael. “Aligning the Non-Aligned: A Re-Interpretation of Why and How Sweden Was Granted Access to US Military Materiel in the Early Cold War, 1948–1952.” *Scandinavian Journal of History* 35, no. 3 (2010): 290–309.
- . “American Propaganda, Swedish Labor, and the Swedish Press in the Cold War: The United States Information Agency (USIA) and Co-Production of U.S. Hegemony in Sweden during the 1950s and 1960s.” *The International History Review* 34, no. 2 (June 1, 2012): 315–45.
- Nordholt, Henk Schulte. “Indonesia in the 1950s: Nation, Modernity, and the Post-Colonial State.” *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde* 167, no. 4 (2011): 386-.
- Noreng, Øystein. *Crude Power Politics and the Oil Market*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2006.
- Norris, Jacob. “Repression and Rebellion: Britain’s Response to the Arab Revolt in Palestine of 1936–39.” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 36, no. 1 (2008): 25–45.
- Nöthling, F.J. “A Dilemma of Conflicting Interests: South Africa, Suez and Egypt, 1947–1956.” *Kleio* 35, no. 1 (2003): 41–61.
- Nugent, David. “Knowledge and Empire: The Social Sciences and United States Imperial Expansion.” *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 17, no. 1 (2010): 2–44.
- Nur Masalha. *Land without a People: Israel, Transfer and the Palestinians, 1949-1956*. London: Faber and Faber, 1997.
- O’Brien, Patricia. “Remaking Australia’s Colonial Culture?: White Australia and Its Papuan Frontier 1901–1940.” *Australian Historical Studies* 40, no. 1 (2009): 96–112.
- O’Brien, Phillips Payson. “Britain and the End of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance.” In *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1902-1922*, 264–84. Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2009.

- . “The Titan Refreshed: Imperial Overstretch and the British Navy before the First World War.” *Past & Present*, no. 172 (2001): 146–69.
- Oldenziel, Ruth. “Islands: The United States as a Networked Empire,” 13–42. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011.
- O’Reilly, Marc J. “Following Ike? Explaining Canadian-US Co-operation during the 1956 Suez Crisis.” *The Journal of Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 35, no. 3 (1997): 75–107.
- Oren, Amiram, Oren Barak, and Assaf Shapira. “‘How the Mouse Got His Roar’: the Shift to an ‘Offensive-Defensive’ Military Strategy in Israel in 1953 and Its Implications.” *The International History Review* 35, no. 2 (2013): 356–76.
- Oren, Michael B. “Ambivalent Adversaries: David Ben-Gurion and Israel vs. the United Nations and Dag Hammarskjöld, 1956-57.” *Journal of Contemporary History* 27, no. 1 (1992): 89–127.
- Ouellet, Eric. “Multinational Counterinsurgency: The Western Intervention in the Boxer Rebellion 1900–1901.” *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 20, no. 3–4 (2009): 507–27.
- Özbek, Nadir. “‘Beggars’ and ‘Vagrants’ in Ottoman State Policy and Public Discourse, 1876–1914.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 45, no. 5 (2009): 783–801.
- . “Policing the Countryside: Gendarmes of the Late 19th Century Ottoman Empire (1876-1908).” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 40, no. 1 (2008): 47–67.
- Padelford, Norman J. “Financing Peacekeeping: Politics and Crisis.” *International Organization* 19, no. 3 (1965): 444–62.
- Painter, David. “The Marshall Plan and Oil.” *Cold War History* 9, no. 2 (2009): 159–75.
- Painter, David S. “The Marshall Plan and Oil.” *Cold War History* 9, no. 2 (2009): 159–75.
- Pappé, Ilan. *The Idea of Israel: A History of Power and Knowledge*. London; New York: Verso, 2014.
- Parmar, Inderjeet. “American Hegemony, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Rise of Academic International Relations in the United States.” In *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*, edited by Nicholas Guilhot, 182–209. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- Pedersen, Susan. “Back to the League of Nations.” *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 4 (2007): 1091–1117.
- . “Metaphors of the Schoolroom: Women Working the Mandates System of the League of Nations.” *History Workshop Journal* 66, no. 1 (2008): 188–207.
- . “The Meaning of the Mandates System: An Argument.” *Geschichte Und Gesellschaft* 32, no. 4 (2006): 560–82.
- Pelt, Mogens. *Tying Greece to the West: US-West German-Greek Relations 1949-1974*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2006.

- Perdue, Peter C. "Empire and Nation in Comparative Perspective: Frontier Administration in Eighteenth-Century China." *Journal of Early Modern History* 5, no. 4 (2001): 282–304.
- Petersen, Nikolaj. "SAC at Thule: Greenland in the U.S. Polar Strategy." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 13, no. 2 (2011): 90–115.
- Petersen, Tore Tingvoll. "Anglo-American Rivalry in the Middle East: The Struggle for the Buraimi Oasis, 1952-1957." *The International History Review* 14, no. 1 (1992): 71–91.
- Pettyjohn, Stacie L. *U.S. Global Defense Posture, 1783-2011, 2012.*
- Pierre Bourdieu. "Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field." In *State/Culture – State-Formation after the Cultural Turn*, edited by George Steinmetz, 53–75. London: Cornell University Press, 1999.
- Pietsch, Tamson. *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850-1939.* Manchester, New York, Vancouver: Manchester University Press, Palgrave Macmillan and UBC Press, 2013.
- Plesch, Daniel. *America, Hitler and the UN: How the Allies Won World War II and a Forged Peace.* London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011.
- Podeh, Elie. "The Drift towards Neutrality: Egyptian Foreign Policy during the Early Nasserist Era, 1952–55." *Middle Eastern Studies* 32, no. 1 (January 1996): 159–78.
- Poiger, Uta G. "Imperialism and Empire in Twentieth-Century Germany." *History and Memory* 17, no. 1 (2005): 117–43.
- Popp, Roland. "Accommodating to a Working Relationship: Arab Nationalism and US Cold War Policies in the Middle East, 1958-60." *Cold War History* 10, no. 3 (2010): 397–427.
- Porat, Dan A. "Between Nation and Land in Zionist Teaching of Jewish History, 1920-1954." *Journal of Israeli Politics, Society and Culture* 27, no. 2 (2008): 253–68.
- Pouligny, Béatrice. *Peace Operations Seen from below: UN Missions and Local People.* Bloomfield: Kumarian Press, 2006.
- Power, Jane. "'Real Unions': Arab Organised Labor in British Palestine." *Arab Studies Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1998): 13–28.
- Preston, Diana. *The Boxer Rebellion: The Dramatic Story of China's War on Foreigners That Shook the World in the Summer of 1900.* New York: Walker, 2000.
- Price, John. *Orienting Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific.* Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011.
- . "The 'Cat's Paw': Canada and the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea." *The Canadian Historical Review* 85, no. 2 (June 1, 2004): 297–321.
- Raben, Remco. "A New Dutch Imperial History?: Perambulations in a Prospective Field." *BMGN - Low Countries Historical Review* 128, no. 1 (2013): 5–30.

- Rajak, Svetozar. *Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union in the Early Cold War: Reconciliation, Comradship, Confrontation, 1953-57*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Razack, Sherene. *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping, and the New Imperialism*. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Razack, Sherene. *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affairs, Peacekeeping and New Imperialism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- “Rehabilitation and Development of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries in South Korea.” Food and Agriculture Organization, 1954.
- Renton, James. “Changing Languages of Empire and the Orient: Britain and the Invention of the Middle East, 1917–1918.” *Historical Journal* 50, no. 3 (2007): 645–67.
- Rhodes, Benjamin D. “Reassessing ‘Uncle Shylock’: The United States and the French War Debt, 1917-1929.” *The Journal of American History* 55, no. 4 (1969): 787–803.
- Riga, Liliana. *The Bolsheviks and the Russian Empire*, 2012.
- Rikhye, Indar Jit. *The Future of Peacekeeping*. New York: International Peace Academy, 1989.
- . *The Theory & Practice of Peacekeeping*. New York: Published for the International Peace Academy by St. Martin’s Press, 1984.
- Rikhye, Indar Jit, Michael Harbottle, and Bjørn Egge. *The Thin Blue Line: International Peacekeeping and Its Future*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Roberts, Adam. “Evan Luard as a Writer on International Affairs.” *Review of International Studies* 18, no. 1 (1992): 63–73.
- Roberts, Mary Louise. “The Price of Discretion: Prostitution, Venereal Disease, and the American Military in France, 1944–1946.” *The American Historical Review* 115, no. 4 (2010): 1002–30.
- . *What Soldiers Do: Sex and the American GI in World War II France*, 2014.
- Rock, David. “War and Postwar Intersections: Latin America and the United States.” In *Latin America in the 1940s: War and Postwar Transitions*, 15–40. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Rodao, F. “Japan and the Axis, 1937-8: Recognition of the Franco Regime and Manchukuo.” *Journal of Contemporary History* 44, no. 3 (2009): 431–47.
- Rogan, Eugene L. *The Fall of the Ottomans: The Great War in the Middle East*, 2015.
- Rohde, Joy. *Armed with Expertise: The Militarization of American Social Research During the Cold War*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013.
- . “Gray Matters: Social Scientists, Military Patronage, and Democracy in the Cold War.(Essay).” *The Journal of American History* 96, no. 1 (2009): 99–122.

- Rose, S. O. "Race, Empire and British Wartime National Identity, 1939-45." *Historical Research* 74, no. 184 (2001): 220-.
- Rosenfeld. "From Emergency Relief Assistance to Human Development and Back: UNRWA and the Palestinian Refugees, 1950-2009." *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 28, no. 2-3 (2009): 286-317.
- Roslyng-Jensen, Palle. "Til Kamp Mod Arabisk Nationalisme." In *Nye Fronter I Den Kolde Krig*. Gyldendal, 2010.
- Rosner, Gabriella. *The United Nations Emergency Force*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.
- Rotbard, Sharon. "Wall and Tower (Homa Umigdal): The Mold of Israeli Architecture." In *A Civilian Occupation: The Politics of Israeli Architecture*, edited by Rafi Segal and Eyal Weisman, 38-57. Tel Aviv-Jaffa; New York: Baberl; Verso, 2003.
- Rubinstein, Robert. "Peacekeeping and the Return of Imperial Policing." *International Peacekeeping* 17, no. 4 (2010): 457-70.
- Rubinstein, Robert A. *Peacekeeping under Fire: Culture and Intervention*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2008.
- Ruzicic-Kessler, Karlo. "Italy and Yugoslavia: From Distrust to Friendship in Cold War Europe." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 19, no. 5 (2014): 641-64.
- Ryan, W. Michael. "The Influence of the Imperial Frontier on British Doctrines of Mechanized Warfare." *Albion* 15, no. 2 (1983): 123-42.
- Sackley, Nicole. "The Village as Cold War Site: Experts, Development, and the History of Rural Reconstruction." *Journal of Global History* 6, no. 3 (2011): 481-504.
- Salim Yaqub. "No War, No Peace: Egypt and the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1952-1973." *Zeitgeschichte* 31, no. 2 (2004): 64-87.
- Saltford, John. *The United Nations and the Indonesian Takeover of West Papua, 1962-1969: The Anatomy of Betrayal*. London; New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- Samura, Michelle, and Brooke Neely. "Social Geographies of Race: Connecting Race and Space." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34, no. 11 (2011): 1933-52.
- Sandars, Christopher T. *America's Overseas Garrisons*, 2000.
- . *America's Overseas Garrisons: The Leasehold Empire*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Sayigh, Yazid. *Armed Struggle and the Search for State: The Palestinian National Movement, 1949-1993*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Sayward, Amy L. *The Birth of Development: How the World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization, and World Health Organization Changed the World, 1945-1965*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2006.
- Schick, Irvin Cemil. "Print Capitalism and Women's Sexual Agency in the Late Ottoman Empire." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 31, no. 1 (2011): 196-216.

- Schlesinger, Stephen. "Cryptoanalysis for Peacetime: Codebreaking and the Birth and the Structure of the United Nations." *Cryptologia* 19, no. 3 (1995): 217–35.
- Schmidl, Erwin A. "The Evolution of Peace Operations from the Nineteenth Century." *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 10, no. 2 (1999): 4–20.
- . "The International Operation in Albania, 1913–14." *International Peacekeeping* 6, no. 3 (1999): 1–10.
- Schraeder, Peter J. "Cold War to Cold Peace: Explaining U.S.-French Competition in Francophone Africa." *Political Science Quarterly* 115, no. 3 (2000): 395–419.
- Sessions, Gene A. "The Multilateralization of the Monroe Doctrine: The Rio Treaty, 1947." *World Affairs* 136, no. 3 (1973): 259–74.
- Sever, Ayşegül. "A Reluctant Partner of the US over the Suez? Turkey and the Suez Crisis." In *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath*, 123–32. Aldershot; Burlington: Ashgate, 2008.
- Seydi, Süleyman. "Making a Cold War in the Near East: Turkey and the Origins of the Cold War, 1945–1947." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 17, no. 1 (2006): 113–41.
- Shabaneh, Ghassan. "Education and Identity: The Role of UNRWA's Education Programmes in the Reconstruction of Palestinian Nationalism." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 25, no. 4 (2012): 491–513.
- Shachar, Nathan. *The Gaza Strip: Its History and Politics*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2010.
- Shannon, Kelly R. "Truman and the Middle East." In *Companion to Harry Truman*, edited by Daniel S. Margolies, 362–88. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2002.
- Sharp, Walter R. "The United Nations System in Egypt: A Country Survey of Field Operations." *International Organization* 10, no. 2 (1956): 235–60.
- Shaw, Tony. *Eden, Suez, and the Mass Media: Propaganda and Persuasion during the Suez Crisis*. London; New York; New York: Tauris Academic Studies, I.B. Tauris ; In the U.S.A. and Canada distributed by St. Martin's, 1996.
- Sim, David. *A Union Forever the Irish Question and U.S. Foreign Relations in the Victorian Age*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013.
- Sinanoglou, Penny. "British Plans for the Partition of Palestine, 1929–1938." *Historical Journal* 52, no. 1 (2009): 131–52.
- Sinclair, Georgina. *At the End of the Line: Colonial Policing and the Imperial Endgame, 1945-80*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- . "'Get into a Crack Force and Earn £20 a Month and All Found...': The Influence of the Palestine Police upon Colonial Policing 1922–1948." *European Review of History* 13, no. 1 (2009): 49–65.
- Sirrs, Owen L. *A History of the Egyptian Intelligence Service: A History of the Mukhabarat, 1909-2009*. Milton Park, New York: Routledge, 2010.

- Sköld, Nils. *I fredens tjänst: Sveriges medverkan i Förenta nationernas fredsbevarande styrka i Mellanöstern 1956-67*. [Stockholm]: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990.
- Sluglett, Peter. "An Improvement on Colonialism? The 'A' Mandates and Their Legacy in the Middle East." *International Affairs* 90, no. 2 (2014): 413–27.
- Smallman, Shawn C. "Military Terror and Silence in Brazil, 1910–1945." *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 24, no. 1 (1999): 5–27.
- . "The Professionalization of Military Terror in Brazil, 1945-1964." *Luso-Brazilian Review* 37, no. 1 (2000): 117–28.
- Smith, Neil. *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Smith, Simon C. *Reassessing Suez 1956 New Perspectives on the Crisis and Its Aftermath*. Aldershot; Burlington: Ashgate, 2008.
- Soytürk, Mehmet. "Modern State and Security: The Gendarmerie System in France, Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire." *History Studies* 4, no. 2 (2012).
- Sprye, Graham. "Canada, the United Nations Emergency Force, and the Commonwealth." *International Affairs* 33, no. 3 (1957): 289–300.
- Stears, Jill, Lloyd Pettiford, and Thomas Diez. *Introduction to International Relations: Perspectives and Themes*. Harlow, England; New York: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2005.
- Steinmetz, George, ed. *Sociology & Empire: The Imperial Entanglements of a Discipline*. Durham, London: Duke University Press, 2013.
- Stewart, Andrew. *Empire Lost Britain, the Dominions and the Second World War*. London: Continuum, 2008.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Along the Archival Grain – Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- . *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. 2nd Revised edition edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.
- . "Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance." *Archival Science* 2, no. 1 (2002): 87–109.
- . *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.
- Stoler, Ann Laura, and Cooper Cooper Frederick. "Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda," 1–43. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1995.
- Stoler, Mark A. *Allies and Adversaries: The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Grand Alliance, and U.S. Strategy in World War II*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Strang, G. Bruce. "'The Worst of All Worlds': Oil Sanctions and Italy's Invasion of Abyssinia, 1935–1936." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 19, no. 2 (2008): 210–35.

- Stromberg Childers, Kristen. "The Second World War as a Watershed in the French Caribbean." *Atlantic Studies* 9, no. 4 (2012): 409–30.
- Sufian, Sandra M. *Healing the Land and the Nation: Malaria and the Zionist Project in Palestine, 1920-1947*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Swedenburg, Ted. *Memories of Revolt: The 1936-1939 Rebellion and the Palestinian National Past*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas press, 2003.
- Syriatou, Athena. "National, Imperial, Colonial and the Political: British Imperial Histories and Their Descendants." *Historein* 12 (2013): 38–67.
- . "National, Imperial, Colonial and the Political: British Imperial Histories and Their Descendants." *HISTOREIN* 12 (2013): 38.
- Takeyh, Ray. *The Origins of the Eisenhower Doctrine the US, Britain, and Nasser's Egypt, 1953-57*. New York: St. Martin's Press, in association with St. Antony's College, Oxford, 2000.
- Tal, David. "Symbol Not Substance? Israel's Campaign to Acquire Hawk Missiles, 1960–1962." *The International History Review* 22, no. 2 (2000): 304–17.
- Tamari, Salim, and Elia Zureik. "The UNRWA Archives on Palestinian Refugees - A Feasibility Study for Policy and Applied Research - Phase 1." Jerusalem: The Institute of Palestine Studies, 1996.
- Tandon, Yashpal. "UNEF, the Secretary-General, and International Diplomacy in the Third Arab-Israeli War." *International Organization* 22, no. 2 (1968): 529–56.
- Tavares, Antonio C. "The Japanese Colonial State and the Dissolution of the Late Imperial Frontier Economy in Taiwan, 1886-1909." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 64, no. 2 (2005): 361–85.
- Teitler, Gerke. "The Mixed Company: Fighting Power and Ethnic Relations in the Dutch Colonial Army 1890-1920." In *Colonial Armies in South East Asia*, edited by Tobias Rettig and Karl Hack, 154–68. Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2009.
- The Rockefeller Foundation. "The Rockefeller Foundation Annual Report 1956." New York: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1956.
- Thomas, Martin. *Empires of Intelligence: Security Services and Colonial Disorder after 1914*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- . "France's North African Crisis, 1945-1955: Cold War and Colonial Imperatives." *History* 92, no. 306 (2007): 207–34.
- Thoral, M. -C. "Colonial Medical Encounters in the Nineteenth Century: The French Campaigns in Egypt, Saint Domingue and Algeria." *Social History of Medicine* 25, no. 3 (2012): 608–24.
- Thornhill, Michael T. "Eden, Churchill and the Battle of the Canal Zone, 1951-1954." In *Reassessing Suez 1956: New Perspectives and Its Aftermath*, 35–51. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Thorpe, Rosemary. "The Latin American Economies in the 1940s." In *Latin America in the 1940s: War and Postwar Transitions*, 41–58. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

- Tickner, J. Ann. "Retelling IR's Foundational Stories: Some Feminist and Postcolonial Perspectives." *Global Change, Peace & Security* 23, no. 1 (2011): 5–13.
- Tignor, Robert L. "In the Grip of Politics: The Ford Motor Company of Egypt, 1945-1960." *The Middle East Journal* 44, no. 3 (1990): 383–98.
- Tilchin, William N. "The United States and the Boer War." In *International Impact of the Boer War*, 107–20. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Tilley, Helen, and Robert J Gordon. *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism and the Politics of Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Tomlinson, Jim. "The Commonwealth, the Balance of Payments and the Politics of International Poverty: British Aid Policy, 1958-1971." *Contemporary European History* 12, no. 4 (2003): 413–29.
- Tooze, J. Adam. *The Deluge: The Great War and the Remaking of Global Order 1916-1931*. London, New York: Allen Lane, 2014.
- Toprani, Anand. "Germany's Answer to Standard Oil: The Continental Oil Company and Nazi Grand Strategy, 1940–1942." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 37, no. 6–7 (2014): 949–73.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1995.
- Tshibambe, Germain Ngoie, Grace Maina, and Erik Melander. "Analysing the Peace Process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo : From War to the Uncertain Peace." In *Peace Agreements and Durable Peace in Africa*, 161–91. Capetown: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2016.
- Turner, Barry. *Suez, 1956: The First Oil War*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2006.
- Turner, Jackson Frederick, and John Mack Faragher. *Rereading Frederick Jackson Turner: "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" and Other Essays*. New Haven (Conn.); London: Yale univ. press, 1998.
- Turoma, Sanna, and Maxim Waldstein. *Empire De/centered: New Spatial Histories of Russia and the Soviet Union*. Farnham; Burlington: Ashgate, 2013.
- Tuttle, and Tuttle. "Forerunners of Frederick Jackson Turner: Nineteenth-Century British Conservatives and the Frontier Thesis." *Agricultural History* 41, no. 3 (1967): 219–27.
- Tyrrell, Ian. "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History." *The American Historical Review* 96, no. 4 (1991): 1031–55.
- Umetsu, Hiroyuki. "The Birth of ANZUS: America's Attempt to Create a Defense Linkage between Northeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific." *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 4, no. 1 (2004): 171–96.
- Uri Ben-Elizer. "A Nation-in-Arms: State, Nation, and Militarism in Israel's First Years." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37, no. 2 (1995): 264–85.
- Urquhart, Brian. *A Life in Peace and War*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.
- . *Ralph Bunche: An American Life*. New-York; London: W.W. Norton, 1993.

- Urquhart, Brian E. "United Nations Peace Forces and the Changing United Nations: An Institutional Perspective." *International Organization* 17, no. 2 (1963): 338–54.
- van Der Veur, Paul. "The United Nations in West Irian: A Critique." *International Organization* 18, no. 1 (1964): 53–73.
- Vardi, Gil-li. "'Pounding Their Feet': Israeli Military Culture as Reflected in Early IDF Combat History." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 31, no. 2 (2008): 295–324.
- Vego, Milan. "Soviet and Russian Strategy in the Mediterranean Since 1945." In *Naval Policy and Strategy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, edited by John B. Hattendorf, 164–92. Abingdon; New York: Frank Cass, 2005.
- Venkataramani, M. S. "Oil and Us Foreign Policy During the Suez Crisis 1956-7." *International Studies* 2, no. 2 (1960): 105–52.
- Villaume, Poul. *Allieret med forbehold: Danmark, NATO og den kolde krig : en studie i dansk sikkerhedspolitik 1949-1961*. København: Eirene, 1995.
- Waage, Hilde Henriksen. "How Norway Became One of Israel's Best Friends." *Journal of Peace Research* 37, no. 2 (2000): 189–211.
- . "Norway and a Major International Crisis: Suez - the Very Difficult Case." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 9, no. 3 (1998): 211–41.
- Waever, Ole. "The Sociology of a Not so International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations." *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 687–727.
- Watson, Brent Byron. *Far Eastern Tour the Canadian Infantry in Korea, 1950-1953*. Montreal; Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.
- Weis, Anthony John. *The Global Food Economy: The Battle for the Future of Farming*. London; New York; Halifax; Winnipeg: Zed Books ; Fernwood, 2007.
- Westad, Odd Arne. *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Wilmington, Martin W. "The Middle East Supply Center: A Reappraisal." *The Middle East Journal* 6 (1952): 144–66.
- . *The Middle East Supply Centre*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1971.
- Wilson, Kathleen. "Old Imperialisms and New Imperial Histories: Rethinking the History of the Present." *Radical History Review*, no. 95 (2006): 211–34.
- Wilson, Keith. "The Boer War in the Context of Britain's Imperial Problems." In *International Impact of the Boer War*, edited by Keith Wilson, 158–67. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Wiseman, Henry. *Peacekeeping, Appraisals and Proposals*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1983.
- Wolf, Eric R. *Europe and the People without History*. Edited by Thomas Hylland Eriksen. Berkeley, Calif.; London: University of California Press, 2010.

- Woodwards, Rachel. "From Military Geography to Militarism's Geographies: Disciplinary Engagements with the Geographies of Militarism and Military Activities." *Progress in Human Geography* 29, no. 6 (2005): 718–40.
- Yael Darr. "Nation Building and War Narratives for Children: War and Militarism in Hebrew 1940's and 1950's Children's Literature." *Paedagogica Historica* 48, no. 4 (2012): 601–13.
- Yaqub, Salim. *Containing Arab Nationalism: The Eisenhower Doctrine and the Middle East*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Yasigh, Sayid. *Armed Struggle and the Search for State: The Palestinian National Movement, 1949-1993*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Yeşilbursa, B. "The American Concept of the 'Northern Tier' Defence Project and the Signing of the Turco-Pakistani Agreement, 1953-54." *Middle Eastern Studies* 37, no. 3 (2001): 59–110.
- Zaman, Rashed Uz, and Biswas, Niloy Ranjan. "Bangladesh's Participation in UN Peacekeeping Missions and Challenges for Civil–Military Relations: A Case for Concordance Theory." *International Peacekeeping* 21, no. 3 (2014): 324–44.
- Zanotti, Laura. *Governing Disorder: UN Peace Operations, International Security, and Democratization in the Post-Cold War Era*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011.
- Zeidan, Abdel-Latif M. *The United Nations emergency force: 1956-1967*. Stockh.: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1976.
- Zureik, Elia. "Constructing Palestine through Surveillance Practices." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 28, no. 2 (2001): 205–27.

ISSN (online): 2246-1256
ISBN (online): 978-87-7112-713-3

AALBORG UNIVERSITY PRESS