

What can you learn
from source a about
anthony eden's
reasons for opposing
colone...



1. Study Source A What can you learn from Source A about Anthony Eden's reasons for opposing Colonel Nasser? Sir Anthony Eden most certainly thought badly of Colonel Nasser.

First of all the canal was "not vital to Egypt" in Eden's opinion. He thought Nasser was selfish and we know this because he says, "Nasser has seized it for his own ends". He also had to oppose Nasser if he truly thought that Britain's, "oil, machinery and much of our transport would grind to a halt". He wanted to expose all the reasons that might favour his idea to oppose Nasser and go to war.

He also tries to make out that Nasser is inconsiderate by saying, "Nasser has taken over an international company without consultation and without our consent". Then Eden says, "Our quarrel is not with Egypt, it is with Colonel Nasser". Here he is giving an impression to the people of himself. This I think shows the British people that it is just a war against the colonel and not the people of Egypt.

So it is different to the war that had recently ended which was the Second World War. When Eden says, "instead of meeting us with friendship colonel Nasser conducted a vicious propaganda campaign against this country", he is telling his people that he wanted a peaceful option to resolving the problem but Nasser made this impossible due to his campaign against them. Also by saying "vicious propaganda," it said that Nasser hated Britain but this cannot be backed up with anything. Finally he says, "This is how dictatorships behave, and we all remember the costs of giving into Hitler.

" Here he is saying that like in World War 2 appeasement was not the answer and so should not be used as a tactic in this case. At this time it could be presumed the British wanted peace, because of the recent events and their outcomes. Eden says what he had to, to make the people believe in his plan unless they wanted a repeat of World War 2. 2. Study Sources B and C How useful are these sources as evidence of Egyptian public opinion during the Suez Crisis? In Source B I think overall it gives a sense that Nasser had the favour of his country. I believe this is so, because first of all he is smiling and his arms are raised which tells us he is happy and he might be celebrating something.

Also he is above everybody so I am guessing he is on some people's shoulders. This maybe interpreted as an act of approval from the Egyptian people. Finally all the people around him are taking their hats off to him which is a sign of respect to Colonel Nasser. What I have said so far is the usefulness of this source but some things make this source unreliable. First of all the crowd is not very big and so this may only be the few supporters he has. Also the picture is not very clear and due to this we cannot see what is written on the banner to the right of the picture.

Finally, this picture may not have been from the date stated and this is because it could be used as propaganda to bring the morale down of the British people. The Egyptian people around him seem to be very supportive and encouraging. Source C is obviously a mockery of Eden. He is trying to threaten an Egyptian sailor who possibly may be Nasser. Eden says, " If you don't give it back, I'll shoot, " this statement does not distinguish who he will shoot but the picture shows that he will shoot himself.

<https://assignbuster.com/what-can-you-learn-from-source-a-about-anthony-edens-reasons-for-opposing-colonel-nasser/>

This is expressing the point that Eden has no control of the situation and that he cannot do anything about it. The Egyptian sailor looks very happy and the smile tells us he has no care in the world. I think the way he is sitting also shows how calm and relaxed he is even though Eden is about to shoot himself. Eden's body language shows quite a different feeling to the sailor. Not only does he have a gun to his head, his facial expression shows great anxiety and discomfort and finally he has one leg in the air. This is obviously a humorous source but I believe it demonstrates much truth.

To consider to opposite side this source does have its limitations. First of all the newspaper it was published in, is not named and as Source B could be a part of Nasser's vicious propaganda campaign. Another similarity the two sources show is that Nasser is most definitely liked by his people. Nasser has befooled the British government and has an upper hand on them. 3. Study Sources D, E and F Did public opinion in Britain support Eden's decision to take "military action against Egypt"? Explain your answer using the sources and your own knowledge.

Source D certainly gives the impression that the British people were on Eden's side. In this source Eden is not mentioned but still makes Nasser sound malevolent. They also think he is a dictator that resembles Hitler. By calling Nasser, "the boss leader of Egypt," they make him sound like an evil, overpowering king. The words "crude and dangerous," are very strong and are obviously used to make him sound like a bully. The last sentence in Source D shows how Hitler killed himself and left Berlin in a terrible state.

This then led to the British winning the war. I believe this is saying if we go to war we will be victorious as they were last time. One thing it does not mention here is the aftermath of the war. England ended the war whilst they were in a very bad way.

Of the 3 sources this is the only one which supports Eden's idea. Source E is a picture with quite a different perspective. People in England looked like they did not want war. The picture is of a demonstration against Eden's plan to attack Egypt military bases in Suez. The banners which say, " No war over Suez," " Eden must go," all give the impression that war is not wanted nor needed.

Also Eden did not have a secure place as Prime Minister and so he had a chance, if he carried on this way, to be voted out. He couldn't do what he wanted so you could say he was treading on thin ice. In this source there are many people and so it shows that many people disagreed with Eden's plan. If this is anything to go by, the majority of the British public wanted peace rather than war with Egypt. Source F gives the same impression but with a different approach.

It is more to do with the reasons for going to war. Obviously here they think there is no good reason to go to war. This source is fairly reliable because it gives a date and the name of the paper which it appeared in. " what right have we to assume that Nasser will close the Suez Canal," this is a statement which tells us that this whole " military action," is based on assumptions.

It also protects Nasser by saying, “ So far he has made no attempt to do so,” when referring to the canal. This contradicts Eden’s point on Nasser’s propaganda scheme. Finally this article is obviously against Eden when they insult him by saying he, “ is quite immoral.” The majority of people in this argument did not think that Eden’s idea was a good one.

Source D is probably the only one out of the 3 sources that actually supports Eden. So overall Eden’s decision was not accepted by the people of his country and highly unpopular. 4. Study Sources G and H Does source G support Selwyn Lloyd’s statement (Source H) about Britain’s motives for military action against Egypt? Explain your answer by referring to both sources. Overall the two sources do agree with each other in that they are against Nasser but in some cases Source G slightly disagrees with Selwyn Lloyd’s points.

First of all in Sir Anthony Eden’s letter he says “ I do not think that we disagree about our primary objective,” but in Source H Mr Lloyd seems to believe that there is a misunderstanding in objectives. He says “ there may have been mistaken judgements in carrying out our policies.” Also in both sources the point I made just before this is proven because Eden and Lloyd have started two different primary objectives. Source G says the main aim is “ to undo what Nasser has done and set up an international regime for the canal,” whereas in Source H it says that the initial aim is “ preventing a general outbreak of war in the Middle East.” Eden’s main objective which I have quoted above comes in Selwyn Lloyd’s book too, but as the third objective. “ The Suez canal had to be brought back under some kind of international control.

<https://assignbuster.com/what-can-you-learn-from-source-a-about-anthony-edens-reasons-for-opposing-colonel-nasser/>

“Coincidentally both men agreed that there was more than one objective.” but this is not all,” is quoted from Sir Eden’s letter and Source H gives three clear objectives. Many references of Hitler and his comparison to Nasser can be seen in both sources. For example Eden says that Nasser’s route is “unpleasantly familiar”, and also the word “menace”, instantly reminds us of Hitler.

In Source G Eden tries his best to make America and Britain sound united and as one country. He says he wants to, “set up an international regime for the canal,” and “a regime less hostile to the west.” The phrase “international regime”, and the words “the west”, are used to help his thought that Eisenhower will support him if they make him feel closer to England. These words also make the letter sound more considerate towards world opinion and not selfish on Eden’s behalf. On the other hand Lloyd says “national interest”, which gives us a sense that Eden is thinking of personal advantages.

Eden also makes an inference to Mussolini who was an Allie of Hitler and also in Eden’s opinion a milder form of Hitler. Source G says “I have never thought Nasser a Hitler, but the parallel with Mussolini is close”. So Eden is saying that Mussolini is not as bad as Hitler but still very dangerous. We must remember that Source G is a letter appealing for approval and help from America and its resources.

This means that Eden may not be writing the complete truth. He is saying what he thinks Eisenhower wants to hear. Selwyn Lloyd’s book portrays the idea that Eden is more self interested and is more worried about the chance

of another world war 2. This is because the previous war in the 1930's had devastating effects on all aspects of Britain. This included economical problems etc.

These two sources, at face value and fairly supportive of each other but if you look deep into the passages it is clearly visible that Selwyn Lloyd have many differences in opinion. 5. Study all the Sources" Britain was humiliated by international opinion and made to look foolish." Use these sources, and your own knowledge, to say whether you agree with this outcome of the Suez Crisis. I do believe that Britain was humiliated due to widespread opposition to Eden's ideas. The majority of the people involved all over the world disagreed with Britain's actions and ideas.

This is my opinion but the sources do not always agree and now I will elaborate on this. Source A does not tell us much about international opinion because only Eden is speaking and so we might get a biased opinion from him. Here Eden is talking on television to gain public support so there will not be much to say. In this source Eden seems a bit hostile towards Nasser which is understandable but he is also very angry and we can see he wants to go to war.

" He is not a man who can be trusted," and " we all remember the cost of giving into Hitler," prove this point. This will give the impression to people that he is a war hungry person but this is not what they want. The people do not want war and so this is the first disagreement between the British public and Eden's government. Next is source B which is a photograph and it actually tells us a great deal about public opinion of Colonel Nasser. The

people are happy and very supportive of Nasser and his regime. He was obviously popular with them and so we can see that these people were against the British government and Eden himself.

This source is fairly unreliable because of the quality of the picture but it still remains obvious that the people are supporting Nasser completely. The smile on Colonel Nasser's face also tells us that he was pleased with his position with the public and so feels secure in his battle with Britain and France. Source C could also be biased because it is a cartoon drawn by an Egyptian. Never the less, it does have a certain amount of truth. It is telling us how the international opinion of Eden is that he was powerless over Nasser. It was also thought that he had no authority.

The picture shows Eden saying he will shoot himself unless Egypt gives back the Suez Canal. This also shows that Britain was humiliated because they were being laughed at during this period and especially Sir Anthony Eden. Source D is from a British newspaper so we can see a British opinion and not an international point of view. This could be a biased angle to look at it from but I would say it was a more patriotic perspective.

We see a comparison to Hitler who was obviously hated and so we see that Nasser was also disliked by the British public. The phrases "Boss leader," and "Big Shot," emphasise the point that many British people thought he was a bully and very overpowering. As in the last source we see a British point of view in source E. This is because it is a photograph from a demonstration in London.

This source is purely against Eden's possible attack on Egypt. The British public even want to bring down Eden from the role of prime minister. We know this because it says on a banner "Eden must go!" this surely humiliated Eden and his party. Source F is a very good source for this question because it consists of two letters from the public about this situation.

These will give us a genuine opinion of British people. Both these letters question Eden's actions in a negative way. The first letter tells us that Eden is jumping to conclusions. It says "what right do we have to assume that Nasser will close the Suez Canal." The second letter says that the threats of war "against Egypt is quite immoral.

"These both condemn Eden's use of force. The British community obviously were very disapproving of Eden and his thoughts on the situation. The penultimate source which is source G is similar to source A in that it does not give much insight on public opinion because it's a letter to the American president from Sir Anthony Eden. This is a letter seeking support and also clarification of their objectives. It says "I do not think that we disagree about our primary objective.

"The words "I do not think," tell us that they are unclear and so no action has been approved by Eisenhower and this is important because Britain desperately need America's support because they are a very influential super power. Eden compares Nasser with Hitler and Mussolini. He says "Nasser has embarked on a course which is unpleasantly familiar," and "The removal of Nasser - must also rank amongst our objectives." These

comments hint war and this as we saw in source E was not wanted so the public opinion was most certainly against Eden.

The final source, source H is the best source here to find out about international opinion. First of all Selwyn Lloyd says in the second sentence "certain objectives which we believed were in national interest," shows that the government were making decisions without real evidence on what the nation were thinking. This probably caused the public to think that Eden is not consulting them in any way, so as a result they went against him. The section where Mr. Lloyd says "Eden believed that his government had done what was right," is again a bad sign because if he had consulted his people on what should be done next then he would have done what was truly the right thing to do.

The lack of consultation or listening is what I believe aggravated the public the most. The Suez Crisis demonstrated how much the United Nations was needed in the world. It was they who ordered the withdrawal of troops from the Suez area. I think the role which the USA and Dwight D Eisenhower took was very influential to the withdrawal of troops as well as the United Nations.

The increase of oil prices and blockage of the canal caused America to apply pressure on Britain and France to stop the fighting. After the whole Suez saga, Britain is said to have dropped from its former status as a world super power. Their relationship with other countries were changing for the worse and so this is why many people believe that Britain is not as influential in the world as it was 60 to 70 years ago. Finally I think that the comment "Britain was humiliated by international opinion and made to look foolish," is partly

true. I wouldn't say they were made to look foolish but were humiliated because they were obliged to back down by America and the United Nations.

So they were humiliated to a certain extent because their decision was overruled and so this can be fairly shameful. I don't think that the public helped with this but it was only deserved because of Eden's neglect to his people.

Finally the majority of the people from other nations disagreed with Britain's actions and so yes, international opinion was against them which obviously did cause humiliation.