



GENEVA CONFERENCE (1954)



SSICSIM 2014
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Contents

Welcome from the Dais	3
Introduction to the Geneva Peace Conference	4
History of the Early Cold War.....	5
The Postwar Settlement	5
The Splitting of the Grand Alliance	5
The Cold War in Asia	6
Thermonuclear Weapons and Leadership Transitions	7
Topic #1: Indochina.....	8
Historical Background	8
Problems and Possible Solutions	9
The Problem of the Two Vietnams	9
Indochinese Problems.....	10
Religious Tensions.....	10
Indochina’s Role in Global Cold War politics	10
Topic #2: Korea	11
Historical Background	11
Possible Solutions	12
Country Positions.....	13
China	13
Egypt / Poland.....	13
France.....	13
India/Indonesia	13
South Korea.....	14
North Korea.....	14
North Vietnam	14
South Vietnam	15
United Kingdom	15
United States.....	15
USSR.....	15

Welcome from the Dais


I would like to welcome you all to the third annual SSICsim Conference. Our team has worked hard to provide our delegates with a realistic Model United Nations experience dealing with two of the most heated Cold War crises, whose legacies are still with us today. We hope that you will enjoy your roles at the 1954 Geneva Conference Committee of SSICsim 2014!

Sincerely,
Misha Boutilier
Director, 1954 Geneva Conference Committee



Introduction to the Geneva Peace Conference

It is 1954, and the Cold War is at its height. The bloody Korean War, which devastated the Korean peninsula, brought the United States and the People's Republic of China (PRC) into open conflict, and raised fears of superpower confrontation, ended just a year ago in an inconclusive armistice. Meanwhile, in Indochina the French Union forces have just suffered a devastating defeat at the hands of the Communist-inspired Viet Minh forces at Dien Bien Phu, leaving the political future of Indochina in question. As the representatives of the 5 great powers and important regional states, you are tasked with determining the postwar settlements to both Korea and Indochina. Can you restore peace and stability to these regions, or will you sow the seeds of future conflict?



History of the Early Cold War

The Postwar Settlement

During the Second World War (1939-1945), the United States (US), United Kingdom (UK), and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) were bound together into a Grand Alliance to defeat Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. Although this alliance was desired by all parties, it was also divided by its differences. The USSR was a communist country whose ideology clashed with the capitalism espoused by the Western powers. Likewise, the Soviet leadership remained strongly suspicious of Western intentions, just as in the US and UK anti-communism was a strong voice in elite circles. Nevertheless, during the war these three great powers were bound together by their shared interest in defeating Hitler.

As the war came to its close, the alliance partners held a series of summits to discuss the postwar order, most notably those held at Yalta and Potsdam. At the Yalta Conference of February 1945, US President Franklin D. Roosevelt, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Soviet leader Joseph Stalin attempted to settle the future of Eastern Europe and Germany. Stalin's aim was to secure Soviet security against invasion by gaining a buffer zone in Eastern Europe, and he did achieve some recognition of this from Roosevelt in exchange for the support of the USSR in the war against Japan. Stalin did issue a vague pledge that free elections would be conducted in Eastern European countries liberated from the Germans by the Red Army once the war was over.

In June 1945, following the defeat of Nazi Germany in May, the Potsdam Conference was held in an attempt to settle the future of Germany. However, owing to the death of Roosevelt and Churchill's election defeat, the new US President, Harry S. Truman, and British Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, lacked experience in international affairs and were therefore at a disadvantage when negotiating with Stalin. The conference was able to reach a limited agreement to subject Germany to a four-power occupation, and punish it with \$20 billion (US) in reparations, but its ultimate political future was left to a council of foreign ministers, which did hold a series of meetings but ultimately failed to reach agreement. At the conference US President Truman mentioned America's development of the atomic bomb to Stalin. In August, the US dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and Japan surrendered days later.

The Splitting of the Grand Alliance

By 1945, the multipolar great power system that had dominated international relations since the 1600s had collapsed. Germany, Italy, and Japan were in ruins, France was devastated and still smarting from its conquest by Germany, and the UK was exhausted and financially destitute. Only the US and the USSR could truly claim great power status, and these two titans towered over the devastated world. In fact, the Grand Alliance did not survive the end of the war. While the agreements reached at the Potsdam Conference suggested that the Grand Alliance could continue after the war, increasing tensions between the US and the USSR caused the breakdown of the alliance and locked both superpowers into a pattern of confrontation.

The cause for the breakdown was that each side viewed the other as bent on world domination. From the US perspective, the USSR was the centre of communism and aimed to spread that ideological system by subversion or conquest. Equipped with the powerful Red Army and bordered by a weak Western Europe, Middle East, and East Asia, the USSR appeared to be poised to expand. US decision-makers found proof of the USSR's aggressive intentions in the rapid extension of communist domination into

the Eastern European states the Red Army had ostensibly liberated from German occupation during World War II, as well as by the USSR's probing moves against Turkey and Iran in 1946. American diplomat George Kennan advised his government that the USSR was bent on world domination and could not be trusted, but that it could, and should, be contained through deterrence.

However, Joseph Stalin was conscious of Soviet economic and military weakness and saw the USSR as menaced by an America bent on world domination. Stalin's assumption was rooted in the belief that capitalist states were inherently hostile to the communist ideology practiced in the USSR. At the same time, Stalin knew that while the Soviet economy had been devastated by World War II, the US economy was booming. While the USSR did have a larger ground army, the US possessed unchallenged naval supremacy and an air force capable of leveling advanced industrial economies to the ground, especially on account of the US monopoly of the atomic bomb. Stalin believed that the US was mobilizing a diplomatic coalition against the USSR, which would be the prelude to an attack. Thus, he sought to ensure Soviet security by developing an atomic bomb and tightening Soviet control of the Eastern European buffer zone.

In order to implement Kennan's policy of containment, President Truman proclaimed the Truman Doctrine in 1947, announcing that the US would support free countries against communist minorities anywhere in the world. He followed this up by the European Recovery Plan, an economic assistance package that aimed to rebuild the economies of Western Europe and foster Western European cooperation, as well as ensure that Communist parties did not take power in Western Europe. The US and USSR proved unable to agree on Germany's political future, and as a result it was divided into the Federal Republic of Germany in the west, under a capitalist system, and the German Democratic Republic in the east, with a centralized communist government. In response to a communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia and the USSR's attempt to blockade the Western zone of Berlin, the US formed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949, an alliance between the US, Canada, and Western European states that aimed to counter Soviet political influence and military threat.

The Cold War in Asia

While the Cold War began in Europe, it soon shifted to Asia. During World War II, Japan's conquest of much of Southeast Asia from the British, French, and Dutch decisively discredited these colonial empires. When they tried to return after the war, they faced stiff resistance from nationalist movements. Indonesia gained independence in 1949, and communist insurgents fought the British and the French in Malaya and Vietnam respectively. In South Asia, the war accelerated the progress towards independence and confirmed British weakness. The Indian subcontinent was partitioned into India and Pakistan, which both gained independence from Great Britain in 1947. In East Asia, the situation was more complex. The United States occupied Japan and under General Douglas MacArthur the US wrote a new Japanese constitution and tried to radically transform Japanese society based on the American model.

In China following the Japanese defeat, the political scene was divided between Chiang Kai-Shek's Nationalist government and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) led by Mao Zedong. While the two men had formed a United Front against Japan in 1937, tensions re-emerged as the war drew to a close. Ironically, Stalin initially supported Chiang and advised Mao to merge with the Nationalists as their junior partners. When a truce broke down in 1946 and Chiang launched an all-out campaign against the CCP, Stalin gave Mao only limited support and urged restraint. However, playing on the unpopularity and corruption of the Nationalist government, the CCP was able to win popular support and turn the

tide in the Chinese Civil War. The US wrote Chiang off as a lost cause, and by 1949 the CCP consolidated its control over mainland China and established the People's Republic of China (PRC), though the Nationalists fled to the island of Taiwan. In February 1950, the PRC signed a Treaty of Friendship with the USSR, gaining military protection and economic aid. The "loss" of China to communism, combined with the USSR's testing of its first atomic bomb in 1949, appeared to be turning the Cold War against the West.

The outbreak of war on the Korean peninsula further heightened tensions. While the Korean War will be treated in depth in the section covering topic 2, in general the North Korean invasion of South Korea in 1950 triggered a broader conflict that pitted the US against the PRC in a bloody land war that raised fear of nuclear confrontation. The war solidified the Soviet-Chinese relationship and led to closer military and economic cooperation. Simultaneously, it caused the United States to reengage in Asia, and the US committed itself to the defense of South Korea, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand. The US and its Western allies perceived the North Korean attack as directed by Moscow, and were worried by the speed of North Korea's original advance. Owing to these concerns, the US strengthened its Strategic Air Command for nuclear strike missions and proceeded to integrate and strengthen the national armies of NATO members.

Thermonuclear Weapons and Leadership Transitions

By 1954, heightened tension and uncertainty were the rule in international relations. In the US, the Republican Party won the 1952 elections on a platform that blasted the Democrats as weak on communism and pledged to prevent the USSR from chipping away at the free world. Despite his own party's aggressive rhetoric, Republican President and World War II general Dwight D. Eisenhower was well aware of the risks of war and favoured accommodating the USSR where possible. Eisenhower also pursued a "New Look" defence policy that invested in nuclear weapons and pledged to enact a "massive retaliation" against any Soviet attack. This was an attempt to avoid an expensive military buildup to match the USSR in conventional warfighting capabilities.

In the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin's death in early 1953 threw the Soviet leadership into turmoil. Soviet party leaders Nikita Khrushchev, Georgi Malenkov, and Laventi Beria initially formed a triumvirate, but the unpopular Malenkov soon lost standing and the hated secret police chief Beria was soon executed with the agreement of his peers. Still, the Soviet leadership remained divided in 1954. Khrushchev was critical of Stalin's foreign policy for its stress on the inevitability of war and clumsiness that allowed to be portrayed as the aggressor. However, he faced criticism within the Soviet leadership, especially from Vladimir Molotov, Stalin's foreign minister who continued to serve in that capacity under the new regime. While Khrushchev increasingly tried to pursue peaceful coexistence with the West, Molotov attacked this policy as both naïve and a betrayal of communist principles.

The nuclear rivalry between the US and the USSR accelerated. The US was shocked that the USSR was able to test an atomic bomb as early as 1949. As a result, it committed itself to develop even more powerful thermonuclear weapons, which were acquired by 1952. However, the USSR soon caught up, testing its first thermonuclear bomb in 1953. Thermonuclear bombs were much more powerful than the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, and the stockpile accumulated could easily destroy the world. Following their development, the spectre of global annihilation hovered over international relations.

Topic #1: Indochina

Historical Background

During the second half of the 1800s, France conquered the lands of Indochina, encompassing present day Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, making them part of its colonial empire. The French justified their colonialism as a “civilizing mission,” but in fact they denied natives basic political and civil rights and established an extractive economic system that exploited indigenous peoples for France’s benefit. While resistance movements did develop in the late 1800s, at first they failed to present a united front to the French, who were able to repress them with ease.

After World War I the charismatic leader now known as Ho Chi Minh spearheaded the development of nationalist resistance to French rule. Born Nguyen Sinh Cung in 1890, he traveled the Western world as a young man, and wound up in Paris during the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. Renaming himself Nguyen Ai Quoc (Nguyen the Patriot), Ho attempted to persuade US President Woodrow Wilson to apply his principle of national self-determination to the Vietnamese people. However, when it became clear that the US and the other great powers were only willing to apply this to white people, Ho turned to communism. Inspired by the anti-imperialism and racial equality that communism’s founder Karl Marx and the leader of the newly-founded Soviet Union Vladimir Lenin taught, he studied revolutionary methods in Moscow in the 1920s and returned to Vietnam to found the Indochinese Communist Party in 1929. Still, Ho’s movement was brutally repressed by the French during the 1930s, and he lived in exile in China.

The fall of France to Nazi Germany and Japan’s occupation of Indochina during World War II breathed life into Ho’s national liberation movement. The defeat of France at the hands of the Germans discredited French claims to racial superiority, as did the French colonial administration’s acquiescence of and collaboration with Japan’s occupation of Indochina from 1940 onwards. Returning to Indochina, Ho renamed himself Ho Chi Minh (“He Who Enlightens”), founded the Viet Minh resistance movement in 1941, and provided military information to the US intelligence service in exchange for arms shipments. After Japan’s surrender in 1945, Ho declared the independence of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV). Ho’s declaration of independence contained no reference to communism, instead appealing to Western and, especially, American political ideals of freedom. Ho also painted himself as a wartime ally of the US, unlike France which had collaborated with the Nazis and Japanese.

Unfortunately for Ho, his hopes for independence were soon undone. As stipulated at the Potsdam Conference, British and Nationalist Chinese troops entered Indochina to receive the Japanese surrender. Both were opposed to the rule of the Viet Minh, and upon their withdrawal they returned authority to French troops and administrators. Conscious of the Viet Minh’s military weakness, Ho tried to reach a compromise with France and in March 1946 signed an agreement with France that would give the DRV self-government. Together with Cambodia and Laos, the DRV would become part of an “Indochina Federation” within the French Union, as the renamed French empire was called. However, France soon repudiated this agreement and in November 1946 the French High Commissioner in Indochina responded to a dispute with the Viet Minh in the port city of Haiphong by storming and bombarding the city. In response, Ho and his Viet Minh launched a guerrilla war against the French.

The Franco-Vietnamese battle lasted for 8 years. France deployed 100,000 troops along with armour, artillery, and air power, and after seizing control of the major cities conducted search-and-destroy missions in rural areas to flush the Viet Minh out of their hiding places.

Meanwhile, the Viet Minh under the leadership of Ho and the brilliant General Vo Nguyen Giap tried to avoid pitched battles and instead focused on launching hit-and-run attacks. To counter Viet Minh claims of colonialism, in 1949 France set up a puppet Vietnamese state under Emperor Bao Dai, granting it independence in name only within the French Union in 1949. As the 1940s went on, France increasingly benefited from US diplomatic support, as US Secretary of State Dean Acheson came to see the Viet Minh as primarily driven by communism and part of a larger movement of communist insurgencies in East and Southeast Asia. The US also needed French support for the creation of NATO and a West German state, and France was able to extract US help against the Viet Minh in return.

The balance of power in the Franco-Vietnamese conflict shifted in 1949 when Mao's communists won the Chinese Civil War. Immediately, both the PRC and the USSR began to send military aid to the Viet Minh, allowing the Viet Minh to form well-equipped divisions capable of taking the French on in conventional warfare. To counter Chinese-Soviet support, in 1950 the US started a program of military aid and sent military advisers to help France's counterinsurgency efforts. Owing to the Korean War, American policy-makers came to see France as an ally against the spread of communism in Asia. Still, despite US assistance the French position gradually deteriorated and by fall 1953 the Viet Minh had gained control of the countryside.

In late 1953, frustrated with the bloody guerrilla struggle, the French General Henri Navarre decided to force a decisive battle that would destroy the Viet Minh as a fighting force. The French constructed a military base and an airstrip in the remote village of Dien Bien Phu, located in a valley surrounded by mountains. Navarre aimed to draw the Viet Minh to attack and then crush them with superior French armour, artillery, and aircraft. However, Navarre underestimated General Giap. The Viet Minh commander surrounded the 13,000 French paratroopers with 47,000 troops, and hauled Chinese-provided artillery into the surrounding hills that were able to both shell the French base and shoot down French aircraft. Unable to resupply their troops or provide effect air support, the French garrison was cut off and Viet Minh attacks starting in March 1954 began to seize strongpoints around the country.

The French begged the US to intervene militarily to save Dien Bien Phu, but after the prolonged Korean War neither Congress nor President Eisenhower wanted to become entangled in another Asian conflict. Neither was Great Britain interested in trying to save what Prime Minister Churchill saw as a lost cause. Without US intervention, Dien Bien Phu fell to the Viet Minh on May 8. The next day, the Geneva Conference, which France had called for in January 1954, finally began.

Problems and Possible Solutions

The Problem of the Two Vietnams

The Democratic Republic of Vietnam led by Ho Chi Minh has certainly won a military victory and enjoys a high degree of popularity, but it is not the only faction that claims to represent the Vietnamese people. In South Vietnam, Emperor Bao Dai heads a Vietnamese government incorporated within the French Union which has enjoyed US recognition since 1950. The Bao Dai regime is largely run by Catholic pro-French Vietnamese urban elites, who are somewhat distant from the poor Buddhist peasant majority, and Bao Dai is widely seen as a French puppet.

The conference has several options to deal with this problem. First, it is possible to divide Vietnam permanently between the two regimes. Second, the conference could recognize the Ho regime and allow it to unify Vietnam. Third, Vietnam could be unified by nationwide elections and/or provisions for

a coalition government. In this case, determining the details is key. Some important questions to consider are: When will the elections take place? And who will conduct and supervise them?

Indochinese Problems

Vietnam is only one part of a broader Indochinese dilemma. The fates of Cambodia and Laos are very much at stake in the conference. Currently, both states are ruled by royalist governments, and are recognized by the US and France as “Associated States within the French Union” together with the Bao Dai regime in the south of Vietnam. However, these governments face challenges from communist forces. For instance, Viet Minh units are active in both states. In Laos in particular, the Pathet Lao communist guerrilla movement is beginning to mount a strong challenge to the government. It should be remembered that Ho Chi Minh founded the Indochinese Communist Party, which did not only encompass Vietnam, but Cambodia and Laos as well.

The DRV leadership has a strong interest in ensuring communist control of both states. The conference must decide whether or not to recognize the current royalist governments of both Cambodia and Laos, or whether it wishes to set up a new government based on elections. It must also decide how to respond to the presence of Viet Minh forces in both states.

Religious Tensions

One of the major tensions in Vietnamese society is between Buddhists and Catholics. During the French colonial period, French Catholic missionaries were very active and won a substantial number of converts. While most Vietnamese remain Buddhist, and Buddhist monks are very politically influential, the Catholic minority is substantial. Most Catholics are fairly poor, but in the south of Vietnam, Catholics predominate in the upper classes that staff and support the Bao Dai regime. In general, Catholics tend to be pro-French. Because of this, in addition to the Viet Minh’s ideological antipathy to religion, the Viet Minh movement has targeted Catholics for persecution.

At the same time, the Buddhist majority under the Bao Dai regime is dissatisfied with Catholics’ perceived political dominance. Left unaddressed, these tensions could work to disrupt and destroy any peace settlement.

Indochina’s Role in Global Cold War politics

In crafting a solution, delegates must remember that Vietnam should not be considered in isolation, or even within a strictly Southeast Asian context. The Cold War is, after all, a global struggle. Will Indochina be pro-communist, pro-West, or a mix of pro-Western and pro-communist states? One attractive option is neutralizing Indochina. This would mean that any states in Indochina would be constitutionally prohibited from entering alliances or binding treaties with either the Western bloc or the communist states. This proposal is a major restriction of sovereignty, but it could defuse tensions.

Topic #2: Korea

Historical Background

Korea was a colony of the Japanese empire from 1910 until the end of the World War II. After the war, the administration of Korea was divided in half at the 38th parallel. Two spheres of influence emerged as the southern half was governed by a dictatorship installed by the victorious Allies, while the northern half was ruled by a communist regime set up by the Soviet Union. With the advent of the Cold War and rising tensions between the former Soviet-Western allies, no free and fair elections were held in either North or South Korea. A communist regime run by Kim Il-Sung was established at the north while the Allied powers installed a right wing dictator, Syngman Rhee, in the south. After Soviet troops withdrew from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK/North Korea), the communist regime in the North urged its southern neighbors to do the same but Syngman Rhee refused as he determined a strong US-aligned Korea would be beneficial to stave off the threats of both North Korea and Japan, Korea's ancient enemy.

In 1950, US Secretary of State Dean Acheson made a speech in which he demarcated American interests around the world, establishing certain 'red lines' the US did not want the Soviet Union or their allies to cross as that could result in a war. However, the speech failed to mention Korea at all. This emboldened Kim Il-Sung, who felt he could take South Korea by military force as the US would not respond militarily, as well as the perceived permission of both Stalin and Mao and understanding that he would have their support in a coming invasion. Despite ongoing re-unification negotiations, border skirmishes between the two Koreas escalated into a full scale war as the North crossed the 38th parallel and invaded the South on June 25, 1950.

The issue was brought to the United Nations Security Council, although the Soviet delegation was boycotting the UN due to the perception of an overwhelming number of 17 capitalist nations as members of the UN and the West blocking the applications of individual Soviet Social Republics within the USSR to become recognized as independent states within the UN. This was a fatal mistake the Soviet Union never repeated again, as the absence of the only communist VETO power-holder in the UNSC allowed the Western nations to intervene in South Korea against North Korean aggression.

The UN forces, almost 90% of whom were American troops, landed in Korea and pushed back Northern forces across the border at the 38th parallel. The UN troops, commanded by General Douglas MacArthur, then invaded the North and eventually went on to cross the Yalu River, which demarcated the border between North Korea and the People's Republic of China (PRC). The UN ignored China's threats of an intervention should they cross the river as they interpreted China to be weak, having just suffered a civil war that had only ended in 1949. Chinese forces then pushed into North Korea pushing back UN forces and eventually attempted a failed invasion of South Korea as well. Although the Soviet Union did not provide troops directly to the conflict, it did provide materiel support to the North Koreans in the form of weapons, vehicles, and aircraft, among other types of military equipment. After July 1951, there was a stalemate in the Koreas which descended into trench warfare for the next two years, until the end of the war in 1953.

When the war finally ended in 1953, neither side had gained much. A formal political border was created along the 38th parallel along with a Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) along the border that was four kilometers long. An extensive network of landmines has since been placed along the DMZ to prevent either North or South Korea from invading each other. Furthermore, an armistice was signed between

the two Koreas which ended the war *de facto* but not *de jure*, which means that although they are no longer fighting each other, the two Koreas are still in an official state of war with each other.

The Korean War was both the first limited war and the first proxy war fought in the Cold War. It was a limited war in the sense that the conflict, despite involving the Soviet Union and the United States, did not expand into Europe or result in a potential third World War between the Eastern and Western Blocs. There was also no use of nuclear weapons, despite both the USSR and the US capability of doing so. It was also a proxy war as the US and the Soviet Union used their allies in the Asia-Pacific region to fight the war for them. Proxy wars shaped the way the Cold War was fought for the next 4 decades.

Possible Solutions

The Geneva Conference of 1954 could serve as a springboard for several possible solutions to not just the situations in Korea and Vietnam but future conflicts as well. To begin with, one possible solution would be to mimic the Austria State Treaty of 1955. This treaty gave the Austrian state independence after it was divided into Eastern and Western spheres of influences after the Second World War. In it, there were neutrality clauses added by the Austrian parliament which effectively banned Austria from joining any military alliance with the United States or the Soviet Union, essentially they were banning them from joining either NATO or the Warsaw Pact. While there is no Warsaw Pact in 1954 (it came into existence in 1955 after West Germany was accepted into NATO despite the Soviet Union's protests), there is a Soviet/Communist sphere of influence, a subtle military alliance of sorts. A possible solution could be to create a unified Korean or Vietnamese government which would be barred from entering into an alliance with either the United States and its allies, or the Soviet Union, China, and their allies. It would effectively have to become a part of the Non-Aligned Movement. This obviously presents some challenges, both as the superpowers have already established their respective governments and spheres of influence within the regions and also due to South Korea's explicit policy of allying with the US to stave off any further North Korean or Japanese aggression.

Nevertheless, should the delegates pursue this solution it should begin with a peace treaty between the two Koreas or between the two Vietnams and France, as they are still official at war.

Another possible solution is to deploy permanent UN Peacekeepers into the region. Although the peacekeepers as a group did not exist until 1956-1957, when the organization was formed as a response to the Suez Crisis, delegates have a chance to rewrite history and implement peacekeepers along the Korean border. UN peace observer missions had already existed from 1948, deployed into conflicts such as the one between Israel and its Arab neighbours and later on between India and Pakistan. To implement peacekeepers would simply require lightly arming the existing observer missions with weapons. Take note that as the peacekeepers were invited by their host countries they are guests, and so they can be ordered to leave by their host countries. Delegates can choose whether they want to continue this clause in any new peacekeeping operation they implement throughout the course of conference, but they should take note that it could have implications for sovereignty if peacekeepers are forced upon nations unwillingly.

Finally, though perhaps not necessarily as successful and perhaps more difficult to implement than some of the other solutions, a national unity government could be established in the regions in question at the Geneva Conference. This presents challenges as it would require the US, the USSR, and their respective allies to put aside their differences in an era when both Eastern and Western nations were immensely prejudiced by each other.

Country Positions

China

The People's Republic of China borders both North Korea and North Vietnam. US foreign policy will likely take China's threats of intervention more seriously as its intervention in Korea during the war there was relatively successful—although they did not eliminate South Korea, they stopped UN forces from overrunning the North. As the US does not recognize China, it is unlikely that the US delegate will speak to the Chinese delegate at all. China will be very concerned about capitalism on its borders as it does not want capitalist influence to threaten the communist rule there. Thus, it is a core interest for China to keep US or Western troops out of Indochina. Furthermore, it has good relations with Non-Aligned nations such as India. China won't be open to UN peace keeping forces as it was fighting them just 1 year ago.

It will be very difficult for China to embrace any treaty such as the Austria State Treaty as Mao Zedong's ideology encourages the spreading of communism across the world, and such a treaty would limit that capability. Aside from that, the Chinese will likely cooperate with the Soviet Union on its foreign policy, though there will be some tension as Mao sees himself as the leader of the Communist world after Stalin died in 1953, something the Soviet Union disagrees with.

Egypt / Poland

Poland and Egypt are respectfully a satellite and an ally, of the Soviet Union. Poland has a communist government that was installed and enforced by the Soviet Union while Egypt has a left wing military dictator in charge. They will take whatever position the Soviet Union takes regarding the Austrian State Treaty solution and peacekeepers.

While it is natural to assume Egypt may support a peacekeeping solution, it is important to note that Egypt did not support—though wasn't necessarily against—a peacekeeping solution until Israel attacked them during the Suez Crisis in 1956; the current conference is taking place in 1954, a full two years before the Suez Crisis. The Egyptian delegate should also keep note that it will be the informal representative of the Algerian freedom fighters, primarily the FLN (National Liberation Front of Algeria). Algeria is still a colony of France, though there is an increasing separatist movement rising there.

France

France's overriding interest is to find a way to extract itself from Vietnam. France's war in Vietnam is politically unpopular in France, and is also economically costly and is economically costly while resulting in many French casualties. France wants to withdraw its forces and abandon Indochina while saving as much of their reputation as possible. By abandoning its Indochinese Empire, France hopes to concentrate its attention on rebuilding its position in Europe and in Africa, where the French colonial empire is beginning to come under threat. In Algeria, France has long faced political opposition from Algerian nationalist groups who have diplomatic support from the surrounding Arab states, and it fears these groups may turn to violence.

India/Indonesia

India and Indonesia are the representatives of the Non-Aligned Movement and will support both the peacekeeping and the neutralization solution to be applied to Korea and Vietnam. Both were former colonies of Britain and the Netherlands, though it is important to note that Indonesia gained freedom through violent rebellion while India obtained it peacefully. Both nations would enjoy the Austrian State

Treaty solution as it would likely add new members to the Non–Aligned Movement and impact the Cold War in a positive manner.

They will likely be courted by the Western Capitalist democracies and the Communist bloc in order to help them pass their resolutions, as simple majorities will be required which neither western nor eastern blocs have on their own. India and Indonesia should take this opportunity to enhance their standing in the world while negotiating concessions (such as trade agreements) in return for supporting a resolution from either the American led alliance or the Soviet led alliance. However, it is important to note that these countries should remain neutral and not join or take one side over the other in the Cold War; that is their highest priority.

South Korea

South Korea in 1954 is recovering from its recent war. Although it is officially a “Republic”, in practice it is an autocratic dictatorship run by President Syngman Rhee, who is responsible for violently repressing his own people. South Korea is still officially at war with the North, even though it has signed an armistice. Both South Korea and North Korea want to re-unify but they do not want their respective governments to cease to exist. South Korea would be seriously against any solution similar to the Austria State Treaty.

South Korea may be open to a treaty similar to the Austria State Treaty should the North give significant assurance and take steps to demilitarize, but this is both highly unlikely and would not solve the issue of South Korea’s insecurity against Japan despite Japan’s current lack of military. South Korea views peacekeepers as unnecessary as the DMZ and American troops stationed within their borders offer enough security against North Korea, though it may be open to a peacekeeping mission owing to the UN’s successful repelling of the initial North Korean invasion. South Korea would only be open to a national unity government as long as the communist party of the North’s power is severely restrained, making this solution quite unfeasible. Regarding the question on Vietnam, South Korea will take whatever position the US and her allies choose to take.

North Korea

North Korea is a Stalinist totalitarian dictatorship run by Kim Il-Sung. It is allies with the Soviet Union and China. North Korea realizes its needs the military support of foreign powers such as China and the USSR in order to survive. It would be highly opposed to any UN peacekeeping involvement as the UN was responsible for invading North Korea in which the North had more casualties and suffered a great deal of bombing from American and UN aircraft. This almost definitely rules out any neutralization or peacekeeping solution. Nevertheless it is still devoted to unification with the South, though it may be more likely to employ military solutions then diplomatic ones despite having ended the war just one year ago.

North Vietnam

Ho Chi Minh has devoted decades to his life’s goal: the liberation and unification of Vietnam. As a result, the DRV will push strongly for the unification of Vietnam under its leadership. Of course, Ho is a patient man, and the DRV may be willing to consider a gradual program of elections if they are likely to lead to national unification under communist leadership. North Vietnam also wants to see communist movements triumph in Laos and Cambodia. Internationally, the DRV is dependent on its primary backers, the Soviet Union and China. However, it can try to play the two off against each other. Moreover, in the past Ho has exhibited willingness to cooperate with the United States, and he would not be adverse to doing so again should the US make a credible offer.

South Vietnam

The Bao Dai regime in South Vietnam is essentially a product of French colonialism. It is plagued by corruption, has unstable and weak political institutions, and does not enjoy much popular legitimacy. If left alone to face the Viet Minh and the DRV, it would likely collapse. Therefore, South Vietnam aims to secure external support, especially from the United States. It is unlikely to support reunification schemes based on well-monitored elections, because Ho Chi Minh stands to win the popular vote. South Vietnam also aims to prevent the extension of communist influence into Cambodia and Laos.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom, led by aging Prime Minister Winston Churchill, sees Vietnam as a lost cause. It refused to support or join an intervention to save the French at Dien Bien Phu, and supports a French withdrawal. The UK's attention is drawn to securing its imperial position in the Middle East and building up the defense of Western Europe against the Soviet Union. As a result, it wants to prevent the United States from becoming entangled in another Asian land war so that the US can contribute more in Europe and the Middle East.

However, the UK is not indifferent to the spread of communism in Southeast Asia. Malaya is still a British colony, albeit one on its way to independence. Great Britain has substantial military forces present there and they are currently combatting a guerrilla insurgency directed by the Malayan Communist Party that is backed by elements of Malaya's Chinese population. As a result, the UK wants to ensure that Communist influence in the region is contained.

United States

The United States is the world's most powerful nation, its position challenged only by the USSR. Under the Eisenhower administration, the US took a strong and realist approach to the USSR that fell short of full scale war. The US is not above using capitalist dictators as allies while chanting its slogan of defending freedom from communist oppression. It believes it is acting defensively against Soviet aggression and often compares the USSR to Nazi Germany, painting it as a reckless expansionist power.

It has used its strategy of containment to contain Soviet and Communist influence and prevent it from spreading it to its allies and to the rest of the Non-Aligned world. The US will continue its strategy of containment against the USSR and her allies and will not hesitate to do anything, short of full war with the Soviet Union, to stop the flow of communism. Regarding China, the US does not officially recognize the PRC, choosing to recognize the Republic of China (in exile in Taiwan) to be the rightful ruler of the Chinese people instead.

As such, the US delegate, as did happen in the real world, will not engage in any conversation with the PRC delegate. It will also actively have to court the Non-Aligned nations of India and Indonesia in order to get their support for any resolutions they may have regarding Korea or Vietnam, since they will likely be determined and passed by a simple majority, which the US and her allies do not have on their own.

USSR

Ironically, as the US sees the Soviet Union as an expansionist power bent on world domination, the Soviet Union sees the US in the same light, and believes it is acting in self-defense. The Soviet Union would definitely be open to a neutralization agreement to solve the issues of Korea and Vietnam, given that the two territories are not very strategic. If the USSR delegate decides the two regions are strategic, their policy may change to the preservation of communist governments in those regions. It may be open to UN Peacekeeping operations as well, depending on the details.

It will no doubt stress sovereignty in either case, and will have to lead the Communist Bloc against further containment from the US in order to protect its interests, both internal and external. The ongoing power struggle within the Soviet Union, however, may complicate its foreign policy, depending on who is in charge or gains influence within the Kremlin. As such, the Soviet delegate should be ready to change their positions on any number of issues.