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Abstract:
The Egyptian civilization is a monumental pillar of the modern history of humanity and contributes greatly to the increase of current knowledge. Together, Ali M. Yahya’s Egypt and the Soviet Union, 1955-1972 (1989) and Rami Ginat’s The Soviet Union and Egypt, 1945-1955 (1993) established a chronology which enable a discussion of this influential Arab country’s past in terms of its present; this intervention tests a variety of methods from the “digital humanities” as an e-learning technology. Clearly, the events which occurred during 1955 were sufficient to accomplish Egypt’s geopolitical alignment; seeking to explore Yahya’s and Ginat’s established chronology, this intervention uses new research and analytic techniques in an attempt to identify specific aspects of historical experience of Egypt’s geopolitical realignment during the pivotal year 1955, which (among other developments) introduced the Aswan High Dam as a new focal point for water issues, regional rivalries and conflicts over the control of natural resources.
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Introduction

In his recent work, Ehren Helmut Pflugfelder states: “we need to understand the structure, content, purpose, and effect of... geoconstructivist discourses and sound an alarm about their deliberative directions.” adding “we need to make clear how geoengineering proponents intuitionally and unintentionally marshal other geological actors into their arguments;” having said that, a cursory glance at the book fails to yield evidence that he consulted historical records from the period of Egypt’s geopolitical realignment (Pflugfelder 2022). The issue of Egypt’s realignment during 1955 is currently at the center of popular and academic discussions: reflecting on that moment, El Dabaa Nuclear Power Plant is referred to as both “the largest project of Russian-Egyptian co-operation since the Aswan Dam construction,” and “the first nuclear power plant built on the African continent using the Russian technology,” which is how Moscow’s state company Rosatom describes this cooperative venture (Mills 2023). For his part, Amgad Al-Wakil (chair of Egypt’s Nuclear Power Plants Authority, NPPA), said the nuclear power plant in Al-Dabaa on Egypt’s northern coast represents the largest joint project between Egypt and Russia since the construction of the Aswan High Dam under the regime of late president Gamal Abdel-Nasser in the 1960s (Essam El-Din 2023). The current intervention test Pflugfelder’s statement and subsequent assertions by means of comparison deriving from the empirical basis of contributions to Jeff Karam and Andreas Hilger’s workshop the “Arab-Soviet Internationalism – Socialist Internationalism, International Organizations and the Politics of Revolution in the 20th and 21st Centuries” which convened in Berlin (July 2022). Together, Ali M. Yahya’s Egypt and the Soviet Union, 1955-1972 (1989) and Rami Ginat’s The Soviet Union and Egypt, 1945-1955 (1993) established a chronology for this structured research. While Ali M. Yahya titles the first chapter of the book, “Goals of Egyptian Foreign Policy,” Rami Ginat titles the second half of the book, “The Beginning of Soviet Involvement in Egyptian Affairs,” breaking the overall argument into two aspects: first steps, and Soviet response to western attempts to form a Middle East defense organization. Analytically, the distinction between the region’s affairs before 1955, and after that date is matched by the distinction between Egyptian goals and Soviet involvement, between foreign policy and domestic affairs. The current intervention addresses these neglected aspects.

Materials and Methods

The “digital humanities” are an area of scholarly activity at the intersection of computing or digital technologies and the disciplines of the humanities, which includes both the systematic use of digital resources in the humanities, and analysis of their application; having said that, the “digital humanities” are rooted in social science research methods as well. While the study of history is considered a part of the humanities, it is also classified as a social science. On behalf of the American Historical Association, Douglas Seefeldt and William G. Thomas assessed “digital history” to be at the center of a “whole...
new field” which opened up “as historians tried to experiment with the new medium;” the present intervention testing Pflugfelder’s assertion can be considered just such an experiment (Seefeldt and Thomas, 2009b).

When they were writing, Seefeldt and Thomas considered this field to be very much in flux: “because the medium is still so new in comparison to traditional modes of communication, and the technology is still rapidly changing, we historians have only just begun to explore what history looks like in the digital medium” even in the absence of well-defined examples of digital scholarship, established best practices, and, especially, and clear standards (Seefeldt and Thomas 2009b). Given Seefeldt’s and Thomas’s concerns, the current intervention should be considered an essay in digital methodologies available to historians who are interested in Egypt’s geopolitical alignment of 1955.

**Digital Sources**

Let us begin an historically based conversation with Pflugfelder’s assertions and the sources from which they were derived, with digital sources of government records and other documents, which were widely-used during the Covid-19 pandemic, and finally addressing AI analytic tools at the conclusion of this intervention. For the purposes of this analysis, internet-based documentation will be considered half of the materials and methods of “digital humanities.” For example, the U.S. National Archives’ website contains answers to preliminary research-related questions regarding the location of Federal records on the website, including such resources as an internet-based database to numbered microfilms created by or purchased by the U.S. National Archives for researchers’ use, a crowdsourced platform (“History Hub”), an Access to Archival Databases (AAD) search engine into electronic records’ holdings.

Pflugfelder does not cite documents from “bricks and mortar” archives, which turns this conversation to digital sources. It’s important to recognize that “the archive” is not universal. Several historians are preparing to meet for a conference at the American University in Cairo, co-sponsored by the CEDEJ and the IFAO, which addressed “Impossible Archives? Rewriting the Contemporary in Egypt” (3 July 2023). Founded in Cairo during 1828, the National Archives (which are currently two facilities) are among the world’s oldest. The Ministry of Culture maintains Dar al-Watha’iq (under Law no. 356 of 1954) as an official repository for government ministries’ documentation, excepting documentation from the “sovereign ministries” of Defense and the Interior. In addition, the Ministry of Finance maintains a separate facility Dar al-Mahfuzat ‘al-‘Umumiyya as an active government office: for this reason, there is no public catalog nor is there a website for reference (Byrne 2020). In addition, East View Information Services’s Al-Ahram Digital Archive database is not currently available to me (also Bar-Noi, n.d.)
In the Russian Federation, each of the federal archives under the “Rosarkhiv” agency has its own website: among many others, these include Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (GA RF) [State Archive of the Russian Federation], the Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov (RGADA) [Russian State Archive of Early Acts], and the Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA) [Russian State Historical Archive] (ArcheoBiblioBase, n. d.). In addition to Moscow, other capitals successor jurisdictions to the Soviet Union (Alma-Ata, Ashkhabad, Baku, Dushanbe, Frunze, Kiev, Kishinev, Minsk, Riga, Tallinn, Tashkent, Tbilisi, Vilnius and Yerevan) are home to national archives. As just one example, Kazakhstan is home to five central and 15 state archives; as of July 1, 2012, the total number of items stored in Kazakhstan archives is more than 20 million (files and documents; Open Archives, [2019]).

Seeking to answer Seefeldt and Thomas’ question, “so, what is digital history and how should we understand its characteristics?” the current intervention recognizes that the survival of documentation offers yet another differential form of privilege, then compares three digital sources of documents pertaining to Egypt’s geopolitical alignment: Adam Matthew’s Archives Direct “Confidential Print: Middle East, 1839-1969” commercial product providing remote access to documents from the U.K. Foreign Office, the ProQuest “Historical Newspapers” commercial product, and (finally) the U.S. Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS). These three are available to students, staff, and faculty at Texas State University through the Online Resource Grant program.

**U.K. Foreign Office**

The U. K. National Archives include record group “FO,” which refers to records created or inherited by the U.K. Foreign Office. The “Confidential Print” series within the “FO” record group consists of 421 volumes (extending from 1839 until 1973); this series has been digitized and is available commercially. Within the “Confidential Print” series, records within a subseries are variously titled “Correspondence respecting Egypt and the Sudan” and “Further Correspondence respecting Egypt and the Sudan” (1947-1949), as well as “Correspondence Respecting Egypt” (1950-1956). None are cited in Pflugfelder’s excellent work. Ten records within the subseries were surveyed for reference to “Moscow” and/or the “Soviet Union;” these were FO 407/226 until FO 407/235. Given that the scanned files include both “Correspondence” and “Supplements,” the following figures are inclusive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Foreign Office records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FO 407/226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 407/227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 407/228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 407/229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 407/230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A long-standing debate seeks to justify U.K. Foreign Office documentation until 1955 as a source for the history of modern Egypt. For example, in The Ends of British Imperialism (2006), Wm. Roger Louis suggests that the manipulation or intervention in Egyptian politics of His Britannic Majesty’s Ambassador to Egypt and the Sudan Sir Miles Lampson (1936-1946) served to indicate a lapse of British diplomatic expertise (Whidden 2017). At several points in the Oxford History of the British Empire (1999, including vol. IV) Louis makes the point that it was the Foreign Office’s policy to encourage Arab nationalism.

Sir Ralph Stevenson served as Ambassador during this key period of Egypt’s geopolitical realignment (1950-1955). Appointed Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to His Majesty the King of Yugoslavia during 1943, Stevenson held that post until 1946. He was the British Ambassador to China from 1946 to 1950, serving as Her Britannic Majesty’s Ambassador to the Kingdom of Egypt from 1950 to 1953 and later to the Republic of Egypt from 1953 to 1955. The Papers of Sir Ralph Claremont Skrine Stevenson (1895-1977) are held in the Manx National Heritage Library and Archives as reference IM 147 MS 10859.

**ProQuest “Historical Newspapers”**

Several citations in Pflugfelder’s excellent work derive from the ProQuest “Historical Newspapers” database; for this reason, the database was searched for items containing both the geonyms “Cairo” and “Moscow.” In addition to four government archives of the Russian Federation, Elena Zubkova’s Russia After the War (1998) includes numerous citations to periodical press of the U.S.S.R., which turns the attention of a researcher based at a university in the United States to the “Historical Newspapers” database which serves as a digital equivalent to the printed Russkaia periodicheskaia pechat’.

Texas State University’s Alkek Library’s collections of databases include ProQuest “Historical Newspapers.” With more than 60 premier historical titles (including the Wall Street Journal), every issue of each title includes the complete paper, cover-to-cover, with full-page and article images in easily downloadable PDF format. The “Historical Newspapers” archive contains more than 52 million digitized pages, enabling researchers to study articles, photos, advertisements, classified ads, obituaries, and editorial cartoons. According to Paivi Rentz (head acquisitions librarian, Alkek Library), “‘Requests’ involve the retrieval or viewing of the full text of content, and an
‘Investigation’ is an action that is related to the content in some way, for example an abstract view or full-text view;” that over a period of time, members of the university’s research community placed 563 “requests” of the *Wall Street Journal*, and 583 “investigations” of the same newspaper.3

For the single year 1955, thirty items meet search criteria for the current research: one from January, four from February (none from March, April, or May), four from June, one from July, two each from August and September, nine from October, one from November, and four from December. Compared with the U.K. Foreign Office records, the digitized ProQuest “Historical Newspapers” database would initially appear to be a less strong source for information regarding Egypt’s geopolitical alignment during 1955.

**U.S. Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS)**

President Roosevelt created a Foreign Broadcast Monitoring Service (FBMS) under the authority of the Federal Communications Commission on 26 February 1941 to monitor, translate, and disseminate openly available news and information from media sources outside the United States within the U.S. government. When President Harry S. Truman created the Central Intelligence Group under the direction of a Director of Central Intelligence by presidential directive on January 22, 1946, the re-named Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) became an open source intelligence component of the Central Intelligence Agency’s Directorate of Science and Technology; after which the National Security Act of 1947 gave rise to a Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and FBIS was transferred to it.

While Pflugfelder’s references do not extend to FBIS, its institutional history underscores the potential of FBIS to inform the current research. The database was searched twice for the current research: once, for broadcasts from the Soviet Union containing the word “Cairo;” and a second time for broadcasts from Egypt containing the word “Moscow.” During 1955, Cairo-based radio stations (including Radio Cairo home service in Arabic, Radio Cairo broadcasting to Latin America in Arabic, and Radio Cairo’s “Voice of the Arabs” programming to the Arab world in Arabic) mentioned “Moscow” 18 times. The same year, Moscow-based radio stations (including the Soviet European service in [Russian] *Hellschreiber*, Soviet European service in French, Soviet home service in Russian, Soviet Near Eastern Service in Arabic, Soviet Near Eastern Service in Turkish, Soviet North American service in English, and the Soviet United Kingdom service in English, as well as the TASS Russian News Agency) mentioned “Cairo” 33 times.

---

3 Personal communications (1 January 2021, 29 February 2023).
Results

The results of this interrogation of Pflugfelder’s work are presented as both “preliminary” and “conclusive.” Preliminary analysis results derive from ChatGPT is an artificial-intelligence (AI) chatbot developed by OpenAI and launched in November 2022. Preliminary results are derived from ChatGPT which is a sibling model to InstructGPT (trained to follow an instruction in a prompt and provide a detailed response). Conclusive analysis results are derived from conventional forms of historical analysis (to be continued below, under “discussion”)

Confidential Print

Each sub-series of the Foreign Office “Confidential Print” includes a “subject index.” Even though Pflugfelder does not cite the “Confidential Print” series, the “subject index” to FO 407/227 references “communism in Egypt,” that to FO 407/231 references “Liberation Square,” and that to FO 407/233 addresses “communism in Egypt” as well. The “subject index” to FO 407/234 addresses “Arms Deal between Egypt and Czechoslovakia,” “Arms Supply for Egypt,” “High Aswan Dam,” and finally “Soviet Arms for Egypt.” Finally, the “subject index” to FO 407/235 acknowledges the “Aswan High Dam,” “Egyptian Constitution, The New,” “Egyptian Labor and Social Affairs,” “Evacuation Celebrations in Egypt” acknowledged the visit of M. Shepilov; the “Liberation Province Development Schemes,” “Nationalization of the Suez Canal,” “Soviet Bloc Activities in Egypt,” and, finally, “Soviet Egyptian Labor Relations.”

Sir Ronald Campbell’s report, “Communism in Egypt” (19 March 1948) was directed to Ernest Bevin. Of the report’s nine paragraphs, one is pertinent to this project: “An interesting point in the policy of the Communists is the encouragement of and cooperation with nationalist sentiment. Mr. Adolf Berle, who, when Assistant Under Secretary in the United States Department of State interested himself in Communist activity in the American continent, told me in 1942 or 1943 that the feature of this activity in Latin American countries was that it had begun to work, though the nationalist section of opinion in each. He thought the object of this was to create for the post-war period a sentiment friendly to Russia amongst those posing as putting up a patriotic resistance to the ‘imperialism’ of the United States. It is rather early yet to hazard an opinion, whether the nationalist aspect of Communist activity in Egypt is likely to result in the production of pro-Russian feeling among the masses and whether, if it did, the politicians would feel tempted or bound to follow such sentiment in their foreign policy” (FO 407/227, “Communism in Egypt,” pp. 18-19).

Sir Ralph Stevenson’s report, “Developments in the Organization of the ‘Liberation Squads’ in Egypt” (18 December 1951) was directed to Anthony Eden. Of the report’s seven paragraphs, one is pertinent: “Towards the end of November the police appear to have raided a depot of the Socialist Party squads, although accounts differ
whether this was at a place in Cairo or in Sharkiya province some fifty miles from the capital. It seems certain, however, that a raid of some kind took place. It may have been intended to blackmail the squads into accepting Government control, but it was nicely calculated to destroy any confidence in the Government’s intentions which the leaders of squads may have felt. In consequence of such Government actions one of the effects of their assumption of control has been the opposite of what they had intended” (FO 407/231, “Developments,” pp. 1-2; see also “Telegram from Sir R. Stevenson to Foreign Office, May 13, 1952”).

Sir Ralph Stevenson’s report, “Communism in Egypt” (8 July 1954) was directed to Mr. Anthony Eden. Of the report’s thirteen paragraphs, one is pertinent, regarding: “the loose use locally of the term ‘communist.’ As under former Governments, so under the present regime, any person holding progressive virtues is apt (if he belongs to the Opposition) to be accused of Communism. Comparatively few of those who are active in the local Communist groups would in all probability qualify for membership in the Communist Parties of Europe. Nevertheless, progressive or frustrated elements who look for inspiration to the leaders of political thought in Moscow rather than, or in addition to, the Socialists of Western Europe, and who consort with member of the self-styled Communist groups in the country, constitute a considerable, if ill-defined, body of people” (FO 407/233, “Communism in Egypt,” pp. 80-82).

FO 407/234 addresses “Arms Deal between Egypt and Czechoslovakia,” “Arms Supply for Egypt,” “High Aswan Dam,” and finally “Soviet Arms for Egypt.” Sir Humphrey Trevelyan’s report, “Soviet Arms for Egypt” (6 September 1955) was directed to Mr. Macmillan. Of the report’s five paragraphs, a section of one is pertinent: “The Russians offered [Nasser] arms in the spring when resentment at the Turco-Iraqi Pact was at its height and the impact of neutralist influences at Bandung fresh. But he refused and intensified his efforts to get arms from the Americans, ourselves, and the French. He did a deal with the French in June, probably in return for a promise to cease attacks against the French in Morocco [sic] and assistance to Moroccan [sic] rebels, but the French have now refused deliveries on the ground that the Pact is broken. He sent emissaries to England, but got nothing out of his new requests. He came up against payment difficulties with the Americans and finally indicated to them that he could wait no longer in the face of pressure from the Army on which the regime is completely dependent” (FO 407/234, “Soviet Arms for Egypt,” [p. 14]).

Harold Macmillan’s minute, “Conversation in New York between the Secretary of State and Mr. Fawzi” (30 September 1955) was directed to Sir Humphrey Trevelyan. Of the minute’s seven paragraphs, a section of one is pertinent to this project: “with regard to the question of arms for Egypt, he said that the incidents which had so much disturbed us were very regrettable. He used this expression twice. He said it had all grown out of a misunderstanding. He did not think it was worth while having any recrimination about the past. He thought we should sit down together and work out the precise position. The situation is still fluid... he proceeded to say that nobody had
less desire than his government to have Russian or Communist influence in Egypt, Africa, or Asia…” (FO 407/234, “Conversation,” pp. 62-63).

Sir Humphrey Trevelyan’s report, “Egyptian-Czech Arms Deal” (24 October 1955) was directed to Harold Macmillan. Of the report’s ten paragraphs, a section of one is pertinent to this project: “In June the Egyptians seem to have started to think seriously of negotiations with the Communists. According to a report from the Jordanian Military Attaché in Cairo which was heard of in Amman in the middle of June, the Egyptians had declared that in four months’ time the Gaza situation would be changed by the delivery of heavy equipment from Czechoslovakia…” (FO 407/234, “Arms Deal,” pp. 67-69). Sir Humphrey Trevelyan’s brief note, “High Aswan Dam” (24 November 1955) was directed to Mr. Macmillan. Of the report’s two paragraphs, one is pertinent to this project: “According to to-day’s press, Production Minister Hassan Ibrahim told reporters after last night’s Cabinet meeting that Egyptian Government was keen to sign contracts in July 1956 with the firms which would build the High Dam so that work might start in July 1957” (FO 407/234, “High Aswan Dam,” p. 76).

FO 407/235 acknowledges the “Aswan High Dam,” “Egyptian Constitution, The New,” “Egyptian Labor and Social Affairs,” “Evacuation Celebrations in Egypt” acknowledged the visit of M. Shepilov; “Soviet Bloc Activities in Egypt,” and, finally, “Soviet Egyptian Labor Relations.” In “Egypt: Annual Review for 1955” directed to Mr. Macmillan, Sir Humphrey Trevelyan referred to “Evacuation Celebrations” (31 January 1956). Of the report’s nine paragraphs, part of one is pertinent: “in 1955 the Communists started a drive in the Middle East. Footballers, third-rate dancers, and VOKS [the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries of the U.S.S.R.] have been in evidence in Egypt, but the real bait is arms, economic and technical aid and the assurance that Egypt can dispose of large quantities of her staple produce through barter agreements with the communist world. The supply of arms to Egypt was a major communist victory, which must give them increasing influence in the country unless there is a settlement with Israel…” (FO 407/235, “Egypt,” pp. 1-5).

Sir Humphrey Trevelyan’s report, “Egyptian Constitution, The New” (2 February 1956) was directed to Selwyn Lloyd. Of the report’s twenty paragraphs, part of one is pertinent: “Nasser has on numerous occasions described himself as a socialist and it has been natural to wonder whether he and his colleagues, with their basic inexperience and limited capabilities for critical analysis, might not have fallen prey to the misuse of language and perversion of terminology in which the Communists are expert. If, however, his Constitution and his public utterances leading up to it are any guide, it seems clear that he means no more than he says. Not even the word ‘socialism’ figures in the text of the Constitution…” (FO 407/235, “Egyptian Constitution,” pp. 9-14).

Sir Humphrey Trevelyan’s brief note, “High Aswan Dam” (10 February 1956) was directed to Selwyn Lloyd. The text’s single paragraph is a statement Eugene Black and “the Egyptians” issued, which includes the following: “During the past two weeks
representatives of the Government of Egypt and Mr. Eugene Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, have been discussing the participation of the Bank in the financing of the High Dam project. These discussions have been very fruitful and have resulted in mutual understanding, for a substantial agreement has been reached covering the basis of the Bank’s participation necessary for the financing of the foreign exchange cost of the High Dam project for an amount equivalent to 200 million dollars...” (FO 407/235, “High Aswan Dam,” p. 15).

Sir Humphrey Trevelyan’s brief note, “Egyptian Labor and Social Affairs” (4 April 1956) was directed to Selwyn Lloyd. Of the report’s five paragraphs, part of one is pertinent to this project: “The most noteworthy feature of the period under review has been the continued growth of the trade union movement. Although precise figures are wanting, both the number of unions and the size of their membership have increased considerably. Union leaders, who at present and probably for some time to come, rule their members rather than represent them clearly relish the increasing prominence given them by the regime during the past two years...” (FO 407/235, “Egyptian Labor,” pp. 43-44). Sir Humphrey Trevelyan’s report, “Soviet Bloc Activities in Egypt” (19 April 1956) was directed to Selwyn Lloyd. Of the report’s fifteen paragraphs, part of one referring to the U.S.S.R. is pertinent to this project: “their decision to allot a higher priority to Middle Eastern matters and to embark on a wide initiative in all these fields may be seen, in retrospect, to have been marked by a declaration of policy issued by the Soviet Foreign Ministry on the 16th of April 1955” (FO 407/235, “Soviet Bloc,” pp. 45-48).

Sir Humphrey Trevelyan’s brief note, “Soviet Egyptian Labor Relations” (17 May 1956) was directed to Selwyn Lloyd. Of the report’s five paragraphs, one is pertinent to this project: “it was announced by the Egyptian press on the 4th of May that the Soviet Government had invited the Egyptian Government to send a delegation of eight Egyptians concerned with Labor Affairs on a three months’ visit to the Soviet Union” (FO 407/235, “Soviet Egyptian,” p. 53). Dietmar Rothermund addresses the psychological moment of July 1956, when “Nehru accompanied Nasser on his flight to Cairo; on this flight Nasser told Nehru about the American denial of the aid for the Aswan Dam on which he had counted” (Rothermund, 2014, p. 23.).

**ProQuest “Historical Newspapers”**

At five points, Pflugfelder cites the New York Times, which happens to be one of the 60 U.S. newspapers indexed “Historical Newspapers” (2022, pp. 187, 208, 225, 226, 230). An independent survey of news from 1955 which referenced “Cairo”—surprisingly—did not pertain to Egypt. “Moscow Reply to Peace Bid ‘Limited’” noted the “Cairo and Berlin declarations, signed by the governments of Britain and the United States” which identified Taiwan [Formosa] to be an integral part of the national territory.
of China (Chicago Daily Tribune, 1955a), as did reference to “the Cairo agreement and the Potsdam declaration and other international documents including a statement by President Truman in 1950” (Daniel, 1955a, p. 5.).

So, too, did “Shake-Up in Moscow is Portentous” (Los Angeles Times, 1955). The announcement of U.S.S.R. Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov to the Supreme Soviet regarding the development of hydrogen bombs, also referred to the Cairo and Potsdam declarations as well as the capitulation of Japan that Formosa and the Pescadores “are undeniably territory of the [communist] Chinese people’s republic” (published as “Textural Excerpts from Speech by Molotov Outlining Soviet Union Foreign Policy, The New York Times, 1955a, p. 5.; as well as Chicago Daily Tribune, 1955b).

The specific dates of these references are contentions. W. Mott and J. Kim address what they call “the geopolitics of Cold War,” they note the events of three years previous to these developments: “by 1952... Moscow was courting New Delhi” (Mott and Kim 2006). The first reference to Egypt’s geopolitical realignment appeared during the summer in a reference to “Prime Minister Nehru, who flew [from Moscow] to Warsaw and will go on to Vienna, Belgrade, Rome, London, Cairo, and New Delhi” (Daniel, 1955b, p. 3.).

According to the periodicals digitized in the “Historical Newspapers” database, the penultimate step of Egypt’s geopolitical realignment was “the official invitation to Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser to visit Moscow and Colonel Nasser’s acceptance to make the trip next spring are being made full use of by Egyptian propagandists for consumption at home, in the Arab world, and abroad” (Marashian, 1955).

A high point in this narrative arc regarding Egypt’s geopolitical realignment occurred during U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles’ press conference, at which “choosing his words carefully, the Secretary explained that he had received indications that the Soviet Union had offered to supply military equipment to Egypt; these indications were unofficial, but they bore the mark of reliability, he said” (Schmidt, 1955, p. 1.).

**Foreign Broadcast Information Service Daily Reports**

In conversation with Pflugfelder’s book on geoengineering which references Soviet scientists Mikhail Budyko and Vladimir Vernadsky (2022, pp. 111, 141), references to “Moscow” in Radio Cairo’s various domestic and regional services followed narrative arc similar to that noticed in the Proquest Historical Newspapers database. The year 1955 began with a journalist’s report on President Eisenhower’s “State of the Union” address before the U.S. Congress, which referenced Radio Moscow’s analysis of the same speech (FBIS-FRB-55-006, 7 January 1955).
Egypt’s geopolitical realignment was marked by India’s Prime Minister Nehru’s press conference in Cairo, during which he expressed a hope to visit Moscow “in June or July and not before,” observing that diplomatic “alliances are meant for peace, but they cause a feeling of anxiety and lack of tranquility” (FBIS-FRB-55-034) 16 February 1955).

Meanwhile, Cairo Radio monitored Radio Moscow, relaying the latter’s comment on “Britain joining the Iraqi-Turkish alliance” (FBIS-FRB-55-066, 4 April 1955). A high point in this narrative arc regarding Egypt’s geopolitical realignment occurred with the return from the Bandung Conference of Gamal Abdel Nasser “who earned the gratitude of half the nations of the world and who commanded great respect and esteem... all people in New Delhi, London, Washington, Moscow, Paris, and Rio de Janeiro hail and support the victory of Gamal and the cause of peace and U.N. principles” (FBIS-FRB-55-086, 2 May 1955). Of geopolitical pacts, Mohammed Hasanayn Haykal observed: “alliances are alliances, whether concluded by America or Russia; the hydrogen bomb remains the same, whether Moscow or Washington sets it off” (FBIS-FRB-55-098, 18 May 1955). When Nehru returned from Moscow, his joint statement with Nasser placed his diplomatic mission in the arc of Egypt’s geopolitical realignment: “the Western allies would have liked him, the messenger of peace, to have visited San Francisco where the United Nations was celebrating its 10th anniversary; it is as if Nehru went to Russia to point out to the Western allies that the road to peace passes through Moscow” (IS-FRB-55-135, 13 July 1955).

In addition to monitoring other nations’ broadcasts, as a service to local communities Cairo Radio monitored the local press. According to Radio Cairo’s Egyptian Home Service, both the official newspaper Al-Jumhuriya and the semi-official Al-Ahram recalled to the four world leaders Bulganin, Eden, Eisenhower, and Faure gathered for disarmament talks in London, memories of World War II: “it is essential that each of the Big Four recall memories of war and its aftermath, as well as the hopes of other people for peace” (FBIS-FRB-55-138, 17 July 1955). This provides context for the editorial in the semi-official daily newspaper Al-Akhbar, responding to Nasser’s plans to visit Moscow, that “the visit the Egyptian Premier will pay to Soviet Russia is considered a major turning point in Egyptian policy and in the policy of the Middle East in general” (FBIS-FRB-55-156, 10 August 1955).

Radio Cairo’s Egyptian Home Service emphasized the significance of Nasser’s travel plans: “the importance of this news is attributed to two factors: first, this visit will be the first visit for an Egyptian Premier and leader to the Soviet Union; second, it shows clearly what Premier Gamal Abdul Nasser asserted more than once, that his policy does not follow the East nor the West, but that it reflects Egypt’s interest first and foremost” (FBIS-FRB-55-157, 11 August 1955). FBIS also picked up reports from Radio Beirut: first, that Egypt’s ambassador presented his credentials (FBIS-FRB-55-166, 25 August 1955); and second, that members of Egypt’s press delegation visited Moscow State University, prayed communally at the Moscow mosque, and laid a wreath on [what was then] the Lenin-Stalin mausoleum (FBIS-FRB-55-178, 10 September 1955).
According to Radio Cairo’s Egyptian Home Service, the newspaper Al-Tahrir published an article under the byline of Col. Anwar Al-Sadat, with his analysis of the visit of U.S. Assistant Secretary of State George Allen to Nile lands: “the capital of Egypt is Cairo and not Washington, or London, or Paris, or Moscow; Cairo and Cairo alone is the capital which plans and implements the policy insuring the reinforcement of its army, the guaranteeing of its security, without requiring consultation or interference, control or guardianship from any foreign state, whether in the East or West” (FBIS-FRB-55-208, 5 October 1955). To the rest of the Arab world, the “Voice of the Arabs” shortwave service analyzed three foreign sources of news—the daily France-Soir, as well as weeklies Time and Newsweek—as the world puzzles over the arms deal concluded between Egypt and “the Eastern Bloc countries” (FBIS-FRB-55-211, 27 October 1955).

According to Radio Cairo’s Egyptian Home Service, the weekly newsmagazine Al-Musawwar informed readers: “the best description of the American stand toward our question these days is that America does not understand us, as Premier Abdul Nasser has stated: when Egypt headed toward Moscow and Prague to obtain its requirements of arms, it did not choose this course, but America and its Allies have chosen it for us when they refused to supply us with arms on acceptable terms” (FBIS-FRB-55-215, 3 November 1955). The year of realignment concluded with Radio Cairo’s Egyptian Home Service, which reported from the semi-official Al-Akhbar “that Pandit Nehru has made another statement against the Baghdad Pact; the pact is thus being attacked from several directions: Russia in the North, India and China in the East, and the Arab states opposed to foreign alliances in the West and center” (FBIS-FRB-55-237, 7 December 1955).

References to “Cairo” in Radio Moscow’s various services was more extensive during this specific year. Reporting in Russian to the Far East, Moscow’s TASS reported from Beirut that the Lebanese press commented widely on the decisions of the Arab League’s political committee in Cairo (FBIS-FRB-55-002, 3 January 1955). The following day, via Radio Moscow in Arabic to the Near East, Prof. Lapitsky delivered his second lecture: “Pages from the History of the Worker’s Movement in Egypt” (FBIS-FRB-55-003, 4 January 1955). The following week, Ivan Vassilyev recalled the Cairo Declaration of 1943, in his analysis of the U.S. treaty with Chiang Kai-Shek (FBIS-FRB-55-009, 13 January 1955).

In Turkish, Radio Moscow’s Soviet Near Eastern Service reported that Cairo radio reported that members of the Syrian parliament protested any defense pact between Iraq and Turkey (FBIS-FRB-55-017, 23 January 1955). With this passing reference to Cairo as a city at the center of Arab politics, Radio Moscow continued to refer to “Cairo” as a metaphor for the legal status of Taiwan/Formosa—similar to the U.S. newspapers in the “Historical Newspapers” database. In English, Radio Moscow’s North American service responded to the New York Herald Tribune’s statements about Taiwan and the Pescadores, recalling “in the Cairo Declaration of 1 December [1943], the United States not only recognized China’s territorial integrity but also confirmed
that the island of Taiwan was an inalienable part of Chinese territory” (FBIS-FRB-55-018, 26 January 1955). In Russian, Radio Moscow’s home service returned to the Arab League’s head of state conference in Cairo FBIS-FRB-55-019, 26 January 1955). In French, Radio Moscow’s European service responded to Le Monde’s assertion that Formosa and the Pescadores were not Chinese territory, with a reminder: “in the Cairo Declaration of 1 December 1943, the United States and other powers confirmed that Formosa forms an inalienable part of China” (FBIS-FRB-55-019, 26 January 1955).

Radio Moscow occasional broke the series of references to “Cairo” as a metaphor for the legal status of Taiwan/Formosa, and acknowledged Egypt’s capital as a city at the center of Arab politics. In English, via Radio Moscow’s North American service, Yakov Viktorov posed a series of questions to listeners regarding military bases, including “should relations between countries be built on a basis of equality or inequality?” (FBIS-FRB-55-023, 2 February 1955). Also in English, via the North American service, with regard to Taiwan/Formosa, referred again to “the Cairo Declaration, the Potsdam Declaration, and the agreement on the capitulation of Japan, all of which the United States signed” (FBIS-FRB-55-024, 2 February 1955). Also in English, via the service to the United Kingdom, another commentator responds to the Times, the Daily Telegraph, the Glasgow Herald, and the Yorkshire Post that “Britain has twice confirmed the fact that Taiwan belongs to China—by its signature under the Cairo Declaration and the Declaration adopted in Berlin after the end of the war” (FBIS-FRB-55-026, 4 February 1955).

“Cairo” continued to serve Radio Moscow as a metaphor for the legal status of Taiwan/Formosa. In English, Radio Moscow’s North American service responded to “some papers in the United States,” which were “trying to mislead the public about Washington’s position toward the Chinese People’s Republic” (FBIS-FRB-55-026, 5 February 1955). Transmitting in English-language Morse code to North America, Moscow’s TASS reported from Cairo that the Arab Prime Minister’s conference closed without a press communiqué (FBIS-FRB-55-027, 7 February 1955). Transmitting in Russian to the provinces, Moscow’s TASS reported that “Formosa and the Pescadores… are undoubtedly Chinese territory; this was especially admitted in the Cairo Declaration of 1943 and the Potsdam Declaration in 1945, signed by both the United States and Britain” (FBIS-FRB-55-028, 8 February 1955). In Russian, Radio Moscow’s home service hosted Yuri Bochkarov who referred to “the fact that Taiwan and Penghulitao belong to China—is recognized in such international documents as the Cairo and the Potsdam declarations” (FBIS-FRB-55-032, 14 February 1955).

Transmitting in English-language Hellschreiber to Europe, Moscow’s TASS reported that the conference of Prime Ministers of Arab countries held in Cairo... clearly showed that... Egypt and Syria and Saudi Arabia are against Nuri Al-Said’s treacherous machinations” (FBIS-FRB-55-033, 15 February 1955). Yet throughout this year of realignment, for Radio Moscow “Cairo” referred to China, as frequently as it referred to Egypt. In English, Radio Moscow’s North American service recalled again: “on 1
December 1944, the United States, Britain, and China signed the Cairo Declaration which said that all the territories Japan had seized from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, should be returned to China” (FBIS-FRB-55-034, 16 February 1955).


*Radio Moscow*, broadcasting in Arabic to the Near East, sustained a weekly review of Arab events which acknowledged: “It is known that the United States, supported by Britain, is at present pursuing a policy aimed at the establishment of the so-called ‘northern wing of the Middle East bloc’ with the participation of the Arab states” (FBIS-FRB-55-050, 11 March 1955). Radio Moscow, broadcasting in English to the United Kingdom, returned to the “Cairo Declaration, which the governments of Great Britain and the United States signed on 1 December 1943, they proclaimed it to be their purpose to restore to China all the territories wrested from the Chinese by Japan, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores” (FBIS-FRB-55-074, 14 April 1955).

Meanwhile, transmitting in Russian-language *Hellschreiber* to Europe, Moscow’s *TASS* quoted the Egyptian newsmagazine *Rose Al-Yussef* “that imperialist circles of the United States and Britain are planning to set up a new military pact which would tie the countries of Central Africa to Anglo-American military plans” (FBIS-FRB-55-087, 3 May 1955). Similarly, in Russian-language *Hellschreiber* to Europe, *TASS* reported a list of goods appended to the 27 March 1954 trade agreement between the U.S.S.R. and Egypt (FBIS-FRB-55-096, 13 May 1955). Finally, *Radio Moscow*, broadcasting in Arabic to the Near East, reported that Shaikh Ahmad Hasan Al-Baquri, as Egyptian minister of Islamic charitable endowments (waqf), visited China with Professor Mustafa Kamil of Cairo University: “they spent three weeks seeing for themselves the activities of the cultural and educational organizations and the state of religions” (FBIS-FRB-55-115, 11 June 1955).

Transmitting in Russian, Moscow’s *TASS* reported from Cairo that U.S.S.R. Ambassador Daniel Semyonovich Solod hosted a reception in honor of chief editor of *Pravda* D. T. Shepilov, which Egyptian ministers of trade and health attended, with the Arab League secretary, heads of embassies, representatives of Egyptian business, and Egyptian journalists numbering 200 total (FBIS-FRB-55-147, 28 July 1955). In Arabic,
Radio Moscow’s Soviet Near Eastern Service reported the “events of 30 July” as the 25th anniversary of Egypt’s “struggle for freedom and independence” as joined with “its struggle against joining military alliances which are being formed in the Middle and Near East” (FBIS-FRB-55-149, 1 August 1955, see Gifford 2019, Gershoni and Jankowski 2002, and Badrawi 1996). Transmitting in English-language Morse code to North America, Egypt’s official daily newspaper Al-Jumhuriya described Egyptian cotton exported to the People’s Republic of China as “an important act [which] means that Egypt has broken the fettering foreign monopoly on the country’s basic agricultural product” (FBIS-FRB-55-155, 9 August 1955).

Transmitting in English-language Hellschreiber to Europe, Moscow’s TASS reported that Egypt’s Premier Gamal Abdul Nasser accepted an invitation to visit the U.S.S.R. the following spring (FBIS-FRB-55-157, 11 August 1955). In Russian-language Hellschreiber to Europe, Moscow’s TASS reported on differences in interpretation of the Anglo-Egyptian agreement (12 February 1953) between Great Britain and Egypt regarding the Sudan (FBIS-FRB-55-159, 14 August 1955). Via Radio Moscow in Arabic to the Near East, an unidentified commentator surveyed the Egyptian daily press with regard to Premier Abdul Nasser’s plans to visit the Soviet Union (FBIS-FRB-55-163, 19 August 1955), then criticizing John Foster Dulles’ proposal for peace with Israel (FBIS-FRB-55-170, 30 August 1955).

Transmitting in Russian-language Hellschreiber to Europe, Moscow’s TASS drilled down on the U.S. President’s plan for utilization of the Jordan waters (FBIS-FRB-55-174, 5 September 1955). Via Radio Moscow in Arabic to the Near East, Victor Beloslovsky noted the expansion of Egypt’s trade relations to Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, and Rumania (FBIS-FRB-55-175, 7 September 1955). Transmitting in Russian to the provinces, Moscow’s TASS reported the exchange of 60,000 tons of Egyptian rice for 500,000 tons of Soviet petroleum “on the basis of mutual advantages” (FBIS-FRB-55-176, 8 September 1955).

Via Radio Moscow in Arabic to the Near East, an unidentified commentator noted Soviet Moslems’ meetings with leaders of Al-Azhar university, testifying on the freedom of worship they enjoyed before embarking on the annual pilgrimage to Mecca (FBIS-FRB-55-181, 15 September 1955). In Persian, Radio Moscow’s Soviet Near Eastern Service reported on the rice-for-oil agreement (FBIS-FRB-55-185, 21 September 1955). Via Radio Moscow in Arabic to the Near East, an unidentified commentator noted the growth of the Partisans of Peace movement (FBIS-FRB-55-188, 22 September 1955, see also Bishop 2020).

Transmitting in English-language Hellschreiber to Europe, Moscow’s TASS reported that Premier Abdul Nasser’s speech at the opening of an arms exhibition in Cairo was widely-reported in the local press (FBIS-FRB-55-191, 29 September 1955). Via Radio Moscow in Arabic to the Near East, an anonymous commentator recalled the speech at the exhibition: “the decision of the Egyptian government to purchase arms
from Czechoslovakia... was purely a commercial transaction...” (FBIS-FRB-55-192, 1 October 1955). Transmitting in Russian-language *Hellschreiber* to Europe, Moscow’s *TASS* reiterated that Premier Abdul Nasser’s speech at the Military Academy “emphasized the tremendous importance of the agreement with Czechoslovakia to purchase arms concluded on a purely commercial basis” (FBIS-FRB-55-193, 3 October 1955).

Again, transmitting in Russian-language *Hellschreiber* to Europe, Moscow’s *TASS*’s anonymous commentator noted a second meeting between Premier Abdul Nasser, U.S. Abassador Byroade, and Undersecretary of State Allen—allegedly, in an attempt to persuade Egypt’s head of state to annul the agreement with Czechoslovakia (FBIS-FRB-55-194, 4 October 1955). Again, in Russian-language *Hellschreiber* to Europe, Moscow’s *TASS*’s anonymous commentator repeated the statement of Sheikh Abdurrahman Tag as rector of [Al-Azhar], supporting Premier Nasser’s defense of the sovereignty and independence of Egypt (FBIS-FRB-55-195, 5 October 1955).

Again, transmitting in Russian-language *Hellschreiber* to Europe, Moscow’s *TASS*’s anonymous correspondent reported the remarks of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia’s minister of the interior, regarding Egypt’s decision to purchase weapons from Czechoslovakia: “Egypt, being an independent state, has to take all the measures to equip her army adequately” (FBIS-FRB-55-196, 6 October 1955). In Russian, Radio Moscow’s home service reported the success of the U.S.S.R.’s public diplomacy; “the Egyptian public is greatly interested in the forthcoming concerts... all tickets were sold several days before the arrival of the artists” (FBIS-FRB-55-197, 7 October 1955).

Transmitting in Russian to the provinces, Moscow’s *TASS* updated listeners with a “new” variation for division of river waters between Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon, and with Israel: they rejected construction of a dam and hydroelectric station on the Jordan River (FBIS-FRB-55-201, 13 October 1955). In Russian-language *Hellschreiber* to Europe, Moscow’s *TASS*’s anonymous correspondent reported the Soviet Union had signed a friendship treaty with Yemen (FBIS-FRB-55-213, 31 October 1955). Again, transmitting in Russian-language *Hellschreiber* to Europe, Moscow’s *TASS* correspondent V. Medvedyev commented on the friendship treaty with Yemen (FBIS-FRB-55-218, 5 November 1955).

Transmitting in Russian-language *Hellschreiber* to Europe, Moscow’s *TASS*’s anonymous correspondent reviewed the Egyptian press on the U.S. State Department’s statement about the Baghdad Pact organization (FBIS-FRB-55-227, 21 November 1955). In Turkish, Radio Moscow’s Soviet Near Eastern Service reported local resistance to the Baghdad Pact organization (FBIS-FRB-55-241, 12 December 1955). Closing out the year, Radio Moscow’s North American service reported in English that [Egyptian] students staged a demonstration before Jordan’s embassy in Cairo, appealing “to the people of Jordan to prevent her from joining this military organization” (FBIS-FRB-55-246, 17 December 1955).
Intermediate Results

Having consulted primary sources pertaining to Egypt’s realignment which are available via the internet via the U.K. Foreign Office, the “Historical Newspapers” database, and the Foreign Broadcast Information Service database, this analysis offers strategies which extend Ehren Helmut Pflugfelder’s arguments about geoengineering, persuasion, and climate change. Next, this analysis turns to secondary sources pertaining to Egypt’s geopolitical change which are available via the internet as well. Beyond ever-widening circles of access to other scholars’ research results provided by Academia.edu and JSTOR, this intervention consults artificial intelligence tools which are marketed to higher education which allow users to generate what claims to be original text including ChatGPT and scite assistant.

Academia.edu


JSTOR

JSTOR is an online platform which provides access to more than 12 million journal articles and book chapters, as well as primary sources in 75 disciplines; JSTOR is a part of ITHAKA, which is a not-for-profit organization what includes Artstor, Ithaka S+R,

ChatGPT

Egypt and the Russian Federation have had a long-standing relationship that dates back to the Cold War era. In recent years, their diplomatic ties have become stronger, with both countries actively seeking to enhance their cooperation in various fields. In particular, Cairo and Moscow have been collaborating on issues related to security and defense (including military training and arms deals) as well as regional challenges such as the Syrian crisis, and the fight against terrorism. Egypt has also been keen on expanding its economic ties with Russia, with trade and investment between the two countries increasing steadily in recent years; overall, Egypt’s current diplomatic relations with the Russian Federation are characterized by cooperation and mutual respect. Egypt’s diplomatic relations with the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union are significantly different due to various political, economic, and social changes that have occurred in both countries over time.4

scite assistant

In 1955, Egypt’s diplomatic relations with the USSR were well established; the motives behind Egypt’s decision to establish these relations have not been thoroughly probed or systematically studied by either Soviet or Middle Eastern research, and Soviet interests and political activity in the Middle East during the Stalinist period were believed to be marginal, focusing mainly on nurturing local communist parties (Ginat 1999). However, the Soviet Union viewed Egypt as a bridgehead to expand its interests in the Middle East; the Soviet-Egypt special relations were based on three factors: international system, states, and decision-makers, and pursuit of common security instead of economic interests became an important factor in promoting Soviet-Egypt special relations (Degang, 2018). After negotiations, the two sides finally reached a consensus and signed the Soviet-Egypt Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, which was valid for 15 years.

4 ChatGPT does not generate academic citations.
According to this agreement, Egyptian leaders promised to consult with the Soviet Union in advance before taking any significant measures, and the Soviet Union responded by providing advanced weapons to Egypt, including MiG-23 and Scud missiles, which were superior to the Phantom fighters in performance (Degang, 2018).

**Discussion**

Inspired by current references to antecedents to the Al-Dabaa power plant, this exercise in digital history builds from Yahia’s *Egypt and the Soviet Union, as well as Ginat’s Soviet Union and Egypt*. Informed by both the Ideological Scramble for Africa and Russia After the War, in order to question Pflugfelder’s twinned assertions that “rhetorical strategies coming from geoengineering advocates have been largely deceptive, hegemonic, deterministic, and exploitative” (Pflugfelder 2022, p. 7) and that “we need to understand the structure, content, purpose, and effect of these geo-constructivist discourses and sound an alarm about their deliberative directions” (Pflugfelder 2022, p. 8).

Primary sources consulted identify key moments in the geopolitical realignment of Egypt toward the U.S.S.R. and AI techniques are tested for their ability to generate cohesive prose. Primary sources also draw attention to Radio Moscow’s multi-valent broadcasting, including a shift from “Cairo” as a metaphor for China’s claim to offshore islands, to Egypt’s political capital. Secondary works provide necessary context: cinema and filmmaking, compensation from Austria, emergence of nuclear power, existentialist feminism, Intellectual history, music, the legal freedoms of Germans in the U.S.S.R. and of women in Egypt, and, finally, both Turkey’s foreign policy and that of the U.S. toward both China and India.
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