

ZITATE, 12. NO

2. April 1946, Stabschefs der britischen Streitkräfte:

“Control of the area Egypt-Palestine would provide the Russians with a ready-made base area which could be built up by the short sea route from Russia itself and which then would enable them to extend their influence both westward and southward into Africa. Such an extension would prejudice our position both in North-West Africa ... and in the Indian Ocean. It would be the first step in a direct threat to our main support area of Southern Africa.”

Protokoll des Defense Committees, 5. April 1946, zur Haltung des Außenministers Bevin:

“The Foreign Secretary said that he agreed with the Chiefs of Staff that we must maintain our influence in the Mediterranean. It was impossible to retain the necessary diplomatic strength if military support was withdrawn, and in his view, Russia only respected nations which had the power to command respect. At the same time, our presence in the Mediterranean served a purpose other than military, which was very important to our position as a great power ... abandoning this area would mean a great loss to both our peace and wartime economy, trade and man power.”

29. November 1943, Schreiben von R. M. A. Hankey, Mitarbeiter im Foreign Office:

“If we are not to produce a Mahdist or pan-Arab revolution, which will spread from wherever it breaks out to the whole Arab world, we must co-operate with the Nationalists in each country, even if they are difficult, in helping them along the road of constitutional progress towards cultural, economic and also possibly political unity of the Middle East.”

W. Roger Louis, The British Empire in the Middle East, 1945-1951. Arab Nationalism, the United States and Postwar Imperialism, OUP 1984:

“The history of the British Empire in the Middle East during this period may be read as the unsuccessful attempt at conversion from formal rule and alliances to an informal basis of equal partnership and influence. Here is the final paradox. The purpose of this transformation was the perpetuation of Britain as a great ‘world power’. Non-intervention thus becomes intervention by other means.