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The steady graph of Nasserite foreign policy witnessed sharp crests and falls under President Sadat. Exhibiting seemingly similar policies of Nasser, as pursued by him during 1967 to 1970, Sadat initially stepped into the foot-prints of his predecessor and achieved the zenith also. But soon he deviated from that path and began to manoeuvre some elusive efforts to rebuild Egypt in his own way. He restructured Egypt basing upon three major parameters such as regime legitimacy, domestic compulsion (both economic and military) and international option. Egyptian foreign policy objectives, basing upon these three parameters as articulated and acted upon by Sadat, underwent a fundamental change from that of Nasser. The tangibly defined and definitely pronounced goals of Nasserite foreign policy got a severe set-back under Sadat. It had also a profound impact upon the non-aligned image of Egypt which can be gauged from three broad phases:

(a) Pre-1973/1974 period,
(b) 1974 to 1978/1979 period, and
(c) post-1979 period.

Egypt, during Nasser era, was one of the pioneers of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and helped to establish the politico-juridical structure of non-alignment in Cairo from 5 to 12 June 1961. The world is indebted to Nasser, Nehru, Nkrumah, Sukarno and Tito, the protagonists of a movement which has become a vital factor in world development. The messages of the pioneers of the
movement as laid down by the Belgrade Non-Aligned Summit of 1961 and expanded by the subsequent summits is still alive and vivid. The movement is still concerned with issues of peace, alleviation of international tension and economic development of its peoples. Its principal effort was, and still remains today, the non-conciliatory and forceful struggle against colonialism, imperialism, Zionism and racial discrimination, the scourges from which millions continue to suffer. Over the years, despite many obstacles, the movement and the policy of non-alignment have achieved significant successes.

The seventies witnessed a number of changes in Egypt's foreign policy as well as in international field. While the Egypt-USSR Friendship Treaty of 1971, October War of 1973, breakdown of Egypt-USSR Friendship Treaty in 1976, Sadat's Jerusalem visit of 1977, Camp David Talks of 1978 leading to a Peace Treaty in 1979 were some of the important events in Egypt's foreign policy. The detente politics, oil embargo, increase in number of non-aligned countries and holding of NAM Summits in 1973, 1976, 1979 were other notable features at international level. While the changes in Egypt's foreign policy predominantly influenced Sadat's version of non-alignment, the global changes moulded Sadat's actions in the NAM.

The Cold War between the two power blocs had turned into detente in the seventies. This called for a change in approach on the part of non-aligned countries, particularly that dangers increased, as attempts were made to convince them that their movement had lost its raison d'être with the end of the Cold War and the dawn of world detente and accordingly, the mission of non-alignment had
been accomplished. But world realities contradicted that argument, and indicated the need to uphold non-alignment; challenges had changed only in form.¹

The non-aligned countries were beset by an acute economic crisis due to the rising price of petroleum and the growing arms-trade as a result of increasing military confrontation. This situation put the economic factor in the forefront superseding all others within the NAM. With a change in priorities, new countries gained prominence, especially those whose economic potentials enabled them to help solve the problems of the group.

The seventies also saw the increase in the number of the non-aligned countries. They numbered twenty-five at the Belgrade NAM Summit of 1961, forty-seven at the Cairo NAM Summit of 1964, fifty-four at the Lusaka NAM Summit of 1970, seventy-five at the Algiers NAM Summit of 1973, Eighty-six at the Colombo NAM Summit of 1976 and Ninety-two at the Havana NAM Summit of 1979.²

Most of the Third World countries had joined the non-aligned group. This increase in number led to the disappearance of the pioneering leadership. Non-alignment moved from individual initiatives to group action. A group approach and method had to necessarily differ from those followed by its pioneering leadership.


Consequently, Egypt's role in the seventies was that of cooperation within the movement and consolidation of non-alignment.³

During Sadat's period three non-aligned Summits were convened under group leadership which were instrumental in preventing the collapse of the movement. The problems which the non-aligned group were facing reached the extent of wars between members of the group as well as acute political struggles; a situation which had not existed before. Indeed, the survival of non-alignment was, in itself, a tremendous achievement. The policy of Egypt during that stage mainly took the form of cooperation with the countries of the group, and consultation at bilateral level to workout means whereby to secure the survival of the movement, and find solutions to the group's problems.⁴ It should be noted that the Sadatian Egypt, in spite of all odds, could be able to participate actively in the three non-aligned Summits and other conferences held during his time and could be able to redefine the goals of the movement. In fact, Sadat's Egypt reaffirmed the earlier defined five main components of non-alignment such as:

1. an independent policy based on peaceful co-existence;
2. support for the national liberation movements;
3. the refusal to subscribe to collective military alliances that include a super-power;
4. the refusal to sign bilateral military alliances that include a Super Power;

and

³ Egypt Govt. Document II, p.13
⁴ ibid.
(5) the refusal to grant military bases to a Big Power.\textsuperscript{5}

These five principles have been the golden rules of NAM which have guided Egypt's actions right from the Belgrade Summit of 1961.

The Fourth non-aligned Summit and the first in the Sadat period was held at Algiers, the capital city of Algeria, from 5-9 September 1973.\textsuperscript{6} Sadat attended this conference and along with other participants noted that over half the countries of the world, representing the majority of the world population, attended this conference. The number and level of participants and the general tenor of the meeting are an indicator of the vitality and dynamism of non-alignment. Sadat said:

"The pioneers of non-alignment were a select few, but now they represent the majority of the world citizenry".\textsuperscript{7} Sadat emphasized upon political freedom as a startoff to economic and social liberation. The political liberation only could lead to the control of one's economic resources by a free country. He also made it clear not to let the non-aligned nations be used as a fuel for war; their land as an arena for battles; and their countries as military bases. He claimed that the policy of non-alignment had not lost its importance in the era of detente. Rather in the light of the prevailing detente, it was imperative for the non-aligned nations

\textsuperscript{5} Addresses delivered at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Havana, 3-9 September 1979, [hereafter Addresses, Sixth NAM Summit] p.186.

\textsuperscript{6} NAM Documents, 1961-82, p.108.

to act together to bring about peace with justice. The justice, which Sadat emphasized, must be political, so that no more aggression, domination or imperialism would exist; social, so that racism and discrimination would be eliminated; and economic, so that no longer there would be robbery, monopoly and exploitation. To corroborate such a foundation Sadat added:

(1) We must coordinate our thought, act in unison and take the appropriate steps which could serve the cause of international justice as it relates to specific problems.... We believe that our joint stand carries a weight in the international community.

(2) We must act so that the non-aligned may enforce respect for law and for United Nations principles and objectives. We have to begin from reinforcing the self-reliant forces of each of us, to the best of each one's ability, while building up solidarity in our defenses. Thus, we could resist anyone who wishes to exploit our resources or monopolize our means of defense.... Any aggression on a member state of the NAM, must be considered as harmful to the security of the rest. We must withstand this aggression and take joint measures against it, in terms of extending aid to the victim. In the final analysis, an aggression which begins against one member-state, is actually directed against all of us.

(3) Politics of detente will, by necessity, take many problems out of United Nations jurisdiction. Therefore, the non-aligned nations must strengthen United Nations role and effectiveness in resolving international conflicts. This obligates us to execute the decisions of the international body and all the clauses of its charter, including sanctions, when the United Nations fails to avert aggression by
other means. Sadat reiterated that the political and economic struggles were interwoven and complementary of each other. The Middle East, placed at the heart of the non-aligned world, is engaged in an awesome struggle which provides a living example of the provocations launched against the non-aligned policies. This struggle shall determine in the long run not only the future of this region but also the future of the unity of non-aligned nations. He continued emphatically in the Algiers conference:

We brought here our marked confidence in the prospects of a broadening front within the non-aligned world, which aligns itself with our problems - its problems... We want to achieve peace (salaam) with justice in our region as well as progress and prosperity so that we could partake of the peace and prosperity of the non-aligned countries and the whole world. Peace, however, can be achieved only contingent upon a full withdrawal of the Israeli forces of aggression from all Arab territories, and upon safeguarding the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, who have been insisting on their right to self-determination. We believe that our non-aligned countries shall not only condemn Israeli and Zionist policies as well as those who support those policies, but that our resolutions can effect the transition from talks to deeds...

'What the American press has been terming a war to conquer the desert' is nothing but a scheme to control the resources of developing countries, amounting to a sheer revival of colonialism. Thus, we believe that our non-aligned countries shall not only condemn Israeli and Zionist policies as well as those who support these policies, but that our resolutions can effect the transition from talks to deeds.9

Egypt had striven hard during the First and Second non-aligned Summits, in Belgrade and Cairo respectively, to attain peace and prosperity for all people, by means of reconfirming the principles of peaceful co-existence and acting

---

8 Address to the Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries on Algiers, Radio Cairo, 6 September 1973, quoted in Raphael Israeli, n.7, pp.422-23.

towards a constructive international cooperation between members of the world community. Following the Third Summit at Lusaka, and the joint evaluation of the international situation, Egypt had continued to act so as to spare the world the horrors of war and to relax international tensions which was caused both inside and outside the United Nations. It should be noted that the United States had cast her veto for the fifth time in the Security Council in July 1973 reconvened to vote on the non-aligned draft resolution regarding the Arab-Israeli issue. Out of 15 members who attended this meeting of the Security Council 14 had expressly condemned Israeli imperialism and the policy of Zionism but unfortunately it succumbed to the U.S. veto.\textsuperscript{10} It is pertinent to note here that it was the time when Egypt was still depending on USSR both economically and militarily in its foreign policy option and the October War - the turning point - was yet to come. Thus, the Egyptian antagonism towards the United States was overt.

The Fourth non-aligned Summit was held under the shadow of shifting international environment. Sadat, along with other Heads of States and Government of the non-aligned countries, noted with satisfaction that the development of international relations had confirmed the vitality and lasting value of the aims, principles and practice of the policy of non-alignment. The participants also noted that peace was not even close to being a certainty in all parts of the world as particularly in Middle East, Cambodia, Africa where there has been a new outbreak of colonial wars of extermination and aggression against independent states; and in Latin America, where the colonial situation still

\textsuperscript{10} Israeli Raphel, n.7, pp.414-24.
exists and where imperialism conspires against the sovereignty and security of states. The participants reaffirmed the determination of the non-aligned countries to strictly observe the principles of sovereign equality and territorial integrity of all states; to refrain from the threat or use of force, and to settle their disputes by peaceful means, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.\textsuperscript{11}

The situation in the Middle East continues to give cause for great concern. Israel’s obstinacy in pursuing the policy of aggression, expansion and annexation, as well as the Israeli policy of oppressing the inhabitants of the territories which they have occupied by force, are a challenge to the international community, to the United Nations and to the universal declaration on human rights and are a threat to international peace and security. Calling attention to the inadmissibility of the forcible annexation of territories the conference called upon Israel to withdraw from all occupied territories forthwith and unconditionally, and to undertake the obligation to aid Egypt, Syria and Jordan with all means in the liberation of their occupied territories.\textsuperscript{12}

Egypt, along with other non-aligned countries, held that the restoration of the national right to the Palestinian people is a fundamental pre-condition for the establishment of an equal and lasting peace in this area. The struggle of the Palestinian people to recover their homeland which was taken from them is an integral part of the struggle of all nations against colonialism. The non-aligned

\textsuperscript{11} NAM Documents, 1961-82, p.94.
\textsuperscript{12} ibid, p.94.
countries were highly alarmed because of Israel's policy of aggression and expansion, which represents, in fact, a severe assault against the sovereignty of the Arab people and a threat to their security and territorial integrity. Egypt, in the non-aligned group of countries, considered that Israel's policy of aggression and occupation of Arab territories deprives the countries in those regions of their right to exercise sovereignty over their natural resources, which is at variance with the aims of the non-aligned countries and the strategy of development of the United Nations and the resolutions of the United Nations confirming the right of states to exercise sovereignty over the natural resources located in all their territories.

Egypt, along with others, condemned Israel for having resorted since its inception to methods of the most brutal oppression and terrorism. The resolutions passed in the conference underlined that the military, economic, political and moral support of some Western powers, the USA in particular, has enabled Israel to pursue its policy of aggression and to prolong its occupation of Arab territories. Moreover, they (1) demanded that Israeli forces withdraw at once and unconditionally from all the Arab territories which they occupied after June 1967 War, (2) reaffirmed the full and effective support for Egypt, Syria and Jordan in their struggle for recovering their occupied territories with all means, (3) condemned the violation of human rights by Israel in the occupied Arab territories, and its refusal to apply the Geneva Convention of 1949 on the protection of the civilian population in war time, (4) denounced Israel's policy bent on altering the nature of the occupied territories and considered that such actions represent war
crimes and a challenge to humanity, as stated in a resolution of the 28th meeting of the Human Rights Commission.  

The non-aligned group, in which Egypt was an active participant, also noted with concern that the struggle of the Palestinian people to recover their usurped homeland was an integral part of the struggle of all peoples for self-determination, and against colonialism and racial discrimination. The resolutions of the conference contained the direct denunciation of Zionism as a form of racism and the Declaration on the struggle for national liberation which read: "Having exhausted all peaceful means, and faced with the tenacity of the colonial powers and the collaboration of their protectors, including members of NATO, the oppressed nations have no resource other than armed struggle as a way of eliciting respect for their right to self-determination and independence."

In an answer to the clarion call given by President Boumedienne of Algeria regarding the total liberation of Africa Egypt, along with other Arab states, said that there must be quid pro quo in the NAM: if they are asked to increase their material aid to African independence movements, the Africans, in return, must support Arab positions on the Middle East. Thus, the non-aligned Summit of

Algiers of 1973 marked the active support of Egypt in a group sphere where the major issues were discussed. Egypt's role in this Summit needs to be noted in the light of Egypt's attitude towards the West during this time. In fact, till this time, Egypt maintained the same old tempo as was witnessed in Nasserite era. The Fourth non-aligned Summit was succeeded by several other non-aligned conferences like the Lima conference which was held on 24 August 1975. This was a conference of foreign ministers/ambassadors of some non-aligned countries and was called to take a decision whether or not to move for Israel's suspension at the scheduled U.N. General Assembly meeting. Key delegations at the conference were privately seeking to reconcile the division between the Arab hard-liners who wanted a strong stand against Israel, not excluding its expulsion from the UN to be adopted and those wanting a mild stand. Egypt and Saudi Arabia appeared to have preferred a moderate approach in view of the US Secretary of State, Dr. Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy to bring about an interim agreement on Israel. This stand of Egypt should also be noted in the light of Egypt's new economic and military relationship with USA. The draft resolution, which was adopted at Lima conference, was based on a draft resolution fairly close to the one adopted with the backing of Egypt and the majority of African countries at the meeting of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) at Kampala in July 1975. It called for continued pressure on Israel to implement UN

---

17 The Hindustan Times, 29 August 1975.
resolutions, but made no reference to "expulsion" or suspension of Israel from the world organisation.\textsuperscript{18}

The Lima Conference and other conferences maintained the non-aligned tempo which even got reflected in several statements of representatives of some non-aligned states. Mr. Mohammed Atef El Nawawi, Ambassador for the Arab Republic of Egypt in Sri Lanka, in February 1976, in a lecture on "Egypt's Foreign Policy" that was sponsored by the Sri Lanka Foreign Correspondents' Association at the Conference room of the Hotel Taprobane, said:

In the present international climate the most 'lethal danger' threatening an independent nation was to fall within spheres of influence. To avoid that was the main principle of Egyptian policy of non-alignment. Since 1973 the Arab world had become a powerful group speaking for itself. The non-aligned countries had stood by Egypt and the Arab world and foremost among them in severing relations with Israel was Sri Lanka.\textsuperscript{19}

Egypt took a lead in maintaining the non-aligned spirit when Cairo became a venue for a special meeting of Arab countries, held in April 1976, in which the main issues to be taken up in the forthcoming Colombo NAM Summit of 1976 were discussed.\textsuperscript{20}

The Fifth non-aligned Summit at Colombo held from 16-19 August 1976 emphasised the significance of an international information order in the fields of information and mass communication which was as vital as a new international

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{18} \textit{The Hindustan Times}, 30 August 1975.
  \item \textbf{19} \textit{Ceylon Daily News}, 12 February 1976.
  \item \textbf{20} \textit{Ceylon Daily News}, 27 April 1976.
\end{itemize}
economic order. Whether the participants in the Colombo Summit gave a new direction to the NAM or not, there could be no question about the need for it. The anti-imperialistic slogans themselves no longer served the interests of most of the member countries, much less of the Third World as a whole. For instance, instead of continuing to denounce the United States for its support to Israel, Egypt, the country directly and in a sense most adversely affected, had come to depend on US goodwill to arrange for an honourable settlement with Israel. But this change in stand of Egypt should be analysed in the light of Egypt’s domestic compulsion of economic and military needs.

Thus, the main problem the non-aligned countries were facing was the economic issue, as Mrs. Bandarnaike, the then Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, had rightly pointed out. She said,

their solution calls for cooperation with, rather than antagonism, towards the West. For, apart from the oil-rich countries of the Gulf like Saudi Arabia, Iran, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates, it alone has the capacity, if it so wishes, to help the third world in a big way. The Soviet bloc of countries just do not have either the necessary resources or the institutional infrastructure in the shape of organisations like the World Bank to assist the developing nations as a whole on a significant scale.22

The inclination of Sadat’s Egypt towards USA corroborated this fact and this trend had led Sadat to annul the Egypt-USSR Friendship Treaty in 1976.

Colombo, the majestic port city of the Indian Ocean which is known as the Pearl of the Orient, was bedecked with flags and slogans of solidarity on 15


22 Times of India (Delhi), 11 August 1976. 
August 1976. The Heads of State and Government of 86 non-aligned countries representing more than half of the member states of the international community embracing the majority of the world's population had assembled to discuss vital political and economic questions. From Belgrade through Cairo, Lusaka, Algiers and now Colombo, the NAM had expanded in membership, content and significance. The Arab nations have been an integral part of the movement from its inception and its role has grown in impact as the movement has matured from a once almost laudable voice of a small group of developing nations to the authoritative command of the Third World. A founder member of the NAM, Egypt, has throughout been in the forefront of the activities of the movement together with others. Hence it shared the credit for the achievements of the movement so far.23

In this Fifth NAM Summit, President Sadat criticised the "big power interference" in the internal affairs of non-aligned countries.24 Egypt's crucial role in this NAM Summit could be gauged from the importance given to President Sadat as one of the regional leaders along with India's Premier, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Premier Burnhein of Guyana and Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus who spoke for Asia. The agenda of the conference and its office bearers, already processed in two stages by the officials - Co-ordinating Committee and the Foreign Ministers' Bureau - were adopted in a matter of minutes. Among the

24 Statesman (Delhi), 17 August 1976.
eighteen Vice-Presidents elected, Sadat was chosen to hold a position from Asia.25

Sadat, in his address to the conference on 16 August 1976, predicated some general concepts which might guide the non-aligned countries commensurate with their unshakable faith in the principles of non-alignment. He said:

(1) In the past, we had defined non-aligned as an abstention from joining international blocs, and as a positive partaking of international politics, without aligning with any particular bloc of power; this definition is now deficient and no longer serves the purposes of the last quarter of the twentieth century. Non-alignment should be expanded to include freedom of choice and freedom of will, independent of the pressures exerted by the powers, be they political, economic or otherwise. Along these lines Egypt has scored her achievements against racist colonialism and imperialism, by virtue of insistence on her free will and freedom of decision.

(2) As a group on the international scene, we ought to take the initiative instead of merely reacting. This will enable us to circumvent faith-accomplis that other powers are trying to force on us. We must express unequivocal collective views about all international problems of importance.

(3) We must accord to our mutual and collective solidarity a top priority in our international dealings in all of the political, military and economic domains.... We must achieve an inner boundless cohesion and solidarity.

(4) We must repel, jointly and resolutely, all attempt to interfere in the domestic affairs of any non-aligned country.

(5) We should not content ourselves with sterile decisions and announcements as a substitute to real action.26

He also emphasized that this conference which lent special emphasis upon solidarity and joint action entailed the following:


(1) We should plan the development of our economy so as to conform to the principles of our collective self-sufficiency, which is the best guarantee for the undoing of foreign influence and pressures.

(2) We must lend foremost priority to our economic and trade cooperation and to achieve a growing amount of economic integration and cooperation.\(^{27}\) In fact the economic resolution of this conference was co-sponsored by Egypt, Cuba, India, Guyana, Indonesia, Vietnam, Tunisia and Yugoslavia. It recalled the relevant provisions of the action programme for economic cooperation adopted by the Fourth NAM Summit. The resolution said that the members were strongly convinced of the need to set up a co-ordination council of non-aligned countries at government level for devising measures for cooperation and coordination of NAM countries.\(^{28}\) The Summit, in which Egypt participated actively at a group level, reached the unanimous conclusion that the process of decolonisation had enforced its final and most decisive phase and hailed the growing struggle of the people of Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa, Palestine and other dependent territories.\(^{29}\) The Colombo NAM Summit of 1976 welcomed, with satisfaction, “the successful struggle against Zionism and the

\(^{27}\) ibid, p.1361.


striking demonstration of the capacity for struggle of the Arab people in their liberation war of October 1973 against Israeli forces of aggression.\textsuperscript{30}

The Sixth Summit of Heads of State and Government of non-aligned countries was held in Havana, Cuba, from 3 to 9 September 1979. The representatives of ninety-two members of the NAM met. Fifty-four heads of state, twenty national liberation movements, states and organisations and eighteen states and organisations with guest status attended the conference.\textsuperscript{31} Boutros Ghali, the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, represented Egypt in this NAM Summit. In addition to the general problems faced by the non-aligned countries, the Summit took up some other controversies. Egypt's continued non-aligned status, the Algeria-backed liberation struggle by Polisario in Western Sahara against Morocco supported by the U.S. and Egypt, oil prices for the poorer developing countries and of course the Kampuchean issue were some of them.\textsuperscript{32} The ensuing debate on non-alignment, and on the Middle East was a continuation of the debate started at the two immediately previous meetings, in Algiers in 1973 and Colombo in 1976. However, this time some new and significant variations were added to the standard rhetoric. With the NAM tilting towards the Soviet Union under Castro's guidance, the Middle East issues at the

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{31} Addresses, Six NAM Summit, 1979, p.881.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Amrit Bazar Patrika}, 4 September 1979.
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sixth Summit were now judged within the context of US-USSR rivalry rather than from the perspective of a neutral Third World.  

By mid-day on the extended day of the Sixth non-aligned Summit broad agreements had been reached on most of the divisive issues that had dominated the meet but the controversial Arab move to suspend Egypt from the movement had still to be disposed of. The main point of dispute was whether the Summit should condemn the Camp David Accords and the parties by name or should merely disapprove of "partial solutions". While the Arab group with the backing of the radicals had been pushing for strong condemnation and the naming of the parties including the United States, the African bloc had been opposed to condemning the Camp David Agreements and the parties by name. Replying to Premier Castro's denunciation of Egypt's "treasonous action", Boutros Ghali declared: "It is because Sadat is an authentic revolutionary that he went to Jerusalem to liberate Palestine. We are the only Arab power fighting to liberate Palestine. One does not have to agree with our procedure, but one cannot say that we have become the gendarme of American imperialism".  

Egypt fought back forcefully against its critics describing its treaty with Israel as a non-aligned victory. Egypt's Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Boutros Ghali, told the Summit's plenary session that he would like to stretch out his hand to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), one of Egypt's most

severe critics over the peace treaty, and pledged that Egypt would struggle until the creation of a Palestinian state.\footnote{The Hindu (Madras), 9 September 1979.} Ghali expounded:

President Sadat's initiative of proposing peace and justice to the enemy in November 1977 was a truly revolutionary action that is in the purest militant, progressive, Third World traditions of the movement of non-aligned countries, in spite of all the allegations, accusations and lucubrations by certain parties. This historic initiative, that we support and will continue to support with determination and strength, leads, has always led and will continue to lead to the establishment of peace in our territories and a search for a peaceful solution to the Palestinian problem, in accordance with the desires of the Palestinian people - the victims of oppression exercised not only by their enemies but also, it must be said, by some of our Arab brothers. By signing a peace treaty with Israel, Egypt has recovered all its territories that were occupied by the enemy and has re-established its territorial integrity. This is doubtless an Arab victory, an African victory and a non-aligned victory, of which we should all be proud. By signing another treaty at the same time, Egypt obtained an agreement in principle for the evacuation of Israeli troops from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and for the Palestinians' right to establish their own Provisional Government, that will negotiate with the Israelis to determine the definitive status of their homeland. It is the Palestinians and they alone who should determine their future. Neither Egypt nor any other Arab state can pretend to speak on behalf of the Palestinians. Here, during the Sixth Summit conference, in Havana, before this august assembly, before all of you, I offer my hand in friendship to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). I reaffirm Egypt's solemn and militant commitment to continue to struggle for our Palestinian brothers until a Palestinian state has been created. Together, we will be able to oppose the expansionist and colonialist desires of the state of Israel. Together, we will be able to force Israel to renounce its attacks, that the world condemns. Together, within the framework of this Movement, we will be able to win.\footnote{Addresses, Six NAM Summit, 1979, pp.190-91.}

The non-aligned Summit, throughout rocked by the intra-Arab controversy over Egypt's action in making peace with Israel separately and by the thorny problem of Kampuchean representation, ended on 9 September 1979 after putting
off decisions on both issues. On Kampuchean issue the conference decided to refer the question of the representation of Kampuchea to the Co-ordinating Bureau, which would act as an ad hoc committee; to continue analysing this question; and to submit a report to a subsequent ministerial conference.37

At the end of the all-night session the Summit decided to condemn the Camp David Agreement between Egypt and Israel and the partial agreements reached by them but shelved, until 1981, the persistent demand by hardline Arab states for the suspension of Egypt from the movement.

The approved resolution which angered Egypt, was on the recommendation of a twenty-two member Summit steering committee presided over by President Castro. Ghali referred to a "brutal minority" which dreamt of putting the movement under its trusteeship - seen as a reference to the Cuban-led radicals in the organisation. Ghali defended his government's action and assailed his Arab critics by saying: "Your hands are full of blood and you are trying to wipe the blood off on Egypt's back. Our hands are clean."38

However the conference, in its resolution no.2 on the question of Palestine, reaffirmed its recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people including (a) the right of Palestinians to return to their homes and property from which they were expelled (b) the right of self-determination without external interference, and (c) the right to establish an independent sovereign state in Palestine, condemned energetically all the partial agreements and separate

37 ibid, p.885.

38 Asian Recorder, 8-14 October 1979, p.15118.
treaties which constitute a flagrant violation of the rights of the Arab nation and of the Palestinian people, the principles of the charters of the Organisation of African Unity (O.A.U.) and the United Nations and the resolutions adopted in different international forums on the question of Palestine, which impede the aspirations of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland, to achieve self-determination and to exercise full sovereignty over their territories.

Bearing in mind that the Camp David Agreements and the Egypt-Israel Treaty of 26 March 1979 constitute a partial agreement and a separate treaty that means total abandonment of the cause of the Arab countries and an act of complicity with the sustained occupation of the Arab territories and violate the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine, to condemn the Camp David Agreements and the Treaty between Egypt and Israel.

Within this context, the Heads of State or Government considered the proposal that the Government of Egypt be suspended as a member of the movement of non-aligned countries for having violated its principles and resolutions. The conference decided to entrust the Co-ordinating Bureau, acting as an ad hoc committee, with the examination of the damage caused to the Arab countries, particularly the Palestinian Arab people, by the conduct of the Egyptian Government in signing the Camp David Agreements and the Egyptian-Israeli Separate Peace Treaty. The ad hoc committee will report on this matter to the Ministerial Conference to be held in New Delhi which will take a decision regarding the status of Egypt in the movement.39

The proposed meeting of non-aligned foreign ministers of 1981, scheduled to be held in New Delhi, was authorized to decide the suspension issue aided by an *ad hoc* committee.

The expanded co-ordinating bureau (of which India was a member) would act as the *ad hoc* committee and examine "the damage caused to Arab countries, particularly the Arab people of Palestine, by the behaviour of the Egyptian Government after signing the Camp David and the separate peace treaty with Israel. The *ad hoc* committee would send its report to the New Delhi meeting, which will decide the "status" of Egypt in the movement, Egypt is a founder member of the NAM.

Ghali, defending continuously his Government's action in concluding a peace treaty with Israel, said in this important conference that there was no consensus behind the formula adopted by the Summit. He said, twenty-six countries had supported Egypt. 40

The Summit's decision on the issue of suspension of Egypt followed an accord reached earlier in the 25-member conference bureau. The agreement was based on a resolution which itself was the result of an agreement between the African bloc and the Arabs. The African group was opposed to condemning the Camp David Accords and the Peace Treaty by mentioning the countries involved by name and insisted on following the recent Organisation of African Unity Declaration adopted in Monrovia which condemned partial settlements but it relented.

Yugoslavia which had been defending Egypt all along did not also put up a fight. It was left to India to tone down the resolution and go to the aid of Egypt, which it did, despite the reaction of the radical Arabs who supply oil. The Minister of External Affairs of India, Mr. S. N. Mishra, who participated in the bureau meeting, raised India's voice of opposition to the suspension move and suggested some amendments, most of which were accepted. He candidly conveyed that the main issue was rather the intransigence of Israel which was the villain of the piece and nothing should be done to divert attention away from this aspect. The Egypt-Israeli Treaty could not be condemned totally as some parts of it benefited the people of Egypt. Mr. Mishra, therefore, urged that the bureau tone down the language and substitute "cannot condone" for "condemn". This was not, however, acceptable to the Arabs and the radicals who insisted on a strong condemnation. Another suggestion made by Mishra was that the issue of suspension be referred to the Co-ordinating Bureau rather than to an ad-hoc committee. The difference would be technical but the bureau had clearly laid down procedures and any number could attend its meetings. The conference bureau finally decided that the issue could be referred to the Co-ordinating Bureau functioning as an ad hoc committee and also agreed to give Egypt the right to defend itself. Mr. Mishra said that India did not favour suspension but could not object to the matter being discussed in the Co-ordinating Bureau. The Bureau would only examine the question and not take any decision. It would report to the New Delhi Ministerial Conference to be held in 1981 and the prospect of Egypt being suspended was
remote. It should be noted here that Prime Minister Morarji Desai of India had earlier (on 2 June 1979) said that whatever be the disagreements between Egypt and the Arab countries there was no provision to remove Egypt from the NAM so long as it fulfilled the conditions of membership. One might or might not agree with, what Egypt had done, but as long as Egypt did not violate the conditions of membership of the NAM no action could be taken against it.42

What was important of this Havana NAM Summit was that India played a crucial role to save Egypt and "India and Yugoslavia re-wrote the Cuban draft to make it more acceptable to the majority."43 The role of Egypt in this conference was to support the non-aligned issues and to cooperate with non-aligned countries at group level to save the NAM. As its own survival was at stake, it could not propose major solutions in this conference at the individual level as it did during the previous conferences. It is pertinent to note here that the Sixth NAM Summit portrayed the intra-NAM conflicts. President Castro, in his opening address, strongly attacking what he described as US interference in the NAM, alleged that a campaign had been mounted by "Yankee Imperialists, their old and new allies," firstly to prevent the holding of the conference in Havana (this having been opposed by several countries including Egypt, notably at the Ministerial Conference of the non-aligned countries in Belgrade in July 1978) and secondly

41 The Hindu, 10 September 1979.
42 Deccan Chronicle (Hyderabad), 2 June 1979.
to obtain modifications in the Cuban draft of the final documents.\textsuperscript{44} In fact, the draft was heavily modified and rewritten by India and Yugoslavia.

Danger to the basic concept of non-alignment arose not only from Cuba's attempt at ideological partisanship but also by the anger aroused against Egypt.\textsuperscript{45} This danger was averted by the vital role played by some of the NAM countries like India. Egypt continued its cooperation hoping for the best in the ministerial conference scheduled to be held in New Delhi in February 1981.

The 93-member non-aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference began at New Delhi from 9-13 February 1981. The speculation was that some of the controversies inside the NAM and some of the non-aligned issues would be solved. The stage for this conference was set by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the then Indian Premier.\textsuperscript{46} Mrs. Gandhi opened the conference with a speech in which she called for unity to be maintained within the NAM. However, the meeting was marked by deep divisions, notably over the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan dating from December 1979 and Cuba's support for the Soviet Union on this issue, which was regarded as endangering the "anti-bloc" commitment of the movement. The unity of the movement was further threatened by issues which had already emerged at the September 1979 Havana Summit such as the problem of Kampuchea and the proposed suspension of Egypt from the movement and newer issues like the Iraq-Iran War. Moreover on 29 September
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1980, it was reported from Cairo that President Sadat had suggested to Saudi Arabia that a joint Egyptian-Saudi naval force should police the Persian Gulf and that the President of Egypt had granted the United States permission to set up a base at Ras Banas, on the Red Sea, opposite the Saudi Arabian coast, as a third US base in Egypt, in addition to those west of Cairo and at Qena (400 miles South of the capital). And on 2 November 1980, President Sadat said that the Treaty of Friendship between Syria and Soviet Union and the Iraq-Iran War were signs of dangerous developments in the Middle East.\footnote{Keesing's Contemporary Archives, Records of World Events, vol.27, 7 August 1981, p.31010.}

No progress was made on the Kampuchean issue, the Indian Government having extended invitations neither to the Pol Pot regime deposed in January 1979 nor to the Soviet and Vietnam backed Heng Samrin Government, although the ambassador of the latter government (newly accredited to New Delhi on 6 February 1981) was permitted to attend the inaugural session of the conference.

The final declaration called for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Afghanistan and Kampuchea. On the issue of the Middle East, the ministers recalled paragraphs of 107 and 108 of the Declaration of Havana and declared that the Camp David Agreements and the Egypt-Israel Treaty have no validity in so far as they purport to determine the future of the Palestinian people and of the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967. They condemned also any initiative based on that approach or those agreements. They also condemned any partial or separate solution and any agreement that would harm the rights of the Arab countries and the Palestinian people, violate the principles and
resolutions of the movement of non-aligned countries and the United Nations General Assembly or prevent the liberation of Jerusalem and the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and the attainment and full exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights. But on the issue of suspension of Egypt the conference again deferred the decision to the next non-aligned Summit which was to be held in New Delhi in March 1983.

The New Delhi non-aligned Summit of March 1983 "endorsed and adopted" the Fez Peace Plan recognizing Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) as the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and guaranteeing their right to return home to set up an independent sovereign state with Jerusalem as its capital. It rejected the Camp David Accords as inadequate. But the long-standing controversy over proposals for Egypt's suspension from the NAM, which had been put forward in 1979 and had been reviewed and deferred by the foreign ministers in 1981, had apparently diminished by late 1982, when President Hosni Mubarak visited New Delhi on 1-2 December 1982. In February 1983, the second conference of journalists from non-aligned countries was held in Cairo and was attended by representatives of forty-five countries, including fourteen members of the Arab League.

51 Keesing's Contemporary Archives; Record of World Events, vol.29 (1983), no.8, Longman, p.32350.
After a Libyan call, in New Delhi NAM Summit on 8 March 1983, for the expulsion or suspension of Egypt from the NAM until Egypt tore up its 1979 peace treaty with Israel, President Mubarak addressed the Summit on the same day in what was described as a speech marking Egypt's reintegration into the movement. While in New Delhi, President Mubarak also had meetings with Iraqi, Jordanian, Kuwaiti, Lebanese and Qatari leaders. Egypt's contacts were, thus, apparently had been restored to some extent with all Arab countries except Libya and Syria. The assassination of President Sadat also seemed to reduce the virulence of the attack by some Arab radicals. President Mubarak was more acceptable, especially after his reaction to Israeli military attack on Lebanon in 1982. In his speech President Mubarak called for resolution of the Palestinian question by putting into motion proposals for replacing Israeli occupation of Gaza and the West Bank by a Palestinian authority.52

Thus, Sadat's period witnessed critical postures of Egypt in the NAM. While pre-October War period was a period when Sadat pursued the trail blazed by Nasser, the period of post-October War till 1978/1979 was a period when Sadat followed ambiguous policies which got reflected in Egypt's policy in the movement. During the post-1979 period Sadat tried to recover the Egyptian image of fallen-horse-man. While this process of recovery was gaining momentum, Sadat was assassinated and the Presidential mantle was soon transferred to Hosni Mubarak who ventured to rectify the Sadati wrongs and get back Egypt's international stature.

52 ibid, p.32353.
These developments in Egypt's policy in the NAM during that period are easily explainable in the context of Egypt's domestic and foreign policies. The Algiers NAM Summit of 1973 noted Sadat's critical comments of United States as till this time Sadat was using USSR as a lever to get the help from USA, and the October War of 1973 warranted the modest help of USSR. Sadat dropped his Soviet option thereafter. Since 1974 Sadat had tried to compensate the Soviet help with the help of United States. Sadat's perception of "U.S. effort that only could solve the Arab-Israeli dispute", and his consideration, of "USA as a better ally than the USSR" led him to come closer to the USA and the West vis-a-vis Israel. In the process he challenged the Arabs, even traditional Arabs. A number of Arab states pursue either an anti-US or an anti-Soviet policy but few of them pursue an open "anti-Arab policy" as Sadat did.\(^5\) He, thus, had to face the consequences. Arabs not only laid down the final norms for the boycott of Egypt by the Arabs in the ministerial council of the Arab League at its meeting in Baghdad on 27 March 1979, but also tried hard to suspend Egypt from the NAM as on the Havana Summit. Fortunately countries like India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia as also several African states and some Arab states like Oman and the Sudan saw to it that Egypt was not expelled from the NAM.

Thus, the policy of Egyptian non-alignment and Egyptian role in the NAM became feeble in contrast to the earlier resolute position made under Nasser. Thanks to the foundation laid by Nasser and the support base given to Sadat, during his lean periods, by Organisation of African Unity, India and Yugoslavia

which not only neutralised the Egyptian opposition groups like Arab League and Organisation of Islamic Conference (OIC), and also Latin American countries like Cuba but also rejuvenated Egyptian action in the NAM. Hosni Mubarak, who took the rein, nonetheless, started playing a crucial role in revitalizing Egypt's lost position.