Mohamed Hosni Mubarak succeeded Anwar el-Sadat as the President of Egypt after the assassination of Sadat by some Islamic radicals belonging to al-Jihad group during a military parade on the 'Day of Triumph' - 6 October 1981 at Cairo. That was the day of the annual military parade held in observation of the Egyptian victory in the October War of 1973. Hosni Mubarak, who was the Vice-President at that time, had also the distinction of rejuvenating the Egyptian Air Force. He was entrusted by Nasser with the vital task of training the Egyptian Air Force officers after the catastrophe of June 1967. Later he was appointed as Chief of Staff of the Air Force. Since he was not identified with any of the power factions that operated under Nasser and during Sadat's early advent to power, Sadat took him into confidence to control the air force by making him the commander-in-chief in April 1972. Later, Sadat appointed him the vice-president by replacing Hussein Shafei in April 1975. While Sadat was not groomed by Nasser to become his successor, Mubarak was groomed by Sadat to become his successor. While Nasser and Sadat had seized power, Mubarak, in contrast, did not seize it. Rather, he inherited it. Though Mubarak lacked the revolutionary skills of both Nasser and Sadat, still he had gained stature as a successful commander of the air force especially after the October War. He came to power
through a constitutional process -nominated by the People's Assembly and confirmed in a public referendum.¹

Egypt, which Mubarak inherited, was a complex legacy of both Nasser and Sadat eras. Thus, Mubarak had to march forward cautiously. While he tried to revive some of the memorable imprints of Nasser for which he was verily venerated by the Egyptians and Arab people, he had to moderate the path of Sadat for which he was assassinated. He had to move tactically to save Egypt when it was facing the challenge of Islamic radicalism on the domestic political scene, suffering ostracization from Arab League and regional Arab states and was still languishing in the non-aligned world. Though Mubarak has not been able to create any sensational history still his policy of equilibrium in domestic, regional and global spheres has contributed substantially to the stability of Egypt. His varied roles like the attempt in restoring Egypt's status in the Arab hegemony, in enhancing Egypt's non-aligned position amidst special relations with United States in economic and military field are, nonetheless, arresting nodes of attraction.

After assuming presidential office in October 1981, Mubarak perceived the rising threat of Islamic radicalism, threat that had started taking a more violent form during the last stage of Sadat's reign, particularly due to Sadat's foreign policy towards United States and Israel. The emergence of Islamic radicalism was "partly due to rapid and unbalanced social change like unbalanced development of education which even made the university campuses a special

¹ Ann M. Lesch, "Democracy in Doses: Mubarak Launches his Second Term as President", Arab Studies Quarterly, vol.11, no.4, Fall 1989, pp.88-89.
breeding ground of Islamic resurgence."\(^2\) Also it was "partly due to the westernisation of the traditional Islamic society."\(^3\) It was the alliance with the United States and peace with Israel that were seen as a capitulation to infidel powers.

It is true that the Islamic radicalism had begun with Sadat's encouragement of the Ikhwan. Although technically banned since 1954, the Ikhwan al-Muslimun or the Muslim Brotherhood had enjoyed de facto recognition by the Egyptian Government since mid-1970s when Sadat had sought their help in countering his leftist and Nasserite opponents.\(^4\) But the appeal to Islamic values, as part of Sadat's strategy of containment of the Nasserites, did not produce its intended results. The Ikhwan protested against the so-called 'normalisation of relations with Israel' by Sadat through his Jerusalem visit in 1977, Camp David Accords of 1978 leading to a Peace Treaty in 1979 and offer of asylum to 'Shah or Tyrant of Iran'.\(^5\) The media attacks on Sadat's Jerusalem visit and the Camp David Accords prompted a halt by Sadat in 1981 to their publications - al-Dawa (The Call), al-l'tisam (steadfastness), and al-Mukhtar al-Islami (The Islamic Digest) and

---


they were not spared in Sadat’s September 1981 crack-down on the opposition.\textsuperscript{6} In the crack-down Sadat clamped down most of the prominent Islamic radicals like Omar Telemessani, the Ikhwan’s leader; and Sheikh Abdel-Hamid Kishk, whose writings and ‘bawling cacophony of pronouncements’ had a broad following not just in Egypt but also in the Arab world.\textsuperscript{7} But the rising trend of the Ikhwan movement became a major force for Sadat to counter and it was this force that later contributed substantially to the militancy of al-Jehad radicals to choke the breath of Sadat in October 1981, and an attempted coup to overthrow Mubarak. It even worked up a plan to establish a country-wide system of councils to run Egypt as an Islamic Caliphate. This threat was perceived by Mubarak quite early at the advent of his reign. Thus, when Sadat stunned Egypt by arresting around 1536 radicals, Mubarak secured another wave by arresting around seven-hundred radicals.\textsuperscript{8} But, interestingly, Mubarak also tried to mend forces with the political opposition particularly the Socialist Labour Party led by Ibrahim Shukri, who was a particular target of Sadat. Mubarak also released Mr.Hassanein Heikal, the influential journalist. Several other important political leaders like Khalid Mohiuddin of the pro-Soviet Communist Party, Mr.Mustafa Kamal Murad of the Liberal Party, some leaders of the Wafd Party and even some moderate leaders


\textsuperscript{8} \textit{International Herald Tribune} (Paris), 8 January 1982.
of the Muslim Brotherhood were released by Mubarak.\(^9\) Thus, after cracking down and mending up political opposition forces, wherever necessary, Mubarak turned his eyes to the domestic economic and military scene. Mubarak took the leadership in an era when Egypt was still officially suffering ostracization from the Arab world and, thus, was legally unable to secure the Arab aid. Egypt had already broken economic and military relations with USSR. It was in this perspective that Mubarak had to maintain the tempo of economic and military relations with United States as engineered by Sadat. A study of economic and military relations of Egypt with the United States shows that Mubarak has been able to secure a large amount of economic and military aid in the 1980s and also in the early part of the 1990s.

In 1982, Egypt secured $1064.9 million from the United States as economic aid while the amount in 1983 was $1005.1 million, in 1984 it was $1104.1 million and in 1985 it rose up to $1292.1 million which was even more than what Egypt got during Sadat's 1979 and 1980 fiscal years. This trend continued till 1991-92 and in 1993 it started diminishing. While it had received $4466.2 million from 1982 to 1985, it received $5243.4 million from 1986 to 1990.\(^{10}\)

---

9 Ibid; and *Indian Express* (New Delhi), 2 March 1982.

Table-1: Economic Assistance Given to Egypt by USA: Fiscal Years 1982-94 (In millions of US dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Loans (A)</th>
<th>Grants (B)</th>
<th>Total (A+B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>262.0</td>
<td>802.9</td>
<td>1064.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>238.3</td>
<td>766.8</td>
<td>1005.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>237.5</td>
<td>866.6</td>
<td>1104.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>213.8</td>
<td>1078.3</td>
<td>1292.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986 &amp; 1987*</td>
<td>409.1</td>
<td>1899.4</td>
<td>2308.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>153.0</td>
<td>720.4</td>
<td>873.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>817.7</td>
<td>968.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>192.9</td>
<td>900.5</td>
<td>1093.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>160.1</td>
<td>837.8</td>
<td>997.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>892.9</td>
<td>933.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>753.3</td>
<td>753.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>601.2</td>
<td>606.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to non-availability of separate data for 1986 and 1987, they have been calculated and clubbed together.


It is also pertinent here to trace the military relations of Egypt with USA during the said period. Egypt had not only received a heavy amount of military aid but also could secure huge amount of arms from the United States. In the fiscal year 1982 Mubarak secured $902.4 million as military aid from which $700.0 million was in the form of loans and $202.4 million was in the form of grants. In the fiscal year 1983, military aid rose up to $1326.9 million out of which $900.0 million was in the form of loans and the rest were grants. In the fiscal year 1984, the aid rose further to reach a height of $1366.7 million out of which $900.0 million were loans and the rest were grants. It is interesting to note that in the fiscal year 1985, out of the $1167.7 million military assistance given to Egypt all were in the form of grants. Egypt, while had received $4772.4 million from 1982
to 1985 as military assistance, this assistance increased up to $6446.5 million from 1986 to 1990.\textsuperscript{11}

Table-2: Military Assistance to Egypt by USA: Fiscal Years 1982-1994 (in millions of US dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Loans (I)</th>
<th>Grants (II)</th>
<th>Total (I+II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>700.4</td>
<td>202.4</td>
<td>902.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>900.0</td>
<td>426.9</td>
<td>1326.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>900.0</td>
<td>466.7</td>
<td>1366.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>1176.7</td>
<td>1176.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986 &amp; 1987*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2549.6</td>
<td>2549.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td>1301.5</td>
<td>1301.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>1301.5</td>
<td>1301.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>1295.9</td>
<td>1295.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>1301.9</td>
<td>1301.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>1301.8</td>
<td>1301.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>1301.8</td>
<td>1301.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td>1300.8</td>
<td>1300.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to non-availability of separate data for 1986 and 1987, they have been calculated and clubbed together.


In addition to this huge amount of military assistance Egypt has also received US arms in a large scale. Since the 1980s till recent times Egypt's bulk of arms were coming from the United States. In fact the USSR, the major arms supplier during Nasser period, is totally absent in this sphere during this period. This trend had started from 1975-76 which continue till recently. The table below broadly shows the major arms transferred by United States to Egypt from 1970 to 1992.

\textsuperscript{11} ibid.
Table-3: Arms Transfer from USA to Egypt - 1970-1992

**Combat Aircraft**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-4 Phantom</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-16</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2C Hawkeye AEW planes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport airlarge</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache attack helicopters</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Armour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBT (main battle tanks)</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC (armoured personnel carriers)</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARV (armoured recovery vehicles)</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC armed with TOW anti-tank missiles</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH (Scy-propelled howitzer)</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH (towed howitzer)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Navy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knon-class frigates armed with Harpoon anti-ship missile and ASW helicopter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minesweeper (on order 1994)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Missiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM (surface to air HAWK system long range)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaperral short-range</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrow medium range</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinger man-portable</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASM (Air to Surface)

AGM-61A

Hell-fire for Apache helicopter

AAM (Air to air)

Sparrow radar guided

Sidewinder 1R guilder Anti-Tank Guided Missile

TOW

Ship-to-ship Missiles Harpoon

Source: Calculated on the basis of data given in the SIPRI publications.

Military relations between Egypt and the USA during Mubarak period is also significant from the point of the view that USA was enjoying a direct military presence in Egypt. USA's direct military presence in Egypt rested on the Peace Treaty of 1979 between Egypt and Israel under which multinational forces were formed to verify observance of the treaty, and also on the 1981 agreement allowing the USA to use Egyptian military bases with certain reservations in the part of Egypt. Joint US-Egyptian military manoeuvres were held after 1983. Joint military transport aviation exercises and also naval exercises involving warships of the US-Sixth Fleet (Sea Wind) was also being witnessed.¹²

Though military and economic relations with United States continued in an even pitch and United States continued to be the primary source of economic and military aid for Egypt till 1995, Mubarak tried to revive the relations with USSR in

his new foreign policy. This step can be viewed as a step of moderation by Mubarak against Sadat's America centric world policy. Mubarak reestablished a tentative relationship by inviting as many as sixty six Soviet technicians to work on Egypt's three major projects - the Aswan Dam, the Nag Harnadi Aluminium Plant and the Helwan Iron and Steel works. And vehement attacks are no longer encouraged in Cairo. The major diplomatic step in Egypt-Soviet relations took place on 7 July 1984 when Egypt and USSR agreement to upgrade their bilateral relations to ambassadorial level and in mid-September 1984 ambassadors were exchanged.

While ambassadors were being exchanged, the conflicting standpoints on the repayment of Egyptian debts were still unresolved. But subsequently an accord, or at least closer understanding, was achieved on that issue. In March 1987, the Soviet Union offered Egypt an agreed on the repayment of Cairo's military debt amounting to 1.4 billion pounds sterling (about $3.5 billion). After the final break with the Soviet Union, President Sadat had unilaterally suspended repayments for ten years, i.e., until 1986. Moscow now agreed to reschedule the debt over a period of twenty-five years at the usually low interest rate of two per cent, part of it repayable in goods which, due to their inferior quality, were often

unsaleable in open markets. This agreement paved the way for an expansion of bilateral trade, which was of particular interest to Egypt, and renewed supply of spare parts for the military sector where arms and equipment of Soviet origin reportedly still accounted for sixty-five percent of Egypt's stocks. It was also agreed to modernise industrial plants that had been built with Soviet assistance. The visit of Soviet Foreign Minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, to Cairo in February 1989 and Mubarak's visit to Moscow in May 1990 gave sound proofs of the normalisation of relations between Egypt and USSR. This change of attitude can be viewed particularly after a decline in international super-power tension in 1984 when Reagan was installed in White House and Gorbachev was installed in Kremlin.

Thus, Mubarak succeeded in maintaining a middle path in his foreign policy towards the USA and the then USSR.

While Mubarak has been able to strike a balance towards the USA and USSR he also tried and succeeded in restoring Egypt's status and position in the Arab world as well. Reassuring the United States of Egypt's continuing respect for its Camp David commitments, Mubarak tried to seize every opportunity to demonstrate that these obligations did not tie Egypt's hands regarding its Arab commitments. A series of such opportunity came in early 1980s when Israel invaded Lebanon in June 1982. Relations were further strained after the Sabra and Shatila massacre that had occurred on 8 September 1982 causing nearly

one-thousand deaths of Palestinian refugees. Matters were further complicated because of Israeli air raid on PLO headquarters in Tunis on 1 October 1985 and the Achille Lauro cruise liner affair of 7 October 1985. Egypt condemned the Israeli invasion of Lebanon of June 1982 that had resulted in eighteen thousand deaths, eighty-four percent of whom were civilians. The invasion occurred just six weeks after Israel’s withdrawal in an orchestrated ceremony in sight of border fence. Egypt also froze the normalisation process with Israel and cancelled planned official visits to Israel and Egyptian medical teams were allowed to travel to Lebanon. Egypt withdrew its ambassador, Saad Mortada, from Tel Aviv after the massacre of Palestinians in the camps of Sabra and Shatila, on the outskirts of Beirut, in September 1982 and refused to visit Jerusalem because its status as the capital of Israel was not accepted by the Arab states. The Egyptian navy also guarded the ship, across the Mediterranean, carrying Yassir Arafat when he left Lebanon in December 1983. Mubarak received him in Cairo in the same month when he was on one of his peripatetic rounds to gather support for the Palestinian fighters under siege in Lebanon.

---


20 Anthony McDermott, n.7, pp.82-83.

Events on the Arab-Israeli peace process had started moving further. Mubarak's Egypt hailed the new Arab willingness to negotiate under the Fez Charter which was passed in the second phase of the twelfth Arab Summit held in Fez from 6-9 September 1982. The Fez Charter, *inter alia*, put forward: "the establishment of a Palestinian state with Jerusalem as capital" (Point 6); "the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied in 1967" (Point 1); "the dismantling of settlements established by Israel ... after 1967"; and "the reaffirmation of the Palestinian people’s right to self-determination and the exercise of its imprescriptible and inalienable national rights under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO), its sole and legitimate representative (Point 4). The Gaza strip and the West Bank were to come under United Nations control for a transitional period. The UN Security Council was to guarantee 'peace between all nations in the region' and 'the respect of these principles'.  

Although the Fez Charter, which was a considerable improvement on the Fahd Plan, was rejected by the Israelis, still it had a wide impact in the Arab world. Egypt, though not a signatory to the proposals, still appreciated the new Arab willingness for negotiation with Israel. The Israeli invasion and its aftermath paved the way for Mubarak to support overtly and covertly the Palestinian cause. In addition to its condemnation of Israel, Mubarak extended military support to Iraq in its war with Iran from 1980-1988. Egyptian officers were sent as advisers, especially to the Iraqi Air Force, and many Egyptians were recruited into the Iraqi Army. According to a report, there were more than two-

---

hundred Egyptian military advisers present in Iraq and Egypt had sold arms and spares worth $8.2 billion to Baghdad by December 1987. Mubarak also cooperated with Jordan in its efforts to resolve the future of the West Bank and Gaza. These efforts of Mubarak had tremendous impact upon the Arab mind and helped to welcome Egypt to the Arab fold. Jordan restored its full diplomatic relations with Egypt on 25 September 1984. Djibouti followed the Jordanian line in the Autumn of 1986. However, Egypt's readmission to the Arab League was thwarted by Syria and Libya who took full advantage of the clause in the League Charter stipulating that all major decisions were to be taken by consensus. But this threat gradually vanished. At the Islamic Summit in 1987 at Kuwait, Egypt was informally back to the Arab fold. Mubarak participated in the Fifth Islamic Summit held at Kuwait from 26-29 January 1987. The emergency Arab League meeting at Amman in October 1987 and Mubarak's support to the Palestinian during these days had not only prompted Yasser Arafat to comment that the Arab world without Egypt was like a horse without a rider. Egypt was also made a co-founder of the Arab Cooperation Council (ACC), an economic organisation created in February 1989.

23 The Hindustan Times, New Delhi, 14 December 1987.
In March 1989 President Mubarak, along with King Hussein of Jordan and Yassir Arafat, the PLO chairman, held a joint news conference after meeting at Ismailia (Egypt) and urged Israel to respond sincerely to the overtures of Arab-Palestinian moderates to bring about a comprehensive, full and immediate solution of the West Asian problem. No doubt these developments solicited Egypt's readmission both in the Arab world and in the Arab League on 24 May 1989. Thus, Boutros Boutros Ghali, the then deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, commented that "Nineteen Eighty-nine, more than any other year in the past decade, was a bench-mark for Egyptian diplomacy and a prelude to the promise and challenge which we see for the decade ahead".28 Egypt formally returned to the Arab fold to the applause of the leaders of twenty-one members of the Arab League from which it had been expelled eleven years ago for signing the Camp David Accords with Israel.29 On 27 December 1989 Syria, one of the most important radical Arab states, resumed its diplomatic relations with Cairo.30 The Arab League headquarters finally returned to Cairo from its exile in Tunis with the former Egyptian Prime Minister, Esmat Abd al-Majid, as its Secretary-General. The formal decision was taken on 1 November 1990.31


30 Teheran Times, 11 January 1990.

31 "Arab League Transfer to Cairo: Tunisia Protests and Egypt Calls for Unity", News Reviews on West Asia (New Delhi, Institute for Defense Studies and Analysis), vol.22, no.12, December 1990, pp.613-14.
After resuming full membership in the Arab League, Mubarak's Egypt has been busy in demonstrating its Arab leadership role keeping intact its broad foreign policy towards the United States. The Iraq-Kuwaiti crisis of 1991 highlighted Egypt's key role. Although Mubarak's decision to join the US-led coalition forces resulted in minor popular discontent still there were no public demonstration like the food riots in Sadat days. Moreover, Egypt gained economically and militarily when United States wrote off over $7 million of Egyptian military debts. 32

Unlike the Sadat period, Mubarak's Egypt has been pursuing the goal of establishing a more unified Arab system by fostering closer relations with Syria, Libya and other Arab states including Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) states. Besides, Egypt is busy in demonstrating its commitment to the security of the Gulf states.

Mubarak has already displayed his deep concern for an Arab-Israeli peace in the region. Mubarak's Egypt has been host to numerous visits by Arab-Israeli delegations involved in the peace process since then. The historic peace accord of 13 September 1993 between PLO and Israel and of Jordan and Israel of 25 July 1994, are accredited to Mubarak's quiet diplomacy along with that of the Clinton Administration, PLO leader, Yasser Arafat, King Hussein of Jordan and Foreign Minister Shimon Peres and Prime Minister Yitzak Rabin of Israel.

Mubarak's role in the Arab affairs has been, thus, an influential one. Mubarak's broad Arab policy amidst Egypt's economic and military dependency upon the United States is singularly important. It has a tremendous impact upon the non-aligned image of Egypt. It is, therefore, important to highlight the Egyptian policy of non-alignment and Egypt's role in the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) during Mubarak period in the light of the above deliberated domestic, regional and international scenarios.

Mubarak's concept of non-alignment and his vision of NAM, at the time of the advent of his presidency, can be substantially understood when we analyse some of his statements made in 1981, 1982 and 1983 in this regard.

On 13 December 1981, after two months of his ascendancy to the presidential office, Mubarak stated to a delegation of foreign correspondents at the UN that special relation with any of the Super Powers does not negate commitments to the concept and policy of non-alignment. He said:

We deal with all camps provided our dealings are on an equal footing.... We have economic and military relations with the USA which provides us with effective aid. Our relations with the Soviet Union have not the same scope, but this does not mean that we are not a non-aligned country.\(^33\)

Mubarak also likened the case of Egypt with India. He argued that India, a founding member as Egypt, has very good relations with the two Super Powers, but has stronger relations with the Soviet Union. This, however, did not prevent India from being a non-aligned country. Non-alignment, as he conceived it, meant

---

that the non-aligned countries should not allow the establishment of foreign bases on their territory, and that they should not be party to pacts.\textsuperscript{34}

Egypt, in spite of its unique position amid continents, was never a mere bridge linking various civilizations and cultures, but was a melting pot of such civilizations and a meeting ground for people who tirelessly sought lofty values and endeavoured to protect their legitimate interests and just rights. It was, therefore only natural that the spark which generated non-alignment was lit in this great land, and that the Egyptian people were at the vanguard of those forces which had faith in their principles and philosophy, safeguard their mission and noble objectives and were capable of constant sacrifice to protect them. Indeed, non-alignment is the symbol of the most shining aspect of the contemporary human experiments, whether as regards establishing relations among peoples and nations on the basis of right and justice, devoting efforts to entrench peace and security, alleviating tensions, preventing polarization and the division of the world into spheres of influence, or establishing a new international economic order, which would strike a balance between the interests of the various nations, irrespective of their wealth or force. From this premise, Egypt gives its commitments to the principles of non-alignment and its policy commitment is the highest order of priority and considers it a focal point in its relations and action at international level, a sustained trend at present and in the future as well as an unflinching course to follow. Indeed, the changing international conditions reinforce Egypt's conviction that non-alignment is one of its best courses, as well

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{34} ibid, p.30.
\end{flushleft}
as a safety valve in the face of the dangers threatening the international community as a whole. Thus, Mubarak's commitment to the policy of non-alignment solidified his role not only among the Arab nations but also among the non-aligned world.

Mubarak reminiscing Egypt's role as a founder member of the NAM emphasized that Egypt would remain firm in its belief in the principles of non-alignment. He said: "non-alignment is a movement of great importance... adherence to the NAM in no way imposes restrictions on our freedom to extend our hands in friendship and cooperation to all countries. Nor does it prevent us from responding sincerely to the peoples who are genuinely keen on strengthening their political, economic and cultural relations with Egypt. Although we are not party to military pacts nor allow the establishment of foreign military bases on our territory, we nevertheless seek to establish good relations with all nations and peoples, and bear grudges against no one. We deal with various countries without any complex or sensitivity in so far as it is in our common interest and in the light of our national security and strategic interests. Egypt shall always be at the vanguard of those who defend the interests of the peoples and human rights. It shall always call for commitment to international legitimacy and the rule of law. It shall always strive to establish a new international order that will achieve greater justice, equality and stability for all countries.\(^{35}\)

Mubarak has also emphasized that the NAM today needs to be given a strong impetus and to be reactivated, so that it did not deviate from its main goals.

---

35 ibid, pp.26-27.
and avoid polarization or alignment. It must remain geared to the objectives for which it was established.

On the eve of the Seventh non-aligned Summit, which was scheduled to meet in New Delhi, India, an age-old and friendly country with which Egypt has been enjoying a close and strong relation and has shared a sustained struggle to secure the rights of the Third World in Asia, Africa and Latin America, Mubarak became determined to uphold the course of the movement and increase its efficacy within the international arena. Thus, Mubarak spelt the intention of rekindling the Nasserite policy of non-alignment and NAM to add kudos to Egyptian foreign policy.

In 1983 after two years of Mubarak’s presidency, the non-aligned world organized a great event, the Seventh non-aligned Summit at New Delhi, "The convening of the Seventh NAM Summit in the capital of India", declared Mubarak on 8 March 1983, "is most significant and is reminiscent of eventful memories of the not too distant past which saw the rebirth of our robust movement following strenuous efforts by a group of leaders dedicated to national liberation and progress, of whom Jawaharlal Nehru, Josip Broz Tito and Gamal Abdel Nasser were pioneers."  

Egypt's membership in the movement had been challenged by a number of Arab countries in the Sixth non-aligned Summit due to the signing of Camp David Accords and the Peace Treaty. But the matter was no longer an issue at

---

the New Delhi non-aligned Summit of 1983. This development can be seen as a result of Mubarak's attempts to improve good relations with the estranged Arab nations.

During the Seventh non-aligned Summit at New Delhi, Mubarak used the opportunity to confer with several Arab leaders as part of an effort to end Egypt's isolation. This act of Mubarak was also corroborated by his earlier sympathetic acts towards the PLO.

Mubarak declared in the conference: "non-alignment is the inevitable option for all peoples of the Third World who look forward to a better future where justice, security and stability are more pronounced." He put forward some fundamental and essential suggestions which inter alia were:

The unity of the non-aligned movement is the secret of its power and efficacy. Without this unity, the movement would become a mere quantitative accumulation, unable to become a quantitative structure, thereby turning into a prototype of the international organisations existing within the framework of acute conflict and competition. Its influence would, therefore, diminish, its role would recede and its ability to steer events would erode and its independent character and distinct identity would melt away.

This unity of the movement is not a mere slogan to be chanted or a refrain to be repeated. Rather, it is a fact based on identity of interest and sharing in a cause. We believe in the impossibility of real contradiction between the interests of two countries affiliated to the Third World so long as we agree that we all are committed to liberation and progress and are diametrically opposed to imperialism, exploitation and dependency.

While the two conflicting blocs - with all the contradiction between them - have accepted peaceful co-existence, irrespective of the disparity in their economic and political orders, it should be incumbent upon us - who share identical interests and the same -

to pledge not to allow ideologies to impede our solidarity, cooperation or to break our ranks or disintegrate our unity.

It is imperative that we agree to give cooperation among the countries of the movement top priority over dealings with other countries either in the political field or in the field pertaining to overall economic and social development.38

After putting forward a few fundamental suggestions Mubarak also highlighted some issues which needed better attention. Among those issues, the security of the non-aligned countries, economic problems between developing countries, and the questions of solidarity among non-aligned countries were very important.

Regarding the first major issue, i.e., security problem, Mubarak said:

We find that the Third World countries are in actual danger of invasion from outside of infiltration of foreign influence and of practices based on pressure and threats by foreign powers which have the potential of impact and influence all over the world. With all our concern that our movement should not become a third bloc involved in world conflict and tension, but we should enhance our cooperation and solidarity as a safeguard against these dangers. This should be achieved in collective and well organised form and not be left to some haphazard or isolated chance.

Regarding economic problems Mubarak said:

the developing countries were able to give tangible shape to its attitude in the Caracas working programme of May 1981 which coordinated cooperation among them on the field of trade, raw material, energy, food, science and technology, industrialization, funds, and financing. This programme complemented the economic working programme issued by the Fifth Non-Aligned Summit. What remains is for both programmes to be implemented through decision-making and the adoption of the necessary policies by member states.

Regarding the third problem of solidarity, he said:

The least conceivable solidarity among the Non-aligned countries is the prevention of all and every form of armed conflict between them and their commitment to resort to peaceful means along in settling their disputes. In this regard we find it incumbent upon ourselves to take specific measures to end Iraq-Iran war.\(^{39}\)

Regarding the Iraq-Iran crisis during that time Mubarak continued:

Iraq has fulfilled its duty when it declared its unconditional acceptance to end the war, its commitment to the 1975 border agreement between the two countries, and its support of all efforts exhorted within the framework of non-alignment and the Islamic community to put an end to the war. There remains for Iran to respond to the unanimous position adopted by all countries and proclaimed by them in their different assemblies, starting with the UN Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. And we all share an equal concern for the interests of both the Iraqi and Iranian peoples. We are not required to adopt a position against this or that party.\(^{40}\)

It should be reminded here that Mubarak's Egypt, though had declared an impartial attitude towards both Iraq and Iran, had taken a positive side with Iraq by providing military aid to Iraq during the war that continued from 1980-1988. This attitude can be a development of Egypt's striving efforts to come back to the Arab fold while it tried to secure a middle path in its non-aligned aspect of foreign policy.

Regarding the Israeli occupation of Lebanon, Mubarak said:

The problem is a gave precedent of intervention in the affairs of small countries and in destroying altogether the peace and security of their people. We do not accept the pursuit of this occupation under any pretext. We proclaim our insistence on the prompt and total withdrawal from the Lebanese territory... We should never lose sight of the fact that there is a golden opportunity to put in motion the wheel of a comprehensive settlement based on the ideas put forward and around which a consensus was recently reached.

\(^{39}\) ibid, pp.4-7.

\(^{40}\) ibid, p.8.
and aimed at replacing the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip by a Palestinian authority exercising its powers and responsibility in coordination with the Arab countries concerned foremost among which comes Jordan which stands boldly, shouldering its national responsibility along side the brotherly people of Palestine, considering that we all are in one trench facing one and the same problem with a direct bearing on our destiny and fundamental interests. 41

The speech regarding the Lebanese crisis and Egypt's pro-Lebanon stand substantially proved his intention to bring Egypt back into the Arab fold. This declaration among the non-aligned countries corroborated the action taken by Mubarak, during that time, as discussed earlier. It may also be noted that Mubarak's Egypt, during this time, had supported, along with United States, the UN General Assembly Resolution 38/3 of 27 October 1983 concerning Kampuchea which, recalling its earlier resolutions 34/22 of 14 November 1979, 35/6 of 22 October 1980, 36/5 of 21 October 1981 and 37/6 of 28 October 1982, inter alia, convinced that,

...to bring about durable peace in South-East Asia, there is an urgent need for a comprehensive political solution to the Kampuchean problem that will provide for the withdrawal of all foreign forces and ensure respect for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and neutral and non-aligned status of Kampuchea, as well as the right of the Kampuchean people to self-determination free from outside interference. 42

The countries which were along the side of Egypt-US group, among others, also included Yugoslavia. The group that opposed the resolution included, among others, Libya and Syria and USSR. The notable country to abstain from voting

41 ibid, pp.13-14.

was India. The resolution was passed with 105 votes in favour, 23 against it and
19 abstaining from voting.

On the situation of Afghanistan the same year, on 23 November 1983, the
General Assembly in its Resolution 33/29

- reiterated that the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity,
  political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan is
  essential for a peaceful solution of the problem;

- reaffirmed the right of the Afghan people to determine their own
  form of government and to choose their economic, political and
  social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion
  or constraint of any kind whatsoever.\textsuperscript{43}

This resolution was passed by 116 countries in favour, 20 countries against
it and several countries abstaining from voting. Egypt and United States and
others, like Yugoslavia, were in the supporting group while Syria, Lebanon and
USSR were among others, in the opposing group and India, among those that
had abstained from voting.

Thus, it was significant that Egypt during this time though on the side of the
United States due to its economic and military constraints, was striving to have
a middle path in the Arab as well as non-aligned group. It is pertinent to note
here that in the extra-ordinary ministerial meeting of the non-aligned countries on
the question of Palestine that was held from 15-17 July 1982 at Nicosia, Cyprus,
in response to a call by PLO leader, Yasser Arafat, in order to examine the grave
situation in Lebanon, Egypt was invited to participate as a non-aligned country.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{43} ibid, pp.232-35.

\textsuperscript{44} Government of India, Twenty-five Years of the Non-Aligned Movement,
These developments can be attributed to Mubarak's new drive for Arab cooperation in early 1980s.

While Mubarak was endeavouring to rehabilitate Egypt in the Arab fold, one important ministerial meeting of the coordinating bureau of non-aligned countries, which preceded the Eighth NAM Summit, was held in New Delhi in April 1986. Egypt participated in this conference as a member of the Coordinating Bureau, a position which it was not accorded in the ministerial meeting on the question of Palestine in July 1982. The ministers reaffirmed the validity of the principles and policies adopted by the NAM as major factors for the preservation of world peace.45

The ministers and heads of delegation of non-aligned countries, meeting in an emergency session in New Delhi on 15 April 1986, noted with deep shock and profound indignation the armed attacks by the United States of America undertaken with support and collaboration by its NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation) military ally, the United Kingdom, against the territory of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. They strongly condemned this dastardly, blatant and unprovoked act of aggression against a fellow non-aligned country.46

The ministerial meeting was followed by the important Eighth Non-Aligned Summit, held in Harare, the capital of a front-line African state, Zimbabwe, from

45 Government of India, Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of Non-aligned Countries, New Delhi, April 1986, Final Documents, New Delhi, pp.1-4.

1-6 September 1986. The Eighth Non-aligned Summit began with a fervent appeal by top leaders for united and action-oriented efforts to end apartheid policies in South Africa. Robert Mugabe, the Chairman, also said that foreign intervention, especially as expressed through the presence of foreign forces in such countries as Afghanistan and Kampuchea, should be speedily terminated and the people of these lands left to determine their own destiny. The formulations on Kampuchea, Afghanistan and the Iraq-Iran War, as recommended by the Delhi meeting of non-aligned bureau were reiterated, support was pledged to the inalienable rights of the Palestinians to have their homeland. The Summit emphasized that the essence of non-alignment was the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, apartheid, racism, Zionism and all forms of foreign aggression, occupation, domination, interference or hegemony, as well as against Super Power bloc politics. The PLO chief, Mr. Yasser Arafat, who spoke on behalf of the liberation movements, thanked NAM for assistance to the Palestinians' struggle for an independent homeland and was confident that they would achieve the objective.

Interestingly the Eighth Non-aligned Summit was marked by Libyan leader, Gaddafi's critical speech against the NAM in general and Egypt in particular. He

---


48 The Times of India, 2 September 1986; and The Hindu, 2 September 1986.

49 The Hindustan Times, 7 September 1986.

50 The Telegraph, 2 September 1986.
criticized Egypt, along with Zaire, Cameroon and the Ivory Coast, as "puppets and spies" who had littered NAM by recognising Israel. But Egypt's Foreign Minister, Dr. Boutros Boutros Ghali, dismissed the speech as "nothing more than a comedy staged by a mentally disturbed head of state who lived in a state of political backwardness and adolescence." Rajiv Gandhi, the then premier of India who represented India in that conference, also reported to have remarked against Gaddafi that "he is a mad man. He is going to join the Warsaw Pact." 51

Two pro-American states, Malaysia and Singapore, also attacked the NAM for being partisan to the Soviet Union. They claimed that there had been no direct reference, so far, to the Soviet Union in any of the non-aligned resolutions on its military intervention in Afghanistan while the United States had been named several times. 52

Although almost every non-aligned Summit had to contend with issues capable of dividing the movement, the Harare Summit faced a formidable challenge. The issues of Afghanistan and Kampuchea, that tormented the Delhi Summit of 1983, were placed in a back seat in Harare. It was no longer a question of just condemning one Super Power or the other, but the unity of the movement was in danger which was even indirectly reflected in United Nations, a year later, on these issues. Instead of taking a unified stand on these issues the non-aligned countries were divided in the UN General Assembly as was the case in 1983. On 14 October 1987, Resolution 42/3 of General Assembly relating


52 News Time, 4 September 1986.
to Kampuchean issue had been passed by 117 countries in which Egypt was in the vocal pro-United States group. This resolution was opposed by other non-aligned countries like Cuba, Syria, Libya who were in the pro-USSR group. Notable non-aligned countries who abstained from voting on this resolution included India, Iraq etc. In the case of Afghanistan, similarly, on 10 November 1987 Resolution 42/15 of General Assembly was passed by 123 countries in which Egypt along with Yugoslavia, was again in the pro-United States group. The resolution was opposed by 19 countries including USSR and non-aligned countries like Syria, Libya. Again the notable countries which abstained from voting included India.\(^5^3\) However, due to the efforts of India, Egypt and some others, the movement could sustain its coherence. Soon the basic aims were emphasized by the non-aligned countries by supporting the liberation struggles as was seen on the case of South Africa. These issues were again highlighted in the Ninth Non-Aligned Summit held in Belgrade in September 1989. Egypt attended this Summit which was attended by 102 non-aligned countries. Mubarak was officially accorded to speak at number two, only second to Kenneth Kaunda, in the opening session of the movement.\(^5^4\)

The Ninth Non-Aligned Summit was held at a time when Soviet Union's conscious military disengagement from arenas of regional conflicts like Afghanistan and its prodding to countries like Vietnam and Cuba do likewise in Kampuchea and Angola, while encouraging policies of national reconciliation in


\(^{54}\) New Strait times, 4 September 1989.
these troubled areas made a significant contribution to the lowering of tensions in these areas. Though the tension had been lowered, it was not totally wiped out. The partial success of the Paris Conference brought down the Cambodian issue again in the NAM table at Belgrade. Thus, there was a need for the non-aligned countries to play a role in its solution. The Summit assigned the ASEAN group for a solution through Jakarta Informal Meeting (JIM) process.\textsuperscript{55} Egypt's selection as an important country in a 15 member group to enhance South-South cooperation could be a potential development in this NAM Summit.\textsuperscript{56} It showed the important role that Egypt played during Mubarak in the NAM.

The increasing important role of Egypt was again visualized in the Tenth NAM Summit at Jakarta that continued from 1-6 September 1992. Egypt represented by Amre Mousa, the then Minister for Foreign Affairs, played a major role particularly in the economic field. In the basic final document the Heads of State and Government of non-aligned countries reconfirmed their long-standing conviction that only a free, open rule-based and non-discriminatory international trading system could provide an effective and viable basis for the promotion of the equitable development and economic prosperity of all countries. They welcomed the successful outcome of UNCTAD VIII and the spirit of multilateralism. It was reflected in its final document \textit{A New Partnership for Development: Cartagena Commitments}.\textsuperscript{57} It should be noted that this idea of North South cooperation as

\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Indian Express}, 9 September 1989.

\textsuperscript{56} \textit{National Herald}, 9 September 1989.

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Tenth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned} (continued...)
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proposed in the Summit was a development of the idea first proposed by Egypt along with India, Senegal and Venezuela in Paris in July 1989.\textsuperscript{58}

The Heads of State and Government, in their deliberations in the Summit on question of North-South Cooperation, identified free access to the developed countries markets as an indispensable means of taking full advantage of international trade, which they considered as the most important vehicle for advancing the economic growth and sustaining the momentum of development of the non-aligned and other developing countries. In pursuit of these central objectives, the developing countries had initiated various supportive trade policy measures, including the adoption of unilateral trade liberalization measures.

The Heads of State and Government expressed deep concern at the fact that the international trading system was currently encountering manifold constraints. Among the most serious experiences was the rising tide of imbalances that threatened to submerge the best efforts of the developing countries to advance their development objectives. Thus, rampant protectionism and multilateral and bilateral trends of a discriminatory nature, such as managed trade, tiered preferences and inward-looking trade blocs, could conflict with the basic principles of the system and the commitments already undertaken at Punta del Este. They emphasized the imperative need for taking decisive steps towards

\textsuperscript{57}(...continued)
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preserving and strengthening multilateralism through a very early conclusion of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations with a balanced outcome.

The Heads of State and Government urged that the results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations (URMTN) should be fully responsive to the special needs of the non-aligned and other developing countries and be conducive to the integration of their economies into the mainstream of the world economy. In expressing dismay over the failure to conclude the URMTN, they further strongly urged the developed countries to ensure without further delay a balanced, equitable, meaningful and satisfactory conclusion of the Uruguay Round that should take into account the interests of all parties, and especially the development needs and concerns of the developing countries.59

This Summit also gave emphasis to the South-South cooperation in which Egypt aligned with other Heads of State and Government played a crucial role. Recognising the various obstacles to and the difficulties encountered in promoting South-South cooperation, the Heads of State reaffirmed the urgent need for a pragmatic and action-oriented plan of action. In this regard they welcomed the report of the South commission entitled The Challenge to the South which contained specific recommendation towards the promotion of greater South-South interaction. The Heads of State or Government stressed that Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC) was an important catalyst for South-South cooperation and a significant dimension of the national development

process. Thus, the Tenth Non-Aligned Summit emphasised upon the economic problems faced by the non-aligned countries.

Along with the economic issues the Summit also expressed its deep concern over some of the political issues. Egypt along with others expressed concern at the volatile situation in the West-Asian region resulting from continued Israeli occupation of the Palestinian land, the Syrian Golan Height and other Arab territories. The Heads of State or Government agreed that, amid the positive transformation of the global political landscape and peaceful settlement of various disputes, West-Asia could no longer be a cauldron of violent upheaval, insecurity and instability. They called for a new regional order of justice, dignity and stability through mutual accommodation, based on the principle of peaceful co-existence and international legality.60

The leaders of the NAM noted that the signing in Paris of the Agreements on the comprehensive political settlement of the Cambodian conflict was an initial success. Still they realized some of the difficulties in implementing phase two of the agreements. In this regard, they urged all parties in Cambodia to cooperate fully in the implementation of the agreements in order to end the suffering of the Cambodian people. The Heads of State or Government commended the heroic struggle of the Afghan people against foreign invasion and foreign imposed regimes. They congratulated the Government of the Islamic state of Afghanistan and considered it a positive development towards peace.61

60 ibid, pp.47-50.
61 ibid, pp.43-45.
While Egypt's role in the Tenth NAM Summit was important its role in the subsequent non-aligned Summit, the Eleventh Non-Aligned Summit, held at Cartagena (Columbia) in October 1995 was also significant. The Summit, represented by 113 Non-Aligned countries, was held in a Latin American country. It came out with the "call from Columbia Declaration". The said Declaration, apart from reaffirming the validity of NAM and its fundamental principles, pointed out that the Movement constituted a forum which provided the Non-Aligned members with the basic framework to coordinate the interests and positions (of NAM members) in the international environment. While it further said that NAM would continue to strive, for peace, independence, sovereign equality of the states and non-interference in their internal affairs, it pledged to continue unflinchingly to work towards the economic and social betterment, the strengthening of democracy and the free determination of the peoples.\(^{62}\) The Cartagena Summit Declaration, \textit{inter alia}, emphasized the completing of the fulfilment of commitments agreed upon at the UN Conferences on Environment and Development at Rio de Janeiro, Human Rights at Vienna, Population and Development at Cairo, Social Development at Copenhagen, World Trade at Uruguay etc.\(^{63}\)

The Eleventh NAM Summit assumed an added importance in the sense that it came at a time when both the developed and developing nations of the world were on the critical threshold of a new world order brought about by the

\(^{62}\) \textit{Rising Nepal} (Kathmandu), 31 October 1995.

\(^{63}\) \textit{Patriot} (New Delhi), 12 January 1996.
demise of the Cold War polemics. It symbolized that the NAM had not only survived as a movement but also thrived, much to the dismay of the West, even after several attacks of aphorisms like "Immoral", "stooging for the Soviets", "Inconsequential", etc. It also presaged the idea that non-alignment as a policy was always relevant since it was that part of foreign policy which epitomized the fundamental principle of "independence". Thus, on the same vein, NAM can be relevant to sustain that principle. The Cartagena Summit ended with a happy blending of the fundamental principles of the past and the new Cartagena spirit of the non-aligned countries.

Egypt’s policy of non-alignment and its role in the movement, under Mubarak, has been an important one. Mubarak has not only talked of non-alignment, reminiscent of Nasser era, but also has acted in that line. He even once commented that "Egypt has a pioneering and leading role whether we and others like it or not. Egypt has its history, culture and the ability to act. The fact is that I acted." Credit goes to Mubarak for adding glory to the non-aligned status of Egypt in the movement by reviving it when it was virtually shattered by Sadat’s policies and when the Arabs were still posing a threat to Egypt’s place in the NAM.