Mubarak Matters:
The Foreign Policy of Egypt Under Hosni Mubarak

by

Eric Fillinger

SIS Honors Capstone

Supervised by

Professors Kristin Smith Diwan and Linda Lubrano

Submitted to the
School of International Service
American University

In partial fulfillment of the
requirements for graduation with
University Honors in International Studies
Bachelor of Arts Degree

May 2009

Abstract

The goal of this research is to identify how Egypt defines its national interest and how it uses its foreign policy to promote this interest during the presidency of Hosni Mubarak. The capstone paper achieves this objective through an examination of three case studies—the 1980-1988 Iran-Iraq War, the 1991 Persian Gulf War, and the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Neoclassical realism is the primary theoretical framework for the project, combined with insights from analyses of foreign policy decision making. The use of both research traditions provides a more complete understanding of how Mubarak executes foreign policy. Such a study is needed because available scholarly work on the topic of Egyptian foreign policy during Mubarak's time in office is scarce and is not focused on Egypt's definition of its national interest. Research for the project was conducted with primary sources, such as newspaper editorials and documents from the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as scholarly articles that analyze and critique Egyptian foreign policy. The results indicate that Egyptian foreign policy is determined by Mubarak's desire to guarantee the influence and power of Egypt throughout the region, as well as a need for Mubarak to guarantee the security of his regime.

Contents

Introduction

How Egypt defines its national interest and how it pursues its foreign policy are issues that have theoretical and practical significance in the field of international relations. The signing of the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty in 1979 seemed to usher in a more hopeful era in the Middle East. Prior to this treaty Egypt was seen as the leader of the struggle against Israel as well as the promoter of Middle Eastern independence from the West. Egypt had the strongest military and was a key player in the three major Arab-Israeli wars. Additionally, Egypt openly courted the Soviet Union and at times advocated socialist causes. Moreover, Egypt was the strongest voice calling for pan-Arab unity during the presidency of Gamal Abdel Nasser. Egypt seemed bent upon ending the status quo in the region and had an explicitly region-based outlook on foreign policy.

The focus of academic scholarship on the Middle East deals mainly with issues related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Considerable attention is also given to the political economy of the Gulf states and to the relations of the West with Iraq and Iran. The international relations scholarship on Egypt is largely confined to examining the policies of Egypt through the lens of U.S. interests in the region. These interests have largely been focused on Egypt's relationship with Israel, which is viewed as one of the most positive Arab-Israel relations in the region. This scholarship, however, does not focus on what motivates Egypt to take the action that it does. Egypt doesn't get the attention it deserves as a large and important state. Although perception throughout the Arab world is often that Egypt's power is on the decline, it still has immense potential to become a major player in the region again, and thus an examination of Egyptian desires and motivations for the formulation of their international relations is necessary.

With the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty Egypt appeared to forsake war with Israel. The deal was brokered by the United States, and Egypt received substantial financial assistance from the U.S. as a result. It appeared, then, that Egypt had moved decisively out of Soviet influence and into America's sphere. Furthermore, following the death of Anwar Sadat, who signed the treaty,

Hosni Mubarak assumed the presidency and appeared to continue Sadat's move towards the United States. Mubarak was seen as a moderate and a technocrat who would continue to tow the line on issues that America deemed vital. A more sober analysis of Egypt's foreign police since the beginning of Mubarak's rule may reveal that Egypt has never been a reliable client for the United States and, indeed, has pursued a policy designed solely to further its own interests and power. Therefore, this research project will seek to examine how Egypt defines what is in its national interest and how it seeks to promote this interest through its foreign policy.

The focus of this research will be Egyptian foreign policy during the rule of Hosni Mubarak, who ascended to office in 1981 and remains president to this day. Additionally, it will prove useful to recall the rule of Sadat, whose turn away from explicit pan-Arab politics set the stage for much of Mubarak's pragmatic rule. In terms of the international relationships to be examined, those between Egypt and Iraq will form the core case studies. However, there will also be an examination of Egypt's relationship with the United States, Israel, and other Arab states, as it will be vital to have some understanding of all of Egypt's relationships in order to understand its foreign policy.

Neoclassical realism and decision-making theory will provide the main analytical frameworks through which this topic will be analyzed. It is possible that Egypt, if it is concerned solely with furthering its own national interests, may provide an excellent case study of neoclassical realism in action in today's world. This may be especially interesting to approach, given that prior to the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty Egypt's leaders often espoused the idea of pan-Arabism and called for unity among all Arab peoples. In comparison, Egypt's foreign policy after Camp David took on a decidedly realist approach rather than the high-minded idealism of Pan-Arabism. As will be shown, Mubarak's rule has continued this neoclassical realist approach.

In a broader sense, using neoclassical realism in this case will prove the continuing relevance of this framework to the field of international relations. This paradigm has often been criticized as outmoded since the end of the Cold War. But if Egypt's foreign policy fits within the framework of

neoclassical realism, the framework itself clearly still has merit. Examining Egypt's foreign policy will also provide an example of how a state that operates under neoclassical realistic aims manages the globalized nature of the world today as well as the proliferation of non-state actors, both of which are viewed as challenges to the framework of neoclassical realism. Thus theoretically it will also be important to examine the challenges to the state structure that confront neoclassical realism, such as sub-state forces.

The use of neoclassical realism in the case of Egypt appears to be particularly relevant. Although a more expansive examination of Egypt's decision-making will come later in this study, it is important to emphasize that the president of Egypt has tremendous power, and very closely approaches the concept of the unitary actor so central to neoclassical realism. Additionally, Egypt has long maintained one of the largest armies in the Middle East, which in neoclassical realism is a primary determinant of a nation's power. However, Egypt's reliance on its military has decreased and the state has not fought a major conflict since 1973, so it may also be important to examine the other ways that Egypt works to forward its purposes and maintain relevance in the Middle East. Ultimately, this research will seek to measure Egypt's foreign policy by their adherence to the key concepts of neoclassical realism, such as a overriding focus on national security and a focus on relations between sovereign states above all else.

The use of neoclassical realism has several assumptions built into it. First and foremost for this research is the assumption that Egypt is acting to primarily strengthen its national security, as opposed to acting for some other, 'higher' purpose. There is also the assumption that because Egypt's president has so much power, he can act as a true unitary actor in making decisions that guide Egypt's foreign policy. However, it may be the case that some other actors within Egypt's government are able to exert some considerable influence on Egypt's foreign policy and in that case this assumption would be incorrect. Finally, one more key assumption is that there is a discernible pattern to Egypt's foreign policy over such a relatively long period of history. It is possible that the fundamental patterns and

rationales for Egyptian foreign policy have changed over this time frame and that any one theoretical perspective will be insufficient to properly understand it.

Decision-making theory will also be utilized in this study. Decision-making theory examines both the systemic constraints and the personality attributes that cause leaders to make the decisions that they do. As E. Victor Wolfenstein has noted,

> Because man, for all his individuality, is a social being, we cannot understand his nature without understanding the social and political institutions that he uses, well or poorly, to structure and safeguard his existence. At the same time, we cannot make sense of these institutions and social practices without knowing something about human psychology; for politics does not exist without individual men anymore than men exist without politics.[1]

Thus, an understanding of Mubarak as a leader and as a person is necessary if we are to understand the actions that he has taken as the leader of Egypt. Put simply, the person in charge matters. They are not simply slaves to the structure of domestic or international politics.

In addition to the scholarly applications of this research, there are practical ones for policymakers in the field of international relations. Egypt still plays a central role in the Middle East, and may prove vital in many delicate issues in the region, such as the resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Its often volatile border with Israel and the Gaza Strip ensures this important role. Additionally, Egypt has and remains to be a vital location where high level talks can take place in the Middle East. Therefore, a more complete understanding of Egypt's justifications for their actions and the way in which they implement their foreign policy is extremely important for international relations practitioners. Additionally, Egypt receives enormous amounts of aid from the United States, and is often viewed as an important ally in the region for America. As such, an accurate understanding of Egypt's foreign policy is necessary especially for policymakers in the United States who will guide the future of the relationship between the two states.

This research can also be more generally applicable in a practical sense. By gaining a better understanding of how states that appear to have aligned themselves solidly with the United States are

---

[1] E. Victor Wolfenstein, *Personality and Politics* (Belmont, CA: Dickenson Publishing Company, 1969), 1.

truly motivated, policymakers will be able to formulate policy more clearly and better anticipate the actions of states when their interests come into conflict with those of the United States'. There often seems to be surprise on the part of U.S. policymakers when states do not act as they are expected to, and often this stems from a lack of true understanding as to the actual motivations of these states. Hopefully, this research will serve as a reminder that even when two states appear to be closely aligned, their national interests may at times serve different purposes.

A Survey of the Existing Scholarship on Egyptian Foreign Policy

A debate exists in international relations scholarship over the nature of Egyptian foreign policy after the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty in 1979. This debate can be broken down into three main schools of thought. The first school, which can be labeled the pan-Arabism school, believes that Egypt has never abandoned its commitment to the Arab world in general and to the Palestinian cause in particular. The second school asserts that Egypt has eschewed pan-Arabism for primarily domestic political reasons. Jon B. Alterman uses the phrase "foreign policy as domestic policy" to describe this school of thought and this seems the most accurate way to identify it.[2]

The final school, which can be called a traditional realism school, agrees with the second that Egypt has left pan-Arabism behind. However, it differs in that it believes that the rationale for this turn in foreign policy was out of a desire to improve Egypt's national security and power regionally. The pan-Arab perspective is too idealistic and fails to take into account much of Egypt's policy decisions after 1979. Foreign policy as domestic policy and the traditional realism school are far more compelling, however, as they correctly assess the change in Egypt's foreign policy after the signing of the peace treaty and then provide well-reasoned explanations.

Although pan-Arabism is often considered a dead movement, some scholars still use it as the framework through which they view Egyptian foreign policy. The pan-Arab perspective acknowledges

---

[2] Jon B. Alterman, "Dynamics Without Drama: New Options and Old Compromises in Egypt's Foreign Policy," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 18, no. 3 (2005), 360.

a change in Egyptian foreign policy after the 1979 peace treaty, but does not view the change as a turn away from Arab or Palestinian causes. It argues that the primary foreign policy concern for Egypt remains finding a solution to the Palestinian issue, and its foreign policy formulation flows from this concern.

The pan-Arabism school also sees Egypt as a continuing leader in the Arab leader, while emphasizing the unity of this region. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the Egyptian academic and ambassador who eventually became Secretary General of the United Nations, is a proponent of this argument. Writing about Egyptian foreign policy after Sadat, he said: "Egypt thus has every intention of assuming fully her responsibility as an Arab country."[3] For Boutros-Ghali, Egypt may have changed its approach to foreign policy, but it has not changed its substance or goals. Michael C. Hudson also argues that pan-Arabism still influences foreign policymaking throughout the Middle East, including in Egypt.[4] Hudson argues that because the Israeli-Palestinian conflict remains a deep concern for most Arab civilians, states such as Egypt must act under pan-Arab pretenses in order to maintain legitimacy.

The pan-Arabism school suffers from a major flaw, in that it takes at face value the proclamations of Arab unity mouthed by Egyptian leaders while ignoring Egyptian foreign policy decisions that clearly put Egypt first and the rest of the region a distant second. For example, it does not address such issues as Egypt's strong association with the United States, its assistance to the coalition that ejected Saddam Hussein's army from Kuwait in 1991, nor its relatively hands-off approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict since 1979. As such, it is not a satisfying paradigm to view Egyptian foreign policy through.

The "foreign policy as domestic policy" school, which asserts that a fundamental change in Egyptian foreign policy has occurred, and that it has been largely driven by internal political conditions, is far more useful for analysis. This approach first correctly identifies the turn from pan-

---

[3] Boutros Boutros-Ghali, "The Foreign Policy of Egypt in the Post-Sadat Era," Foreign Affairs 60, no. 4 (1982), 788.
[4] Michael C. Hudson, "Public Opinion, Foreign Policy, and the Crisis of Legitimacy in Arab Politics," *Journal of Arab Affairs* 5, no. 2 (1986), 131.

Arabism that Egypt took following the 1979 peace treaty. By examining the domestic political situation in Egypt in the 1970s and beyond, it attempts to construct an explanation for this turn. There are several domestic issues that are emphasized, with the primary focus being Egypt's stagnant economy and the difficulties in maintaining political legitimacy that Anwar Sadat (the president who signed the peace treaty) and his successor Hosni Mubarak have encountered.

Scholars such as Ibrahim Karawan argue that in order to address these domestic issues Egypt's leaders needed to put aside the distraction of war with Israel, to gain economic support from the United States, and to focus security resources on the maintenance of domestic political power. For Sadat and then Mubarak, the main threat to their continued rule of Egypt was not external forces like Israel, but domestic instability. Karawan sums up this perspective by saying "the shift was not driven by an interest in maximizing Egypt's power vis-à-vis other regional actors, but by emphasis on the retention of state power over society."[5] Although this is an interesting analysis of Egypt's foreign policy, it seems to underestimate Egypt's desire to secure a powerful place within the region.

Jon Alterman also belongs to this school, as previously referenced. He lists several goals of Egyptian foreign policy, all of which are concerned with maintaining the power of the ruling government. These include increasing international trade, obtaining foreign assistance, and international prestige. None of the goals that Alterman identifies address the Israeli-Palestinian conflict or the broader Arab world. Emad Gad also argues that Egypt's goals have shifted from geo-political strength to economic growth.[6] This change in focus has led Egypt to strengthen relations with Europe out of a desire to strengthen trade ties and to grow Egypt's internal economy. From Gad's perspective, Egypt's focus is distinctly introspective and not primarily concerned with regional power.

---

[5] Ibrahim Karawan, "Foreign Policy Restructuring: Egypt's Disengagement from the Arab-Israeli Conflict Revisited," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 18, no. 3 (2005), 336.

[6] Emad Gad, "Egyptian-European Relations: From Conflict to Cooperation," *Review of International Affairs* 3, no. 2 (2003), 187.

There are, however, some deficiencies with the "foreign policy as domestic policy" approach to Egypt's foreign policy. For one, it does not address the domestic problems created by Egyptian foreign policy. For instance, the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty was very unpopular domestically. In fact, Sadat was assassinated by an Islamist group that opposed the treaty and any sort of normalization with Israel. In addition, the assumption that the goals of Egyptian foreign policy are almost exclusively related to domestic political issues is too narrow an interpretation. That said, this approach can still have some utility in analyzing Egypt's foreign policy and should not be completely discarded.

The traditional realism school of thought approaches Egyptian foreign policy after the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty from a national-interest perspective. For this school, Egypt's foreign policy has been oriented towards the goal of ensuring Egypt's national security and regional power. Domestic issues exert some pressure but are not dominant. This perspective comes closest to the realist school of international relations scholarship. Robert Springborg, writing soon after the treaty was signed, articulated many of the assumptions of this school of thought. He claimed that Sadat wanted to limit the negotiations to bilateral talks between Egypt and Israel so that other Arab countries were cut out of the diplomatic process in the region.[7] In this way, Egyptian prestige and power in the region would be increased and those of the other Arab states would be diminished. This analysis of Egyptian foreign policy seems the most accurate of the three schools outlined above.

Samuel J. Spector has written about Egypt's foreign policy in relation to the United States and arrived at conclusions that place him within the traditional realism school. Spector has seen little interest of the ruling party in the concerns of the population. Instead, maintaining regional power for Egypt is key. According to Spector, Egypt sees itself as "the Arab world's paramount broker of moderation and stability."[8] It is a dominant role in the region and not the approval of its people that Egypt seeks. Duncan L. Clarke also argues that Egypt has sought to obtain a position of power within

---

[7] Robert Springborg, "US-Egyptian Relationship: Failed Expectations," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 10, no. 4 (1981), 162.
[8] Samuel J. Spector, "Washington and Cairo: Near the Breaking Point?" *Middle East Quarterly* 12, no. 3 (2005), 11.

the region, and that it uses its relationship with the United States to achieve this.[9] The main way that Egypt exploits this relationship, according to Clarke, is through the economic aid that Egypt receives. Egypt's leaders know that they will continue to receive massive amounts of aid from the United States as long as they maintain peace with Israel and have used this aid to increase their power in the region.

Gregory R. Copley also rejects the idea that Egypt remains interested in pan-Arabism, or even a leadership role in the Arab world. His research fits into the traditional realism framework. Copley has examined Egyptian foreign policy and noted that there has been a shift in focus towards Africa from the Middle East. Copley also argues that Egypt seeks to establish power outside of its relationship with the United States, by building up a domestically based defense industry and cultivating ties with countries like Pakistan and China.[10] Indeed, Egypt has begun to pay attention to conflicts between non-Arab countries in Africa, such as between Ethiopia and Eritrea, which may threaten Egypt's security.[11] Thus, Egypt is orienting itself for a position of power in the world without connections to any particular political movement.

All three of these schools provide interesting analytical lenses through which to examine Egypt's foreign policy. The first school, focused on pan-Arabism, can provide useful insight into some of the rationales given for Egyptian foreign policy, but it lacks explanations for Egyptian actions that run against pan-Arab aims. The "foreign policy as domestic policy" school, which emphasizes domestic pressures, is convincing up to a point, but attributes too much power to domestic interests in determining foreign policy. Ignoring external influence on Egyptian foreign policy is a mistake. The traditional realism school provides an emphasis on state power and influence that does seem to influence many of Egypt's decisions, but it also fails to take into account the domestic and pan-Arab ideals that the first two schools speak of.

---

[9] Duncan L. Clarke, "US Security Assistance to Egypt and Israel: Politically Untouchable?" *The Middle East Journal* 51, no. 2 (1997), 200.

[10] Gregory R. Copley, "Egypt Shifts its Geo-Strategic Policy Priority Toward Africa," *Defense and Foreign Affairs Strategic Policy* 33, no. 6 (2005), 20.

[11] John Cella, "Line in the Sand," *Harvard International Review* 27, no. 2 (Summer 2005), 6.

Ultimately, a realist approach is most appropriate for judging Egyptian foreign policy. As mentioned previously, I will employ neoclassical realism as the analytical framework through which I will examine Egypt's foreign policy. Neoclassical realism, as suggested by the name, is an attempt to update traditional realism in the vein of Machiavelli for a modern world. In contrast to neorealism, which uses the positivist tradition, neoclassical realism relies on an interpretive approach.

A major theorist in neoclassical realism was Hans J. Morgenthau, whose *Politics Among Nations* remains a major text in the field. Morgenthau identified six principles of neoclassical realism (which he refers to as political realism).[12] The first principle is that politics is governed by objective laws that have roots in human nature. Because there are objective laws, scholars can use reason and interpret the actions of policy makers to understand what their objectives might be. The second principle outlined by Morgenthau is that interest is defined in terms of power. Morgenthau rejects the study of motives of statesmen in the examination of foreign policy, but urges a focus on rational determinations of state interests defined by power. Morgenthau also warns of "equating the foreign policies of a statesman with his philosophic or political sympathies," a warning that will help guide this study as it seeks to delineate between the pan-Arab proclamations of Egypt and the actual foreign policy undertaken.[13]

The third principle of Morgenthau is that interest defined as power does not have a meaning that is fixed. For Morgenthau, power "may compromise anything that establishes and maintains the control of man over man."[14] Power, thus, is not only defined in terms of military capabilities but other, more subtle forms (although military power remains a key determination of a state's power within neoclassical realism). The fourth principle of Morgenthau is that political realism is aware of the moral significance of political action, as well as the "ineluctable tension between the moral command and the

---

[12] Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), 4.
[13] Ibid., 7
[14] Ibid., 9.

requirements of successful political action."[15] The fifth principle is that political realism refuses to identify the "moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe."[16] For Morgenthau, it is erroneous to believe that nations act with moral convictions and the moral law of the universe on their side. Interest defined in terms of power is the driving force for statesmen. The final principle of Morgenthau is that the political sphere remains autonomous from the rest of society. Policies are examined in how they affect the power of the nation. Moralistic interpretations are not part of a political (or neoclassical) realist analysis.

As mentioned previously, this study will also utilize decision-making theory to analyze Egyptian foreign policy under Mubarak. The idea that the decision-maker himself plays a large role in the outcome of policy has a long history in the interpretive field of realism, harkening all the way back to Niccolò Machiavelli's study of politics in Italy. Machiavelli's recommendations on obtaining and maintaining power, found in *The Prince*, remain influential ideas in the field of realism. For Machiavelli, a prince (political leader, in more modern terms) must seek a stable state and the political power to maintain this stability. Domestic forces must be balanced again foreign adversaries, and the leader must work to maintain his power from threats from within and outside the state. Throughout Machiavelli's study, the leader himself is key. In examining Egypt's foreign policy under Mubarak, it will therefore be important to keep in mind both domestic and foreign threats to his security and power.

More recent scholars also agree that political leaders play an important role in determining foreign policy. One such scholar is John G. Stoessinger, who has examined the role of policy-makers in the creation and execution of foreign policy. Stoessinger, in the neoclassical realist tradition, acknowledges that power is a primary driver of foreign policy. He argues, however, that the personality of leaders plays a major role in determining the course of foreign policy. He argues that "to speak of 'actors,' 'powers,' or of 'systems' merely beclouds the basic truth that human beings, made of

---

[15] Morgenthau, 10.
[16] Ibid., 11.

flesh and blood, make these decisions on behalf of collectivities called states."[17] Particularly when it comes to matter of war and peace, Stoessinger believes that the personalities of leaders play a vital role.

As we can see, even though neoclassical realism looks at the state as the primary actor in international relations, the importance of the leader is not underestimated. DeRouen Jr. and Sprecher have argued that decision-making and rational frameworks such as neoclassical realism can coexist.[18] Decision-making theory can help us understand how these leaders impact foreign policy. Therefore, the next portion of this study will examine decision-making processes within Egypt and attempt to fit them into a broader framework of decision-making in foreign policy. It is vital to understand how Egypt's foreign policy is made so that we can then understand why it is made. First, I will establish the authoritarian nature of the Egyptian state, as this character plays a large role in the decision-making process. Next, I will present theories of decision-making and evaluate them. Finally, I will examine the specific characteristics of Egyptian foreign policy decision-making and attempt to apply theory to practice.

The Authoritarian Nature of the Egyptian State

Kassem identifies Mubarak's regime as continuing the tradition of "personal authoritarian rule" in Egypt.[19] An understanding of what exactly constitutes an authoritarian regime and how decisions are made in such regimes will help us understand how Egypt pursues its foreign policy. First, I will provide a definition of an authoritarian regime and show that Egypt meets this standard. Second, I will outline the theoretical assumptions about decision-making in authoritarian regimes. Then I will describe the nature of decision-making in Egypt and show that it displays an authoritarian state decision-making model. This determination will shed light on how and why Egypt under Mubarak took the actions that it did in the three case studies to be examined.

---

[17] John G. Stoessinger, *The Might of Nations: World Politics in Our Time* (New York: Random House, 1982), 37.
[18] Karl DeRouen Jr. and Christopher Sprecher, "International Crisis Reaction and Poliheuristic Theory," *The Journal of International Conflict Resolution* 48, no. 1 (February 2004), 66.
[19] Maye Kassem, *Egyptian Politics: The Dynamics of Authoritarian Rule* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2004), 1.

15

Purcell has identified three variables that define an authoritarian regime.[20] The first variable is limited political pluralism within the state, where "interest groups are partially tied to, and dependent upon, the regime."[21] The second variable is low subject mobilization, which Purcell defines as "a situation in which politicized individuals possess a 'subject' rather than 'participant' (or independent) attitude."[22] This means in practice that individuals in society are rarely involved in the political process, and are generally called upon only to ratify decisions already made by the ruling regime. The final variable is the presence of patrimonial rule. This means that "the ruler grants privileges, goods, or similar 'benefices' to a select portion of the ruled. In exchange, the individuals (clients or subjects) acknowledge the authority of the ruler and defer to him."[23]

Egypt's conformance to the first variable, limited political pluralism, can be demonstrated through both the nature of party politics within Egypt and the state of Egyptian civil society. Although Mubarak has at times made limited attempts at opening up the political process, it remains extremely difficult for opposition parties to operate and effectively field candidates. The ruling National Democratic Party remains the strongest force within the parliament and Mubarak has repeatedly used coercive means to prevent opposition parties from gaining traction.[24] Power is somewhat more diffuse within Egyptian civil society, particularly within the professional syndicates, but Egyptian civil society has yet to organize into united opposition to Mubarak's regime. Thus, political pluralism remains weak in Egypt.

The lack of political pluralism in Egypt has contributed to the low level of subject mobilization. Indeed, political participation within Egypt has remained extremely low during Mubarak's rule. For example, during a public referendum on amending the Constitution in 2005 only an estimated 3-5% of

---

[20] Susan Kaufman Purcell, "Decision-Making in an Authoritarian Regime: Theoretical Implications from a Mexican Case Study," *World Politics* 26, no. 1 (October 1973), 30.
[21] Purcell, 30.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.
[24] For several examples of this, see Kassem, 55-74.

voters turned out.[25]   Thus, as in other authoritarian regimes, popular participation in the political process remains extremely low in Egypt.

Finally, the third variable of patrimonial rule is extremely strong within Egypt. This can be seen through the political machinations of the National Democratic Party. Instead of belonging to any particular ideology, NDP members are primarily chosen for their ability to deliver specific goods to their constituents. For example, one NDP member of Parliament has stated: "'I'll get you the water, the school, the electricity' is all I say in my election campaign. Nobody cares what my political orientation is."[26]

Theories of Decision-Making

Decision-making theories operate under an important assumption: that "decisions made are not solely determined by systemic constraints. Judgments of decision makers are critical."[27] As stated previously, leaders' personal preferences can have an impact on foreign policy within the neoclassical realist framework. Decision-making theory can provide powerful explanations for why leaders take the actions that they do within a neoclassical realist framework. Neoclassical realism provides an explanation for the primary desire of states: security. Decision-making theory shows how leaders decide on actions to best protect their security.

There are three primary schools of decision-making within foreign policy. These have been called the rational choice school, the cognitive psychology school, and the poliheuristic school.[28] While the rational choice and cognitive psychology schools stand on their own, the poliheuristic school

---

[25] Mona El-Ghobashy, "Egypt's Paradoxical Elections," *Middle East Report* no. 238 (Spring 2006), http://www.merip.org/mer/mer238/elghobashy.html (accessed February 24, 2009).

[26] Hamdi al-Sayyed (address during conference on elections at the Research Center for Human Rights, Cairo, Egypt, December 25, 1995), quoted in Kassem, 80.

[27] James F. Voss, "On the Representation of Problems: An Information-Processing Approach to Foreign Policy Decision Making," in *Problem Representation in Foreign Policy Decision Making*, ed. Donald A. Sylvan and James F. Voss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 21.

[28] Alex Mintz, "Integrating Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy Decision Making: A Poliheuristic Perspective," in *Integrating Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy Decision Making*, ed. Alex Mintz (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 1.

seeks to integrate elements of both. The rational choice model focuses primarily on the outcomes of foreign policy.[29] Decision-makers are seen as rational actors who weigh the various outcomes of foreign policy choices and then decide on the course of action that would maximize the gains for decision-makers or their states. The main drawback to this school, obviously, is its reliance on decision-makers acting rationally. There are numerous examples of this simply not being the case, and thus the rational choice school falls short of being a comprehensive theory of decision-making.

In contrast, the cognitive psychology school focuses on the process through which foreign policy decisions are made. In this model, the perception of the situation by decision-makers is key.[30] In this school, much emphasis is placed on the often skewed form of information that is available to decision-makers, and how these misconceptions can affect policy-making. In contrast with the rational choice school, decision-makers are not assumed to have arrived at the most beneficial policy for their state, because the imperfections in perceptions and information often obscure the best course of action. This school also takes into account the biases and misperceptions that decision-makers themselves may harbor. This school also has a major flaw, however, in that it focuses far too much on processes and not enough on outcomes. Without providing explanation for how decision-makers integrate outcomes, this model also falls short of a comprehensive explanation of how decisions in foreign policy are arrived at.

The polyheuristic perspective, in contrast, seeks to integrate elements of the two above schools to reach a more comprehensive model of decision-making in foreign policy. Scholars in this field argue that rational and cognitive theories "*must* be integrated in order for us to arrive at realistic and productive assessments of the nature of foreign policy decision making."[31] Decision-making in this perspective is the product of a two-step process. The first step involves decision-makers applying a

---

[29] Mintz, 2.

[30] Charles S. Taber, "The Interpretation of Foreign Policy Events: A Cognitive Process Theory," in *Problem Representation in Foreign Policy Decision Making*, ed. Donald A. Sylvan and James F. Voss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 29.

[31] Brandon J. Kinne, "Decision Making in Autocratic Regimes: A Poliheuristic Perspective," *International Studies Perspectives* 6, no. 1 (February 2005), 115.

"noncompensatory principle" wherein decisions are weighed versus their impact on one of several different dimensions.[32] The most common dimension affected is the political dimension. This is because, in most cases, decision-makers are in some way political leaders and their future success depends on not creating undue political problems for themselves. Thus, decisions are weighed against the likely political impact for the decision-maker. Even if the benefits of a certain decision would be high in certain areas, that decision will be rejected by decision-makers if it is believed that it will have a highly negative impact on a key dimension (again, chiefly political).[33]

After choices have been eliminated using the noncompensatory principle, leaders will either utilize a rational choice model of weighing outcomes and comparing relative utility, or will operate within the cognitive psychology school and make decisions based on their perceptions and biases regarding a given situation. These decision-making shortcuts are referred to as heuristics, which gives this model its name. In evaluating decision-making, this model comes closest to taking into account every possible factor of the process. It acknowledges that rational deliberation can have a major role in decision-making, but at the same time allows for cognitive issues such as bias to play an important role. It also takes into account sources outside of the foreign policy sphere that may impact the decisions of leaders, such as political concerns. As the "foreign policy as domestic policy" school shows, domestic politics do play an important role in Egyptian foreign policy. However, the polyheuristic correctly shows that other elements are involved with foreign policy decision-making beyond political calculations.

Authoritarian States and the Polyheuristic School

Examinations of the polyheuristic school have primarily taken place on decision-making within democracy.[34] This logically makes sense, as the school itself places an emphasis on the political

---

[32] Mintz, 2.
[33] Ibid., 3.
[34] Kinne, 115.

dimension. This dimension is more important within a democracy, as leaders are more responsible to their constituents and decisions that would do great political harm would likely end a decision-maker's career. It would seem, then, that authoritarian states would be less susceptible to public opinion, as the powers of an authoritarian leader are generally larger than that of democratic leaders and public opposition, if kept below a threshold of violence, can generally be ignored.

Kinnes, however, points out that the polyheuristic school still applies to authoritarian states, as "decision makers, regardless of the regime type of their respective states, wish to stay in power."[35] Societal forces still play a role in shaping decision-making in authoritarian regimes because they can pose a threat to the power of the regime if they are agitated by foreign policy decisions. Single-party regimes, as in Egypt, use the ruling party as the conduit for public support. As shown above, Egypt's paternalistic structure provides material benefits to supporters of state action, and uses coercive measures to prevent opposition to threaten the power of the regime. Indeed, "leaders in single-party regimes depend on the party to ensure their political survival."[36]

Kinnes looks at several different types of authoritarian states. Most applicable for this study is the personalist autocracy category that he identifies.[37] In many ways, this type of regime lines up excellently with Kassem's portrayal of the personal authoritarian rule that is the characteristic of Mubarak's regime. In this type of authoritarian state, the main leader of the state is the central actor in the decision-making process.[38] Although there may be other considerations, in most cases the leader (in the case of Egypt, Mubarak) makes foreign policy primarily by himself. The foreign policy establishment serves not to generate policy but to propagate the decisions made by the leader. Public opinion has little influence on the decisions of such leaders as well, because leaders in these states are relatively insulated from popular rule through institutions such as elections.

---

[35] Ibid., 118.
[36] Ibid., 120.
[37] Ibid., 116.
[38] Ibid., 120.

The Personalist Autocracy as Practiced in Egypt

Now I will show that the decision-making process in Egypt demonstrates characteristics of the personalist autocracy category laid out by Kinnes. As previously outlined, Egypt is an authoritarian state with most state power concentrated in the hands of the president. The Egyptian Constitution invests substantial power in the office of the president, making him virtually the sole decision-maker in all forms of policy, including foreign policy. Korany writes that "crucial policies and turning-point decisions are not publicly debated and civil society is generally relegated to a supportive function."[39]

This form of decision-making is a hold-over from the rules of Nasser and Sadat, who "both centralized and personalized the foreign policy process, limiting the role of institutions."[40] Additionally, the ability of other actors to influence foreign policy was based not on their position within the government but rather on their personal relationship with the president.[41] Officially, the Egyptian Foreign Ministry states that "The Egyptian political leadership has made way for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other institutions to participate actively in the decision-making process through genuine consultations, and through accepting suggestions as well as options proposed by those institutions to the leadership."[42] Despite such official proclamations, however, the president still remains the single most powerful actor in determining foreign policy.[43]

Characteristic of Egyptian foreign policy decision-making is the personal nature of the process. Beginning with Nasser and Sadat, foreign policy was influenced by the personalized nature of the rule. Mubarak's rule has seen a continuation of this type of personalized diplomacy, most obviously in his reaction to Saddam Hussein's deception over the impending invasion of Iraq, which will be discussed

---

[39] Bahgat Korany, "Egypt: Between Overstretch and Pivotalness in its Foreign Policy," in *Diplomacy and Developing Nations: Post-Cold War Foreign Policy Making Structures and Processes,* ed. Justin Robertson and Maurice A. East (London: Routledge, 2005), 171.

[40] Ali E. Hillal Dessouki, "Egypt," in *Security in the Middle East,* ed. Samuel F. Wells, Jr. and Mark A. Bruzonsky (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987), 72.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Arab Republic of Egypt, "Historical Background," http://www.mfa.gov.eg/MFA_Portal/en-GB/About_the_Ministry/historicalview/rulee.htm (accessed February 28, 2009).

[43] Korany, 173.

in greater detail below. This type of personal rule tracks extremely well with Kinne's ideas of personalist autocracy, where the leader's personality has an outsized influence over the foreign policy decision-making process in comparison to other types of leadership systems.

Mubarak's personal style has been characterized as that of a technocrat and a man of moderation.[44] Key to this aura of moderation is his insistence of restoring a more balanced place of Egypt in the Middle East and beyond. This personal predilection for the middle road can be seen in Mubarak's decisions regarding foreign policy in each of the three case studies below. Each is marked by a desire to protect Egypt's security while at the same time not taking unnecessary risk or openly pushing back at powers such as the United States. Additionally, Mubarak's caution can be seen in his reluctance to push strongly for a position of regional dominance as under Nasser. However, this has not prevented Mubarak from still pushing for a more central role, if not a hegemonic one, for Egypt within the Middle East. Finally, some have suggested that Mubarak's style of decision-making, in attempting to remain as cautious as possible, approaches passivity in outlook.[45] This observation will be important to keep in mind while examining Egypt's actions in the third case study, that of the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

Method of Research on Egyptian Foreign Policy

The key source of information for this study will come from examining the actions of Mubarak and Egypt during three case studies that will be detailed below. By examining the decisions and actions taken by Mubarak and Egypt during these case studies, it will be possible to see how well these actions fit with the neoclassical realist framework. This information will come from several sources, including official statements from Mubarak and other government sources, the Egyptian newspaper *al-Ahram* and other Western newspapers that provide quotations from Egyptian officials, and the academic literature on Egyptian foreign policy.

---

[44] Dessouki, 82.
[45] Korany, 177.

The project design includes references to speeches by Egyptian government officials on foreign policy, official documents published by the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Egyptian newspapers writing on foreign policy issues. Such analysis will identify how Egyptian officials define the primary reason behind foreign policy decisions. For instance, are Egyptian officials making appeals to the idea of Arab unity or the need to support the Palestinian struggle for statehood? Or are justifications primarily couched in terms of Egyptian interests and needs?

While examining quotes by Egyptian officials, it will also be important to examine not only justifications, but the actions themselves. This will involve both what Egyptian officials say and what they actually do. A discrepancy between the two will be important to note, as it will indicate a gap between what Egypt claims it stands for and what interests it actually pursues. In this way it will be possible to determine how Egypt pursues what it claims to be its national interest. In order to more accurately understand the gap between what Egypt claims to be its national interest and what it actually identifies as its national interest, academic sources on Egyptian foreign policy will need to be consulted as well. These sources can provide the context and criticism necessary to determine what Egypt really believes is in its national interest.

These speeches, documents, and texts are a valid method of assessment because they will come directly from, or will be written about, those who are most responsible for crafting foreign policy in Egypt. Their actions and statements are thus directly relevant to answering the research questions identified above. Additionally, because the statements and documents are widely accessible, the data will be easy to access for interested scholars, and the results obtained from this research will be replicable.

It is important to note the distinction between foreign policy itself and the decision making process that determines foreign policy. Foreign policy will be defined as the actions and statements that Egypt makes towards other countries, while foreign policy decision making is the process through which the policies of Egypt are created. Although this project will focus primarily on the foreign

policy of Egypt specifically, the decision making process cannot be ignored as the two are interdependent. Additionally, in analyzing the gap between what Egyptian officials say and what they choose to do, it is important to recognize that a decision making process occurs. It will be impossible to understand the reasons behind Egyptian foreign policy decisions without understanding the decision making process within the country. Therefore, this research will examine the decision making process as well as the actual implemented foreign policy of Egypt.

It will not be possible, of course, to examine all of the documents and statements by public officials in Egypt, or to examine every academic article written on Egyptian foreign policy. Thus, several cases will be focused on in order to provide an overview of Egyptian foreign policy during the presidency of Hosni Mubarak. Three such cases should provide a sufficient sampling to determine how Egypt has defined its national interest and how it has sought to further it. All three cases will involve Egypt's interactions with Iraq. The leadership of Iraq (under Saddam Hussein) and Egypt (under Mubarak) remains the same in all three cases. These constants will make it easier to identify the variables that are responsible for changes in Egypt's foreign policy.

The first case will be Egypt's statements and actions in response to the Iran-Iraq War, which took place from 1980 to 1988. This should prove useful in evaluating the strength of Egypt's claims of Arab unity, as it pitted an Arab state (Iraq) against a non-Arab state (Iran) within the Middle East. However, Egypt has also competed with Iraq for a position of leadership and influence within the Arab world. Also key will be evaluating the effect that Egypt's isolation from the Arab world following the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty had on its foreign policy. Thus, the support that Egypt provides Iraq, both in words and in actions, will be useful in determining the true motivations behind Egyptian foreign policy.

The second case will be Egypt's role during the 1991 Gulf War between Iraq and an international coalition led by the United States. Again, the war saw combat primarily between an Arab and a non-Arab army, although significantly this time the non-Arab army was from outside the Middle

East. Egypt provided support for the American-led coalition, but a deeper examination of its words and actions during this period will allow scholars to determine why Egypt chose to take the actions that it did. It will also be useful to compare and contrast the actions and statements from Egypt during this war to its actions and statements during the Iran-Iraq War.

The final case study will be the 2003 invasion of Iraq by the United States and the subsequent occupation, which continues to this day. Egypt's role in this war was much more ambiguous than in the previous Gulf War, as Egypt did not commit troops or provide logistical support to the United States despite requests. Analysis of texts and speeches of this period will either show that in fact Egypt has pursued a consistent, realist foreign policy or that Egyptian foreign policy in this instance was in fact aligned towards a more pro-Arab viewpoint.

The Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs will be the primary source of data on the statements of Egyptian officials, as their website contains an archive of releases and documents put together by the Ministry. Because the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is primarily responsible for developing Egypt's foreign policy, their reports and statements are particularly relevant. Absent direct interviews with foreign policymakers, these documents provide the best insight into the way Egypt articulates its place within the Middle East and the broader world.

Archives of Egyptian daily newspapers can also be useful in analyzing Egyptian foreign policy. Opinion pieces on foreign policy issues can provide an insight into the Egyptian government's thinking, especially in newspapers in which the government exercises some editorial control through the Ministry of Information. One such newspaper is the daily *al-Ahram*, which provides archives in English. Thus, *al-Ahram* will provide an excellent source of information on the Egyptian foreign policy process and ultimately the foreign policy actions of Egypt.

However, the archives of *al-Ahram* are limited, and only readily available beginning in the early 2000s. Therefore, the analysis of newspapers will be limited. More fundamentally, while there is a large and varied environment of journalism within Egypt, most of it is only available in Arabic. As I

do not possess enough skill in Arabic to accurately access this information, it is not available for this study. I have to acknowledge, therefore, that there may be perspectives that this study misses. Attempts to supplement *al-Ahram* will be made by consulting some Western newspapers that provide quotes from Egyptian officials during the time frame prior to *al-Ahram's* archived coverage, although the possibility of bias or inaccuracies in quotation must be acknowledged. However, this appears to be the best possible solution to obtaining quotes from officials from the time-period of the case studies.

The final major source of data will be from archives of scholarly articles and books written about Egyptian foreign policy. This will involve an examination of publications by Egyptian academics, who will have first hand experience within the country and should be able to provide a more accurate picture of the foreign policy there. Those Egyptian scholars who take a critical view of the government and of Egyptian foreign policy should be especially interesting in reaching an understanding of how Egypt actually defines its national interest, as opposed to how it justifies its action in public. Scholarly articles written by non-Egyptian authors will also be utilized, although they may not be as useful as articles written by Egyptian scholars.

The case studies selected should prove effective for several reasons. First, the span of time (from 1980 to 2003) is significant and eliminates the possibility that any one case is an isolated incident that has no bearing on Egypt's overall foreign policy formulation. Second, as mentioned before these case studies all take place during the rule of Hosni Mubarak and involve the state of Iraq. These variables will thus be held constant, allowing for more accuracy in determining the real causes behind differences in Egyptian foreign policy. Third, each case study involves Egyptian relations with a non-Arab state, thereby providing a way to test Egypt's commitment to Arab unity versus its desire to further its own goals.

In summary, this project will use qualitative research and an interpretive analysis in order to discover how the Egyptian government defines its national interest and how it uses its foreign policy to pursue its interests. Identifying these two items will come through the examinations of official

statements and documents from the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as an examination of critical scholarship from primarily Egyptian academics. By selecting three case studies that span a significant amount of time, a comprehensive picture of Egyptian foreign policy will be created. These design choices will allow for research that is accurate and repeatable.

The broad hope of this research project, then, is to create a fuller picture of how Egypt defines its national interest as well as the nature of its foreign policy. This is an area of study underserved by current academic research. Egypt's continuing importance to the Middle East underscores the necessity of my research. My research will also seek to demonstrate the continuing utility of the neoclassical realist school in international relations research. This project will take into consideration both the decision making process as well as the end result of this process in the form of Egypt's actual foreign policy. The results will enhance our understanding of Egypt's foreign policy and the application of neoclassical realism in international relations theory.

It is now time to look at three key case studies. The cases of the Iran-Iraq War, the 1991 Gulf War, and the 2003 invasion of Iraq provide three excellent opportunities to examine the factors behind Egypt's foreign policy. As previously stated the presence of Iraq in all three cases provides a steady baseline from which to evaluate the primacy of different variables in affecting Egyptian foreign policy. Additionally, the leadership of both Egypt and Iraq by Hosni Mubarak and Saddam Hussein, respectively, are constant and help limit the number of variables that would effect foreign policy formation and implementation.

The Iran-Iraq War

Egypt's actions during the Iran-Iraq War provide the first major opportunity to evaluate Egypt's foreign policy under Hosni Mubarak. The conflict, which began in 1980 and lasted for eight brutal years, began shortly before Mubarak assumed the presidency. Thus, it would prove the first foreign policy challenge faced by the new president. Mubarak decided to support Saddam Hussein and Iraq

during the conflict. This decision is particularly intriguing given the later breakdown in relations between Iraq and Egypt. After giving a brief background on the conflict and on Egypt's role during the war, I will examine the reasons why Mubarak decided to support the Iraqi regime against Iran.

The motivations behind Iraq's invasion of Iran in 1980 are numerous, and include long-standing border disputes and Hussein's concern that the recent Islamic Revolution in Iran might be exported to Iraq and its Shi'a majority.[46] Significant to this study, it has also been suggested that Iraq launched its invasion at this time because Egypt was isolated after the signing of its peace treaty with Israel and this provided Iraq with the opportunity to establish itself as a major regional power.[47] The war itself ground on until 1988, and witnessed the use of chemical weapons, extended trench warfare, and "human wave" attacks by unarmed Iranians. At the end of the conflict, over 360,000 Iranians and Iraqis were dead and Iraq's economy was devastated.[48] Ultimately, the war ended without a clear victor.

Egypt took several actions in support of Iraq during the Iran-Iraq War. On the material side, Egypt initiated large-scale arms transfers to Iraq.[49] Additionally, Egypt sent thousands of military advisors to assist Iraq.[50] Finally, Egypt sent civilian workers to Iraq to assist Iraq's economy.[51] This aid was extremely useful to Iraq during the long course of the war, and certainly helped Iraq to continue fighting. Such support seems strange, given Iraq's leading role in criticizing Egypt following the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty.[52] Was it Iraq's status as an Arab country that provoked Egypt's support? Mubarak's claim during the early stages of the war that "we sympathize with Iraq and will not hesitate to do whatever we can" seem to indicate an affinity with a fellow Arab nation.[53] However,

---

[46] Martha Wenger and Dick Anderson, "The Gulf War," *Middle East Report* no. 148 (September-October 1987), 24.
[47] F. Gregory Gause III, "Iraq's Decisions to go to War, 1980 and 1990," *The Middle East Journal* 56, no. 1 (Winter 2002), 50.
[48] William L. Cleveland, *A History of the Modern Middle East* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2004), 419.
[49] Korany, 164.
[50] Cleveland, 418.
[51] Gregory L. Aftandilian,. *Egypt's Bid for Arab Leadership* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1993), 27.
[52] Laurie Mylroie, "Iraq's Changing Role in the Persian Gulf," *Current History* 88, no. 535 (February 1989), 89.
[53] Olfat M. El Tohamy, "Gulf Arabs Press Egypt to Pledge them Troops," *Christian Science Monitor*, March 30, 1982.

several key factors can be identified to explain why Mubarak would take this action that go beyond a more idealistic attachment to a fellow Arab country.

The first major factor was a strategic one: the need to check Iranian power in the Middle East. Allowing Iran to defeat Iraq militarily would drastically change the geopolitical balance of power within the region. Iran has long competed for leadership within the Middle East. The Islamic Revolution once again put Iran on the leading edge of Islamic thought and could serve to disrupt Arab regimes throughout the region by appealing to domestic populations in Arab states with ideas of Islamic solidarity and revolution. An Iranian victory over Iraq would further boost Iran's power in the Middle East and challenge Egypt's claim to be the preeminent state in the region. Iranian dominance over the Persian Gulf would also impact global oil supplies and further enhance Iran's power throughout the region and world. Mubarak could not allow Iran to challenge Egyptian security and power within the region, and many believed that Egypt's help was necessary for Iraqi success. Indeed, Iraq itself argued that Egypt was the only state in the Middle East with the manpower and strength to effectively check Iran.[54] Thus, Egypt had a vested interest in backing Iraq to check the emerging power of Iran in the region.

The second major factor was Egypt's position of isolation within the Arab world following the peace treaty with Israel signed by Sadat. The rejection of the peace treaty was widespread in the Arab world. It appeared to many Arabs that Egypt was forsaking the Palestinian cause in order to achieve a separate peace. Actions taken against Egypt included the suspension of Egypt's membership in the League of Arab States, the transfer of the League's headquarters from Cairo to Tunis, threats to boycott Egyptian companies that did business with Israel, and the breaking off of diplomatic relations with

---

[54] Laurie Mylroie, "After the Guns Fell Silent: Iraq in the Middle East," *The Middle East Journal* 43, no. 1 (Winter 1989), 63.

Egypt by several Arab countries.[55] This was a profound turn of events from Egypt's previous place in the Arab world, where Gamal Abdel Nasser commanded the attention and respect of the entire region.

The Iran-Iraq War provided an excellent opportunity for Mubarak to reintegrate Egypt into the fabric of the Arab world. By providing support to Iraq, an Arab state, in its conflict with Iran, a non-Arab state, Egypt bolstered its credentials as a vital power in the Arab world by "demonstrating its usefulness in helping to protect the Arab world's eastern flank."[56] Arab nations, in calling for assistance from Egypt to turn back Iran, acknowledged Egypt's importance to the region's security. Tashin Bashir, a diplomat with close ties to Mubarak's government, summed up this feeling when he stated, "You see now that when Iraq is in trouble, who do they come to? Egypt."[57] Additionally, the focus on Iran as a threat to the Arab world diverted attention away from the conflict with Israel, further diminishing hard feelings over the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty. Indeed, Egypt's assistance to Iraq paid diplomatic dividends, as Egypt began the process of reintegrating with the Arab world throughout the war.

The Iran-Iraq War then provides somewhat of a mixed bag in motivations for Mubarak. Although maintaining a positive position within the Arab world was a definite motivator, there were other, more pragmatic aims at play as well. The geopolitical shift that would have occurred had Iran defeated Iraq would have threatened Egypt's claims to regional dominance. Even Egypt's attempts to regain standing within the Arab world were not motivated out of a desire to boost the Arab world as a whole, but rather to re-establish Egypt's position of power within the region.

When evaluating the actions of Mubarak and Egypt during the Iran-Iraq War, we can see that the tenets of neoclassical realism hold up well. Egypt was, at this point, largely outside the influence of the Arab world due to the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty. Thus, a claim of pan-Arab leadership falls short, as the Arab world was not listening to Egypt at this point. Egypt thus needed to reclaim a place

---

[55] Dessouki, 81.
[56] Aftandilian, 27-28.
[57] Mary Curtius, "Gulf War Could Yield Diplomatic Gains For Egypt," *Christian Science Monitor,* January 22, 1987.

within the region, in order to protect its security and influence within the region. The threat posed by Iran impacted Egypt, and neoclassical realism would predict actions by Egypt to check Iran's growing influence and power. The geographic proximity certainly played a role in Egypt's reaction. Additionally, the aggressive rhetorical nature of the Iranian regime, with its call for Islamic revival and revolution, posed a definite threat to Egypt's security.

The personalist autocracy school of foreign policy decision-making also sheds some light on Mubarak's decisions on the Iran-Iraq War. Mubarak, for instance, sought to re-establish Egypt's ties to the Arab world. This was due to his more moderate and cautious temperament, as he sought to repair some of the damage done by Sadat's foreign policy. Thus, Mubarak's personality played a role in his decision to render aid to Iraq during the war. Furthermore, Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran espoused an extremely revolutionary form of Islam, which was in many ways far more extreme than anything that Mubarak would support. Mubarak's caution and desire to find a moderate middle path contributed to his desire to check the power of Iran's revolutionaries.

The 1991 Gulf War

The actions of Egypt during the 1991 Gulf War contrast sharply with its actions during the Iran-Iraq War. A decade prior, Egypt had provided men and material, as well as rhetorical support, to Iraq. Conversely, after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990 Egypt stood in opposition to the Iraqi regime. This opposition culminated in Egypt's participation in an unprecedented military coalition that turned back Iraq's army. Significantly, this coalition was largely organized and manned by the United States. Why did Egypt align with a non-Arab state against Iraq, a state which it had helped support ten years before? Even more than the Iran-Iraq war, the 1991 Gulf War sheds light on the inconsistency of Egypt's commitment to pan-Arabism and helps provide further clarity to how Mubarak drives Egyptian foreign policy. As with the Iran-Iraq War, I will first lay out a brief background to the conflict and describe Egypt's role in it. Then I will examine the reasons that Egypt under Mubarak took the actions that it

did. Because Egypt's role was larger in this conflict, and because Mubarak's motivations were more complex, I will go into greater depth in analysis.

In August of 1990 Iraqi forces invaded and annexed Kuwait. There were several reasons for Iraq's invasion of the small emirate of Kuwait. These include long-standing claims that Kuwait was incorrectly separated from Iraq after the fall of the Ottoman Empire. In addition, Iraq's coffers had been largely depleted due to the Iran-Iraq War, and Kuwait's lucrative oil fields were a prime target for Saddam Hussein's attempts to rebuild Iraq's economy. Iraq also owed significant debt to Kuwait from the Iran-Iraq War, and Hussein saw invasion as a way of 'canceling' this debt.[58]

The invasion sparked immediate condemnation on the world stage, particularly from the United States. The United States, under President George H.W. Bush, began assembling a coalition to prevent further Iraqi aggression and ultimately to drive Iraq from Kuwait. Reaching out to potential Arab allies was a key part of building this coalition, and Egypt was a prime target. At first, Mubarak urged the United States to remain out of the conflict.[59] As it became apparent that Hussein would not relent, Mubarak became more open to taking measures to turn back Iraq. This included an Arab League resolution that called for an Arab military force to protect Saudi Arabia that passed largely due to the efforts of Egyptian officials.[60] Eventually, Egypt supported United Nations resolutions calling for the full withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and decided to ally itself with the U.S.-led coalition. While Egypt's forces were primarily used to defend Saudi Arabia, the United States and other allied countries attacked Iraqi forces in Kuwait on January 16, 1991 and succeeded in driving Iraq from Kuwait with a minimum of coalition casualties.[61]

---

[58] Joe Stork, "The Gulf War and the Arab World," *World Policy Journal* 8, no. 2 (Spring 1991), 367.
[59] Andrew Bennet, Joseph Lepgold, and Danny Unger, "Burden-sharing in the Persian Gulf War," *International Organization* 48, no. 1 (Winter 1994), 56.
[60] Bennet, 56.
[61] S.B. Cohen, "The Geopolitical Aftermath of the Gulf War," *Focus* 41, no. 2 (Summer 1991), 23.

Egypt's contribution to the 1991 Persian Gulf War was substantial. Most significantly, it provided 40,000 troops to the coalition.[62] Additionally, Mubarak allowed U.S. aircraft to use Egyptian airspace, and allowed U.S. aircraft carriers to transit through the Suez Canal.[63] Egypt's push for Arab support for the coalition was also key in legitimizing the coalition's mission. Thus, in contrast with the Iran-Iraq War, Egypt took numerous and substantial steps to counter Iraq. What lay behind this decision? The Egyptian Foreign Ministry suggests that the primary motivation for Egypt's actions were out of concern for Kuwait: "Egypt exerted all possible efforts to defend Kuwaiti rights, and to restore the independence and security to Kuwait."[64]

Are there other factors, besides a desire to protect Kuwait, which may have been a factor? Several such factors can be identified. The first was geopolitical in nature. Iraq, in invading Kuwait, threatened to upset the balance of power within the Middle East. Capturing Kuwait's oil fields would give Iraq substantial economic power. The possible threat to Saudi Arabia's eastern oil fields compounded this problem. Additionally, by using military force to conquer another Arab state in the Middle East, Iraq appeared to be striving for a position of regional dominance. Mubarak was unwilling to see Iraq obtain such a position. Prior to the invasion, power was not substantially concentrated in any one state in the region, which allowed "Cairo to slowly and steadily reassert its leadership role in the region without the opposition of a major power."[65] Mubarak explicitly argued that Iraq was seeking to claim a more prominent role in the region at the expense of Egypt, noting that Iraq sought to "usurp Egyptian leadership" and that this was an "impossible thing."[66]

Another major factor was economic in nature. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait threatened to destabilize the economy of Egypt in two major ways. First and foremost, remittances from workers in

---

[62] Bennet, 56.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Egypt and the GCC Member States," http://www.mfa.gov.eg/MFA_Portal/en-GB/Foreign_Policy/International_Relations/egypt_Mideast/The+Egyptian+Relations+with+the+GCC+Member+States.htm (accessed February 20, 2008).

[65] Aftandilian, 29.

[66] Hosni Mubarak (interview with *al-Ahram*, September 28, 1990), quoted in Aftandilian, 86.

Gulf countries dried up due to the war. These remittances, which totaled an estimated $3.7 billion, were a substantial hit to Egypt's economy.[67] Second, tourism to Egypt fell as a result of the instability in the region. The total loss of direct tourist revenue was estimated at $1.2 billion, with an additional $1.8 billion in indirect loss.[68] Tourism provides a major source of revenue for Egypt, and as long as the crisis in the Gulf persisted, Egypt's economy would suffer greatly. Third, Gulf countries and Kuwait in particular invested heavily in Egypt. For instance, Kuwaiti investments in Egypt represent 25% of all Arab foreign investment in Egypt.[69]

Additional financial incentive for cooperation was presented by debt cancellation. Egypt's economy had been saddled with a large amount of debt, and debt cancellation was a strong incentive for Egyptian participation in coalition activities. For instance, the Gulf Co-operation Council promised to write off $7.7 billion in debt owed by Egypt for Egypt's participation in the coalition forces protecting Saudi Arabia.[70] Additionally, the United States pledged to forgive $7 billion in military debt that Egypt owed.[71]

A third major factor for Egypt's actions was Iraq's influence on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Egypt had long seen itself as the key to a peace settlement between Israelis and Palestinians. Saddam Hussein, however, sought to assume a greater role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. His approach, however, differed from Egypt's. Rather than seek peace with Israel and serve as a possible mediator, Hussein believed that only through demonstrating strength and military power could Arab countries deter further Israeli aggression and push Israel to the negotiating table. Prior to the outbreak of hostilities with Kuwait, Hussein repeatedly made belligerent comments towards Israel, in contrast to Egypt's position of accommodation towards the Jewish state.

---

[67] Nigel Ash, "Egypt Exploits its Gulf War Bonus," *Euromoney* (April 1993), 138.
[68] Ibid., 139.
[69] Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Egypt and the GCC Member States."
[70] Ash, 139.
[71] Dennis J. Wamsted, "Iraqi Invasion Reverses the Pecking Order in Bilateral US Relations," *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs* 9, no. 5 (October 31, 1990), 19.

Mubarak has long spoke of Egypt's special role in mediating the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. In his 1981 inaugural address, Mubarak spoke of Egypt's "historical responsibility" towards the Palestinians and of said that Egypt was "determined to protect all the fruits of peace."[72] Additionally, in 1989 Mubarak stated that "we are helping the Palestine question more than anyone else."[73] Egypt's position of importance in regards to the Palestinians was a point of pride to Mubarak. It was also a way to show Egypt's continuing relevance within the Middle East. Hussein's approach jeopardized this by calling into question not only Egypt's method of negotiation, but also Egypt's significance within the region.

This forceful approach did attract support from many in the Arab world, particularly Palestinians who felt abandoned by the international community. There appeared to be a real threat to Egypt's role the key player in Israeli-Palestinian affairs. Mubarak openly criticized Hussein's approach, saying that progress in reaching a peace could not be achieved through "one-up-manship" but rather through "confident insistence on the goal."[74] Thus, even before the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait tensions existed between Mubarak and Hussein over the course of the peace process in the Middle East. This tension would make it easier for Mubarak to decide to commit forces to fight Iraq. After the invasion, Hussein continued to press the Israeli-Palestinian issue, arguing that he would not withdraw from Kuwait unless Israel withdrew from the occupied territories.[75] That this demand was met with some popularity within the Palestinian community was especially frustrating for Mubarak, as in September of 1989 Egypt had put forth a comprehensive ten-point plan for a Palestinian peace deal.[76] Allowing Hussein to continue to pound Egypt's approach to Israel was damaging to the legitimacy of Egypt within the region.

---

[72] Walter Laqueur and Barry Rubin, eds, *The Arab-Israeli Reader* (New York: Penguin Books, 2001), 237-238.
[73] Ibid., 358.
[74] Ann Mosely Lesch, "Contrasting Reactions to the Persian Gulf Crisis: Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and the Palestinians," *The Middle East Journal* 45, no. 1 (Winter 1991), 34.
[75] Lesch, 37.
[76] Laquer and Rubin, 362.

There is another, more personal factor for Mubarak's decision to stand again Iraq. Prior to the Iraqi invasion, Mubarak attempted to personally mediate a settlement resolving some of the differences between Iraq and Kuwait. Although no breakthroughs occurred, Hussein did reassure Mubarak that no invasion was imminent.[77] This personal affront did nothing to endear Hussein to Mubarak, and fed into the Egyptian perception that Hussein was a destabilizing and untrustworthy leader within the Middle East. Additionally, it threatened to decrease the credibility of Mubarak within the Middle East, as he had provided assurances to the emir of Kuwait that Iraq would not invade.

A final factor in Mubarak's actions was the attitude of Egypt's population towards Iraq. As Lesch writes, public support was "galvanized by Egyptians' genuine anger at the past Iraqi treatment of Egyptian workers."[78] This ill-treatment included "severe restrictions on repatriating savings, the mistreatment and even killing of Egyptian workers by demobilized Iraqi soldiers" as well as "Iraqi soldiers who stripped money, gold, and consumer goods from them at roadblocks."[79] Even though public opinion did not provide the justification for Mubarak's actions, it made it easier for him to undertake his foreign policy actions.

As with the case of the Iran-Iraq War, the neoclassical realist framework seems to accurately fit on Egypt's actions during the 1991 Gulf War. There were several threats to the overall security of the Egyptian state. These included economic threats (from the loss of income from Egyptian workers in the Gulf and the threats to global oil supplies due to Iraq's occupation of Kuwait's oil fields) and more traditional geopolitical threats posed by the rising threat of Saddam Hussein's Iraq. Additionally, the geographic proximity and aggressive nature of the Iraqi regime appears to have made an impact on the foreign policy of Mubarak. These, as noted, are key factors in determining threat within the neoclassical realist framework. Mubarak also seemed keen on preserving Egypt's legitimacy within the region, especially regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict. This legitimacy can be viewed as key to

---

[77] Aftandillian, 28.
[78] Lesch, 39.
[79] Ibid.

Mubarak's concept of Egypt as a vital player in the Middle East, and a further way for Mubarak to strengthen the security of his regime.

The decision-making process of personalist authoritarian states highlighted above also sheds some light on the way that Mubarak reaches the decision to assist the coalition in turning back Iraq. In particular, the personal affront of Hussein breaking his promise to Mubarak that he would not invade Kuwait certainly influenced the decision of Mubarak to take the actions that he did. This is consistent with the personalist authoritarian model, as the power to make decisions is heavily invested in a unitary figure at the head of government, whose decisions can become highly personalized at times.

Additionally, Mubarak's desire to maintain Arab support for the coalition (as seen in Egypt's role in pushing for Arab League support for a military solution to Hussein's aggression) demonstrates his cautious and moderate personality. The personalist authoritarian model, of course, emphasizes the importance of the personality of the leader in determining their foreign policy decisions. Additionally, the lack of popular domestic support for Egypt's participation in the coalition had little effect on Mubarak's decisions, as the public in a personalist autocracy has little impact on the creation of policy.

The 2003 Invasion of Iraq

The 2003 invasion of Iraq by the United States and allied countries marks yet another chapter in Egyptian-Iraqi relations under the rules of Mubarak and Hussein. As it saw the fall of Hussein's regime, it also provides the cap to the period of time where both leaders ruled their respective countries. Additionally, the actions of Egypt during this conflict were significantly different from its actions in either the Iran-Iraq War or the 1991 Gulf War. Therefore, finding out what different factors affected Mubarak's decisions will be extremely useful in determining the major factors that guide Egyptian foreign policy. Once again, I will provide a brief outline of the conflict, and then follow with Egypt's actions during it. Then, I will outline the factors and reasons that led Mubarak to take the actions that he did.

The build up to the 2003 invasion of Iraq was led by the United States. Claiming that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction and connections to terrorist organizations, the administration of George W. Bush portrayed Iraq as a mortal threat to the security of the world. Although attempts were made by the Bush administration to create a coalition as broad as the one created during the 1991 Gulf War, they largely failed.[80] This did not deter the United States, however, and on March 20, 2003 the war began. Within three weeks, Hussein's regime had fallen. Of course, the defeat of Hussein's army did not mark the end of the Iraq conflict, as American forces have had to fight an insurgency of varying strength ever since.

Caution was (predictably) the course for Mubarak in dealing with the 2003 invasion. The United States made concentrated attempts to bring Arab countries into the new "coalition of the willing." Mubarak however, in contrast to the 1991 Gulf War, did not offer material support or troops for the coalition.[81] Although Egypt would again allow naval vessels of the coalition to use the Suez Canal, it would not permit the use of airbases by coalition air forces (although it did permit the use of its airspace).[82] In the lead up to the war and during the opening phases, Mubarak repeatedly urged the United States not to go to war. Indeed, Mubarak expended substantial diplomatic effort to prevent the conflict. This included sending high-level envoys to the United States urging a halt to the build up toward war. Mubarak made his position even clearer when he stated that "All Arab peoples and governments oppose the war. Opinions diverge on Saddam Hussein; but sympathy with the Iraqi people is unanimous."[83]

At the same time, Mubarak did not attack the United States or other coalition countries directly. Indeed, he laid much of the blame for the war on Iraq and Saddam Hussein, particularly through his

---

[80] Michael Dunne, "The United States, the United Nations, and Iraq: 'Multilateralism of a Kind'," *International Affairs* 79, no. 2 (March 2003), 277.

[81] Abdennour Benantar, "Egypt and the War on Iraq: Implications for Domestic Policy," *Journal of Third World Studies* 24, no. 1 (Spring 2007), 227.

[82] Ibid., 228.

[83] Nevine Khalil and Soha Abdelaty, "Before the Storm," *al-Ahram*, February 27-March 2003.

Information Minister Safwat al-Sharif.[84]   Additionally, Mubarak and other officials "wished" for a quick war, hoping that the coalition would achieve victory quickly and with a minimum of casualties on all sides.[85]   Clearly, Mubarak did not want to commit to either the Iraqi or American side completely. The reasons for this middle approach will now be examined.

First, I will look at the reasons that Mubarak sought to prevent a war in Iraq. Considering the long-lasting rivalry between Iraq and Egypt for leadership in the Middle East, this at first seems odd. Traditional realists might argue that Egypt should have done all in its power to remove such a threat to its goal of regional power. However, there were several mitigating factors that prevented Egypt from pursuing a more aggressive stance towards Iraq during this conflict.

The first factor was the domestic unrest unleashed by the build up to war. The build up saw large-scale protests to possible Egyptian intervention, many of which were led by the Muslim Brotherhood (the main opposition group in Egypt). Essam el-Erian, a prominent member of the Muslim Brotherhood, summed up the effect of the war on the Brotherhood's power when he stated that "The failure of Arab regimes to solve the problems and conflicts, especially the U.S. war against Iraq, gives the Muslim Brotherhood more credibility in the street and gives us more resolve to handle this conflict."[86]   The Egyptian government has always viewed the Muslim Brotherhood as a possible threat to the security of the regime, and Mubarak did not wish to further inflame public opinion and push more people towards the Brotherhood.

Other major forces within Egyptian society also called for solidarity with the Iraqi people. The most influential of these other groups was al-Azhar University, one of the best-known and well-respected Islamic centers of learning in the Muslim world. Scholars at the prestigious university issued a fatwa in March of 2003 stating that it was the "duty of all Muslims to defend Iraq against foreign

---

[84] "Egypt's Mubarak Blames War on Iraq's Saddam," *Human Events* 59, no. 11 (March 31, 2003), 5.
[85] Benantar, 229.
[86] Cam McGrath, "Iraq: War Revives Egypt's Once-Violent Muslim Brotherhood," *Global Information Network,* March 27, 2003.

invasion."[87] This is especially notable considering the traditionally conservative outlook of al-Azhar, which was widely viewed as being closely tied to the government.[88]

Also worrying to the Egyptian regime was the possibility of regional destabilization following an invasion. Mubarak spoke of his concern to President Bush about the destabilizing effects of the war when he said that "it will unleash reactions that will be difficult to control. Violent action in one part of the Middle East will have an equal but opposite reaction elsewhere."[89] The possibility of a power vacuum within Iraq following the toppling of Hussein's regime, along with the possibility of terrorist forces operating from within this vacuum could pose a threat to Egyptian security. The historical precedence for this was the conflict in Afghanistan, which saw the appearance of *mujahedeen* (literally, one involved in *jihad*) who sought to fight the Soviet invasion. These mujahedeen came from throughout the Middle East, including Egypt, and after the conflict in Afghanistan ended many returned to their home countries. Many of these fighters would go on to participate in many deadly and destabilizing terrorist attacks within Egypt throughout the 1990's. Fear of another wave of such fighters would have been a powerful motivation for Mubarak to proceed with caution.

A third reason for Mubarak's approach was a fear that a precedent of regime change would possibly threaten the security of Mubarak's own regime. As a high level Egyptian official, Osama el-Baz, stated: "(the invasion of Iraq would be) contrary to the sovereignty of states and the rights of people to self- determination."[90] Mubarak has faced pressure in the past from the United States to liberalize his regime, and has had problems with Egyptian extremists launching international attacks (Mohamed Atta, the leader of the terrorists who committed the September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon was Egyptian). The possible invasion of Iraq was perceived as

---

[87] McGrath, 1.
[88] Gilles Kepel, *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), 278.
[89] Milan Vesely, "Kurdish Unrest: Egypt's Pre-Invasion Warning Comes True," *Middle East* 347 (July 2004), 18.
[90] Nevine Khalil and Soha Abdelaty, "Trying to Avoid a War," *al-Ahram*, January 23-29, 2003.

aggressive and could set the precedent for an intervention into Egyptian internal affairs. This posed a direct threat to the security of Mubarak's regime.

Additionally, the invasion of Iraq was often coupled with American claims that a democratic Iraq would be the first in a new wave of democratization throughout the region. Obviously, Mubarak's authoritarian regime would be threatened by such a sea change in Middle East politics. Previous American regimes had largely overlooked Mubarak's autocratic rule due to Egypt's position as the first Arab state to sign a peace treaty with Israel and its generally stable relationship with the Jewish state. However, if the Iraq War truly was the first step in a shift of American priorities in the region, it indicated a threat to Mubarak's continuing rule as a powerful autocrat. Mubarak's regime, in fact, made a pointed effort to differentiate Egypt from states such as Iraq. This appeared to be due to fear that the regime system in Egypt may have been in danger due to the new objectives of the United States in the Middle East. Information Minister al-Sharif summed up this attempt when he stated in response to a BBC question on whether Egypt may be the next regime to be targeted that "Egypt is a civilized country, a country of well-established institutions, it respects international agreements, it enjoys freedom of opinion and respects its neighbors."[91]

Another reason for Mubarak's reluctance to strongly support the invasion was linked the continuing Arab-Israeli conflict. Mubarak had consistently called upon the United Nations and international agreement to be the driving force in resolving that conflict, rather than unilateral actions by Israel (of course, Mubarak saw Egypt as the key player in international efforts to bring about such a settlement). By largely bypassing the United Nations and international approval, the United States called into question the ability of the United Nations to mediate conflicts in the future. This would threaten Egypt's ability to affect the outcome of the Arab-Israeli conflict by removing a path for it to influence the conflict.[92] It should be noted, however, that Mubarak's motivation was not to save the

---

[91] "Egypt's Mubarak Blames War on Iraq's Saddam," 5.
[92] Benantar, 228.

credibility of the United Nations per say, but rather to preserve a path for Egypt to exercise influence over a conflict that Mubarak saw as vital to the continuing security and legitimacy of his country.

Additionally, the possibility for economic disruption as a result of the war worried Mubarak. As before the 1991 Gulf War, Egypt had substantial economic ties to the Gulf region. Beyond the large amounts of Egyptian workers that were employed in Gulf states such as Kuwait, Egypt maintained substantial trade with Iraq itself. This trade amounted to $2.5 billion in 2002 alone.[93] Tourism and Suez Canal traffic were also once again a factor, as a war in the region threatened these vital parts of the Egyptian economy. The economic security of the state was thus threatened by a possible outbreak of war. This was a different situation than in 1991, when war had already broken out and Egypt wanted to end hostilities as soon as possible to restore its economic ties to the region. However, it should be clear that economic security is a vital component of Egyptian foreign policy.

Why then did Egypt still offer tepid support for the coalition (in the form of Suez access) and why did Mubarak seek to lay the blame ultimately on Hussein? Certainly, from a pan-Arab perspective, it would be expected that Mubarak would be extremely vocal in standing up for the protection of Iraq from outside forces. The main reason was the continued relationship between the United States and Egypt. As Benantar writes, "for Egypt…the relationship with Washington was and is more important than Arab solidarity."[94] The amount of military aid given to Egypt was second only to the aid given to Israel. Additionally, substantial development aid has also flowed to Egypt through the United States Agency for International Development. This aid totaled $2.4 billion a year prior to the 2003 invasion.[95] Mubarak's regime depended on this aid, and a strong challenge to the United States over Iraq could jeopardize this money. Therefore, Mubarak tread carefully, never openly attacking the United States, but rather indirectly calling for caution and a diplomatic resolution to the tensions between Iraq and America.

---

[93] Ibid.
[94] Ibid.
[95] Mary H. Cooper, "Reassessing Foreign Aid," *The CQ Researcher* 6, no. 36 (September 27, 1996), 848.

Again, the neoclassical realist paradigm seems best to explain Egypt's actions during the 2003 invasion of Iraq. The key concern for Mubarak, as in previous cases, was a preservation of Egyptian security above all else. This manifested itself in protecting the regime from internal security threats (such as political opposition from the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Azhar) as well as protection from external security threats (such as the one posed by a new precedent of U.S. intervention into states within the Middle East and promoting democracy as a central tenet of U.S. foreign policy). Economic security, as before, was also a major motivation for Egypt to follow a middle path, seeking to neither unduly agitate its American sponsors nor severely threaten its economic interests in Iraq and the Gulf.

Additionally, utilizing the decision-making process within a personalist autocracy, we can identify Mubarak's personality as a key reason for a moderate approach. Mubarak's desire to avoid taking extreme actions shines through in the build-up to the 2003 invasion. Although faced with pressure within society to more strongly condemn the invasion and the United States, Mubarak continued to push for diplomatic resolutions and moderation throughout the region. The central nature of the presidency in decision-making within Egypt allowed Mubarak to take a position that was moderately unpopular with the public without losing his ability to make policy. Any opposition to his moderate approach was ineffective because of the extreme power invested in the office of the presidency.

Conclusions on Egyptian Foreign Policy in the Era of Mubarak

There are several main conclusions that we can make from this examination of foreign policy under Mubarak. These conclusions can be divided into two main categories, the theoretical and the practical. The practical conclusions on Egyptian foreign policy provide policy makers a better understanding of how Mubarak makes decisions and what motivates his actions, whereas the theoretical conclusions provide scholars of international relations with an example of the continued usefulness of the neoclassical realist paradigm in international relations research. The theoretical

conclusions also demonstrate the utility in using decision-making theory in studying foreign policy formation.

Three practical foreign policy conclusions can be drawn from the case studies presented in this paper. First and foremost, the claims of pan-Arab unity appear to be primarily a means to legitimize Mubarak's actions within Egypt itself and throughout the wider Arab world rather than a true foreign policy objective. Egypt's relationship with Iraq under Saddam Hussein is a perfect example of this. Mubarak's policy towards Iraq has not been one of consistent Arab brotherhood. In fact, Mubarak's view of Iraq under Hussein was one of distrust and rivalry for leadership within the region. This rivalry was overcome significantly on only one occasion, when Iraq was seriously threatened by Iran. As has been shown, however, Egypt's actions in support of Iraq were mainly designed to check Iran's growing influence as well as reintegrate with the Arab world rather than as purely motivated by support for a fellow Arab state. Even reintegration with the Arab world, which may appear to have some pan-Arab motivations, was more a matter of Egypt regaining regional dominance and relevance rather than any more idealistic aim.

A second major conclusion is that Egyptian foreign policy is chiefly oriented to protecting the security of the Egyptian state. Security threats can be traditional military threats from aggressive states like Iran, Iraq, or the United States. The (perceived or actual) aggressive actions of these states threatened Egypt's security in various ways, as highlighted above. Security threats can also be economic. Egypt's dependence on economic ties with the Gulf was threatened in all three cases, and Mubarak's actions were motivated by economic as well as security concerns. The key point, however, is that the Egyptian state under Mubarak takes actions in a way to maximize the security, whether physically or economically, of Egypt.

A third conclusion is that domestic issues, while not the primary motivation behind Egyptian foreign policy, do play a role in determining Mubarak's decisions. This can be seen especially in domestic protests during the 2003 invasion of Iraq, which had some impact on the course plotted by

Mubarak. These domestic issues themselves can be viewed as a sort of security risk, however. The risk is not so much to the state as whole, but rather to the ruling regime of Hosni Mubarak. Mubarak, in protecting the security of his regime (and in his mind, the state of Egypt), must sometimes act to disperse, or at least to diminish, public discontent. It is important to note, however, that external security measures still reign supreme. Whereas public opinion in 2003 would have had Mubarak take a more extreme position against the invasion, he charted a substantially more moderate course in order not to jeopardize relations with the United States.

Theoretically, this study has show that neoclassical realism continues to provide a useful paradigm for understanding foreign policy within international relations research. Mubarak's actions, although occasionally justified under the rhetoric of Arab solidarity, hew more closely to a neoclassical realist framework. His need to guarantee the security of Egypt is indicative of this. Conversely, however, the impact that internal Egyptian politics has on Mubarak's decisions should not be understated. This reveals some of the limitations of neoclassical realist theory, while not completely dismissing it. Decision-making theory, especially of the poliheuristic school, provides us with excellent tools to understand how and why Mubarak came to the decisions that he did. We can see that once Mubarak determined the political cost of an action, his actions largely fit within the neoclassical realist paradigm of international relations.

These conclusions provide policy makers with useful information on Egypt's likely foreign policy in the future. By identifying possible threats to the security of Mubarak's regime, whether internal or external, policy makers can predict how Mubarak is likely to respond to future foreign policy crises. Policy makers who believe that Egypt will tow the line in the future need only to look to Egypt's actions during the 2003 invasion of Iraq to see that Egypt's primary motivation is its own security, and that Mubarak will not always bend to the will on the United States on issues that deeply affect his ability to retain power. Ultimately, this study shows that Mubarak values the security of the state above anything else and policy makers should take this into account when dealing with Egypt.

Bibliography

Articles

Alterman, Jon B. "Dynamics Without Drama: New Options and Old Compromises in Egypt's Foreign Policy." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 18, no. 3 (2005): 357-369.

Aly, Abdel Moneim Said and Robert H. Pelletreau. "U.S.-Egyptian Relations." *Middle East Policy* 8, no. 2 (2001) 45-59.

Ash, Nigel. "Egypt Exploits its Gulf War Bonus." *Euromoney* (April 1993): 138-141.

Barnett, Michael N. "Regional Security After the Gulf War." *Political Science Quarterly* 111, no. 4 (Winter 1996/1997): 597-618.

Benantar, Abdennour. "Egypt and the War on Iraq: Implications for Domestic Policy." *Journal of Third World Studies* 24, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 227-247.

Bennet, Andrew, Joseph Lepgold, and Danny Unger. "Burden-sharing in the Persian Gulf War." *International Organization* 48, no. 1 (Winter 1994): 39-75.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros. "The Foreign Policy of: Egypt in the Post-Sadat Era." *Foreign Affairs* 60, no 4. (1982): 769-788.

Cella, John. "Line in the Sand." *Harvard International Review* 27, no. 2 (Summer 2005): 6.

Cohen, S.B. "The Geopolitical Aftermath of the Gulf War." *Focus* 41, no. 2 (Summer 1991): 23-26.

Cooper, Mary H. "Reassessing Foreign Aid." *The CQ Researcher* 6, no. 36 (September 27, 1996): 841-864.

Copley, Gregory R. "Egypt Shifts its Geo-Strategic Policy Priority Toward Africa." *Defense and Foreign Affairs Strategic Policy* 33, no. 6 (2005): 20-21.

El-Ghobashy, Mona. "Egypt's Paradoxical Elections." *Middle East Report* no. 238 (Spring 2006). http://www.merip.org/mer/mer238/elghobashy.html (accessed February 24, 2009).

Gad, Emad. "Egyptian-European Relations: From Conflict to Cooperation." *Review of International Affairs* 3, no. 2 (2003): 173-189.

Gause III, F. Gregory. "Iraq's Decisions to go to War, 1980 and 1990." *The Middle East Journal* 56, no. 1 (Winter 2002): 47-71.

Gause III, F. Gregory. "Sovereignty, Statecraft, and Stability in the Middle East." *Journal of International Affairs* 45, no. 2 (1992): 441-470.

Halliday, Fred. "The Gulf War and its Aftermath: First Reflections." *International Affairs* 67, no. 2 (April 1991): 223-234.

Heikal, Mohamed Hassanein. "Egyptian Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs* 56, no. 4 (1978): 714-727
.

Hudson, Michael C. "Public Opinion, Foreign Policy, and the Crisis of Legitimacy in Arab Politics," *Journal of Arab Affairs* 5, no. 2 (1986): 131.

Karawan, Ibrahim. "Foreign Policy Restructuring: Egypt's Disengagement from the Arab-Israeli Conflict Revisited." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 18, no. 3 (2005): 325-338.

Kinne, Brandon J. "Decision Making in Autocratic Regimes: A Poliheuristic Perspective." *International Studies Perspectives* 6, no. 1 (February 2005): 114-128.

Khashan, Hilal. "The New Arab Cold War." *World Affairs* 159, no. 4 (1997): 158-159.

Lesch, Ann Mosely. "Contrasting Reactions to the Persian Gulf Crisis." *The Middle East Journal* 45, no. 1 (Winter 1991): 30-51.

Melman, Yossi. "Domestic Factors and Foreign Policy in the Arab-Israeli Conflict." *Washington Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (1986): 33-42.

Mylroie, Laurie. "After the Guns Fell Silent: Iraq in the Middle East." *The Middle East Journal* 43, no. 1 (Winter 1989): 51-67.

Mylroie, Laurie. "Iraq's Changing Role in the Persian Gulf." *Current History* 88, no. 535 (February 1989): 89-99.

Purcell, Susan Kaufman. "Decision-Making in an Authoritarian Regime: Theoretical Implications from a Mexican Case Study." *World Politics* 26, no. 1 (October 1973): 28-54.

Rodman, Peter W. "Middle East Diplomacy After the Gulf War." *Foreign Affairs* 70, no. 2 (Spring 1991): 1-18.

Spector, Samuel J. "Washington and Cairo: Near the Breaking Point?" *Middle East Quarterly* 12, no. 3 (2005): 1-11.

Springborg, Robert. "Identity in Crisis: Egyptian Political Identity in the Face of Globalization." *Harvard International Review* 25, no. 3 (2003): 18.

Springborg, Robert. "US-Egyptian Relationship: Failed Expectations." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 10, no. 4 (1981): 161-170.

Stork, Joe. "The Gulf War and the Arab World." *World Policy Journal* 8, no. 2 (Spring 1991): 365-374.

Vesely, Milan. "Kurdish Unrest: Egypt's Pre-Invasion Warning Comes True." *Middle East* 347 (July 2004): 18-19.

Wamstead, Dennis J. "Iraqi Invasion Reverses the Pecking Order in Bilateral US Relations." *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs* 9, no. 5 (October 31, 1990): 19.

Wenger, Martha and Dick Anderson. "The Gulf War." *MERIP Middle East Report* no. 148
(September–October 1987): 23-26.

Books

Aftandilian, Gregory L. *Egypt's Bid for Arab Leadership.* New York: Council on Foreign Relations
Press, 1993.

Art, Robert J. and Robert Jervis, eds. *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary
Issues.* New York: Pearson Longman, 2009.

Ayubi, Shaheen. *Nasser and Sadat: Decision Making and Foreign Policy.* Wakefield, NH: Longwood
Academic, 1991.

Bender, Gerald J, ed. *International Affairs in Africa.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1987.

Brown, L. Carl, ed. *Diplomacy in the Middle East: The International Relations of Regional and
Outside Powers.* London: I.B. Tauris, 2001.

Cleveland, William L. *A History of the Modern Middle East.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2004.

Clinton, W. David, ed. *The Realist Tradition and Contemporary International Relations.* Baton
Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007.

Feiler, Gil. *Economic Relations Between Egypt and the Gulf Oil States, 1967-2000: Petro Wealth and
Patterns of Influence.* Brighton, England: Sussex Academic Press, 2003.

Gallhofer, Irmtraud N. and Willem E. Saris. *Foreign Policy Decision-Making: A Qualitative and
Quantitative Analysis of Political Argumentation.* London: Praeger, 1996.

Hinnebusch, Raymond and Anoushiravan Ehteshami, eds. *The Foreign Policies of Middle East States.*
Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.

Kassem, Maye. *Egyptian Politics: The Dynamics of Authoritarian Rule.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner
Publishers, 2004.

Keppel, Gilles. *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard
University Press, 2002.

Laqueur, Walter and Barry Rubin, eds. *The Israel-Arab Reader.* New York: Penguin Books, 2001.

Lorenz, Joseph P. *Egypt and the Arabs: Foreign Policy and the Search for National Identity.* Boulder,
CO: Westview Press, 1990.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince*. New York: Penguin Books, 1991.

McLaurin, R.D., Don Peretz, and Lewis W. Snider. *Middle East Foreign Policy: Issues and Processes.*
New York: Praeger, 1982.

McLaurin, R. D., Mohammed Mughisuddin, and Abraham R. Wagner. *Foreign Policy Making in the Middle East: Domestic Influences on Policy in Egypt, Iraq, Israel, and Syria.* New York: Praeger, 1977.

Mintz, Alex, ed. *Integrating Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy Decision Making*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Robertson, Justin and Maurice A. East, eds. *Diplomacy and Developing Nations: Post-Cold War Foreign Policy Making Structures and Processes.* London: Routledge, 2005.

Stoessinger, John G. *The Might of Nations: World Politics in Our Time.* New York: Random House, 1982.

Stoessinger, John G. *Why Nations Go to War*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Telhamy, Shibley and Michael Barnett, eds. *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Wells, Samuel F. and Mark A. Bruzonsky, eds. *Security in the Middle East: Regional Change and Great Power Strategies.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987.

Wolfenstein, E. Victor. *Personality and Politics*. Belmont, CA: Dickenson Publishing Company, 1969.

Primary Source Databases

Al-Ahram Weekly. "Archives." http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/archives.htm.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Arab Republic of Egypt. http://www.mfa.gov.eg/mfa_portal/en-gb//