

REVIEW PAPER

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND EGYPT: A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Hrustan Šišić¹ ¹ International Burch University, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Hrustan Šišić, International Burch University, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. E-mail: hrustan.sisic@ibu.edu.ba

ABSTRACT

This article examines the strategic partnership between the United States and Egypt, highlighting the historical significance and dynamics that have shaped this partnership since the 1970s. Egypt's strategic location and control of the Suez Canal contribute to its significant role in world trade and military strategies. Since the Cold War, U.S.-Egyptian relations have been characterized by military cooperation and significant economic assistance, despite occasional conflicts over human rights and democratization. While promoting democracy and protecting human rights worldwide, the United States has simultaneously supported authoritarian regimes in Egypt and the Middle East. Analyzing U.S. foreign policy towards Egypt, this study reveals a dichotomy between promotion of democratic values and security interests. This study highlights the benefits that the United States receives from this long-standing partnership as well as the implications for regional stability. Focusing on the intersection of U.S. values and security interests, this paper provides a balanced understanding of the long-term alliance and its impact on regional stability and international perceptions. This study uses historical analysis method to understand the nature and dynamics of the strategic relationship of the United States and Egypt.

Keywords: United States, Egypt, partnership, military cooperation, economic assistance

**MAP SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Volume 5

ISSN: 2744-2454/ © The Authors.
Published by MAP – Multidisciplinary Academic Publishing.

Article Submitted: 29 May 2024
Article Accepted: 30 July 2024
Article Published: 31 July 2024



Publisher's Note: MAP stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

<https://doi.org/10.53880/2744-2454.2024.5.55>

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

Šišić H. (2024). **Strategic partnership between the United States and Egypt: A Historical Overview**. MAP Social Sciences, 5, 55-67.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.53880/2744-2454.2024.5.55>



© The Author(s). **Open Access Article**
Creative Commons CC BY: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.



Introduction

Egypt, located in northeastern Africa and partly in Asia due to the Sinai Peninsula, occupies a crucial geographical position. It shares latitude with the Persian Gulf, through which a significant share of the world's oil supply passes. Over the years, Egypt has facilitated overflights and refueling stops for the U.S. military aircraft, primarily due to their long-standing military relationship, which has persisted for more than three decades. Bordering Libya to the west, Sudan to the south, the Mediterranean Sea to the north, and Israel and Palestine to the east, Egypt holds a strategic position. Particularly dynamic is its eastern border, where Egypt has historically played a key role in mediating disputes between Israelis and Palestinians, including brokering ceasefires to end conflicts (U.S. News, 2014).

Since the 1970s, following President Anwar Sadat's pivotal shift in the Cold War alliances, Egypt has been considered an essential strategic asset for the United States (Aftandilian, 2013). The U.S. was a principal promoter of the peace agreement between Egypt and Israel, which was finalized in 1979, shortly after the Camp David Accords in 1978. These accords, signed by Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin on 17 September 1978, marked a significant turning point in Middle Eastern history (Quandt, 1986). Although Egypt entered peace negotiations due to its national security concerns, the U.S. aimed to reduce Soviet influence in the region. The peace agreement resulted in Egypt becoming the first Arab state to officially recognize Israel.

Military assistance has been a cornerstone of the bilateral relationship between Egypt and the United States. Generations of Egyptian soldiers have been educated in the U.S., gaining knowledge from prestigious military institutions (Congressional Research Service, 2015). Cooperation between the two armies has been ongoing since the 1950s, with the most significant joint operation occurring during the Gulf War in the 1990s, when the Egyptian and the U.S. forces collaborated to expel Iraqi troops from Kuwait.

The strategic bilateral relationship between Egypt and the United States has yielded substantial benefits for both nations from the 1980s to the present. In 2007, the U.S. Ambassador to Egypt Francis Ricciardone highlighted the importance of financial aid, stating: "The Egyptian strategic partnership played a central role in promoting peace and stability, countering extremism and terrorism,

and creating an environment in which political and economic reforms can prosper. A key pillar of the relationship, the U.S. economic and security assistance both symbolizes and vastly strengthens our nation's historic cooperation and long-term commitment to the partnership." (Axelrod, 2011, p. 2).

The strategic partnership between the United States and Egypt spanning more than four decades has significant implications for regional stability and international relations. The importance of this study lies in the comprehensive examination of the multidimensional nature of this relationship, especially in the context of American foreign policy. By analyzing historical events, political shifts, and the relationship between American values and security interests, this research provides critical insights into the evolution of this partnership and its continued impact on the Middle East. This research highlights Egypt's strategic importance to the United States and the potential repercussions for regional and global stability in the event of shifts in political relations. Therefore, this study seeks to answer the questions: a) How has the strategic partnership between the United States and Egypt evolved since the 1970s, and what are the historical milestones that have shaped this relationship? b) What are the primary components of US foreign policy toward Egypt, and how have these policies balanced the promotion of democracy and human rights and support for authoritarian regimes? Addressing these questions, this study aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the US-Egypt strategic partnership, exploring the historical context and political dynamics.

Literature Review

In the period of modern human history, behavior of global powers in the Middle East have always presented dynamic and interesting field for the scholars of international relations. Furthermore, because of strategic goals in the region, foreign policy of great powers has been continuously different in theory and practice. Such is the case with the United States and its presence in the Middle East from the 1950s until today.

Tauber in its work discussed the confrontation between American values and American security interests in the Egypt and entire region (Tauber, 2013). This paper analyzed the U.S. foreign policy in Egypt from 1945–2013, with the special accent on recent political activities in the country. According to Tauber, American officials always promoted freedom and protection of human rights, but historical

facts showed that same country indeed favored its security and economic interests rather than the process of democratization. Furthermore, since the end of World War II, the U.S. has supported authoritarian dictators in the Middle East and North Africa to maintain regional stability and, more recently, to contain terrorism, all the while ignoring substantial human rights violations and inhibiting the development of political rights (Tauber, 2013). Tauber carefully studied historical facts using the documents of the U.S. government to discover a nature between American values and significant security interests, putting the main attention on Egypt.

Considering that foreign policy of great powers represents an interesting field for study, many of the scholars are included in these topics. Beside Tauber who mainly discussed the position of American values in the preservation of its security interest's region, Jessica Andreasen, analyzed foreign policy of the United States through financial aid. She started her work with a speech of former state secretary Condoleezza Rice to the State Department: "Foreign assistance is an essential component of our transformational diplomacy to empower developing countries to strengthen security, to consolidate democracy, to increase trade and investment, and to improve the lives of their people, and to prevent future failed states like Afghanistan." (Lancaster, 2008, p. 29).

A main question which author Andreasen touched has been the achievement of foreign policy objectives through financial aid. According to author, financial aid represents the instrument through which the United States and other big powers are trying to achieve its interests. Aid is used as one mechanism of shaping and promoting shared security matters between the U.S. and its allies (Essex, 2013). It is important to stress that the financial aid lasting more than thirty years has been both sided, because beside its humanitarian background, financial support was released mainly to achieve the United States's security interests in the region and economic interests linked with Gulf states. First author, Lilian Tauber, proved that American interests in the Egypt are confronting the American original values.

Modigs also claimed that the United States played a significant role in the Middle East during the second part of twentieth century (Modigs, 2003). His work included a deep analysis of the U.S. political moves during the Cold War. Modigs claimed that the results of the U.S. foreign policy in the Mid-

dle East have varied, and created new friends and foes (Modigs, 2003). This directly confronted the politics of the United States pursued in the Middle East, mainly because it affected national interests of the country in that region. Nevertheless, the main purpose of this work was to examine whether the U.S. foreign policy efforts in the Middle East served positively to the national interests or not (Modigs, 2003).

Axelrod put his attention at the military relationship between the United States and Egypt defining the role of financial aid in political power of Egypt (Axelrod, 2011). His work included a historical analysis of thirty years old strategic partnership between two countries. However, a main part of Axelrod's work were two critiques on military partnership, which are basically contradictory, but lead to the same conclusion - reducing aid. The first critique argued that Egypt does too little to support the U.S. interests in the region. It means that military aid should buy more than it does, and that Egypt might not be such a valuable strategic partner (Axelrod, 2011). On the other side, second critique argued that the United States should reject strategic partnership with Egypt because its regime holds its power through oppression and fear.

Sharp claimed that the U.S.-Egyptian relations are aimed at maintaining regional stability, improving bilateral relations, continuing military cooperation, and sustaining the March 1979 Egyptian Israeli peace treaty (Congressional Research Service, 2015). Also, with analysis of historical background of strategic partnership between the United States and Egypt, Sharp discussed the issues which affected relationship of two countries. Decline in relationship started with American invasion of Iraq in 2003 and Egyptian rejection to support its traditional ally. It continued with abuses of human rights and slow process of democratization under the rule of President Mubarak. However, a main question which author touched was the U.S. long lasting financial assistance which has been crucial for Egyptian economy. From the 1998, Egypt received 28, 969.2 dollars of economic assistance and 32, 735.4 dollars of military assistance (Congressional Research Service, 2015).

Our study provides an analysis that fills a critical gap in the literature by providing a comprehensive examination of the U.S.-Egypt strategic partnership. Focusing on the intersection of the U.S. values and security interests, this paper provides a balanced understanding of the long-term alli-

ance and its impact on regional stability and international perceptions. This study uses historical analysis method to understand the nature and dynamics of the strategic relationship of the United States and Egypt. Historical analysis method seeks to make sense of the past through the disciplined and systematic analysis of the traces it leaves behind. Historical analysis is commonly used in social research as an introductory strategy for establishing a context or background against which a substantive contemporary study may be set (Sage, 2015). Also, this study contains political analysis of the United States foreign policy during the reign of different presidents. It includes their different approaches towards world politics and Middle East as region, considering their different usage of theories of international relations. This study is based on all relevant documents which are directly connected with the topic such are: books, journal articles, government reports, World Bank reports, statements of officials, official websites of the U.S. and Egyptian governments, and analysis of scholars in international relations.

Strategic significance of Suez Canal

Egypt has functioned under two political systems (monarchy and republic) and three types of party systems since the days of Khedive Ismail Pasha (1863-1879). The multiparty system lasted until the 1952 Revolution, the so-called single-party system lasted from 1953 to 1976, and the contrived multiparty system has been in place since 1978 (Arafat, 2009). A main strategy which has been used by Egyptian governments throughout the history to secure the state borders was change in political orientation towards foreign alliances. Therefore, in the modern history foreign alliances of Egypt changed from Great Britain to the Soviet Union, and then to the United States.

After the Second World War, the United States wanted to convince regional leaders in the Middle East that they will not allow former colonial powers like France or Great Britain to regain their previous positions. The United States was in fact ready to offer economic aid and, if carefully managed, military aid to insure the independence and internal security of those countries (Gardner, 2011). Such political activities performed by the United States were to make transition from old power in the Middle East to the new system lead by the United States. Americans also aimed to constrain extreme nationalists and communist groups from the possible negative actions which could ruin a start of American dominance in the entire Middle East.

One of the key questions at the end of Second World war was in which way will the United States replace the dominance of British Empire at their tactical possessions in the Middle East. Egypt was never a formal colony, but the history of Anglo-Egyptian relations resolved around the issue of continued British control of the Suez Canal and the military base and garrison that had protected the canal since the late nineteenth century (Gardner, 2011). Suez Canal has been built by French company operating under monitoring of Sa'id Pasha- the Egyptian ruler at that time.

At the beginning, British government was not interested in Suez Canal and at some moments they even opposed the process of construction. Nevertheless, when channel became significantly important for global trade, and when government of Egypt decided to sell the shares of company, British officials hastened to take it. In 1869 Canal was first time opened for shipping. But, because of Egyptian huge international depth, they had to sell it to stabilize economic situation. Although the Constantinople Convention of 1888 declared the Suez Canal a neutral area, Sa'id's successor invited British troops in to suppress a rebellion against his government (Gardner, 2011). With significant authorities, they stayed in this area until the end of the Second World War.

The strategic importance of Suez Canal dates to the time of Egyptian Pharaohs B.C. Within the politics of all future regimes in Egypt this channel remained as an important strategic point. With the landing of Napoleon in Egypt in July 1798, the history of the Suez Canal entered its modern phase (Obieta, 1970). The arrival of Napoleon and its army served as an exploration of possible opening the channel for trade, but also at the same time it attracted attention of international observers regarding the strategic importance of Suez Canal. From historical perspective, political activities regarding the Suez Canal can be divided into three periods: from the 1869 and opening the Canal for shipping until the arrival of British troops in 1882; a period of British rule of the Canal throughout the years until 1954; and last period dates from removal of British influence on Suez Canal in 1954 until today.

First period has been marked with opened British interest regarding the strategic importance of the Suez Canal. As it is previously mentioned, British officials from the beginning of construction were not interested in any political affairs regarding the Canal. Almost immediately after its opening, the Suez Canal had a significant impact on world

trade as goods were moved around the world in record time, but in 1875, debt forced Egypt to sell its shares in ownership of the Suez Canal to the United Kingdom (About Education, 2015). Because of the Suez Canal ownership, period of nineteenth century has been marked with British dominance at the international stage. Therefore, the authority over the Middle East and Suez Canal is linked with world hegemony. Such is the case with the United States having dominance in this region especially at the second part of twentieth century. What Britain presented to the world in nineteenth century, the same did the United States in the twentieth century.

The revolution in 1952 and successful overthrow of British monarchy in period after that marked significant political changes in Egypt. By signing a treaty in 1954 regarding the full liberation of a country, it was more than logical that new Egyptian government will free and liberalize its economy and Suez Canal. With successful nationalization of Suez Canal, Gamal Abd al-Nasser became national hero and symbol of independence from British suppression.

Gamal Abd al-Nasser's rule

Revolution in the July 1952 resulted in a way that Gamal Abd al-Nasser appeared as the most dominant person in Egypt having enormous support for the leadership of the country. Gamal Abdel Nasser's leadership and charisma were essential to his rise within the Free Officer's Corps and the eventual overthrow of the British backed government in Egypt (Danielson, 2007). At that time, he was at position of Prime Minister until the referendum period in 1956 when new constitution was introduced, and his candidature for presidency. Using his great maneuvers, Nasser was the main person leading 1952 overthrow of the British monarchy. It all resulted in a way that he became a synonym for Egypt pride, symbol of protecting Arab values and a president with readiness to stand against West dominance and its supremacy.

Nasser's heroic image within the first decade of his rule was based on the popular response to his success in ending the British occupation of Egypt, defiance of the western monopoly on arms sales to the Middle East, opposition to the Baghdad Pact, the nationalization of the Suez Canal Company, political victory in the brief Suez War of 1956, the seizure of foreign properties and business enterprises, the rejection of the Eisenhower Doctrine, the union of Egypt and Syria, and the adoption of

doctrinaire socialist policies in 1961 (Podeh, 2015). Nasser's successes showed that he was a symbol for protection of identity, modernization and development of the country.

The U.S. foreign policy perspectives in the Middle East in Egypt in the 1950s were revolving around protecting availability of oil resources to the West countries and particularly the United States (Teaching History, 2010). Americans aimed also to end a British rule in Egypt and to stop propagation of communism in the region. However, a key goal in this period was to decrease Soviet influence in the Middle East and to give support to a newly formed Israeli state, while at the same time being sure of non-intervention of Arab states. In all this, the U.S. State Department regarded Egypt as the natural leader among the Arab States and sought to make it an ally and to encourage pro-Western elements in Egyptian society (Teaching History, 2010).

In the period between 1950s and 1960s and reign of Kenedy administration, Egypt has been considered as a potential strategic partner rather than the U.S. enemy, especially because Nasser appeared as a leader of newly established regime in such important part of the Middle East. However, Gamal Abd-al Nasser was a big enigma for Washington government for the years. Opinions about Nasser's diplomatic moves were two sided at the domestic political stage at that time in the United States. One side believed that Egypt under his rule could be an enemy supporting Soviet Union and communism. On the other side, some of the officials and their administrations thought that Egypt with Nasser could be their potential ally.

After the World War II, the United States following Truman doctrine entered a Cold War with defined goals and approaches (U.S. History, 2015). The U.S. officials established a new policy to achieve its interests in the Middle East. However, they faced some problems mainly because of the complexity in the decision-making processes, particularly about its foreign policy. An interesting problem was that they wanted to make Egypt free from British rule and to allow Egypt to have full self-ruling country with domestic leaders and politicians. Also, the U.S. officials believed that instability of Egypt in 1950s could make some space for Soviet Union influence and spread of communism. Such assumption was based on arguments that Soviet bloc could support growing leftist movements in Egypt whose main agenda was anti-Western politics and anti-Israeli view.

After the 1952, Washington was optimistic regarding the new regime in Egypt because of the big possibility of communists to impact the previous King Faruq's monarchy through internal and external channels. Revolutionary Command Council in Egypt (RCC) mainly consisted of young pragmatic officers, who came to power after the revolution in Egypt in 1952. Even if officially this command council was led by General Muhammad Nagib, still Gamal Abd al-Nasser managed its main duties and was its background. The Free Officers railed against corruption, which had so characterized King Faruq's monarchy and the feudalist-controlled party structure embodied by the Wafd Party (Lesch, 2015). From all beginning of Nasser's regime Americans believed they are in favorable position because of the space for market economy and industrial growth inside the Egyptian borders. Having in mind that it could decrease influence of Soviet Union in the region, the U.S. administration fought for the openness of Egyptian government to the West countries from the beginning of Nasser's regime.

The U.S. government was aware that Egypt from the 1950s was not ready for democracy and complete change of government structure. The idea was that political and economic stability of the country could be a good basis for future cooperation and possible democratic changes. To assist new Egyptian leaders to succeed in having political and economic stability, the U.S. officials helped the new government to move out the British influence and to completely decrease the impact of foreign actors. To help the transitional authoritarian regime in this regard, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) assisted in establishing Egyptian intelligence (the GIA) so that the RCC could ward off any oppositional, particularly communist, movements (Lesch, 2015). The United States seemed to be aware of the geographical position of Egypt and its geopolitical significance within the region. From the start of cooperation with new regime the U.S. officials showed level of contentment working together. In November 1954, the U.S. ambassador to Cairo, Jefferson Caffery, concluded that the new regime "had done more for Egypt in two years than all their predecessors put together before them (Beattie, 1995, p. 102).

In making its foreign policy in 1950s, the United States found itself at the crossroads many times. Formation of State of Israel in 1948 has been significant challenge to the U.S. foreign policy in the region. Having in mind anti-Israeli public opinion of some part of Egyptian population, President Truman together with his administration refused to

send military assistance to Egypt during the Nasser's consolidation of power. It is said that such denial was a breaking point for the future diplomatic relations between Nasser's Egypt and the United States.

President Eisenhower and his administration

With the President Eisenhower coming to the power in 1953 Arab population thought the United States will play more favorable role for the Arab countries in the future. On the other side, new set of officials of the U.S. government noticed a need to put more attention on oil reserves and oil transport from the region of Middle East. It particularly meant the security and stability in the region. Having in mind complexity of situation in the Arab world and their conflict with Israeli state, the United States decided to form agreements and pacts among non-Arab countries which had been in the northern part of the Middle East: Iran, Turkey and Pakistan. The Baghdad Pact was created in 1955 by Britain, Iraq, Turkey, Iran and Pakistan with the aim of strengthening regional defense and preventing the infiltration of the Soviet Union into the Middle East (Lesson from History, 1955). Also, the Baghdad Pact was a defensive organization for promoting shared political, military and economic goals founded in 1955 by Turkey, Iraq, Great Britain, Pakistan and Iran. Like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the main purpose of the Baghdad Pact was to prevent communist incursions and foster peace in the Middle East (US State Department Archive, 2015).

Improvement of relations with countries in the Middle East worried Nasser and his government representatives. It seemed that Egypt's importance in the region was decreasing slowly, but it was true for some of the Arab states in the region also. President Nasser succeeded in tendency to establish diplomatic talks with British officials by signing agreement in October 1954 (Barrett, 2010). Anglo-Egyptian treaty over the Canal allowed a British military presence until 1956, and the right of reoccupation if the Canal was threatened (Barrett, 2010).

All the various events in the period 1954-1955 including establishment of agreement regarding rule of Suez Canal between Egypt and Britain, and signing of Baghdad Pact in 1955, brought Israel to the level of uncertainty. After a few days of signing Baghdad Pact Israeli forces decided to attack Egypt

in February 1955 in popular Gaza part (Bassiouni, 2009). Such attack completely embarrassed Nasser and his administration which have been consisted of professional military men and was expected to re-establish its military power and reorganize it in a stable opponent to Israel. Such expectations failed with Israeli attack in 1955.

A popular Gaza raid in 1955 showed the superiority of Israeli military forces in the region and it showed to Nasser that Gaza strip is becoming hot potato in the hands of Egypt. Having in mind political situation in 1955, Egyptian government was aware that military advancement and re-organization was needed. Therefore, Nasser firstly turned to West powers asking for military assistance which was crucial in their conflict with Israel. However, negative answers came from the side of the three big powers: United States, Britain and France. Both the United States and Britain claimed that they need to respect tripartite agreement which underlined that they will not send military weapons to the countries in Middle East. French sent negative answer as well because they believed Egypt was supporting Algerian rebellions in the Algerian War (1954-1962). Getting negative answers from the West, Nasser decided to turn to negotiations with East, particularly Soviet Union. Diplomatic talks resulted in military support from the Soviet Union. The 1955 arms deal delivered to the Egyptians some 200 tanks and other weapons and amounted to about \$325 million (ABC Clio, 2011).

Military support in 1955 marked the beginning of an alliance between Soviet Union and Egypt which lasted until the mid-1970s. It opened the doors for increasing of Soviet Union in the Middle East and spread of their ideologies. Reactions from the West appeared in a way that the United States and Britain to stop their financial support for Egyptian projects inside the country. This forced Nasser to nationalize Suez Canal in 1956 which included Suez Canal Crisis in October and November in 1956.

Period between 1954-1956, including all political activities of Nasser's regime, turned President Nasser from friend of the United States to an enemy. His views of anti-Baghdad Pact, anti-Israeli and turn to Soviets in 1955 were crucial in jeopardizing relations with the United States. The fruition of the transformation from friend to foe was the Eisenhower Doctrine, announced by the president in January 1957 which offered military and economic aid to any state in the Middle East that requested it to fend off the advances of 'international communism' (Lesch, 2015).

President Kennedy and a new foreign policy in the Middle East

With the Syrian secession from the United Arab Emirates in 1961, Nasser was considered as being in weakened position from Washington side (McHugo J., 2013). However, presidential elections in 1960 and triumph of Kennedy brought new foreign policy perspectives in the United States government. His main message was that nationalist leaders in the Middle East should not be feared at all, but it should be tried to improve bilateral relationships again. A main attention has been put on Nasser. Kennedy's tendency to improve relationship with Nasser's regime again was based on facts which show that previous strategic partnership has been diminished and it needs to be recovered to benefit from the Egypt's geopolitical importance in the region.

Even Jewish votes played an important role in his presidential elections in 1960, President Kennedy had various political moves which from the beginning of 1960s have not been likely accepted in Israel. To bring Egypt closer to the diplomatic talks President Kennedy promised support for Palestinian refugee and involvement of UN Commission in the process for the loss Palestinian property, and his administration had put efforts to resolve Palestinian refugees' problem (Hart, 2009). One of the most important factors in recovering damaged relationship between the United States and Egypt was placing former rector of the American Cairo University John Badeau as the U.S. ambassador to Egypt (Badeau, 1969). Nasser replied positively on this signal showing his great political maneuvers. From the period of 1961 Nasser showed that he is a real example of diplomatic acumen, standing between two powers and during one period Egypt was receiving aid from two sides. It resulted with Egypt's significant economic growth in 1961 and a stable position in the region. Overall, Kennedy performed well with placing United States as a power in the middle between Arabs and Israeli state. However, his assassination in 1963 changed a discourse of slightly improved bilateral relationship between Egypt and the United States. After his death, diplomatic talks of two countries were almost completely ruined. Tensions resulted in another Arab Israeli war in 1967 and Israeli acquisition of territory of Gaza part and Sinai Peninsula.

Egypt's relationship with the United States had its own ups and downs during Nasser's regime mainly because of constant changing of dynamics in the political space at that time. As mentioned,

Nasser was a big enigma for Washington. He saw himself in the same position as Tito with Yugoslavia, being able to stand between superpowers and to perform its diplomatic maneuvers depending on political situation. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that Nasser during his reign was friend or enemy for United States. However, a big effort was launched in the U.S. foreign policy in order to maintain a good relation with a leader of Arab world.

Anwar al-Sadat's and the United States

Muhammad Anwar Al-Sadat belonged to the group of Free Officers in 1952 seeking to free Egypt from British rule and to establish republic. Free Officers Movement was secretly orchestrated by Nasser who became President of Egypt after the revolution. President Anwar Al-Sadat was closely tied with Nasser serving the position of Vice President twice until he succeeded the throne in 1970. However, he did not come to power because of revolution. Rather, he continued Nasserist system which was not easy to inherit because of many contradictions within the whole framework of the rule. The Sadat era cannot be analyzed in terms of either continuity or disjuncture, taken separately (Aulas, 1982). Egyptian politics in the beginning of Cold War was a complex process. Therefore, it was not easy for President Nasser to lead a country with such strategic importance in the region, especially because of pressure from both the United States and Soviet Union. Nevertheless, Sadat's Egypt has been more opened for peace treaties with Israel and for improvement of diplomatic discussion with the United States.

As a new president of Egypt, Sadat was influenced by different political ideologies including authoritarianism, Marxism, and liberal democracy. President Sadat opened the political system in 1976 and excluded large parts of the ruling party he had inherited from his predecessor without facing popular demands for political reforms, and it resulted in a transition to an authoritarian regime (Michalik, 2015). Even he came from the low-class family, it has not been problem for him to adopt to the ruling elite and follow their behavior. However, President Sadat did not have enough confidence in military officers who stayed at the positions from the previous regime. Because of that fact he started to make an alliance with the second rank officials putting them at the top positions in the following period.

Beginning of his reign has been marked with Arab-Israeli war in 1973 initiated by President Hafez

al-Assad in Syria and Anwar al-Sadat in Egypt, supported by Arab states coalition (History, 2015b). Syria and Egypt entered a war with different intensions. At one side, President Assad had main intention to regain lost Arab territory in Six-days War in 1967, while on the other side Egypt also aimed to regain lost Suez Canal, but still Sadat with his administration wanted limited war and to come closer to the process of peace policies with Israel. During the war, both the United States and Soviet Union were supporting its allies. The Yom Kippur War lasting from October 6-25 was stopped by the United Nations proclaiming stoppage of fire on the 25 of the same months. Arab states were not humiliated in this war as it was the case with Six-days War in 1967, but still it has been marked with Israelis military achievements in the battlefield. On the other side, Israel noticed that it is going to be hard for them to sustain military supremacy over the countries in the region and so far, they have been more opened for peace negotiations.

From the liberation from British monarchy until 1967, Egypt negotiated and cooperated with the government of the United States. However, at the time of Arab Israeli war in 1967 when Israeli state destroyed Egyptian military, the relationship between the United States and Egypt became ruined and Cairo did not have any diplomatic connections with Washington. Nevertheless, when President Sadat succeeded throne relationship between two countries improved. While Anwar Sadat sought territory and foreign investment, the White House wanted a strategic advantage over the Soviet Union (Brownlee, 2012). With the opened diplomacy from the side of Egypt and the United States, both side goals were clear.

From the period of taking office in 1970, President Sadat through war activities succeeded to attract attention of the United States which was his primary goal. Furthermore, liberalization of the market and more opened party system were also tools he used to form a strategic alliance with the United States. New politics of Egyptian government with the President Sadat at the top brought many positive changes in the region of Middle East. As a result of new cooperation with the United States three main political decisions occurred: Firstly, Egypt got back entire Sinai Peninsula inside its borders. Secondly, the United States urged a long-lasting peace between Israel and Egypt. And thirdly, Egypt became strategic partner of the United States, the same partner it has been before to the Soviet Union.

No one has been more taken with the image of Anwar es-Sadat as 'the master of decision' than Egypt's president himself (Baker, 1981). Starting from the 1971 he launched so-called Corrective Revolution to protect country from injustice, humiliation and terrorism. In 1973, together with Arab coalitions he launched a war against Israel, while at the same time he had huge support of mass in Egypt. During the year of 1974, President proclaimed famous 'open door policy' which gave more freedom for the economy and investments in the country. In 1976 he interrupted Egyptian-Soviet Treaty explaining that it has been proved that Soviet Union wants to take control and to have domination of this country. In this way he started to slowly close the doors for Soviets and to re-open it for the United States. In 1977 he made official visit to Jerusalem, claiming that a main intention is 'to address the Israeli people with frankness' (Baker, 1981).

During the 1978, President Anwar al-Sadat participated at Camp David Accords. Peace negotiations lasted for twelve days including President of Egypt Anwar al-Sadat at one side and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin on the other side. U.S. President Jimmy Carter has been a main observer of negotiations process. It was followed by 1979 signing peace treaty with Israel which had two important implications. First one was that Egypt became a first Arab state officially recognizing state of Israel. Second implication important for Egypt had been the return of Sinai peninsula to Egyptian borders. By forming an agreement, both state representatives received Nobel Prize in 1978. However, during the first framework of peace negotiations regarding Palestinian questions, United Nations condemned such process because of Palestinian representatives not attending the diplomatic talks.

From the year of 1979 Egypt became an important strategic partner of the United States receiving more than \$1 billion of financial assistance annually. Such financial assistance has been mainly expressed in terms of military assistance. It can be concluded that in the last period of Sadat's rule Egypt turned completely to the West and it started to develop bilateral strategic relationship with United States. In 1981, President Anwar al-Sadat was assassinated, and it was an end of eleven years of rule at the position of president of the country.

Hosni's Mobarak foreign policy towards the United States

As a fourth president of Egypt Hosni Mobarak has been on the throne from 1981 to 2011 and his rule presents the most lasting one in the modern history of Egypt. As it was case with previous two presidents, he was a man with military background serving as a chief marshal of air force for some period. Before coming to the presidential office, Anwar al-Sadat was serving as a Vice President of Gamal Abd al-Nasser. It was the same for Hosni Mobarak, who served as a Vice President of Anwar Al-Sadat from 1975 until his assassination when he assumed the throne.

From the beginning of the rule Mobarak wanted to put himself apart from Sadat and his style, being at the distance with Israelis but still he was aware not to ruin diplomatic ties with both the U.S. and Israel. Among Egyptians, Palestinians and other Arabs, he encouraged those who wanted to see in him a leader with the stature and Arab nationalist inclinations of Nasser (Tucker & Stork, 1982). The most significant problem he faced at the start of his reign was Egypt's economic crisis. World Bank warned Egypt at the beginning of 1980s that their foreign debt increased dangerously. Dangerous deficit between exports and imports annually and rise of unemployment especially in urban areas were also important problems to solve. Therefore, it was not surprise that Mobarak put most of attention on domestic politics and recovery from economic crisis, while his predecessor Sadat was mainly dealing with foreign policy.

American foreign aid and its military assistance continued in the period of Mobarak regime. From the improvement of relationship with the United States in 1975, Egypt received a huge amount of foreign aid. In the six years between 1975 and 1981, Egypt received \$6.6 billion, which was more the U.S. financial assistance than the Marshall Plan of assistance to Western European countries after World War II (Jackson, 1982). However, President Mobarak considered domestic issues as the most important to be solved. With Israeli withdrawal from Sinai Peninsula there has been significant space for using natural resources of this region (Kliot, 1995). To recover production and industrial growth of the country, government widen the territory of oil production with the help of international companies.

The United States remained a strategic partner of Egypt under the rule of President Hosni Mubarak. Its financial aid continued, and, in some periods, it grew to more than \$2 billion annually. In return, Egypt was providing overflights for the U.S. military aircrafts and the passages of their naval ships for the years. The most important operation of two strategic partners was military cooperation during Gulf War in 1991, when the United States led coalition including Egypt to stop Iraqi invasion of Kuwait (History, 2015a). When the U.S. was looking for an ally in the region to be included in this coalition, Egypt responded positively without hesitation. In return, they benefited the most, because Europe forgot their 14 billion foreign debt (The New York Times, 2011).

On the morning of October 12, 1992, a major earthquake measuring 5.8 on the Richter Scale racked the city of Cairo (Darraj, 2007). More than hundred people died as result of an earthquake and many others were injured. Considering that infrastructure of Cairo was highly damaged, people from the streets urged from the government to solve the situation and finance complete repairing of destroyed homes. However, government of President Mubarak did not offer proper solutions because of financial constraints, but Muslim Brotherhood movement played a very significant role. Because of their high involvement in social works of everyday life in Egypt, a main intention of movement was to present its real picture to domestic population.

Because movement has been suppressed from different regimes throughout the years, they wanted to distance its activities from other radical groups. Also, to cooperate with existing political regime, a movement used more soft propaganda presenting its power through the establishment of educational institutions, hospitals, etc. (Paision, 2011). From the 1990s, Egypt saw a rise of two different Islamic movements: a radical one and other one (Muslim Brotherhood) cooperating with current Egyptian government; As two distinct Islamic movements were rising, President Mubarak was responding to their politics in two different ways. It has been said that radical parties in Egypt felt many violations of human rights, while on other side President Mubarak in some level supported the work of Muslim Brotherhood and indeed welcomed the up-rising religiosity of Egyptian population.

Hosni Mubarak was a president promoting conservative Islamic agenda. Many Muslim authorities in Egypt supported him and praised the work

of his government, but most probably it was under the pressure of president himself. However, from the 1990s his popularity was decreasing slowly. On June 26, 1995, there was an assassination attempt on his life during a visit to the city of Addis Ababa in Ethiopia (Paision, 2011). While President Mubarak together with accompaniment was driving through the city, a group of militants opened fire on them killing two guards but failing in completing the assassination. Later, President accused both Sudanese and Ethiopian government of being involved in the plan of his assassination. Hosni Mubarak has survived no less than six assassination attempts (Paision, 2011).

His popularity was also shattered because of the Egyptian dependance on the United States financial support. As it was the case with many other leaders in the world, Hosni Mubarak thought that war on Iraq was not good political decision. Many countries in the world were affected with the demonstrations of angry population because of the wrong American politics at that time. Even the demonstrations have not been allowed in Egypt by law, President Mubarak allowed anti-war demonstrations to be held, and many international observers saw it as a message of Egypt to the government of the United States. A clear condemnation of American politics was not possible because of the risk of losing financial support from the United States.

Without any doubts the invasion of Iraq happened at the beginning of 2003, and coalition led by the United States and Britain displaced Saddam Hussein from the power in the period of few weeks. Such scenario was expected since Iraqi military was still in the process of recovering from the Gulf war in 1991, and its economy was in bad conditions. After the invasion of Iraq, popularity of Hosni Mubarak went down like never before. Angry population was asking why the president did not criticize enough its traditional partner while they were destroying the entire Iraqi state. As a respond to the angry population and to stabilize political situation in Egypt, President Mubarak promised to open political system to some level during the election period. It meant that elections in September 2005 did not consist only President Mubarak political party NDP, but it gave a right to the other parties excluding religious political parties (Paision, 2011).

However, elections were not set up mostly because some sides like Muslim Brotherhood were excluded from the participation. Therefore, followers of Brotherhood movement were advised not to

vote for the President Mubarak, but to criticize his campaign. Mohammed Mahdi Akif, a spokesperson for the Society of Muslim Brothers stated: It is enough that he has been at the head of the authority for twenty-four years, during which he did not achieve political reform to make us support his candidacy (Paison, 2011). Beside Brotherhood side, other groups were also surprised with the process of political campaign which only included Mubarak's images and motto. Because of the great political dominance in the country, he was the only one showing in the radio shows, television, etc. Such constraint of entire process of elections damaged a freedom and fair choice of president and new government.

With the elections in 2005 for the People's Assembly, President Mubarak's NDP political party won most of the seats. Also, president promised that any party winning the five percent of the seats in Egyptian parliament could present its presidential candidate for the year 2011. Muslim Brotherhood movement was still prohibited to join the elections and political life in general, but they were trying to increase their influence through the independent candidates. However, because of more opened political system in 2005, many analysts were asking if Egypt becoming more democratic. But many people refused this possibility because of the two facts. Firstly, Egypt with the rule of Hosni Mubarak did not have a position of the vice president at all. And secondly, president's son Gamal Mubarak started slowly to show up at political scene of Egypt (Billingsley, 2010). It meant that President Mubarak wanted his oldest son to inherit him at the throne. Nevertheless, political events in the future proved opposite to the Mubarak's plans.

Regarding the Egyptian diplomatic relations with United States, it could be said that until 2002, Egypt stood as a mid-power between many disputes and served as a main strategic partner of the United States in the region. However, President Mubarak did not want to support the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, claiming that firstly Israeli-Palestinian question should be solved. Later, when Obama together with his administration stated they will be an umbrella protecting allies from Iran nuclear power, Mubarak responded negatively in a way that Egypt will not be under nuclear umbrella protecting the Gulf countries (Inter Press Service, 2015). A nuclear umbrella is usually used for the security alliances of the United States with non-nuclear states such as Japan, South Korea, much of Europe, Turkey, Canada, and Australia, originating with the Cold War with the then Soviet Union (Inter Press Service, 2015).

Because of its repressive policies and deep economic crisis, rule of President Mubarak started to lose its credibility after the 2000s. In response, Mubarak government added new younger technocrats to the regime who were more enthusiastic about liberalization and permitted other candidates to stand in the presidential election of 2005 (Aknur & Okalan, 2012). However, such political move did not guarantee Mubarak's total supremacy from the 2005 until 2011. Despite widespread fraud in the 2005 parliamentary elections, out of 444 seats, the Muslim Brotherhood managed to win 88 seats (Darwis, 2005). Nevertheless, a periodical democratic opening by President Mubarak were only aimed to preserve the power in Egypt.

Democracy promotion by the U.S. produced some results during Mubarak's rule, such as Mubarak's reformation of his own political party, the National Democratic Party, the introduction of multi-party presidential elections, and allowing the establishment of 5,000 civil society organizations (Aknur & Okalan, 2012). However, democracy policies supported by United States did not produce positive outcomes in the judiciary and government of Egypt. In its attempts to promote democracy in Egypt, the U.S. used a series of mechanisms, including USAID, bilateral agreements, direct grant programs, the Middle East Partnership Initiative, and the Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative (Aknur & Okalan, 2012).

The United States foreign policy after the Cold War has been marked with a serious confrontation between democracy promotion and the U.S. strategic interests. Therefore, during the last reign of President Mubarak, democracy initiatives were undermined whenever they conflicted with higher level strategic interests such as regional security and US oil supplies (Aknur & Okalan, 2012). It can be pointed that a full process of democratization in Egypt was indeed threat to the American foreign policy interests, because it could bring Islamist parties to the power as it was the case with democratically elected President Morsi in 2012. In the last decade of Mubarak's rule, strategic partnership between the United States and Egypt remained at decent level.

Conclusion

With successful overthrow of British monarchy from Egypt in 1950s, President Nasser together with his officers succeeded to nationalize Suez Canal. Nasser's era was marked with political unity between Egypt and Syria, and adoption of certain

socialist policies in the country. For the years in the power, President Nasser remained a big enigma for Washington, mostly because of his great diplomatic skills, and because of his courage to reject different initiatives coming from the United States. However, at the time when President Nasser rejected the cooperation with the United States, it was not easy for the U.S. officials to move Egypt far from Soviet influence, and to prevent expansion of communist ideologies in the region. Therefore, the U.S. policy of achieving foreign policy interests through financial aid remained as a very successful one.

The beginning of American dominance in the Middle East is directly connected with President Anwar al-Sadat and his attitude towards the United States. President Sadat's policies represented a big shift in Egyptian political life, because he decided to sign a peace agreement with Israeli government, and to openly cooperate with the United States. Since then, the United States became a strategic partner of Egypt in political, economic and military level. Sadat's political turnover in seeking partnership with the United States can be analyzed through Egypt's obvious attempt to solve its deep economic problems. With the succession of throne, President Mubarak continued Sadat's politics towards the United States. Therefore, government officials of the United States had one door to knock when they wanted to discuss the regional problems.

References

ABC Clio. (2011). *Arab-Israeli wars: 60 years of conflict*. <http://www.historyandtheheadlines.com/Contentpages/ContentPage.aspx?EntryId=1281477¤tSection=1271019&productid=16>.

About Education. (2015). *Suez Canal connects the Red Sea with the Mediterranean Sea*. <http://Geography.about.com/Od/Specificplace-sofinterest/a/Suezcanal.Htm>.

Aftandilian, G. (2013). *Egypt's new regime and the future of the U.S. – Egyptian strategic partnership*. Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/res-repl1369>

Aknur, M., & Okalan, E. (2012). The limited impact of the USA on political liberalization in Egypt during the Mubarak era. *Turkish Journal of International Relations*, 11(2).

Billingsley, A. (2010). *Political succession in the Arab world: constitutions, family loyalties and Islam*. Routledge.

Arafat, A. D. (2009). *Hosni Mubarak and the future of democracy in Egypt*. Palgrave Macmillan US.

Badeau, J. S. (1969). *Oral history interview – JFK*.

Baker, R. W. (1981). Sadat's open door: Opposition from within. *Social Problems*, 28, 378–384. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:145779361>

Lancaster, C. (2008). *George Bush's foreign aid transformation or chaos?* Brookings Institution Press.

Congressional Research Service. (2015). *Egypt: background and U.S. relations*.

Danielson, R. (2007). *Nasser and pan-Arabism: Explaining Egypt's rise in power*. 89.

Darwis, A. (2005). Egypt, an election epic: This one could run and run. *Middle East Journal*, 63(3).

Essex, J. (2013). *Development, security, and aid: Geopolitics and geoeconomics at the U.S. agency for international development*. University of Georgia Press.

Hart, A. (2009). *Zionism: David become Goliath*. World Focus Publishing.

History. (2015a). *Persian gulf war*. <http://www.history.com/topics/Persian-Gulf-War>.

History. (2015b). *Yom Kippur war*. <http://www.history.com/topics/Yom-Kippur-War>.

Inter Press Service. (2015). *Disarmament: Egypt rejects U.S. nuclear umbrella*. <http://www.ipsnews.net/2009/08/Disarmament-Egypt-Rejects-Us-Nuclear-Umbrella/>.

Jackson, H. F. (1982). Egypt and the United States after Sadat: continuity and constraints. *Issue*, 12(3–4), 70–75. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1166720>

Brownlee, J. (2012). *Democracy Prevention*. Cambridge University.

- Tucker, J., & Stork, J. (1982). *In the Footsteps of Sadat*. MERIP.
- Kirk, J. B. (1995). Egypt during the Nasser years: Ideology, politics, and civil society. *The Middle East Journal*, 49(3).
- Lesch, D. W. (2015). *Abd al-Nasser and the United States: Enemy or friend*. University of Florida.
- Lesson from History. (1955). *1955 Baghdad pact*. http://www.Artsrn.Ualberta.ca/Amcdouga/Hist112/Resources/Lesson_history_baghdad_pact_1955.Pdf.
- Tauber, T. (2013). *American values vs. foreign policy interests in Egypt*. Sweet Briar College.
- Gardner, L. C. (2011). *The road to Tahrir square: Egypt and the United States from the rise of Nasser to the fall of Mubarak*. The New Press.
- Bassiouni, M. C. (2009). *A guide to documents on the Arab-Palestinian/Israeli conflict: 1897-2008*. Martinus Nijhoff.
- Aulas, M. C. (1982). *Sadat's Egypt: A Balance Sheet*. MERIP.
- Axelrod, M. C. (2011). *Aid as Leverage? Understanding the U.S.-Egypt military relationship*. University of Pennsylvania.
- McHugo, J. (2013). *A Concise History of the Arabs*. Saqi Books.
- Michalik, S. (2015). Multiparty elections in authoritarian regimes: Explaining their introduction and effects. In *multiparty elections in authoritarian regimes: Explaining their introduction and effects*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-09511-6>
- Kliot, N. (1995). *The Evolution of the Egypt-Israel Boundary: From Colonial Foundations to Peaceful Borders*. University of Durham.
- Obieta, J. A. (1970). The Suez Canal from 1854 to 1888: The International canal. In *The International Status of the Suez Canal* (pp. 48-65). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-6445-0_4
- Paison, M. (2011). *The History of the Muslim Brotherhood: The Political, Social and Economic Transformation of the Arab Republic of Egypt*.
- Podeh, E. W. (2015). *Rethinking Nasserism*. University Press of Florida.
- Barrett, R. C. (2010). *The Greater Middle East and the Cold War: US Foreign Policy Under Eisenhower and Kennedy*. I.B. Tauris.
- Modigs, R. (2003). *United States Foreign Policy in the Middle East after the Cold War*. Faculty of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College.
- Sage. (2015). *The SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods*. <http://srmo.sagepub.com/Publicstart?AuthRejection=true>.
- Darraj, S. M. (2007). *Hosni Mubarak (Modern World Leaders)*. Chelsea House Pub.
- Teaching History. (2010). *The U.S. and Egypt in 1950s*. <http://Teachinghistory.Org/History-Content/Ask-a-Historian/23930>.
- The New York Times. (2011). *Half of Egypt's \$20.2 billion debt being forgiven by U.S. and allies*. <http://www.Nytimes.Com/1991/05/27/Business/Half-of-Egypt-s-20.2-Billion-Debt-Being-Forgiven-by-Us-and-Allies.Html>.
- U.S. History. (2015). *The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall plan*. <https://www.Boundless.Com/u-s-History/Textbooks/Boundless-u-s-History-Textbook/the-Cold-War-1947-1991-27/the-Cold-War-211/the-Truman-Doctrine-and-the-Marshall-Plan-1172-9755/>.
- U.S. News. (2014). *The Middle East peace conundrum*. <http://www.Usnews.Com/News/Articles/2014/12/11/Challenges-Face-the-U-s-as-Lead-Middle-East-Peace-Negotiator-between-Israel-and-Palestine>.
- US State Department Archive. (2015). *The Baghdad pact (1955) and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO)*.
- Quandt, W. B. (1986). Camp David and Peacemaking in the Middle East. *Political Science Quarterly*, 101(3).