The Future of the Peace between Israel and Egypt

Ephraim Kam

Since the signing of its peace treaty with Egypt, Israel's attitude toward the bilateral relations has always been twofold. On the one hand, peace with Egypt was seen as a strategic asset of the highest order for Israel, because it removed Egypt from the belligerent circle around Israel, thereby also removing the threat of war with other Arab nations. It had a positive effect on Israel's relations with the Arab and Muslim world, and granted Israel greater freedom of action in the region. On the other hand, Israel had expected Egypt to invest more in cultivating normalized relations, and was disappointed when that did not occur. The peace between the two nations has remained cold and the normalization of relations has remained limited, largely because Egypt did not want relations to develop further.

The transformation in Egypt since 2011, still underway and not yet fully defined, invites many questions about the future of Egypt's relationship with Israel. The rise to power in Egypt of an influential element whose basic attitude to Israel is hostile, both ideologically and in practice, raises serious doubts about the components of the peace that will be left in place between the two countries. This essay seeks to examine the variables likely to affect Israel-Egypt relations and the directions these relations could take.

Peaceful Relations in the Mubarak Era: A Firm but Narrow Base

Israel-Egypt relations were shaped during the Mubarak era, and over the years the relationship proved to be firm and stable. Both nations have made

a point of not violating the peace treaty since it was signed in 1979, even in periods of disagreement and tension, and have made it clear that they share a fundamental interest in maintaining the treaty. Egypt as well as Israel has defined peace between the two nations as a strategic asset. As a result, over time both sides developed a measure of confidence in the continuation of the treaty and its stability, and there did not appear to be elements in the offing threatening the treaty.

However, normalization of the relationship was never fully reached: there was limited contact between the respective leaderships and the respective embassies, transportation lines were opened that allowed civilian transit between the countries, though mostly from Israel to Egypt, and there were some cultural ties. Contact at the senior levels was in the hands of Mubarak and his close circle, and security cooperation was conducted by the two armies. Israeli representatives did not have access to Egypt's government ministries, parliament, or media, and the Egyptian public was not educated to understand the advantages of peace for Egypt or to recognize the right of Israel to exist.

In certain periods Egypt allowed an improvement in its relations with Israel. During the Rabin government – seen by the Egyptians as having a positive approach to the Palestinian issue – contact between the leaderships increased, Egyptian regulations on civilian and commercial traffic were relaxed, and there was a significant increase in agricultural cooperation. When the Gaza Strip was seized by Hamas, considered by the Mubarak regime a hostile and threatening entity and an Iranian proxy, security cooperation between Israel and Egypt expanded, with particular focus on the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula. However, these improvements did not affect relations as a whole between the countries, and the relationship remained limited and cool. Moreover, even the improvements in the economic realm were partly curtailed: Egyptian exports to Israel, which grew in the second half of the 1990s, dropped sharply since 2000. Egyptian imports from Israel never reached any significant scope.

Several factors led Mubarak to limit normalization ties with Israel,[1] the most important of which was the Arab-Israeli peace process, especially the Palestinian track. Egypt was committed to the establishment of a Palestinian state, and since the signing of the peace treaty it was required

to confront the allegation that, concerned only with its own interests, it had not made enough of an effort to reach agreements on the other Arab fronts. It therefore found it hard to expand the scope of its relationship with Israel as long as there was no real progress in the other channels of the peace process. The lack of a solution to the Palestinian problem weighed on Egypt because it felt that Israel had led it astray and failed to play the role it was obligated to by the Camp David accords, concluded before the peace treaty itself was signed. Therefore, Egypt used the Palestinian issue to pressure Israel on the peace process, emphasizing that full normalization would be possible only after the achievement of a comprehensive peace between Israel and the Arabs.

Another important consideration for Egypt had to do with internal constraints. Several key sectors in Egypt have a negative attitude toward peace and normalization with Israel. Among the more prominent of these sectors are the trade unions, influenced by Islamic organizations, left wing groups, and Nasserites; Islamic groups, headed by the Muslim Brotherhood; opposition parties; and many intellectuals and students, among whom both religious and left wing groups wield a great deal of influence. Various reasons account for the reservations about peace with Israel among these sectors. The Islamic groups, especially the Muslim Brotherhood and the religious establishment, were in principle opposed to the existence of Israel, seen as an alien entity planted by Western imperialists on Muslim land. Despite the peace treaty many Egyptians continued to have trouble accepting Israel as a legitimate state, while those who feared its military and technological superiority, which threaten Egypt's regional status, continued to view Israel as the enemy.[2] The Palestinian issue joined these domestic factors, and pictures of the intifada and confrontations between Israel and Palestinians in the media affected Egyptian attitudes to Israel and amplified the anger and hatred.

Another important consideration was the Arab stance. Egypt paid a steep price in the Arab arena for signing a peace treaty with Israel, and was shunned and semi-isolated for close to a decade. Since then, Egypt's isolation ended and the leaders of the Arab nations in principle accept the notion that the conflict with Israel must be resolved politically rather than militarily. However, the fact that the great majority of Arab states do not

have peaceful relations with Israel created a significant constraint in terms of Egypt's Israel policy. From the Egyptian perspective, Israel exploited the peace treaty to expand its freedom of action toward the Arabs, for example by taking military steps against Palestinian organizations, fighting in Lebanon, and expanding the Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

On the other hand, there is the American factor. The American administration was a partner to the peace treaty; it provides an annual financial aid package to Egypt and maintains close relations, including military ties, with it. Clearly, the administration wanted and encouraged the expansion of normalization with Israel, and Egypt could not ignore America's wishes. But in the end, the American factor had only a limited effect on relations with Israel, and was more helpful in making sure these did not deteriorate, rather than prompting them to grow closer. In fact, many of Egypt's promises to the Americans during the Mubarak era to improve relations with Israel were never kept.[3]

Finally, Cairo's policy was affected by consideration of the Egyptian interest. The leadership understood that the country could benefit from economic cooperation with Israel, given the latter's technological capabilities. Because of this, normalization progressed in economic and trade matters rather than in other areas, and Egyptian businesspeople were those with the most positive attitude to Israel and the peace treaty. Egypt also made a point of being consistent in its supply of oil to Israel as stipulated by the peace treaty, and in 2005 signed a natural gas agreement with Israel. Likewise in this vein, Israel and Egypt signed an agreement on allocating recognized industrial zones in Israel and Egypt for the joint manufacture of goods to be exported to the United States under a preferred tax agreement.

The Changes in Egypt and the Peaceful Relations

In general, the factors that shaped the peaceful relations between Egypt and Israel during the Mubarak era – particularly Egypt's reservations on normalization versus economic and military considerations, as well as the role of the United States – will, for better and for worse, continue to affect the relationship under the new regime. But the changes that have taken

place in the character and composition of the Egyptian political system since 2011 are liable to have a negative effect on relations between Egypt and Israel. At the same time, the radical internal changes in Egypt are not over, and the alignment of forces and their interactions can be expected to evolve for quite some time with strong internal struggles. Consequently, final results and their ramifications for relations with Israel are not yet clear and may deviate from what seems likely at present.

Three changes at the heart of developments in Egypt stand to have the biggest effect on future Israeli-Egyptian relations:

a. The Muslim Brotherhood has become the key political power in Egypt, controlling the government, parliament, and – above all – the presidency. That said, the long term power of the Muslim Brotherhood is not guaranteed, and it is confronted with strong elements that refuse to grant the President unlimited power and object to Egypt's transformation into an Islamist society.
b. The army, until now an important political force in Egypt, lost much of its power because of public criticism, and even more so after President Mohamed Morsi, in a quick decisive move, ousted the top military brass that controlled Egypt in the interim era after the toppling of the Mubarak regime. Nonetheless, the army remains an important element in the Egyptian establishment, and the struggle between the Brotherhood and its rivals might bolster the military's influence.
c. The Egyptian public, which under Mubarak was generally passive and silent, became an important and vocal political factor as it took to the streets at the outset of the revolution. The new regime considers itself obligated to attend to the prevalent mood and at times, cater to it as well. However, the power and influence of this public are still unclear, as the Muslim organizations have managed to sideline the younger guard of the revolution and keep it from building an organized political force.

The most important of these factors is the emergence of the Muslim Brotherhood as the central power in the Egyptian political system. The organization's basic attitude to Israel and to the peace treaty is negative, if not hostile. In 2011, the leader of the Brotherhood, Dr. Muhammad Badiya, labeled Israel and the United States Egypt's greatest enemies, and

attacked what he called the American plan to seize control of the region so as to establish a greater Israel in the new Middle East. He called the Camp David accords an agreement of surrender and demanded an end to normalization, abrogation of all economic agreements, and the permanent opening of the Rafiah crossing. Badiya made similar declarations on several subsequent occasions. Even more confrontational was an announcement issued in March 2012 by the Committee on Arab Affairs in the Egyptian parliament and endorsed by the parliament, denying Israel's right to exist and recommending that Egypt never be a friend, partner, or ally of "the Zionist entity," the number one enemy of Egypt and the greater Arab people. Thus, the parliament called on the government to reexamine its relations and agreements with the enemy and the threat it represents to Egypt's security; sever diplomatic relations; stand fully on the side of the armed struggle against Israel and view resistance as the strategy for liberating the occupied lands; and readopt the policy of total embargo on Israel.[4]

The current Egyptian government has never adopted such extreme recommendations, which would mean return to a belligerent policy – even if not necessarily a direct military conflict – with Israel. On the contrary, senior Egyptian figures, including President Morsi himself, have stressed that Egypt will respect the international treaties it has signed. However, the repeated demand to change the approach to Israel is cumulative and affects the relations. Moreover, many Egyptians, not only from Islamic organizations, have stressed the imperative of reexamining the peace treaty with Israel, be it to abrogate the treaty because Israel has violated it; to examine its permissibility according to *sharia* law; to allow the Egyptian people to vote on it via a referendum; or to amend certain components.

The two other changes that occurred during the revolution likewise have negative implications for peaceful relations with Israel. The Egyptian army command attributed special importance to maintaining Egypt's security interests, and as such was an important channel for promoting security cooperation with Israel, especially regarding the Gaza Strip and Sinai Peninsula. The weakening of its status resulting from the ouster of the veteran military leaders by Morsi in the summer of 2012, and the appointment of new leaders much more dependent on the President, is

liable to damage relations with Israel. The enhanced status of the Egyptian public as an important player in the political field is also liable to impact negatively. Relations with Israel and the peace treaty were not a key issue in the riots and demonstrations starting in 2011, though it did occasionally surface. But an important part of this public is influenced by Islamic and Nasserite elements, and was never educated to see peace with Israel as a positive value in and of itself or even accept Israel's right to exist. Israeli institutions have no way of reaching this public directly, and much of this public is openly hostile to Israel.

Possible Considerations of the Morsi Regime

The Egyptian regime's considerations about the future of peaceful relations with Israel are still in flux. It is doubtful that the regime has formulated its orientation and policy regarding Israel, as it is burdened with more pressing domestic and economic problems. The issue of Israel is fairly low on its list of priorities. Therefore, it seems that the regime has not demonstrated fundamental changes in its policy to Israel, including on the question of the peace treaty.

Several factors could motivate Egypt's leaders to preserve relations with Israel in more or less their current format. First, the basic factors that motivated Egypt to sign the peace treaty with Israel in the first place are still there: acknowledgment of the advantages of peace with Israel; awareness of Israel's military superiority and the desire to avoid a military confrontation; the need to invest resources domestically rather than militarily; and the close relations Egypt built with the United States starting in 1980.

Indeed, the position of the United States is critical to the Egyptian regime. The Egyptian economy – in difficult straits even in the Mubarak era – has deteriorated further because of the internal crisis, and the regime needs American aid more than ever before. In July 2012, the American administration made in clear it was committed to providing Egypt with all aid necessary to ensure its security on its way to democracy, and that it is in principle opposed to any Congress-sponsored linkage to military aid to Egypt. The Egyptian regime presumably understands that insofar as the American administration is tied to the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty, it will

exert pressure on Egypt not to undermine the treaty. An Egyptian move to undermine the treaty could lead to an undesirable confrontation with the United States.

Although the administration maintains a dialogue with the Egyptian regime, Egyptian-American tensions exist over certain domestic issues. The Egyptian regime does not want to be dependent on the United States, as it wants to rid itself of the image as a lackey of American interests. In September 2012, President Obama himself pointed out that while the United States and Egypt aren't enemies they aren't allies either. Thus, the following points remain unclear: the extent to which the Brotherhood wants to continue maintaining close relations with the United States; how much the American administration is willing to continue supplying Egypt with arms; and the extent to which the administration can or wants to intervene in Egypt's relations with Israel.

Egypt and Israel share interests that could help maintain peaceful relations: preventing deteriorating relations to deter terrorist attacks; preventing further armed conflict between Israel and Hamas in Gaza and attaining a stable arrangement between them; promoting an Israeli-Palestinian agreement; and preventing threats from the Syrian front.[5] Egypt's position on the Iranian threat – an important component of Mubarak's policy – is still unclear, but thus far the current Egyptian regime has not charted a new course on the issue, and it may continue to share interests with Israel regarding the Iranian challenge.

The vacuum in the Sinai Peninsula is of great importance, and both sides would like to see Egypt enhance its control of the area. Egypt apparently understands that cooperating with Israel on Sinai could be the best way to confront the strongholds established by terrorists threatening Egyptian sovereignty there.

Finally, the Egyptian army is a positive force in maintaining cooperation with Israel because it is charged with maintaining Egypt's security interests. It has a history of contacts and security cooperation with Israel and understands very well the significance of Egypt's relations with the United States. For now, the Egyptian army continues to keep channels of communication and cooperation with Israel open, allowing problems to be resolved in a constructive atmosphere and without conflict. There is thus

a positive correlation between the extent of the army's political influence and continuing security relations between Egypt and Israel. The question remains, however, what the army's influence will be now that Morsi has curtailed it.

On the other hand, several regime concerns are liable to impinge on peaceful relations with Israel to some extent or another. The first is the religious-ideological aspect, which translates into hostility by the Muslim Brotherhood toward Israel. Many in the organization still see Israel as an enemy and a threat that lacks the right to exist as a political entity, and some have said so openly since the revolution in Egypt. Were it only up to Brotherhood ideology, it is highly possible that the peace treaty would already be a thing of the past. The key question is what kind of compromise the Brotherhood can devise to balance its ideology with existing constraints.

The second factor is the centrality of President Morsi: Mohamed Morsi quickly emerged as the strong man of the regime, and after ousting the top military brass, there is no element to balance his power. Unlike Mubarak and Sadat, Morsi has to date avoided conducting a meaningful, direct dialogue with Israel.

Third is the Palestinian problem. The lack of progress in the political process with the Palestinians casts a steady shadow over Israeli-Egyptian relations because of Egypt's basic commitment to an independent Palestinian state. As long as this goal remains unfulfilled, Egypt will continue limiting normalization with Israel. This was Mubarak's policy and will undoubtedly be Morsi's as well. The Brotherhood has explicitly accused Israel of violating the peace treaty because of the unresolved Palestinian issue, thereby opening – at least theoretically – a door to shirking Egypt's obligations should it so choose. On the other hand, the new regime too presumably understands the complexity of the issue, and that in order to promote a settlement it will have to engage with Israel and mediate among the Palestinian factions.

A related issue is the link with Hamas. The Muslim Brotherhood is the parent organization of Hamas and the two share an ideological basis, which is a potential source of friction between Israel and Egypt. Cairo is liable to increase its support of Hamas, unlike under Mubarak, who viewed Hamas as a threat to Egypt and Iran's vanguard. On the other hand, this

closeness generates its own constraints. The Hamas government in the Gaza Strip is liable to create security problems for Egypt, and the Egyptian army will not allow Hamas to damage the country's security or violate its sovereignty. The tunnels between Gaza and Sinai and traffic between the Gaza Strip and Egypt create tensions with the Egyptian government, and strengthening Hamas will come at the expense of the Palestinian Authority, an entity Egypt has no interest in weakening. Moreover, Egypt's political activity during Operation Pillar of Defense indicates that Egypt is willing to continue to take advantage of its ties with both sides to serve as mediator between Hamas and Israel in order to reduce the confrontations between them. In this sense, the links between the Brotherhood and Hamas have some positive meaning, given that as a mediator Egypt will have to take Israel's security needs and demands into account.

An additional issue concerns public pressure. The new Egyptian regime will be more sensitive than its predecessor to the public mood. Because many in the Egyptian street are hostile to Israel, the regime is liable to placate them by taking anti-Israel steps should it see the necessity to do so. And finally, Egypt's standing in the Arab world constitutes another challenge. More than the Mubarak regime, the Muslim Brotherhood desires to lead the Arab world actively, using the Islamic element while exploiting the weaknesses of key Arab nations, such as Iraq and Syria and the changing of the guard in Saudi Arabia. In this case, the regime might use hostility against Israel as a means to expand its influence.

Future Israel-Egypt Relations

The starting point for examining Israel-Egypt relations is the future of the peace treaty. While some in Egypt are calling for the treaty's abrogation, many Egyptian leaders, including President Morsi, stress that Egypt will remain committed to the international treaties it has signed. And while most of these leaders do not explicitly mention the peace treaty with Israel in this context, it is possible to understand that they have no intention of annulling it. One may therefore assume that as long as the regime's current considerations and constraints do not change, Egypt will not revoke the treaty, for several reasons. Morsi is not under any serious domestic pressure to do so, and in any event the issue is not at the top of Egypt's agenda. The

United States is pressuring him to maintain the treaty at a time when Egypt is more in need of American financial aid than ever before. Furthermore, the Egyptian regime must take into consideration the fact that Israel would react to the treaty's abrogation in a way that would hurt Egypt. Finally, as it is now trying to rehabilitate its international status, annulling an international treaty would place it in an uncomfortable position.

Even should Egypt decide not to abrogate the treaty, however, it is likely to take at least two steps on the matter. The first is the demand to amend the treaty, specifically the military appendix dealing with the deployment of troops in Sinai. This is of significant importance to Egypt. Fifteen years after the treaty was signed, the demand to amend it is legitimate. Egypt was never satisfied with the limitations on its sovereignty in Sinai and would like to see them relaxed. It is important to the new regime to show it can gain something from Israel that the previous regime did not achieve. And most important, increasing Egypt's military presence in Sinai is critical to strengthening the regime in its fight against the terrorists there, and it would like to formalize this in the agreement rather than depend on Israel's goodwill.

As for the second step, the Egyptian regime will presumably empty the treaty of at least some of its components even without abrogating the treaty as a whole. The regime has already taken steps in this vein. President Morsi does not speak directly with Israel's leaders; Israel has an ambassador in Egypt but the embassy is dormant, even if the reason is the difficulty in finding an appropriate solution for securing the embassy rather than a decision on the part of the Egyptian regime; the 2005 natural gas agreement, one of the few key manifestations of the normalization of relations, was cancelled by Egypt in April 2012. Should Morsi continue to avoid direct talks with Israel and leave these in the hands of the army, the security services, and the Foreign Affairs Ministry, it would be yet another devaluation of the level of relations with Egypt. In the meantime the talks between the respective armies are held at noticeably lower echelons than in the past. On the other hand, Morsi did dispatch a new ambassador to Israel, a clear signal that he intends to maintain the treaty. This move also encouraged Amman, after a two-year hiatus, to send a new Jordanian ambassador to Israel.

In any case, even if Egypt damages its relations with Israel, the probability that it will return to waging war seems low. While many people in Egypt have reservations about peace with Israel, there is not one serious leader or organization – nor has there been one since the signing of the treaty – proposing a return to armed conflict with Israel. Given Egypt's assessment about the balance of power and understanding the drawbacks of war, the probability is low that Egypt will seek to return to this path in the future.

Yet even if Egypt has no desire for a military conflict with Israel, the potential for local, unintentional deterioration is there, given developments in Sinai. Jihadist terrorist organizations have built strongholds in the Sinai Peninsula with the express intention of carrying out strategic attacks to puncture the peace treaty, as Israel would be forced to enter Sinai with force to prevent such attacks. In addition, Palestinian terrorists from Gaza are active in the eastern part of Sinai, which serves as a route for smuggling weapons to the Gaza Strip. Egypt did not have full control of Sinai in the Mubarak era either, but the situation has deteriorated further since the regime change. Following the deaths of 16 Egyptian soldiers in a terrorist attack in August 2012, Egyptian security forces have made great efforts to root out the terrorist nests, but this is not enough. Given the situation, a large scale attack that would force Israel to intervene in Sinai is liable to cause local deterioration between the two armies, which in an extreme situation could conceivably endanger the future of the peace treaty.

A possible confrontation between Israel and terrorists carries another dimension. The Mubarak regime's attitude to military confrontations between Israel and Palestinian organizations or Hizbollah was relatively reserved. The new Egyptian regime is liable to take a much more rigid stance toward Israel during such conflicts, especially with regard to Hamas in the Gaza Strip. Therefore, a large scale Israeli action in Gaza is liable to trigger a more severe Egyptian reaction than in the past, such as recalling the ambassador permanently and freezing relations with Israel, a response liable to cause Jordan to do the same. To be sure, the Egyptian response to Operation Pillar of Defense was fairly moderate, limited to summoning the Egyptian ambassador for consultations and dispatching the Egyptian Prime Minister to Gaza for a visit. However, this restraint was directly

linked to the operation's short duration, its limited scope that avoided a ground incursion, and the few civilian casualties in the Gaza Strip. A future broad operation, particularly if it includes a ground incursion, is likely to generate a harsher Egyptian reaction.

Conclusion

Relations between Egypt and Israel under the Muslim Brotherhood regime will differ from those during the Mubarak regime, but the extent of the difference is still unclear. Some changes have already occurred: references to Israel in the Egyptian public discourse are more hostile; President Morsi does not speak directly with Israel, and may never do so; many in Egypt are demanding the peace treaty be amended, if not revoked; and the few manifestations of normalization have become even fewer. On the other hand, there has so far been no radical transformation in Egypt's relations with Israel: continuity of the relationship is greater than any change in it; and so far the foundations of the treaty have been maintained. The treaty has not been violated; Egypt's security interests along the Sinai border and inside the Sinai Peninsula provide Egypt with motivation to continue security cooperation with Israel, and the existing dialogue offers a way to resolve problems. In addition, Egypt and Israel share other interests, the American administration is exerting pressure on Egypt not to damage peaceful relations with Israel, and Egypt's faltering economy has positive implications for relations with Israel, because it occupies most of the regime's attention and increases dependence on the United States.

The root of the problem lies in the religious ideology of the Muslim Brotherhood toward Israel, which denies Israel's right to exist and views it as a threat and an enemy. On the one hand, the regime must take into account constraints of the situation as well as security, economic, and political considerations. Egypt's policy in general and its attitude to Israel in particular derive from the tension between ideology and practice. So far, the regime has tended more to the pragmatic than the ideological side, mostly because it has almost no choice; in any case, Israel is not high on its priorities. Will the regime maintain its moderate line over time, or does it intend to bolster its political and ideological base and at some point, when it feels strong enough to deal with its obstacles and enemies, decide to

realize its ideology generally and toward Israel specifically? This remains an open question. Should the regime reach this point, its true attitude toward Israel will be tested.

The Palestinian issue will likely be pivotal to the future of Egypt-Israel relations. At some point in the foreseeable future the Egyptian regime will presumably turn its attention to it and try to promote a settlement, despite the problems and complexity, in part because this would be the most important way for Egypt to build its strength as a leader in the Arab world. The longer the freeze in the Israeli-Palestinian process lasts and the resolution of the problem seems more distant, the greater the shadow cast over Egypt-Israel relations, which would be especially tested during a violent confrontation between Israel and the Palestinians. Alternatively, real progress in the process, and certainly if Egypt is involved in achieving it, could help improve the relations between Israel and Egypt and enhance Israel's image in the Egyptian public. This would have particular significance for peaceful relations between Egypt and Israel because it would give the relationship the Muslim Brotherhood's seal of approval.

The Sinai Peninsula is becoming an important arena in Egypt-Israel relations, both for the terrorist activity there and as the route for smuggling arms and personnel into Gaza. Until now, Egypt and Israel had a common interest in curtailing this activity, and both are still interested in greater Egyptian control of the area and in preventing attacks against Israel. In the near future the Egyptians will likely raise the issue of amending the peace treaty so as to allow them better control of Sinai; this does not necessarily contradict Israel's interests, and may even have some positive aspects for it. Above all, since the purpose of the terrorists in Sinai is to undermine relations between Israel and Egypt by carrying out a large attack against Israel, Israel will have to demonstrate sensitivity, restraint, and caution to make sure these elements do not achieve their goal.

Finally, it will take some time until the outlook of the current Egyptian regime is fully fashioned. The change of regime has occurred in tandem with a struggle between the Muslim Brotherhood and its rivals, which includes the army as well. Therefore, Egypt's future policy toward Israel will be influenced by the greater process of change, and as such may ultimately present differently from the way it appears today.

Notes

1 See David Sultan, *Between Cairo and Jerusalem: Normalization Between Arab Nations and Israel – the Egyptian Example* (University Institute for Diplomacy and Regional Cooperation, Tel Aviv University, 2007), pp. 35-38.
2 Ibid., p. 70.
3 Ibid., p. 35.
4 Yonatan D. Halevy, "The Position of the Islamic Political Parties in Egypt in the Context of the Camp David Accords," Jerusalem Center for Public Policy and State Affairs, December 21, 2011; Yonatan D. Halevy, "Worrisome Signs towards Israel in the Egyptian Parliament on the Eve of the Egyptian Presidential Election," Jerusalem Center for Public Policy and State Affairs, March 14, 2012.
5 Shlomo Brom, Shai Feldman, and Shimon Stein, "Israel and the New Egypt: Is It All Bad News?" *American Interest*, September 4, 2012.