

فلسطين الحرة

free palestine

Vol. 2, No. 5, September 1970

stop the shooting!

It was only to be expected that the Palestine liberation movement *reject* and that the overwhelming majority of Arab regimes *accept* the American initiative for peace in the Middle East and Mr. Rogers' call "to stop the shooting and start talking." Both the movement and the regimes acted in accord with principles that have governed their political behavior in the past.

The so-called "American peace initiative" is based on the U.N. political solution of November 1967—a solution which the Palestine liberation movement has denounced and declared unacceptable. The Arab regimes, nonetheless, have welcomed it and have made efforts towards its implementation. One thing must be made clear—the U.N. resolution and the American peace plan address themselves only to the consequences of the 1967 war. So do the efforts of those regimes who accept these novelties; their aim is to "eliminate the effects of aggression." Not much effort was needed to curb these regimes or tempt them into accepting such proposals.

On the other hand, the Palestine liberation movement has addressed itself to finding a solution *radical* to the problem resulting from the 1948 war—a solution to the earlier dislocation of the Palestinian people. The U.N. resolution and the U.S. plan are totally irrelevant and inconsequential in this respect.

The movement thus far has refrained from attacking the regimes and exposing them despite the fact that the movement, ever since its inception, has been persistent in its stand against such "political solutions." The movement justifies this position simply: in the light of its long-standing policy of steering away from conflicts with Arab regimes—without historical justification. The steps taken by Nasser today and, following him, by the regimes in Jordan, Libya, Sudan and Lebanon (to name only those immediately involved) constitute a noteworthy development in the modern history of the Arab nation. It amounts to betrayal of the declared goals of the entire Arab revolution and is a stab in the side of its vanguard, the Palestine liberation movement. The Palestine liberation movement, at this point, has had to stand up to these feeble regimes to prevent another Arab defeat of their making. In the view of the PLM, enough is enough.

The Arab regimes have opted for talk. They had the choice of shooting their way to a real victory or "talking it out" toward another illusory "answer." But they have tried it before and, as far as they are concerned, talking has worked. Unmindful of Israel's declared intentions, they think they can bluff her out of Arab territories without paying the requisite price, or pay a price and bluff to the Arab people that it was worth it. In either case, they assume, success in the game depends on the art of talking,

which they think they master. To stop the shooting and embark on an endless sea of words—exalting the leadership, glorifying the armed forces, and inflating victories over the enemy—was an offer they could not resist.

These regimes knew well that the PLM would be determined to resist such a course of action and they know also that the movement's strength lies in the overwhelming support it has among the multitude of Arab people. In order to secure the success of the plot, therefore, the movement would have to be isolated, or at least hindered from mobilizing that support and turning it against the regimes that champion a "peaceful solution." To this end, the regimes moved fast. First came an avalanche of familiar jargon presenting Arab acceptance of the American plan as a genius tactic which would throw the enemy camp—Zionism and imperialism—into disarray. An enormous campaign was mounted aimed at confusing the Arab masses. Then, somewhat foolishly, they thought they could silence the voice of the revolution by closing its broadcasting station in Cairo. This was followed by a desperate attempt to lay siege upon news of the revolution in the media; information about the commandos disappeared from loyal publications. Soon enough there ensued attacks on supporters of the revolution—attacks which degenerated into name calling and blackmail. The guerrillas came next—they were divided into noble and ignoble, extreme and liberal, but, all in all, they were characterized as ineffective and adventurous.

Underlining his ignorance of what a popular war of liberation is all about (despite his claim of belonging to a revolutionary regime) Mr. Haykal, the confidant of President Nasser, added his voice to those of the counter-revolutionaries. He declared that "the Palestinians cannot carry out a popular liberation struggle by themselves. Palestine is neither Algeria nor Vietnam. Acting alone, the guerrillas can only annoy Israel." Mr. Haykal and his like still think a classical war can be won by mere acquisition of hardware; they think terrain is the decisive factor in a people's war of liberation. Haykal cannot envision Egypt waging a war without MIG's and SAM's and he cannot imagine a popular war without rocks or rainforest.

If "acting alone the guerrillas could only annoy Israel," can they in collaboration with Mr. Haykal, and what he stands for, defeat Israel? The experience of the past provides an ample answer to that query—what does Haykal mean by "acting alone"? Indeed, guerrillas will continue to act alone as long as people like Haykal continue to run the Arab world. The guerrillas have put forward their goal in unmistakable terms; they have adopted the strategy of popular war and have been acting accord-



ingly. The mere pronouncement by Mr. Haykal of the phrase "acting alone" either betrays total ignorance of what the guerrilla movement is all about, or it is purposeful distortion of the facts. Since when do guerrillas function alone and in isolation from the masses? The masses do not count for Mr. Haykal, though—for as long as the guerrillas do not act in concert with governments (as far as Mr. Haykal is concerned), they will be acting alone. Mr. Haykal (on whose shoulders rests the responsibility of defending the Egyptian regime's latest move) was clearly taken aback by the revolutionaries' downright "no" to Nasser's leadership. It is surprising how arrogant such people are, who after repeated failure, still have the gall to expect silence acquiescence to their thoughtless gestures. Despite admonitions given by the guerrilla groups to those countries—that they'd better revamp the structure of their military operation—in Egypt, the leadership is still following the course of action it was on *prior to*, and which culminated in, the defeat of 1967.

It is obvious that it is this course of action which has forced upon Nasser the acceptance of the new ceasefire. It has become for him a vicious cycle, bringing him again and again to his starting place. This being the case, the Palestinians can only refuse to listen to him. The need for a Palestine revolution arose because of the very nature of the Arab regimes, their inability to do anything about Palestine. It would be self-defeating for the revolutionaries to join them.

Nasser's early acceptance of Rogers' plan was immediately labelled a master stroke because it would corner Israel. Granted, for the sake of argument, that Israel had indeed been cornered—what then? Israel would still be Israel. The ball wouldn't have stopped rolling... which brings us to the question: *which is the ultimate goal, cornering Israel or liberating Palestine?*

Nasser's claim to fame has been his gainsaying imperialism and Zionism. If this peace plan were ever to materialize, Nasser would be in the position of having sanctioned the Zionist presence in the Middle East and, what's more, legitimized imperialist guarantees of the *status quo* in that corner of the world. □

"... WE SHALL TURN JORDAN INTO A GRAVEYARD FOR PLOTTERS ... WE ARE GLADLY WILLING TO LET THEM TRY THEIR LUCK. AMMAN SHALL BE THE HANOI OF THE MIDDLE EAST.

THE POLITICAL SOLUTION WILL NEVER PASS THROUGH BUT WILL BE DEFEATED BY OUR RIFLES. THIS NATION NEVER BENT DOWN TO THE CRUSADERS AND THE TARTARS AND CERTAINLY WILL NOT DO SO TO THE ZIONISTS.

YASSER ARAFAT
AUGUST 16TH 1970

WE ARE ALL EXTREMISTS DEFENDING THE REVOLUTION

Abu Iyad, one of the leaders of the Palestine National Liberation Movement, Al Fatah, talks to FREE PALESTINE about the present situation in Jordan.

Free Palestine: How do you view the situation now in Jordan as far as the Palestinian Revolution is concerned? To what extent have the causes of the last confrontation been eliminated, and do you expect a renewal of clashes between yourselves and the counter-revolutionary forces?
Fatah: We are living at present in a period of vigilance while the four-man Committee appointed by the Arab States carries on a series of meetings with the authorities and representatives of the revolution to discuss the causes that led to what they call the crisis and we call a conspiracy. Until this period of vigilance elapses, it is difficult to assess whether the present situation is calm or a situation of psychological and material mobilization on either side. As for the renewal of clashes, this depends on the realization of several issues, of which two are in our view of fundamental importance.

First: That this regime and other Arab regimes neighboring our occupied homeland should understand that the revolution of a people who had lived for 20 years far from active struggle is a reality, and that the Palestinians are determined to fight the Zionist enemy. All that our people want is to live in a period of struggle without being exposed to stabs from its brothers. Further, they must know that coexistence with our revolution must be based on the understanding that a revolution can neither be restrained nor restricted, and that it has special circumstances which prevent it from abiding by the laws and regulations prevailing in the normal circumstances of peace.

Second: That there is a basic contradiction between those who call for a political solution and those who wish to fight until liberation and victory. The nearer the protagonists of the political solution get to the logic of the revolution, the more the fears of the revolutionaries are dissipated and consequently the danger of clashes becomes remote. We believe that any political settlement entails the liquidation of the revolution; we cannot envisage that a peaceful settlement which restores the Arab territories occupied in June 1967 will allow thousands of our fighters to carry on the struggle until liberation. This is the crux of the matter which takes various shapes on various occasions. This is what took place on 11/4/68, on 2/10/70 and recently on 6/9/70.

When the regime has a sympathetic understanding of these two important issues, there will be coexistence between the revolution and the authorities.

F.P. During and immediately following the recent incidents, news and comments appeared, pointing out "the moderation" of al-Fatah and stating that its leadership was hesitant and lost control over its followers. It is also pointed out that the PFLP imposed ultimately its will on the authorities. What is your answer?

Fatah: The conspiracy was aimed at the Palestinian revolution and there cannot be a Palestinian Revolution without al-Fatah, basically because of its potentials and because of its strong presence within the revolution. Therefore it is inconceivable that Fatah should be hesitant when it is the target. We have on more than one occasion declared that we do not only defend al-Fatah, but we equally defend the right of any organization to have the freedom of struggle even if it differs from our point of view or harbors us a grudge shown by unjustified and extravagant demands. Throughout the crises which the Palestinian Revolution had to overcome whether in Lebanon or in Jordan, the men of al-Fatah fell defending the revolution.

Our slogan is: no moderation, no extremism we are all extremists in defending the revolution. Some foreign newspapers and other doubtful Arab papers together with the official organs of certain organizations contributed in a tragic-comical way to depict the situation as mentioned in your question. I would like to quote to you some figures recorded during the recent incidents in order to inform the public opinion about the role of al-Fatah: casualties were 205 dead, 97 of them al-Fatah men who fell at the gates of Amman trying to stop the tanks enter-

ing the city. Of the 900 wounded, more than 220 were members of al-Fatah. The other organizations suffered only 30 killed or wounded. The Jordanian artillery shelled al-Fatah's main arms and provisions depot and destroyed more than 54 military vehicles, six ambulances included. On the political level the official spokesman of al-Fatah Abu Ammar, told the authorities that they had to choose between the expulsion of Sharif Nasser Ben Jamil and Shari Zeid Ben Shaker and between the survival of the regime. This was the determining factor as far as this question was concerned. Nevertheless we prefer to act more and to talk less.

F.P.: The news of the struggle between the Fedayeen and the Arab governments have become more dominant in the Western circles than the struggle of the revolution against the Zionist existence. Is this an expected development on the part of the revolution, or has the revolution unintentionally changed its basic political course?

Fatah: In all the side battles which the revolution had to fight following the conspiracy in Jordan and Lebanon we had no alternative but to defend ourselves. We had on more than one occasion stated that we will not interfere in the internal affairs of any Arab State, provided that these States do not hinder the progress of the Revolution. We have asked the States neighboring our occupied homeland to adapt themselves to our existence, in a manner which will safeguard their sovereignty but will not impose regulations and laws which were acceptable before June 5th, 1967. The Revolution does not want to change its basic political course and will not accept that its guns be directed away from its enemy, but certain battles are imposed upon us and we are faced with the problem of whether "to be or not to be".

F.P.: How is the political and strategic situation of the Palestinian armed struggle against the Zionists? It is said for instance that Israel has succeeded to a great extent in restricting the actions of the Fedayeen inside the West Bank and across the river Jordan and that the military operations are limited to shelling across the River and the Lebanese border.

Fatah: We have always said that the Palestinian Revolution has to exist in difficult circumstances. The Palestinian revolutionary has to fight his enemy in his occupied homeland, to fight against all the counter-revolutionary forces and also to fight to put an end to the dissidence within his ranks and to unite the various fighting forces. Each of these fronts bleeds the Palestinian Revolution. If all our efforts were directed against one front, the situation would be different.

Despite the fact that we had to fight two conspiracies in the past four months we can modestly say that our military operations have not been restricted to shelling across the border. If you review our recent military communiqués, you will realize that our revolution has achieved a near miracle. We believe that we must escalate our struggle but it would be ridiculous to say that this was possible without an atmosphere of security surrounding the revolution.

F.P.: Do you believe that the recent American "peace proposals" have any chance of being realized? What is your attitude towards some Arab States who have not taken a decisive stand concerning the U.S. plan; some of these States having gone as far as expressing optimism?

Fatah: We believe that the Zionist entity is closely linked to the United States and no plan presented by this imperialist State can take us or our revolution or our people a step forward on the path of liberation and victory. As we have rejected all liquidatory solutions which were offered under the cover of peaceful solutions we reject this last American initiative.

As for the Arab regimes, we have more than once raised our voices asking the Arab masses to take decisive steps to prevent the realization of plans which threaten their existence, their future and their freedom. We have said our attitude towards any Arab regime is measured by the attitude of that regime towards the cause of Palestine, and its attitude towards the various attempts aimed at the liquidation of the problem and the revolution. Here I would like to emphasize that we are not against peace, we have a proposal for peace, namely the establishment of a Palestinian democratic State as a substitute to the exclusivist Zionist society which aims at oppressing the Arab nation. □

Editorial

For the last twenty years, officers of Arab armies and heads of Arab states have stubbornly held to the notion that a sudden blitzkrieg attack on Israel could liberate Palestine. In the light of events transpired these past few years, it seems altogether doubtful that such plans ever made it as far as the drawing boards.

An interesting question has arisen: have the "petit bourgeois" military bureaucracies, by accepting the "American Plan" for peace in the Middle East, conveniently substituted the tactic of political blitzkrieg for the apparently more difficult task of mounting the military blitzkrieg they have advocated for so long?

For a blitzkrieg to succeed it must come as a final step in an all-out effort to consolidate men and materiel. The reason the Arab blitzkrieg never got off the ground is: it was conceived of as the beginning and end of the whole war effort. All the prerequisites for the success of sudden attack were lacking—i.e., battle preparedness was not possible of achievement due to internal and external factors.

Arab regimes were preoccupied internally with local considerations, and so Arab armies were not united. There was no popular participation in advancement towards the alleged goal of each ruling clique (liberating Palestine); no role in the war effort was assigned to the Arab masses in general, whose involvement was deemed an impediment to a classical war effort; and none was assigned to the Palestinian people, for whose benefit the whole effort was supposedly being staged.

Furthermore, the developing Arab nations were unable to surmount external hindrances to their military success: (a) the lack of total political and material cooperation by an outside power, and (b) tactical roadblocks set up by the West to benefit its Mediterranean outpost, Israel.

Arab ruling cliques seem incapable of comprehending the dimensions of the Palestine problem. The very factors which worked against their military strategy—and cause it to fail—will undermine their latest political plans as well.

The Arab regimes which have accepted the "Rogers' proposal" have advertised their move as a coup which will throw Israel for a loop. This latest tactic of the bureaucrats has, in point of fact, no greater chances than the forsaken one.

Blitzkriegs (military or political), even when they have devastated temporarily, did not work for Germany, and they have not worked for Israel. The only possible way to victory in the Middle East is by total mobilization of resources—human and material—into a war effort of probable long duration. Among Arabs, only the Palestinian commandos, so far, have set out on the hard path, the one that gets somewhere.

P. L. O. CENTRAL COMMITTEE

No Letup In Liberation Struggle



In creating the state of Israel, the colonialist-Zionist aim was to establish a permanent, human colonialist base in the heart of the Arab nation. This base was to physically prevent the unity and progress of the area and protect colonialist interests in the Arab world.

Meanwhile, the aim of the Palestinian masses specifically, and the Arab masses generally, since the British occupation of Palestine, has been to repulse the Zionist-colonialist incursion to prevent the establishment of the Zionist state, and to liberate Palestine as an indivisible part of the Arab nation. For this purpose, the Arab Palestinian people undertook several uprisings and revolutions throughout the duration of the British mandate at the cost of great material sacrifices and tens of thousands of martyrs. British colonialism subsequently goaded the Arab governments to abort the greatest Palestinian revolution prior to the establishment of the state of Israel and up to the joint conspiracy of colonialism, Zionism, and Arab governments in the face of the first Palestinian war in 1948. The Arab armies entered this war not to prevent the creation of the Zionist state in Palestine but to ensure its creation by preventing the Palestinian people and the Arab masses from taking up arms to protect the homeland.

Ever since the creation of the state of Israel, the Arab nation has been generously contributing, at the cost of its own food and clothing, to the building up of the Arab armies with the aim of liberating Palestine. The Arab regimes, however, while pretending to uphold the cause of liberation, were also preventing the Palestinian people and all the Arab masses from actual participation in the battle against Zionism which is organically linked to world imperialism headed by the U.S.A., Britain, and West Germany. When the Arab armies were defeated in the June 5 War of 1967, it became evident that the Zionist-imperialist invasion of the Arab world, which began with the usurpation of Palestine, required the wide participation of the masses to confront and repel the old as well as the new aggression. This was the springboard for Palestinian commando action and the flocking of Palestinian and Arab masses around it by means of evolving it to become a popular war of liberation in which all the Arab masses would take part.

However, most Arab officialdom did not respond genuinely and seriously to the demands of the Arab masses, and the governments met in Khartoum after the defeat. There, they hammered out a number of resolutions which were tanta-

mount to the final abandonment of the aim to liberate Palestine in the guise of what was called political action to remove the traces of the 1967 Zionist aggression, thereby ignoring removal of the traces of the 1948 Zionist aggression, and attempting to hide behind a misleading set of resolutions: no negotiations with Israel, no recognition of Israel, no peace with Israel, and no tampering with the Palestine cause.

Following this, they turned around and accepted the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967 which liquidates the Palestine cause and implies the recognition of Israel. From there they moved on to more concessions by accepting what is called the American initiative included in the letter of the American foreign minister, Rogers, as presented to the foreign ministers of the U.A.R., Jordan and Israel. The Rogers Plan includes and implies the following:

First: Appointment of a representative from each country to negotiate, under the supervision of Dr. Jarring, implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967.

Second: The Recognition of Israel.

Third: Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied during the June War.

Fourth: Reinstitution of the cease fire for a period of at least three months.

This is based on the condition that Jordan, the U.A.R., and Israel would sign the document presented by Jarring to U Thant containing the aforementioned details prior to the commencing of negotiations.

Negotiations with Israel to implement the Security Council resolution and the recognition of Israel mean, other than going back on the Arab commitment not to negotiate with Israel, the final abandonment of the Arab Palestinian people's right to their homeland, Palestine.

Withdrawal from "territories" occupied during the June War means incomplete Israeli withdrawal, i.e., specifically not withdrawing from Jerusalem, the Golan Heights, and other Arab areas.

Reinstitution of the cease fire means the preclusion of commando activity and, consequently, a confrontation with the Palestinian resistance movement. This deduction is confirmed by the American-Israeli position and the previous plans presented by the U.S.A., outlining its definition of a permanent and just peace in the area.

It is obvious that the American plan is essentially an underhanded plot aiming at rending the unity of Arab ranks and shattering the internal Arab front. It also aims at striking and liquidating

(The Central Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization announced July 25 the rejection by the Palestinian people of "the Security Council resolution (of November 23, 1967) in all its forms and manners of application, including the Rogers Plan." The Central Committee statement said "The Palestinian people who have taken up arms to liberate and return to their country and exercise their right to self-determination will not lay down their arms or abide by the ceasefire agreement and will continue their armed struggle until total liberation." Following is the full text of the statement as announced 48 hours after UAR President Nasser's formal acceptance of the Rogers Plan).

the Palestinian resistance movement, specifically, and the Arab liberation movement, generally. The American plan not only secures great gains for Israel, but it also inflicts drastic losses on the Arab nation.

The Central Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, speaking on behalf of the Palestinian Arab people and expressing the objectives of their struggle, announces the Palestinian people's refusal of the Security Council resolution in all its forms and manners of application, including the Rogers Plan. It also affirms that no Arab or foreign source has the right to annul the Palestinian people's existence and relinquish their country to Zionism and imperialism, thus being instrumental in its final and total liquidation, as people and homeland.

The Palestinian people who have taken up arms to liberate and return to their country and exercise their right to self-determination will not lay down their arms or abide by the cease fire agreement and will continue their armed struggle until total liberation. The Arab masses standing by the Palestinian resistance movement are asked to increase their support and backing of the resistance. They are also asked to share in foiling all imperialist, Zionist and counter-revolutionary plots directed against the Arab homeland and nation — mainly all plans which aim at liquidating commando action and the Palestine cause.

The Arab nationalist movement has now to assume its historical responsibility in proving its ability to lead the masses and to direct the stage of democratic national liberation at this dangerous phase confronting our people.

The Arab masses that had struggled against colonialism and secured many great victories are now asked to maintain this independence by refusing to submit to imperialist and Zionist dictates. They are required to move swiftly and effectively to destroy the dangerous Zionist-imperialist conspiracy against the Palestine cause. Time has come for the Arab masses to play their effective role in facing the battle of destiny and imposing their will in steadfastness and liberation.

The present plot is directed against the destiny of these masses and their right to life and liberty. The Arab and Palestinian masses should close their ranks to thwart the conspiracy of liquidation.

Let the masses declare their decisive determination in every way and with utmost force. The Palestine Revolution pledges to the Arab masses to continue its struggle until victory and liberation. □



A CONVERSATION WITH paul jacobs

Paul Jacobs, a former trade-union organizer, a participant in liberal, radical and Jewish activities has been deeply involved with Israel, since its inception. He is the author of "THE STATE OF THE UNION," "IS CURLY JEWISH," "BETWEEN THE ROCK AND THE HARD PLACE" and other books and articles. FREE PALESTINE is pleased to publish an interview with this American liberal whose views it respects but does not necessarily share. This interview was concluded in the first week of May 1970. We welcome our readers' comments concerning the thoughts expressed in this interview.

Q: You state in your article, **No Peace in the Middle East**, that "physical survival is the dominant *raison d'être* for an increasing number of Israelis." How can this concern for physical survival be a *raison d'être* for Israelis when the Palestinian Arabs say that they are willing to live together with the Jewish citizens in a secular, democratic, pluralistic society?

A: The strong feelings of Israelis about the threat to their physical survival grow from these factors:

In the period immediately prior to the June 1967 war and during the war itself, an overwhelming majority of Israelis were convinced that they faced annihilation if the Arab states won the war. This conviction was based, initially, on the Arab propaganda, particularly the Arabic radio broadcasts predicting the physical slaughter of the Israelis in the days just before the war. After the war had ended, the Israelis' feelings were reinforced by the discovery of materials, particularly in the Golan Heights, distributed by the Syrian Army to the Syrian soldiers, which did call for wiping out the Israelis. And today, when Israelis hear Arafat state that to Fatah peace "means Israel's destruction, nothing else," they can only assume their own physical destruction is included.

The Israelis are extremely sceptical about the Palestinian Arab statement that "they are willing to live together with the Jewish citizens in a secular, democratic, pluralistic society." Most Israelis, including non-Zionist Israelis, are not prepared, as yet, to accept the good faith of the Palestinian Arabs making this statement, especially since Fatah sometimes defines the "secular, democratic, pluralistic" state as an Arab state in which the Jews will become a minority.

At present, much confusion surrounds the phrase "secular state." At times, Fatah seems to mean that the secular state it proposes will be an Arab counterpart of Israel, i.e., a Palestinian Arab state in which Jews will be welcome as a minority. At other times, Fatah seems to project a vision of a tri-partite state patterned after the Lebanese model and I have heard discussions that suggest a cantonal state, in the model of Switzerland.

Which is it to be? One of these or a combination of them or some other form of state? Until that question has been answered more accurately, Israelis will continue to be suspicious.

Partially, too, the Israeli concern about this question is related to the positions of some Arab groups that only those Jews who were living in Palestine prior to 1947, or at some other date, would be permitted to live there after an Arab state has been established. In addition, Shukeiry's inflammatory statements are still remembered.

The existence of this fear is used by those elements within the Israeli government who are the most bitterly anti-Arab. And the fear itself becomes an important element strengthening the structure of national unity. The only way in which any large number of Israelis will become convinced that the Palestinian Arabs do not seek their destruction will be when Palestinian Arabs and Israeli Jews find some kind of common meeting ground in discussions or in actions. But so long as the Palestinian Arab movement makes as a prior condition for any discussion with any Israelis that the Israelis be prepared in advance to accept the concept of giving up the existence of Israel, as a state, the fears of Israeli Jews about the intentions of Palestinian Arabs will continue to grow.

Q: There has been much confusion over the maintenance of a state of Israel and the maintenance of a Jewish state. Do you think that the struggle for the maintenance of the state of Israel is, in fact, the maintenance of a Jewish state? Is the desire for the maintenance of a Jewish state inspired by national sentiment, religious sentiment or both?

A: I think that at present the struggle for the maintenance of the state of Israel is the struggle for the main-

tenance of the Jewish state. In the past, when the notion of a bi-national state had a measure of credibility among some Zionists, it might have been possible to develop a Palestinian state in which Jews and Arabs lived bi-nationally. But the movement for a bi-national state died because:

Many Zionists were bitterly opposed to it and attacked bitterly those other Zionists like Judas Magnes or Henrietta Szold who supported it and because no influential Arab leaders were willing to accept it either.

The desire for the maintenance of a Jewish state is inspired both by national and religious sentiments. The initial impetus for a Jewish state developed from a growth in Jewish self-identification on non-religious grounds, but with religious overtones. In my judgment, it is almost impossible to separate the national from the religious sentiment, although for the great majority of Israelis the religious sentiment is much less important than is the need for national self-identity.

Q: You state the FLN experience is not relevant to the Palestine problem and you further state that Arafat recognizes the differences. Despite the differences, are there not also similarities? Was not part of the Algerian experience the international support the FLN engendered and the consequences of French colonization on the local populace as the basis of popular support behind the FLN.

A: Although it is true that part of the Algerian experience included the international support given to the FLN, the FLN had the support of many Frenchmen in France and that support was far more important. Many of the French intellectuals and political activists understood clearly that the French were colonizers in Algeria and that the French had a homeland outside of Algeria. But no parallel exists between the French colonists and the present generation of Israelis. Where would the Israelis go? Their homeland is Israel and so the parallel does not exist.

Q: Your observation that a weakness in Fatah's program is its failure to detail the specifics of the character of the society it wishes to create. In short, its lack of politics as far as the future society is concerned. Cannot the politics and specifics grow out of the liberation struggle? Do you regard this as occurring?

A: Yes, the politics and specifics can grow out of the liberation struggle if a conscious effort is made to develop political positions. But it is also true that some liberation struggles take place without a proper political analysis and in those situations the struggles fail, in the sense that the new society may be as repressive as was the old one. What, for example, does Fatah understand to be the character of the secular state it espouses? What are the future institutions of state power? Is the state to be a socialist state or one committed to the continuation of capitalism? Through what political forms will power be exercised? What will be the role of the military and how will the military be subordinated to the civilian? How will the state police itself?

Such questions cannot be dismissed, in my view, by saying, merely, that the answers will be given later, after the military struggle is complete. Unless some attempt is made, now, to create, perhaps only in microcosm, the Fatah vision of the state as it will be, I will continue to be wary of it. However, I think some attempt is being made now within Fatah to develop positions on these questions.

Q: Do you think there is any political program or specifics in which Palestinian Arabs and Jews could live together in a secular state which would attract a significant support in the Israeli population?

A: I do not believe that at present, the definition of the "secular state," propounded by the Palestinian Arabs, can attract any significant support within the Israeli population. With the exception of the Matzpen group,

all of the other elements in Israel committed to a secular socialist state are committed also to the concept that the secular socialist state should be a Jewish one. Jewish nationalism, as an expression of Jewish identity, is considered by such Israelis to be as natural and desirable as Palestinian Arab nationalism is to the Palestinian Arabs. The basic difference between those Israelis who seek a secular socialist state based on humanist concepts, and those Israelis who seek to expand the territory of their state, at all costs, is that the former group understands and accepts the notion of Palestinian Arab nationalism as being legitimate. I think they would accept a solution to the problem which does injustice to the legitimate Palestinian Arab aspirations, but yet does not give up the existence of a Jewish state in the Middle East.

The dilemma of those Israelis who resist the expansionist concept of Israel exists, although in a different form, for the Palestinian Arabs too. Fatah speaks of creating a secular state and seeks to do so through the instrument of a developing, aggressive Palestinian Arab identity. But such a formulation creates precisely the same problem as the one forced upon the Zionists who were also socialists, i.e., a basic contradiction between a commitment to human brotherhood and a society which excludes part of that brotherhood from first-class status.

The development of a sense of self, of Palestinian Arab identity, is, in my judgment, essential at this point in history. But one ought to be aware that the most likely form of fulfillment for such an identity is the creation of a state in which Palestinian Arabs dominate the society, thus becoming the mirror image of the Jewish state.

It is conceivable that, given the present state of development of national aspirations and the need to resist colonialism, in all its forms, such a state is the only possible solution for Palestinian Arabs. But then one cannot argue against those who see the Jewish state as their answer to the same problems; if no person has the right to define another person's identity, no state has the right to such a definition on another state. That is the meaning of sovereignty.

In the large sense, it is the concept of sovereignty that is the crux of the matter. Two rival sovereignties, both legitimate, in my judgment, are clashing now over control of the identical piece of land. But some Israelis and most Palestinian Arabs deny the legitimacy of the other group's claims; therefore, an armed conflict is taking place. And since I believe neither side can win that conflict, militarily, I am convinced it will have to be resolved, politically, through a division of that piece of land. Either that division will take place and two sovereign states will exist where only one does now or the best of the Middle Eastern youth will be killed for years to come.

Q: In your article you quote Cabinet Minister Gallili's statement concerning the "Zionist dream is that millions of Jews, the vast majority of our people from all parts of the Diaspora, gather in the state of the Jews for a healthy, spiritual and earthly life." Don't you think that this attitude is a large part of the Palestine problem? How many Israelis, do you think, would condemn this statement and call for the dismantling of the world Zionist organization/Jewish Agency?

A: I believe one consequence of the "Zionist dream" was the creation of a state in which the Arab population could never be more than a group of second-class citizens. In this sense, I think the Zionist dream contained a fundamental contradiction and many early Zionists did not understand the consequences of their position in relationship to the Arab population.

I don't know how many Israelis would condemn Gallili's statement and call for the dismantling of the WZO or the Jewish Agency. But I do know many Israelis are totally unconcerned with Zionism as a proselytizing movement. Their primary concern is that they be allowed to continue living in their own country, rather than enlarging the size of its population by bringing in Jews "from all parts of the Diaspora," as Gallili seeks to do.

(Continued Next Page)

The International Association of Democratic Lawyers held its 9th International Congress on July 15-19 in Helsinki where delegations of lawyers affiliates from numerous countries around the world attended. As might have been expected, the Palestinian-Zionist conflict was to be one of the most hotly contested issues. Opposition to the anti-Zionist-Israeli position of the overwhelming majority of the delegations came from the delegations from the United States and Argentina. To accommodate these latter delegations, the delegates representing the various Arab countries and the observer from the Palestine Liberation Movement met with these delegations over a table to discuss the differences. The main bone of contention of the United States and Argentinian delegations was that "Israeli sovereignty was supported by international law." For the first time, these delegates discerned differences in the positions of the various Arab delegates. When the Congress reconvened after the meeting, the United States and Argentinian delegations chose to abstain on the Resolution which the Congress ultimately passed, dealing with the Palestinian-Zionist conflict. Following is the text of the Resolution:

The IXth Congress of the I.A.D.L. held from the 15th to the 19th of July 1970 in Helsinki declares its condemnation of the Israeli aggression of June 5, 1967, an aggression which led to the occupation of the territories of 3 countries, members of the U.N.

- Noting the fact that 3 years have elapsed since the aggression, and that the occupied territories have not yet been evacuated.
- Noting Israel's continuing escalation of its aggression with the support of World Imperialism headed by American Imperialism which prevents the establishment of peace in the area.
- Noting Israel's persistence in violating International law and U.N. resolutions by its bombing of civilians in schools and factories, and by imposing its laws and jurisdiction on the occupied territories in general, and Jerusalem in particular.
- Noting Israel's deliberate and persistent defiance of U.N. resolutions, and particularly the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967;

- Noting that the Palestinian people expelled from their homes, and prevented by force by the Israeli Government from returning therein, that the Palestinian people, also subjected to all forms of terrorism, could only resort to heroic resistance which has developed into a National Liberation movement with all the legal consequences which follow, thus proving the existence of a Palestinian people and a Palestinian nation to be an objective, reality.

The Congress, in the interest of realizing international cooperation and in the interest of safeguarding peace in the Middle East area.

1. Calls upon all lawyers, all lawyer organizations, and democratic organizations to double their efforts by taking all necessary positive steps to prevent the Israeli government from obtaining material, economic and other forms of aid which enable it to pursue its policy of aggression.
2. Condemns the attitude of Imperialist powers which encourage the escalation of Israeli aggression, and the continuation of the state of war in the area, so as to continue their exploitation of the resources in the area, and to

- re-establish it under imperialist domination.
- 3. Demands the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied territories.
- 4. Demands the respect of the Palestinian peoples' right to return to their homeland and the guarantee of their fundamental rights stipulated in the U.N. Charter and in the provisions of International Law in general, and the Geneva Convention in particular, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; including their legitimate and inalienable right to self-determination in their own homeland.
- Recognizes that the armed Palestinian resistance is a legitimate resistance and is the expression of a National liberation movement constituting an integral part of the world struggle for liberation, against imperialism.
- Calls upon all Democratic Lawyers, and all peace and freedom-loving peoples of the world to support the Palestinian people and their heroic resistance for the realization of their legitimate aims, and for the safeguarding of World Peace and Security.

In my judgment, Gallili does not represent the views of more than a small percentage of Israelis, and while in the past, the views he expresses were an important element in Zionist ideology, I think those views are of little significance in the attitude of Israelis today, especially the youth. Gallili gains legitimacy for his views because of the escalating conflict; if the Palestinian Arab problem was resolved by Palestinian Arabs and Israelis, the zealots of Zionism would have almost no base, either in Israel or outside it.

- Q: What possible change in the internal political structure of Israel do you regard as possible? Under what conditions do you see this occurring?
- A: I can't conceive of many changes taking place in the internal political structure in the near future. Unfortunately, the combination of a large number of minority parties together with the rigid bureaucratic structure of the larger political parties, makes it very difficult for those who seek change to achieve it. This situation is complicated even more because under the present war situation, those in power in Israel can call for national unity in the face of the enemy and for a cessation of all attacks upon it. A fairly large number of Israelis are challenging some policies of their government, but I do not see such challenges as being very effective while the present conditions of conflict exist.
- Q: You state categorically that Fatah cannot succeed in its stated aims of eliminating Israel as a Jewish state. Is this a statement based on a military assessment only? What part do you see the political, moral and psychological dimensions of struggle playing in this?
- A: I believe that the elimination of Israel as a Jewish state is impossible for a combination of military, political, moral and psychological reasons. At the military level, Fatah would be forced to pay such an enormous cost to eliminate Israel that the Palestinian Arab movement would be crippled for many years to come. I am convinced, however, that the Israelis cannot eliminate the Palestinian guerrillas on a purely military basis, either. A political solution is the only lasting one.

In addition, the rival imperialisms of the Soviet Union and the United States are using the Middle East struggle for their own benefits. It is a reality that behind Israel stands the U.S., temporarily at least, and behind the Arab states is the U.S.S.R. Both Israel and the Arab states are willing to accept assistance from the rival imperialisms without considering the dilution of moral and political strength that must follow from such actions. If I condemn the Israelis for their close relationship to U.S. imperialism, why should I not also condemn those Arab states for their relationships to the Russian Bloc, especially since I believe the Soviet Union opposes national liberation movements which it cannot control. Thus, when Fatah condemns Israel for accepting support from American colonizers, it invites condemnation when it seeks support from Russian colonizers, seeking to advance Soviet interests, even at the expense of Palestinian Arabs.

The great tragedy of the Middle East is that the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist struggle was coordinated by the Zionists to their drive for state power with the result that they lost sight of the real enemies, the British and French who sought to dominate the Middle East for their own purposes.

Now, I see the Palestinian Arabs repeating the errors of the Zionists by seeking help from those forces, especially the Soviet Union, who might assist the Palestinian Arabs but will demand a very high price for that help, i.e., the domination by the Soviet Union of the whole area. In that case, future Palestinian Arab states will become an outpost of a repressive Soviet technological society just as Israel is in danger of becoming no more than an outpost of a repressive American technological society.

- Q: You state that the Palestinians must renounce the concept of eliminating the Jewish state and the Israelis must reverse their policy of annexation and make public serious proposals for dealing with the rights of Palestinian Arabs. In which order do you think that these measures should occur? Do you think that Palestinian Arabs might have their national rights satisfied in an area other than their former country?

A: I believe it is incumbent upon the Israelis to reverse their policy of annexation and make public serious proposals for dealing with the rights of the Palestinian Arabs, especially the refugees, without demanding prior conditions. The Israelis are in the best position to make the first proposal. I am opposed, vigorously, to the Israeli policy of consolidating its hold over the occupied territories by any form of annexation. I think that every settlement of Israelis in such places as Hebron exacerbates and intensifies the escalation of the conflict.

Perhaps some Palestinian Arabs might believe their national rights could be satisfied in an area which was once outside of their former country. But I believe such a decision must be made by them and not by outsiders. Ideally, given the existence of Israel, I believe it might be possible to accommodate the national aspirations of both Palestinian Arabs and Israelis in separate states within the boundaries of the area once known as Palestine. Perhaps, if such states existed, a new dual federation might evolve in the future.

- Q: You state "any war such as the one being conducted in the Middle East, whether a group or individual is described as 'terrorists' or 'guerrilla' is often more dependent on who is using it, than upon the quality of the act carried out." Do you think there is any legitimate usage for the word "resistance"? If so, what is that usage?
- A: In general, the word "guerrilla" seems to be used to describe people whose political views embody a moral quality, while the word "terror" is associated with a lack of morality and the maintenance of power for its

own sake. Thus, we speak, correctly, of the "Stalinist terror" or the Nazi use of "terror" tactics against large groups of the civilian population. In the Middle East struggle I distinguish between Palestinian Arab attacks upon military installations and military patrols which I accept as part of a military struggle while I condemn, absolutely, blowing up an Israeli commercial plane, bombing student cafeterias or making a bazooka attack on a school bus.

The use of violence in a political struggle is a most serious question and not one to be treated lightly. First, a direct political connection must exist between the violence and a specific objective. Second, the violence must be pointed towards a specific target and not used randomly. Third, and perhaps most important, when it is necessary to resort to violence, and I understand that necessity even while deploring it, it must be always understood that a moral price is paid for the use of violence. And that price is paid by those who utilize violence.

I avoid, wherever possible, the use of such terms as resistance, terror, guerrilla, etc., since all of them seem to me to be pejorative, in one sense or another. Nevertheless, I might use the word "resistance" to describe some activities of some Palestinian Arabs living in occupied territories and attempting to fight the Israelis in those territories. On the other hand, the indiscriminate use of violence against civilians does not fit my definition of proper tactics for a "resistance movement."

In this connection, I believe Fatah's policy is weak. Although it has rejected some of the more bizarre and irresponsible tactics of other groups, i.e., bombing airplanes and making bazooka attacks on school buses, it must do so more unequivocally if it is to have a legitimate credibility for socialists and humanists. Many Israelis protest, publicly, those policies of their government of which they disapprove and incur public disapproval as a result. Many American Jews speak up for Palestinian Arab rights and suffer within their own community as a result. Where are their Palestinian counterparts? Privately, some Palestinian Arabs protest the vicious policies of some Arab states and Palestinian Arab organizations but refuse to do so publicly, presumably in the interests of unity. But such unity is false and anti-socialist.

Finally, while I understand why Fatah refuses to meet with any Israelis except those who say they are willing to give up the existence of the state, I think Fatah is wrong in continuing that policy. Ultimately, Fatah will have to deal with the Israeli state and it ought to be considering all the options which may lead to a political solution: some of those options can be found in positions being advanced within Israel by those Israelis who accept the reality of a Palestinian Arab identity and of a Palestinian Arab state, which is not a puppet of Israel. □

ABU OMAR INTERVIEWED

CONTINUED FROM LAST ISSUE

FP: What is the force that motivates these people to rally around your movement?

Fatah: It takes no great imagination to see that any free people, when subjected to oppression, military occupation, repression, expulsion, takes up arms to resist and to fight such an occupation, such repression. The basic motivating force is the goal of reasserting our rights as human beings and to assert our political rights as people.

FP: How do you explain the multitude of commando organizations?

Fatah: There should be a number of commando organizations. It is rather natural for a society which in the last twenty years has been divided into five segments, a people that has been expelled and has lived under many different systems. Also, some of the contradictions in the Arab areas do reflect themselves in the Palestinian revolution, but I must emphasize that the differences between these various organizations have been overemphasized in the press. What unites these commando movements is much greater than that which divides us—if we look not at our rhetoric but at our action. In terms of class origins, there are no differences between the organizations; in terms of our aim, we are all committed to the liberation of Palestine; in terms of the path for arriving at this liberation, we are all committed to long range armed struggle as the path. In these we are united and therefore as an expression of this unity we have created frameworks of cooperation like the Palestine Liberation Organization which we joined and revolutionized, the Palestine Armed Struggle Command, the National Council, the Central Committee, the Executive Committee, the Military Council; all these unite and create the framework of the activities for all the commandos. So we do not demand that we should have absolute agreement of all the groups to act together, but we do have agreement on the basic problems.

FP: Do you mean to say that there is a trend towards unity among the commandos? What are the circumstances that bring about such a unity?

Fatah: Definitely we have been achieving a greater degree of unity as the revolution has progressed. The circumstances are not so much the formal meetings and the formal choices and decisions as much as the unity of the combatants in the revolution. By acting together, by fighting together, by standing against the enemies from within and without together, greater unity of the masses of our people is being forged.

FP: How do you finance your movement?

Fatah: Our movement is financed by voluntary contributions from the Palestinian masses and from the Arab masses and friends all over the world.

FP: Doesn't that put any limitation on your freedom of action?

Fatah: It does not put any limitation on our freedom of action because the masses support our movement wholeheartedly and therefore the source of our income is assured. There might be problems in channeling these contributions where some governments insist that they should come through the governments; that might present difficulties, but those who want to contribute and pay will find no difficulty in delivering their contributions despite what the positions of the governments might be.

FP: How do you procure your arms?

Fatah: Naturally the details of how we procure our arms is a military secret, yet the world market in armaments is very active and if one has the money to purchase armaments, one finds that one can purchase them in many parts of the world. Also, there are friendly governments that can assist us in this task.

FP: How do you assess the weight of your movement at the present time in the Middle Eastern scene?

Fatah: I think that our movement is the most significant phenomenon in this period of history in the Middle East and the Arab world because, as I mentioned before, it is the first movement that is attempting to face imperialism, to face Zionism, to face the enemy, not by changes at the top or from the top but by beginning a real mass movement—not that will express itself in an outburst, but a sustained mass movement—that creates the necessary power to be able to defeat imperialism and Zionism.

FP: What would be the attitude of your movement to the so-called "peaceful solution"?

Fatah: Big powers and small powers have been attempting to resolve the problem in our part of the world for more than a half a century, and they have failed. They have failed because their analysis of the problem is wrong, because they do not see what the problem is.

They deal only with the manifestations of the problem, with the branches and never get to the roots. The real problem is the confrontation between an alien Zionist movement that has expelled our people and occupied our country and created an exclusivist racist society and our own people who are trying for self-determination in their own territory and for building a society that does not make any distinctions on the basis of race, color, or creed. Therefore, if one does not get to the root of the problem, if one does not follow a radical solution of the problem, all these talks of peaceful settlement of the problem will not get anywhere, just as they have not in the past fifty years.

HANOI STANDS WITH THE ARAB MASSES

Hanoi's declaration of opposition to the Middle East cease-fire was issued as an article in the official Hanoi Daily, NHAN DAN and through a broadcast by Hanoi Radio on August 12th, 1970. The declaration which aroused high diplomatic concern in Moscow, Washington and Peking, stated:

"The U.S. scheme is extremely prefidious... [it is] obviously intended to help the Israeli aggressors grab part of the Arab territory and strengthen their position for securing a position of strength in negotiation.

At the same time it is also intended to create conditions for Israel to increase its forces for an eventual renewed attack on the Arab countries in case a political solution beneficial to the U.S. and Israel fails to materialize. By proposing a cease-fire, the U.S. also attempts to divide and weaken the resistance of the people of the Arab countries and to stamp out the liberation movement of the Palestinian people.

Standing on the forefront of the struggle against U.S. imperialism, the Vietnamese people have followed with deep concern the fight of the Arab people, their intimate comrades-in-arms and brothers."

FP: What do you consider as a radical solution to the problem of Palestine?

Fatah: The radical solution is that Palestinian people ought to have the right to determine their destiny, they ought to have the right to return to their country, they ought to have the right to choose the political system that would insure the interest of the masses of the Palestinian people. Of course our attitude towards the occupier is not that we should throw the occupier away somewhere—because we are dealing here with an occupying society, not only an occupying army. And we have offered to our occupier more than any people have offered to their occupiers in the past. We are offering them, if they want to stay and live in Palestine, that they stay and live there as Palestinians, in equality. And more than equality we couldn't possibly offer those who came under the slogan of "a land without a people for a people without a land" and who didn't even recognize our existence. Our country was hardly a land without a people, and even though they acted to make it so by throwing the majority of our people out of the country, we insist on our right and as a humanist revolution do offer them the opportunity of sharing with us. But to have our country at our expense and by throwing us out, we will never accept. And the only solution for Palestine, therefore, is the solution that gives all those who want to live in Palestine the right to do so as equals.

FP: Many people have raised questions with regard to Article Six of the so-called *National Covenant of the Palestine Council*. Could you explain that problem?

Fatah: We have heard lots of Zionist propaganda about Article Six. In many ways this sort of exegesis of sentences and paragraphs is the resort of a people who are bankrupt in their palaces. They have picked on this article and interpreted it in a way which is incorrect. What the article does is to define who is a Palestinian and it does it in such a way as to exclude Zionists from the definition. Now, it does not say anything about who has the right in the future to participate in the new Palestine. It only defines Palestinians, as I have said, *as such*, so as to exclude Zionists because they do not want to consider themselves as Palestinians. They do not want to be and live as Palestinians. As far as the future, nothing is said about it. I think this is the essential meaning of Article Six. The position of our movement with regard to a future Palestine is that any person who has accepted Zionism, was deluded by Zionist ideology, if he is willing to reject Zionism, to adopt the ideals and work for and fight for the ideals that we are fighting for, would have the right and opportunity to participate and live in the future Palestine.

FP: Abu Omar, why didn't your movement put down a detailed program for the future Palestine that you envision.

Fatah: If we were merely indulging in intellectual exercises, we could sit down and make all sorts of blue prints. I think this would be a utopian approach. We are not an intellectual movement isolated and unrelated to action; we are a political movement, we are involved in long range revolution. It would be premature to set a blue print for a stage that is very distant from this stage because every stage depends on the progress and the course of the previous stage. And secondly, because we do say that we are for a democratic Palestine, in which all those who are involved ought to have a say as to the details of the society, we cannot pre-judge the issue now. It is the people who would reach the liberation stage, whether they be Jewish or Muslims or Christians, who would be the ones to formulate specifically the arrangements needed at that time—on the basis of the then-existing conditions. If we were to do this at this stage, it would be utterly utopian and unscientific.

FP: Have you, at least, drawn the broad lines for the possibility of a future detailed program of society?

Fatah: We are committed to essential principles. We are committed to a democratic society where each man is treated as equal, regardless of his origin. We are committed to equality and to social justice. We have phrased the slogan: "a land belongs to the arms that liberate it," meaning of course that this should not be interpreted literally to say that only those who are carrying the guns have a right to Palestine. It means that it is the segment of people who achieve the liberation who would have the say in formulating the details of the new Palestine. We have said that there will be no discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed—or language—which means that in the new Palestine, the freedom to express oneself, to worship in the way one pleases, to express oneself culturally as one desires, to create in the manner one desires, would be assured and there will be allowed no cultural discrimination.

FP: Would that future free Palestine be open to Jewish immigrants from all over the world?

Fatah: I think the future Palestine would have immigration laws as any state does. And I would assume that a future Palestine would have no religious or racial conceptions in its own constitution or of those it would welcome. And I should hope that Palestine will have immigration laws that will open it to any person who wants to come and live and share in Palestine and not select them on the basis of their color or their religion. But, of course, this is for those who liberate Palestine to decide. I myself cannot say at this stage.

FP: Do you think that that future Palestine would offer security to Jews in that area?

Fatah: It will offer security definitely—to people not only of the Jewish faith but to all other communities and groups of people as well. The only security for the people of Jewish faith in that area is not to live there on the basis of force and dominance and superiority of arms, but to live in a system that relates them in a human way to the rest of the population of the area. I think that will not only give them security, but I think that *that* is the only arrangement that will ensure the security of the Jews in Palestine.

FP: Thank you, Abu Omar, very much.

oniz redto thez redto other side

JAVITS ON THE "PEACE PLAN" AND ISRAEL

Following the acceptance by Egypt and Israel of a cease-fire initiated by the United States, Senator Javits (R - New York) appeared on the CBS program "Face the Nation" on August 9, 1970, to air his views regarding the so-called "Rogers plan" for peace in the Middle East. The senator was interviewed by a friendly panel of discussants composed of: George Herman - CBS News; John Finney - N.Y. Times; Nelson Benton - CBS News.

Free Palestine finds it appropriate to comment on this interview—not because it attaches any importance to the senator's views concerning the proposed plan, senator and proposal both being equally irrelevant as far as the Palestine Revolution is concerned, but—to expose contradictions in the senator's argument and to show the deceptive means used by Zionists to manipulate American public opinion.

All through the interview, Javits was very anxious to emphasize U.S. commitment to Israel's security and Israel's activities in the service of American and Western interest. Asked whether the U.S. gave Israel any secret assurances before reaching the cease-fire agreement, he replied: "I would hardly call them secret." When asked about further arms-supply to Israel, he answered: "Well, I think—I'm sure that that could be included. It all depends upon the situation Israel faces, both now and at the end of the 90 (ninety)-day truce." Only a few days after that interview, news of disagreement between Israel and the U.S. came into the open. What happened to the secret assurances? Did the U.S. renege on its promises? Perhaps it was only Senator Javits' sand-castle that had collapsed.

When Mr. Herman asked "what do (the Russians) stand to gain out of this American initiative," Senator Javits replied:

The Russians stand to gain more than anybody except Israel. Israel stands to gain a land and survival, though I believe she could have made it because I believe the United States would have backed her anyhow, in our own self-interest, as we just cannot afford to have the Mediterranean a Russian lake, and soon the NATO countries would have wakened to the same fact of the time-honored axiom of Churchill about the soft underbelly of Europe, which is extremely vulnerable to the Mediterranean. So I believe Israel would have made it, but nonetheless she wants to make it in peace, not in war, and this gives—opens the door to that.

Now as to the Soviet Union, she is in the Mediterranean. If there is peace in the Mediterranean, she will have tremendous standing in the Arab countries, she will very likely have free transit, just as we want Israel to have it through the Suez Canal, giving her the opportunities of the Indian Ocean, and we will face Soviet competition, diplomatically, economically, and in every way—and militarily—in the Indian Ocean and all over the world. That is not necessarily bad, as this situation in the Mideast has shown, because I doubt that the people in the Arab countries, who are engaged in all of this war and intransigence, could have been restrained otherwise, than by the Soviet Union being strong then. Now the Israelis might have beaten them all hollow, but to carry on 30 or 40 years of war with 50 to 100 million people is not funny by a small nation of two or three million.

And that's the world overview in which we have to look at it, and in which the United States obviously did look at it, in consulting its own national interests. The statement the President made, backed by 71 Senators, on July 1, was, I think, the key to the ability of the United States to bring this off.

Mr. Herman's answer: *I got a little drowned in words... Free Palestine sympathizes with Mr. Herman; it is not hard to see why.*

It is doubtful that the United States "brought off" the peace initiative for the 'self-interested' purpose of strengthening the USSR's position in the Mediterranean, the Arab countries, and the Indian Ocean. How is this in the American interest?

Where does Mr. Javits stand? On the one hand he says the U.S. and NATO "cannot afford to have the Mediterranean a Russian lake", and on the other, he says it is not necessarily bad that Russia "have tremendous standing in the Arab countries." If Mr. Javits were sincere in his alleged concern for the security of the NATO countries, how can he justify to them his advocacy for a strong Soviet presence in the Mediterranean and in the Arab countries. He says that Russia will thus exert a restraining influence on "the Arab countries who are engaged in all of this war." But, since when and according to whom are the Arab countries a threat to NATO?

Mr. Javits must know, however, that the communist presence in the area is not in the best interests of the U.S. or of NATO—and he could hardly care less whether it is good for the Arab countries or not. Mr. Javits welcomes the Russian presence in the Middle East on the Arab side because that way, he thinks, Israel can be assured of whole-hearted American support. Either he does not care that this could easily turn the Arab-Israeli war into a global conflict, or he underestimates the power of the Palestinians.

Elsewhere in this interview, Javits states that the situation in the Middle East could become like that of Berlin; that is, with two big powers guaranteeing a political status quo. Under this plan, Middle East peace would be insured because each side would fear touching off another world war. As usual with political solutions offered for the Middle East, this "peace initiative," which Javits so enthusiastically endorses, overlooks Arab revolutionaries, who have the power and are determined to liberate their lands from political domination and from imperialistic suppression of their national aspirations. If big powers are drawn to the arena and begin to tear at each other, so much the worse for the big powers.

On another point, the Senator got himself in even deeper quicksand.

To wit, (he said) can you be doveish in respect to Vietnam and can you be hawkish in respect to the Middle East, and my answer is decidedly yes. And the reasons are very numerous, but I'll give only two, just to save time. One reason is that the strategic situation is completely different. The United States' fundamental national interest, as defined by the President, as defined by NATO, because we're charged with coming to the rescue of the NATO countries, as defined by our economic and commercial interests with three continents at stake—Europe, Africa and Asia, the crossroads of which is the Middle East—our strategic interest is heavily and deeply involved in the Middle East.

That is unlike Southeast Asia, where the best that Lyndon Johnson could do is to say we're trying to establish the principle of self-determination for small peoples, and will not allow them to be the subject—swallowed up by aggression by a communist-backed state.

Secondly, and very importantly, in the Middle East you've got the whole energy resources of Europe—80 per cent of Europe's oil comes from the Middle East and 90 per cent of that of Japan. So the economic life of the world is at stake, which the Soviet Union, which is now in there in a big way, could hold hostage and succeed in a way which the Soviet Union never dreamed of, in terms of holding the world for ransom. Now we and the rest of the world just can't allow that to happen.

But these important, strategic and well-endowed countries are inhabited by Arabs, and the Senator wants the Russians to be there to restrain the wild natives. How, then, can this desire be effected? Would Russia hold back the people while the U.S. holds onto the land? Or is Javits saying that nothing matters so long as the U.S. safeguards the survival of Israel?

Finally, the Senator crowned his interview, sticking his foot in his mouth, by comparing Israel to South Vietnam.

We don't have a government which is under attack, a government which has to be propped up. In terms of an ally, we have a tough, durable, effective little Israel which says, give us the stuff and we'll do the job.

If Israel possesses all these great characteristics, why then all the talk about survival? The U.S. is supplying "little David" with the best it has in its arsenal. Why does Javits imply the necessity of American physical intervention? And if it is a confrontation with Russia, how much could Israel really contribute to helping its ally—the United States?

Much more significant, however, is the role which the Jewish Senator assigns to the Jewish state. Leftist analysts who have talked about Zionism and Zionist leaders as tools of Western imperialism have always been ridiculed and called all sorts of names by Zionists. Now, here comes Senator Javits to exemplify the typical Zionist capitalist who does not hesitate to employ Israel in the service of the socio-economic system he cherishes. We have been told that Zionism is a national liberation movement and that Israel is of vital necessity to the Jewish people. Mr. Javits, Israel's honest broker in the U.S., tells us why: *Just give us the stuff and we'll be the mercenaries safeguarding your interests.* A great goal for the idealistic Zionist state.

IBN AL-BALAD

FATAH INVITES CASTRO TO TOUR

AMMAN - Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro has been invited to tour Palestinian commando bases.

A message sent to the Cuban leader by Yasser Arafat Fatah's official spokesman and head of the PLO, invited Dr. Castro to visit Palestinian commando bases to mark the 17th anniversary of the Cuban revolution.

Arafat, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, told Dr. Castro in the message that he could not attend anniversary celebrations in Cuba because the Palestinian resistance movement was passing through an important phase.

NO TO SUBMISSION,

Yes To Revolution!

Tens of thousands of Palestinians demonstrated in Jordan on July 31 and in Lebanon on August 2 to protest against the US-sponsored submissive "peace plan for the Middle East" also known as the Rogers Plan.

The submissive plan was accepted by the Egyptian government July 23. Following in Egypt's suit were the governments of Jordan, Libya, Sudan, Lebanon and, naturally, Israel. The plan has been rejected by Algeria, Iraq, Syria and the Palestinian people.

Shortly after accepting the U.S. proposals on July 23, Egypt shut down two Cairo-based Palestinian commando radio stations--Fatah's "Voice of Assifa" and the Palestine Liberation Organization's "Voice of Palestine." The Palestinian radio staffs were refused entry to their offices. Sudan also cancelled Palestinian radio and TV programs.

The first official slap in the face to the intended submissive settlement came from the PLO Central Committee, which groups all commando organizations, which issued a statement July 25 reiterating the rejection by the Palestinian people of Security Council Resolution 242 and their avowed intention to continue their armed struggle until total liberation.

Twenty-four hours later, on July 26, the Central Committee resolved:

1. To implement forthwith the resolution of the Seventh Palestinian National Congress calling for immediate integration in all military sectors of the commando units in order to escalate commando operations.

2. To appoint delegations for wide Arab and international contacts.

3. To invite a number of Arab militants to participate in meetings of the Palestinian National Congress.

All international news agency reports agreed that the Palestinian protest march on July 31 was the biggest ever held in Amman.

Estimates of the number of demonstrators varied between 75,000 and 100,000.

The Associated Press reported from the Jordanian capital that day saying:

"Their protest march was the biggest ever held in Amman. Tens of thousands of Palestinians crowded the streets for more than three miles, shepherded by armed guerrilla police."

In a five minute speech, Yasser Arafat (Abu Ammar), Fatah's official spokesman and Executive Committee chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization told the Amman demonstrators:

"The Palestinian Revolution is now waging this battle such as it has done since it was launched in 1967, when it declared that our basic aim is to liberate the land from the (Mediterranean) Sea to the (Jordan) River and from Naqoura (to the north) to Aqaba (to the south).

"We were not concerned with what took place in June (1965) nor in eliminating the consequences of the June war. The Palestinian Revolution's basic concern is the uprooting of the Zionist entity from our land, the land of our ancestors, and liberating it... We will fight the war (of liberation) with all our strength, supported by the iron fist of the Arab masses... and the will of the people which makes history."

In a message to the Algerian head of state, published in Algiers on August 1, Arafat reiterated that the Palestinian commandos would not heed the ceasefire called for by the submissive Rogers Plan. He said armed struggle would continue until the total liberation of Palestine.

The Palestinian revolution, Arafat added, would not feel concerned by the ceasefire.

Arafat, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), said that no Arab or foreign leader had the right to speak on behalf of the Palestinian people and dispose of their national territory.

He called on each Arab government to clearly define its stand on the US plan so that the PLO could decide its relations with them accordingly.

He also urged each Arab government to provide the Palestinians with military, political and financial support as well as facilities in the field of information.

On August 2, scores of thousands of Palestinians demonstrated in and around their camps scattered throughout Lebanon to protest the submissive plan of the U.S. secretary of state.

Placards carried by the Palestinian demonstrators in Lebanon read:

- *A Million Times--No To Submission.
- *The American Proposals and those who Adopt them Are Enemies of the Palestinian People.
- *We Set Forth. We Pledged. The World Cannot Stop Us.
- *Popular Liberation War Is the Only Way to Liberate Palestine.
- *Political Solutions Are the Scaffold of the Palestinian Revolution.
- *No to Submission, Yes to the Revolution.
- *The Fate of the Peaceful Settlement Will Be Determined by Our Guns.
- *We Were Born Before June 1967 and We Shall Survive Beyond Liquidation of Its Sequels.



Free Palestine is a monthly paper published by the Friends of Free Palestine. Editor: Abdeen Jabara. "Free Palestine" welcomes its readers submitting comments, letters and articles.

FREE PALESTINE
P. O. Box 21096
Kalorama Station
Washington, D.C. 20009

Address Correction Requested

(Send to above address)

Please enter a year's subscription
for the enclosed \$5.00;

Name _____

Street _____

City & State _____

Zip Code _____

FIRST CLASS MAIL