The cease-fire which halted the guns of October gave a big push to diplomatic maneuvers, through which "a lasting peace" would be achieved. "Sadat and Kissinger, the puppet and the ousteer, are laying the groundwork of "peace" i.e. the domination of the Middle East by U.S. Imperialism.

Through the Geneva Conference, Kissinger and Sadat have already secured the disengagement of the Israeli and Egyptian forces from the Guez area, but that really is quite a minor step compared to their projected goal of talk of a "Palestinian State is on the agenda and the security of Israel based on U.N. resolutions 242 and 338 is a fait-accompli. The above indicates that for Imperialism to achieve its goal it must maintain a special equilibrium in the region as to insure the operationalization of its "peace plan(s)."

In the past few weeks, two events have taken place that at first sight would seem to be unrelated, yet when we probe deeply the underlying connections will crystallize.

First, unrest in the ranks of the Jordanian military was reported. Basically the reasons behind it were economic. The large gap between the officer elite and the mass of rank and file reared high proportions, in a time when the cost of living was skyrocketing. Since one-fourth of the Jordanian population survives on soldier's salaries, the military in turn is really on economic institution that affects the lives of a sizeable portion of the Jordanian population. The ensuing unrest among the rank and file of the 40th brigade was similar to a labor union strike i.e. the unionization of the military.

Such developments acquire importance when we identify Kissinger's advice and influence on Hussein, and how in some developments played a crucial role in convincing the latter to modify his position, as regards the Palestinians.

Let us backtrack a bit. During Kissinger's visit to Jordan, he responded to Hussein's request for economic aid by sardonically suggesting that he cut down the size of the army and security forces from 100,000 to a more moderate size of 15-20 thousand. This assures Israel of secure borders on the Jordanian front, but Kissinger was quick to point out that the King's security would also be looked after. In addition, Kissinger advised him to take a more moderate position concerning Palestinian representation at the Geneva Conference. The King initially refused to succumb to Kissinger's proposals but after the mini uprising within the ranks of the military, it become evident that Hussein's power is shaky. The dissidents of the 40th brigade were not only demanding the elimination of the socio-economic inequality in the military, but their slogans indicated that they favored Prince Hassan who supports the idea of a Palestinian federation. These developments are in contradiction to Hussein's proposed federation.

Very soberly, Hussein recognized that he is expendable in the eyes of Imperialism, if he were not to operationalize their plan for the area which, when simply put, is: create a Palestinian state through the present negotiations by eliminating not only the resistance but the actual idea of resistance and struggle. This would require full Palestinian politicization so as to discredit the so-called "extremists" i.e. those who have postulated people's war as the only means by which Palestine will be liberated.

Hussein, a well trained puppet, began to soften his position. First, as he delivered a speech at the Elite Sportive in Amman in which he said, that he had no objection to Palestinian representation. A few days later as he addressed parliament he pronounced direct negotiations with the leadership of the P.L.O. with the air of agreeing to a common strategy.

In short, Hussein's actions have been revised so as to remain in favor with Imperialism.

On another level, various figureheads from the West Bank and Amman have been to Beirut propagating the idea of Federation and/or State. These representatives of the Palestinian bourgeoisies, Sulaiman al-Nabulsi (a close friend of the PDF and one of four key advisors to the King), Hikmat al-Masri, Abdel Rabou al-Fares and Rashid al-Shareo (ex-mayor of Gaza) in the eyes of Imperialism are the projected national leaders of the future artificial settlements that they hope to impose on the Palestinian people.

It must be noted that these people have been set by certain representatives of the PLO, whose organisations have succumbed to capitulation i.e. PDF and co.

We have serious reservations as regards these closed meetings. Our reactionary "dignitaries" are carrying the message of capitulation by eucharistically claiming opposition to Zionism through their proposed solution: Federation with Jordan.

It is high time that we face our people with the truth, and all the complexities and obstacles that the truth poses.

We conclude the following from the previous discussion: a) The imperialist plan for the region is to pacify the area by the total elimination of not only the Palestinian resistance movement but by the actual elimination of the idea of resistance. To assure such, the proposed Palestinian state is viewed as a terminal solution and not as one of our "friends" believe it to be— one of the stages through which the whole of Palestine will be liberated. b) The development of a right wing alliance taking into account that some of the previously so-called petit bourgeois regimes (Egypt) have been pursuing a full course towards an organic alliance with the reactionary forces of the area i.e. Saudi Arabia. These developments have forced Egypt to become more and more one of the essential pillars of "rob reaction. c) Given the present international balance of powers, the proposed settlement would be essentially the translation of the imperialist plan for the region, and would require that we veer off the revolutionary path, a sacrifice we can neither ask of nor impose on our masses.
THE MASSES EXPEL THE P. D. F.

World imperialism, as portrayed by the US, is trying to impose artificial settlements on our people. Anyone from within our ranks falls prey to the imperialist bait. It is our moral duty and right to raise our voices and demand that the revolution not be weaned off its course. Last week, in Baghdad, the PFLP was kicked out of the Higher Palestinian Committee because of its dubious and precarious positions concerning the proposed Palestinian state. This should be a warning to all those who are too willing to compromise, instead of displaying revolutionary perseverance.

The Popular Democratic Front (PDF) continues its conspicuous attempts at gaining support for its submissive position regarding the Geneva Conference and the creation of a Palestinian puppet state. This position is the same as that of the rightist and reactionary Arab forces serving the plans of imperialism and Zionism. The popular committee of Cheltilia and Sao al-Bayyinah camps issued statements condemning these attempts and the defunct spirit they contained, but the PDF has ignored the masses and their voices. Here are some excerpts of Cheltilia's popular committee statement:

"The revolution is responsible before the masses since they carry the axes and know that it is the only way to regain their rights."

The expression of sincerity to the Palestinian people and their dreams lies in coherence to the cause of liberation through armed struggle.

The question of national unity is a matter of life or death to our cause, our revolution and our people. Hence, we should fight all attempts of dividing our cause among the people.

The PDF actions are contrary to its "call" for national unity and the recognition of the PDF as the sole representative of the Palestinian people. The popular committee and officials of various organizations have twice more than once to stop the PDF from undertaking such activities, but the organization is intent on violating the rules. It refused to condemn the visit of Kissinger, who is the architect of conspiracies against the oppressed peoples of the world. We urge our people to express such distorted conduct and we are confident that they can put an end to actions that confuse our masses. Consequently, the popular committee and the organizational officials in Cheltilia camp proceeded with the membership of the PDF from the popular committee and the gathering of signatures on the PDF memorandum.

Similarly, the popular committee of Sao Berqeh camp attacked the PDF on its counter-revolutionary stand:

"The PDF has carried out a series of suspicious actions. This group has begun to write petitions that urge the "peace-loving" nations to implement US resolutions which flagrantly violate the rights of our people." The statement added that PDF members on the popular committee are being suspended because they urged the P.L.O. to take part in the Geneva conference.

TASSUS OF THE NEW STAGE


Write: FOREIGN RELATING COMMITTEE C/O AL-MAQAM P.O.B. 212 BEIRUT - LEBANON

The map of the Arab fast is being redrawn not for the benefit of the oppressors and even that of the ruling Arab cliques in the long-run, but for the purpose of establishing neo-colonialism in the area and placing it within the orbit of American global strategy.

The cartographers are Kissinger the "superstar", Sadat the "commando for peace", Mrs. Meir "the only man in the Israeli cabinet", and Feisal "the king of all Arabs". If Idi Amin is removed at the Islamic summit conference at Lahore, Pakistan, the title shall be: "Feisal, King of all Moslems". Those grand designers foresee a "permanent" Israel in Palestine with "secure and defensible borders" and when a final peace treaty is signed, Israel shall have access to Arab markets, capital, and society. As for the Arabs, a new status quo free of pan-Arabism, socialism and revolution shall obtain and be maintained under a Saudi-Egyptian entente based on Islam, oil, and friendship with America and Europe and underpinned by a joint Saudi-Gulf-U.S. partnership of investors whose reconquest of Egypt shall be enthralled in the reestablishment of an expanded stock exchange pyramid and emboldened in the heart-palpitations for would-be investors ready to stake their future on the new paradise of oil and godliness.

In brief, an attempt is being made to reverse a half-century of Arab socialism and revolution; to install a new order in the Middle East which requires for its implementation the abortion of the "national democratic" phase of the revolution; the sanctification of regionalism in the Arab World; the abandonment of the vision of a one Arab, socialist-nation-state from the Atlantic ocean in the West, to the Arab Gulf on the Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean in the East. In other words, the 20 year Nasserite struggle to rid the Arab nations of their foreign masters and assert true independence is being overthrown by a right-wing alliance under the aegis of neo-colonialism American style instead of a new order in the Mideast which requires for its advent a truly socialist society?

The question is, can the revolutionaries at this juncture in history, what must be done to undo the counter-revolution and replace it by a truly revolutionary socialist society? The answer lies in taking stock of America's historically doomed if established; but the revolutionaries must do their utmost to smash it before its midwives give it birth. Thus the question that has to be posed tor the Arab masses to sustain national independence and
ANCE OF THE UNHOLY ALLIANCE

by aligning itself with the non-aligned states and the Socialist bloc headed by the Soviet Union. But the Americans had not derived the phenomenon and persisted in their efforts to make the Arab world safe for their domination and exploitation.

In order to realize their objectives, the Americans relied on the strengthening of three central pillars: the Israelis as the regional superpower; the right-wing regimes as a counterpoise to Nasserism; and oil, strategy, hostilities and finance as a means of alliance and deterrence. As a result of the June War, the U.S. attained its main goal: the defeat of Nasserism. And since then, its main objective has been the consolidation of Israel as a regional superpower; the denazification of the Arab world in collaboration with regionalists; the liquidation of the Palestine liberation movement and along with it the Arab nationalist forces; and, the arming and supporting of two new regional superpowers: Iran and Saudi Arabia.

From June 1967 to Oct. 1973, America forged new alliances and created new friends in the region as Arab "nationalist" and "right-wing" regimes endeavored by diplomatic means to align themselves with the non-aligned states andPersisted in their efforts to make the Arab world safe for their domination and exploitation.

As regards Israel, the Americans did their utmost to help the Israelis to control or even to penetrate into occupied territories: the West Bank and Gaza, the Golan Heights and Sinai. The Israelis were able to weaken the resistance in the occupied territories not only because of their barbaric policies of collective punishment, deportations, demolition of homes and preventive detentions, but also because of a policy of coercion, economic blackmail and "open bridges" which was aided by mistaken political strategies and policy implementations on the part of a substantial sector of the resistance.

With the stabilization of the Israeli front and the implementation of "pacification" measures inside the occupied territories, the heat was turned on fully to implement the "pacification" measures inside the occupied territories and to adjust the Arab regimes to the situation after the July massacres in Ajloun and Jerash (March 21, 1968). The Israelis were able to weaken the resistance not only because of the barbaric policies of collective punishment, deportations, demolition of homes and preventive detentions, but also because of a policy of coercion, economic blackmail and "open bridges" which was aided by mistaken political strategies and policy implementations on the part of a substantial sector of the resistance.

In sum, on the eve of the October War, the U.S. had three "local" supergazsnae soldierying its service: Israeli, Iran and Saudi Arabia. And the Arab "notional" regimes were not only in a state of disarray as a bloc but were competing against each other to dislodge their reasonableness and good intentions vis-à-vis the U.S. Hence concession followed concession, retreat came in the footsteps of retreat, and maneuver and counter-maneuver intermingled in a smoke-screen that deceived no one except its inventors. This policy of self-abandonment and repudiation ostensibly impelled the U.S. to offer a peace plan which was accepted by Egypt on July 23, 1970 as a means of "exposing Israeli intrusions to world public opinion". Though the Rogers proposals were no more than a refurbished version of 242, which recognized the "Palestinian claims" and the "territorial status quo", and the so-called "peace settlement" between the Arab states and Israel, excluding the resistance movement. Since then it has been a downhill roughshod glide against the resistance as the "proposals" were even discarded by their American sponsors and the U.S. and Israeli negotiators were left in the dark pleading for their implementation. However, the same proposals were resurrected and revamped in the aftermath of the October War. The 0/101, and Geneva in the Annapolis Conference of superpowers and their allies.

It is in this new context which the "realists" call "new facts", that we must perceive the current negotiations, their backgrounds and their future prospects. As to the backgrounds, America's peace has been the defacto peace for the past seven years though it was not formally acknowledged by the Arab states which were pledged to salvage something for themselves and their social classes out of the wreckage of the June War and what followed in its wake. The September Accords made by Sadat are the new screen that deceived no one except its inventors. Since the imprisonment of allegedly pro-soviet elements such as Ali Sobhi, the expulsion of Soviet advisors, the grounding of all connections Philip, the selection of Bechtol for the construction of the "Persian Gulf" pipeline instead of the European consortium etc.) and co., and the oil pressure; Saudi Arabia for its "peace settlement" between the Arab states and Israel, excluding the resistance movement. Since then it has been a downhill roughshod glide against the resistance as the "proposals" were even discarded by their American sponsors and the U.S. and Israeli negotiators were left in the dark pleading for their implementation. However, the same proposals were resurrected and revamped in the aftermath of the October War. The 0/101, and Geneva in the Annapolis Conference of superpowers and their allies.

Meanwhile, the U.S. widened the creation of two additional regional superpowers in the area: Iran as the guardian of the "Persian Gulf" and Saudi Arabia as the watchdog of the Arabian peninsula. However, the overwhelming concentration of power on the part of the U.S. in Iran (the provision of over $ 5 billion worth of modern weaponry with U.S. "advisors" and a greatly expanded "military mission" to Tehran) disaffected Saudi Arabia somewhat because it thought of itself as the rightful guardian and the more competent policeman because of its pre-eminence as the defender of the faith, the power on the scene, the protector of the Arab friends in Lebanon and abroad in terms of block gold and the more "righteous" in terms of despotism. Consequently, regional rivalry ensued and the so-called "Moslem brotherhood" as the Skh branded his U.S.-made weaponry and declared himself lord and master of the "Persian Gulf" and the invader of the Sheikh Zaid Bin Sultan Qaboos in order to maintain absolutism on the peninsula against non, history and time.
As a result of their uninterrupted string of victories, the Israelis and the Americans become so arrogant and Mr. Kissinger told Arab envoys to the U.N. (Sept. 25, 1973) in blunt language that the Middle East was not on his list of top priorities in the coming months as his U.N. address clearly indicated by merely expressing a platitudinous reference to the "occupied territories" since June 5, 1967 with "minor border rectifications" would be here in advance the detailed provisions of the remaining three, but the stages are sufficiently clear for even the blind to see in broad outlines. At any rate, it is essential for us to focus on the first significant step toward a lasting peace in the Middle East. To attain their objective they conceived of a process of de-escalation consisting of four stages: 1) Ceasefires and separation of forces accords on all fronts, including the Syrian and Palestinian; 2) a declaration of non-belligerence on the part of all combatants; 3) withdrawal of Israel from "occupied territories" since June 5, 1967 with "minor border rectifications"; 4) the signing of peace accords between the Arab states and Israel after they were reaching some kind of "understanding" regarding "Palestinian legitimate rights".

Since we're still in stage one, we're not expected to outline in advance the detailed provisions of the remaining three stages, but the stages are sufficiently clear for even the blind to see in broad outlines. At any rate, it is essential for us to focus on the implications of stage one.

First of all, let's underline what Mr. Kissinger, the middleman- guarantor of the disengagement of forces agreement told a group of fellow Jewish intellectuals on his latest mission. According to the Boston Evening Globe (Dec. 28, 1973, p. 7), he informed a high powered pack of "kids" that "the Arab-Israeli war was a military defeat for Israel". But he emphasized that as long as he is Secretary of State, "the basic security interests of Israel would not be placed in jeopardy". The Globe goes on to note that Kissinger "took credit for the arm resupply of Israel and he mentioned obstruction and resistance within the Pentagon". Before their departure, the intellectuals were assured that "Israel would be here in 10 years but worried about the Taiwanization of Israel, the country's long-run danger". Kissinger also reminded his audience that he too was a Jew and that 12 members of his family had died in Nazi concentration camps, and that as long as he was involved, the United States would not tamp down the security of Israel. The Globe states further: "Kissinger told the group, which represented a wide variety of political thinking, that the United States and Israel had no minor differences in tactics and that they could pass the word in meeting with their peers that the United States foreign policy toward Israel had not changed even if that nation's military and diplomatic stance had been altered."

Secondly, since Nixon issued a statement (Jan. 17, 1974) calling the separation of forces accord as "the first significant step toward a permanent peace in the Middle East", it is worth recording what a Radio Cairo broadcast (Jan. 18) reported Sadat as saying regarding the American role:

"In the past the United States always expressed its readiness to intervene with a proposal. They then reached a point accepted by both sides. Therefore, my signature is for the United States, and Golda Meir's signature is for the United States."

Thirdly, the Israelis agreed to negotiate with Sadat via Kissinger and sign an accord after they were convinced by U.S. senior officials that Sadat had "really come around to a farsighted view". That is, Sadat had worked up a new priority list for Egypt, that he planned to focus on his country's domestic problems, develop closer ties with the United States and back away from total confrontation with Israel".

Fourthly, Egypt demonstrated in the past and since the October war once again that it is ready to discard its Soviet alliance and isolate the Soviet Union even at the Geneva summit conference where the Soviets are supposed to be the co-sponsors with the U.S.A., John K. Cooley reported to the Christian Science Monitor (Jan. 3, 1974) the following: "Egyptian Foreign Minister Ismail Fahmy Dec. 22 privately informed the Americans that Egypt did not really want its Soviet allies on the working group, despite its public show of agreement with them on this."

Fifthly, the separation of forces agreement was not merely military; it was augmented by a secret "understanding" that involved the reduction of Egyptian troops on the east bank of the canal from 70,000 to 7,000 and from 700 tanks to 30; a ban on emplacing surface-to-air missiles there which will make the canal the prey of the Israeli air force; the creation of a buffer zone patrolled by U.N. troops, which will simply mean Egyptian troops are frozen in their dugouts and incapable of making any surprise moves. This situation prompted an acute American observer to comment (Arnaud de Borchgrave): "With a United Nations force between the two sides, Egypt's military threat to Israel would be rendered for less credible. And without that Egyptian credibility and the ability to project a detectable and the superpowers on a collision course- Israeli forces might never get out of the Sinai."

Sixthly, although it was patently clear for all to see that Mr. Sadat had signed a separate and partial
agreement with Israel, he nevertheless insisted on
"termining it as an "historical turning-point in the history of the region" and contended that he was also committed to a similar accord on the Syrian front. Therefore, he set out on a Kissinger-like whirlwind tour of the Arab world—carefully bypassing Iraq and Libya—attempting to convince King Feisal, President Assad and others that the Americans had indeed changed and that the Arabs must reciprocate by lifting the oil embargo on the U.S. This attempt to counteract the impression that what Sadat had signed was a sell-out was a qualified success, since Feisal was a little unhappy that he wasn't consulted in advance and Assad had heard about it, as usual, from the press wire services. Sadat also implicated the resistance movement by having Arafat on hand at Aswan to witness the signing ceremony, and Sadat strongly intimated that what he was doing was being done in concert with Syria and the resistance and what Henry Kissinger was doing was also "the by-product of Soviet-American co-ordination". Moreover, to complete the circle, Sadat declared in Algiers (Jan. 22, 1974) that he was prepared to meet King Hussein if the latter publicly recognized the right of the Palestinians to attend the Mideast peace conference. In other words, Mr. Sadat's peace train was travelling a high speed as he beckoned all and sundry to jump aboard while he was trumpeting the glories of America's change of heart and selling its peace plans. He blurted out: "For every change in the American position it is necessary for the Arabs to make an identical change towards the United States" (Times, London, Jan. 23, 1974).

Is it unfair to conclude that Mr. Sadat has become America's salesman in the area and his over-anxiety to renew diplomatic relations with the U.S. is motivated by a "peace mongers" mentality? The idea that the war was an "operetta" staged for the purpose of acquiring a 10-year lease on life for the decrepit Arab regimes themselves or a "progressive"? Many questions could be posed, but it is enough to ask one: Have the U.S.-style "peace mongers" become so megalomaniac that they've forgotten that they're not the only people in the Arab world? We dare say "Yes", but make it clear that he "believed much ground is to be covered on the road to a political settlement before the Arabs sheath their oil weapon".

As a matter of fact, it we look back on the period of 1948 and compare it with the contemporary scene, we will find much that would give us heart; generally there is a collective Arab consciousness that did not exist in 1948; there are 18 independent Arab states whose armed forces are not composed of the scions of the feudalists and the upper bourgeoisie; there are thousands of trained and armed fighters roving the lengths of breadth of Palestine and lying in wait to pounce on the enemies of the people. Need we remind the present heads of Arab states of the fates of their predecessors? Surely, all of them remember what happened to King Abdullah, grandfather of Hussein? Solh of Lebanon? Kuwatly of Syria, Nuri of Iraq? And Anwar Sadat couldn't have forgotten what happened to Nukroshi and later to King Farouk of Egypt.

SINGAPORE OPERATION

In a joint operation the P.L.A., and the Japanese Red Army launched an attack on Jan. 31 against the Shell oil installations in Singapore. The operation was carried out by a small and efficient mortar naval battalion and a tank group, aided by a number of small but well-equipped and trained marines. The operation was a complete success, and the Japanese Red Army was able to capture the oil installations without a single casualty. The Japanese Red Army is a well-equipped and trained unit, and the operation was a success due to the efficiency of the Japanese Red Army and the well-trained marines who assisted them.
HABASH: 
LIBERATION 
NOT 
NEGOTIATION

The following interview was granted by comrade George Habash, Secretary General of the PFLP, to the Italian newspaper Il Manifesto, whereupon it was published on January 29-30/1974. This segment is the first of a series.

Q.1. The P.F.L.P. was the organization which openly opposed participation in the Peace Conference, can you explain the political reasons behind your refusal?

A.1. The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, as a revolutionary organization struggles for the interest of the oppressed Palestinian masses, for liberation, repatriation and self determination. Given that we are part of the Arab liberation movement and the world revolution, the P.F.L.P. cannot adopt a position except through the recognition of the basic interests of these revolutionary forces.

In refusing participation in the so called "Peace Conference" in Geneva, it does not base its refusal on either emotive or chauvinistic reasons, rather it derives its position from clear recognition of what this conference actually represents at this point and time.

The Conference is in basic conflict with the interests of the Palestinian and Arab masses and its national progressive and revolutionary forces. In addition, it is an attempt to curb the necessary conditions for the development of their struggle. The "Peace Conference" relies on two factors: The legal factor and the political factor.

A) The legal factor: The Geneva Conference convenes based on the U.N. Security Council resolution 338 which in turn is based on resolution 242 plus the negotiations with Israel. Both of these resolutions provide for the withdrawal from the 1967 occupied territories, and at best from all the occupied territories hence. It return they implicitly impose the recognition of Israel and a guarantee of its presence and its borders.

Such a recognition, which the convening of the Geneva Conference will concretize as the basis to solve the Middle East crisis, provides a clear recognition of the legitimacy of the Zionist colonization on the greater portion of the Palestinian homeland. Simply put, the recognition of the Israeli, Zionist aggression till June 4, 1967. This clearly represents a major setback as regards the rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland and their right to self-determination.

By the simple fact of any participation on the part of any representatives of the Palestinian people would mean the acceptance of the Security Council's two resolutions, hence recognition of the setbacks they contain, regardless of the geographic boundaries of the Zionist entity.

Concerning this same people are claiming the possibility of dividing the Palestinian rights into temporary versus historic rights, in other words we are capable of acquiring part of the Palestinian land now as a step on the road of struggle to fully acquire it.

To these people we would like to clarify the major difference between partial liberation throughout struggle and the establishment of a revolutionary authority on it, and the acquiring of that part without struggle but by giving the other part of the land.

Partial liberation represents a great leap forward in the process of struggle and creates more favorable conditions for the whole Palestinian and Arab revolutionary process including the Jewish one. In addition it increases its revolutionary alliances on the world level. Whereas the second represents an abortion of the local revolutionary process and the first step in resolving the revolutionary alliance of the Palestinian resistance internationally. If it goes beyond what it required as "temproary rights". What would we then tell the world after we bow out of the agreement we had accepted.

B) As for the political factor: The Geneva Conference meets under very important and dangerous political conditions. It represents an attempt to curb a clear uprising of the Arab masses so as to crystallize the

Imperialist-Zionist and the reactionary interests threatened by the uprising.

The Geneva Conference meets in the aftermath of the October war which produced two categories of results: Basic results which form objective conditions for a progressive Arab uprising; and results that would permit for the advancement of the Imperialist-Zionist-Reactionary attack.

The first category is summarized in the following:

A) Destruction of the myth regarding the enemy's supremacy. As a result the Palestinian and Arab masses regained their confidence in their abilities and ultimately in the inevitability of victory. At the same time it shook the Zionist forces' confidence, both in and out of Israel, in addition to all of the Imperialist and reactionary forces that stand behind it, in the ability of the Zionist entity to expand and to play both the colonialist and imperialist roles it is entrusted with.

B) The October war took place in a period where Arab political divisions were quite strong, but the escalation of the contradictions with the Zionist enemy caused the renewal of unity among the Arab masses to a degree not even expected by the closest observers. While the calls for settlement- e.g. the Geneva Conference- represents the shortest road to circumscribe this unity.

(The unity among the Arab masses is not a metaphysical
or chauvinist matter, but it is a material objective power that proves its ability when confronting imperialism and its weakness. It’s nature is progressive, revolutionary and liberating. This nature is more deeply rooted to the extent that the revolutionary and progressive forces are capable of leading the struggle.

C) The October war proved more to the world than any other time, what the Israeli leaders have been trying to hide, that the entity is not dependent on any state but a presence that is organically linked to and protected by U.S. Imperialism.

The PFLP’s contention that U.S. Imperialism is our main enemy was confirmed, whereas the Zionist entity and the reactionary Arab forces are nothing more than appendages to U.S. Imperialism.

The danger of the Geneva Conference regarding this point is that it weakens the Arab peoples’ animosity towards U.S. Imperialism and depicts the latter as a neutral arbitrator as opposed to the main enemy, a fact recognized by our people during the last war.

Hence the struggle of the Palestinian and Arab masses would be transformed from an anti-imperialist national liberation movement, into a limited nationalistic fight for the regaining of some of the lost lands.

The October war proved very clearly the importance of the relations between the Arab national liberation movement with the socialist countries. In addition the war proved the Arab masses’ willingness to fight and the Socialist countries continued material support. In fact, the Arab masses’ desire to fight is the real basis upon which our struggle is founded and what provides the material grounds for the support we receive from the Socialist countries. In spite of the opportunistic and dangerous political trends adopted by certain Arab regimes prior to the war, regarding the sacrificing and curtailing of intimate relations with the Soviet Union, in favor of a change of direction leading to a pro-U.S. position: The dependence of the reactionary all kingdoms who have a very frank and blunt hatred for anything pertaining to communism, the Socialist countries and the Soviet Union (The massacre against the Sudanese Communist party, and the pushing out of Soviet military advisors from Egypt). In spite of all these antagonistic developments, the Soviet Union and the Socialist countries presented all sorts of material-economic aid.

This close inter-relationship between the Arab national liberation movement and the Socialist countries is actually based on a common struggle against Imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction. Such intimate relations provide the liberation forces with an essential weapon by which to wage their struggle.

The last war in a practical and definite way also proved the importance of relations between the Arab national liberation movement and the Socialist countries. A relationship which is an essential source of strength for the Arab liberation struggle.

The second category can be illustrated through the following:

A) Exposing the conflict between the interests of the present Arab regimes in achieving victory over Israel and their interests in preventing the provisions that can secure victory. Generally speaking the Arab nationalist regimes are opposed to Israel and Imperialism, but that is fundamentally different from i.e., people’s war, and the giving in to U.S. Imperialism by relying on Arab reaction.

Under the present circumstances of anti-progressive, anti-neutral policies, any “Palestinian entity” that is proposed in Geneva must be rejected because not only would it be a partial Palestinian entity, i.e. 22.2% of all Palestinian land, but in addition it is organically linked to the anti-progressive principles, and in fact would be established to serve and further the interests of this anti-progressive and anti-national policy.

Hence we do not only reject the attendance of representatives of the Palestinian people, but we reject as well the political control implicit in the direction that the Arab regimes have taken.
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This close inter-relationship between the Arab national liberation movement and the Socialist countries is actually based on a common struggle against Imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction. Such intimate relations provide the liberation forces with an essential weapon by which to wage their struggle.

The last war in a practical and definite way also proved the importance of relations between the Arab national liberation movement and the Socialist countries. A relationship which is an essential source of strength for the Arab liberation struggle.

The second category can be illustrated through the following:

A) Exposing the conflict between the interests of the present Arab regimes in achieving victory over Israel and their interests in preventing the provisions that can secure victory. Generally speaking the Arab nationalist regimes are opposed to Israel and Imperialism, but that is fundamentally different from i.e., people’s war, and the giving in to U.S. Imperialism by relying on Arab reaction.

Under the present circumstances of anti-progressive, anti-neutral policies, any “Palestinian entity” that is proposed in Geneva must be rejected because not only would it be a partial Palestinian entity, i.e. 22.2% of all Palestinian land, but in addition it is organically linked to the anti-progressive principles, and in fact would be established to serve and further the interests of this anti-progressive and anti-national policy.

Hence we do not only reject the attendance of representatives of the Palestinian people, but we reject as well the political control implicit in the direction that the Arab regimes have taken.
With the military and economic blow received by the colonialist regime overrunning Palestine in the October War, the nature of the Zionist ideology as well as imperialism's class was brought out in their most blatant form. The extent to which the enemy fought to preserve conquests beyond Occupied Palestine proper (conquests which imperialist needs for purposes of barter) has become obvious to all concerned. The subsequent elections have answered the question whether such a preservation of conquests and such openness to imperialist objectives represent the will of the entire Zionist elite or merely that of a ruling coalition alone. All indications point with clarity now to the first alternative.

It is true that with the publication of the Zionist election results on January 8 of 1974 we find no substantial change in the so-called balance of power within the Israeli regime. However, certain results should be kept in mind. While the October blow significantly reduced the number of Knesset seats won by the 'Coalition Government', the four seats kept by the 'Coalition Government' show the magnitude of the power of the right bloc in the eight elections of the Knesset as well as the survival of the 'traditional Arab leaders' (made up of the Likud, the Independent Liberals, 'progressive' and 'traditional' Zionists, and various factions and splinter groups originating in the 'Labour Party'), which has long been an appendage of a growing bourgeoisie-capitalist ideology, in 'Labour' (with the exception of Maki). As the table below indicates, its political power has been growing steadily since 1949. That this right-wing should receive more power during the latest elections shows that the Zionist social structure has been further illusory in its expansionist Zionist ideology. 2. Israeli 'socialism' is pure bankruptcy, with the Kibbutznik itself appearing as a burden on the economy (since it contributes only a fraction of the colonial economy) rather than an attempt at genuine socialization, and 3. an own-door policy to imperialist objectives (a forced status quo, economic subjugation and the institution of right-wing fascist regimes) is being given the final touches in the region.

The table above shows the number of seats held by each bloc in the eight elections of the Knesset as well as the so-called 'Coalition Government'. After the seventh election session, the Coalition Government held 76 seats (if we include the four seats kept by the two Arab lists associated with it). The coming Coalition, if we include the same lists, will contain the following distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bloc or Party</th>
<th>7th Knesset</th>
<th>8th Knesset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Alignment (Labor Party + Mapam)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens' Rights List</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Liberals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likud</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahal (Herut &amp; Liberals)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Official List</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Religious Party</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox Religious Front</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agudat Israel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poali Agudat Israel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haolam Haze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Lists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the number of seats held by each bloc in the eight elections of the Knesset as well as the so-called 'Coalition Government'. After the seventh election session, the Coalition Government held 76 seats (if we include the four seats kept by the two Arab lists associated with it). The coming Coalition, if we include the same lists, will contain the following distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bloc or Party</th>
<th>7th Knesset</th>
<th>8th Knesset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Alignment (Labor Party + Mapam)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens' Rights List</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Liberals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likud</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahal (Herut &amp; Liberals)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Official List</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Religious Party</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox Religious Front</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agudat Israel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poali Agudat Israel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haolam Haze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Lists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, the eight seats gained by the Likud - though insufficient to form a government based on 'emergency' status or 'national unity' - given an alliance with the National Religious Party, they are sufficient for a 'right of veto' on decisions that disagree with these two parties' joint positions. Moreover, if six or seven Labor Alignment members withdraw from a specific issue, the National Religious Party achieves the right to establish an 'emergency' government (with the inevitable inclusion of the Likud).

Thus, the latest Israeli election have not only strengthened the positions of the extreme right, but that of right-wing elements in the Labor Party itself (e.g. Meir, Dayan and Golilis) despite their minority status. Such a result, following a costly effort at preserving Israeli conquests by the dominant Coalition, has proven that the majority of Class A Israeli citizens are no less 'hawkish' than their overlords. The result is verified further by the defeat of all those small lists that advocated within the Knesset supported Arab territories (with the exception of Maki).

On the socio-economic level, the Zionist right-wing (made up of the Likud, the Independent Liberals, 'progressive' and 'traditional' Zionists, and various factions and splinter groups originating in the 'Labour Party') has long been an appendage of a growing bourgeoisie-capitalist ideology, in 'Labour' (with the exception of Maki). As the table below indicates, its political power has been growing steadily since 1949. That this right-wing should receive more power during the latest elections shows that the Zionist social structure has been further illusory in its expansionist Zionist ideology. 2. Israeli 'socialism' is pure bankruptcy, with the Kibbutznik itself appearing as a burden on the economy (since it contributes only a fraction of the colonial economy) rather than an attempt at genuine socialization, and 3. an own-door policy to imperialist objectives (a forced status quo, economic subjugation and the institution of right-wing fascist regimes) is being given the final touches in the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bloc or Party</th>
<th>7th Knesset</th>
<th>8th Knesset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Alignment (Labor Party + Mapam)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens' Rights List</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Liberals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likud</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahal (Herut &amp; Liberals)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Official List</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Religious Party</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox Religious Front</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agudat Israel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poali Agudat Israel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haolam Haze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Lists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The growing list of Arab supporters for the Rakah and their corresponding loss of confidence in the Labor Party, the growing strength of the right-wing (and hence imperialist commitment) at the expense of popular and socialist forces and its corresponding preparation for the subordination of the region to imperialist desires, and the submerging of the settler-state’s masses in the ideology of Zionism, though evident since the birth of the colonialist state in Arab Palestine, were nevertheless brought into sharp focus by the electoral aftermath of the October War.

Thus, the recent Israeli elections merely confirm a well-known fact: that the Zionist nature of the Israeli state is inseparable from its racist and expansionist aims, as well as those of its imperial benefactors, and that there can be no ‘solution’ to the liberation of Palestine save through the militant eradication of its Zionist groundwork and the establishment of a genuine revolutionary socialist state that leaves no one unrecognized.

**SOLIDARITY FROM WEST EUROPE**

We, participants of the International conference of anti-imperialist organisations of Western Europe held in Copenhagen, agree with the necessity of strengthening the cooperation among the anti-imperialist movements in Western Europe on the basis of proletarian internationalism.

We especially greet the heroic Vietnamese people, who through their successful fighting have obtained a brilliant victory in the signing of the Paris agreements. This was a brilliant page in the history of imperialism, and the Saigon puppet regime. On January 27th, we will celebrate the first anniversary of the signing of the Paris agreements. We will acclaim this great historical victory of the Vietnamese people. We support the policy of the PRG of forcing the US imperialists and the Thieu clique to respect the Paris agreements. For the last year these agreements have been violated day by day by the US aggressors and their stooges.

We support the struggle of the heroic peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia for complete and total victory.

We will unite our forces to support the just struggle of the Arab people for liberation and social justice against Arab reaction; especially we support the Palestinian people in their struggle against imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction for establishing a democratic Palestinian state.

We also support their struggle against imperialist “peace” solutions and the proposal of a Palestinian puppet state under the condominium of Jordan and Israel.

We condemn the imperialist, Iranian and Saudi aggression against the revolutionary forces of the Arab peninsula and against the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen.

We unconditionally support the struggle of the People’s Front for the Liberation of Oman and the Arab Gulf to liberate the oppressed people of the Arab peninsula and the Persian Gulf.

We agree that today the main tendency in the world is the revolutionary tendency, which in the long run will smash oppression and exploitation of all people.

Proletarians of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!

With this resolution the following organisations send their militant greetings to the PRG, the DRV, the FNL, the OUG, the NLA, the PLO, the PFLOAG, the PRG, and all revolutionary friends and allies.

Indokomiteerne
Palestina komiteen
PLO komiteen
Sovjetkomiteen
Vietnam komiteen
West European solidarity organisations

---

**VOICES OF REVOLUTION AFRICA**

On January 20, 1973 Amilcar Cabral Secretary-General of the PAIGC (Guinea-Bissau) was assassinated, and today more than a year later Cabral’s dreams are being implemented by the fire of the gun— the gun of liberation. On all fronts, the revolutionary movement in Africa is developing, deepening its roots among the masses and crystallizing its understanding as to the nature of the struggle ahead.

Like the Palestinian resistance movement, the African liberation movement has been temptation for a settlement of their contradiction with racism and imperialism through negotiations. But after a sober evaluation of the existing balance of power and the existing objective conditions, our comrades-in-arms in Zimbabwe have categorically rejected negotiation as the strategy of the imperialists. Undoubtedly they will use the method of negotiation on a tactical basis on the condition that it will not conflict with their strategy for liberation.

In the Zimbabwe Review, official organ of the Zimbabwe African People’s Union (ZAPU) Rhodesia, in an editorial titled Negotiation or Revolution, ZAPU outlined its position as the method of the liberation of the African masses from the racist white minority rule in the following: “The liberation of Zimbabwe can and will come about only through a concerted armed revolution waged by the people of Zimbabwe themselves within the country.” Such a position is based on an understanding of the strategic aims of British Imperialism and its cohort the Ian Smith regime.

The revolutionaries of Zimbabwe point that ever since Queen Victoria granted a charter to Rhodes’ envoys in 1889, the aim was clear: clear-cut exploitation. In fact, Rhodes “was granted the right to promote commerce, business, civilisation and government in Rhodesia”. Does this indicate the British intention of turning the country to its original inhabitants?

So as not to disappoint us the British initially sent 1,000 soldiers of the Imperial forces to quell the first signs of revolt against the white settlers by the freedom-Fighters of Zimbabwe in 1896-97.

In 1923 the British government granted the white minority the right to self-rule in Rhodesia without entertaining a thought to loosening or granting the same right to the African majority.

Ever since, the British government has been an adamant supporter of the white minority regime inspite of the liberal condemnations heard periodically from some members of the British opposition. Consequently, since the dismantling of the Federation (Rhodesia and Nyasaland) after the elections of 1962, Rhodesia has remained in the fascist grip of the minority regime. Smith’s UDI came to power in 1965 and the British government refused to remove him from power.

“It is about nine years since UDI. Can we wisely hope to talk sanity with a man bent on a course that way? Let us not create false hopes by pursuing naked illusions at this hour. Let us face realities and embark upon an armed revolutionary course to liberate our country. It is noble to fight for freedom, ignoble to succumb to oppression.”

ZAPU has postulated People’s war as the only method by which the rights of the African majority
can be won by the destruction of the material basis upon which the white minority regime is founded. However, in determining the nature of the enemy ZAPU have not identified racism as the enemy but rather view it in the proper context as the tool which safeguards "the interests of the Western metropolises. What therefore appears as racism is that small part of the iceberg; deep down it is imperialism- that vicious stage of capitalism... ZAPU is committed to the destruction of the system that breeds colonialism and not its symptoms. What is to be overthrown is capitalism: the system that breeds colonialism and racism as its in the process of exploitation and domination of the majority Africans in southern Africa."

As all of us reach new crossroads in the development of the system that breeds colonialism and racialism as the destruction of the causes of this ailment and not its tools in the process of exploitation and domination of the majority Africans in southern Africa.

Needless to say they failed, so they reverted to their Israeli methods in the occupied territories). As of late, the Zimbabwe African People's Revolutionary Forces (ZPRA) have intensified their armed struggle to unprecedented levels. The ZPRA has struck the so-called security forces of Rhodesia, and the headquarters of their operations, inflicting heavy losses. In addition, numerous strategic roads have been planted with mines and many enemy helicopters have been downed.

Furthermore, the enemy's plan to stop the revolutionary activity has been undermined. The enemy's forces were composed of South Africans from Soweto, Holland, West Germany, Japan and U.S. soldiers, Viet Nam veterans.

The latter's goal was to cut off the supply routes and to drive a wedge between the different fronts in an attempt to isolate ZPRA forces. Needless to say they failed, so they reverted to their fascistic tactics of mass arrests of civilians and carrying out "collective punishment" (remiscient of Israeli methods in the occupied territories).

However the communiqué released by the ZPRA said: "In spite of all the enemy attempts, our people have joined our ranks by the hundreds. Men and women, teachers and students, workers and all those who left their peaceful lives, their work, their studies so as to join our war of liberation."

Interestingly enough the London Times of Saturday February 25, 1977 reported that new powers have been given to the "protective authorities" (police) of the northeast of Rhodesia - which is full of revolutionary activity. Indeed when colonial administrators get frustrated they must revert to their fascistic tactics. Hence the above mentioned authorities have been given power by Salisbury the right to detain people for questioning up to 60 days instead of the previous 30 day limit. In addition the Minister of Justice can under these new measures set up magistrates' courts at any place without prior notification in the Government Gazette.

The new regulations also specify that African residents "living in the guerilla-affected areas of the Northeast may be compelled to do paid forced labour". The work includes building bridges, roads, fences on dams or any projects "necessary in the interests of public security".

Needless to say, these measures imply that the racist regime is becoming desperate for they are unable to halt the tide of revolution in Zimbabwe.

Recently the Portuguese government has appointed Francesco Costa Gomez, a high ranking general to command the Portuguese forces in their colonial war against the people of Mozambique. This change however is not routine, for the revolutionaries of Frelimo who had previously mostly operated in the northern region have as of late opened a wide offensive in various regions including the south, southwestern areas of Monica, Vila Pery and the important port of Peirao, which is vital for Rhodesian shipping.

This sudden shift in leadership was necessitated because the Frelimo revolutionaries have penetrated the population centers of the white communities, the Portuguese etc. who number an approximate 250,000. Frelimo struck one of the largest Portuguese owned plantations which lies between Monica and Vila Pery, an area close to the Rhodesian borders. There were several casualties. These casualties will act as reminders to the colonial communities, that so long as Portuguese aggression denies the African majority self-rule that there can be no peace.

So whereas, in the past, the fighting front was limited to the northern region, now all fronts have been activated. This called for a re-evaluation of the security measures previously taken by the Portuguese colonialists. As part of this re-evolution, General Gomez, former commander of Portuguese forces in Angola, has been brought in to put a new plan in action for the "defense" of the colonialists.

Unfortunately for the Portuguese aggressors, before Frelimo opens a new front they carry out political education among the masses hence insuring open roads for the needed supplies of the fighters. In addition, before the actual initiation of a military operation at a new front, Frelimo plants its codes in the surrounding areas as far as 50-100 mile radii. In other words the roots of the revolution are deepening and spreading which means that the day of the extinction of Portuguese colonialism is approaching.

The next few months should be quite important for the struggle of the people of Mozambique, for they should begin to reap the fruits of their political and military labour.