

of the victor after so many years of Israeli occupation, so as to prevent commando action from existing in the areas from which Israel withdraws — all this is designed to prepare the objective conditions in which the policy of encircling and disintegrating the resistance can run its full course.”

THE FIGHTING IN LEBANON IN MAY

The incidents that took place in May between the Lebanese army on the one hand and the Palestinian resistance aided by Lebanese progressive forces on the other were discussed by *al-Balagh* and *Dirasat 'Arabiya*.

Al-Balagh (May 7, 1973) reviewed the causes of the crisis and its links with an Israeli-American plan to eliminate the Palestinian resistance and to “make the Palestinians mere refugees once more... This plan comprises two stages; the first was when Israel was trying to stop commando activity from South Lebanon. In this it achieved considerable success, especially when the other fronts were quiet and the war of attrition came to an end.” In the second stage Israeli military attacks upon Lebanon “will have a different objective; Israeli military, and American diplomatic, pressure on Lebanon will attempt to make the Palestinians once more ‘mere refugees,’ to rid the camps of their struggle potential and their links with the Palestinian resistance, and to contain them by entangling them in the critical and complex Lebanese situation.

.

“The Israeli press recently published an ‘Israeli study’ according to which:

“Firstly, this special appraisal of the position of the Palestinians in Lebanon as regards the Palestine problem as a whole, means that it is the ‘Lebanese Palestinians’ who will be the obstacle to any settlement involving the liquidation of the Palestine problem in the future.

“Secondly, the Palestinians living in Lebanon were freed by the June War of the restrictions that had been imposed on them since 1948. They were no longer ‘refugees’ restricted as to their movement

inside Lebanon and between Lebanon and the Arab countries. They became revolutionaries. They obtained the legal right to take action on behalf of their return both in Lebanon and the Arab countries. They also obtained this right at the international level.

“Although the Palestinians were fettered in Jordan by the Jordanian regime, though only after bloody massacres, and although Israel itself has undertaken the task of fettering the Palestinians in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, there is still no suppression of the Palestinians in Lebanon.

“This report reflected the attitude of the United States, and it is generally believed to be a joint American-Israeli report, as often happens.” The American attitude at the Security Council had been a demonstration of joint action; the United States was not prepared to agree to a resolution condemning Israel “unless such a resolution implicitly holds Lebanon responsible for Palestinian action.”

Al-Balagh then asked what was going to be done about Lebanon to ensure that the Palestinian resistance is liquidated? “Will action be taken to aggravate the Lebanese domestic situation so that Lebanon may follow the example of the Jordanian regime?

“Or will the Lebanese authorities be neutralized and Israeli forces directly undertake the task of striking at the camps and the Palestinian commands in Lebanon?”

The first solution is unacceptable because “it would mean a grave internal split and economic collapse which Lebanon could not possibly stand. The Palestinians also know that their situation in Lebanon is not the same as their situation in Jordan. There it was possible for them to think of a regime commanded by them and to take action to establish it, but in Lebanon all they ask is that they should retain their right to take action on behalf of return and liberation and a nationalist and democratic situation in the country.”

Even the Lebanese right rejects this solution. “This was expressed by Pierre Gemayyel when he said: ‘If the choice is between occupation by Israel of South Lebanon, or striking at the commandos and involvement in civil war, then I am in favour of the first alternative.’”

As regards the second solution (the neutralization of Lebanon and abandonment of the resistance to the Israelis): "Such an attitude would soon be condemned as defeatist by all Lebanese, because aggressions against the Palestinians in Lebanon are aggressions against Lebanon, and the Lebanese regime cannot stand up to its people and justify its failure to join the Palestinians in repelling such aggressions. Indeed, such incidents, when they took place recently, in the form of the assassination of the three resistance leaders, forced Prime Minister Salam to resign, because all he had to say to the people was that 'he had given orders for the Lebanese army to engage, but his orders had not been carried out'."

"Lebanon is part of the conflict that is in progress in the Middle East; it cannot adopt a neutral attitude. It must perform its true role, not only to defend the Palestinian cause, not only to defend Arab destiny, but to defend its own existence, the territory of the South, and the waters of the South. And if we have to pay the price for our existence, let us pay it by following the course of Arab history, of which we are a part, and not by going against that course."

In an editorial in *Dirasat 'Arabiya* (June, 1973) entitled "Dialogue and Clash in Lebanon," Naji Allush analysed the causes of the attack, "which was not an accident, nor the consequence of minor incidents or misdemeanours by this or that party in the resistance. The attack was the consequence of a group of factors, both internal and external, and Lebanese, Arab and international. They are:

"I. At the Lebanese level, the government represents the reactionary right which consists of the isolationist leadership which is opposed to the Arab progressive movement, and of other confessional leaderships, which are either subservient to the isolationist leadership, or linked with it in one way or another. The pivot of this government is the isolationist reactionary right which is linked with Arab reaction on the one hand and world imperialism on the other. It is therefore against the Palestinian revolution from many points of view, and for the following reasons:

a) Because the resistance upsets the internal balance of power for, whether it likes it or not it is, in the long run, part of the Lebanese nationalist movement. This is why rightist circles talk so much about the dangers of the politicization of the resistance, and of the alignment of certain groups within it with this side or that. The growth of the resistance movement, and its increased interaction with the Lebanese masses, is a shock to the idea of a little Lebanon which has become a great Lebanon, the whole of whose population the isolationist groups want to win over to the idea of an isolationist Lebanon which is 'the West' and is only Arab with respect to tourism and trade, and when compliments are being exchanged.

b) Because Lebanon's international links, and its fundamental link with imperialist circles, require that it should submit to the policy of these circles.

c) Because the Zionist occupying state is exerting intense and extensive pressure to induce the authorities in Lebanon to strike at the resistance.

"II. At Arab level, the prevailing trend is towards settlement, however much fighting is talked about. The trend towards settlement is linked with an internal policy which has no confidence in the masses and is doing nothing to arm and train them, and moreover it is afraid that the masses may become a trained and armed force...

"These 'official' circles are publicly advocating that an end be put to resistance with a popular character and an independent will. Thus will be destroyed the phenomenon of the people under arms, and the fundamental force which the Palestinian resistance constitutes as long as it stands aside from the settlement plan.

"Official Lebanon is part of the Arab reality. It signed the Cairo Agreement at a time when Egypt was fighting a war of attrition, when Jordan was a citadel for thousands of combatants, etc. But today there is no war of attrition, and no resistance in Jordan, so why should Lebanon not abrogate an agreement that was concluded in different circumstances?"

The third major factor perceived by the author was the involvement of the United

States. Its role is an increasingly active one, he stated, although it relies for the execution of its policies on Israel. "It is making every effort to ensure that the counter-revolutionary forces also take part, because this will assure the escalation of the liquidation campaign and provide more extensive forces to take part in it, giving it new dimensions.

"If we realize all this it must be clear that dialogue between the authorities and the resistance depends on a number of factors, failure to understand which can only lead to confusion. So as not to deceive the Palestinian, Lebanese or Arab masses, we must make it clear that dialogue is only possible if the authorities need it, or

are unable to undertake its opposite — a clash. For the authorities to be in such a position the following factors must be applicable:

1. An increase in the strength of the resistance movement.

2. The Lebanese nationalist masses and the Lebanese nationalist forces must be made ready to protect the resistance by wide-scale political action, and by the necessary military preparedness.

3. The Arab nationalist movement and the Arab mass movement must be impelled towards fighting against the enemy, and the struggle against surrender solutions and the policy of settlement and liquidation must be escalated."

THE RED FRONT TRIAL: THE DEPOSITIONS OF TURKI AND ADIV

In its March, 1973 edition, *Shu'un Filastiniya* published the depositions of Daud Turki and Ehud Adiv, two of the defendants in the Red Front Trial accused of conducting espionage against the State of Israel. The first extract is from the deposition of Daud Turki.

"The majority of parties in the state of Israel are Zionist parties. Although there are parties which do not subscribe to the Zionist concept, the mere fact that they approve or accept the facts created by Zionism makes me regard them as assisting and accepting Zionism. I therefore cannot see that there is a place for me in any of these parties, although a small part of them do accept Arabs in their ranks. After the war I felt the need to establish a new organization which would be guided by Marxism, with due regard for the experiences and teachings of other revolutionaries in the world, like the international hero Ché Guevara, and the leader of the Chinese Communist Party, Mao Tse-tung. What I had in mind was that the organization I was thinking of establishing should, above all, include every one in Israel, whether Jew or Arab, who was prepared to adhere to the socialist faith and ideology, to work for this programme and take part in all its intellectual and organizational activities. The object of this organization would be to establish a socialist regime in Israel and the Arab countries. Most unfortunately the picture of this organization has not been completed as I intended; in deter-

mining the framework of relations between members I made provision for central democratic discipline, with the members choosing, in secret, the organization's command, which was to be responsible for and direct the activities of the organization, so that each member should not act as he thought best. I believe that there is a place in it for the Jewish members of the organization, and they agree with me, because I cannot see that there is any Palestinian organization whose programme takes Jews into account. Regardless of the number of Jews in the country, I do not, and never shall, call for the Jews to be expelled or thrown into the sea. On the contrary, I oppose this trend with all my force, and I am prepared to do all in my power to prevent any man being made to suffer for his race, his religion or his nationality, and the Jewish members of the organization hold the same view. We have a programme whose goal is socialism. Socialism is the common goal of all workers, peasants and those who are persecuted in Israeli society. The Jews have a share, and they must have a share, because they are members of the organization on a footing of equality with me, in establishing a new government and a new regime which will allow both the Jewish people and the Arab people to play an effective part in the struggle of the Arab people for liberation.

"Zionism, throughout its history in the country, both before and since the establishment of the state, has placed the Jewish