

US imperialism and Britain claim that this campaign is waged based on 'values' and aims at protecting innocent lives. A person has to be really stupid to believe this! Where were these values when the US and Britain used their veto power to prevent condemnation of the Zionist enemy that daily terrorizes the Palestinian people in occupied Palestine, and the people in Lebanon? When all of humanity, as represented in the UN and Security Council, condemned the barbaric Israeli terror, the US used the veto to save 'Israel'. Who could believe that the US is launching this campaign to uphold human values? History tells us about the methods used by the colonizers against the colonized, by the exploiters against the exploited. The colonization of Asia, Africa and Latin America took place under slogans that had a human exterior, but whose essence was barbaric exploitation. The aggressor always needs a cover for hiding its aggression. The true aim of this campaign is to strike the countries that oppose US imperialist policies. The attack on Libya aimed at subduing the Libyan leadership and people, because they oppose US policies in the area - the policies of Camp David.

Confronting this campaign requires strong confrontation of the US imperialist policies in our area, in each country and on the pan-Arab and international levels. In addition, we have to expose this campaign and its real aims. Moreover, we should not give imperialism any reasons to justify its aggression before international public opinion. This explains the PFLP's position condemning some operations that have been used by imperialism to justify its campaign.

Today, many talk about 'terrorism' launched from the Middle East, by Syria, Libya, the PLO and the Palestinians, and the Lebanese nationalist forces. The strategy of imperialism in the Middle East is spreading Camp David in the Arab area as a whole. The campaign against 'terrorism' has been escalated as part of this strategy. There are Arab forces that oppose the Camp David policies, especially the PLO, the Lebanese people, Libya and Syria. It is logical that imperialism accuses them of terrorism in order to find a justification for attacking them to remove the obstacles to Camp David.

In 1986, the two most prominent attempts to spread Camp David, normalizing relations between 'Israel' and the Arab states prior to a treaty, were the Ifran and Alexandria meetings. What is your evaluation of these attempts? What obstacles remain?

First, please allow me to explain the phrase: normalization prior to signing a treaty... The Egyptian regime signed the Camp David accords in 1979, which aimed at normalizing diplomatic, economic, political, social and cultural relations between Egypt and 'Israel'. This was a preparation for implementing US imperialism's larger strategic goal of establishing a coalition grouping the US and all its allies in the area, to confront the popular movement in the region, and the Soviet Union as well. This year, the US conducted the Bright Star military maneuvers in Egypt, and it seeks to stage maneuvers that include Egypt, 'Israel', Jordan and the whole Arab area by 1995. Although the Camp David accord was signed by the Egyptian regime, it is still facing difficulties due to the position of the Egyptian masses and nationalist forces. The most recent example is the Egyptian doctors' union's refusal of the Israeli government's offer of medical and scientific exchange.

The Jordanian regime is with Camp David, but benefitting from Egypt's experience, it seeks to enact the normalization policy in practice first, in preparation for signing an agreement. It wants to make an expanded Camp David a reality before signing an agreement. This is the real threat: Secret normalization is more dangerous than overt normalization. Therefore, it is dangerous to give any sort of political cover to the Jordanian regime while it is normalizing relations with 'Israel'.

The Ifran (Peres-Hassan II) and Alexandria (Peres-Mubarak) meetings were not the only attempts to spread Camp David. Before 1986, the US made many attempts to spread Camp David, such as the May 17th agreement between Lebanon and 'Israel', that was abrogated by the heroic Leba-

nese people. Then, there were attempts to draw the Jordanian and Palestinian link into Camp David via the February 11, 1985 accord signed by Yasir Arafat and King Hussein. US imperialism was hoping that these attempts would succeed. Now, US imperialism talks about direct negotiations as the last resort for the Arab countries, after itself failing to draw the Lebanese link and the PLO into Camp David.

While the Soviet Union advocates an international conference to resolve the Middle East conflict, the US talks about separate, direct negotiations. The continuous attempts to spread Camp David prove that the US is determined to exclude the Soviet Union from the Middle East negotiations. The US wants direct negotiations between countries, which means eliminating the PLO from the negotiations as part of liquidating the Palestinian cause. This will enable imperialism to achieve its dream of an imperialist-reactionary coalition to confront the masses...

One of the obstacles facing Camp David is Israeli obstinacy and the extent of the concessions that 'Israel' is demanding of the Arab reactionary regimes, and the difficulties involved in the regimes' giving such concessions. Another obstacle is the position of the Arab masses and nationalist forces refusing and confronting the Camp David policy. There is also the position of the official and popular steadfastness forces, that we must reinforce. The role the PLO has played is also very significant. The Palestinian revolution became a phenomenon that filled the vacuum left by the end of Abdul Nasser's role in confronting the imperialist policies in the area. The PLO was the core of the Steadfastness and Confrontation Front which constituted the biggest obstacle to spreading Camp David from 1978 until 1982. Focusing on the role of the PLO does not mean neglecting to draw up a complete confrontation program aimed at gathering all the Arab forces that are confronting the Camp David alliance.

The Arab situation is deteriorating as seen in the absence of Arab solidarity and the Steadfastness Front's role, and in the weakness of the Arab popular movement. What is the way to overcome this?

This is the main characteristic of the Arab situation, but it is not the only characteristic. The other characteristic is steadfastness. There are forces of steadfastness in the Arab world that have expressed themselves on more than one occasion, and that were successful in foiling the imperialist schemes which aimed at increasing the deterioration of the Arab situation. Otherwise, how do you explain the Marines' departure from Lebanon, or the Israelis' withdrawing from the mountains, Beirut, Sidon and Tyre, without having extracted any political price, officially or publicly? How do you explain Reagan's shameful failure in his challenge to Qaddafi? How do you explain the failure of the Israelis and the Jordanian regime to create an alternative to the PLO, or to liquidate the PLO? How do you explain the popular mobilization around the PLO as the symbol of the Palestinian national identity, and the increasing support to the PLO, despite the deviation of the leadership and the splits this led to?

In order to overcome this reality, we must analyze it correctly. In our analysis, the primary factor is the nature of the leaderships in power in most of the Arab countries. These regimes' class nature harmonizes with the Camp David policy. It is in their class interests to end the conflict with the Israeli enemy. If the conflict continues, this will deprive them of enjoying the oil wealth. Most of the regimes, then, are deteriorating. The deterioration that hit Egypt, when it withdrew from the struggle with the Zionist enemy, hit other countries as well. The Egyptian regime that joined Camp David was made an outcast by the Arab masses, but is no longer isolated on the official level. There are Egyptian-Jordanian relations and Egyptian-Iraqi relations. The Steadfastness and Confrontation Front, despite its class and ideological make-up, could have initiated a national response. The coherence of this front in the first period enabled it to have the Baghdad Summit resolutions adopted. However, things turned out otherwise due to the program of the nationalist regimes, their nature and mistakes, and due to the division of the PLO which was the main