

From Imperialism vs. Palestine Israel the plan



from US the image

Ulises Estrada Lescaille

"The neo-conservatives have consolidated the idea and the political base for the rulers in the United States, that the plans and interests of the US can be measured on the basis of 'what's good for Israel, is good for the United States'", expressed the coordinator of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine in Europe, Dr. Jihad K. Suleiman Rashid, in an exclusive interview with Tricontinental

Tricontinental: Let us speak of the current situation in Palestine – from the point of view of Sharon's aggressiveness, from the position of the European countries, from the position of the United States and from some Latin American countries in support of the Palestinian people and others closer to Israel.

One cannot speak of the current situation of Palestinian people and of their national cause, without making an important assessment of what the war and military occupation of Iraq has meant, of the immediate secondary effects on the Palestinian cause, and on the cause of Arab people in general.

The occupation of Iraq was prepared stemming from US interests; on the one hand, attempting to fulfill their commitment to defend Israeli interests, to which both sides are partners in an old plan and later, including the area of the Middle East, in a plan of attaining its military superiority in which it will dedicate its economic, political and strategic hegemony over the area.

Israel, who has not been able to defeat the vigorous response of our people over the last four years – represented by the Intifada –, has embarked in unusual warlike activity that represents the most intense phase of the US-Israeli aggression against our people and against the people of Iraq. In addition to the US military victory, this represents an important political objective for Israel. Since with this US aggression, Israel has not felt like a protected country but as a country partner in the aggression that allows it, in the name of war, in the name of the fight against terrorism, to participate in the unjust aggression against the Iraqi people. This partnership allows them to justify all fascist and racist aggression against the Palestinian people in the name of terrorism, all with the US giving the green light.

The war of Iraq has made the Palestinian question more complicated than previous phases of the war. With the US military victory, Sharon has his hands free to increase his aggression against the Palestinian people; this was evident in the immoral approval by the Bush government for Israel to begin the construction of an apartheid-like wall at the expense of the Palestinian people.



This wall, which will ultimately be around 300 kilometers long, will literally separate the whole West Bank territory and will end up separating houses and families with the objective of making any illusion of the creation of an independent Palestinian state disappear. After depriving the Palestinian people of their inter-territorial connection with the West Bank, the state of Israel can at any time, apply its military hegemony and military intervention against the Palestinian territory to defend and protect its settlements.

The wall reduces the Palestinian territory in the West Bank to 20 percent,

depriving the Palestinian people of all rights to use their own natural resources and putting entire control into the hands of Israel and occupation forces; it reduces the area of eastern Jerusalem in Palestinian hands to less than 8%, making it lose all of its Arab character. A wall allows the Israelis to take possession of all fertile land that is still in Palestinian hands and paralyzes the future of the Palestinian state.

Since this war, Sharon's hands have been freed to practice – without ethics, morals or scruples of any type – a military policy directed against our people, of razing cities and villages,

closing schools, impeding the normal life of all the Palestinian people, paralyzing their health and crushing the rest of their social and economic systems.

Sharon's government, a partner of the United States in the aggression, in the face of a lack of a response by Israeli society – by the Israeli Labor Party, by a political program of the once-called Israeli left – feels capable of applying a militarist policy, which offers him as the only figure who could respond to what Israeli society demands of him: security against the danger emanating from the Palestinian people.

With the US occupation of Iraq, Sharon's government can compensate for its own failure in the face of the second Intifada and its own failure to seal off and block the support that the Palestinian people receive at the international level.

Sharon's policy has blocked international pressures over the last few months with regard to the international plan that enjoys legality, the "Roadmap" supported in the United Nations with a resolution that was presented by Russia and supported unanimously except for the US vote. Resolution 1515, establishes the Roadmap as the possibility for peace in the Middle East that includes the right of the Palestinian people to its independent state; the retreat of Israel territory to the June 4 borders, the right of Palestinian refugees to the return of their homes and includes Jerusalem as the capital of the Palestinian State.

Sharon's aggressiveness against Palestinian people, the apartheid-like fascist military policy against Palestinian people, has met with a ferocious resistance by that people, with stronger national unity despite the victory in Iraq by the US with its Israeli partner.

National unity would give the Palestinian people elements of positive compensation to defeat the right-wing Israeli government, to regroup in unity around the National Arabic Movement,

the official Arab policy and to again win the international legal battle against Sharon's political party and would push him in to a different role, as much by the Arab League as by the United Nations and international public opinion.

There is not the least doubt that Sharon, with his military aggressiveness, will never provide security for the state of Israel, for Israeli society, who are less secure with that military and aggressive policy and would become an anti-democratic society.

For the Palestinian people to achieve their inalienable rights – an independent democratic state with recognized borders, the withdrawal of Israel to its 1967 borders with Jerusalem as the capital of Palestine and the right of return granted to Palestinians to their cities and houses – and to closer achieve their desired objectives, it is fundamentally necessary to look for all the roads to unity, to use all the resources in the function of unity and to achieve the creation of a united program of struggle between distinct political forces. What is needed is a political program that deepens the Intifada and gives better representation to our Palestinian people at the national and international level; a program that reforms its institutions, democratizes our constitution and better uses all available resources for the construction and the reconstruction of our independent Palestine in the future.

On March 30, Palestinian people opened a new battlefield that had been brewing since 1976, after the fall of several of our people's martyrs while defending the right to our land and our well-being.

There is no doubt that the fight of our people faces an Israeli Zionist doctrine that has been maintained by each and every one of the successive governments since the formation of the Israeli state. The Zionist doctrine is based on the context that the existence of the state of Israel always depends on the capacity of its governments to end the Palestinian presence in the territory,

that is to say, to close them out of all the possibilities to live in its land, to force them to abandon Palestine. It is an ethnic cleansing policy, one of genocide; it is a racist, Zionist doctrine.

This doctrine that the security and permanency of Israel is based on the exit of Palestinians from their homes and their land, is what we have most confronted in the last years, because in all the peace processes, as much as Israel, supported by United States, as the rest of the political forces that support it, have tried to take the vital point out of the discussion – that Palestinians have the right to the return to their land.

Every year, on March 30, our people – as much in the occupied territories as Palestinians who live on their lands inside the state of Israel, as the millions who live in the Diaspora – confirm their devotion to the principle of defending for now and always the right to return to our homes, to our land and our villages. March 30 is a very significant day, especially today, after Sharon has been unable to defeat the Palestinian people and with the United States, feeling obligated to pressure the Palestinian people, after its victory in Iraq, to give concessions that affect in an immediate way the right of Palestinian people to return.

The United States has tried to pressure Israel to become the state of all Jews in the world, a Jewish State, and with this, it tries to uproot the right of Palestinian people to return to their land.

Sharon accepted the Roadmap Plan with 14 conditions; it was an acceptance that left out any possibility of applying this peace plan supported by international law. Among these conditions, there was no acceptance of the return of any Palestinian to their land, and it impeded any progress in the peace process.

For the Palestinian people, the right to the return to Palestine is vital. Without addressing this question, no possibility of progress in any peace process can be considered. Sharon has been unable to defeat the Intifada,

Sharon's policy has blocked international pressures over the last few months with regard to the international plan that enjoys legality, the "Roadmap" supported in the United Nations

international public opinion, or UN resolutions that force him to recognize the right of Palestinians to return. Sharon is trying to maneuver – before the insistence of the Intifada, before the fight of our people – to empty the Roadmap of its contents, to impede any commitment at the international level with regard to the rights of the Palestinian people and he is also trying to camouflage his defeat by the Intifada and our people in a partial, unilateral retreat out of the Gaza Strip.

If Sharon is trying to see his retreat as an application of the Roadmap, he is making a mistake, because absolutely no relationship exists between his retreat from the Gaza Strip and the Roadmap. Sharon is withdrawing from the Gaza Strip because he cannot do anything else, the Palestinian Intifada has not left him a response. He is leaving Gaza defeated, but he leaves without any prize. With this plan, Sharon is trying to hold up any international negotiation with regard to the peace process. He is also trying to feed the division between Palestinians by wasting time and manipulating. I am referring to the dangerous game being played by some Palestinians over the principles of the struggle of our people, the Geneva agreement, in which they have negotiated and manipulated the international resolutions in this regard, which has given up un-negotiated concessions to Sharon's government. Sharon has in turn taken advantage of this whole situation to declare the Roadmap impossible because of the continued Palestinian support of violence, who continues fighting Israel and combating the Israeli military presence through the Intifada.

For these reasons, March 30 is another opportunity for our people wherever they live – be it inside or outside Palestinian territory, in Arab countries, in refugees camps or in countries of the European continent, the United States, Canada or Australia; they can show their commitment to the fight for the right of return of all the

Palestinians in the Diaspora to their homes.

How do you see the role of the United States government relative to the heroic and ongoing struggle of the Palestinian people?

The US role with regard to the interests of Israel has been experiencing important modifications through a growing reinforcement of relationship of interests, a bilateral relationship with coordination in all fields – military, logistical, economic, and espionage – between Bush's government and the state of Israel. Bush has possibly been the president to most clearly show himself in support of the policy of Sharon's government. Bush, under the influence of the Zionist lobby, plagued by US neo-conservatives with comfortable movement throughout the Pentagon and the State Department, is the president that has contributed more to this aggressiveness, always on the

side of the governments of Israel and against our people.

The Zionist lobby who enjoys a great influence in the United States has transformed Israel into an inseparable working partner in American interests. The US has designed it a role that responds to the old Zionist dream of creating the Great Israel, which is nothing more than the US plan for a Great Middle East. And this did not arise with September 11 or the war in Iraq, but much earlier. In fact, in 1981 Ariel Sharon clearly expressed this saying "the national independence of Israel," just as he said on previous occasions, "is not finished because we need to have a vital and dynamic Middle East, with freedom of action for the state of Israel."

Later, neo-conservatives – protecting the interests of Israel in the United States, political strategists of successive US governments – reinforced the idea and transformed it in to the US



image. From Israel the plan and from the United States the image. In this context, Bush in the last years, after transforming Israel into an organic partner inseparable from its own interests, has played an outstanding role in influencing the Zionist neo-conservatives who work comfortably in US governments and especially in the last legislature under Bush's administration. The neo-conservatives have consolidated the idea and the political basis for the rulers in the United States that the plans and interests of the US can be measured on the basis of "what's good for Israel is good for the United States". This explains clearly the role that Israel can play, is playing, and will play after the war in Iraq and within the future plan of the Great Middle East.

This way, the United States and Israel will use their military, economic and political might with their capacity for intervention at any time and any place to respond to their interests. Therefore, Bush's role, with regard to Israel has never been one of indifference, weakness or ignorance, but a role aware of the unconditional support, from the military or diplomatic point of view, with all necessary vetoes to any resolution that might damage the image of Israel economically or strategically. Bush has played a very active role in consolidating Israel as a first-rank colonial, racist and military force that is an inseparable partner working in its interests.

What is the position that the European Union has taken, as a group, with respect to the particularities of some countries considered members or not of this regional block?

I believe that it is necessary to examine this from the perspective of a line dividing the situation before the last Spanish elections – when the ruling Spanish right-wing was working in collaboration with the United States – and the political situation in Europe after the last national Spanish elections. With the commitments obtained on the part of those who won that country's elections.

Europe has played a weak role, due to its lack of political unity, affected by internal divisions and the policy of alliance by some European countries, especially Great Britain, which was always obvious in its linkage to the United States. In addition, Spain was headed by the right under Aznar, who joined in an immediate and active way with the military policies of Bush's government.

During this period, the Palestinian cause and the application of the peace process was substantially damaged, with the support of the United States, the United Nations, Europe and Russia. At this stage, the United States could freely apply its own policy in the Middle East without European political resistance; without those countries even defending their own interests in the Middle East. Europe was surprised by the exit of Aznar's right-wing administration from the fold, a government that had clearly manifested its inclination and support for Sharon's government calling him the "man of peace" and the "man of state" with a right to the presumption of innocence.

The departure of Spain from the European unit has caused serious damage to the Palestinian cause in the European environment, blocking – just as the United States – each and every one of the resolutions that could have advanced toward the application of the Roadmap, in favor of maintaining an aggressive policy of Aznar along with Bush and Blair against the people of Iraq and against Arab people in general.

Regardless of the fact that there have been massive protests of millions of Spanish and European citizens who came out against the war, this did not generate the effect or enough political force on European governments to face the pro-war government of Bush and the tripartite alliance between Bush, Aznar and Blair.

As the US carried out its invasion, Europe played a decreasingly lukewarm, ineffective, and secondary role, while Aznar's role seemingly grew. However,

National unity is practically the heartbeat of our Palestinian people and that through which we can continue opposing Israeli occupation until we achieve our objectives

the pressure of the Iraqi resistance, the response made in the form of the Palestinian Intifada, the massive response of Arab people and the response from peoples all over the world have become serious obstacles to Bush, Blair and Aznar's policy at the national level and within each one their countries.

In Spain, massive responses begin to grow after the deaths of the first soldiers, the failure to discover any signs of weapons of mass destruction, and the demonstrated use of the lie to attack a people and a country. After the public in Spain, as well as in Europe, began to see a less democratic, less secure, less prosperous, and less independent Iraq, the leaders – especially in Spain – began to suffer the consequences of their own policies. The anti-war, anti-terrorism and pro-peace forces began to grow in Europe; but without surrendering the democratic principles to fight terrorism, without surrendering the defense of colonized people – such as the Palestinian people – without surrendering the defense of the right of the UN to be the framework for international legality through which problems between nations might be resolved.

The last elections in Spain have come to demonstrate the desire of the majority of Spanish people for political change, the rejection of political militarism in the Aznar government, the desire for the return of Spain to the European mainstream, and the desire for the recovery of a coherent and realistic role for Spain in the European and international context.

The March 11 terrorist operation in Madrid had nothing to do with the victory of Spanish people against terrorism. The right wing, headed by Aznar, has tried and will try to justify its own political defeat, its own political errors by using the terrorist operation - condemned by all democratic forces of the world. The winner in Spain is the Spanish people; the winner of the elections, which is speaking to all the people of Europe.

With the defeat of Aznar, new perspectives are opening up at the European level. The political situation in Spain is being welcomed as an important change in all European countries. It appears that the first serious crisis will be in the country that has adopted the closest position to Spain's policies of alliance with Bush: Poland. The doors are opening up to Spain by all European countries for it to play an important part within a democratic European Union and as a defender of international law. The victory of the Spanish people opens possibilities that the UN will have to again play a much more positive role and block the free reign of international terrorism. This is possible with the redirection of the nation's policies after the loss by the Spanish right wing

A dividing line exists relative to the situation in Europe after four years of right-wing policy in Spain and a US-led alliance of Bush-Aznar-Blair in the last two years, which has maintained a policy of unconditional support for Sharon's government. The line runs between the policy of division by the Spanish right that headed a series of small countries in the heart of the European community, and the arrogant policy of the government led by Aznar at the Latin American level, distributing safe-conducts to those who seemed to him to be appropriate or not, as president of a government.

New perspectives have already opened up in all these fields – the United Nations, among Arab countries – for relationships with Europe and Spain to have another chance to be part of a European political unit facing pending problems, especially the Palestinian question. Also, this gives a strong political push to the Roadmap because Europe, Russia and the United Nations will not unconditionally leave the United States on the side of Israel, supporting Israel, imposing solutions that they deem appropriate with their double standards to measure what we are accustomed to seeing in US policy.

The policy of Europe in these moments requires an important modification that has not been made. It requires greater stability in the Spanish government-elect's application of their commitments to their people; it requires of the European Union greater stability against the policy of apartheid by the state of Israel, a policy which is still weak; it requires of Europe a policy for the application of the Roadmap peace plan and the defense of the right to return of Palestinians in all international resolutions in this respect. It requires Europe to break US military aggressiveness in an area as vital for world peace as is the Middle East.

Is this possible? We believe that it is, but without a doubt, some nations and democratic forces will have to make it possible through unceasing efforts and without reducing anti-war pressure for peace and in support of freedom for all people.

We know that Latin American people are with the Palestinian people; however, we want to know your assessment of the position of Latin American governments as community and individually regarding the struggle of the Palestinian people.

Making a kind of observation or an assessment of the whole process over the last few years in Latin America, I – as a Palestinian, as an Arab – at this time detect a greater intensity in the support that we are receiving from the Latin American people, from Latin American political forces and from governments that are also showing, in a progressive manner, greater support for international law in United Nations resolutions regarding the Palestinian people and their rights.

Without a doubt, this is not a phenomenon isolated from the events on the international level and of the policies of globalization. It is increasingly clear that this globalization is imperialistic and savagely capitalist, and that the peoples of Latin American and their governments will increasingly reject it. This would not only be reflected

at the local level in each country, but in the necessity to unite forces among different peoples in the world, among them Latin American peoples standing up against global economic policy, a very right-wing and savage policy that continues to reduce opportunities for development and the normal evolution in these Latin American countries as in other continents that share similar economic situations.

In my way of seeing things, the Latin American perspective is becoming more intense in its level of support for the Palestinian people among traditionally sympathetic peoples. A change is being observed with regard to our cause by many Latin American governments. At the moment, we are seeing a positive process at the political level in Latin America, not only in traditional sectors but also in sectors that previously did not take political positions committing themselves to causes in the Middle East. The national bourgeoisie in Latin America is also endangered by US globalization. The governments that have experienced political changes in the last few years also favor the balance between the support that we received from traditionally committed sectors with Palestinian and Arab people; and there are positive changes in other ruling sectors or sectors of the Latin American economy.

I really believe that this will open some very hopeful perspectives that we have always wanted: the coordination between different peoples and governments of the South facing up to the right wing and governments of the North, the governments of exploitation, headed by the United States. That would benefit the struggle, because international support would increase through the unity of Latin American governments with the just cause of our Palestinian people.

The UN, and its Security Council, which approves the fundamental agreements of the organization, does not approve anything going against the strategic interests of the United States. Nevertheless, there is a series of

resolutions approved by the UN on the crisis in the Middle East and particularly on the necessity of giving the Palestinian people their national State. How do you assess the position of the UN relative to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict?

I believe that in the last few years, especially since the rise to power of the most recalcitrant right in US society – the neo-conservatives with a political puppet in the form of Bush's son – the United Nations has lost a great part of its role to the military doctrine of the Pentagon, plagued with neo-conservatives and with Zionist comfortably installed there. They move and make decisions against Palestinian people with ease, decisions against the Arab peoples and in support of the right-wing government of the state of Israel.

This is the reality that is confirmed with each resolution, which is blocked, held up or avoided on the part of United States with its unconditional ally, the state of Israel. It is a manifestation – more than a crisis of identity – of the internal crisis, of the representation crisis that the United Nations is suffering. Despite all the resolutions approved concerning the interests of the Palestinian people and regarding the Palestinian-Israeli Middle East, none has been applied, none has been respected, nor have they been taken in to consideration by any of the Israeli governments, either by the right or the pseudo-left represented by the previous Labor Party.

This would not have occurred without US influence, without US commitment to its principal ally. It would not have happened without the military power of the Pentagon that has devoted itself to the doctrine that the United States has to have an enough military might to crush any force against its interests any where in the world. This means it is very clear what the United Nations serves: the US position and US interests.

Up to this moment, this has been possible due to factors favorable to this policy at the world level: the fall of the Berlin wall; the collapse of the socialist camp; the lack of European unity; the

fragmentation of progressive forces; the lack of coordination among poor peoples of the South; the disappearance of different blocks and their important roles, such as Non-Aligned Movement and others. It has also been possible due to the lack of democracy in different countries as vital to the United States as is the Middle East.

But if it is certain that the force of the United States has drained the United Nations of its historical role and has given the US the opportunity to use its military might to colonize and devote its strategic, military and economic hegemony over different areas of the world, it is no less certain that this hegemony can also be snatched from the United States. In the future, it can be blocked of all its intents to divest the United Nations of its historical role, making possible the recovery of such important elements as Palestinian unity at the Palestinian level; the coordination and unity of the Arab world at the Arab level; the coordination of the political unity of Europe at the European level; the coordination of all the forces struggling against US globalization in all the poor countries at economic and social levels. In the South, the poor world calls for the reinforcement of the struggle of democratic forces within the United States; and at the Arab level especially, this requires the defeat of the United States and their transformation of Iraq into a new Vietnam and to deprive the US the possibility of further aggression. The United States did not enter Iraq thinking to stop there. It entered Iraq so as to go on to other countries and to achieve the geopolitical re-division of the Middle East, leading some countries, occupying others and dictating new constitutions to the rest of the nations in the Middle East, especially those that produce oil.

A Fascist Re-Division?

Without a doubt. It is a total and absolutely fascist, neocolonial redesign without precedent, unusual in their tactics and their techniques used against different peoples of the world.

But if in these moments, the role of United Nations is weakened because of

the reasons mentioned, the role of the United Nations is recoverable. Just as it is possible to overcome the same factors that have weakened peoples, recovering Europe, recovering Arab unity, recovering the unity of different forces of poor countries of the South in their fight against a savage and inhuman globalization.

After the recent murder of HAMAS leaders, how do you see the immediate perspective for Sharon's policy, approved by the US government to weaken the unity, the Palestinian struggle, through the murder of their main leaders?

Since he began to build the wall, Sharon has crossed and violated all the lines designed by the United States and with the permission of the United States. He has violated the line of not returning to the cities of 'A' zone, he has crossed the line of hitting hard the infrastructure of the Palestine National Authority – not the Intifada, but the PNA – because previously the United States had given him the green light to hit the infrastructure of the Intifada, to put an end to the Intifada. Sharon is already violating the infrastructure the PNA. Arafat is in physical danger and has been placed on a list for selective murders, following sheik Ahmed Yassin.

This means Sharon at this time has the total and absolute green light to violate, without any scruples at all, each one of the international rights, the human rights and international laws that obligate him to respect people, their culture, their necessities and their free movement. Maybe it would not have been possible for Sharon to act if the Palestinians had achieved a greater national unity, if the Palestinian leaders had achieved a political program desired by all our people, that defined the objectives of the Palestinian people, a program of national address that defined with clarity the mission and objectives of their governments that, regrettably, have achieved very little success with regard to the struggle against Israeli occupation.

We speak of this because national unity is practically the heartbeat of our Palestinian people and that through which we can continue opposing Israeli occupation until we achieve our objectives.

With national Palestinian unity, we prevent fragmentation and the divisions so desired on the part of the United States and by Israel. With national unity, we can play better roles in the Arab league. Coordinating with our brothers and sisters of the Arab countries – with peoples and governments – pending national problems; and how to deal with them at the national and international level. With a program of national unity, the Palestinian cause is presented much stronger before international public opinion, with a solid image that upholds our rights in the United Nations, in the European councils and in any of the other international institutions.

If we speak of national unity, we speak of the only question in which we can find a reason to carry out any of the struggles of our people. National unity is the outstanding subject to be able to maintain not only the Intifada but also the national causes, the existence of our people outside any danger, in the face of policies as aggressive as those of Sharon's fascist government.

I do not want to end our conversation – it is more than an interview, it is a conversation between revolutionary friends – without asking how you assess the position of the Arab countries relative to Israel and the Palestinian people?

The Arab countries live a double crisis at the moment, an internal crisis, of how they have to respond to a humiliating aggression, to a humiliating occupation on the part of United States, of their peoples and, on the other hand, the rejection of most of the Arab countries of US demands for democratization.

On one hand, this crisis hinders the US's plans in the area, because it is generating and will continue generating a greater rejection of the American presence. On the other hand, this crisis of trust between the United States and some Arab countries opens a positive perspective for coordination among Palestinian people and their representatives and different Arab countries with and without causes pending resolution in the Middle East.

It is opening the route to reinforce collaboration between the Palestinian people, the PLO and Egypt. It opens the possibility for better coordination – between Palestinians, Syrians and other Arab countries, especially those of the Gulf, – on the Palestinian cause.

At this time, each and every one of us has the possibility to progress toward national unity, possibly, with less difficulty than before the war and during the American invasion, between the Palestinian people and the rest of the Arab peoples. This returns us again closer to the union that existed previously between the Palestinian cause and the national movement for Arab liberation. That is to say, at this time we are seeing the difficulties of the United States in the area growing. The distrust between the United States and its own allies is growing. This is an opportunity that the Palestinians should not miss. But for these to be exploited to the possible maximum, what should really be channeled is the plan of national unity toward sure success among the different Palestinian forces.

The Democratic Front has played an important role in bringing closer all the possible postures to create a unified plan among different Palestinian forces. Inside the PLO, a plan for national unity, a political program for all the Palestinian organizations based on the rights of the Palestinian people recognized internationally in the withdrawal to the June 4 borders, in the creation of the Palestinian state – with Jerusalem as its capital, and in the right of Palestinians to return.

The Democratic Front, without exaggerating, has been the only Palestinian force that has been present at each and every one of the meetings in the last two or three years with a written unity program. It is the only organization that, in all the settlement talks led by Egypt and other countries, has offered a program of national unity. One bringing closer the various postures of all Palestinian forces so as to unfold the struggle that is the political program of national unity and give direction that can better guide any peace process now or in the future, to give the greatest force to our people, united against any manipulation of their rights at the regional and international level ■