

# Break the vicious circle of bloodshed

*Meir Vilner*

General Secretary, CC,  
Communist Party of Israel

Genocide, "final solution" and "new order" are terms reminiscent of nazi crimes. But at present they apply to the policy of Israel's Zionist rulers and this is perfectly right. For all the distinctions, the affinity is beyond doubt. It consists in unbridled racism, reckless aggressiveness, a policy of territorial conquest and genocide, as in the case of the Palestinian people. There is also a similarity in the bid to bring about a "final solution" of the problem — that of Palestine in this case — and impose a "new order" —

on Lebanon today, and on Syria, Jordan and other countries tomorrow.

The Israeli aggressors' crimes on Lebanese soil are in the same category as the fascists' atrocities during World War II. A new blood-curdling indication of this was the massacre committed in West Beirut's Palestinian refugee camps on orders from high-ranking persons in Israel. This heinous crime marked a new phase in the war of aggression in Lebanon, at which

the sons of Israel have become oppressors and occupiers.

### *The U.S.-Israeli partnership*

War is admittedly a continuation of politics by other, military means. And to assess correctly the nature of any war, it is essential to ascertain its causes and political aims.

The Zionist top leadership of Israel has never started wars of aggression all alone. It did not do so in 1956 or 1967. In the former case the war was Anglo-Franco-Israeli and in the latter, U.S.-Israeli. But at that time the imperialists tried to disguise their complicity in the planning and execution of acts of aggression and to conceal advance preparations and agreements. The public did not learn the facts until later. The Zionist rulers would never have been able to wage a large-scale war without military, economic and political support from the biggest imperialist state (or several imperialist states). For all the megalomania of the Likud<sup>1</sup> government and the Maarach<sup>2</sup> leaders backing it, Israel is by no means a great power. Take away the U.S. F-15 and F-16 planes used by the Israeli Air Force, U.S. engines for aircraft of "Israeli make" and U.S. credits and subsidies (which exceed all of Washington's credits and subsidies to other countries put together). Withdraw the U.S. veto on the draft resolution concerning the war in Lebanon submitted to the Security Council by a NATO ally, France (an unprecedented occurrence). Think of the fact that the United States was the only country at the extraordinary special session of the UN General Assembly on the Palestinian problem to side again with its Israeli partner and to vote along with Israel against a resolution condemning the massacre in West Beirut and which was supported by 147 countries. And then you will see Israel's real size.

However, there is a substantial difference between the wars of the past (1956 and 1967) and the current war, for in the latest case collusion has been an open secret from the outset. The Reagan administration openly sided with the Begin-Sharon government and publicly defended the aggression mounted by Tel Aviv. "Never before has Israel received such support from the United States as now," Israeli Minister Mordechai Zipori said during the war.<sup>3</sup> Commentators pointed out that the U.S. wanted to achieve during the war in Lebanon the same objectives as were sought by the Israeli aggressor, except that it counted on political means.<sup>4</sup> The mission entrusted to Reagan's emissary, Philip Habib, was to add a diplomatic offensive to the armed aggression, to exert pressure on the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)

and democratic forces in Lebanon and Syria.

A noteworthy article about U.S.-Israeli cooperation in the war against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples was published in *Davar*. Criticizing Washington because it had allegedly refused to give the Israeli army the "green light" to storm Beirut, which was what Begin and Sharon demanded, and made it keep up for a time a state of "blockade without invasion,"<sup>5</sup> its author, Hagai Eshed, affirmed that the U.S. stand was at variance with the U.S.-Israeli agreement on implementing the "grand program" for aggression. "The Americans," he wrote, "publicly defined the maximum aims of the war which Israel is carrying on in Lebanon. But they did not allow it to implement the military solution, which is a requisite of achieving these aims."<sup>6</sup>

Yes, it was Washington which decided on the maximum aims of the operation, aims supported by Israel. Thus it is obvious that there are coordinated and far-reaching common objectives and certain tactical differences over ways of achieving them. The Begin-Sharon government insists on using military means everywhere. The U.S. has nothing against it but is compelled from time to time to take into account the impact of its policy on the Arab world and its international implications as well as the state of relations with the NATO allies. This explains why the two accomplices in the criminal operation on Lebanese soil argued occasionally over whether the maximum goals they had set themselves could be achieved by diplomatic means serving as a continuation of military operations, or whether they should proceed to the next stages of the armed aggression in Beirut and northern Lebanon or even in regard to Syria. Washington had no objection in principle to escalating the armed intervention, as I have noted, but neither did it rule out the possibility of using the services of diplomats while brandishing the big stick of a likely continuation of military operations.

### *The Lebanese adventure is a direct outgrowth of Camp David*

The military political situation in Lebanon and the Middle East and developments on the international scene fully bear out the estimation of the situation made by our party immediately after Israel's robber-like invasion of Lebanese territory. The communists pointed out that it was not merely an Israeli but an Israeli-U.S. aggression, or a U.S.-Israeli one to be exact.

The war against the Palestinians and Lebanese and provocations against Syria are no isolated actions. They are an important part of

imperialism's global policy of aggression, which has assumed particularly dangerous proportions since Ronald Reagan moved into the White House. That policy is aimed at undermining international détente and is fraught with a return to cold war. While fomenting a cold war, the present U.S. administration misses no chance to kindle the flames of "hot" conflicts at the local or regional level. The Zionist rulers are answerable to history for their complicity in the deeds of the most aggressive imperialist forces. In trying with the aid of U.S. imperialism to end the national existence of the Arab people of Palestine, they are ready to commit any crime, nor do they scruple to play the role of a fuse that could set off a world conflagration.

The U.S.-Israeli aggression in Lebanon is one of the dangerous consequences of the Camp David accords signed by Egypt, Israel and the United States. It has from the first been evident to all unbiased observers that those accords mark the formation of an aggressive strategic bloc against the Arab national liberation movement, primarily against the struggle of the Palestinian people and their representative, the PLO. In a more general context, the Camp David plan has an anti-Soviet slant and is directed against all forces of progress and socialism. That collusion directly serves the schemes of U.S. imperialism, which seeks military-political supremacy in a region lying in the immediate proximity of Soviet frontiers and wants to stamp out any progressive movement there, to suppress the struggle for national and social liberation.

While preparations for the Lebanese operation planned long before were under way — this time almost openly — the Israeli press pointed to the link between that adventure and the more ambitious Camp David plans. "... Anyone who reads Sharon's words correctly," wrote Zeev Schiff, military commentator of *Haaretz*, "realizes that the aim is not to carry out another Operation Litani.<sup>7</sup> The aim is to destroy the military and political structure of the PLO and even to create a favorable situation in Lebanon for the formation of a new government that would sign a peace treaty with Israel."<sup>8</sup>

It will be seen that both the dimensions of the war and its long-term objects were determined long before the aggression began and not during it.

#### *New conspiracy against peace*

In turn, this criminal move itself was used by the U.S. imperialists as a possible means of extending the framework of Camp David and

backing up their hegemonist claims in the Middle East. This is the meaning of the much-advertised "Reagan Plan," presented as a "new" initiative, an all but radical change in the U.S. Middle East policy. Revealing with amazing frankness and, indeed, cynicism what determined Washington's attitude to the war in Lebanon, Reagan said that as a result, the U.S. "had an opportunity for a more far-reaching peace effort in the region."<sup>9</sup> The peace he meant was Pax Americana, of course. And this is why the President flatly denied the Palestinians the right to establish a national state of their own and said not a word about the PLO, recognized by the international community as the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine. In point of fact, everything is coming full circle, back to what was planned at Camp David.

The announcement of the "Reagan Plan" prompted the Political Bureau of the CC CPI to make a statement sharply condemning Washington's new anti-Arab conspiracy. The statement stresses that the plan leaves the Palestinian problem — the centerpiece of the Arab-Israeli conflict — unsettled and puts off the achievement of a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the region; it means implementing the Camp David accords, which have proved that they do not lead to peace but to war and bloodshed. As for the negative stand of the Begin-Sharon government on the "Middle East initiative" of its overseas patrons, the Political Bureau points out that this stand is on the one hand, a reflection of the Israeli government's bid for the complete annexation of the occupied Palestinian territories and the expulsion of the Arab people of Palestine from their native soil, a bid backed by U.S. imperialism. On the other hand, the tactical differences between the rulers of Israel and the United States are designed to offer Arab reaction an excuse for accepting the plan.

#### *The "grand program" of the Begin-Sharon team*

It should be clear from the foregoing that the implementation of the U.S.-Israeli "grand program" in the Middle East neither began nor ended with the invasion of Lebanon. The prelude to the aggression was a campaign launched in the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip with a view to abolishing the Palestinians' national rights.<sup>10</sup> The armed intervention in Lebanon was a direct continuation of this terrorist campaign.

The outlines of the Begin-Sharon government's monstrous adventurist schemes are quite distinct now. The aim is to destroy the

PLO's positions in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, liquidate patriotic Palestinian leaders on the occupied lands, disrupt the military political structure of the PLO in Lebanon, expel Palestinians from Lebanese territory and form a new Palestinian leadership to be composed of U.S. and Israeli agents and other reactionary elements. It is planned to exterminate all left patriotic forces in Lebanon, put a puppet government in power, divide the country into spheres of influence or turn it into a virtual Israeli colony and set up a base for the U.S. militarists. The Zionist rulers are set on forcing Syrian troops out of Lebanon and putting political, economic and military pressure on Syria to make it alter its independent policy or to overthrow its regime. Thereupon Israel expects to formally announce the complete annexation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Armed provocations against the population of these territories as well as against Jordan will be designed to expel the majority of Palestinians from the seized lands.

Also emerging are the outlines of further stages of implementation of the "grand program." The Likud government tends more and more to accept the idea of working toward the conversion of Jordan into a "Palestinian" or "Palestinian-Jordanian" state. The idea has already been endorsed by both Defense Minister Ariel Sharon and Foreign Minister Yitzhak Shamir. It is winning support with the Reagan administration, a fact embarrassing King Hussein of Jordan. Proceeding from a "Palestinian settlement" in Jordan at the expense of 800,000 Palestinians to be expelled into that country from the occupied territories, the Israeli authorities would like to kill two birds with one stone, that is, to get rid of the Palestinian problem by forcibly imposing its "final solution" and to prevent the rise of a sizable Palestinian minority in "Great Israel" and hence its becoming a binational state.

This fiendish "solution" has also found supporters in the Labor Party. "Israeli political quarters," *Davar* wrote, "have come to the conclusion that they must crush the Palestinians in both Nablus and Saida<sup>11</sup> without entering into talks with them on an eventual compromise. This policy breeds brutality; its implementation means war in one place and administration by Milson<sup>12</sup> in another . . . Sharon is announcing for all to hear that the second stage of implementation of his 'grand program' will be a war to change the situation in Jordan under the code name 'Peace for the Jordan Valley.' The seizure of the first forty kilometers of territory will win support from Maarach, for such

is the depth of the 'security belt,'<sup>13</sup> envisaged by the Allon plan."<sup>14</sup>

This, then, is what the authors of the "grand program" covet today. But history has shown on more than one occasion that the more ambitious a plan for aggression and expansion is, the more it is likely to fall through.

### *The war is boomeranging against its makers*

There is ample evidence that the aggression in Lebanon is boomeranging against its U.S. and Israeli instigators. Militarily there can be no question of victory. Israel brought its entire fighting strength to bear, was fully and openly backed by the U.S. and used the most up-to-date U.S. weapons to commit acts of barbarity and vandalism against the civilian population and destroy towns, villages and refugee camps. But the war went on and became the longest and grimmest of all Arab-Israeli wars. Israel suffered very serious casualties and material losses. The PLO, backed by the mass of the people, showed staunchness and set an example of courage and heroism. This is now recognized even in our country. The Syrian troops held their ground in battle. The Soviet arms used in fighting against the aggressor proved highly effective, something which even Israeli sources cannot deny.

Speaking of the political aspect of the matter, the results of the invasion are plainly the opposite of what the invaders and their patrons had counted on. The war in Lebanon placed the Palestinian problem in the focus of all international policy toward the Middle East. The range of world forces demanding that the Arab people of Palestine be enabled to exercise their right to self-determination and set up an independent state is widening. The PLO has gained considerably in political prestige. Countries which had approached the prospect of recognizing it with reserve are establishing direct contacts with it.

Israel's international prestige shows a sharp decline. Many of those who were seen as sympathizing with Israel have come out against the aggression and the barbarity of the Israeli military. Various sections of the Jewish public abroad, which until recently had approved of the policy of the Zionist rulers, now prefer to dissociate from that policy and have, indeed, begun to resist it. Anti-Israeli sentiment in the Arab world and developing countries is so strong that even frankly pro-imperialist forces are careful not to side with Tel Aviv.

The Arab peoples' hostility to U.S. imperialism has increased to an unprecedented degree, and this despite attempts to mislead them by

means of anti-Soviet lies. Notwithstanding the deep-going split in the Arab world, a split which became one of the factors enabling the U.S.-Israeli alliance to attack Lebanon, there is a growing trend toward uniting popular forces to fight the U.S. imperialists, their Israeli allies and pro-imperialist Arab reaction.

The importance of Arab unity also found expression in the decisions of the recent Arab summit in Fez. They are plainly at variance with the "Reagan Plan." The principles of settling the Middle East conflict and the Palestinian problem set out in them do not contradict the provisions of the peace program advanced by the Communist Party of Israel and can, in our opinion, serve as a basis for eliminating seats of the war menace in the Middle East and assuring all the peoples of the region a life in peace and security. A requisite of implementing these principles is unrelenting struggle against the aggressive schemes of the U.S. imperialists and the Zionist leadership of Israel.

Last but not least, a marked differentiation occurred in Israeli society during the war over the attitude to the conflict. For the first time in the history of Arab-Israeli armed conflicts, a mass anti-war movement developed in our country against genocide, for a fair Israeli-Palestinian peace. Today a much larger body of our public opinion is aware that the war in Lebanon is unjust, that the Palestinian problem cannot be solved by force of arms and that the current policy of the Zionist leadership jeopardizes the existence of Israel itself.

#### *New developments in the anti-war movement*

On the very first day of the war, the Political Bureau of the CC CPI released a statement emphatically condemning the sanguinary adventure in Lebanon. It demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops and the resignation of the Begin-Sharon cabinet. The Committee Against the War in Lebanon, set up a little later, held a historic demonstration — in response to its call, over 20,000 people took to the streets of Tel Aviv on Saturday, June 26, to condemn the aggression. The tremendous success of the demonstration had its effect on those who, even being opposed to the war in Lebanon, had decided at first to refrain from any action against it while "our soldiers were fighting at the front." This opportunist approach was due to the fact that at the early stage a wait-and-see attitude won the upper hand in the leadership of the Peace Now movement.<sup>15</sup> But after the demonstration the leaders of the movement had to reconsider their

posture and called for a big demonstration on July 3 under the slogan "Against a War Like This One." This time the demonstration involved over 100,000 people — civilians, in particular young people belonging to diverse social sectors, army officers and soldiers.

The people's mass struggle against the war of aggression is a new development in Israel. A vast opposition movement against the regime's adventurist policy is taking shape in our country for the first time in years. It encompasses both civilians and servicemen. Yet in 1956 and 1967 our party was the only political force to demand an end to aggression. We were then completely isolated, for the Zionist rulers contrived to mislead all population groups and political parties except the CPI.

This time, however, a very important change occurred. What is more, the struggle against unleashing the Lebanese carnage began long before the invasion. Nearly all parties outside the ruling bloc demonstrated their disapproval of the sinister plans of the Begin-Sharon cabinet.

Nevertheless, when the war became a fact, the leaders of the Labor Party, their Maarach bloc partners from the United Workers' Party and the leaders of other major Zionist parties supported the bid for conquest out of what they called "patriotism." They readily allowed themselves to be "persuaded" by the thoroughly false argument that the Israeli army had invaded a sovereign state with the sole aim of pushing the Palestinian fighters 40 kilometers back from the northern frontier of Israel so as to prevent the shelling of settlements in Galilee.

#### *Responsibility for complicity in aggression*

The Knesset debate last summer on the war in Lebanon was something of a political test that brought out the real attitude of diverse parties. The Democratic Front for Peace and Equality group, in which the communists hold a leading place, moved for a vote of no-confidence. Ten deputies from other parties abstained, or to be more exact, refused to vote because they did not want to back the Likud line.

Labor MPs, deputies from the frankly pro-fascist Tehia organization and the Telem<sup>16</sup> party joined MPs from the ruling coalition in voting against the motion and for the government. Thereby the Labor Party assumed responsibility for complicity in the aggression and for all its immediate and subsequent implications. Its leaders — Shimon Peres and Yitzhak Rabin — followed in the footsteps of the Begin-Sharon cabinet by becoming in the war

days obedient executors of its will and a mouthpiece of the ruling bloc.

For its part, the leadership of the United Workers' Party decided to approve of the armed action within a 40-kilometer zone on Lebanese soil, which meant, in fact, subscribing to a war of aggression. However, this party and, incidentally, many of those that had refused to join in the first mass anti-war demonstration on June 26, took part in the next major protest demonstration mentioned earlier, which involved 100,000 people and constituted a powerful action against the government and its war policy (in spite of the involvement in it of forces that were not prepared as yet to campaign consistently against the aggression and to demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli army from Lebanon).

The movement against armed adventures is growing. Anti-war actions encompass a wide range of social sectors and forces of different political views and ideological convictions. The working class, organizations of youth, students and women, associations of academic personnel and others play an important part.

The Arab population of Israel has been making a tangible contribution to the struggle against armed intervention. Last July 10, its spokesmen held a meeting in Nazareth that was also attended by Jewish democratic peace supporters. The meeting formed a Committee Against the War in Lebanon, for Israeli-Palestinian Peace, to work among Israeli Arabs. The committee's action program says that a just and durable peace in the Middle East can only be based on the establishment of an independent Palestinian state next door to the State of Israel, within the boundaries valid before June 4, 1967. In response to the call of the Committee Against the War in Lebanon as well as the National Committee of Heads of Arab Local Authorities, the Arabs in Israel carried out a general strike to protest against the Beirut massacre. The strikers included inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories.

The cold-blooded massacre of defenseless civilians committed by the aggressor and his mercenaries gave rise to an unprecedented wave of anti-war actions in Israel. Many thousands of people joined in demonstrations that swept the country. They condemned the atrocious crimes of the Israeli army and demanded an end to the aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and the resignation of the Begin-Sharon government. On September 25, an anti-war demonstration, the most powerful in the country's history, took place in Tel Aviv; it involved 400,000 people. More and more new facts indicate a change in

the public mood under the impact of events in Lebanon.

However, the situation that is shaping should not be estimated one-sidedly. Along with an increasingly strong anti-war movement, the first in the history of our country to unfold at a time of hostilities, there are developments of an entirely different nature. In spite of the heavy casualties of the Israeli army, chauvinist and militarist sentiments are on the rise. The Establishment in the form of the ruling bloc and a tractable opposition refuses to give up the traditional Zionist slogan "a maximum of land with a minimum of Arabs." Begin and Sharon still manage to mislead masses of people, who still believe in spite of what peace supporters tell them that it is possible to bring about a "final solution" of the Palestinian problem by military means. The pressure of chauvinist ideas also manifests itself in a tendency to justify the authorities' anti-democratic measures, to ignore and even to reconcile oneself to the fascist threat, which is growing against the background of the war in Lebanon.

Much of the responsibility for this trend falls on the leaders of the Labor Party, who have proved unable to advance a political alternative of their own. Most Israelis see in them primarily yes-men of Likud who have no particular difficulty in finding a place for themselves in the ruling bloc, with its wide spectrum of guidelines and views. The party has no formula for tackling social and economic problems. Gad Yacobi, one of its leaders, ex-minister of the Rabin cabinet, has proposed that a state of emergency be declared not only in the military political sphere but also in the economy.

In other words, Likud and the Labor Party leadership do not differ essentially on any home or foreign policy issue. Both parties vigorously support the global strategy of U.S. imperialism spearheaded against the Soviet Union and the socialist community, national and social liberation forces all over the world, and against all fighters for independence and progress in the Middle East and other regions.

#### *Unite against the policy of aggression*

It is extremely important in this situation to strive for the cooperation and unity of all who realize the enormous dangers posed to Israel by persistence in the present official policy, the retention of power by the Begin-Sharon team and the Maarach leadership's continued subservience to it. While some advances toward unity have been made, as I have pointed out, it still lacks proper scope and stability. The thinking of many who are by no means inclined to support the Begin cabinet's policy of aggres-



sion is still dominated by anti-communist views as well as by prejudice against the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

In this connection, I would like to emphasize the following: *Israel's communists have no interests other than those of the Israeli people, which coincide with the interests of the Arab people of Palestine and of a lasting peace in the Middle East and the world.*

The CPI attaches great importance to exposing vicious anti-Soviet falsehoods. Soviet foreign policy is a policy for peace meeting the aspirations of all peoples, those of our region included. And it is perfectly logical that the Soviet Union took a resolute stand against the aggression, the campaign of genocide on Lebanese soil, and extended every kind of support to the just struggle of the Palestinians led by the PLO and the patriots of Lebanon. This stand does not damage Israel or its people in any way. On the contrary, the Israelis' vital interests would benefit no less than the interests of the Palestinians if the policy of aggression and occupation being pursued by the Zionist rulers were renounced and a just Palestinian-Israeli peace were established on the basis of the existence of two states for two peoples.

Calling attention to the dangerous consequences of the invasion of Lebanon to peace in the region and throughout the planet, the Soviet Union has served warning that the aggressor's criminal actions may in the end boomerang against Israel and its people. This is a call for wisdom, for the rejection of illusions fostered by reactionaries, who claim that the future and security of our country can be guaranteed with the U.S. sword, by ending the national existence of the Arab people of Palestine.

The statement made by Leonid Brezhnev, head of the Soviet state, who said that the Soviet Union has helped and will help those who refuse to bow down before the aggressor and seek a just settlement and peace in the Middle East, is a serious warning to the U.S. and Israeli hawks, who forget the lessons of history. We are convinced that all sensible people in our country must think hard about how to break the vicious circle of sanguinary conflicts and wars so as to ensure that the peoples of Israel and Palestine live side by side in security, each in its own sovereign state, and that our country, Israel, is really independent, peace-loving and democratic.

A new manifestation of the Soviet Union's noble intentions was the six-point program<sup>17</sup> put forward by Leonid Brezhnev. The program fully meets the legitimate national interests of

the Israeli people and the peoples of Palestine and other Arab countries and shows the way to settling the dangerous Middle East crisis. This constructive program expresses the desire of all fair-minded people for an end to bloodshed in Lebanon, a just solution of the Palestinian problem and the establishment of lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. Unlike the "Reagan Plan," which provides no solution to the fundamental aspects of the conflict, the Soviet initiative offers a dependable basis for achieving peace and assuring both sides security, independence and sovereignty.

The Communist Party of Israel appeals to the country's peace forces, to all who have a stake in peace between the Israelis and Palestinians on the principles of justice, to demand that the government support the Soviet peace program and to insist on the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East to be attended by Israel, the PLO, the Soviet Union, the United States and other states concerned.

What prompts many of those who differ with the government in today's Israel is not fundamental moral considerations or principles; they merely doubt the realism of the motivations of expansion and the claim to hegemony. There are also those who fear that in the long run the ruling circles' policy may prove disastrous to Israel itself as a Middle East state. Others dread the prospect of almost absolute dependence on the United States.

It is not out of pragmatic considerations that we communists of Israel reject the Zionist rulers' policy; we are principled ideological, political and moral opponents of aggression, occupation and close relations with imperialist warmongers. We have always been consistent defenders of the rights of all peoples, and have championed peace in the region and the world, for we are guided by the lofty humanist ideals of communism and inspired with the theory of scientific socialism, whose foundations were laid by Marx, Engels and Lenin. Now as always, our party will resist the national intolerance of Zionism and every manifestation of jingoism with might and main. At the same time, we are willing in the interest of the struggle against aggression, for a lasting and just peace, to cooperate with any political organization or leader whatever their views or orientation.

The flames of war in Lebanon have not died down as yet, nor is the danger of new rounds of aggression and further expansion over: We communists, like other citizens of Israel, have a great historic responsibility. History is not limited to the present day. The world has re-

peatedly witnessed the end in store for those who wanted to destroy other peoples in the name of a "final solution." We communists condemn this barbarity. We do not want to make others shed tears but wish a happy future for all, including our two fraternal peoples, the Israelis and Palestinians. This is why we are fighting for fundamental changes in Israeli public opinion and official policy.

1. Bloc of extreme right-wing parties and groups. — *Ed.*
2. Comprising the Labor Party of Israel (MAI) and the United Workers' Party (MAPAM). — *Ed.*
3. *Al Hamishmar*, July 11, 1982.
4. See, e.g., *Davar*, June 24, 1982.
5. Subsequent events brought to light the illusive nature of divergences between Tel Aviv and Washington over this issue and similar issues. To avoid dooming the civilian population of the Lebanese capital, which the enraged invaders intended to raze to the ground, the Palestinian contingents withdrew from West Beirut. Thereupon Israeli troops burst in and a massacre of Palestinian refugees followed. This was a treacherous violation of the agreement mediated by the U.S. emissary, Philip Habib. The guarantees of security given by the U.S. to the civilians of Beirut turned out to be a scrap of paper. The world shuddered on hearing about the new horrible crime per-

petrated by the aggressor and his underlings. As for those across the ocean, they did not so much as condemn the murderers who had killed women and children in cold blood.

6. *Davar*, July 13, 1982.
  7. The Israeli invasion of southern Lebanon in 1978. — *Ed.*
  8. *Haaretz*, February 7, 1982.
  9. *International Herald Tribune*, September 3, 1982.
  10. For details, see Naim Ashhab, "The People's Will Is Unbroken — the Struggle Goes On" in *WMR*, October 1982. — *Ed.*
  11. Nablus, a town in the West Bank; Saida, a town in southern Lebanon. — *Ed.*
  12. Menachem Milson headed till the middle of September 1982 the "civilian administration" which the Israeli authorities tried to impose on the occupied territories. — *Ed.*
  13. For details of the Allon plan, see Naim Ashhab, "Beating Back the Drive by Imperialism, Zionism and Reaction" in *WMR*, June 1980. — *Ed.*
  14. *Davar*, July 16, 1982.
  15. Broad-based movement championing a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict but showing inconsistency at times. — *Ed.*
  16. Party of the former minister of defense, Moshe Dayan. It has dissolved itself and is now part of the Likud bloc. — *Ed.*
  17. See *Pravda*, September 16, 1982.
-