



SADAT DISMANTLES NASSERISM

PP 2-3 & 8

WHAT OF OUR WAR PRISONERS MR. KISSINGER ?

In early 1974, over 10,000 Palestinians and Arabs languish in Zionist dungeons for no specific reasons other than alleged terrorism, incitement to rebellion, anti-state acts etc. Practically all detainees are held without charges and without trial. Few are periodically put on trial as a means of «detering others» from participating in resistance activities, and for intimidating the populace in the Occupied Territories.

Israel has maintained a wall of silence as regards the moral, emotional and physical well-being of those gallant, self-respecting Palestinians who have refused to submit to Israeli rule unquestioningly and obediently. And the «benevolent» occupation authorities have applied all methods of torture, brain-washing and persuasion in order to break them and institute the peace of the graveyard throughout Palestine. It has failed. Consequently, the Israelis have refused to open their prisons to newsmen and display the failure of their rehabilitative attempts at producing a docile, submissive, captive population. But we think, after a decade of Israeli persecution of Palestinian freedom fighters and their sympathisers, the time has come for the forces of democracy and progress the World over, to express their solidarity with our prisoners of war and to demand that they be treated as such instead of being treated as criminals. That is, if the Geneva Conventions are being applied scrupulously to Israeli citizens, why can't the same rights be accorded to Palestinians?

While the World's press busied itself reporting on the Israeli war prisoners, and demanding their release, our war prisoners waged hunger strikes resisted Israeli torture and refused to receive visitors and engaged in activities that went unreported by the press and in some instances, were concealed with its connivance.

For this and other reasons, we offer our readers a report that corroborates our indictment of Israel and underscores her brutal treatment of our war prisoners.

«Measures taken by Israel in the (occupied) territories are not only a grave infringement of the rights of the civilian population but present the most formidable obstacle to peaceful negotiation and to a just settlement of the Middle East problem».

The question comes from a recent report drafted by the UN Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories.

The report of the committee comprising delegates from Srilanka, Somalia and Yu-

goslavia, has been presented to the UN General Assembly's Political Committee.

One of the salient features of the report on Israeli violations of the human rights of the Palestinian population living under military occupation is the testimony made by Dr. Israel Shahak, president of the Israeli League for Human Rights.

Commenting last April on the poor conditions under which an estimated 10,000 Palestinians are being detained by Israel — conditions which have instigated a series of strikes by the detained Palestinians themselves — Dr. Shahak said he had interviewed not less than 15 Palestinians from Gaza who had been tortured during interrogation.

Dr. Shahak, who is professor of organic chemistry at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, said he could not reveal the victim's names for fear of reprisal from his government.

Torture methods enumerated by the Israeli professor included flogging; suspending prisoners from ceilings for long periods of time; beating them; placing them in water during the night, and subjecting them to electric shocks.

As early as 1969, E.C. Hodgkin: then foreign Editor of the London Times, had predicted: «Repression (in occupied Palestine) is severe and acts of resistance are multiplying, as yet the stage of massive reprisals and collective punishments has not been reached. But eventually, if things go on as they are now, it will come».

Evidence of Hodgkin's prediction is found in the soaring number of Palestinian civilians and guerrillas crowding the military occupier's 17 jails and countless detaining centers.

Although no exact figure of the number of Palestinians crowding Israeli jails is available, the magnitude of this number can be obtained from various statements — albeit contradictory statements — made by Israeli officials and lawyers.

In March 1973, Israel's Prison Commissioner Aric Nir was quoted by the Jerusalem Post as saying there were 3,000 Palestinian «commandos» behind Israeli prison bars. Nir remained tight-lipped on the number of Palestinian civilians facing the same fate — particularly that the military occupier has given himself the right to round up «suspects» without charge.

On May 13, 1971, Israel's daily «Maariv» admitted that, in Gaza alone, no less than 5,600 Palestinians appeared before Israeli courts between April 1970 and April 1971. Of these, 27 were sentenced to life.

Felicia Langer, a Jewish Lawyer who has been crusading against Zionist crimes in occupied Palestine, writes :

«The systematic policy of conviction in occupied territories, where appeal courts do not exist, allow the conviction of people arbitrarily — without consideration for health, age or circumstances... Those (Palestinians) who are able to have a lawyer are lucky. Many are the victims of Administrative Internment Rule No. 111, which allow the imprisonment of anybody without charge or trial. To my mind, such laws should be called the law of Life Imprisonment because no one, under such conditions, knows when he will be freed again».

Langer's statement is substantiated by a similar one by Hodgkin: «Suspects are frequently held for months at a time without trial, without their whereabouts being known and without Lawyers or relatives being able to visit or contact them...»

More recently, the Zionist occupiers extended the realm of their so-called «legal jurisdiction» outside the borders of the Zionist settler-state.

An Israeli military court, in fact, ruled last July that it was competent to try suspected Arab commandos who have never set foot in occupied territories. The commandos were captured by the Israeli armed forces during a raid on Lebanon. The defending council, composed of Mrs. Langer and Ali Rafi' from Haifa had agreed that it would be contrary to international law to try persons in Israel for offenses they had not committed in territory controlled by Israel and who had been brought to the country against their will.

In «sensitive» areas, the occupier undertakes mass arrests to encourage the native Palestinians to leave their Homeland. In Hebron, for instance, where the occupation forces are preparing a Zionist settlement against the will of the Palestinian population, the police arrested last July 19, as many as 50 young men following an attack on an Israeli soldier.

On the words of Hodgkin, «this (Palestinian) population in the occupied territory stands in the way of Israel's expansion policy. As it would be much simpler if these were not there, every effort is being made to persuade them to go...»

Such efforts include not only arbitrary detention and sentencing, but torture as well.

Says Felicia Langer : «I, as a Lawyer, can maintain before anybody that I have seen traces of beating and scars on the bodies of my clients. On several occasions I protested vehemently against such treatments before martial courts. In all hearings, there is mention of these tortures with specifications about places where

re they were inflicted as well as direct testimonies by people who were in a position to see the victims being released by their torturers.»

On April 1, 1970, Amnesty International, the respected London-based private organization that investigates cases of wrongful imprisonment, ill-treatment and torture throughout the world, decided to publish a report in which it said it could not ignore «the apparent existence (in Israel) of practices which are abhorrent to the conscience of man-kind.»

The Amnesty International report said «allegations made to Amnesty's representatives during their investigations cannot be brushed aside. The forms of the alleged tortures were clearly described. The prisons, centers of interrogation, the periods within which torture was alleged to have taken place, and descriptions, names — or pseudonyms, — of the alleged tortures were also given...»

Needless to say that the Israeli government turned a deaf ear to Amnesty's appeal to set-up a Commission of Inquiry to investigate the charges.

Strikes against the ill-treatment and torture of Palestinian prisoners have been on again, off-again in Israeli prisons since 1967. In 1973 alone, such strikes have erupted in jails in Nablus, Beersheba, Ramleh, Shatta, Hebron, Ashkelon, Beit Leed, Kfar Younah and Gaza.

In October 1969, over six thousand Palestinian prisoners went on a 6-day hunger strike in Israeli jails to protest the sub-human conditions of their detention. In September 1971, a similar massive strike was staged by Palestinian prisoners in Ashkelon.

Although the hunger strikes in the prisons are usually triggered by the death of an inmate under torture, an idea of detention conditions can be obtained from a recent list of demands presented to the occupation authorities by the head of municipalities on the West Bank.

Among the demands were :

1. A halt to torture
2. A reduction on heavy sentences
3. A ban on forcing the prisoners to contribute through forced labor to the Israeli war effort.
4. An improvement in food and health conditions in the prisons.

Boasts Israeli Prison Commissioner Nir «Anyone who calls these prisons (where Palestinians are detained) «rest homes» has never seen one. The ones reserved for terrorists (sic) are considerably harsher than those for Israeli criminals. And these too are no Hiltons...»

”



SADAT DISMANTLES NASSERISM

Egypt — the pivot of the Arab world — is being denasserized; the Arab world is being hitched anew to the locomotive of imperialism; Arab relations with the liberation movements and the Socialist countries are being severed with a view to reviving the post-war class alliance of religious fanatics, feudal vampires, capitalist hucksters and foreign depredators. The new class despotism which is being imposed is being sold as modernism, democratization, the expansion of freedom, and the coming of affluence.

Despotism is taking the sham form of parliamentarianism or Sadatism which may be defined as the negation of Nasserism and the reintroduction of a polished Neguibism* in the age of «detente» and world-wide probes and realignments.

* *Neguib was the bogus chairman of the Free Officers Association which toppled King Farouk on July 23, 1952. Neguib himself was removed as president of the Egyptian republic in 1954 in a dispute with Nasser regarding the role of the officers in the new state and the traditional Egyptian institutions, which Neguib had hoped to reform rather than overthrow.*

For a clearer understanding of Sadatism, it has to be defined against its Nasserite backgrounds, rather than being defined in terms of the Marxist perspective which precludes it by definition. Moreover, since Nasserism as a world-view is incompatible with Marxism, it does not follow however, that Marxism is completely antagonistic to it. Indeed, Marxism regards Nasserism as a progressive phenomenon that contributed considerably to the democratic stage of the Egyptian-Arab revolution, abolished feudalism, set in motion new forces of light and progress. Consequently, what is required of Nasserism and Nasserites at the moment, is further deepening of its progressive aspects, mobilization of its bewildered and confused masses and a new leadership to make it a vital and living force again.

Before the argument is advanced further, what is Nasserism as opposed to Sadatism? How do the two differ? and, how do they complement each other? Nasserism was the Arabization of Egypt and the Egyptianization of Arabs, whereas Sadatism is the Islamization of Arabs and the Americanization of Egypt. Put concretely, both Nasserism and Sadatism begin with Egypt as the home base and the constituent elements of both «isms» are roughly the same except the order of priority is almost reversed when four

evaluative criteria are invoked: politics, economics, social affairs, and personal status.

Since Nasser's Egypt was the home of Arabism, it waged relentless struggles against traditional colonialism and neo-colonialism. As such, every colonially persecuted Arab found a haven in Cairo; every revolutionary Arab obtained arms and succor from Cairo; and every black African and Asian democrat was given a platform in Cairo. In brief, Cairo's Arabism made Cairo not only the citadel of all Arabs, but also the fountainhead of revolution of all oppressed the world over. Furthermore, Cairo's Arabism was a vital link in the chain of the emerging world of liberation, non-alignment, and socialist development. Consequently, friend and foe were clearly defined and policies regarding both stemmed from an ever-mushrooming circle of commitment and class identification.

Now Sadat's Islamism (the making of fundamentalist Islam the cornerstone of domestic and foreign policies) blurs and confuses Nasserite distinctions, encompasses the same features of Nasserism, retains most of its rhetoric, though it has since its ascent to power (Sept. 28, 1970) disgorged the Nasserite contents. Sadatism takes from Nasserism its earlier class solidarity and applies it indiscriminately on

a world-wide scale. For instance, on the verbal level, diametrically opposed social forces such as those embodied in the Soviet Union and the U.S. are put on a par. Unconsciously borrowing from the «convergence» theoreticians of the West, Sadatism and its protagonists espouse the maintenance of a balance of forces between the super-industrial giants and explain the U.S. — Soviet «detente» in terms of industrial civilization, rather than being a temporary pause in the international class conflict as opposed to the nation-states' struggles and the scramble to divide the world into imperialist spheres of influence. As a result of this one-dimensional view of reality, Pakistanis and Indians are put on equal footing; Saudis, Syrians, Iraqis and Algerians are considered brothers of equal stature; Ethiopians, Tanzanians and Guineans are viewed as fellow Africans without discrimination; and to top it all up, all Egyptians are classified as Sadat's «children» and his wife Jihan is worshipped as the «mother» of the Egyptians fighting the common enemy, Israel. However, facts and slogans contradict each other. The facts are: America, not the Soviet Union is the real ally, according to Sadatism; West Europe, not the liberation movements and the non-aligned states are the friend; Israel is the transitional enemy and neither

Israel nor America is the ineluctable historic enemy; Feisal is the equal without equal who determines Arab destiny in conjunction with Sadat and the U.S. instead of being treated as an American-manufactured regional power to oppress the Arabs; and, finally, Sadat's «children» are conceived of as subjects, not citizens who must obey their sovereign father without questions or suffer the consequences should they protest his counsel. In other words, political Sadatism orbits in the world of Islam, non-alignment, the Arab World and the U.N. And in all its orbiting, it is reaching for the American sun, the European constellations, the Afro-Asian stars and the Soviet trail.

On the economic level, Nasserism meant the progressive adoption of a mixed economy with an ever growing predominance of the public over the private sector; the liquidation of the comprador feudal bourgeoisie; the sequestration of foreign capital; the nationalization of stolen public properties such as the Suez Canal company; the encouragement of national capital; the building of an industrial base and the development of Egyptian and Arab societies. In sum, Nasserist economics tied independence to economic growth and stipulated a correlation between the two in order to achieve, maintain and enhance national prosperity, individual well-being, enlightened citizenship and a humanist-universalist outlook. Nasser realized in the mid-fifties if Egypt were to become a liberation fortress (especially after the Bandung Conference of April 1955) it had to have a strong national economy based on the solid foundation of heavy industrialization, adequate infrastructure, a skilled and educated labor force and a more equitable distribution of land ownership. He therefore set out to redistribute the land, provide needed communal services and to expropriate foreign enterprises. But when capital flights increased in the post-Suez era, he embarked on a 3-year industrial program (57-60), then launched the first Five Year Plan (60-65) and the second (65-70) which ended with his death.

As the national economy expanded — Nasser's critics called it «statist», Nasser nationalized the Banks of Misr and the National Bank of Egypt in 1960 and introduced the Socialist decrees of July, 1961 in what was termed the «Social Suez War». By March 1964, when the decrees had taken full effect, «the public sector accounted for 91% of all investment and 85% of all means of production», according to Asad Abdul-Rahman in his doctoral dissertation: *Military Bureaucracy, Politics and Society in Egypt: The Era of Nasir*. (April, 1973) Although Abdul-Rahman interprets Nasserite policies as a means to «weaken adversaries by economic measures» and a «struggle over decision-making» in economics and politics, he nevertheless concedes that Nasser established a strong public sector and grouped it around 38 state agencies that organized the 367 nationalized companies on a sectorial basis. And with the advantage of hindsight,

Abdul-Rahman comments: «Every aspect of Egyptian life had to rotate in a predetermined orbit and always around one center - Nasir and the new political bureaucracy.» (p. 96.)

It is at this juncture that economic Sadatism interposes itself and threatens to topple the whole Nasserite apparatus in the name of «democracy, freedom and prosperity». Put succinctly, Sadat hopes to strengthen the private at the expense of the public sector on a well-known road trodden by both Ataturk's Turkey and the Iran of Shahanshah. That is, since the feudal and comprador classes loved their capital more than their countries, they took it elsewhere and invested it profitably. Therefore, the state had to assume the role of investor, educator and technician until the economic foundation of the state was firmly established. Thereupon, the capitalists returned to «their» countries in order to enjoy the fruits of other's labor. What is strange is that the same phenomenon is being repeated in Egypt and it is being carried out openly, speedily and shamelessly. So much so that the state is practically auctioning 49% of the public sector which has been eviscerated, if its entire blood stream has not been punctured. Needless to say, the Arabic press as a whole has hardly taken notice of this dangerous development and the reconquest of Egypt by foreign capital. However, those in whose interests the changes are being made have written glowingly and some analytically regarding the matter. Here are samples from Western and Egyptian sources:

a) John Leech of the *Financial Times* (Jan. 18, 1974) notes that «there are not many western tourists (in Cairo) but the main hotels abound with businessmen

from Britain, the U.S. and Europe, from other parts of the Arab world, from Japan and, of course, from the eastern bloc.» Then Leech enumerates the wheedlers of his living ecstasy: «After a few days the word any visitor will most closely associate with Egypt is 'welcome'. 'Welcome' from the immigration officer at Cairo airport and from the pretty girl customs officer; 'Welcome' from the taxi driver, the hotel clerk, the waiters and the people you have come to see. 'Are you British? American? Welcome, welcome.' You hear it everywhere and are over-whelmed with courtesy. In the street you consult your map and you will quickly be involved in a conversation with an Egyptian who will tell you he is a 'Doctor of Archaeology trained at King's College'. You are 'welcome' in Egypt and he wants to guide you to repay similar favours done for him by Britons while in London.»

b) From wheedlers in Cairo we move to a sober-minded rational analysis proffered by the voice of international finance, the *British Economist*, to its business clientele. The *Economist* points out that Dr. Abdul-Aziz Hegazi, the minister of finance and foreign trade is likely to become prime minister and when he does, his confirmation «in the job would symbolise and accelerate Egypt's drive to dismantle President Nasser's Arab socialism. He is no believer in total state control of banks, basic industry and other large firms, nationalisation of most foreign investment and economic links mainly with the Soviet bloc. Instead, he will be looking for Arab money and western know-how. So far, Arab money has been chocked off by Egypt's perennial payments weakness, and by memories of Nasser's national-

sations in which Arab banks were nationalised along with the rest.

Near the head of the queue of western investors, Phillips Petroleum (oil in the western desert) and Pfizer already have joint ventures in Egypt, British Leyland has pulled out of Israel, and this week (the Arab countries were considering whether to take it off the blacklist; this would enable it to revive its Middle East sales network and it might set up plants in Egypt, Lebanon or Saudi Arabia. Egypt's newly-revived policy of free zones ought to be a help. The foreign investor can import components freely, with nil tariffs, provided he sets up in approved industries and areas.» (the *Economist*, Jan. 26, 1974. p. 91.)

c) Lest it be thought we're only relying on Western sources, let us cite an interview given to the newly acquired western friends which was not made available to Arab sources. Sharif Lotfy, the under secretary of finance and economy justifies the new trend in the following manner: «The traditional agricultural economy in Egypt (where farming still accounts for half the labour force and a third of the national income) meant large differences in the past between rich and poor. Narrowing this gap, however has meant that for the last 20 years the role of government was too much emphasized.

Now it's time to run the economy in a more decentralized way. So we are allowing market forces to play a larger role in the price system, and allocation of resources. One of the first steps has been to stimulate foreign trade by a partial lifting of exchange controls. Hard-currency receipts for tourism and 'non-traditional exports' may be used to purchase imports, except consumer goods, without need for government clearance. Wide areas of agricultural exports still do not fall under this plan, but the idea is to enlarge the areas of free exchange gradually. We can't fully liberalize all foreign trade, so we're doing it by steps.

In an effort to attract foreign investment, the government has also created industrial 'free zones,' on the Mediterranean coast and near Cairo, where manufacturers may import and export free of duty or government control. We are giving five years' tax exemption for these enterprises, plus guarantees against any nationalization or other nontrade risk. To back up these guarantees, Egypt has signed a convention under the auspices of the World Bank for international arbitration on any disputes concerning foreign investment.»

The interviewer, the Associated Press of the U.S.A. happily places the Lotfy interview of the press wire and introduces it by the following remarks: «Egypt has a little-publicized but potentially significant plan to revive the private sector of its battered economy.



CONTINUED
ON PAGE [8]

HABASH : LIBERATION NOT NEGOTIATION

2

In the last issue of the Bulletin (9) we published the first part of this interview which was originally granted by Dr. George Habash, Secretary-General of the P.F.L.P., to the Italian «Il Manifesto». The original was published on January 29-30/74. In this issue we publish the remainder of the interview since the issues discussed then if anything are as relevant now as the time of their discussion.

Q. 2. How does the PFLP evaluate the Syrian and Iraqi positions ?

Q. 3. What is the Egyptian political role in the present stage?

What is your evaluation of the Feisal-Sadat axis?

A. 2 & 3 The PFLP's evaluation of the present Arab conditions is centrally based on the conflict between two lines that crystalized since the October war. This evaluation is not in disagreement with the PFLP's strategic look before the war, but stems from it and emphasizes its basic features.

1. The line that holds to the positive achievements of the October war and aims to overcome its negative results. In other words the line that holds more to the ability of the Palestinian and Arab masses in their abilities and the inevitability of victory through releasing its capabilities for the continuation of the struggle.

2. The line that is more convinced after the October war that it cannot achieve victory over the enemy without sacrificing its own class interests which insures the victory. This line depends more now in its political direction towards a settlement on the basis of safeguarding its personal interests to that of the battle and the struggle.

The Arab political division between these two lines is not geographical as it appears for the first instance. That is to say that Iraq is in the first line and Egypt in the second. For in Egypt itself there is a very wide mass force that struggles in the direction of the first line. There is an internal battle between these two lines in all of the Arab region including the Palestinian one as well, although the majority of this line or that appears to be different in this region or that. While we

see that the Iraqi forces who fought heroically in the October war refuse the proposed Kissinger settlement, and we see that the Egyptian regime puts forward all the concessions it can to make successful the settlement, the Syrian regime ties its approval to the Security Council resolution 338 with a special understanding that views Israeli withdrawal from all occupied territories in 1967 as a precondition in addition to the respect of the lawful rights of the Palestinian people.

Our position concerning these various Arab states is crystal clear. We are a revolutionary Arab force as much as we are a Palestinian revolutionary force. As such the battle between these two lines that are mentioned above spreads all over the Arab region and is also our battle. Without reservations we are with the political and social forces of the first line in every Arab state from Mauritania to Bahrein and against the forces of capitulation. And of course we have in every position of this large battle an evaluation of the nature of the fighting forces, the limits and the size of the necessary local alliances for the interest of the whole revolutionary process in the area.

We believe that this explanation of the PFLP's present position answers question number 2 regarding Syria and Iraq and question number 3 regarding the Egyptian role and the Faisal-Sadat axis.

Q. 4. What is the PFLP evaluation of Faisal's oil policy? Does this policy guarantee Faisal's independence from the U.S.? Or is it a U.S. policy to strike European and Japanese interests?

A. 4. The oil in the Arab countries as it is in the other underdeveloped countries is exposed since its discovery to the

ugliest process of thievery and exploitation by the Imperialist monopolist oil companies. And it has presented in this century the most important target that the Arab homeland has faced of Imperialist military and political attacks that reached a barbaric level. It is very natural that one of our basic struggles, and that of the Arab national progressive forces is the enabling the Arab masses to liberate themselves and liberate their sources of which oil is top priority. So it is natural that we support every step that is directed against the thievery operation and we were, as were all of the Arab masses, highly in favor of the Arab steps taken in this field such as the nationalisation of the Iraqi Petroleum Company and its pipelines in Iraq and Syria a year and a half ago, and also support the measures taken in Libya and Algeria.

In addition to this, our principal position that oil is one of the main Arab weapons in the battle of liberation that is waged by the Palestinian and Arab masses. We demanded since the outset of our struggle with the necessity of striking the imperialist interests in the Arab homeland, specially the oil interests. Particularly during the October war this became a demand that the masses insisted upon. It is impossible for the Arab masses to accept the fact that the air bridge which was continuously supplying the enemy with all kinds of weapons to protect and expand its aggression was consuming Arab oil. They would not maintain their silence!

The popular demands were summarized as follows:

1. Cessation of the oil flow to all countries that support the enemy especially the U.S.A.
2. Nationalization of these countries' shares in the oil companies, and the nationalization of all their interests in our countries.

With the increase of the insistence of the Arab masses on these demands, the Arab governing reactionary regimes in most of the oil countries were not capable of keeping the oil weapon neutral in the battle. We cannot deny that the usage of this weapon received a welcome from the masses.

Principally we support all measures that liberate the Arab oil and strikes the thievery operation that it is exposed to, and principally we are for the use of oil in the battle.

But we are the first to object to the methods used by the reactionary Arab regimes. We took the initiative of writing a long analysis concerning this matter in our central organ — Al Hadaf. The main points can be summarized as follows:

1. The cessation of oil to the U.S.A., and diminishing the amount exported to other countries is by no way a substitute to the necessity of nationalizing U.S. interests. This nationalization we consider the basis for the usage of oil in the battle.
2. The method that was used by Arab

reaction in this field leads to an unequal harm between the U.S., Europe and Japan. This brings to the U.S. more profit than it loses by the cessation of Arab oil to it.

3. The increase of oil prices by the Arab countries is a legitimate right and a demand to be insisted upon. But this without the nationalization of the oil companies brings the majority of the profits to the accounts of the oil monopolies of which the U.S. share is 60%.
4. Nationalization alone is capable of correcting this unequal harm that the U.S. benefits from. The policy of diminishing oil production without distinguishing among friends and enemies and neutrals does not serve the Arab interest. It might enable the U.S. and the hostile propaganda machinery to create a wave of animosity towards the Arabs. It might also enable the U.S. to convince Europe and Japan to support its policy through claiming that they cannot guarantee continuous Arab oil supply except through the success of its policy which aims at the control of the whole area.

Events have proven our comments. According to the Far East Economic Review «By exploiting the present oil crisis the western oil industry have increased its profits 44% as compared to the same period last year. During the third quarter

of the present year «Exxon's» profits increased 80%, «Gulf's» increased 91%, «Mobil's» 64%, «Standard Oil of India» 37%, «Getty» 71%».

The New York Times wrote the following: «What concerns the international oil companies, the sudden increase in the price of international oil, was accompanied by a great increase in their profits.»

This is one example of the limited and more appropriately non-existent impact of the oil weapon in the absence of the nationalization of Imperialist oil interests.

Q. 5. Imperialism is rearranging the area in a way to stabilize it under the leadership of Faisal and Sadat. What are the tasks of the Resistance Movement, militarily, politically and socially at the present stage?

A. 5. Pin-pointing the revolutionary task in any stage calls in addition to the understanding of the nature of that stage, the specification of the central points of that stage, the specification of the central points or point that governs the movement and expressions in that stage.

Regarding the Palestinian Resistance Movement and the Arab national liberation movement there are two central issues that we must face at this stage. The first is the continuation of armed struggle and the increase of that struggle through involving more powers of the Palestinian and Arab masses in all the military and non-military battles. The second is to face the dangers surrounding the existence of the Palestinian Resistance, which mani-

fest themselves in the attempt to liquidate it or liquidate its cause. This is centralized now in the Geneva Conference which is known as the «Peace Conference», and the politics that it contains as we pointed out previously. Resisting the danger cannot be done except by the following:

1. Preservation of the unity of the Resistance Movement, and strengthening of this unity by mobilizing the widest mass base and its powers, by rejecting the liquidation operation prepared at this time. Such an emphasis on national unity and its structure as well as its revolutionary political line are the conditions capable of silencing those elements who are deviating from the line, without causing a split in the resistance.
2. To work to the utmost possible to coordinate and develop the Arab revolutionary effort that is carried out by all the progressive forces in the Arab homeland. Depending on the positive results of the October war so as to curtail the setback of the regimes and what this represents

principal position, regarding the external operations of the resistance. In short, the clash on the external front is a confrontation between the Palestinian people who were uprooted from their homeland and dispersed abroad in the presence of the forces and interests that still work and assist in the continuation of the state of dispersion and uprooting.

This existence outside the Palestinian and the Arab Front provides the external confrontation its legitimacy. But in our opinion as a revolutionary organization with a proletarian internationalist scope, this legitimacy should be guided with a safe look at the interests of the Palestinian, Arab and International movement.

Concerning every operation that we are responsible for we are required to evaluate the costs and the benefits that are achieved by the revolutionary movement on all levels, Palestinian, Arab and international.

But at the same time we do not represent all the uprooted and dispersed Palestinian people, and we do not plan all the foreign operations. Hence we can not guarantee the wisdom and the correctness of all operations that take place outside, neither the outcome to the interest of the



of political dangers on the Palestinian level, the Resistance and the revolutionary Arab national liberation movement.

Q. 6. What is the P.F.L.P.'s position concerning the «Rome Massacre». In addition what do you think of the Imperialist powers who are attempting of placing the blame of the «Rome Massacre» on the Palestinian revolution and in particular the P.F.L.P. ?

A. 6. Before entering the details of the Rome operation we should clarify our

revolutionary movement. It is only natural that the dispersed and uprooted Palestinian people express their national aspirations and justified wrath in ways and means that might be wrong in certain cases. In other words to exercise this legitimate external confrontation which is derived from the nature of the Palestinians presence with the enemy abroad, in ways that are not controllable by any revolutionary political line.

Such characteristics fit the last «Rome Operation» which we had nothing to do with. In addition the PFLP supported the resolution of the Central Council of the

P.L.O. to form an investigative committee to probe into the background of the operation and to determine who is behind it. Upon the termination of the investigation, the facts will be publicly released.

Q. 7. After the October war, it became clear that there is a rightist trend in Israel; in your opinion what is the role played by the U.S. to influence this trend? What is the situation of the Red Front inside Israel?

A. 7. Throughout the first days of the war, the PFLP studied the various possible contingencies likely to result from the war specially as regards the internal impact of the war on Israel. We reached the conclusion that the human, material and political losses that the Israeli entity would suffer would usher important political changes. We specified it as follows :

1. A defeat to the ruling circle of Zionism.
2. The growth of two lines: One on the right of the present leadership. The second on the «left» of that leadership, we called it the Nahum Goldman line.
3. We also noticed the growth of the radical line which is represented through the following parties and organizations: Rakah, Matzpen, Siah, Black Panthers and the anti-war elements among the students, youth and intellectuals.

We expected that the balance of power of these changes will be determined (size and percentage) by the length of the war and its military, economic and political results.

We believe that the shortcomings of the October war which the Arab political leadership bears responsibility for, is what made capable the rise of the right wing in Israel. Depending on the results of the war, the right wing justified Israeli losses to only military and political mistakes that the leadership had committed and accordingly this wing claimed that it could have avoided it. It presents as proof the partial victories that Israeli army was capable of achieving towards the end.

This is regarding the internal effects of strengthening the extreme right wing inside Israel. As for the external effects we notice that the U.S. propaganda machinery has contributed greatly in making this prominent. Although the U.S. depends on the ruling wing in Israel, it sees that the presence of the extreme right wing allows it to employ it as means to pressure the Arab regimes for more concessions.

This is regarding the extreme right. Regarding the Red Front, the subject to a great extent enters the issue of the security of the revolution. The PFLP looks at the Red Front as a historical symptom which forms a very important dimension of the struggle in the future. In the view of the PFLP it is inevitable that many Jews will rebel against the

Zionist ideology and liberate themselves from its ranks and limits. Their look that their interest is common with the revolutionary Arab forces to build a democratic socialist society which presents the just and peaceful solution to all national, religious and racial problems.

Q. 8. Does the PFLP believe that there is a possibility of the Resistance Movement being attacked militarily during the Peace Conference or after it.

A. 8. Those who are part of the «Peace Conference specially the participating Arab regimes have a dual look at the Palestinian Resistance Movement. They need the Palestinian side to participate in the settlement which they were not capable of acquiring from outside the ranks of the Resistance Movement. On the other side they considered the Resistance with its revolutionary dimension as not being that side, or the contrary are that might present the main obstacle in the way of reaching a settlement.

On the basis of this dual look which contains the need for the resistance and the need for its participation, the work now is in the direction to squeeze the revolutionary content out of the Resistance, hence to eliminate its danger for the possible settlement. Also to transfer the Resistance to an entity without a mass revolutionary content which will make it an easy prey for cooption. This policy moulds very closely the political battle taking place now within the Resistance and tries to be on its results. It might find it necessary at a certain time that the result of the battle to its favor might come through a certain military attack on the presence of the Resistance here or there. We suspect that Israel is the first possible agent that will carry out such an attack or the Lebanese regime which falls second in line.

The first possibility is most probable, and might manifest itself through an Israeli attack on southern Lebanon, which will provide the chance to bring the Lebanese water resources in the Geneva Conference. Or it might manifest itself in special Israeli operations that will enable the Arab regimes and their propaganda machinery to compare between their «victories» during the October war and the «inability» of the resistance even in defending itself.

In considering all of the above, we notice that the essential position by the U.S. is to amnept to line the Resistance Movement into participating in the capitulation plan. The major danger lies in the pressure that the reactionary Arab regimes are applying so as to insure Washington's goal of bringing the Resistance to Geneva. In addition the already anticipated attacks from both Israel, Jordan and Lebanon to liquidate the resistance will act as another agent that would push the Resistance in participating in this capitulationist operation.



CAN MEIR'S GOVERNMENT SOLVE ISRAEL'S PROBLEMS?

After weeks of indecision, internal strife and power struggles, Golda Meir has finally announced the formation of a new government whose political program differs little if any with previous programs of the Israeli government.

Meir in outlining her government's program accentuated the following points:

- A. Israel retains the «right» to strike the «terrorists», and their corresponding bases. In addition, Israel views any country that supports or houses these «terrorists» as responsible for their actions.
- B. More importantly, Israel refuses to go back to the borders of June 4, 1967, because they do not provide her with «defensible» and «secure» borders.
- C. Moreover Israel opposes the establishment of an independent Palestinian state on the West Bank and Gaza.
- D. Finally, Israel opposes Palestinian participation or representation in the Geneva conference.

Upon the issuance of the Zionist state's program, Radio Damascus said: «This program is a reaffirmation of Zionist strategy based on expansion and occupation and the continuous refusal of returning to the borders of pre June 1967.»

Israel's Position is no surprise, in fact only by changing their basic program would we have been surprised. In short, Israel continues to be a colonial settler-state that occupies the land of Palestine by negating the right of its rightful inhabitants, the Palestinian people in exile.

Syria's position and that of other Arab countries (excluding Egypt and Saudi Arabia who have already capitulated to the Imperialist demands) must be posited in a proper historical framework so as to make sense of the present political realities.

As P.F.L.P. we have outlined our position (in P.F.L.P. Bulletin No. 9, and elsewhere in this issue) as to why we refuse at this point and time the establishment of a Palestinian state and participation in the Geneva conference. As of yet there is no united Palestinian position, but if we have obstacles to overcome, the obstacles that lie in front of Syria and other Arab regimes if they were to accept capitulation seem to be equally difficult if not more.

Historically, the Palestine question ever since World War II and more precisely since the partition plan of Palestine of Nov. 29, 1947 has occupied central stage in Arab politics. Moreover, the mass reaction to the Arab defeat in the Palestine war of 1948 gave rise to three major political developments:

1. Strong opposition of the Arab masses



ses to the establishment of the state of Israel;

2. The prestige of the governing elite deteriorated - basically due to their poor performance during the Arab-Israeli war;
3. Emergence of a new and more conscious movement of Arab vengeance, inspired by a determination on the part of Arab youth to face the challenge, i.e. liberation.

Briefly, the 1948 war fulfilled the function of what Marx described as: «This is the uplifting aspect of war, it tests a nation. Just as mummies instantly fall apart when exposed to the atmosphere, so war pronounces a death sentence on all institutions that no longer possess vitality.»

These trends were to «pronounce a death sentence» on the old institutions of Arab politics and give rise to a host of political developments and changes.

These major developments grew as the first phase of the Arab renaissance (Nahda) was culminating in national movements dedicated to independence by extirpating colonialism from the Arab world. The creation of Israel at that historical juncture was then met by a mass public outrage. So although Anti-colonialism-Imperialism and corruption were major pillars in the arena of social mobilization, none was as important as Palestine. In short, Palestine became the running score of Arab politics. Both right and left wing had sworn to rid themselves of this alien body in their midst.

Initially as a reaction to the Arab defeat in the 1948 war, a wave of political assassinations took place, directed against people who were either responsible for the defeat or had collaborated with the enemy.



On Dec. 4, 1948 Nukrashi Pasha, Prime Minister of Egypt, was assassinated. July 20, 1951, King Abdullah of Jordan was assassinated by a Palestinian in Jerusalem. And early in the 50's Riad Solh, Prime Minister of Lebanon, was assassinated in Amman.

In addition, the defeat of 1948 gave impetus to new revolutionary parties and secret societies i.e. the Arab Nationalist Movement. The above coupled with a wave of coups d'etat in Egypt (1952), Syria underwent three coups d'etat in 1949 followed by others in 1963, 1966. And Iraq underwent three coups in 1958, 1963, 1968. These political movements — both the parties and the political change over through military take-over were expressions of a more radical tendency propogating Arab unity, Socialism and Palestinian militancy. These political developments and their accompanying slogans are what the Arab masses were nurtured upon. This means that if any present leadership in Syria or elsewhere attempts to negate this process of political development by accepting the right of Israel to exist would necessarily be met with hostility on the part of the Arab masses.

Now with the new political conditions after the October war, Imperialism is doing its utmost to prod the Arab regimes to recognize Israel and to capitulate to their demands by participating in the Geneva conference so as to legitimize the U.S. proposed «Peace solutions». What the U.S. did not take into account is:

- A. The response of the Arab masses who have been nurtured all their lives with anti-Imperialism and anti-Zionism;
- B. Israel's refusal to acknowledge new facts i.e. its total dependence on U.S. imperialism.

At this point we must invoke the dictum of «turning our weaknesses into strengths». We recognize the obstacles facing us, but then we also know that Imperialism cannot undo all the political socialization of the Arab masses—which means that Arab rulers if they do not want to commit political suicide, will have to remain bound to the masses' desires.

Secondly, as long as Israel refuses to recognize its own weaknesses, then the Imperialist plans for the region will be more difficult to actualize. It remains for us to strengthen our revolutionary capacity so as to come out of this phase of the struggle on a new ascent towards total liberation. In short, not only must we turn our weaknesses into strengths, but rather we must use the enemy's weaknesses as part of our arsenal in our protracted struggle:

In spite of the statement made by the People's Front for the Liberation of Oman and the Arabian Gulf on the Iranian invasion of the Central Region of the liberated rurals and the interference of the foreign forces in the Sultanate and in spite of the reaction and resentment over the Iranian invasion by the Arab mass circles and their forces and national and democratic organisations, and national liberation movements as well as forces of peace in the Arab homeland and the entire world, yet the Information Ministry of the Sultanate and its information instruments continued to deny the invasion to direct its



abuses and cheap insults not to the revolution alone but also to all patriots, progressives and honest people of the world and regarded such stands by them as to express an international conspiracy being woven by the communist movement against the Arab nation and the puppet Qaboos regime.

But finally the puppets came out with the reality which they often tried to deny and to hide. Finally the puppets started to condemn such acts by them and their criminal policy and national treason. Qaboos stood to tell the world: «Forgive us. We were lying to you all time and we were hoping behind this to make you believe our lies and deceits. But this did not happen. So, forgive us» Qaboos told the Lebanese newspaper al-Hawadeth on 8th February: «No one came to our help other than the Shah of Iran.» In fact, the Qaboos continued, «the Iranians landed at Sallalah airports but did not land on the islands. This is something not secret and we did not try to hide.»

Such statement by the Qaboos came to couple the statement made by the puppet Shah to the Londonite Daily Telegraph and quoted by Agence France Presse on 8th February in which he said: «The Iranian infantry forces, operating in the Sultanate of Oman — performed glorious work by opening the road of Dhofar which is lying between Sallalah and Muscat.» He added: «The Sultan of Oman asked for our help and we responded to his request. We are, also, ready to respond to any request by any ruler in the Gulf in the event that his regime is subject to danger.»



RESOLUTE SUPPORT OF BALUCHISTAN & IRANIAN PATRIOTIC FORCES

«The Democratic People's party of Baluchistan and the Committee for the Solidarity with the Kurdish People in Iran have issued a joint declaration in which they expressed their support for the Palestinian people, and confirmed their support for the revolutionary war waged by the people of the Arabian Gulf under the leadership of PFLOAG against the puppet regime in Oman, the Union of Arab Emirates, British military occupation, American imperialism and the oil monopolies.

They hail the principled stand of the P.D.R.Y. in supporting the revolution in the Arabian Gulf.

The Democratic People's Party condemned the use of Baluchi soldiers by British imperialism, in their war of annihilation against the people of Oman denounced the support, of both equipment and personnel, given by the Iranian and Pakistan governments to the regime in Oman and calls upon the Baluchi soldiers to desert the mercenary army and join the People's Liberation Army in the Gulf.

The declaration condemned the new expansionist policy of the Shah in the Arabian Gulf, clearly demonstrated by the occupation of the Arab islands, Abu Mousa, Tamb al Kobra and Tamb al Soughra. We condemn the role of the Shah's regime in policing the imperialist oil interests in the area. The two organisations consider the struggle of the Arab people in Arabistan as part of the struggle of the Arab national liberation movement».

«Sawt Al-Thawra» Feb. 28/74 Vol. 2 No. 88

SAWT AL-THAWRA

Biweekly Review
Published by

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT
FOR THE LIBERATION
OF OMAN AND THE
ARAB GULF (PFLOAG)



Information Committee
P.O. BOX 5037 - ADEN
PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC
REPUBLIC OF YEMEN

VOICES OF REVOLUTION : LATIN AMERICA

«Many times conquered,
But still I rose again, even
from the furthest star»

PABLO NERUDA

On September 4, 1970 the Chilean people elected the most patriotic government that Chile had seen. Such a development could not be tolerated by both Imperialism and Fascism, for the thought that the Chileans were masters of their own destiny could not be tolerated by the artists of war and crimes against the peoples of the world.

On September 11, 1973 as a Fascist coup was in the making, the U.S. fully supported it and as a security measure brought its warships near the Chilean coastline. The fascists were planning for a civil war, but the leadership of the Popular Unity recognizing that the branches of the military, ground, naval and air forces, and the carabinieri corp had been mobilized against the Allende government quickly ordered the left-wing forces to go underground and offer only rearguard action.

The civil war did not take place, but the fascists unleashed a campaign to terrorize the working masses of Chile. General Pinochet, the self-proclaimed president of the Junta invoked martial law where wholesale killings, torture, roundups and searches are part of «normal» life. Also, immediately following the coup, the «gorillas» closed the Congress, dissolved political parties, the Unitary Central of workers, and the municipalities. They took away freedom of the press, freedom of holding meetings, even the freedom to grieve.

Enterprises were returned to their former owners, nationalized companies were asked to return and run the affairs of these companies. The Junta is also negotiating compensation to U.S. copper-mining firms nationalized by the Popular Unity government. The «gorillas» in camouflaged form are giving back these firms the right to extract Chilean copper on the plea that the Chileans cannot do it themselves, though the experience of the Popular Unity government indicates the reverse. All these measures were first to unmask the direct U.S. role in the coup and secondly, they were means by which the Chilean economy once again became attached to the metropole i.e. became an appendage to the U.S.

In the six months since the Fascist Junta has come to power, more than 15,000 Chileans have been killed, many more have been tortured and an even larger

number linger on in the newly created dungeons of fascism. In addition, there are over half a million jobless, an astrono-

mical figure for a country with a population of ten million. The Junta has stood by as prices of the bare essentials spiral. The prices have increased anywhere from 300, 500 and in some cases 800 per cent. In other words, hunger which had been stamped out once again knocks at the workingman's door.

All this is done in a desperate attempt to stamp out the «red menace». Yet we are not fooled, for beneath the euphemisms of the Junta, the previously rich ruling class is regaining its right to oppress the working masses of Chile. In short, they are replacing the gains of the working class by instituting fascist rule.

The Junta however is in trouble. The left forces of Chile are re-grouping. Carlos Altamirano, secretary-general of the Chilean Socialist party in a press conference held in Havana on January 3, 1974 said that a single resistance organization will be set up in the near future to conduct the struggle against the Junta. He added: «the unity of the Chilean popular movement has grown stronger through the struggle and a de facto united leadership has been established.»

In short, the struggle continues. Only six weeks after the coup, a strike flared up at an underground railway construction site. Though the Junta responded by ordering the execution of the strike leaders, more strikes followed - at the Sumar textile mills, the El Teniente copper mine and elsewhere. So the voice of protest at first cautious is now more distinct and assertive everywhere.

The mood of rebellion though latent at times is already expressed through strikes but also through slogans plastered on walls. The revolutionary activists who paint these slogans risk their lives in so doing, such dedication can only acquire more sympathy from the masses and in turn induce them to struggle.

Along with other revolutionaries we claim our solidarity with the efforts to unify the underground resistance in Chile and in the name of progress and humanity join Volodia Teitelboim, a former Chilean senator as the cries out: «In the name of humanity; Stop the bloodbath! Close the concentration camps and open the prisons.»

Unity Among Latin American Revolutionaries



A major development in the Latin American revolutionary movement has taken place when four revolutionary forces signed a joint statement whereby a unified revolutionary coordinating committee was formed.

The Tupamaros of Uruguay, the revolutionary leftist movement of Chile, the Patriotic National Liberation Army of Bolivia and the Revolutionary Army of Argentina have taken this important step whose impact should be felt in the coming months and years.

This step towards unity was taken so as to increase the capacity of the people's forces to continue their struggle against the imperialist enemy and the indigenous enemy — the bourgeoisies and its apologists. This step towards unity was also viewed as an attempt to unify the socialist forces of Latin America, Guevara's dream and proposed strategy.

The consignees of the statement further pointed out that in the past the peoples of Latin America joined hands to link a unified struggle against the Spanish conquerors. So past experiences especially the Fascist coup in Chile indicate that the only road to struggle is that of armed struggle: People's War.

«Through armed struggle alone» declare our revolutionaries can the yoke of imperialism and fascism in Latin America be destroyed and defeated.

As our own experience indicates, when armed with revolutionary strategy — armed struggle, we can avoid suffering from illusions.



SADAT DISMANTLES NASSERISM

The government has dropped some of its hard-line socialist laws in a bid to attract private foreign investment. Domestic private ownership, which was never abolished will henceforth be nurtured, the government says. And companies established with private capital will be encouraged to list their shares on the Bourse, as the stock exchange is known in the Francophile remnants of Cairo's financial community.

So far, the revival of the bourse is almost all hope and little action. It is a straw in the political and economic wind that depends, like many other things, on peace. Still, it highlights three things about Egypt today that tend to be overshadowed by the Mideast situation but that shed light on Egypt's role in the October war and a potential settlement.

They are the ideological turn-about that President Anwar Sadat is trying to fashion in economic policy, the vast problems the economy faces and the existence of the much-underestimated Egyptian middle class.

And to clinch the argument, the AP cites a nameless U.S. political scientist to the effect that «the opening of the economy and the attraction of foreign capital were, in fact, part of the war aims» of Oct. 1973. The U.S. scholar elucidates further: «I'm convinced in hindsight that this is a large part of what the war was all about. Sadat knew he couldn't attract investment here so long as there were big question marks hanging over the area. So he launched the war to get a settlement and open this place up.» (International Herald Tribune, Dec. 28, 1973)

d) A Sadat apologist, Mr. Mousa Sabry, editor of the Cairo daily Al-Akhbar, is quoted in the New York Times (Jan. 7, 1974) as saying that «the time had come for the Egyptians to lead better after years of sacrifices for military spending». Mr. Sabry believes Egypt must «create confidence for investors against nationalization, bureaucratic meddling and other intimidations». And the Times quotes and comments: «This requires an enormous development program for the coming five years, in which national income must be doubled through rooting out invisible unemployment, forging ahead with unfinished projects, investments in new projects giving quick profit and encouraging Arab

capital by providing incentives equal to those in foreign markets.

Mr. Sabry said that this swift development must be achieved by 'upheaval' throughout the society. He stressed the burden of Egypt's rapidly growing population, now estimated at 36 million and rising at the rate of a million a year.

The extent of the envisioned 'upheaval' was suggested by reports that Egypt might reopen the stock exchange and by a proposal in the People's Assembly that private investors be allowed to buy up to 49 per cent of public economic enterprises.

Need we say more regarding Mr. Sadat's economic intentions and actual deeds? We think not; but we feel we cannot conclude this section without a proper quotation from the weekly fiction magazine, Time (Feb. 18, 1974, p. 14-15):

«Sadat wants to attract not only Western capital but also the oil money flowing into the Arab world in rapidly increasing amounts. Foreign capital is being enticed by such moves as Sadat's recent decision to sign a World Bank agreement that protects foreign investors against losses from nationalization. Plans have been drawn up to turn Port Said into a free-trade zone and make it 'the Hong Kong of the West'. Caireness, accustomed to seeing photographs of their President posing with visiting Arab and Soviet politicians, were astonished last week to see him greeting Chase Manhattan Bank Chairman David Rockefeller, in Cairo to execute an \$40 million loan for Egypt's proposed Sued pipeline and also to arrange for new offices there.»

On the question of social affairs and personal status criteria, there has been no discernible trend as yet to distinguish between Nasserism and Sadatism, that is, education, health, welfare, labor etc. are being affected, but not radically thus far. However, we must stress that Nasserism was imbued with a much greater secularist spirit and a more enlightened, humanistic view of society and citizenship. Moreover, we believe that the attempt to rationalize Egyptian industry, agriculture, cultural life, and social needs was better informed and inspired by the principle of socialist planning, cultural affirmation and humanistic aspirations, besides American pragmatism, the West's technological civi-

lization and the heritage of Islam. Whereas Sadatism is much more impressed by traditional European society, its organicism and set orders in addition to its staunch and inflexible Islamism, that is, class mobility in Sadatism is not ruled out, but class consciousness is rooted in and manifests itself in the «state of institutions», not in «the centers of powers» of Nasserite autonomous powers and Islamism with a modernist veneer is becoming more deeply entrenched. Meantime, the one sovereign of Nasser has a significant number of sub-sovereigns, who are the true props of the political edifice, whereas in Sadat's sovereign, there is a single, absolute sovereign whence all power emanates and is delegated and recovered at the will of the overall sovereign. In the language of 17th century political science, sovereignty is indivisible and indefeasible; it is absolute and unchallengeable and without equal.

Stated differently in the Nasserite case, the personality cult replaced the principle of sovereignty; in Sadat's case, the cult of democracy enshrined absolutist sovereignty and institutionalized charisma in the «state of institutions» along with their loyal servants, thereby completing the chain of command and ensuring the stability, vitality and growth of the sovereign; meanwhile new transmission societal belts are being fashioned in order to enhance and promote the parliamentary process.

At the empirical level, this concept of sovereignty under Sadat has meant the liquidation of Nasser's «centers of power», a program that began in earnest in May of 1971 (the deposition of Ali Sabri's allegedly pro-Soviet, Nasserite wing and the imprisonment of Nasser's own immediate entourage such as Sharaff and Jouma) and ended recently with the dismissal of Shazli as commander of the «victorious» armed forces in the October war and the replacement of King Mohammad Hassanain Heikal (Feb. 1, 1974) of Al-Ahram with the convivial presidential-style zealot, Ali Amin. As Sadatism ascended the throne, it wreaked havoc on its enemies and between May 15, 1971 and Feb. 1, 1974, many a head rolled on the way to oblivion as Sadat's sovereignty spread its searing fire and adopted a scorch Nasserism policy in Nasser's own name. Among the prominent «centers» that were elimi-

nated, we find writers, students, laborers, army men and political bureaucrats.

Inevitably, the current smiling silence of Egyptians is likely to give Sadatism a new lease on life in the aftermath of the October war. But since the new capitalist prosperity that is being promised is not going to solve the fundamental problems of Egyptian society, the «happy» Egyptians are likely to erupt anew in a hurricane of fury that will tear Sadat's sovereignty as under and consign it to the dustbin of history. At the moment, let us adore the new born Kings of Arabia, Feisal, the prince of faithfuls, and Sadat the prince of «new Jerusalem» and let us dream with his newly-acquired prodigal son, Ali Amin, who told Arnaud de Borchgrave, the new Miles Copeland of Egypt, and senior editor of Newsweek (Feb. 25, 1974, p. 18): «The Arabs have now undreamed-of billions of dollars and a tremendous supply of manpower. Soon we will have new pools of technical know-how that will make the Middle East a unique part of the world. And if we are happy and free and unsuspecting, as I think we will be, we will want the whole world to partake of this new age. We will have everything we need to make our deserts bloom and turn our mud huts into decent houses. Ignorance breeds prejudice. And the ignorance will rapidly vanish, too. The Middle East is where the East and West are finally going to come together. Perhaps I am a dreamer, but I also see a United States of the Middle East. Israel would not be included in such a grouping in the foreseeable future. But once a Palestinian state is set up, it will obviously have to live in peace with its neighboring Jewish state. After that there are many hopeful options. The time has come for all of us to develop a more generous vision of the future - and to act boldly and decisively.»

We finally arrive at a definition of Sadatism stripped of Amin's mellifluous rhetoric: Sadatism is Nasser without Nasserism; it is the mummification of Nasser and the exhumation of Senusism; it is Islam without Arabism or Arabism submerged in Islam; it is capitalism without prosperity, oppression without progress, despotism without enlightenment; it is medievalism in the age of liberation, centralism without an Arab center, modernism without democracy.

