

stand by our side in such an event, as will the Soviet Union and socialist countries.

In the case of the second possibility occurring, we will demand clear abrogation of the Amman accord and cancellation of all steps resulting from it, most importantly the Cairo declaration. Secondly, the destructive political trend of this leadership should be brought to trial and accountable. If things came to that, we would furthermore demand that the composition of forces within the leadership and legislative bodies of the PLO be reconsidered, so that the revolutionary, democratic and nationalist forces are able to defeat the deviationist trend and prevent the PLO from sinking into a new crisis after two or three years.

With these answers, we do not risk confusion in the face of future possibilities. The only thing I fear is that the answers of the revolutionary democratic forces will not be unanimous with regard to these possibilities. Furthermore, any serious thought about the unity of the revolutionary democratic forces requires a (common) perception of the future, an analysis of the various possibilities and phases which might occur, and a perception of the method of confrontation. To guarantee the success of a new unity effort, we should agree on how to confront the possibility of the rightist leadership's recognizing resolution 242 and the right of 'Israel' to exist; the possibility of its meeting with the US, and entering direct negotiations. Our response to each possibility should be decided.

We hope that through persistent dialogue, we will be able to reach a joint perception of the future, to form the basis of strong unity between the revolutionary democratic forces. We also hope that through dialogue we can solve any contradictions between the two slogans: «Gathering the maximum number of Palestinian nationalist forces to face the deviationist trend» (the basis of the PNSF's formation) and «Uniting the revolutionary democratic forces.»

Some presented the Gorbachev-Reagan summit as a new Yalta. How do you evaluate this meeting?

There is no doubt that the Geneva summit was the most prominent international event, not only of this year, but of the past several years. Convening this summit became a necessity in order to avoid the extinction of the human race. The whole world is threatened by the nuclear arms race and its spreading to outer space as a result of the US military plan known as «Star Wars».

The summit did not result in essential agreements or resolve the many pending questions, but the event itself and its results have a value which must not be underestimated. Probably the most prominent result is the relative decrease in international tension, and the agreement on the importance of continuing mutual contacts. This will be at the summit level with meetings decided on for 1986 and 1987; it will be between foreign ministers who are charged with following up major regional issues; it will involve specialists and advisers to follow up bilateral relations, cooperation agreements, and talks on halting the arms race and decreasing nuclear arsenals.

The failure of the summit to reach an agreement on «Star Wars» and regional questions is basically due to Washington's aggressive policy. The Reagan Administration persists in the arms race, militarizing space and igniting «hot spots». During Reagan's first term in office, the US repeatedly tried to impose its hegemony in the international arena and achieve clear military superiority over the Soviet Union, via the cold war policy, escalating international tension and using the big stick.

Obviously, this aggressive policy is an expression of the

increasing influence of the military industries in the USA. After the relative setback experienced by the oil monopolies, the need to revive the US economy has been addressed by escalating military production and marketing its products internationally. It became clear towards the end of Carter's term and the beginning of Reagan's, that a new policy was establishing itself based on demolishing detente, escalating the arms race and the antagonism towards the Soviet Union.

In the light of this, we did not expect dramatic results from the summit. Nor did we think that Washington would stop its aggressive drive. Several US officials went back to using the aggressive tone which had prevailed before the summit. The US's acceptance of talks with the Soviet Union is the result of the firm, principled stand of the latter, together with the socialist community, the people's struggle in the world, and the movements for peace, democracy and liberation. We must not underestimate the peace movement which swept across Europe after the decision to deploy new nuclear missiles. It has played a role in creating international public opinion opposed to the missile deployment and the militarization of space. The growth of this movement has to a certain extent influenced the positions of the Western European governments. These countries have displayed discontent with Washington's military policy because it constitutes a threat to European security. Moreover, their economic situations are worsened by the revival of the US economy and the extraordinary rise of the dollar. This is basically a result of the aggressive arms policy, the dominance of the military monopolies and their increasing influence in the economic and political life of the US.

Washington is well aware that the Soviet Union will not allow it to achieve the superiority it desires. The US therefore strives to exhaust the Soviet Union by opening new fields of competition in the arms race, especially by invading outer space, hoping to increase the problems of the socialist economy. However, Washington will sooner or later be faced by the impossibility of realizing its dreams due to the solidity and ultimate superiority of Soviet socialism, as compared to capitalism. Based on this analysis, we do not expect immediate results from the summit concerning the Middle East. The Middle East was not dealt with due to Washington's insistence on dominating the region, and because the Arab forces are unable to benefit from the principled Soviet support or from the international balance of forces which is tilting towards socialism, peace, progress and liberation.

The deceptive description of the summit as a «new Yalta» is used by the Palestinian and Arab right wing. This stems from a wrong understanding of the original Yalta. The imperialist and reactionary media claim that the world was divided up at that time, and that a new division of the world would be engineered through the Geneva summit. Those who promote this misconception want to insinuate that the Soviet Union, like the US, acts according to its own interests, as does any imperialist super power. In this way, they make no distinction between the enemy and the friend. They repudiate the historical record of Soviet support to the Palestinian and Arab people, while turning a blind eye to the US's criminal record of conspiracies against our people and national cause.

The results of the Geneva summit serve to expose the depth of the differences between the USA and the Soviet Union. They emphasize the Soviet's adherence to its unswerving principled stand alongside our people and their just struggle. They expose the US's insistence on pursuing its aggressive policy. These results thus dealt a blow to the theory of a «new Yalta» and to those who advocate such misconceptions. ●