

Inclusive ‘We’ and Speech Acts (Commissive And Directive) Used as Rhetorical Devices in The Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas’s Discourse Before the Central Council in Ramallah On April 26, 2014



Stylistics

Keywords: rhetorical, commissive speech act, directive speech act, inclusive ‘we’, power, vocative text, argumentative text, discourse.

Aysar Yaseen

The Arab American University-Jenin (AAUJ)

Abstract

In his speech before the Central Council in Ramallah on April 26, 2014, president Mahmoud Abbas of Palestine made good use of some rhetorical devices, namely, inclusive “we” and commissive and directive speech acts to gain the support of his people. Inclusive ‘we’ or generic use of first-person plural pronoun (referred to hereinafter as IPPP), which has interesting connotations and rhetorical effects in discourse and has been ignored by grammarians (Wales, 1996), was executed professionally by Abbas. He managed to reiterate what had been said or done during years of negotiations with the Israelis as if the entire community and not Palestinian leaders alone conducted these negotiations. In other words, Abbas claimed the right to speak on behalf of the entire community to rekindle hopes and memories. This intentional use served rhetorical effects, namely, disclaiming personal responsibility of the derailment of the negotiations on the one hand and exempting Palestinian Authority leaders from any wrong doings or mishaps regarding the concessions (as claimed by rivals) made since Oslo on the other hand. On many occasions, president Abbas made several promises through commissive speech act as indications of power since powerless cannot make promises. It is used as a reminder to his opponents and rivals that he is still in power and in command. Fairclough (1989) and Pennycook (1994) argue that the use of IPPP as well as I-reference (First-person singular pronoun 1PSP) is often political and implies power relationships.

Introduction

Language permeates in all our actions and activities. It plays an important and decisive role in our life. If language is so vital in our life, we should know more about it than the mere fact that we use it on daily basis. Because it is there living with us, some believe that its existence and our own are merely a sheer coincidence, i.e. we take it for granted. Language use is an aggregate work of art. This type of art is nurtured and is not acquired by default, i.e. ‘some’ people acquire this kind of art by being members of particular social groups, institutional groups, or speech communities in combination with full knowledge of the surrounding context. The vocabulary of an individual or group is an index of what is important to that individual or group. Language users whether producers (writers/speakers) or receivers (readers/hearers) rely on multi-faceted techniques in delivering or interpreting linguistic messages. As for writers/speakers, knowledge of the language system (semantics, phonology, syntax) and the surrounding context (audience, culture, social norms) is a prerequisite for delivering a concise message. With regard to the readers/ hearers, interpreting the message depends primarily on their knowledge of the techniques employed by the writers/speakers. Language enables man both to express himself and to orient himself to the world and society because his sense of the world depends largely on it.

Because of globalization and the formulation and dissemination of new ideas, coining new terminology becomes inevitable. The uncontrolled evolution of technical terms can no longer be relied on to ensure unambiguity in the use of language. Words are loaded with new shades of meaning by their users; this leads to confusion and lack of communication and gives rise to tampering with the truth and manipulation. I am not claiming here that knowledge of the language system and the surrounding context by the receiver is not required. What is meant is that the way writers/speakers stage and word their message is of greater importance because it limits and directs the receiver’s perception and foci. Because writers and speakers, especially when they are in powerful positions, rely heavily on the way they word their message and on rhetorical techniques, readers/hearers must be vigilant in order not to fall in the writers’/speakers’ snares. Language of advertising, for example, appeals more to senses rather than to cognition by creating new realities through the use of glamorous language and combining words

with pictures; in visual advertisements, persuasion through tampering with viewers' feelings and emotions necessitates that seeing overshadows hearing. In political speeches, employing the art of lexical choices such as *I*-reference, *we*-reference, and speech acts is crucial in the process of reaching out for the public and selling one's point of view. The reader/hearer becomes vulnerable and under the mercy of the writer/speaker especially when the former is a layman who is thwarted by the shrewdness of the latter.

Language use is meant to be transparent and unambiguous, and language is used to describe reality. Under certain circumstances, language is also used to suppress, and/or create new realities through deception, manipulation and oppression. Language is not a neutral device, and man can be menaced by other man's words. By the use of discourse especially by those in powerful positions, the foundations are laid for the production and reproduction of asymmetries in the distribution of power and deepening of social inequalities. This is where critical discourse analysis intervenes to uncover these inequalities and provokes the intrepidity of the dominated groups who are victims to this faulty way of using discourse.

Rhetoric

The main intent in this study is to use the term 'rhetoric' to refer to written or oral discourse that intentionally or unintentionally alter attitudes and mobilize actions because this kind of discourse is formed and planned. Rhetoric can be defined as the study of man's symbolic attempts to make order of his life, to discover who he is, and to interact with others in ways that make his life more satisfying. In this sense rhetoric includes the study of the persuasive dimension of all language (Campbell, 1972).

Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST) is an approach to textual coherence and organization (Mann & Thompson, 1988). Coherence is achieved by discourse markers (connectives) that signal the presence of a particular relationship. These coherence relations are paratactic (coordination and repetition) and hypotactic (subordination) relations that hold across two or more text spans (Taboada, 2006).

According to the rhetorical theory, style is demarcated as one of the five pillars of rhetoric (the other four pillars are: invention, arrangement, memory and delivery) and should be at the very heart of studying the practice of everyday life (Corbett & Connors, 1999; Crowley & Hahee, 1999; de Certeau, 1984). Cintron (1997) argues that style can be taken as a central issue when analyzing the relations between power and language. Poetic dimensions of discourse are crucial in the process of persuasion. They contribute largely to meaning making and mediation in sociocultural context (Poveda, 2002; Mishler, 1999; Gee, 1991; Hymes, 1982). Georgakopoulou (1998: p. 322) postulates that 'poetic keys or dimensions in discourse such as the use of rhythmic patterns and various forms of repetition including parallelism are among the means through which speakers may solicit identification through their discourse styles'. Burke (1969) elaborates on the concept of identification and that rhetorical persuasion is achieved through a process of identification. He contends that rhetoric involves the use of word by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents. According to Burke, employing situationally appropriate stylized language, speakers generate communion (identification) between themselves and their audience. Apparently, speakers' language becomes audience's own language through responsive evaluation and a change in the audience's future behaviour takes place.

The study of rhetoric discourse embodies the investigation of the relation that holds between man and his language, the symbolic relation between man and the world around him, and the relation between man and the others. Rhetorical discourses share the following characteristics: first, rhetorical discourse is 'propositional'-that is, formed from complete thoughts (Campbell, 1972). It is prose discourse planned and structured in a consistent and coherent fashion to justify and announce certain conclusions; in this sense, it is considered an 'art' of

rhetoric or persuasion. Second, rhetorical discourse is ‘problem solving’. What constitutes a problem is the difference between what is wanted and what exists, or the discrepancy between one’s personal goals, or values, and the existing structures, procedures and conditions. This characteristic focuses on the evaluative, subjective, and personal dimension essential to rhetoric (Campbell, 1972).

Rhetorical discourse is concerned with values and norms that the individual and society should adopt. This is the advisory nature of this type of discourse. It always gives advice, takes position, evaluates and makes judgements. Third, Rhetorical discourse is ‘public’, i.e. addressed to others. It is concerned with social matters that are of interest to social actors within societies. These social issues need concerted actions (Campbell, 1972). Fourth, rhetorical discourse is ‘practical’; it does not aim at sharing information, but rather at making change (Campbell, 1972). Fifth, rhetorical discourse is ‘poetic’. The term ‘poetic’ refers to the degree to which a discourse displays ritualistic, aesthetic, dramatic and emotive qualities. Eloquence is crucial in this type of discourse. The hearer expects rhetoric to be part of public rituals and to reinforce cultural values. He is also expected to be touched moved by this type of discourse by speaking of his experiences and feelings. Rhetoric that lacks or ignores this characteristic is more likely to be judged as ineffective (Campbell, 1972).

Man can influence and be influenced because s/he is a rational human being capable of conceptualizing alternatives, and as a social being, s/he needs to belong to a group or society to satisfy his/her physical (food, shelter, sex, etc.) and psychological (courage and honesty) needs. Man is also able to detect, identify and interpret stimuli around him in order to assign meaning and then uses these meanings to determine his future behaviour (Campbell, 1972).

Rhetoric arises out of conflict-within an individual, between individuals, or between groups. A perception of a problem (a straddle between existing condition and desired change) initiates a conflict. The conflict becomes public when an individual assumes that other people recognize the conflict as he perceives it (Campbell, 1972). Contemporary public rhetoric, rather than being conciliatory, provokes argument and dissent (Campbell, 1972).

The interest of studying rhetoric in discourse is associated with Michael Billing. It came to be known as ‘rhetorical psychology’. There are two distinct approaches to the definition of the term ‘rhetoric’ through history. The first (positive approach), views rhetoric as the technique of using language effectively and as an art of using speech to persuade, influence or please. The second (negative approach), is considered a contemporary approach in which rhetoric is viewed as a shallow type of speaking that is concerned with effect rather than content (Wooffitti, 2006).

Recently, there are interests in the study of rhetoric in which discourse is viewed as a persuasive tool: ‘most centrally, perhaps, rhetoric is about persuasion. Thus, for example, we might wish to examine the discourse of economists, philosophers or historians as persuasion; in other words, as discourse that is in some sense akin to what such prototypical persuaders as editorialists, advertisers, and politicians do. Fleshing out the ties between rhetoric and persuasion a bit more, we can say that rhetoric is the form that discourse takes when it goes public; that is, when it has been geared to an audience, readied for an occasion, adapted to its end. Rhetoric is thus a pragmatic act; its functions those of symbolic inducement (Simons, 1989: pp. 2-3).

Billing (1991: p. 44) argues that ‘discourse is argumentative in nature and common sense is dilemmatic, and we cannot understand the meaning of a piece of reasoned discourse unless we know what counter positions are being implicitly or explicitly rejected’. He focuses more on the persuasive nature of discourse. Billing also rejects the cognitivist explanation of social action; he does not accept the idea that we think before we speak then we express our thoughts and opinions in talk. He believes that talk has an argumentative character and

defines it as '*thinking in action*', i.e. we do think in the process of producing words, but primacy is assigned to social activities: 'Cognitive psychologists have assumed that thinking is a mysterious process, lying behind outward behaviour. However, the process and counter response of conversation is too quick for it to be the outward manifestation of the real processes of thought. The remarks are the thoughts: one need not search for something extra, as if there is always something lying behind the words, which we should call the 'thought' (Billing, 2001b: p. 215).

Rhetorical psychology and discourse analysis show similarities in their focus on ideology. Billing argues that ideologies-ways of thinking which support asymmetries in power and advantage- are sedimented in discourse. The way we think and talk about the world and the different issues in our daily life is invariably laden with attitudes and assumptions that eventually give rise to particular type of social organisation. 'Ideologies are intrinsically rhetorical. For they provide the resources and topics for argumentation and thereby for thinking about the world' (Billing, 1990: p.18).

Discourse

The functionalist approach perceives language as language in use, i.e. a social practice. Fairclough (1989); Fasold (1990); Brown & Yule (1983) and Grimshaw (1981) contend that the study of discourse is the study of any aspect of language use, and that the analysis of discourse is, without doubt, the analysis of language in use. They all advocate for a dialectical conception of language and society whereby language and society complement each other; linguistic phenomena are social phenomena.

Argumentative discourse

A cursory survey of everyday affairs shows the extent of their variability. The world we live in is marked by disputes and disagreements. This is applicable to all kinds of our daily activities: family talk, institutional talk, interviews, etc. Our mundane interactions are rife with disagreements, rebuttal, accusations, complaints and criticisms. Arguments are a natural outcome since the outset of this life, and it is mandatory that we engage in arguments with other people and sometimes even with ourselves.

Traditionally, argumentation is defined as the content of a public speech (Benoit, Hample & Benoit, 1992). Wayne Brockriede argues that arguments are not in statements but in people. They are made by people, discovered among them in changing forms, and arguments always deal with problematic ideas, i.e. argument is personal (Benoit, Hample & Benoit, 1992). Daniel O'Keefe explains that the term 'argument' refers to two different senses or two different phenomena. First, it is viewed as a type of communicative act where only one person is involved (e.g. commands, apologies, invitations, etc.). Second, argument is viewed as an interaction where more than one actor are involved (e.g. quarrels, discussions, debates, etc.). In the first one, an argument is viewed as something that a person makes, while in the second one, it is viewed as something that people have. O'Keefe views argument as interpersonal (Benoit, Hample & Benoit, 1992). Dale Hample criticised O'Keefe's classification of argument; he insists that a third sense is required to complete the understanding of O'Keefe's two senses. Hample calls it the cognitive dimension of argument-the mental process by which arguments occur within people; it includes a wide variety of cognitive accomplishments which are considered crucial prerequisites for the argument to take place and to gain continuity. These cognitive accomplishments include the perceptual and inferential experience of noticing an argument or the need for one, the information processing which is applied to the argument and its potential parts, the creative energies that generate new arguments or responses to them, etc. Hample insists on the psychological dimension of argument (Benoit, Hample & Benoit, 1992).

Argumentation is a form of discourse that attempts to persuade and influence readers through the use of a connected series of conceptual relations, violation, value, significance and opposition in order to establish apposition or claim (Toulmin 1958; Beaugrande & Dressler 1981; Andrews 1989; Teefelen 1991; Rottenberg 2000).

Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) identify the classification of text type along function lines. They defined three text types: descriptive, narrative and argumentative. They define the argumentative texts as ‘those utilized to promote the acceptance or evaluation of certain beliefs or ideas as true vs. false, or positive vs. negative. Conceptual relations such as reason, significance, violation, value, and opposition should be frequent. The surface texts will often show cohesive devices for emphasis and insistence, e.g. recurrence, parallelism and paraphrase’ (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981: p.184).

In general, argumentative text is the form that attempts to persuade the listener/reader to accept a claim posted by the speaker/writer regardless of the manner through which this acceptance took place.

Argumentation texts are of two types. The first is through-argumentative. It follows the organizational plan of thesis cited to be argued-substantiation-conclusion. There is no existence to an opposite view in this type (Hatim 1989a, 1989b, 1991, 1997; Hatim & Mason 1990). The second type is the counter-argumentative. It follows the organizational plan of thesis cited to be opposed-opposition or rebuttal of the thesis cited-substantiation of the rebuttal-conclusion (Hatim 1989a, 1989b; Jaber 2001).

Hatim (1990, 1997) argued that these two types of argumentation are culturally oriented. He illustrated that English tends towards counter-argumentation and there is a tendency in Arabic towards through-argumentation. He did not deny that a combination of both types is found in both English and Arabic. Hatim (1991) postulates that Arabic writers/speakers have historically had the option to develop counter-arguments, i.e. presenting the opponent’s view and countering it. In modern Arabic, a preference is given to a different type of argumentation in which no reference is given to an opposing view. Instead, an argument with an explicit concessive (e.g. the use of ‘although’) is presented. Koch (1983: p. 47) found out that ‘culture dominates rhetoric conventions’. She argued that English is made linguistically cohesive through subordination, while Arabic argumentation achieves persuasion through repetition and paraphrasing. El-Shiyab (1990) found out that English uses less cohesive devices than Arabic, And Arabic uses lexical repetition not only as a cohesive device but also as a tool for persuasion¹⁰.

Biber 1988, 1989 classifies texts according to the sets of syntactic and lexical features that co-occur frequently in them; he found out that argumentative texts tend to employ modals of prediction, necessity and possibility, conditional clauses, intensifiers, lexical repetition, rhetorical questions. To him, these features play a crucial role in persuasion.

The term ‘argument’ connotes disagreement. Written as well as spoken argumentative texts require that language users (writers and speakers) start by a succinctly stated point of view. This point of view should be followed by either evidence to support it or a counter-argument or point of view. Persuasion and argumentation have the same goal, namely: to influence. Argumentation and persuasion go back to the ancient Greece. The Greek called the language of persuasion “*rhetoric*”¹¹. Argumentation of the oratory discourse is meant to change the opinions of the others and to express the speaker’s/writer’s point of view. Rhetoric (the art of persuasion) is

¹⁰. Abbadi, R. The Construction of Arguments in English and Arabic: A Comparison of Linguistic Strategies Employed in Editorials. Available from: ling.mq.edu.au/translation/ctir-working-papers [Accessed 2 May 2008].

¹¹. Argumentative Texts: Structure and Characteristics Free Essay. Available from: <http://www.freeessys123.com/essay21860/argumentative-text.html> [Accessed 2 October 2008].

very important in politics where the ultimate aim is always to win the hearer/reader to the speaker's/writer's side¹². Argumentative texts differ from the scientific ones in that the former tends to be subjective while the latter is objective in nature.

In argumentative texts, the author may opt for '*logos*' (logic) and addresses the reason such as 'there will be fatal consequences if we follow this plan because...'. According to him/her, appealing to the audience's reason is the most effective way of convincing them to change their future behaviour. S/he may opt for '*ethos*' (ethical); the author here may choose to touch on the shared ideas between him/her and the audience of what is just and fair (e.g. 'I agree with you', 'I am convinced too that we should do this...'). A crucial weapon the speaker/writer may use for the sake of persuasion is '*pathos*' (emotions)¹³. Persuasion is achieved through a careful choice of emotive expressions. Also very compelling in persuasion is the use of anecdotes (narrative personal experiences in particular) to illustrate the main point.

The use of rhetorical devices such as rhetorical questions, repetition, etc. is also crucial in the argumentative texts to achieve persuasion. Using a quotation from an authority (a writer, a poet, a politician, a sacred text, etc.) is a strategic tactic used to make people change the way they think. The language user (speaker/writer) in an argumentative text must seek a common ground between him/her and the listener/reader; this generates trust and acceptability. Maintaining coherence in discourse by using discourse markers (however, although, but, on the other hand, therefore, on the contrary, etc.) is significant in keeping the listener/reader connected. One must not forget the importance of the rhetorical devices (rhetorical questions, humour, emotive language, metaphors, irony, repetition, exaggeration, anecdotes) in the formation of the argumentative discourse. These devices are the tools that pave the way for persuasion.

Vocative discourse

A vocative text targets thoughts and suggestions, rather than being declarative and final, and aims to show experience rather than addressing rationality (van Manen, 1997). In other words, it appeals to the feelings and emotions. Its language is used to encourage knowing through the senses and to prompt knowing that is felt and that has texture (Todres, 1998). An important purpose of such discourse is to touch readers by making them indispensable and indivisible part of it. Vocative texts tend to be characterized by five textual elements: concreteness, evocation, intensification, tone, and epiphany (van Manen, 1997). What is of importance for this research is concreteness, evocativeness, and tone. Concreteness refers to the use of specific and particular descriptions that place an experience concretely in the life world, and helps readers/listeners identify closely with what they are reading or listening to. Concreteness prompts readers to appreciate the experience in terms of their own lived experiences (van Manen, 1997). In vocative discourse, the reader is addressed directly. In this case, the major intent is to help readers/listeners start orienting to both the content and lived nature of the experience. This is achieved by incorporating direct quotes or events from previously lived or encountered experiences. Evocation involves using words to evoke and vividly reveal the experience. Evocation contrasts sharply with concreteness, whereas concreteness anchors the experience, evocation evokes lived meanings extending beyond immediate real experience (van Manen, 1997). Tone or tenor of discourse, i.e. the relationship or the degree of closeness between the addressor and the addressee, denotes the way in which readers/listeners are addressed. The goal is to instill the text with a tone that speaks to readers/listeners in a direct, feeling, and stirring manner (van Manen, 1997).

¹². Various Texts: Text Type. Available from: <http://englischlehrer.de/texts/texttypes.php> [Accessed 2 October 2008].

¹³. Write a More Effective Argument. Available from: <http://www.englishbiz.co.uk/mainguides/argue.htm> [Accessed 2 October 2008].

Speech acts

Whenever we engage ourselves in a talk exchange, we do things (asking questions, making promises, apologising, etc.). In the 1930s, when positivism was in reign, utterances were judged as meaningful or meaningless based on true/false scale (Mey, 1993; Levinson, 1983;). This lasted until Wittgenstein introduced his slogan ‘meaning in use’ and that utterances are explicable when related to their context (Levinson, 1983).

When humans produce grammatical stretches of language, they perform actions. Actions performed via language are called speech acts. These acts are either compliments, invitations, promises, complaints, apologies or requests (Yule, 1996). Speech acts are actions that take place in the real world and they make changes in the exited state of affairs. In his stance as an opponent to positivism and in affirming that language is a form of action, the philosopher John Austin made a distinction between ‘constative utterances’ (utterances in which something is said that can be evaluated along a dimension of truth) and ‘performative utterances’ (utterances in which something is done which can be evaluated along a dimension of felicity (appropriateness)). For example, ‘I promise to buy you a car’ is not felicitous unless I really intend to buy you a car and there is a commitment to do so. Later, Austin replaced his constative-performative terminology by a three-fold distinction:

- a- Locutions: the act of saying something. In
‘I promise to buy you a car’
- b- Illocutions: what is done *in* saying something.
I made a promise
- c- Perlocutions: what is done *by* saying something.
I made you count on my promise and start taking driving lessons to get your driver’s license.
(Verschueren, 1998: p. 22)

John Searle continues Austin’s paradigm by introducing his speech act formula ‘Fp’, where ‘F’ stands for ‘illocutionary force’ (the action side of every speech act), and ‘p’ stands for ‘proposition’ (the content side of the speech act) (Yule, 1996; Verschueren, 1998; Levinson, 1983). Searle also systematised Austin’s ‘felicity’ and proposed that every speech act must meet the following conditions:

- a- Propositional content condition (for a promise, for example, the content must be about a future event and that the event will be carried out by the speaker).
- b- Preparatory condition (for a promise there are two preparatory conditions: the event will not happen by itself and there will be a beneficial effect).
- c- Sincerity condition (for a promise, the speaker intends to carry out the future action).
- d- Essential condition (creating an obligation to carry out the action). (Verschueren, 1998: p. 23).

Searle did not like Austin’s taxonomy of speech acts into ‘verdictive’, ‘expositive’, ‘exercitive’, ‘behabitive’, and ‘commissive’ (Mey, 1993). Austin’s insistence on the existence of the speech act verb as a prerequisite for a speech act to be considered as such was criticised by Searle. Leech (1983) criticised Austin when the latter supposed that verbs in English correspond one-to-one with categories of speech act. He adds ‘Austin’s classification into verdictives, exercitives, commissives, behabitives and expositives is a prime example of what I have called ‘illocutionary-verb fallacy’” (Leech, 1983: p. 176). Searle 1977 argued that speech acts differ not only because of the difference that holds between the two speech acts verbs, but rather there are many levels that contribute to the existence of such difference. One should not identify speech acts verbs with speech act type

(Levinson, 1983; Searle, 1977). For example, the two different speech act verbs ‘to order’ and ‘to command’ are the same in reality. Searle puts his claim as there are several quite different principles of distinction: that is, there are different kinds of difference that enable us to say that the force of this utterance is different from the force of that utterance’ (Searle, 1977). Searle also stated that ‘differences in illocutionary verbs are a good guide, but by no means a sure guide to differences in illocutionary acts’ (Searle, 1975: p. 28).

In addition, Searle put twelve dimensions along which speech acts can be different. They are: ‘the illocutionary point (when we make a speech act, we ask ourselves what is the point behind making such an act? In a speech act such as the ‘directive’, the point is to give an order), direction of ‘fit’ (the word fits the world, i.e. the fit between language and reality), expressed psychological state (a state of mind, such as a belief can be expressed in a number of different ways using different speech acts), force (the difference between utterances could be attributed to the difference in the illocutionary force. The terms ‘suggest’ and ‘insist’ have different forces), social status (any utterance has to be situated within the context of the speaker’s and hearer’s status in society in order to be properly understood), interest (as a preparatory condition, interests of interlocutors should be reflected by the speech act), discourse related functions (speech acts refer to the context in which they are being uttered), content (separating out speech acts in accordance with what they are about), speech act verb (statements are not prefaced by anything that even remotely resembles the speech act verb), societal institution and speech acts (institutions not only allow for and determine the illocutionary point of the appropriate speech act, but also they are construed through the macro-social use of the appropriate language), speech acts and performatives (only certain speech acts have a performative character, i.e. the property of doing what they explicitly say), and style (for most people, the way we say things-that is the speech acts we avail ourselves of when saying certain things-is more important than the content)’ (Mey, 1993: pp.151-162).

Searle categorised five different speech acts. They are: the representative (assertions that carry the values ‘true’ and ‘false’, and they should fit the world to be considered true), directive (the speaker wants the hearer to do something in order to achieve a goal), commissive (changing the world by means of creating an obligation that carried out by the speaker), expressive (expressing an inner state of the speaker such as apologising), declaration (they bring about some alteration in the status or condition of the referred such as announcing husband and wife in a marriage ceremony by the priest at a church).

For Searle, the communicative function of every speech act is determined by the combination of the speaker’s/writer’s intention and the felicity conditions. Speaker’s/writer’s instances of language use (speech acts) function according to their intentions because of the prior knowledge the listeners/writers have and share that apply to these performances.

Austin and Searle agree that language is an instrument of action and not just of speaking. People perform speech acts whenever talk exchanges take place regardless of the performative characteristic. Linguists and philosophers should focus on the illocutionary aspects of the language use rather than on the dubious distinction between locutionary and illocutionary acts (Searle, 1969; Levinson, 1983).

Textual analysis

This paper studies the use of inclusive ‘we’ (*we*-reference or 1PPP), *I*-reference (1PSP), and commissive and directive speech acts and their rhetorical indications in president Abbas’ discourse before the Central Council in Ramallah on April 26, 2014; a copy of Abbas’ speech is found in the Appendix. Since tribe, family and extended family constitute power marker in the Arab social world, Abbas resorted to the argumentation strategy of ‘vox pop’ (the voice of the people) to achieve persuasion. He distanced himself from his discourse using 1PPP to

speak for the whole community via the use of inclusive ‘we’. When he talked about what the Palestinian Authority has achieved so far, he invoked the people’s voice and wishes, and he proclaimed that these achievements reflect the needs and the desires of the people, and that the Palestinian people were partners with the PA in the negotiations and the taken measures during the past years. By doing so, Abbas succeeded in no small measures in safeguarding himself at the personal level from being held responsible for the failure of the arduous and fruitless negotiations on the one hand and the mishaps committed since Oslo Accords on the other hand, and eventually portrayed himself as an insider. In other words, he implicitly stated that ‘if we succeeded, we succeeded together, and if we failed, we failed together, i.e. disclaiming direct responsibility. This demagogic tone (to speak for the community) is prevalent throughout the speech. President Abbas wanted to instil confidence into the Palestinian people that he is from the people to the people. *I*-reference was used on several occasions in Abbas’ discourse as an indication of power and authority. In doing so, Abbas maintained the powerful position as the president and the decision maker. *I*-reference was used by Abbas as a reminder to the Israelis and rivals as well that he is on the powerful side. The following table shows the frequency of the generic use of 1PPP:

Pronoun	Frequency
Inclusive ‘We’	176
<i>I</i> -reference	38

The generic use of 1PPP and the use of 1PSP are interspersed throughout the speech. Examples to illustrate this are:

We-reference:

- *We hold this Council under difficult and complex...*
- *We continue and will not give up...*
- *Today we have different issues...*
- *Which we must not lose sight of the start...*
- *We speak today and hopefully we can take it all...*
- *We wrote a letter to Mr. Netanyahu...*
- *We are the authority and not the power, so we're going to the United Nations...*
- *We cannot and do not accept...*
- *We believe and insist that prisoners are returning to their homes, and here we have two serious precedents in the past will not be repeated...*
- *We said the same words that we will refuse...*
- *We will go to international organizations...*
- *And we will say to the State of Israel as an occupying power, you are responsible for everything here, all these blanks here, please take your responsibilities...*
- *We recognized the State of Israel...*
- *That's what we had on the issue of negotiations and reconciliation...*

I-reference:

- *What do we have? We have a very important question I asked before I left to the United Nations, and I was told what you'll get from this recognition? I'll get one thing is that the Palestinian land occupied in 1967 is the land of State under occupation, and no longer as seen by Israelis and still see it even now disputed territory...*
- *I am flexible and reasonable, and must deal with matters with wisdom...*

- *I waited in my Office...*
- *According to John Kerry and asked us to meet either in Egypt or Saudi Arabia, I choose, and agreed to resume negotiations on the basis of the 1967 borders...*
- *I took a decision of the General Assembly that the State of the Palestinian territory is the 1967 borders with Jerusalem as its capital...*
- *I must read each word...*
- *Why am I committed?*
- *I recognized Israel, I renounce violence and terror, and I recognized the international legitimacy and recognition, and I am committed to international obligations...*
- *I asked former Egyptian President Mohammed Morsi for this project...*

As for the speech acts used in Abbas' discourse, commissive and directive speech acts are seen at the end of his speech. This is an indication that president Abbas is very well familiar with discourse progression and formulation with regard to rhetorical devices. He concluded his discourse by making promises he can keep as the head of the Palestinian state. Knowing that only powerful people can make promises, Abbas consolidates his powerful position as the incontestable president. In doing so, he constructs overt authorial presence. Examples to illustrate this are:

Examples of commissive speech acts:

والحكومة التي ستأتي ستكون كالحكومات السابقة، تقوم بالعمل على الخاص بالسلطة، أما المفاوضات فهي شأن من شؤون منظمة التحرير، لأنها تمثل كل شعبنا ولأن التفاوض باسم كل الشعب ومصالح كل الشعب وأولها اللاجئين، والمنظمة هي التي تمثلهم وترعى مصالحهم وهي التي تحمي كل ما يحتاجونه، فالحكومة تآتمر بأمرى وسياسيتى، أنا معترف بإسرائيل وهي معترفة وأنا أنبذ العنف والإرهاب، وأنا معترف بالشرعية الدولية وهي معترفة، وأنا ملتزم بالالتزامات الدولية والحكومة ستنفذ الاتفاقيات الدولية التي وقعنا عليها

Translation: The upcoming government will be the same as the previous ones. The government is subject to my orders and policy. I recognize Israel and the upcoming government recognizes Israel too. I denounce violence and terrorism, and the government does too. I recognize the international legitimacy, and the government does too. I am committed to signed international agreements, and the government is committed as well.

نحن لن نقبل الاعتراف بالدولة اليهودية

Translation: The Palestinian government will never recognize Israel as a "Jewish state"

وسنتمر في هذا الجهد وسنستمر في هذا الموقف

Translation: The Palestinian government will not interfere in the Syrian issue.

Examples of directive speech acts:

وأنا أقول أنه لا يوجد قدس لا توجد مفاوضات

Translation: I say (Abbas) 'No Jerusalem, no negotiations'.

والانقسام سينتهي وستعود الوحدة الوطنية الفلسطينية

Translation: Division (between Fatah and Hamas) will end and the Palestinian national unity will prevail.

Conclusion

When we interact, our interpretation of the talk exchange is not restricted to interpreting words and sentences, but rather larger stretches of language (texts). Interpreting and analysing these texts take a totally different trajectory other than mere linguistic analysis, i.e. semantic analysis alone is not a reliable procedure for conveying the intended meaning. A text must be linked to a context of situation and a context of culture (transformed into discourse) in order to be adequately interpreted; the semantic meaning must be conjoined with the pragmatic one.

As language users, we use language and we abuse it at the same time; language is under the mercy of our thoughts. Because we make constant choices from the available wide range of linguistic elements (grammatical, phonological and semantic), and because our choices are loaded with intentions and motivations to maintain or to achieve personal goals and purposes, we are the ones to be blamed for producing and reproducing inequalities, dominance and asymmetries in power within the social structure.

We shape and create different realities in societies by our discourse. Discourse is the flow of knowledge that determines individual and collective doings and formative actions that shape societies; it can be viewed as sui generis material realities. As a result, it creates asymmetries in power within societies; it does that because it is institutionalised, regulated and linked to action. Discourse caters for some institutions in societies and has ideological effects (Parker, 1990).

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) seeks to uncover inequalities caused by the abusive ways of using language in societies. It seeks to explain the enormity of using discourse (through abusing language) by certain powerful individuals and groups. CDA takes the part of the underprivileged and tries to unearth and expose the twisted linguistic means used by the privileged to sustain or intensify inequalities and asymmetries of power in societies.

A quick look at President Abbas's discourse conspicuously shows that particular stylistic peculiarities are inherent in his discourse. Persuasion through identification with the Palestinian public is a strategy used in Abbas's discourse. He managed to construct intimacy with his Palestinian audience. Right after the speech, moved Palestinian masses took to the streets to express their support to their leadership. This was made possible by the use of rhetorical devices, namely, inclusive 'we' and commissive and directive speech acts. Dominance of the use of generic 1PPP and 1PSP is prevalent in president Abbas' discourse. Abbas relied heavily on the use of inclusive 'we', and, on many occasions, he alternated between the 1PPP and 1PSP in his discourse to disclaim any personal responsibility of any wrong doing on the one hand and as a sign of power on the other hand. Commissive and directive speech acts were used as markers of power and authority to indicate to the Israelis, the world and his domestic rivals that he is still in command.

References

1. Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
2. Benoit, W. L. , Hample, D. & Benoit, P. J. 1992. *Readings in Argumentation*. Berlin & New York: Foris Publications.
3. Biber, D. 1988. *Variation Across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
4. Biber, D. 1989. *A Typology of English Texts*. *Linguistics* 27, 3-34.
5. Billing, M. 1990. 'Stacking the Cards of Ideology: The History of the Sun Souvenir Royal Album', *Discourse & Society*, 1(1): 17-38.
6. Billing, M. 1991. *Ideology and Opinions*. London: Sage.
7. Billing, M. 2001b. 'Discursive, Rhetorical and Ideological Messages', in M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S.J. Yates (eds.) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, in association

- with the Open University, 210-221. (Originally published in C. McGarty and A. Haslam (eds.) 1997, *The Message of Social Psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell).
8. Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 9. Burke, K. 1969. *A Grammar of Motives*. London: The World Publishing Company.
 10. Campbell, K. K. 1972. *Critiques of Contemporary Rhetoric*. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
 11. Cintron, R. 1997. *Angels' Town: Chero Ways, Gang Life, and Rhetorics of the Everyday*. Boston: Beacon.
 12. Corbett, E. P. J. & Connors, R. J. 1999. *Classical rhetoric for the modern student* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 13. Crowley, S. & Hawhee, D. 1999. *Ancient rhetorics for the contemporary student*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
 14. De Certeau, M. 1984. *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
 15. El-Shiyab, S. 1990. *The structure of Argumentation in Arabic: Editorials as a Case Study*. PhD. Thesis, Heriot Watt University, U.K.
 16. Fasold, S. 1990. *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
 17. Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power*. Londo: Longman.
 18. Gee, J. P. 1991. *A linguistic Approach to Narrative*. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1(1), 15–39.
 19. Georgakopoulou, A. 1998. *Conversational Stories as Performances: The Case of Greek*. *Narrative Inquiry*, 8(2), 319–350.
 20. Grimshaw, A. 1981. *Language and Social Resource*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
 21. Hatim, B. 1989a. *Argumentative Style across Cultures: Linguistic form as the realization of rhetorical function*. In R. Kolmel and J. Payne (eds.) 1989.
 22. Hatim, B. 1989b. *Text Linguistics in the Didactics of Translation: The case of the verbal and nominal clause types in Arabic*. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 27: 2, 136-144.
 23. Hatim, B. 1991. *The Pragmatics of Argumentation in Arabic. The Rise and Fall of a Text Type*. *Text*, Vol. 11, No. 2: 189-199.
 24. Hatim, B. 1997. *Communication across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
 25. Hatim, B. & Mason, I. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. Essex: Longman.
 26. Hymes, D. 1982. *Narrative Form as a "Grammar" of Experience: Native Americans and a Glimpse of English*. *Journal of Education*, 164(2), 121–142.
 27. Jaber, A. 2001. *Arab Translators Problems at the Discourse Level*. *Babel* 47: 4, 304-322.
 28. Koch, B. 1983. *Presentation as Proof: The Language of Arab Rhetoric*. *Anthropological Linguistics* 25: 1, 47-57.
 29. Leech, G. N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
 30. Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 31. Mann, W. C. & Thompson, S. A. 1988. *Rhetorical Structure Theory: toward a functional theory of text organization*. *Text* 8 (3), 243–281.
 32. Mey, J.L. 1993. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
 33. Mishler, E. 1999. *Storylines: Craftartists' Narratives of Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 34. Parker, I. 1990. 'Discourse: Definitions and Contradictions', *Philosophical Psychology*, 3(2): 189-204.
 35. Pennycook, A. 1994. "The Politics of Pronouns" *ELT Journal*: 173-178.
 36. Poveda, D. 2002. *Quico's Story: An Ethnopoetic Analysis of a Gypsy Boy's Narrative at School*. *Text*, 22(2), 269–300.
 37. Rottenberg, A. 2000. *Elements of Argument: A text and reader*. New York.
 38. Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

39. Searle, J. R. 1975. *Indirect Speech Acts*. In Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 59-82.
40. Searle, J. R. 1977. *A Classification of Illocutionary Acts*. In Andy Rogers, Bob Wall and John P. Murphy (eds.), *Proceedings of the Texas Conference on Performatives, Presuppositions, and Implicatures*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, pp. 27-45.
41. Simons, H. W. 1989. 'Introduction', in W. H. Simons (ed) *Rhetoric in the Human Sciences*. London and Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1-9.
42. Taboada, M. 2006. *Discourse Markers as Signals (or not) of Rhetorical Relations*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 38 (2006): 567-592.
43. Teeffelen, T, Van. 1991. *Argumentation and the Arab Voice In Western Bestsellers*. Text 11.2, 241-226
44. Todres, L. 1998. The qualitative description of human experience: The aesthetic dimension. *Qualitative Health Research*, 8(1), 121-127.
45. Toulmin, S. 1958. *The Uses of Argument*. London: Cambridge University Press.
46. Verschueren, J, 1998. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London New York and Sydney: Arnold. van Manen, M. 1997. From meaning to method. *Qualitative Health Research*, 7(3), 345-369.
47. Wales, K. 1996. *Pronouns in Present-day English*. Cambridge: CUP.
48. Wooffitt, R. 2006. *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.
49. Yule. G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix

(Abbas's speech in Arabic)

...الأخوات والإخوة

كلام مكرر بأننا نعقد هذا المجلس في ظل ظروف صعبة ومعقدة، ولكن يحدونا الأمل وقد نكون هذه الأيام وصلنا إلى ذروة التعقيد والصعوبات في كل ما نواجهه وما نفعله، ولكننا سنبقى صامدين متمسكين بحقنا وبثوابتنا، ولا مفر لنا إلا أن نصل إلى حقوقنا كاملة بإقامة الدولة الفلسطينية المستقلة وعاصمتها القدس الشريف، هذا هو هدفنا وهذه هي غايتنا، وهذا ما كررنا حياتنا من أجله ولذلك نحن مستمرين ولن نياس مما نعيشه من صعوبات من ضغوطات من ابتزازات.

خلال اليومين الماضيين برز الأمل بأن هناك عودة إلى وحدة الشعب الفلسطيني، وهذا الأمر يجب علينا أن نتمسك به ونشد بالواجب عليه، وانتظرنا. وستحدث عن هذا طويل وصبرنا وعانينا، ولكن أن الأوان أن نقطف ثمار هذا الصبر ونستعيد وحدة الشعب الفلسطيني.

لدينا اليوم قضايا مختلفة لا بد أن نتناولها لأن كلها قضايا ساخنة، فالمفاوضات أمر ساخن، وقضية الأسرى أمر ساخن، وقضية المصالحة أمر واعد، وهناك القدس التي يجب ألا تغيب عن بالنا أبداً، وألا ننساها أبداً، وأن نتذكرها ونعمل من أجلها في كل المناسبات، لأنها عاصمة دولة فلسطين وهي القلب ومن دونها لا توجد دولة، ولن نقبل أن تكون هناك دولة لفلسطين من دون أن تكون القدس الشرقية التي احتلت عام 1967 عاصمة لها. إضافة إلى ذلك لا بد أن نتناول بالبحث والتمحيص مسألة أخوتنا اللاجئيين في سوريا، هؤلاء الذين عانوا ويعانون الشيء الكثير دون أن يكون لهم ذنب في ذلك، قد تكون من المرات النادرة أننا بعيديون أو أبعدنا أنفسنا عن كل ما يجري حلونا حماية لأهلنا وشعبنا، ومع ذلك أقحمنا من حيث لا ندرى بمأساة جديدة للاجئين تضاهي مأساة 1948 إن لم تكن أصعب منها، فهذه القضايا التي نتحدث فيها اليوم والتي نأمل أن نتمكن من الإحاطة بها جميعاً

المفاوضات أيها الإخوة تعني العمل السياسي، أي أننا نريد أن نحصل على حقنا من خلال المفاوضات، وكان أول إشارة أعطيناها هي في عام 1974 عندما قررنا إقامة الدولة الفلسطينية المستقلة على الأراضي التي تتحرر، وإن كنا قبلها وفي عام 1969 قد ألقينا بقبلة لم تجد قبولا لدى أحد وهي الدولة الديمقراطية الفلسطينية.

إذا في عام 1974 كان لدى القيادة الجراءة الكاملة من أجل أن نتحدث بالسياسية وهي تحمل السلاح في ذلك الوقت، وكما قال الشهيد أبو عمار 'جئت بغصن زيتون وبالبنديقية فلا تسقطوا غصن الزيتون من يدي'، وكان جادا جدا في ذلك الوقت فغصن الزيتون يعني السلام، تعالوا إلى كلمة سواء، ولم يحصل شيء، ومرت الأيام وتعرفون أننا أبعدنا عن لبنان بالقهر وبالقوة إلى تونس الخضراء التي نكن لها كل الاحترام والتقدير، ذلك البلد الذي أوانا في وقت عز

فيه المأوى، وهناك أطلق المجلس الوطني الفلسطيني في الجزائر هجوم السلام في عام 1988، حيث قلنا لا بد أن نعتزف ولأول مرة في تاريخ الصراع العربي الإسرائيلي بالقرارات الدولية وحدود 1967 وإقامة الدولة الفلسطينية المستقلة على هذه الأرض، ولم يجد هذا الكلام تجاوبا إلا من القلة، وبعض الدول التي اعترفت بدولة فلسطين في المنفى ولكن المبادرة السياسية بقيت عرجاء

ومضت الأيام وذهبتنا إلى مدريد وأيضاً في ذهابنا إلى مدريد كانت هناك حكمة، فقد طلبوا منا طلبات تُعجز أو نريدنا أن نرد بالنفي، وهو أننا لسنا وفداً مستقلاً، ولا تمثل القدس ولا تمثل منظمة التحرير، وقبلنا لأننا لو رفضنا كنا في الخارج، وقبلنا أن ندخل وفي داخل الأروقة نقاتل ونناضل وهذا ما حصل وتذكرون كل هذا، وتعرفون تماماً أننا ناضلنا وفأوضنا في الكوربيدور، إلى أن انفصل الوفد الأردني برغبة أردنية عن الوفد الفلسطيني، يعني دخلنا مع الأردن وتحت جناحها، وكانت هناك مفاوضات الكوربيدور، وصلنا إلى أن هناك وفداً فلسطينياً وفداً أردنياً، وكانت هناك المفاجأة التي أسماها 'اتفاق أوسلو'، وهو الاتفاق الذي كان سبباً في هذا لاجتماع الذي يعقد اليوم هنا، وأوسلو هو اتفاق مبادئ ولم يدع أحد أنه اتفاق نهائي وحل المشكلة من جميع جوانبها، بل قال هناك قضايا ست يجب حلها وهي القدس والللاجئين والحدود والأمن وغيرها، ليس خطأنا أن ما حصل منذ ذلك الوقت إلى يومنا هذا لم نحصل على شيء، لأن هناك تصميمًا من إسرائيل أن لا يكون هناك حل

وما نلاحظه هذه الأيام وما وصلت إليه المفاوضات هذه الأيام ويؤكد لنا أنهم لا يريدون حلاً عاقلاً معقولاً على أساس دولتين تعيشان جنباً إلى جنب بأمن واستقرار، والدليل على ذلك أننا ذهبنا بعد ذلك إلى كامب ديفيد ولم نتمكن من الوصول إلى شيء، لأن الأفكار التي قدمت لم تكن واضحة المعالم ومحددة لنقول إن هذا مقبول وغير مقبول، وانتهت كامب ديفيد وجاءت المباحثات التي قمت بها مع رئيس الوزراء الإسرائيلي الأسبق أيهود أولمرت، وللتاريخ، هذه المفاوضات كانت جيدة وكانت بناءة وتناولت كل قضايا المرحلة النهائية، يعني لم يرفض السيد أولمرت كما يرفض خلفه النقاش في قضايا المرحلة النهائية، الحدود والقدس والللاجئين والأمن والمستوطنات، وكان هناك تبادل في الخرائط والنسب المئوية وغيرها، وكانت هناك جدية كاملة أن نصل إلى 'حل، والحل يجب أن يعرض على استفتاء شعبي

ولا يوجد أحد من حقه أن يوقع عن الشعب الفلسطيني إلا بعد أن يجري استفتاء عام لكل الفلسطينيين في كل مكان ثم يقولوا وافقنا أو رفضنا، وهي قضية ليست جديدة لم نخترعها اليوم، إنما هي قضية قديمة منذ زمن بعيد، حتى قيل لنا إنه لا يوجد في قوانيننا استفتاء قلنا لهم نخترع استفتاء، لأن الاستفتاء ضروري، السيد أولمرت فشل وأفشل وخرج متهما بقضايا، ثم جاء عهد الرئيس الأميركي باراك أوباما، الذي أرسل ميتشل وحاول ميتشل أكثر من سنة، ونصف أن يقنع الإسرائيليين بوقف الاستيطان، وفي نهاية بعثته وفي نهاية مدته جاءنا إلى هنا وقال 'لقد أفلست وسأنتهي مهمتي

في هذه الأثناء كتبنا رسالة للسيد نتنياهو قلنا له لا تريدون مفاوضات ولا تريدون سلاماً، فأنتم دولة احتلال وهذا الوضع القائم لن نقبل به، أنتم حكومة احتلال ولستم حكومة احتلال، ونحن سلطة ولنا سلطة، ولذلك نحن ذاهبون إلى الأمم المتحدة، ونذكر أن المجلس المركزي في 28-7-2011 اتخذ قراراً بالذهاب للحصول على العضوية الكاملة في الأمم المتحدة، وسبق ذلك قرارات من لجنة المتابعة العربية التي وافقت معنا أن نذهب للأمم المتحدة للحصول على عضوية كاملة

ويبدو أن البعض في العالم إلى يومنا هذا لا يأخذون جدياً ما حصل، وهذه ليست أول مرة، سنعيد الكرة، وفي أوسلو للتاريخ أبلغت أميركا أن هناك مفاوضات يقوم بها شمعون بيريس وأبو مازن، وعندها قال وزير الخارجية ورن كرستوفر 'دع الأولاد يلعبون'، ولم يأخذوا جدياً وحصل ما حصل، وقلنا إننا ذاهبون إلى مجلس الأمن وعندما وصلنا إلى الأمم المتحدة، وجدنا معارضة عنيفة جداً من الأطراف كافة، لا تذهبوا لمجلس الأمن ستخسرون، نحن نعرف في ذلك الوقت أننا سنخسر، لأننا نحتاج إلى تسع دول لتقبل معنا حتى نضع الملف في مجلس الأمن، وجبنا العالم كله شرقاً وغرباً وشمالاً وجنوباً من أجل الحصول على تسع دول ولم نحصل وكانت هذه الخطوة الأولى، والخطوة الثانية هي الفيتو بإمكان الدول الكبرى أن تستخدم الفيتو، ولكن مع ذلك أصرينا أن نذهب ونلقي كلمة أمام الجمعية العمومية وطالبنا بعضوية كاملة وفشلنا

قلنا إذا لم يكن هذا ممكناً فالحصول على عضو مراقب نسعى عليه وهذا لا يحتاج إلى مجلس الأمن، بل يحتاج إلى تصويت نسبي في الجمعية العامة، ومنذ تاريخ ذهابنا في المرة الأولى إلى 29-11 بذلت الدبلوماسية الفلسطينية جهوداً خارقة مع دول العالم كلها من أجل الحصول على التصويت وذهبنا في 23-9-2012 وقلنا لا نريد في هذه الدورة التصويت فارتاح الجميع، لكن قلنا نحن نريد أن نجري التصويت بعد الانتخابات الرئاسية الأميركية التي كانت في 6 نوفمبر وجرى تغيير الموعد، ولكن ماذا تعنون أنكم ستذهبون بعد الانتخابات، قلنا سنذهب في أحد التاريخين إما 15 نوفمبر وهو إعلان الدولة أو في 29 نوفمبر، وهو اليوم الدولي للتضامن مع الشعب الفلسطيني، وذهبنا في يوم 29 نوفمبر وكنا في غاية التوتر، لأننا كنا نخشى من أية الأعياب في الجمعية العامة تعطل التصويت، ومضت الأمور متباطئة وكأنها سنوات وسمح لاثنتين أن يتكلما في صالح المشروع، وسمح لاثنتين أن تتكلما ضد المشروع، ثم أقفل باب النقاش، وكانت النتيجة التي علمتموها هي أننا حصلنا على 138 دولة معنا، و41 دولة ليست معنا وليست ضدنا، وتسع دول ضدنا، وحققنا ما نريد

ماذا حققنا؟ حققنا قضية مهمة جداً سألت عنها قبل أن أغادر إلى الأمم المتحدة، وقيل لي ماذا ستحصل من هذا الاعتراف؟ قلت سأحصل على شيء واحد وهو أن الأرض الفلسطينية التي احتلت عام 1967 هي أرض دولة تحت الاحتلال، ولم تعد كما يراها الإسرائيليون ولا يزالون يرونها حتى الآن أرضاً متنازعة عليها، وهو ما يبررونه لأنفسهم لكي يبنون حيثما يشاءون، والدليل على ذلك أنهم يبنون على أبواب رام الله في مستوطنة بيت أيل فهي لهم، ويبنون في أي مكان لأن الأرض متنازعة عليها، والنقطة الثانية أننا أصبحنا دولة تحت الاحتلال ولنا سلطة، وهذا يعطينا الحق بالانضمام إلى 63 منظمة ومعاهدة واتفاقية دولية، عدنا وكان هناك إصرار من إخواننا على أن نذهب للمنظمات الدولية، فقلنا إننا لا بد أن نصبر لأننا لا نريد أن نقطع الحبال مع كل الناس،

وأنا مرن وعقلاني، ولا بد أن نعالج الأمور بحكمة

وجرت اتصالات مع الإدارة الأميركية ورحبنا بها، ثم جاءنا الرئيس بارك أوباما إلى هنا في زيارة دولة وليست زيارة عمل أو زيارة مجاملة، هي زيارة دولة وهذه كانت مبادرة طيبة جدا من الإدارة الأميركية، ثم بدأنا الحديث كيف نستأنف المفاوضات، وكان هذا الكلام في المملكة العربية السعودية، جاء السيد جون كيري وطلب منا أن نلتقي إما في مصر أو في السعودية، فأنا اخترت السعودية، واتفقنا على أن نستأنف المفاوضات على أساس حدود 1967، وعندما تطرق البحث إلى الاستيطان قلت له بالحرف الواحد 'نحن لا نعترف بالاستيطان من الحجر الأول حتى الأخير'، لأن الاستيطان أصله غير شرعية ولا أقبل أن يضم القسم أو ذلك لإسرائيل، فهي أرض فلسطينية محتلة، وأنا أخذت قرارا من الجمعية العامة أن الدولة الفلسطينية أرضها هي حدود 1967 وعاصمتها القدس، قال نكتفي بهذا، وبدأنا المفاوضات وأقول للتاريخ إن السيد كيري بذل جهودا خارقة، ولا تستغربوا إذا قلت لكم التقيت به 40 مرة خلال ثمانية أشهر ونصف، غير اللقاءات الأخرى هنا وهناك وتليفونات، وهذا يؤكد الإصرار والجدية، ولكن بالنتيجة لم تكن هناك نتيجة

إذا مضينا بالمفاوضات كل هذه المدة وأبلغنا الجانب الأميركي أن هناك 'إطار عمل' وأعطونا أفكارا، لكن لم نأخذ مكتوبا وكان همتنا أن نناقش كل القضايا، وكان موجودا في الأوراق كل القضايا، ولكن إذا أردت أن أعطي جوابا رسميا عليها لا بد لي أن أقرأ كل كلمة، أي يكون الكلام مكتوبا لأحكم عليه بنعم أو لا.

بعد أيام قليلة من الاتفاق على استئناف المفاوضات، طلب منا ألا نذهب للمنظمات الدولية خلال مدة المفاوضات وهي ستة إلى تسعة أشهر، ونحن قلنا لا نستطيع ولا نقبل، وهذا شيء وهذا شيء، عننا إلى هنا وفكرنا كيف يمكن لنا أن نساوم على شيء ملموس ومحسوس له قيمة؟ فقيل لنا أسرى ما قبل أو سلو، هؤلاء محكومون بالمؤبدات ولا أمل لهم بالخروج رغم أن هناك اتفاقا على إطلاق سراحهم ولا أمل بخروجهم، وقلنا لا مانع نساوم وطالبنا أن يطلق سراح 104 أسرى بالاسم، ونحن نلتزم بعد الذهاب لمدة تسعة أشهر للمنظمات الدولية، فورا جاء السيد جون كيري وأخذ الأمور بجدية واتصل بنتنياهو قال موافقون، ولكن السيد نتنياهو لا يثق بكم ويقول إنني كذاب، فهو لا يستطيع أن يطلق سراح الأسرى دفعة واحدة وإنما يطلقها 4 دفعات، وحددت تواريخ الأربع دفعات، والأخيرة كانت في 29-3-2014. وسارت المفاوضات وعملية الإطلاق، وأطلق سراح الدفعات الثلاث، والإسرائيليون حاولوا أن يخلطوا ما بين إطلاق سراح الأسرى والاستيطان أو إطلاق سراح الأسرى والتقدم في المفاوضات، هذه قضية منفصلة عن القضية الأخرى، 104 أسرى مقابل عدم الذهاب للمنظمات الدولية لا بأس، لأن أرواح هؤلاء مهمة لنا ونتحمل ليعيد هؤلاء إلى أهلهم خصوصا أنهم قضاة ما بين 20 إلى 30 عاما داخل السجون، وقيل أن يأتي موعد الدفعة الرابعة قالوا لنا توجد مشكلة، أنه يوجد 14 أسيرا يحملون الجنسية الإسرائيلية وهؤلاء مواطنون إسرائيليون ولا يحق لكم التدخل في تقرير مصيرهم، قلنا لهم يجب أن يقول نتنياهو هذا الكلام من الأول، وهو لم يقل شيئا وأعطينا القائمة كاملة، ونحن نرى ونصر على أن الأسرى يعودون إلى بيوتهم، وهنا لدينا سابتان خطيرتان في الماضي لن تتكررا، الأولى كنسبة المهدي وإبعادهم لمدة سنة ولهم 13 عاما في المنفى، والسابقة الأخرى صفقة جلعاد شاليط بإبعاد الأسرى للدول العربية، هؤلاء لن يعودوا للوطن، ولذلك نحن نقول لن نقبل إلا كل واحد يعود لبيته، ولن نقبل أن ينتزلوا عن الجنسية فكل واحد يحمل جنسيته وتبقى له، وبالتالي هذا هو موقفنا بالنسبة للأسرى ونحن نقول إن الإبعاد مخالف للقانون الدولي والقانون الإنساني ومخالف لكل الشرائع العالمية، لأنك تستطيع أن تحكم بالإعدام على مواطن لديك، ولكن لا يجوز لك أن تطرده من وطنه أو تمنعه من العودة لوطنه، وكانت هذه المشكلة، قالوا إنه يوجد 10 خطيرين سيعودون للصفة نريد أن نبعدهم، وقلنا نفس الكلام بأننا سنرفض، ولذلك نحن لن نقبل بإبعاد أي واحد، وخالصة القول بالنسبة للمفاوضات قلنا لهم إن القدس الشرقية عاصمة لدولة فلسطين، ومسألة حدود 1967 لا نقاش فيها وأصبحنا دولة، وإنهاء الاحتلال تنفق على مدة، واللجانين إذا كان هناك لاجئ لا يريد العودة يبقى وبأخذ تعويضا بالاتفاق مع الدولة المضيفة، أو أحب أن يذهب من بلد إلى بلد يأخذ تعويضا أو أحب العودة لدولة فلسطين يأخذ تعويضا، ولكن يجب أن يكون هناك حق العودة، كما نصت على ذلك مبادرة السلام العربية التي تقول حل عادل ومتفق عليه للجانين حسب القرار 194، إذا يوجد حق عودة، ولذلك أقول لإخواننا المثقفين الذين بعثوا الرسالة المفتوحة لم نسقط حق العودة، إذا هذه القضايا التي نحن نريدها فيما يتعلق بحقوقنا، قالوا كيف يمكن أن نستأنف المفاوضات وقلنا إنه ليس لدينا مانع أن نذهب لتمديد المفاوضات ولكن... يطلق سراح الأسرى القدامى الثلاثين وعلى الطاولة نضع خارطتنا لمدة ثلاثة أشهر بحث الخريطة، وإلى أن يتم الاتفاق على الخريطة تتوقف كل النشاطات الاستيطانية بالكامل، ونحن هذا هو موقفنا الذي نريده ولم نحصل على جواب عليه، وهنا دخلنا في الأزمات، كان المفروض أن يطلق سراح الأسرى يوم 29 آذار الماضي ولم يتم، وسألني وزير الأسرى وقلت له على موعدنا، وذهب إلى سجن عوفر وقلت له إنه يوجد موعد ويجب أن نحترمه، وفي هذه الأثناء كانت الاتصالات قائمة بيننا وبين الإسرائيليين والأميركان، في 29 و30 و31 بعثنا رسالة مكتوبة قرأها الطرفان تقول إنه إذا لم يطلق سراح الأسرى فالقيادة مجتمعة في تلك الأيام وحتى يوم 1 نيسان، سنذهب للمنظمات الدولية، فمضى 29 و30 و31 وجاء يوم الأول من نيسان، وأنا انتظرت في مكنتي والقيادة مجتمعة هنا وستأخذ قرارا، وأنا أنتظر أن يجتمع مجلس الوزراء الإسرائيلي ولم يجتمع، فقررت القيادة يومها الانضمام لـ 15 منظمة دولية، وقلنا للإعلام إننا مع استمرار المفاوضات، ونحن شاكرون لكل الوقت والجهد الذي بذله الأميركيان، ونحن مستعدون للاستمرار، ولكن ما دام لم يحصل شيء اليوم وقفنا على أوراق الانضمام للاتفاقيات الدولية، وقال لنا الإسرائيليون إنهم تفاجأوا بالتوقيع، وأنا قلت أننا بعثنا رسالة وأخبرناكم بذلك، ووقفنا على رسائل الانضمام للمنظمات الدولية في الليل، سألني الأخوان هل نسلم الرسائل للجهات الدولية، قلت سلموها لثلاث جهات للأمم المتحدة وبعضها لهولندا، وبعضها لجنيف وأخبروهم أن يفعلوها

فاستلمت الدول وبدأ التفعيل وجاءتنا الرسائل فوراً، 'جنيف' أنتم أصبحت شريكا متعاقدا ساميا في اتفاقيات جنيف الأولى والثانية والثالثة والرابعة، وفي هولندا أصبحت دولة فلسطين عضوا في هذه المعاهدة رغم أن هولندا لم تصوت معنا في الأمم المتحدة، ولكن في هذه الرسالة دولة فلسطين أصبحت عضوا، وفي الأمم المتحدة حسب الإجراءات الخاصة، وكل المعاهدات مستمرة ونحن أخذنا الـ 15 معاهدة، وفي خطاب أبو الأديب وباقي الإخوان يتحدثون عن الانضمام لباقي المعاهدات، وهنا أقول نحن نسير بصورة عقلانية ولكن كل شيء من حقنا، والدليل أنه عندما جاء الوقت ولم نحصل على الأسرى من

حقنا أن نذهب، لأننا قلنا من البداية تسعة أشهر، وأنتم لم تلتزموا، لماذا أنا التزم؟ وغير صحيح أنهم تقاجأوا بالذهاب للمنظمات الدولية.

الآن أسبق الأحداث قليلاً لأقول إنه نتيجة للمصالحة التي 'فاجأتهم' أيضاً رغم أن الوفد حصل على تصاريح من إسرائيل لدخول غزة، وحدثت إجراءات ضدنا وأول عقوبة فرض عقوبات اقتصادية، فالاحتلال له اليد العليا، ووقف المفاوضات، والشيء الثاني تخفيض مستوى الاتصالات، ليقصر على مجال المفاوضات والأمن فقط، ونحن سنقول لدولة إسرائيل أنتم دولة احتلال، أنتم المسؤولون عن كل شيء هنا، وعن كل هذه الفراغات هنا، تفضلوا تحملوا مسؤولياتكم، وهذا ما يجب أن نقوله لهم وهذا ما قلناه، ما دمتم دولة احتلال الوضع الراهن لن نقبل به واستمرار الاستيطان والاعتداءات على الناس والقدس والحرق والقتل لن نقبل به، وأنتم دولة محتلة بلغوا العالم أن فلسطين دولة تحت الاحتلال، ونحن أخذنا من الأمم المتحدة أن فلسطين دولة تحت الاحتلال، نحن نقول للإسرائيليين باعتباركم دولة احتلال تفضلوا استلموا مسؤولياتكم نحن نصراف ما يجب أن يصرفه الاحتلال ونحمل المسؤوليات، لن نحمل مسؤوليات، وهذه هي الخلاصة التي جاءت نتيجة للمفاوضات ولموضوع الأسرى، ومن يريد العودة للمفاوضات يجب أن يطلق الأسرى ويوقف الاستيطان بكل أشكاله ويعود للطاولة، وإذا لم يقفوا، فليحضروا ويتحملوا مسؤولياتهم.

الإسرائيليون على مدى سنوات الماضية موافقون على الانفصال والانقسام، ومؤيدون وراعون وحامون للانفصال، والسبب هو أن إسرائيل كلما قلنا مفاوضات تقول مع من أتفاوض مع غزة أم الضفة؟ وعلنا مصالحة وقالوا إما تختاروا حماس أو المفاوضات؟ قلنا لهم هذا شيء وهذا شيء، وهذه أرضنا وشعبنا ولا علاقة لك بهم، فهم يقولون إن حماس إرهابيون وعندما يقول إنهم إرهابيون لماذا عملوا معهم اتفاقيات، اتفاقية الهدنة التي وقعت عبر الرئيس محمد مرسي، وكانت هنا وزيرة خارجية أميركا هيلاري كلنتون حملت اتفاق التهدئة وقعت على اتفاق الهدنة، ولنا ضد الاتفاق والتهدئة، وتحترمانا التهديد ولماذا أنا ممنوع أن أذهب لحماس وأختار بيني وبين حماس، وقد قلت ذلك لصحفيين إسرائيليين زاروني قبل يومين هنا في مقر الرئاسة، إن حماس شعبنا وإسرائيل شركاؤنا، لا أستطيع أن أستعني عن شعبنا ولا عن شركائنا، والآن يطالعون بحدوث أنه وضع يده بيد الإرهاب وهذه حجج، وإضافة إلى ذلك قالوا إنهم يجب أن يقوموا بالتشهير الشخصي بأبو مازن وهذا لا يهمني، وغضب ننتياهو بعدما سمع عن المصالحة وقال إنه تقاجأ بها.

الحدث الذي نحن نعترض به ويجب أن نأخذه بمنتهى الجدية، ويجب أن نعمل من أجل إنجازه بكل الوسائل ويجب أن تتوفر النوايا الطيبة لدى جميع الأطراف وليس هنالك حجج، أن الأوان أن نسير في المصالحة، وأنتم تعرفون أننا عملنا انتخابات في 25-1-2006، ومررت فيها ملايين كثيرة لا أريد أن أذكرها، لكن كلها كانت تؤدي إلى ما وصلنا إليه، حدثت أحداث كثيرة في غزة وقامت المملكة العربية السعودية مشكورة بدعوة الأطراف كلها إلى أستان الكعبة لنعد اتفاقاً هناك ينتهي بحكومة وحدة وطنية، وفعلاً ذهبنا وعملنا حكومة وحدة وطنية من أطراف مختلفة، وقبل هذا عندما حصل الانقلاب اجتمعت الجامعة العربية وخولت مصر بالمصالحة، ونحن لأن متمسكون بدور مصر في المصالحة، وبصرف النظر عن التوتر في العلاقات بين مصر وحماس، لكن مصر تميز بين هذا وذاك وحريصة على المصالحة ومستعدة لاستمرار وجودها، ونحن لا نقبل بديلاً عن مصر.

وبعد لقاء مكة باركته مصر، ولكن بعد ذلك حصل انقلاب منذ ذلك الحين ونحن في مساح للمصالحة وأبرز هذه المساعي هي اتفاق في الدوحة، من أجل أن تكون مصر هي الخيمة والراعي، ذهبنا إلى مصر وأعلنا عن هذا الاتفاق وبورك هذا لاتفاق منذ 6-2-2012، ولم ينفذ، والآن لا نلوم أنفسنا، لدينا شيء جديد سنسير به، لدينا اتفاق مبسط من نقطتين نريد حكومة تكنوقراط مستقلين ونريد الذهاب لانتخابات، والاحتكام لصندوق الاقتراع هو أساس الديمقراطية في العالم، فقد مضت 8 سنوات على الانتخابات الرئاسية، والتشريعية 7 سنوات، وأن الأوان لأن نجدد شرعيتنا، خاصة أن لدينا دولة، يجب على الفقهاء والحكام أن يجتمعوا لفهم ماذا يمكن أن نعمل، هل هو مجلس تشريعي أم برلمان؟ هل هي انتخابات لرئيس دولة أم لرئيس سلطة؟ هذه أمور قانونية لدينا الوقت الكافي لأن نبحثها هنا ونخرج بنتيجة وطالما الأمور بهذا الشكل فهي جيدة، وأنا هنا باسمكم جميعاً أحيي الأخ رامي الحمد الله الذي وضع استقالته بالأمس في تصرفنا، وكتب أن ذلك حرصاً على المصلحة الوطنية لتسير إلى الأمام.

والحكومة التي ستأتي ستكون كالحكومات السابقة، تقوم بالعمل على الخاص بالسلطة، أما المفاوضات فهي شأن من شؤون منظمة التحرير، لأنها تمثل كل شعبنا ولأن التفاوض باسم كل الشعب ومصالح كل الشعب وأولها اللاجئين، والمنظمة هي التي تمثلهم وترعى مصالحهم وهي التي تحمي كل ما يحتاجونه، فالحكومة تأتمر بأمر سياسي، أنا معترف بإسرائيل وهي معترفة وأنا أنبذ العنف والإرهاب، وأنا معترف بالشرعية الدولية وهي معترفة، وأنا ملتزم بالالتزامات الدولية والحكومة ستنفذ الاتفاقيات الدولية التي وقعنا عليها، ولا يحق لأحد أن يقول إنها حكومة إرهاب أو متطرفين، وأن الأوان لنرفع الحصار عن غزة، يجب أن نبذل كل الجهد لفك الحصار من كل الاتجاهات، فهم جزء من شعبنا ومن واجبنا ومن حقهم علينا أن نعمل كل ما يمكن لإنقاذ الوضع في غزة، المياه ملوثة بنسبة 95% يشربون الملح، والمواد التمييزية الأولية غير موجودة، والأنفاق أغلقت وأنا مع إقفال الأنفاق جميعاً، ولكن مع أن يعطى الشعب الفلسطيني كل حقوقه هناك، يجب أن ننتبه إلى معاناة الشعب والصعوبات التي يعيشها ويجب أن نزيلها عنه، فالأنفاق غير شرعية وغير قانونية.

...أيها الإخوة أيها الأخوات

توجد فكرة دولة فلسطينية مستقلة في غزة ونوسعها 1600 كيلومتر وحكم ذاتي هنا، وهذه السياسة المتبعة منذ وعد بلفور حتى اليوم، ونحن بالمصالحة والوحدة كسرنا هذا الشعار، وقلنا إن فلسطين دولة واحدة.

وفي قضية معروضة عليّ بخصوص الدولة اليهودية، منذ سنتين أو ثلاث سنوات بدأ يعرض علينا ما يسمى بالدولة اليهودية، نحن موقفنا بأننا في الاعتراف المتبادل اعترفنا بدولة إسرائيل ونحن في الحكومة نعتزف بدولة إسرائيل، وعندما عقدت معاهدة مع مصر لم يطلب منها هذا، وعندما عقدت

معاهدة مع الأردن لم يطلب منها هذا، فلماذا يطلب منا أن نعتزف بيهودية الدولة، وأنا أقول لا للاعتراف بالدولة اليهودية، وأنا أسأل لماذا لا تذهب للأمم المتحدة وتطلب منهم الاعتراف بالدولة اليهودية؟ نقطة أخيرة شرحتها للصحفيين الإسرائيليين قلت لهم قد لا تعرفون تاريخكم نحن نعرفه أكثر منكم، من سنة 1900 إلى 2000 بعد انهيار الاتحاد السوفيتي الصديق، هاجر إلى إسرائيل مليون روسي، أكثر من 50% من هؤلاء مسلمين ومسيحيين، فهم أخذوا حق العودة للوطن، فكيف تسمح لهؤلاء، فهم مسيحيون ومسلمون، كيف تفسر لي الدولة اليهودية، الجندي الفلاشا يتوقف على الحاجز ويصلي، لا شأن لي بهم، ولكن يقول هذا يدخل وهذا ممنوع، نحن لن نقبل الاعتراف بالدولة اليهودية

...أيها الإخوة أيتها الأخوات

لنعود إلى الورا قليلاً بالحراك العربي الذي حصل في الدول العربية والذي بدأ في تونس ثم مصر ثم ليبيا ثم سوريا وقبل ذلك كان في اليمن، كان موقفنا القاطع لا علاقة لنا بما يجري هنا وهناك، ليس لنا دعوة بقضايا العرب الداخلية، لذلك قلنا لا تدخل لنا فيما يجري في الدول العربية وبالذات في سوريا، لأنه يوجد 600 ألف فلسطيني ينعكس وضعهم على 300 ألف آخرين، يعني مليون فلسطين تحت الخطر، ولا أريد أن يكون لنا أي علاقة بهذه الأحداث، لذلك نحن لسنا مع هذا الطرف وللسنا مع هذا الطرف، وللسنا ضد هذا الطرف، ولكن نحن نقول كلمة واحدة فقط تحل المشكلة السورية الداخلية بالحوار، وثبت لهم الآن أن ما قلناه صحيح، ونحن قدمنا أفكاراً بهذا المعنى ورحب بها الطرفان، لأنه يوجد قتال هنا وهناك والضحية هو الشعب وهذا ما حصل في مخيماتنا، وهذه المأساة التي يعيشها أبناء شعبنا، بعد تسعة أشهر ذهب قيس عبد الكريم 'أبو ليلي' ليرى ماذا يجري في المخيمات الفلسطينية فعاد بجملته واحدة 'من دخل بيت أبو سفيان فهو آمن'، ومعنى ذلك أن من يشعر بالخطر يذهب إلى المخيم، ويحلون مشاكل بين المتخاصمين، وفجأة أقحم الإخوان المخيمات في الصراع فكان الدمار واللجوء، وكان واجبنا أن نكلف الأخ الدكتور زكريا الأغا والأخ الدكتور أحمد مجدلاوي لحل المشكلة، وحصلت انتقادات لذهابنا، ولكن قلنا إنه لا علاقة لنا فيما يجري هناك فقط أريد أن أحمي شعبي هناك، وذهبوا إلى هناك والتقوا مع الكل ونجحوا في التخفيف من معاناة شعبنا، وبدأت تدخل المعونات، لعل وعسى يعود اللاجئون الذين تشردوا من المخيمات السورية، وستتم في هذا الجهد وستستمر في هذا الموقف، ليس لنا علاقة بما يجري، وليس لنا علاقة بالحراك العربي، إما نقول كلمة طيبة أو نصمت، وهذا هو وضعنا

...أيها الإخوة أيتها الأخوات

بالنسبة لموضوع القدس الشريف فهي درة التاج، تحتاج إلى جهود كثيرة، وما يحصل أنه ليس فقط لا تأتي هذه الجهود إنما تعرقل، فكثيرون يدعون إلى عدم الذهاب للقدس، وأنا سمعت من قال إن زيارة القدس حرام وتطبيع، وأنا أقول إن من يحضر لتثبيت أهل القدس لا يطبع، فالقدس من دون مواطنيها لا قيمة لها تصبح حجارة فقط، والإهمال كبير للقدس، ومنذ القمتين العربيتين اللتين عقدتا في مدينة سرت الليبية، والتي تعهدوا خلالها بدعم القدس ولم يصل شيء، وأنا قلت للعقيد معمر القذافي، يا سيادة العقيد لم يدفع أحد، فأجاب ماذا أفعل أضع يدي في جيوبهم فقلت له لا ضع يدك في جيبيك، مع الأسف فقد قرروا دفع 500 مليون لصندوق القدس في البنك الإسلامي ووصل منها 37 مليون فقط، ومن يريد أن يحمي القدس ويرعاها يجب أن يدعم صمود أهلها، الآن إسرائيل يمكن أن توقف الاستيطان إذا ضغط عليهم بشدة في كل الضفة من دون القدس، وأنا أقول أنه لا يوجد قدس لا توجد مفاوضات

هذا ما كان لدينا حول قضية المفاوضات والأسرى والمصالحة العريضة على قلوبنا والتي نأمل أن تتم بخير وأن تكون هناك نواباً طيبة لدى الجميع لدفعها إلى الأمام، ليست لدينا خيارات أخرى، الخيار الآخر هو تقسيم البلد وإقامة دولة في غزة كما يريد الإسرائيليون والحديث عن توسيع غزة بـ 1600 كيلومتر، وكان الحديث عن منطقة حرة وأنا سألت الرئيس المصري السابق محمد مرسي عن هذا المشروع، فقال من أجل إخواننا في غزة، فقلت له هذا مشروع غير وطني ينهي الحل الوطني، ويرمي غزة في وجه مصر، ونسي القسم الأول وقال ماذا يعني هذا؟ كم عدد سكان قطاع غزة؟ قلت له مليون ونصف نسمة، فقال ماذا يعني نضعهم في شجرة ونحضر لهم وجبات ساخنة، فقلت له هكذا فهمتها، أيغورا أيلند هو من أحضر المشروع فكانت النية بـ 1600 كيلو متر وبدأت الكرافانات تدخل سيناء، والمشروع كان في طريقة للتنفيذ ولكنها لا دامت لهذا ولا دامت لذلك، والانقسام سينتهي وستعود الوحدة الوطنية الفلسطينية

...والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

(The Arabic text was translated by Google translator. It is not an accurate translation; it is meant for statistical purposes only).

Sisters and brothers..

Cliché that we hold this Council under difficult and complex, but we hope we have today reached a peak of complexity and difficulty in everything we do and what we do, but we will remain steadfast to our right and the highest ethical standards, and we must get to our complete the establishment of an independent Palestinian State with Jerusalem as its capital, this is our goal and this is our goal, and that's what we have devoted our lives for it so we continue and will not give up what we experience difficulties from the pressure of blackmail.

In the past two days has hope that a return to the unity of the Palestinian people, and that is we must stick to it and brought to nawajes, and we waited and we'll talk about this long and patience and we suffered, but it is time to pick the fruits of this patience and restore the unity of the Palestinian people.

Today we have different issues must we address to all the hot issues, negotiations is hot, and the issue is hot, and the issue of reconciliation is promising, there is Jerusalem, which we must not lose sight of the start, but never forget, and we remember and we work in all events, it is the capital of the State of Palestine, without which no nation, we will not accept that there is no State of Palestine with East Jerusalem occupied in 1967 as its capital. In addition we must research and scrutiny of our brothers in Syria, those who have suffered and suffered much without the guilt in the rare times that we are far away or turning ourselves from everything being they sweetened us protection to our people and our people, co-opting the wonder of new refugee tragedy comparable to the tragedy of 1948, if not the most difficult, issues which we speak today and hopefully we can take it all.

Negotiations, brethren means of political action, which we want to obtain our rights through negotiations, was the first indication we gave it in 1974 when we decided the establishment of an independent Palestinian State on the territories liberated, although we accepted and in 1969 a bomb we didn't find acceptable a democratic Palestinian State.

If in 1974 had the audacity to leadership that occur and are carrying weapons at the time, Abu Ammar said, ' I came with an olive branch and a gun, don't let the olive branch from my hand ', and was serious too in that time, olive means peace, come to a common word, and nothing has happened, and the days passed and you know we have extradited from Lebanon with oppression and force to Tunisia green we all respect and appreciation, a country that at the time it iz lawana shelter, there The Palestinian National Council in Algeria attacks peace in 1988, where we must admit for the first time in the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict by international resolutions and the 1967 borders and the establishment of an independent Palestinian State on the land, and did not find this response only a few, and some States have recognized the State of Palestine in exile but political initiative remained lame.

The days we went to Madrid and also we went to Madrid there was wisdom, they requested us requests or want us to fail to respond in the negative is that we are not a separate delegation, not Jerusalem, PLO, us because if we we were abroad, us to enter inside the hallway fight and fight and that is what happened and you remember all this, and you know that we fought and which we have negotiated in alkoridor, that ripped off the Jordanian delegation to the Jordanian desireThe Palestinian delegation, entered with Jordan and under its wing, and there were negotiations, alkoridor, we got to a Palestinian delegation and Jordanian delegation, there was surprise that the name ' Oslo ', which was the cause of this meeting held here today, Oslo is an agreement of principles and not one that a final agreement and resolve the problem in all its aspects, but there are six issues to be resolved are Jerusalem, refugees, borders and security and others, not our fault what happened since that time to the present day We don't get anything, because there's a design from Israel that there is no solution.

And what we observe these days and the negotiations these days and assures us that they do not want to sound reasonable solution based on two States living side by side in security and stability, so we went to Camp David and we couldn't reach something, because the ideas presented were not clearly defined and specific to say that this is

acceptable and unacceptable, and the Camp David talks that we came out with former Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, to date, these negotiations have been good and constructive. Each addressed the issues of the final stage, means denied Mr. Olmert as his successor rejects discussion in the final stage, borders, Jerusalem, refugees, settlements, security and there was an Exchange in the charts, percentages, etc and there was a seriousness to reach a solution, and the solution must be put to a referendum'.

And no one has the right to sign the Palestinian people only after a referendum of all Palestinians everywhere and then say we have approved or rejected, the issue is not new to invent it today, but the old long ago, so we were told that there is nothing in our pipeline for inventing a referendum, said the referendum was necessary, Mr. Olmert failed and failed and came out charging issues, then came the era of President Obama, who sent Park Mitchell and Mitchell tried over a year and a half that Convince the Israelis to stop the settlements, at the end of his mission at the end of the year brought here and said 'I have avelsht and I'll finish my task'.

In the meantime, we wrote a letter to Mr. Netanyahu said he does not want negotiations and do not want peaceful, you are an occupying power and that the status quo will not accept it, the Government of the occupation and not the Government of the occupation, we are the authority and not the power, so we're going to the United Nations, we recall that the Central Council on 28-7-2011 made a decision to go for full membership in the United Nations, earlier resolutions of the follow-up Commission agreed with us that the Arabic go to full membership.

It seems that some people in the world to this day do not take seriously, and this is not the first time, we're going to the ball, in Oslo to date America was informed that there were negotiations conducted by Shimon Peres and Abbas and then Foreign Secretary Warren Christopher 'let the boys play, and did not take seriously and got what you got, and we said we were going to the Security Council when we arrived, we found a very violent opposition from all sides, do not go to the Security Council the loser, we know time we will lose, because we need The nine States to accept us until we put the file in the Security Council, and cowardly World East and West, North and South for nine States did we get this first step, the second step is the major States can veto the use of veto, but we insisted that we go and take a look before the General Assembly and demanded full membership and failed.

We said if this is not possible, access to our observer member and this does not require the Security Council needs to vote in the General Assembly, since the first time we went to 29-11 the Palestinian diplomatic efforts have made superhero with all nations of the world to get votes and went 23-9-2012 and we do not want this vote, everyone is relieved, but we said we want to hold the vote after the US presidential elections on November 6, the date was changed, but What do you mean you are going after the elections, we have said we will go on one of the dates of either Nov. 15 and is the State or on November 29, the international day of solidarity with the Palestinian people, and we went on November 29 and we were very nervous, because we were afraid of any gamesmanship in the General Assembly vote, crashes and slow things like years and allowed the two to speak in favor of the project, allowed the two that Jew is against the project, and then close the debate, and the result was that you knew her, we got 138 With us, and 41 State not with us and not against us, and nine States against us, and we have achieved what we want.

What do we have? We have a very important question I asked before I left to the United Nations, and I was told what you'll get from this recognition? I'll get one thing is that the Palestinian land occupied in 1967 is the land of State under occupation, and no longer as seen by Israelis and still see it even now disputed territory, which is justified for themselves to build wherever they please, and that they are building on Ramallah in the Beit El settlement are them, and build anywhere for the disputed territory, the second point is that we are under occupation and State authority, and this gives us the right to accede to the Treaty Organization and 63 Convention International, we came back and there was a determination of our brothers that we go to international organizations, we have said that we must be patient because we do not want to cut the ropes with all the people, I am flexible and reasonable, and must deal with matters with wisdom.

Contacts with the US administration and we welcomed it, and then gave us President Obama to park here for a State visit and not visit or call, is a State visit, and this was a very good initiative from the us, and then we started talking how to resume the negotiations, this was a speech in Saudi Arabia, according to John Kerry and asked us to meet either in Egypt or Saudi Arabia, I choose, and agreed to resume negotiations on the basis of the 1967 borders, when touched to the settlement said, Literally ' we don't recognize the settlement of first stone until the final ', because of illegal origin and settlement do not accept that section or that of Israel, occupied Palestinian territory, and I took a decision of the General Assembly that the State of the Palestinian territory is the 1967 borders with Jerusalem as its capital, we said, and we started the negotiations and say to date that Mr. Kerry superhuman efforts, they find strange if I tell you I met 40 times during the eight and a half months, but other events here and there, telephones, and this confirms the determination and seriousness, but The result was not there as a result.

If we proceeded with the negotiations long and informed us that there is a ' framework ' and give us ideas, but did not take it in writing and we were to discuss all the issues, and was present in all cases, but if you want to give an answer formally I must read each word, which is a written speech to the wisest it yes or no.

A few days after the agreement to resume negotiations, we were asked not to go to international organizations during the period of negotiations and is six to nine months, and we cannot and do not accept, this is something that, went back to here and we thought how can we compromise on something concrete and tangible value? Then we were told prisoners before Oslo, those governed by the eternal and hopeless out although there was agreement on the launch of their secrets and hope they leave, and we don't mind the compromise and demanded the release of 104 prisoners by name, and we are still going for nine months for international organizations, immediately came to Mr. John Kerry taking things seriously and call Netanyahu said agreement, but Mr. Netanyahu did not trust you and say I am a liar, he cannot be released prisoners at once, but by 4 instalments and identified four dates Payments, and the last on 29-3-2014. And the negotiations process, and released three instalments, the Israelis tried to knead between release and settlement or the release of prisoners and progress in the negotiations, this issue is separate from the other, 104 captives in Exchange for not going to a good international organizations, because their lives are important to us and have to return them to their parents especially that they spent 20 to 30 years in prison, and before that a batch date comesThe fourth told us there was a problem, there are 14 prisoners of Israeli nationality and those Israeli citizens, and you may not interfere with destiny, said Netanyahu should say this speech is nothing and we gave him the list complete, we believe and insist that prisoners are returning to their homes, and here we have two serious precedents in the past will not be repeated, 1st Church of the Nativity and removed for a year and their 13 years in exile, and theOther previous package of Gilad Shalit to deport prisoners to Arabic, these will not return home, so we will accept every one back home, and we will not relinquish citizenship each nationality and keep him, so this is our for the prisoners and we say that deportation is contrary to international law, humanitarian law and contrary to all international norms, because you can control your citizen to death, but you may not beResponse from his homeland or preventing him from returning to his homeland, this was the problem, they said that there are 10 serious return to the West Bank want to keep them away, we said the same words that we will refuse, so we will not accept any dimensions, the bottom line for the negotiations, said that East Jerusalem is the capital of the State of Palestine, and the issue of the 1967 borders where we don't talk, we agree on the duration of the occupation, and if there is a refugee does not want back stays and takes the compensationThe agreement with the host State, or would like to go from one country to take compensation or would like to return to the State of Palestine takes compensation, but there must be a right of return, as called for in the Arabic peace initiative which says and just solution agreed to by resolution 194, if there is a right of return, so I say to our fellow intellectuals who have sent open letter do not drop the right of return ', if these issues that we want for our rights,They said how can resume negotiations and we said that we'd go to extend the negotiations but ... Former prisoners released and put on the table a three-month map search map, that map is agreed stop all settlement activities, and we this is our position that we want and we don't get the answer, and here we entered the crisis, was to release the prisoners on 29 March and was not, and family Minister asked me and I told him to meet us and went to Ofer prison and told him that there was an appointment and must beHatrmh, meanwhile, were contacts list shown and between the Israelis and the Americans, on 29, 30 and 31 sent a written message read by both parties say that if the prisoners are not released, the combined leadership in those days to the day of April 1, we will

go to international organizations, 29, 30 and 31 and the first day of April, I waited in my Office and leadership together here and will take a decision, and I'm waiting to meet Israeli Cabinet has not met, the Accession day leadership decided for 15 international organizations, told media that we are continuing the negotiations, and we are thankful for all the time and effort made by the Americans, and we are ready to continue, but as long as nothing has happened today we signed papers of accession to international conventions, the Israelis told us that they were surprised by the signature, I'm told we sent our letter and we've, and signed the letters to join international organizations, asked the brothers whether we acknowledge messages to the international, I surrendered to the three sides of the United Nations and each of the Netherlands, some of Geneva and told them to do.

It received the activation and we started the messages immediately, ' Geneva ' you become a high contracting partner of the Geneva Conventions, first, second, third, fourth, and in the Netherlands became a member of the State of Palestine, although the Netherlands, this Treaty did not vote with us in the United Nations, but the State of Palestine became a member, and in the United Nations by the special procedures, all treaties and we took the 15 Treaty, in a speech Abu Al-Adib and other brothers talk about accession to other treaties, and here I say we rationally but everything Right, and that when it came time, we don't get the prisoners have the right to go, as we have said from the start of nine months, and you did not make, why am I committed? And they were surprised by going to international organizations.

Now earlier events a bit to say that as a result of reconciliation ' unprepared ' although the delegation also obtained permits from Israel to enter Gaza, and updated procedures against us and penalty imposition of economic sanctions, occupation has the upper hand, stopping negotiations, second level, to negotiations and security only, and we will say to the State of Israel as an occupying power, you are responsible for everything here, all these blanks here, please take your responsibilities, what to say to them and that's what we said, what happy state of occupation The status quo would not accept continued settlement activities and attacks on people and Jerusalem, burning and murder will not accept it, and you have the world occupying Palestine State under occupation, and we took the United Nations to the Palestinian State under occupation, we say to the Israelis as occupying power sincerely received responsibilities we spend what we must and assume responsibilities related occupation, will not assume responsibility, and this is the conclusion that came as a result of the negotiations and the prisoners, who wants to return to negotiations to release prisoners and stop settlement activity in all its forms and come back to the table, And if you stand, sit and assume their responsibilities.

Over the years, the Israelis agreed to separation and Division, supporters and sponsors and Hamon for separation, reason is that Israel as we negotiate with says negotiations with Gaza or West Bank? And our interests and they either choose Hamas or negotiations? We told them this thing, this thing, this is our land and our people, and not you, they say that the Hamas terrorists and say they are terrorists, why have worked with them, the truce agreement signed by President Mohammed Morsi, and America's Foreign Minister congratulated Hillary Clinton carried the cease fire agreement, signed the Armistice Agreement, and are not against the agreement and pacification and appeasement and why I respect who all go to Hamas and chose between me and Hamas and has said that for Israeli journalists have come two days ago here in the State House, that Hamas and Israel Our partners, I can not waived our people and our partners, and now learn about the speech he put his hand but terrorism and these arguments, and in addition they must take personal defamation Abu Mazen that don't care, anger Netanyahu after he heard about reconciliation and said he would be surprised by.

Event that we cherish and we must take it very seriously, and we must work to do by all means must have good intentions on all sides and no arguments, it is time to move on, and you know we have elections in the 25-1-2006, and passed many circumstances where I don't want to mention them, but all were to have come, there have been many events in Gaza and Saudi Arabia has kindly invited all parties to the cover of the Ka'bah to hold there agreement ends with the unity Government National, actually we went, our Government of national unity from different parties, and before that when he got the coup met University Arabic and Egypt to reconciliation, and we now hold Egypt's role in reconciliation, regardless of the tense relations between Egypt and Hamas, Egypt distinguished between this and that

and is keen on reconciliation and ready for its continued existence, and we do not accept a substitute for Egypt.

After meeting Mecca blessed Egypt, but then got a coup since we sought reconciliation efforts are highlighted in the Doha agreement, in order to be a shepherd's tent and Egypt, we went to Egypt and declared this agreement this agreement and Burke since 6/2/2012, has not been implemented, and now don't blame ourselves, we have something new we go, we have a simplified agreement from the Government of independent technocrats want points and we want to go to elections, and access to the ballot box is the basis of democracies in the world, eight years have passed Presidential elections, legislative 7 years, it is time to renew our legitimacy, especially since we have a State, the scholars and wise men to come to understand what can be done, if it is the legislature or Parliament? Is it an election for head of State or head of the authority? These legal matters have time because we are discussing here and come up with a result as long as things like this is good, and I'm here on behalf of all pay tribute to brother Rami thank God who placed his resignation yesterday in acted, wrote that in the national interest for going forward.

And the Government that will come will be as the previous Governments, are working on the power, the negotiations are a matter for the PLO, it represents all our people and to negotiate on behalf of all the people and the interests of the people first, the organization is represented by sponsoring their interests and protect everything they need, under government orders, the politicals, I recognized Israel and recognizing I renounce violence and terror, and I recognized the international legitimacy and recognition, and I am committed to international obligations, the Government will implement the international conventions that we have signed, and no one has the right to say It's the Government of terrorism, extremists, and it is time to lift the siege on Gaza, we must make every effort to lift the siege from all directions, understand the part of our people and it is our duty and we must do everything possible to save the situation in Gaza, water contaminated by 95% drink salt, raw material supply, and tunnels were closed and I with the closure of all spending, but to give the Palestinian people all their rights there, you must be attentive to the people's suffering and difficulties experienced by, and must remove them, spending Illegal and legal.

Brothers sisters...

There is the idea of an independent Palestinian State in Gaza and the 1600 kilometres and Hydra autonomy here, and this policy since the Balfour until today, we have broken this reconciliation and unity logo, we say that Palestine State one.

In the case before it concerning the Jewish State two years ago or three years ago we started to introduce the so-called Jewish State, we position our mutual recognition we recognized the State of Israel and we in Government recognize the State of Israel, when they held a treaty with Egypt has not requested this, and when held Treaty with Jordan had not requested this, so why ask us to recognize the Jewish State, I'd say no to recognition of the Jewish State, I ask why not go and ask them the recognition of the Jewish State? One last point I explained to reporters the Israelis told them you may not know your history, we know most of you, from 1900 to 2000 after the collapse of the Soviet Union, he emigrated to Israel million Russians, more than 50% of these Muslims and Christians, they took away the right of repatriation, how allows these, Christians and Muslims, how do you explain me the Jewish State, the soldier falash depends on the barrier and pray, not on me, but says this is this all, we will not accept the recognition of the Jewish State.

Brothers sisters...

To go back a little movement in the Arab States, Arabic and launched in Tunisia and Egypt, then Libya and Syria and before that he was in Yemen, was unequivocal position have nothing to do with what is going on here and there, we invite Arab internal issues, so we do not come to us in Arabic countries, especially in Syria, there are 600,000 Palestinians reflected their status to 300,000 others, mean million under threat, and I don't want to have anything to do with these events, So we are not with the party and not with the party, and are not against the party and we are not against this party, but we say only one word solved the problem of internal dialogue, Sana proved them right now that

what we have said is true, and we have ideas on this and welcomed by the parties, that there was a fight here and there and the victim is the people this is what happened in the camps, and the tragedy of our people, after nine months gone qais Abdel Karim Abu Leila ' ClaireTo what is happening in Palestinian camps they returned with one sentence ' from the House of Abu sufyan entered the it security ', that is, feel the danger goes to camp, and solve the problems between the protagonists, and suddenly plunged brotherhood camps in conflict, destruction, and it was our duty to entrust brother Dr. Zakaria Agha, brother Dr. Ahmed majdalani, to solve the problem, I got criticized for going, but we have said that we have nothing to with being there just want to protect my people there, and they went there and met with everyone and managed to mitigate the suffering of our people, and perhaps aid intervention may return refugees who were displaced from the Syrian wesntmr camps in this effort and we will continue in this attitude, we have no relationship to what is going on, and we have no relationship with the Arab movement, say a good word or shut up, and this is where we.

Brothers sisters...

On the issue of Jerusalem is the Crown Jewel, you need many efforts, and that not only do these efforts but rather hinder, many claim not to go to Jerusalem, and I heard from said that Jerusalem is Haraam and normalization, I'd say the preparing to install the Jerusalemites, Jerusalem does not print without its citizens become worthless stone only and neglect of Jerusalem since the Arab summits held in the Libyan city of Sirte, in which they pledged to support Jerusalem and not something, I told the Colonel Muammar Gaddafi, the Colonel did not pay anyone, he replied what I put my hands in their pockets, I told him, don't put your hand in your pocket, with regret, it had decided to pay 500 million to the Jerusalem Fund at the Bank, of which only 37 million, and wants to protect Jerusalem and must support the steadfastness of its people, now Israel can stop settlements if the pressure firmly on each bank without Jerusalem, I'd say that there is no Jerusalem, no negotiations.

That's what we had on the issue of negotiations and reconciliation and dear to our hearts and that we hope to be okay and that there will be good intentions of pay it forward, we have no other options, the other option is to divide the country and establishing a State in Gaza as the Israelis want and talk about expanding Gaza b 1600 kilometres and was talking about free area I asked former Egyptian President Mohammed Morsi for this project, for our brothers in Gaza, I said, this project is a national solution terminates, Gaza in Egypt, and he forgot the first section "what does this mean? How many residents of the Gaza Strip? I told him a million and a half people, what it means to put them in shubrah and bring them hot meals, I told him so captured, Uighurs island is one of the project was brought by 1,600 km and started caravan enters the Sinai, and the project was on his way to execution, but not this long and not with its long, split end and return the Palestinian national unity.

And peace, mercy and blessings of God...