

Amman accord. The main issue of difference was how these new developments affected the program of the PNSF.

The PFLP emphasized, from the very start, that the PNSF was a temporary framework for restoring the PLO to its national line, not a substitute for the PLO. We have constantly been careful to prevent the PNSF from making the mistake of perpetrating the final split or creating substitutes. This is based on our deep awareness of the danger such a split would entail. Yet we feel that this stand will not last forever if the rightist leadership continues to make concessions to the imperialist-reactionary-Zionist alliance. We are of the opinion that if things reach the point where the rightist leadership actually gets involved in direct negotiations, claiming to speak in the name of our people, then we will not hesitate to declare that we are the PLO and that they represent only themselves. We do not overlook the problem of timing and preparation concerning such an historical step. We consider this issue to be of utmost importance. We are anxious for it to be dealt with in complete coordination with our main Arab and international allies. We are neither willing or able to tackle issues of such historic importance on a strictly national basis.

In contrast to our point of view, there are those who advocate taking the recent developments as an opportunity for revising the program of the PNSF in a way that proposes the PNSF as the PLO. They call for such a declaration to be made. Objectively, this would finalize the split. at least, this is how it would be understood internationally. We did differ with this view which does not give sufficient consideration to our international friends and allies. We feel that we should think carefully, especially when our international allies warn us, before embarking on any new, qualitative step, because we are all part of one movement, and coordination between us is of the utmost importance.

3. There are other problems related to more far-reaching political issues, for example, how to understand the PLO and the decisions of the PNC (especially the 16th session); the international conference and the Soviet initiative; and the interim program of return, self-determination and an independent state.

Two points of view emerged on the above issues. The first considers that those who want to inherit the PLO and continue its course, must not abandon the PLO's heritage - the National Charter, the decisions of the legitimate PNC sessions, and its Arab and international alliances. Otherwise, it cannot be said that they represent the PLO. They must also be aware that when the world recognized the PLO, and established alliances with it, this was on this condition, in accordance with this heritage. Whosoever deviates from this heritage deviates from the PLO itself.

The other point of view considers it necessary to radically revise this heritage, including the program and principle tenets. They justify this by saying that this heritage is the product of the right-wing, so it must be taken apart and reassembled. Needless to say, this view opens the door wide to various dangers and 'revisionist' trends which could drag the Palestinian arena into a whirlpool of internal splits and conflicts.

These are, in short, the most important problems confronting the PNSF, which we are constantly trying to overcome in a positive spirit and with patience, because we want to safeguard this experiment, and because we are confident that it can be successful. I can record the success of the PNSF in terms of overcoming the camp war, at the same time preserving its own unity. That period was, as you know, very difficult for the entire revolution. This experience gives us confidence and

hope. In addition, the fact that everyone considers the main battle to be that levelled at the deviationist trend, objectively motivates all to persevere in overcoming obstacles.

*Some of the revolutionary democratic forces joined the PNSF, while others remained outside. How do you view this, and how can it be overcome?*

Before answering the question specifically, I want to say that the failure of the first unity experience of the revolutionary democratic forces (PFLP and DFLP) does not mean that the principle is wrong or sterile. We firmly believe in the principle of the unity of the revolutionary democratic forces, because its historical value is an established fact. Moreover, this principle has been organizationally approved by our leadership, and dealt with extensively in our basic documents.

Our presence in the PNSF does not prevent us from continuing to consider the unity of the revolutionary democratic forces. We will strive enthusiastically and persistently to realize this goal. We are ready to deal with any new unity experience between the revolutionary democratic forces with an open mind and heart, when the conditions are ripe. We are aware that the division of the revolutionary democratic forces has negative effects on the Palestinian arena; it had consequences which we didn't wish for.

Today we are pleased that there is a degree of closeness between the revolutionary democratic forces and coordination in joint activities. At such moments, talk of unity intensifies. However, as you know the situation is always moving, and the region is always pregnant with possibilities. I am afraid we would not reach united answers to changing events. I say this because of past joint experience. To illustrate, after some time we will be confronted with two possibilities: One is that the deviationist leadership will continue making concessions until arriving at the negotiations table with the Zionist-imperialist enemy. The second is that the leadership might retreat from the miserable option it has chosen after realizing its futility in the face of the Zionist enemy's intransigence, and that the plans to eradicate the PLO and Palestinian cause are continuing. What will be our answer to these two possibilities?

In the case of the first possibility, we will not hesitate to declare that we are the PLO, the sole, legitimate representative of our people, and those negotiating represent only themselves. We will find that all progressive national forces will

