

Al Masri, Jordan's foreign minister, in a speech at the UN two days ago, stated that the Amman accord still exists. In an interview with Monte Carlo radio, Zaid Al Rifai, prime minister of Jordan, said that the accord was not cancelled by Jordan or the PLO. In addition to these official statements, there are press reports which may and may not be true, saying that after the Prague meeting, the PLO leadership sent an envoy to Jordan to say that the Amman accord was not cancelled, and that the Prague declaration is an agreement between three organizations only. Isn't it then our right to say that the Amman accord was not cancelled definitively? What is happening now is a return to the policy of saying neither yes nor no. We suffered greatly from this policy and it is a big mistake to allow it to continue.

I was able to follow the discussions in Prague. The democratic forces' proposal stated: «The Amman accord is no longer in existence.» Naturally, I consider this a flexible formulation, because all of the democratic forces were demanding cancellation of the Amman accord... Still, this was refused by the representative of Fatah's Central Committee, Abu Mazin, and the negotiations were stalled for nearly 24 hours. The statement from Prague said that the Amman accord «is no longer operative.» Notice the difference...

If people were really eager to unify and benefit from experience, and if there was a true wish to cancel the Amman accord, why isn't it cancelled publicly and officially? Then let the PFLP be tested... In this case, we could understand that the efforts to restore the PLO's unity are serious and on a correct basis. Some say that only the PNC can cancel the Amman accord, but this is not true, because the Executive Committee signed the accord as a document, not the PNC... Ask Fatah's Central Committee: Did you cancel the Amman accord? Abu Mazin says yes to the socialist countries, while Arafat tells Mubarak no...

Comrades, it is not a matter of us putting obstacles. We want real assurances; we don't want the people to be disgusted with us if after restoring national unity on a flexible basis, this can be broken at any moment. We want to be sure that this betting (on US solutions), which the Fatah Central Committee engaged in via the Amman accord, no longer exists.

To the last part of the question: Suppose that the PFLP found itself in a crisis in its relations with our Syrian allies. (I am looking at this according to the criteria of nationalism, not as a leftist or Marxist.) Is this an excuse for me to keep bridges open to the Camp David regime in Egypt and the Jordanian regime? When the Amman accord is cancelled and there is no betting on Mubarak, then we could say to Syria: What are your remarks on the political line? The accord is cancelled; the door to Camp David is closed; here we could be effective in reviving the alliance between the PLO and Syria. No matter how much we insist on the PLO's unity... total confrontation of the imperialist plans requires a unified PLO, allied with Syria. If we cannot achieve both steps at once, we could achieve the PLO's unity in a way that facilitates restoring relations with Syria. However, with all these zig-zagging positions and maneuvers, it is impossible to restore this alliance...

Yesterday, Zaid Al Rifai said on Jordanian television that everything the Jordanian regime is undertaking was agreed upon with the official PLO leadership, including the (Israeli) appointments of West Bank mayors... A proof of this is the case of Zafer Al Masri who is considered a martyr by the official PLO leadership... We are now fighting a vicious battle against the Israeli-Jordanian plan in the occupied territories. Isn't it in our interests to cancel the accord and organize the broadest possible front to face these plans?

Of course, I know not to judge the bourgeoisie by the stand point of the democratic or leftist organizations, but it is our right to judge the bourgeoisie on the basis of its adherence to the national position. A bourgeoisie that is trying to have a hand in both sides, without committing itself to any one position, will not do. We can't convince the progressive forces or Syria or a lot of other people in that way. Therefore, the basis

specified by the PFLP is neither Marxist-Leninist nor obstructionist. Politically, it is nationalist. Organizationally, it means that the PLO is no longer the personal property of a single class, as it was for 20 years... If the PLO is common property, sharing the leadership on the basis of proportional and democratic representation, we are ready. We think that our position is the correct one for reunifying the PLO in the light of past experience...

Some say there is an Arab decision for Jordan to liquidate the PLO inside Palestine, while other Arab parties block the PLO's unity; then the PLO could be liquidated easily...

Let us assume for the sake of argument that this is true. Then, the question is how to face this. We can only face it through a clear political program and collective, democratic leadership. Then, the PLO would be strong and able to withstand such plans...

We propose that the democratic forces consolidate their coordination and take a firm position for real reformation, politically and organizationally, in order to achieve results that guarantee restoration of national unity on a correct basis, to be able to confront the fierce schemes that aim at spreading Camp David in the area.

The statement of the PFLP's Central Committee mentioned initiatives and communications by your Politbureau. Do these include dialogue with Fatah's Central Committee within the framework you have defined?

The statement of the PFLP's Central Committee focuses on the necessity of providing the political and organizational basis for unity, and the cancellation of the Amman accord, as a prelude to dialogue. The Central Committee wants our position to have an influence on the situation. Thus, we will have contacts that will enable our position to be influential, but the official overall dialogue will not begin until the prerequisites are met.

Would you comment on Amal's attack on Rashidiya camp a few days ago?

It is painful to me and to all the Palestinian and Arab masses, to see that our camps in Lebanon are besieged by Amal. It is even more painful that this occurs while the Israeli army is still occupying the South, and refuses to withdraw before security arrangements are made to protect its borders. It is painful to see the implementation of plans which aim to destroy the Palestinian armed presence which should be directed against 'Israel'.

For the last year and a half, the Salvation Front has dealt with this matter patiently, trying to find common grounds, namely, the Damascus agreement of June 1985. We worked for a ceasefire with self-control, but unfortunately the attempts to strike Palestinian nationalist armed presence continue. To whose benefit are these conflicts? Based on protecting the Palestinian masses in Rashidiya and all of Lebanon, and defending the Palestinian armed presence in order to continue the fight against 'Israel', I call on the nationalist leaders of Amal and their fighters, I call on our people in the South, on Hezbollah, the Lebanese national movement and Syria - with its great moral weight, to put an end to this tragedy immediately.

Yesterday the Salvation Front met with Amal and our Syrian brothers, and agreed on the necessity of a ceasefire. A delegation from the meeting went to Rashidiya, but unfortunately did not find any Amal official in the Tyre area. They found that Amal people insist on the Palestinians' surrendering their light and medium weapons before anything else, because I don't think there are any heavy weapons in Rashidiya...