

principle for us, yet we cannot ignore the tactical differences that have arisen among the democratic forces. Second, there are two formulas for the presence of the democratic forces in the PLO. The first is a formula of real partnership. The second is the formal partnership which the right wing wants as a progressive cover for its policies. According to the second, the democratic forces would bear moral responsibility without actually participating in drawing up these policies. In the case of a clear and precise agreement among the democratic forces on the form of their participation in the framework of the PLO institutions, the unity of the democratic forces would be very possible, and soon. Third, the political developments in the Palestinian arena are pushing for the close relations between the democratic forces, as mentioned in the question. We in the PFLP are determined to benefit from these developments.

Why does the right wing still cling to the Amman accord after the numerous rebuffs it received? Do you expect the PLO or sections of it to participate in the US solution? What are the possibilities that the right will return to the nationalist position?

Certainly, the Palestinian right's failure to cancel the Amman accord raises a major question, whose answer would help us foresee the future of the efforts being made to reunite the PLO. I raised this particular question in all honesty with brother Abu Jihad during our meeting... I told him I could only see two possible explanations for their not cancelling the accord. One is political, that they are still hoping that mediation by Mubarak of Egypt or another would succeed in reviving the Amman accord; in that case, they are still adhering to the political line that caused the division in the PLO. The second possibility is organizational... that they do not want to admit their mistake in signing such an accord, because this would damage them and their organization, as they see it. In speaking to Abu Jihad, my position was that in the case that they will not cancel the accord publicly and officially for political reasons, then it is very dangerous to have the PLO reunited on a weak and ambiguous basis... If the reason is organizational, I asked Abu Jihad if it isn't in the Fatah Central Committee's favor to do as Abdul Nasser did several times, when he paused to evaluate a period of the national work and criticized himself. Nasser received more support from the masses after such self-criticism. I told Abu Jihad that it is really in their favor to initiate the cancellation of the accord. I asked him why he would give a chance for the masses to say that the PFLP was the only one for cancelling the accord as a result of the dialogue?...

Concerning the question about the participation of some Palestinians in the US solution, this solution includes three parties: the US, 'Israel' and America's Arabs, i.e., Arab reaction. America's Arabs hope that the PLO will participate in the US solution because they need a Palestinian cover for their treachery. 'Israel' refuses the PLO's participation; as Shamir has stated several times, the PLO is unacceptable even if it recognizes 'Israel' or resolution 242. The US does not reject the PLO's participation if the PLO yields to the conditions presented to it. What is the result of the interaction between these three positions? Experience has taught us not to make definite predictions, but the PLO's participation in the US solution is unlikely in the foreseeable future. This is not because of the PLO's own position, but because of Israeli refusal...

Concerning the possibility of the right returning to the nationalist position, this is supported by the objective conditions, i.e., the closing of the door to the US solution. This is the essence of the position we took after King Hussein's speech on February 19th. Still, it requires serious and consistent struggle so that the right can return to the nationalist position, and the PLO could be reunited on a firm basis, making it the instrument capable of achieving our people's goal of national independence.

For a year and a half, the camps in Lebanon have been subjected to continuous wars. What are the goals of these wars and how can they be confronted?

It is sheer stupidity to explain these wars as the result of individual incidents... or of the Palestinian armed presence having returned to its negative, pre-1982 state. It is also stupid to explain the tragedy our people and camps are experiencing by saying that they aim at disarming the capitulationist forces controlled by Arafat. Judging from how these camp wars are waged, whether the first in May 1985 or the third which started two months ago and still continues, the only scientific explanation is that this is a war between two opposing concepts about Palestinian armed presence in Lebanon. Amal's concept is to eliminate this, not only the arms of Arafat, but Palestinian arms in general, including those of the Salvation Front. The other concept is holding on to these arms in order to continue struggling against 'Israel', and supporting the Lebanese nationalist forces against Israeli occupation; supporting their goal of a unified Arab Lebanon which is engaged in the nationalist battle against Zionism, alongside the Palestinians and other Arab nationalists.

Why does Amal want to eliminate the Palestinians' arms? This is because 'Israel' wants that and puts it as a condition for its withdrawal, as it claims, from all Lebanese territory. We regret this position and are suffering from it. Naturally, we hoped that all Palestinian and Lebanese weapons, including Amal's, would continue aiming at 'Israel' to force its total withdrawal from Lebanon, and continue the joint nationalist struggle leading to Palestinian national independence. Of course, things do not happen due to wishes. For more than a year and a half, we have been facing a bitter situation in Lebanon. Confronting this, we find no alternative to standing firm and defending our weapons; without them we lose our dignity and our means for achieving liberation. We are proud of having increased our steadfastness in facing these attacks. At the same time, we extend our hands in hopes of finding a political solution that would regulate Palestinian-Lebanese nationalist relations.

We are fighting a just war in Lebanon. That is why many Lebanese, Arab and international forces are supporting us. We hope that by our fighters' steadfastness and our readiness for a political solution, and our broad range of allies, we can put an end to these wars as quickly as possible, based on safeguarding the Palestinian armed presence and consolidating the Lebanese-Palestinian-Arab alliance to continue the liberation battle.

How do you evaluate the semi-united Palestinian position that has emerged in relation to the current camp war?

This position will be a source of pride in the history of our Palestinian national struggle. Palestinian unity in the field, whether in occupied Palestine or Lebanon, despite the political disagreements between the various organizations, is a clear proof of the masses' correct nationalist sense, obtained from the experience of long years of struggle. There are two main factors in this great unity in the field. First is the disbelief of our masses and fighters that the goal of this battle is to disarm the capitulationists. They know that the goal is to disarm all the Palestinians. Second is the Palestinian people's and fighters' view of their weapons. In light of their bitter experiences since 1948, the Palestinian masses feel that their arms are their honor, dignity, freedom and homeland until the time they return to Palestine. This explains Palestinian united steadfastness in the field.

How do you evaluate the Jordanian-Israeli efforts to divide functions between them in order to impose their joint rule of the 1967 occupied territories?

This plan is the most dangerous development facing occupied Palestine since the 1967 occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The Jordanian-Israeli efforts are not confined to the division of functions, but include the attempt to liquidate the Palestinian cause through the plan that is falsely entitled 'improving the quality of life' for the residents of the West Bank and Gaza. This plan got an okay from the US and 'Israel'