

then, we would be marching along to restore our just national rights.

This, of course, is not the task of the struggle inside the occupied territories only. This struggle can not introduce the needed change in the balance of forces, which would force the establishment of a Palestinian state despite the enemy's will, but rather it is the task of the entire Palestinian struggle, fully linked to its national and internationalist dimensions.

How did your viewpoint develop concerning the relationship between the Palestinian national factor and the Arab national factor?

This viewpoint developed during two stages, each divided into subdivisions. The first stage was my participation in the Arab Nationalist Movement (ANM). This stage overlooked the Palestinian national factor and emphasized the pan-Arab factor. I would like to point out that the ANM viewed the liberation of Palestine as a process that preconditioned achieving comprehensive Arab unity. And the ANM's slogan «unity is the road to Palestine» summarizes the ANM's thinking. The ANM strongly believed in the pan-Arab dimension in the early fifties, when we attempted to wage military actions against the Zionist enemy, due to the continuous confrontations with the Jordanian army which we used to call in those days the «Guardians of Israel».

Several factors played a role in emphasizing the pan-Arab national factor first, the results of the 1948 war and the defeat of the Arab armies in Palestine led us to believe in the pan-Arab response against this enemy. Second, at that time the idea of pan-Arab was in its peak. Third, the atmosphere that the late comrade Wadi Haddad and I found ourselves in, in the American University of Beirut (AUB), where several Arab militants showed readiness to struggle for Palestine, this atmosphere overshadowed the Palestinian national factor. It is worth pointing out that pan-Arab was an ideology opposing imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction. Added to that is the ANM's inability to contact the Palestinian masses living in the 1948 occupied territories and to organize them. The exception to this was the Gaza strip, where the Palestinian chapter of the ANM was a strong force.

The Nasserite era added to our belief that the pan-Arab idea was close to liberating Palestine. But the events that took place later shocked us and forced us gradually to question the old pan-Arab ideas. The first event was the Zionists' plan to transfer the Jordan rivers' water course and president Nasser's failure to respond. The second event was the dissolving of the unity between Egypt and Syria (1963). And the third event was the triumph of the Algerian revolution (1962). These events forced us to seriously reconsider the relationship between the Palestinian national factor and the Arab national factor.

Consequently a Palestinian branch of the ANM was formed, called «The Youth of Revenge». This branch was concerned with the Palestinian struggle. And it was considered a step on the correct path, despite the continued emphasis on the Arab national dimension.

The second stage is the PFLP's. And in my own view point, this stage materialized the correct and precise outlining of the relationship between the Palestinian national and the Arab national dimensions.

The PFLP realized that the Palestinian national dimension in the struggle should be emphasized more than the pan-Arab dimension. The 2nd and 4th PFLP congresses' political reports

outlined precisely the dialectical relationship between the Palestinian national and the Arab national dimensions.

What is your response to the charge that the PFLP still emphasizes the pan-Arab dimension over the Palestinian dimension?

I can easily countercharge those people that they emphasize the narrow national dimension without taking any consideration to the nature of our enemy and the methods to confront it. But this essential issue should not be dealt with charges and countercharges. A correct definition of the relationship between these two dimensions should be outlined. Our success in confronting the imperialist-Zionist-Arab reactionary camp requires mobilizing the broadest alliances between the Palestinian revolution and the nationalist progressive Arab forces and regimes. Emphasizing a narrow Palestinian nationalist dimension could only harm the struggle.

During the past 20 years what were the developments that took place in your viewpoints concerning the structure of the Zionist entity and the factors affecting it, its relations to the west, the confrontation with this entity on the Palestinian and Arab levels in the light of the world situation and the conflict between Socialism and Imperialism and the Israeli democratic forces?

The questions raised have great importance, particularly when understanding the nature of the Zionist entity constitutes an important fact in outlining the forms of struggle against it.

The essential issue that should be discussed in my opinion is the nature and the level of development that the Zionist state has witnessed and the effects of this development on us, rather than discussing the developments that took place in our viewpoints. The Zionist state has witnessed several big qualitative changes on all levels for the past 40 years.

On the economic level, industry is ranked first among the different production sectors, in terms of the industry's share in the GNP or the exports. In 1984, 90% of the Zionist state's exports, which reached 6.5 billion dollars, were manufactured goods. Industry in the Zionist state has become the dominant factor in economy. The major weight in the Israeli industry now is directed towards the «technotron» stage where electronics become the cornerstone of the industrial technology.

On the military level, Israel now produces the MIRKAVA tanks and the KFIR fighter plane and is developing the industry of missiles, including the Jericho-II missile which is capable of carrying nuclear warheads. And it is well-known that «Israel» exports arms to several African, Latin American countries and even to the US army. Although the production of the LAVI-fighter plane has been delayed, developing the plane is still continuing.

Despite these economic and military developments, the main issue of concern are the developments that took place, and could take place, in the organic relationship between the Zionist state and the Zionist movement, and on the relationship between the Zionist state and the Zionist movement on one hand and imperialism on the other hand. When «Israel» was established in 1948, some said that this state could live nor-