

and if their previous practice was on this line. We want to know if they are prepared for self-criticism. On the organizational level, we want to know if they are ready to change the individualist way of leading the revolution. We will not accept general or non-committal responses.

We are also working to get the opinion of the mass and professional unions. There are ten main unions within the framework of the PLO, and we want their view. After this, we want the opinion of prominent Palestinians in Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, etc. Especially, we want the opinion of the independent members of the PLO's Central Council and the Palestinian National Council. Perhaps we will try to forge a front within the PLO for unity and democratic reform, that will work politically and organizationally to give the program real force.

Most important, our party branches everywhere are working to see that this program reaches every Palestinian home, because this is the only program for saving the PLO's unity and ensuring reform. From the response we have received, we feel that a great majority of our people are with this program, because they want unity and reform. We will struggle until we have unity on the basis of reform, and we will succeed.

Now, after the Syrian-Saudi agreement, which ended the fighting, some may say, let's take a rest. On the contrary, our political struggle will escalate. What has happened, in particular the fighting, constitutes a burden on the conscience of all Palestinian leaders. Why did it take place? Aside from external factors, there are two main reasons: First, certain leaders do not recognize the law for how to solve internal contradictions at this stage of our liberation struggle. Second, there was an urgent need for reform. The ceasefire is a temporary treatment, but we want a radical, thorough, permanent treatment.

There is disagreement among those Palestinian forces who want reform, concerning the nature of the Palestinian bourgeoisie and how to face the right wing. How do you view this issue?

At present, the term 'Palestinian right' is being used without an accurate definition. The protest phenomenon that began in Fatah and their Palestinian allies are using this term in an infantile leftist fashion. What is the right-wing at this stage of the Palestinian struggle, which is that of national liberation, not building socialism? In a class sense, the right is the bourgeoisie. At this stage, scientifically speaking, it is in the interests of Palestinian workers, peasants and the bourgeoisie to struggle against the Zionist occupation. Thus, the Palestinian bourgeoisie is a nationalist class.

When the Palestinian bourgeoisie embarked on armed struggle in 1965, it was sincere in wanting to liberate all of Palestine. Even now, if it were a question of wishes, they would like to have a fully liberated Palestine, including its coastal waters, for this would be in their political and economic interests. However, they faced difficulties, because this slogan is hard to fulfill. After the experience in Jordan 1970-71, leaders of Fatah were asking how they could continue. They had seen that liberation is difficult and began to lean towards what they thought were more realistic goals, for example, liberating only the West Bank and Gaza. Still, after the defeat in Jordan, it was easy for the Palestinian revolution to reinforce its presence in Lebanon, where the army was weak. The atmosphere of discouragement vanished, and the bourgeois forces again began to speak of total liberation. This was evidenced in the positive decisions of the 11th Palestinian National Council for full liberation of Palestine, etc.

After the October 1973 war, the PLO gained broad international recognition. Certain western states began to talk to the Palestinian right, saying, we supported you not in

liberating all Palestine, but to have self-determination in the West Bank and Gaza. After the October war, a state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip seemed to be possible, and the bourgeoisie was ready to consider this. PFLP and other radical forces disagreed with this course.

Notice the difference between the bourgeoisie's stand in 1973-74, when it was ready for a US-Soviet compromise proposal as represented by the Vance-Gromyko statement, and its stand after we left Beirut. Only then was the Palestinian bourgeoisie ready to hop on the US line, and for goals even less than a state.

The current division in Fatah has class significance; the protest phenomenon is a petit bourgeois reaction to the right-wing policies of the Fatah leadership, especially after the way the opposition in Fatah was treated by the leadership. Still, the Palestinian bourgeoisie is a nationalist class. Accordingly, Fatah is among the nationalist forces.

Recently two trends have become highly visible on the international scene: US imperialism's renewed willingness to intervene directly, and the growth of the peace movement. What are the reasons for the first, and how do you evaluate the second?

Without going into the whole question of imperialism's increasingly aggressive policy, we can state three reasons why US imperialism is now intervening directly with its own forces:

One: Imperialism feels that its local tools, its class allies and their armed forces, are unable to resist radical or revolutionary change. The formation of the Rapid Deployment Force was a response to the victory of the Iranian revolution. This meant that the US was preparing for direct intervention. Due to the developments of the last ten years - the popular uprisings and victories, the US feels the need for using its own forces.

Two: US imperialism is not satisfied with merely stopping new victories for the people. It wants to roll back the victories that are already achieved, and this is difficult without direct intervention.

Three: Certain points are particularly strategic for US imperialism's global policies and thus require direct US military presence. The US is actually taking all the preparatory measures for a global confrontation. In an area like the Middle East, with its resources and proximity to the Soviet Union, the US deems it necessary to have its own military bases and forces. The same applies to Central America. In this way, one can see why Lebanon and Grenada became the sites of direct US military intervention.

Four: Military intervention is part of Reagan's policy for solving the crisis of capitalism. The Reagan Administration wants to have credit for the fact that no revolution in the three continents has been victorious during its term in office. As internal problems worsen in the capitalist countries, US imperialism tries to divert the people by directing their discontent against an external enemy.

Concerning the peace movement: I am very pleased that it is becoming a real force and a real nuisance to imperialism. This is clear just from reading imperialist propaganda. Demonstrations continue and broaden against the stationing of the cruise and Pershing II missiles in western Europe. When it became clear to people in the US and Europe that we are on the verge of a nuclear war, the common man asked where the policies of imperialism are leading. Now Reagan can't say that it's the communists only opposing his policies. It is broad sectors of his own people demonstrating against these policies. We look forward to the continued growth and development of these forces. This will be a major obstacle for the Reagan-Thatcher-Kohl policies. We salute these forces and feel the importance of their work at this stage for the sake of all humanity. ●