



Democratic Popular Front

For The Liberation Of Palestine

Committees For Solidarity With The Palestinian Revolution

November 1969

1/6.

CONTENTS

Page No.	
1	Introduction
2	Palestine - The New Liberation Movements
3	The August Platform
12	Basic Aims
	Two Interviews:
14	Arab and International Perspectives
17	What are we Fighting For?
22	Statement on the Lebanese Events
23	From a Communique on May Day 1969
25	Towards a Democratic Solution to the Palestine Problem
26	The Palestinian National Liberation Front
	Military Operations:
30	Operation "Red Line"
32	Operation "Ho Chi Minh"

INTRODUCTION

Over the past year, Arab and British leftists have been forming Committees for Solidarity with the Palestinian Revolution in most of Britain's major cities. Our basic aim is to carry on intensive work within the ranks of the British left to further a correct understanding of the present liberation struggle of the Palestinian people — and transform this understanding into active support.

Up to now the C.S.P.R. has issued a number of publications:

1. C.S.P.R. Pamphlet no. 1: "Background to the Middle East Conflict?"
2. Palestinian Revolution no. 1; issued by Manchester C.S.P.R.; no. 2 will be a special issue on the recent Lebanese events.

In addition, we have issued a number of leaflets (among which one on the first onslaught of the Lebanese Bourgeoisie on the Palestinian National Liberation movement last April, later adopted by the P.S.C.) and sent out many speakers on Zionism and Imperialism in the Middle East to Socialist Societies, branches of Leftist organizations, etc.

This present pamphlet seeks to introduce the Democratic/Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the most recent of fidayeen organizations.

C.S.P.R.
c/o Third World Solidarity Group,
Manchester University Union,
Oxford Road,
Manchester.

PALESTINE

THE NEW LIBERATION MOVEMENTS

Like all revolutionary groups which are created from the bottom up – in face of an overwhelming enemy – and then grow as a result of confrontations, the various Palestine liberation movements underwent a whole series of “adjustments” following the June 1967 – dissolution, splintering, sectarianism, regroupments and ideological debates which ranged from fundamental questions of program to hair-splitting definitions of wording. One of the most militant of these movements was the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (P.F.L.P.), which is perhaps the best known in the West for its attacks on El-Al planes in Rome, Athens and Zurich. Originally the P.F.L.P. was formed out of a merger between the Palestine branch of the Arab Nationalist Movement (A.N.M.), which collapsed altogether as a consequence of the June fiasco, and a group of Palestine commandos known as the Jibril-Shruru group. Because strong Marxist-Leninist elements were included among the former, the P.F.L.P. as a whole came into conflict with the anti-Communist Ba’th Party of Syria, which arrested three P.F.L.P. leaders. The Jibril-Shruru group then swore allegiance to the Ba’thi regime and seceded from the P.F.L.P. Thus in August 1968, when the P.F.L.P. met for its second annual conference, it appeared to be solidly Marxist-Leninist. It was then that the “August Platform” (the first text below) was presented by the left. The right wing, viewing itself outnumbered, voted for the platform but only – it turned out – to gain time to regroup its forces and seize control of the P.F.L.P. The left-wing then quit the P.F.L.P. and set up the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (D.P.F.L.P.). Since then, the P.F.L.P. has grown very slowly, despite support from the Ba’th and Nasserites – while the D.P.F.L.P. has spread considerably, especially among Palestinian Arabs. Officially organized in February 1969, the D.P.F.L.P. first brought attention to itself by blowing up the cafeteria of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. It views Zionism as an aspect of U.S. imperialism (see the second text below) and considers itself part of the world revolutionary movement (third text).

THE AUGUST PLATFORM

1, Introduction:

The national problem of Palestine has been linked throughout history to the circumstances in the countries surrounding it. An objective look at the map of the Middle East would immediately uncover the dialectical relation between developments in Palestine and those in the Middle East in general, particularly the areas surrounding it. These developments have always determined and will always determine the fate of Palestine and its embattled people.

Palestine’s modern history proves absolutely the correctness of this judgement. F.. against the background of the weakness of the theocratic-feudalist Ottoman regime, the imperialist countries of Europe began to look forward to the division of the estate of this “sick man of the east”. At the same time, Zionism, led by Jewish capital and motivated by a reactionary, religious ideology, aspired to the takeover of Palestine, for the purpose of constituting there an exclusivist Zionist entity which would unite under its wing Jews from many parts of the world. Because of the common interests between the imperialist powers on one hand, and Zionism on the other, these two found themselves united against the Palestinian and Arab liberation movements, and in agreement on the division of the Ottoman Empire, already disintegrating under the pressure of European Industrial capitalism ...

Immediately after the first world war, the imperialist countries took over the Arab east, and Britain issued the Balfour Declaration of 1917 which granted Zionists the right to a “national home” in Palestine. This pledge was not incidental . . . but a logical outcome of the imperialist policies in the Middle East: to establish an armed, imperialist base to confront the rising tide of the Arab liberation movement whose victory would endanger the imperialist interests in this vital area of the world. This was why the Zionist colonizing ambitions found such favourable response from Britain.

Imperialism and Zionism found fertile ground for the implementation of their vile schemes for the Arab lands, in particular Palestine. The Arab feudal-bourgeoisie regimes had, from their inception, thrown in their lot with the imperialists, in a broad counter-revolutionary front against the Arab movements for national liberation. At the base of this alliance were the mutual interests binding the two sides: the imperialists protected these regimes in their exploitation of the masses while the regimes acted as guardians for the imperialists’ interest . . .

As a result of this alliance these regimes remained passive towards the Zionist ambitions and the imperialists’ promises regarding the “Judaization” of Palestine, contenting themselves with pleading with their “ally” Britain to show some “understanding” for the rights of the people of Palestine.

It was natural for these regimes to take this passive stand on the Judaization of Palestine. Their feudal-bourgeois composition made them unable to face the imperialist-Zionist designs with armed force and patriotic popular revolution: reactionaries everywhere fear the people more than they do the imperialists. To

oppose these designs effectively required the mobilization and arming of the people – and it is this that the reactionary regimes . . . the enemies of national liberation, absolutely refuse to do since it would endanger their very existence which is linked to imperialism (in its old and new aspects) in the Arab lands.

For Palestine, from the beginning of the modern area, it was apparent that its fate would depend on the outcome of the national struggle – i.e., the class struggle between the forces of national liberation . . . on one hand, and the imperialist-Zionist camp and its allies, the Arab reactionary regimes, on the other.

The control, by the feudalists and compradors, of the State machine and its numerous instruments of repression and even of the leadership of parts of the nationalist movement up to 1948, made the fate of Palestine a foregone conclusion.

The defeat of 1948, brought about by the feudalist-theocratic leadership of Haj Amin Husseini, the major bourgeois parties (Istiqlal, Difa') and the Arab feudalist regimes . . . provides the concrete example for the dialectical relation between the Palestinian and the Arab situation, and between this situation and the international one . . .

This brief introductory note is necessary at this crucial stage for the Palestine problem. Throughout history, everything that has happened and is happening in the Arab countries has influenced, in one way or another, the situation and fate of Palestine. Any attempt to gloss over this relation is necessarily reactionary, imperialist or Zionist.

At the present stage, when the Palestine problem is passing through its most arduous and dangerous hour – after the defeat of 1967 – Palestinian and Arab right-wing voices have been raised demanding the separation of the Palestine resistance movement from all events and developments in the rest of the Arab area under the slogan of “non-interference in Arab affairs”. For what has happened and is happening in Arab lands affects the problem of Palestine. The lessons of the (abortive) rebellion of 1936, the catastrophe of 1948 and the defeat of June 1967 are all still fresh in our minds. Further, after June 1967 “Arab affairs” have not divorced themselves from “Palestinian affairs” . . .

The Palestinian right-wing, aided by Arab reaction, prepares the ground for a new military or political defeat which would lead to the liquidation of the Palestine problem according to the proposed settlement contained in the U.N. resolution of November 22, 1967. The reactionary, defeatist Arab regimes support this call to prevent the movements for national liberation in their own countries from drawing the obvious conclusions from the catastrophe of 1948 and the defeat of 1967, for which these regimes were responsible. At the same time these regimes continue to meddle in the Palestine problem, using the U.N. resolution as a pretext.

The Palestinian resistance movement must pass judgment on the Arab regimes where the stand of these regimes on the problem of Palestine is concerned. Otherwise, the resistance movement would lose its identity, becoming a quantitative addition to

the Arab regimes and institutions responsible for the abortion of the rebellion of 1936, the catastrophe of 1948 and the defeat of June 1967. The problem of Palestine could never be understood in isolation from a study of the Arab regimes responsible for the “historic impasse” facing the Palestine problem after the June defeat.

The present Arab regimes, together with the Palestine resistance movement, now face a basic choice: either “liquidation” or the adoption of a program for a people’s war. The choice that they will make is not divorced from the programs of action actually implemented by the Arab regimes and the Palestinian and Arab national liberation movements. These explicit programs, whose manifestations are the daily practices (of the regimes and the movements) since the June defeat, govern the choice between “liquidation” and the patriotic alternative. It is out of these concrete actions and not subjective “good-will” or emotional, demagogic appeals that the choice will emerge . . .

2. Lessons of the June 1967 Defeat

The defeat of June 1967 was not merely military. It was the defeat of a totality: the class structure, economy, military capacity and ideology of the Palestinian and Arab movements for national liberation.

For the war and defeat of June did not concern the Arab feudal-bourgeois regimes. The bankruptcy of these became apparent as early as 1948 when these regimes led their armies to defeat, against the background of their alliance with imperialism and colonialism. And just as the defeat of June was not merely military, so the catastrophe of 1948 was a defeat for all that the feudal-bourgeois regimes stood for . . . its economic and political reactionary practices which had left the economies of Palestine and the rest of the Arab area underdeveloped and subject to the sway of the capitalist world market. The feudal-bourgeois alliance failed to find a solution for the problems of national liberation by achieving economic and political independence from imperialism and the capitalist world market. Soon, indeed, they allied themselves to imperialism to secure their exploitative class privileges and their place at the top of the political-economic pyramid in their countries. With imperialism, they opposed Palestinian and Arab liberation movements with liquidation and containment . . . These regimes, owing to their backwardness and subservience to imperialism could not build modern, patriotic armies capable of defending the homeland and confronting the imperialist-Zionist designs on Palestine and other Arab countries.

The catastrophe of 1948 and the formation of the state of Israel were the logical outcome for the backwardness of Palestine and the other Arab countries ruled by the feudal-bourgeois regimes, the allies of imperialism. The need arose clearly to view the catastrophe (of 1948) not by itself, but (as a function of) the class rule, the economic and military (backwardness); and to see that the liquidation of the state of Israel and the liberation of Palestine depend on the destruction of the feudal bourgeois regimes – the liquidation of the real causes of the catastrophe. Nasser was correct when he told his comrades during the siege of Fallouja, “The defeat was not decided on the battlefield, but there, in Cairo.” And, “The liberation of Cairo from the feudalist-bourgeois

regime of Farouk, the ally of imperialism and Arab reaction, is the central concern in any program of action for the liberation of Palestine."

Thus, for Arab and Palestinian liberation movements, the central concern became the liquidation of the feudal-bourgeois regimes responsible for the catastrophe of 1948, in order to open the way for the solution of the problems presented by the phase of national liberation which demand . . . the construction of a modern national economy (industrialization and land reform), independent, in its development, of the world market. For without the construction of a solid economic base . . . it is impossible to build regular and popular armies capable of waging a protracted battle against the camp of counter-revolution on Palestine and the Arab lands (Israel and imperialism and Arab reaction).

Since 1948, the Arab and Palestinian national liberation movements entered a new phase in terms of class (leadership) ideology and politics . . . The features (of this new phase) began to emerge immediately after the second world war when the rising middle and petty-bourgeois classes began to realize the bankruptcy of feudal-bourgeois regimes and their inability to solve any of the problems brought to the fore by one phase of national liberation; and their failure to adopt effective anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist national policies. The catastrophe of 1948 offered incontrovertible proof of this.

The new bourgeoisie, leader of the Arab national liberation movement, produced a program of action, petty-bourgeois in character . . . for the destruction of the feudal-capitalist-imperialist alliance responsible for the defeat of the Arab national liberation movement and the defeat of 1948; proclaiming the alliance of workers, poor peasants, soldiers and the petty-bourgeoisie — the last providing the alliance with its ideology and leadership . . . This was expressed in the programs of (petty bourgeois) transformation officially inaugurated in the U.A.R., Syria and Algeria (and in Iraq to some extent) . . . for the construction of an economy based on light industry in the first instance, and the solving of the land question in the interests of poor peasants, and the electrification of the country. All this for the purpose of securing an economic base independent of the world capitalist market, and a patriotic social and political base . . . and to establish patriotic regular armies for the defence of the homeland and the liberation of Palestine.

The forces of counter-revolution, faced with the violence of national-class struggle, did not stay passive for long. In 1956, the tripartite aggression (British-French-Zionist) was organized with the objective of liquidating the patriotic anti-imperialist regime which was threatening the interests and positions of the counter-revolution in Palestine and elsewhere in the Arab world. After the aggression of 1956, neo-colonialism, represented by the U.S.A., attempted to contain the Arab liberation movements and the patriotic regimes "from the inside". But those regimes turned the approaches on, continuing, desultorily, in their indecisive petty-bourgeois fashion to wage their patriotic fight against imperialism and neo-colonialism. The American neo-colonialists then recognized the failure of their "peaceful containment" policy for the subjection of the Arab national liberation movements and the liquidation of the Palestine problem in the interests of Israel, and to re-draw the political map of the area in a way to secure the interest of the feudal-bourgeois regimes — those who constitute the

material and political bases for imperialism in the area and the safety valve for the state of Israel.

Hence, the objectives of the June war were not the reactionary regimes, but the patriotic regimes and all the sections of the Arab and Palestinian national liberation movements. Why, then, the defeat? And with what program did the patriotic regimes and liberation movements face the June defeat?

Petty bourgeois and reactionary theoreticians have offered explanations for the defeat. In essence they all centre around the question of technical, scientific and cultural superiority of Israel and American imperialism supporting it. And as small, backward countries, they say, we could not confront American imperialism which has a war-machine vastly superior to any in the underdeveloped world of Asia, Africa and Latin America. These analysts then conclude that our victory over Israel requires overtaking it in science and technology.

Other petty-bourgeois theorists explained the defeat by a series of military errors committed by this or that army — e.g. the unpreparedness of the U.A.R. air force at the time of the sudden Israeli attack. These theorists blithely disregard the facts of contemporary history when they discuss the Arab defeat in June. They purposely avert their eyes from the real causes of the defeat in six days despite noisy sloganeering immediately before June 5th: "(Liberation) inch by inch!", "Scorched earth!" and "Peoples' war of Liberation!" . . . And if the technical superiority of Israel and imperialism was the decisive factor in the defeat, how then could one account for the Vietnamese people's confronting half a million American soldiers in addition to half a million puppet regime troops? . . . And if the defeat was merely the result of certain military errors, why then was it accepted, and why did slogans like "(Liberation) inch by inch!" and "People's liberation War!" disappear — while Vietnam wages its war of liberation in deeds not words "inch by inch", despite temporary setbacks for the revolutionary army here and there . . .

These facts belie the claims of these "theorizers" and expose the real causes of Arab defeat in June, while the small nation of Vietnam (30 million) and Cuba (7 million) stand steadfast and victorious in the face of American imperialism. Why the defeat here and the steadfast confrontation there?

In Vietnam and Cuba there are patriotic, revolutionary regimes which are proletarian and poor-peasant in composition. They place all the countries' resources, material and cultural, to the service of the struggle to overcome the problems of national liberation; the liquidation of all class privileges — material and cultural — and the construction of a solid base for economic and political independence by heavy industrialization, mechanization of agriculture and electrification. The revolutionary classes in society stand at the head of the alliance of all class and political forces opposed to the capitalist-imperialist camp. Such a patriotic economic and political program is able to mobilize and arm all the classes struggling for the solution of the problems of national independence against imperialism and colonialism. The slogan of "People's War!" takes a concrete expression: the vast toiling masses are mobilized in people's militia, partisan groups and the ranks of the regular army for the defeat of imperialism and all its allies.

In our countries the situation is different . . . It is the petty-bourgeoisie which assumes the leadership of the Palestinian and Arab movements for national liberation. This class had effected the social, economic and military transformation of these countries — a transformation that remained within the ideological orientation of this class, and it was this ideology and the whole program that evolved from it that were defeated in June 1967. The economy could not withstand the Zionist-imperialist attack because it was mainly a "consumer economy" geared to light industry. In agriculture, division of land was at the expense of productivity. After the closure of the Suez Canal, an economy like this had to the reactionary "oil regimes" for help.

In the field of ideology and politics the petty-bourgeoisie remained at the top of the pyramid of power . . . the broad masses of the people remained at the base . . . The petty-bourgeoisie, by nature, fear the masses as much as they fear the feudal-bourgeois alliance. They failed to build a national economy developing independently from the capitalist world market, and therefore could not sever all relations with the imperialist camp — especially the U.S.A.

We can see why the petty-bourgeoisie placed its hopes for the defence of the homeland and its preparations for the liberation of Palestine . . . on the regular armies, refusing to mobilize and arm the people . . . to put the slogan it so noisily extolled — "People's War" — into practice . . . And at the moment that the defeat of its regular armies became apparent these regimes quickly either asked for or endorsed a "cease-fire" . . .

After the defeat, the petty-bourgeois regimes were faced with a choice. They could choose the Vietnamese and Cuban way, which would mean a complete transformation of their programs of action: mobilizing all the material and human resources of society, arming the people for a revolutionary war against all imperialist, Zionist and reactionary interests and positions, translating the slogan "Fighting Israel and those behind it" into a daily armed action on the widest possible front against all forces of counter-revolution . . . Only then would the balance of forces favour the Arab and Palestinian movements for national liberation . . .

The other choice is to remain within the limits of the pre-June 1967 policies, which means that the Palestinian and Arab liberation movements would be doomed to continuous withdrawal in the face of Israel, imperialism and Arab reaction . . . We note with bitterness that this was the choice made by the Arab regimes . . . Their class composition and ideology would not allow them to implement a policy of "people's war", for this would have demanded of them the renouncing of their privileges, politically and materially . . .

Throughout the fifteen months following the June defeat the Arab regimes (the nationalist and the reactionary) continued in the same policies that existed before — and had led to — the June defeat. As a result, they found themselves continually yielding ground: they started by rejecting the U.N. resolution, then regarded it as "vague and incomplete", then added the condition that some of its terms should be linked to the problem of Palestine as a whole . . . and lastly, they accepted it "completely, unconditionally" — adding reassurances to Israel as "one of the facts in the Middle East."

A look at the U.N. resolution of November 1967 suffices to show that its acceptance and implementation herald the liquidation of the Palestine problem. The resolution itself is precisely such an imperialist attempt to liquidate the problem. It stipulates:

The right of all states in the Middle East to live within "secure boundaries".

Recognition of each state by all other states.

The right of "innocent" passage in the waterways of all states.

A "just" solution for the refugee problem.

The problem now for the Arab regimes and the Arab and Palestinian movements of liberation is not to weigh the pros and cons of the U.N. resolution. It is also not to argue whether the official stand regarding it is or is not merely a matter of tactical convenience. It is to see whether the economic, political, military and ideological programs being adopted by the regimes and the liberation movements could lead to the liquidation of the effects of the June aggression, i.e. the liberation of Sinai, the Western bank and the Golan heights as a first step in the protracted war for the liberation of Palestine and the liquidation of the Aggressive, racist Zionist structure.

To pose the problem in these terms is necessary if we want to counteract the confusions of the spokesmen of Palestinian and Arab right wing and the petty-bourgeoisie who alternately present the acceptance of the U.N. resolution as either a tactical convenience or an inescapable necessity forced on the Arabs by their inability to confront the U.S.A.

Those who have declared their rejection of the U.N. resolution are required to link this rejection to a new economic-military program . . . otherwise their rejection is an empty gesture similar to the thousands of "revolutionary" demagogic slogans that found no expression in practice in the war of June.

3. The Arab Regimes and the Problem of Palestine: Conclusion

Fifteen months after the defeat of June it became clear that the Arab regimes and the liberation movements could not produce a critical appraisal of the causes and results of the June defeat, and to crystallize such an appraisal into a radical program of action . . . This is only natural since the regimes and movements are unqualified (by reasons of class composition, ideology and policies) to carry out radical programs which would place Palestinian and Arab masses in the arena against counter-revolution instead of leaving them (or keeping them) spectators waiting for a miracle . . . It is quite wrong to demand that these regimes implement a policy of "popular war". This would be tantamount to demanding them to produce their opposite — something that would negate their own class nature, privileges and internal and international relations.

4. The Palestinian Resistance Movement and the National Question:

The Palestine resistance movement was the only bright spot on the Arab political map after the defeat of June 1967. Palestinian and Arab masses expected of it to open

a new road for the Palestine and Arab liberation movements – starting from a rigorous critical appraisal of the Palestinian movement throughout its modern history and ending in a Palestinian radical patriotic policy on Arab and international affairs.

Did the movement effect such a policy? Did it represent a radicalism transcending the Arab and Palestinian conditions that gave rise to the June defeat?

This, in broad outline, is the political line of the movements: 1. in the Arab context all the sections of the movement have accepted the slogan of “non-interference in Arab affairs” – But how was this understood? It is, obviously, not required of the resistance movement to substitute itself for the local movements of liberation in every part of the Arab world . . . But, at the same time, we must remember that “non-interference in Arab affairs” requires the Palestinian movement to be vigilant whenever the affairs of these regimes deal with Palestine. It is simply impossible to arbitrarily abstract the Palestine problem from its relation to the rest of the Arab world . . . The Palestinian right-wing disregarded the facts of history and gave the slogan of “non-interference” an absolute meaning, translating it in practice into a complete “conspiracy of silence” regarding the defeatist stands of Arab regimes on Palestine. It is most unfortunate that all sections of the resistance movement accepted this demagogic, reactionary slogan unquestioningly, so that not one of them stood up to denounce the responsibility of the Arab regimes for the defeat of June, after twenty years of preparation . . . The Popular Front publicly denounces this slogan as translated into practice in the last fifteen months, denouncing and criticizing publicly its own practices in this regard up to now . . . 2. The problem of Palestinian national unity: all sections of the resistance movement (including the Popular front) fell into a major error regarding Palestinian national unity, both ideologically and in practice. Against the background of the dominance of right-wing ideology, the movement failed to discover the true patriotic perspective for the question of national unity . . .

The resistance movement – because of its present crisis in class composition, ideology and politics – has not yet produced a critique of the modern history of Palestine which would uncover the essential laws of development of the liberation movement in Palestine particularly, and in the underdeveloped countries in this the age of imperialism, in general.

By this neglect of the facts of modern Palestinian history, the movement slipped into reactionary and erroneous practices regarding the problem of “national unity”. These practices placed reactionary cadres and leaders at the head of the resistance movement – the same cadres and leadership that led the liberation movement to failure throughout the modern history of Palestine. At the same time that the sons of the revolutionary classes – workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals – are fighting for the liberation of Palestine and the destruction of the Zionist occupation, the leadership of the resistance movement confirmed the presence of the reactionary (feudal and capitalist) cadres at the head of the political sections of the movement – cadres that throughout the modern history of Palestine had nothing to do with the armed struggle of its people . . .

“The concrete analysis of the concrete situation” in the history of the national

movement shows the impotence and bankruptcy of the feudal and big bourgeois classes as a leadership for national liberation . . . These classes were given a new lease on life by the resistance movement, clothing them with a patriotic appearance which does not by rights belong to them. We do not need to analyze the whole of Palestine’s history to distinguish between the struggling patriotic classes and the defeatist reactionaries, allies of imperialism and Arab reaction . . . There are specific instances which show this clearly; the most important of which is perhaps the 1936 rebellion. The armed struggle started on the initiative of elements of the toiling classes, one of the most active among whom was a poor *sheik*, Izzidin Al Kassam . . . which found response among the poor peasants in the countryside and the workers in the towns. The theocratic feudal leadership and the big bourgeois parties withheld their support. Then they went further and demanded that the struggle for national rights should be by peaceful means “like memoranda, demonstrations, conferences”. When armed struggle spread, it forced these parties to meet and declare their support for it. Now, when these defeatist, reactionary leaderships found that they could not abort the rebellion from outside they tried to contain it from the inside and in this they were successful. After three years of armed struggle these leaderships obtained a declaration from Arab kings and presidents promising to “negotiate with the ally, Britain” for Palestine’s national rights . . . These same feudal-bourgeois leaderships were at the head of the national movement up to 1948, surrendering it to the feudal-bourgeois Arab regimes, the allies of imperialism, to reap the catastrophe of the establishing of the state of Israel.

After the catastrophe of 1948, throughout the twenty years succeeding it, these leaderships gave themselves up completely to the reactionary Arab regimes responsible for 1948. The Palestinian people suffered terribly at their hands, for these classes became instruments in the hands of the regimes repressing the people of Palestine – and mystifying them.

This glimpse suffices to show the impotence and treachery of the feudalists and the big-bourgeoisie, and proves the first law of the national liberation movement which is that the classes genuinely opposed to imperialism and Zionism and qualified to lead the armed struggle for national liberation after June ’67 are the same classes that took up arms against British imperialism and the designs for the Judaization of Palestine – the classes that will lose nothing by fighting to the death . . . but will win everything – their homeland. This was proved after June – for those who took up arms were the sons of the working classes and the poor peasants. Despite the bitter experiences of the liberation movement and the lessons it had learned, the right wing could still infiltrate the resistance movement and even assume the leadership of its political wing, under slogans of “Palestinian national unity!” and “Liberation is the concern of all!” History has given the lie to these claims, before and after 1948.

“Palestinian national unity” is a political and patriotic necessity – but what form should it take? It is a national unity which can achieve revolutionary victories by mobilizing and arming the Arab masses and strengthening their revolutionary will for a protracted resistance against an enemy whose strategy is mainly to gain quick decisive victories . . .

The Palestinian national unity that is required is of the revolutionary fighting forces under its own leadership – with the working class and its political forces

organized in a broad national liberation front . . .

The Popular Front therefore denounces publicly the slogan of "national unity" in the way it was implemented and the content it acquired since June '67 . . . It raises the slogan in its correct context: a national unity whose vanguard and leadership are the fighting revolutionary forces implementing a radical, patriotic program towards the formation of a broad front for national liberation containing all forces opposed to Zionism, imperialism and reaction . . .

5. The Road to National Salvation:

(i) The experiences of the national liberation movements in our countries (Palestine and the Arab world) and in the underdeveloped countries prove that the road to national salvation and liberation starts with the necessity of arming oneself with "Revolutionary tools" capable of defeating the militarily and technically superior imperialist countries: revolutionary anti-imperialist, anti-Zionist ideology – a scientific ideology (the ideology of the proletariat) . . .

(ii) Raising the people's patriotic, radical consciousness: our people face a modern enemy supported by the largest imperialist power, the U.S.A. The relation between the people and the resistance movement should be based on a scientific outlook which implements "the concrete analysis of the concrete situation". The raising of the political level of consciousness starts by exposing the causes of the failures of the Palestinian and Arab liberation movements, whose glaring examples are the defeat of the rebellion of 1936 in Palestine at the hand of Palestinian and Arab reaction, the catastrophe of 1948, and the defeat of 1967. In those defeats are the lessons for our future victory.

(iii) Rejection of all defeatist policies and of the U.N. resolution and the insistence on a program for a popular war of liberation by arming and mobilizing the people in popular militias, so that the war can be fought on the widest possible front against Israel and those who are behind it (including the pro-imperialist Arab forces).

Protracted war waged by a mobilized, self-reliant people, armed with proletarian ideology, is the sole road for national salvation and for the defeat of the technically superior Israeli-imperialist enemy . . .

BASIC AIMS *

The D.P.F.L.P. will struggle to establish a wide patriotic front where all anti-imperialist, anti-Zionist, and anti-reactionary political and class forces are represented, under the leadership of the revolutionary freedom-fighters, in order to achieve simultaneously a real and a revolutionary Palestinian national unity.

Our revolutionary Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine pledge itself to continue the struggle, armed with a radically patriotic outlook, placing every aspect of the Palestine problem critically and publicly before the masses – the very substance of the revolution and its inexhaustible sea.

The D.P.F.L.P. shall fight alongside all the patriotic sections of the resistance movement in a protracted people's war for the liberation of our country and the solution of the problems of the phase of national liberation in a Popular Democratic State of Palestine where cultural and religious rights are respected and social and constitutional legalities guaranteed.

The D.P.F.L.P. produced and the revolutionary politico-military August (1968) Program, which affirms that in this age of imperialism and colonialism, armed struggle is the only path for the liberation of the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America – a struggle based upon the revolutionary ideology of the proletariat. The D.P.F.L.P. shall, therefore, fight daily to confront Zionism, imperialism and the forces of reaction in the context of the global wars for liberation. It will do so side by side with all the forces opposing imperialism and reaction in the world (the Socialist bloc, the movements for national liberation throughout the world and the socialist working class parties in the capitalist imperialist countries) in order to defeat imperialism and Zionism and to liberate both man and the land. Our Front shall struggle towards a worldwide anti-imperialist front . . . Imperialism persists in waging its exploitative war against the peoples of the Third World to destroy their patriotic aspirations and stem the tide of World Socialist Revolution. The Zionist-Imperialist aggression of June 1967 is a link in the chain of counter-revolution led by the United States of America, enemy number one of the international liberation movement and the socialist camp.

The question of the liberation of Palestine is dialectically and immediately linked to the common world-wide struggle against imperialism and world reaction in exactly the same manner as the maintenance of the structure of Israel is dialectically and immediately linked to imperialism in general and U.S. imperialism in particular.

Let all guns point towards the Zionist-Imperialist enemy!

Long live the solidarity of all sections of the resistance against the external and internal attempts to liquidate it by the right-wing chauvinists and fascists!

Long live the revolutionary Palestinian resistance movement. Long live the solidarity of the common, world-wide struggle against imperialism, Zionism and reaction!

*Extract of a proclamation issued in February 1969 announcing the constitution of the D.P.F.L.P. as an independent guerilla organisation.

TWO INTERVIEWS

1. ARAB AND INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Q. What is the impact of the various attempts at implementing the 'peaceful solution' on the Palestinian armed struggle?

A. Many world and local powers are involved in our cause. World imperialism, led by the U.S., is concerned about safeguarding its interests, especially oil, and stamping out the spark of the Palestinian revolution before it spreads to the other Arab countries where imperialism holds many interests and exercises its hegemony over the Arab peoples. There is also the fear of Soviet influence and of the anti-imperialist movement in the area. The U.S. ruling circles have proposed a liquidationist plan on Palestine consisting of the following points: Israeli administration over Jerusalem; Annexation of the Gaza strip to Jordan by means of an inland corridor; freedom of navigation for Israeli shipping in the Suez canal and the Tiran straits; a solution to the problem of the Palestinian refugees and the establishment of demilitarized zones in the Arab territories after Israeli withdrawal. The U.S. government has asked that its plan be studied as one and not as separate parts. This proposed plan, taken as a whole, calls for certain modifications on the *status quo* in the area so as to consecrate Zionist sovereignty over Palestine and preserve the existing Arab regimes at one and the same time. It is also designed to put an end to all possibilities of revolutionary initiative in the area which might threaten U.S. interests or weaken its control over the Arab peoples and their right to self-determination.

The U.S. plan has met with the approval of Britain, despite the fact that the British delegate, Lord Caradon — spoke in the first meeting of the Big Four conference about the possibility of setting up a Palestinian state in the West Bank which would be independent of both Israel and Jordan. As for the French government, it is working to implement the U.N. resolution of November 22, 1967 — as was declared by Michel Debre.

The positions of the various powers of the imperialist camp, despite their differences, are for Israel. Nevertheless, the Zionist circles wish to achieve additional gains in so far as they have won the war. Israel calls for a permanent peace which will secure for it an opening into the Arab markets, not merely a consecration of Zionist sovereignty over Palestine. Thus we hear the Israeli Minister of Information declaring that nothing useful can come out of the Big Four talks; that Israel is firmly opposed to such talks and knows how to refuse to abide by any decision which is detrimental to its interests. It is of extreme importance that the alert sections of the Arab masses come to know about this Israeli position, for the deception spread among the masses by pinning hopes on the Big Four talks is a cynical demagogic manoeuvre designed to lull those masses into believing that the Big Four meetings will result in a just solution to the Palestine problem. In reality, what is going on in those talks is more dangerous than the Security Council resolution itself; especially if we bear in mind that the Big Four conference declared, in its first meeting, that it had no intention of imposing a settlement. Therefore, the masses must not slacken in their conviction that the Big

Four talks are nothing but a new link in the chain of imperialist plots. The masses, for that reason, must not go back on their support for the Palestinian revolutionary armed struggle and should continue to foil all attempts at containing this struggle and limiting its effectiveness in the area.

As for the Soviet Union, it proposes a time-table for the implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967 — i.e. the Soviet Union abides by this resolution and works for its implementation. In this way it contributes to the attempts made at containing the Palestinian revolution and at limiting its effectiveness.

Also, the government of the United Arab Republic has welcomed the talks on the grounds that they will bring about the implementation of the Security Council resolution; after the U.A.R. dropped its demand that Israel should first withdraw from the territories it occupied in June 1967. The U.A.R. is well aware that the Security Council resolution is in contradiction with the interests of the Palestinian people and has recognised the right of the 'fidayeen' organizations to reject this resolution. Therefore, its support for the Big Four talks can only mean that it is contributing to the containment of the armed struggle and disregarding the rights of the people of Palestine.

As for the Jordanian position, Mohammed al-Farra* expressed it by saying that the Jordanian government will certainly co-operate with the four powers and wishes them success.

It is evident, then, that the four Powers talks constitute one of the new attempts to liquidate the Palestine problem. This is mainly expressed, so far as the Palestinian armed struggle is concerned, by the attempts to contain this struggle and cut off its sources of support as a prelude for the final liquidation, of the guerilla organizations, themselves at the hand of the forces of counter-revolution.

Q Do you expect any specific form to be taken by the counter-revolutionary offensive?

A. Presently, the armed struggle is passing through a very dangerous phase. The forces of counter-revolution could attempt its liquidation in one of two ways, or both of them together: there exists the possibility that the Zionist forces launch major operations against the bases of the 'fidayeen', using artillery and air force in particular. Another possibility is that of the Arab regimes imposing a series of armed confrontations upon the guerilla organizations in order to liquidate them separately. The D.P.F.L.P. expects the blows to fall on it soon, or on any other guerilla organization.

On our part, we are working for the escalation of Arab resistance in the West Bank. On the other hand, we are depending on mobile bases for our revolutionary armed forces and work toward reducing the importance of the bases on the East bank by

* then Jordanian Foreign Minister.

transforming them into logistic bases for operations in the West Bank.

Furthermore, the cadres of the D.P.F.L.P. conduct political education campaigns among the masses in the refugee camps, the towns and the countryside. These campaigns are encountering the enthusiastic co-operation of the masses of refugees and peasants and their readiness to protect the armed struggle and confront the enemy no matter how costly the sacrifices are. But the masses are still limited in their effectiveness, for they are poorly organized and lacking in arms.

What are the Arab and internationalist perspectives of the D.P.F.L.P.?

A. The liberation of Palestine forms integral part of the revolution in the area. The present struggle on the Jordanian-Palestinian front is the weakest link in the chain of contradictions in the area. In opposition to the camp of counter-revolution represented by world imperialism, Zionism, the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie and the remnants of feudalism stand the masses of the revolutionary camp representing the workers, peasants and the petty-bourgeoisie. In opposition to the bourgeois ideology of the counter-revolutionary camp, the revolutionary camp can only be guided by the ideology of the working class. The Palestinian armed struggle is the vanguard of the revolutionary movement in the area. Yet it is only capable of winning victory by merging into an all Arab revolutionary front against imperialism, Zionism, the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie and the remnants of feudalism, led by the alliance of workers and peasants and guided by the ideology of the proletariat.

Moreover, an essential condition for the victory of the Palestinian armed struggle is its merger with the revolutionary forces on the international scale under the banner of Proletarian Internationalism and through common struggle against imperialism, Zionism and reaction. It should be noted here that the policies of peaceful co-existence have contributed up to now to the isolation of the movements for national liberation in the world from the camp of revolution. From Cuba to Vietnam to Palestine, the question of revolution is one and the same. All the revolutionary forces in the world must work toward establishing viable internationalist links among themselves aiming at the victory of the revolution and the building of a socialist order.

Interview with Saleh Ra'fat, prominent military cadre and member of the Political Bureau of the Democratic Popular Front. This interview was published in the Lebanese weekly AL-Hurriya, April 14, 1969.

2. WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

Q. What is the position of the D.P.F. (L.P.) in relation to the regimes of Syria, Egypt, Iraq and Algeria, and how does this compare with the attitudes of the Popular Front and the Al-Fatah as you see them?

A. The position of the Democratic Popular Front on the regimes of Syria, Egypt, Iraq and Algeria is that those regimes are the regimes of the petit bourgeois ruling class and have amply illustrated and proved during the June war 1967 their incapacity to wage a long protracted popular war which would achieve victory. No victory is possible without an adoption of the revolutionary ideology of the working class and without a popular protracted war based on the Arab and Palestinian workers and peasants. The ruling petit bourgeois class in Syria, Egypt, Iraq and Algeria is incapable of organizing those classes because it is afraid of the revolutionary potential contained in the Arab workers and peasants which would obviously be directed against their regimes as such. The basic difference between the Democratic Front and the Popular Front is the refusal of the right-wing leadership of the Popular Front to analyze critically the reasons and causes that led to the military defeat of June '67, under the pretext of refusing to interfere in the internal affairs of the Arab states and the Arab regimes. In this sense the Popular Front has a position not dissimilar to the position of Fatah.

In contrast to them the Democratic Front has analyzed thoroughly the nature and limits of the petit bourgeois leadership of the national liberation movement in the Arab world and has come to the conclusion that this class is incapable of an integral solution of the problems of the Middle East. The Democratic Front believes that the struggle for national liberation of the Palestinian people is intimately related to the struggle of the Arab masses against imperialism, reaction and the petit bourgeois regimes and as such it does not conceive of its own struggle except as part of this overall struggle in the whole of the Middle East.

Q. In view of the likely pressure on the Arab regimes to implement the U.N. resolution of November 22, 1967, is there a likelihood that the situation between the Democratic Popular Front (and possibly the other Palestinian movements) and the Arab states may turn into open warfare in the near future?

A. The Democratic Front is well aware that in as much as the Arab regimes come closer to the implementation of the U.N. resolution the confrontation between the Hashemite monarchy in Jordan and the Palestinian Liberation Movement is going to be imminent and inevitable.

Q. What is the ideological and organizational make-up of the Democratic Popular Front?

A. The Democratic Popular Front believes that all its members should actively participate in military activity, thus forging a well built and strong military and militant detachment that will be capable of defeating imperialism, Arab reaction and Zionism. This necessarily means that the Democratic Front is not divided into a political and military wing. All militants are equally political militants and their politico-military activity is based on the revolutionary ideology of the working class Marxism-Leninism. This distinguishes the D.P.F. from the other organizations of the Palestinian Liberation movement. The D.P.F. looks at the Palestinian people as one without distinction of religion or creed. While refusing the concept of a bi-national state the D.P.F. looks at the inhabitants of Palestine as one people. As the D.P.F. puts the struggle in Palestine in its proper context, it aims at establishing in Palestine a Palestinian state under the leadership and hegemony of the working class. This Palestinian state would obviously grant *all* its inhabitants equal rights.

Q. Does this imply that the D.P.F. would be happy to achieve a socialist Palestine in which, for a while, the Jews might be a majority, provided of course that the Zionist structure and the Zionist organizations abroad were dismantled?

A. Jewish numerical majority would be unlikely at present because the last census of population in Israel puts forward the figure of 2¼ million among whom 350,000 are Arabs. On the other hand the Palestinian people now number about 2,000,000 which would mean that the situation would approach numerical equality between Arabs and Jews. Nevertheless the D.P.F. accepts that Palestine is for all its inhabitants, Arabs and Jews, which have to have as a pre-condition the ending of *institutionalized* Jewish emigration to Palestine. Further immigration into Palestine would have to be decided by the new social order that is going to be instituted in Palestine. This means that any possible immigration would be discussed and decided upon its merits, and obviously that would not exclude anybody and needless to say it wouldn't exclude Jews from emigrating to Palestine.

Q. What part do you think the Jewish working class in Palestine might play in your struggle, in time?

A. The D.P.F. believes that Zionism is equally dangerous for Arabs and Jews in the Middle East. Consequently both Arabs and Jews should fight against Zionism defending their own interests as one people.

Q. As I am sure you know, there is a small but growing left-wing revolutionary movement inside Israel. Do you foresee that at some time in the future the struggles of the Palestinian revolutionaries and the Israeli revolutionaries may be united?

A. The revolutionary left you mention still emphasizes the need to preserve the national entity of the Jews in Palestine which negates what we have been emphasizing

on the Palestinians as one people, one undivided people. As far as the second part of the question goes, in as much as this revolutionary left proves itself in practice and proves by its activity the extent and militancy of its opposition to the Zionist regime presently controlling Palestine, co-operation and co-ordination with the revolutionary national liberation movement of the Palestinian people is possible. Only then could there be one broad class struggle in Palestine.

Q. From what groups or forces in the world at large outside the Middle East does the D.P.F. seek its support?

A. Unfortunately up to the present very few outside forces do support the D.P.F. One reason for this is that the Democratic Front is a new organization, no more than four months old in fact. The Democratic Front seeks to rally the support and solidarity of the anti-imperialist forces and the working class movements all over the world.

The position of the Democratic Front on the present position of the Soviet Union on Palestine is that the interpretation by the Soviet Union of the Palestine problem runs counter to the essential basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism. This had been made amply clear in two documents issued by the Democratic Popular Front, one urging the Soviet Union to change its position, get rid of the bureaucratic and Stalinist hangovers on Palestine and adopt a position on Palestine consistent with the basic tenets of Marxism and Leninism and especially with the basic Leninist principle of opposing national oppression and supporting national self-determination. In particular, the Democratic Front seeks to rally an active support from China, Vietnam and Cuba.

Q. What is the general military strategy and objectives of the Democratic Popular Front and how does this tie up with the political struggle inside the occupied territories?

A. The D.P.F. seeks to move its bases from the eastern bank to the western bank so that the east bank bases would only be relay bases for the basic centres of its activities inside the occupied territories. At the same time the Democratic Popular Front prepares for mass action and mass participation of the workers of the east bank to offset any attempts at counter-revolution. This dual strategy in the view of the D.P.F. is a specific implementation of the principles of popular protracted warfare in the context of Palestine, namely the activity and operations against Zionist occupation from within the occupied territories proper, and at the same time mass action and preparation inside the east bank against Hashemite and Arab reaction. The Democratic Front aims at building a wide popular front of all the forces that are opposed to Arab reaction, imperialism and Zionism.

Q. Do you see a useful part as being played by the civilian struggle in the occupied territories and are you trying to develop this aspect as well as the military aspect?

A. The Democratic Popular Front considers that civilian resistance in the occupied territories is complementary to the military activity waged by the Palestinian liberation struggle. We would also like to emphasize that as far as the Democratic Front is concerned we do not distinguish between military and civilian activity. We believe that what popular warfare essentially means is that all the people carry the most varied active participation in the struggle against occupation. What is a daily activity of the Democratic Front in the east bank is propaganda and action among Palestinian and Jordanian masses. This entails, for example, weekly visits of Democratic Front doctors to villages that are not regularly visited by the doctors of the Jordanian monarchy, political education, propaganda, etc. As for similar activities within the occupied territories it should be borne in mind that the recent emergence of the Democratic Front and the extreme difficulties that face its attempts to establish itself as an independent armed movement has not yet given it ample chance to develop its political organization inside the occupied territory. It should also be remembered in this context that in spite of those enormous difficulties the volume of activities of military operations carried on by the Democratic Front inside the occupied territories is quite considerable.

The Democratic Front has carried on a series of military activities inside the occupied territories which include the regular activities carried on by any liberation movement, namely, attacks on military Israeli occupation units, military targets, etc. Two or three operations of the Democratic Front are worthwhile commenting upon. Those three operations have a clear propaganda value aimed especially at the Jewish community in Palestine and in this sense the Democratic Front is carrying on armed propaganda or propaganda by deeds. The first of those operations is the bomb in the cafeteria of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. This operation carried out in March 1969 has been interpreted as follows in an official statement of the D.P.F.: "The Hebrew University is responsible for producing the main cadres for the Israeli state, namely the administration, the police and the army. It is also responsible for the inculcation of reactionary Zionist culture in the ranks of Jewish intellectuals. This is why the Democratic Front feels responsible to discourage Jewish intellectuals from criminally following the Imperialist and Zionist policy". The meaning of this text is quite clear. The bomb in the cafeteria of the Hebrew University is a warning and at the same time an active propaganda act aimed at the Jewish intellectuals to open their eyes to Zionism and to turn them from it. The second operation of the Democratic Front was the demolition of the Labour Exchange at Nablus, carried on in the second half of April 1969. The D.P.F. explained this activity in the following terms: "The Democratic Front aims at hitting the prominent Zionist military and political institutions in the occupied territories. This is why the demolition of the Israeli Labour Exchange in Nablus expresses the rejection by the Democratic Front and the masses of Nablus of the Zionist, political and military policy of employing Arab labour in order that Israeli workers can be drafted into the occupation army. Moreover the establishment by the enemy of Labour Exchanges in occupied territories is designed to employ cheap labour thus furthering the exploitation practised by Zionist capitalism and increasing its wealth". The third operation was the demolition of a factory in the Golan Heights. The aim of this operation was the propaganda value directed at the Jewish workers in a similar manner as the Hebrew University operation was directed

Q. It is often said that the Zionist state thrives on the existence of war. Can it not be said that the carrying out of military operations against purely civilian targets as opposed to military or economic targets will make the task of the revolutionary left inside Israel more difficult and tend to solidify the Israelis more and more behind Zionism?

A. Three points could be made in answering this question. First point: military operations against civilians form part and parcel of any struggle for national liberation. In this sense the national liberation struggle of the Palestinian people is no different from any struggle, no different from the national liberation struggle waged by the Vietnamese people. Second point: the military operations carried by the armed struggle of the Palestinian people is designed to create as much disturbance and as much dislocation in the Zionist state occupying Palestine, to prove by deeds that the Zionist design is no longer comfortable, no longer profitable for anybody and no longer viable even for the one people who initially believed in it. Third point is that those same military operations are designed to warn the Jewish community in occupied Palestine of the crimes committed in its name by Zionism against the whole people, i.e. against the Palestinian people.

Q. Is there anything you feel ought to be said to the Israeli revolutionary left?

A. The struggle in Palestine is uneven. The Palestine problem has uneven effects. Zionism is equally dangerous to both Arabs and Jews. One basic fact should be borne in mind: the principal victim of Zionism is the Palestinian people. The condition of the establishment of the Zionist state in Palestine has been the displacement of the Palestinian people. Consequently the principal contradiction at present is between the Palestinian people in its majority – either under Israeli rule and the victim of racial persecution and oppression or displaced and in exile in the surrounding Arab countries on one side – and the Zionist structure that binds the Jewish community together in Palestine. The second point pertains to that concept of the Hebrew nation in Palestine. This concept reveals an inherent contradiction. If by asserting the existence of a Hebrew nation one implies from this the legitimate right of the Hebrew nation to possess and establish its own state then we sink back obviously into Zionism. Clearly this implication of the concepts goes against the whole interpretation and the whole rejection of Zionism. But if by the term Hebrew nation is meant that the Jewish community in Palestine possess its peculiar cultural features and implies a code for respecting those cultural peculiarities, then clearly any revolutionary socialist platform in the Arab world respects and helps further the cultural development of all minorities in the Arab world. Not only Jews but Kurds, Armenians, etc. To clarify further when we talk of minorities in this context, we refer to minorities in the context of a united socialist Arab republic in the Middle East.

Interview by Bill Hillier of Peace News (London) of a top-ranking member of the D.P.F.L.P., in London on May 16, 1969.

STATEMENT ON THE LEBANESE EVENTS (APRIL 25TH 1969)

On April 23rd, 1969 the Lebanese masses responded to the call of the forces of the revolutionary left and demonstrated in Lebanon's major cities in support of the Palestine armed struggle, denouncing the attempts of the commercial-financial bourgeoisie to liquidate the fidayeen bases in Southern Lebanon. This brutal repression resulted in 30 dead, about 200 injured and scores of leftist militants in jail. But the attempt to suppress the fidayeen activities in Lebanon was defeated and the Lebanese pro-imperialist regime plunged into a severe political crisis. The following is a statement by a spokesman of the Political Bureau of D.P.F. on April 25th:

The recent developments in Lebanon reveal that the popular masses in the area, guided by their revolutionary instinct, have uncovered the imperialist-reactionary plot of all the forces of counter-revolution to encircle the Palestine resistance movement and the anti-imperialist Arab movement at large and impose upon them the conditions of imperialism: the liquidation of the struggle in the Middle East and the implementation of the U.N. resolution.

The struggle waged by the Lebanese masses to defend the Palestine armed struggle and defeat all attempts to suppress it, proves that the mounting mass movement in the area has taken upon itself the task of foiling all plots directed against the national liberation movement and the mass upsurge in the area – the majority of these plots are executed by the treacherous bourgeois regimes subservient to imperialism.

By their uprising, the Lebanese masses

1) express their categorical rejection of all attempts aimed at the liquidation of the Palestine and Arab national liberation movements and their subjugation to the conditions and pressures of imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction;

2) reveal the readiness of the masses of the Middle East to wage a violent and protracted struggle against any such attempts at encirclement and repression;

3) confirm the non-patriotic character of the Lebanese bourgeoisie which was initially scared into voicing verbal support of the fidayeen only to move its forces of suppression against their bases in Southern Lebanon and inflict many casualties among them. This bourgeoisie which directs all its hatred against the mounting mass movement in Lebanon is well aware that this movement will ultimately direct its struggle towards their overthrow as one of the representatives of U.S. neo-imperialism in the area;

4) The Arab mass movement has totally unmasked the hypocrisy of some forces and personalities which feigned support for the Palestinian and Arab patriotic cause – the bullets directed against the Lebanese masses have revealed the true nature of such bourgeois forces, their bitter hatred against the masses and their subservience to imperialism and Zionism.

The Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation Palestine salutes the militant Lebanese masses presently engaged in a resolute fight to defend the Palestine armed struggle and the whole national liberation movement in the area against the common

offensive of Zionism, imperialism and their allies. The Democratic Popular Front for the liberation of Palestine extends comradely greetings to all sister progressive parties and movements in Lebanon which led the popular uprising of the masses, thus proving, indeed, the unity of all the revolutionary forces in our area and the world over, against the forces of counter-revolution

Long live the unity of revolutionary forces in the Arab countries and the world!
Long live the struggle of the Arab masses against Zionism, imperialism and the local forces of counter-revolution!
Defeat and shame to the traitors and enemies of the people, and their Fascist suppression of the masses' uprising!

25.4.69.

FROM A COMMUNIQUE ON MAY DAY 1969

Workers of the world! Socialist forces of all countries! The Palestine problem is presently in the forefront of the world problems which require a true Marxist-Leninist and internationalist stand from the workers' movements and the socialist bloc. Since the nineteenth century, Palestine has been the victim of a Zionist settlers' aggression headed by Jewish capitalism in alliance with British colonialism, then with U.S. neo-imperialism. In 1948, when the Arab world was under the domination of weak feudalist regimes allied to imperialism, Zionism and imperialism managed to annex a part of our territory. In June 1967, the Zionist-imperialist aggressors occupied what remained of Palestine in addition to new Arab territories in Sinai and the Golan Heights. Throughout this period, an important section of the international workers' and communist movement disregarded the justice of the Palestinian people's cause and adopted an erroneous position on the Palestine problem which still accepts the Zionist-imperialist nationalist oppression to which our people have been subjected.

The Palestine workers and poor peasants are waging a just resistance which is but the initial phase of a protracted popular war of liberation against Zionist colonisation (in its borders of 1948 and 1967). They are fighting the joint enemies of the Palestine people and the forces of national emancipation. On this May Day, the Palestinian workers and poor peasants call upon all workers of the world and all the sections of the international communist movement – the natural allies of the Palestinian people and of its right to national self-determination – to take a just internationalist stand that rejects all forms of exploitation of man by man, of a people by another people, or of a nation by another nation; and to vehemently denounce all form of national and class oppression.

The world communist movement, headed by the Soviet Union – the land of Lenin, champion of the rights of oppressed people to self-determination – is urgently requested to revise its erroneous Stalinist-Bureaucratic stand on the Palestine problem

and adopt a true Marxist-Leninist position which recognises the right of all peoples to self-determination and rejects imperialist and national oppression. The world Communist movement, with the Soviet Union at its head, is required to recognise the rights of the Palestinian people to their country and to reject the artificial Israeli structure based on oppression and usurpation and resulting from the marriage of Jewish capitalism to international capitalism, and U.S. capitalism in particular. The only correct Marxist-Leninist position is the one that calls for the establishment of a popular-democratic Palestine which will abolish all forms of class exploitation and national oppression.

Similarly, the Arab C.P.s are urged to revise their erroneous stand, both on the national and international levels, and to adopt a true Marxist-Leninist position on the Palestine problem which rejects the Israeli entity and recognises the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination in a popular democratic Palestine.

On the First of May, our people extend their acknowledgement and gratitude to the Chinese Peoples' Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Korea, and Cuba, for their true internationalist position on the Palestine problem. We also hail the positions of the Sudanese C.P. and the Iraqi C.P. (Central Command faction) which call for the overthrow of the Israeli-Zionist structure and the establishment of a Democratic Palestinian state. We also note the recent position adopted by the Lebanese C.P. in its Second Congress – a position which approximates the correct stand to take on our country's cause.

Our people are well aware that the forces of Imperialism, Zionism and Arab and Palestinian reaction are trying to exploit the erroneous stand taken by a section of the world communist movement on the Palestine problem in order to sow the seeds of hatred among our people against the friendly socialist bloc and the world communist movement. Such attempts to drive a wedge between our people and their natural allies and friends are doomed to failure. The thoroughly proletarian spirit with which we direct our criticism towards those friends will expose the malicious misrepresentations of the forces of reaction. Our people have learnt, through experience, to differentiate between their enemies and friends and are even more determined to strengthen their ties with the countries of the socialist bloc.

The contradiction between our people on the one hand, and imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction on the other, is a fundamental contradiction. But, the contradiction between our people's right to self-determination and the erroneous attitude of important sections of the international communist movement is not an antagonistic contradiction. It is not to be resolved by struggle, but by mutual criticism which should result in a correct Marxist-Leninist attitude towards the Palestine problem.

Our opposition to imperialism, Zionism, and reaction forms the common platform around which we should rally all the forces of national liberation, socialist revolution and the working-class movements of the capitalist countries. We are by duty bound to unite against counter-revolution. Disunited and fragmented, we constitute an easy prey to imperialism.

Workers of the world unite against imperialism, Zionism and reaction!

The Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. (D.P.F.L.P.) May 1st, 1969.

TOWARDS A DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION TO THE PALESTINE PROBLEM*

(. . .) The Palestine National Congress, basing itself on the belief of the Palestinian people in a democratic solution to the Palestine problem, resolves the following:

1. The Palestine National Congress rejects all chauvinist, reactionary and Zionist – imperialist solutions to the Palestine problem based on the recognition of the state of Israel as one of the existing 'facts' in the Middle East. These solutions not only negate the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, but also consecrate the Zionist and expansionist structure of the state of Israel, tied to imperialism and opposed to the Palestinian and Arab national liberation movements and to all the forces of liberation and socialism in the world.
2. The Palestine National Congress rejects the Palestine and Arab chauvinist solutions prevailing before and after June 1967 calling for 'butchering the Jews and throwing them into the sea'. Similarly, it rejects the reactionary solutions calling for recognition of an Israeli state within safe boundaries as stipulated by the U.N. resolution of November 1967. These solutions, which again negate the right of the Palestine people to self-determination, seek to maintain in the Middle East a racialist, capitalist, and expansionist state serving the interests of imperialism and diametrically opposed to the Palestine and Arab national liberation movements, and to the national liberation movements and the forces of progress and socialism in the world.
3. The Palestine National Congress will struggle for a popular democratic solution to both the Palestinian and Israeli problems based on; a) the overthrow of the Zionist structure represented by the state institutions (army, administration and police) and all the Zionist and chauvinist political and trade union institutions; b) the establishment of a popular democratic Palestinian state where Arabs and Jews enjoy equal rights without discrimination and where all forms of national and class oppression shall be abolished; c) granting both Arab and Jew the right to develop their own national cultures.
4. Because of the link of history and common fate that binds Palestine to the Arab nation, the popular democratic state of Palestine will become an integral part of a unified Arab state – democratic in context and opposed to colonialism, imperialism, Zionism and to both Palestinian and Arab reaction.
5. Only such a democratic solution is capable of freeing both Jews and Arabs from all forms of chauvinistic and racialist ideology – the Arab will be liberated from reactionary ideology and the Jew from Zionist ideology.
6. This democratic solution, opposed to national and class oppression, is also capable of liberating Palestine from imperialism and of transforming it into a revolutionary progressive stronghold which will join the world-wide struggle against imperialism and counter-revolution.

7. The national liberation movement can only establish this popular democratic Palestinian state by means of armed struggle and of a popular liberation war directed against Zionism, imperialism and reaction; by the overthrow of the Israeli state and the liberation of Jews from Zionism (. . .)

The Sixth Palestine National Congress after having adopted this democratic solution calls upon all anti-Zionist Jews and Israelis to rally around this solution and to engage in the common Palestinian armed and mass struggle for its implementation.

The Sixth Palestinian National Congress calls upon all forces of national liberation and socialism all over the world to adopt this democratic solution and to engage in the struggle on the side of the Palestinian people for its implementation, i.e. for achieving the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

* (Draft resolution presented by the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine to the Palestine National Congress - September 1969).

THE PALESTINIAN NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT*

The unification of the fighting organizations of the Palestinian people is one of the main problems which the resistance movement is required to solve. At a time when the Palestinian national liberation movement is faced with the threat of physical liquidation and the attempts to impose upon it the terms of imperialism and Zionism, it has become a pressing historical necessity to strengthen the unity of all patriotic forces against the enemy.

The D.P.F.L.P. emphasizes the needs for unity because of its awareness of the historical significance of the unity of all the enemies of imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction and all the patriots with a keen interest in the integral liberation of their homeland. History teaches us that a colonised, underdeveloped country can only liberate itself after the fulfillment of several conditions, most important of which is the unity of all the patriotic sectors of the population in a protracted people's war, aiming at destroying the colonisers' military machine.

Since the June war, the resistance movement has been trying to develop its

action into a guerrilla war in the occupied territories. Wide sections of the population gave their support, but they have not yet been organized or politically educated to ensure their active participation in the struggle nor have the masses become a homogeneous fighting force - conditions that would ensure the transformation of the resistance movement into a people's war of liberation.

Presently, the resistance movement suffers from many contradictions and centrifugal forces operating within it. The patriotic forces are unable to agree on a minimum national platform which would take those contradictions into consideration and achieve co-ordination between the fighting forces and the escalation of the struggle. The reactionary regimes, on the other hand, are united and prepared to clamp down on the resistance movement by restricting its freedom of action, containing and eventually liquidating it. They are motivated by a desperate attempt to achieve a political settlement in the hope of putting an end to the revolutionary situation that has been threatening them since the defeat of June 1967. The only way for the reactionary regimes to save themselves is to co-ordinate with their imperialist masters for the liquidation of the resistance movement. They fear that the growth of the resistance movement will lead to a radical change in both the form and content of the national liberation movement all over the Middle East.

The more advanced Arab regimes, which suffered the defeat of June 1967, are incapable of introducing the radical changes necessitated by the anti-imperialist struggle: arming and organizing the masses, granting political freedom to the people, gearing all economy to serve the needs of the confrontation and severing all economic and political links with the imperialist camp. Consequently, they hesitate and waver in their support for the resistance movement. They accept the political settlement as a way out of the trap. They were led into the June 1967 war, and view the resistance movement as an effective means for applying pressure on Israel and the imperialist powers to obtain the concessions required for the "peaceful" settlement. Thus, they are in need of controlling the resistance movement and create agent-organizations within this movement through which they achieve some of that control. They merely seek to use the resistance movement in order to achieve their slogan of "saving what can be saved" while containing it within the limits of this slogan.

On the international scale, imperialism, led by the U.S., is increasing its efforts to maintain its domination over the underdeveloped countries. It is determined to liquidate the Arab national liberation movement by exploiting to the full the privileged position Israel acquired after its victory in the June war. To achieve this aim, imperialism is exerting pressure on the advanced regimes to yield more and more concessions until the peaceful liquidation of the intensive conflict is finally achieved. Moreover, imperialism is fully aware that those regimes will eventually yield to pressure so long as they persist in following their present indeterminate policy.

Some socialist countries - by their erroneous policy on the Palestine problem and the Arab national liberation movement as a whole and by their policy of a peaceful settlement of the conflict with Israel and the imperialist powers - are undoubtedly contributing to the increasing aggressivity of imperialism. Yet, such erroneous policies of those socialist countries by no means puts them on an equal footing with U.S. imperialism - as some reactionary Palestinian circles wish us to believe - and our criticism of those policies is in no way the same as our ideological,

political and military struggle against imperialism.

In facing those threats, the resistance movement still adopts policies which lag behind the immediate requirements of the present stage. It rejects all the plans for a political settlement, though in a vague and general manner, yet neither does it wage a daily struggle to criticise and explain the various attempts at implementing this settlement, nor does it carry on the political educational work of exposing the Arab regimes that call for it among the masses. Furthermore the resistance organizations have not engaged in common practical preparations to rebut an onslaught against them from the rear, and the masses have not yet been organized to defend the resistance movement.

The alliance of all the patriotic forces in a united front with a common platform, based on egalitarian relationships among its different organizations is the effective answer to the dangers that threaten the Palestinian national liberation movement. This task is yet to be achieved. The present phase of fragmentation which the resistance movement is experiencing results from several factors:

1. **The Palestinian people is composed of different classes and groups. Each of the existing Palestinian organizations represents the structure, interests, ambitions and programme of one group or the other.** Palestinian history provides us with the decisive proof of the failure of the programme of the feudal-bourgeois class and the betrayal of the national cause by a sector of this class. New classes and social groups have emerged which express their interests through a variety of parties and organizations. The Palestinian middle class, in all its strata, has played a fundamental role in the formation of these organizations. The existence of many organizations is explained by the variety of interests within this class and by the geographic distribution of the Palestinian people: large demographic concentration in Jordan in addition to the Palestinian communities in several Arab countries each of which is affected by the economic, political and cultural conditions of the host country.

2. **There has always existed a dialectical relationship between the objective conditions of Palestine and those in the other Arab countries.** In the past, Arab feudalist regimes used to call upon the political forces in Palestine to unite when this unity served the interests of their Palestinian feudal allies and preserved the latter's leadership of the national movement. This was the case, prior to 1948, when the Arab regimes sponsored the Arab High Committee under the leadership of the Palestinian feudalists.

The Arab regimes, of the post 1948 era, played a similar role when they coerced many Palestinian organizations into dissolving themselves and joining the Palestine Liberation Organization which followed the instructions of these regimes through the Arab League and the Summit Conferences.

On other occasions, the Arab regimes work for increasing the fragmentation of the Palestinian national liberation movement. At this present stage, they are either planting fake organizations inside the resistance movement or supporting those organizations with the least mass following. Such organizations are totally dependent on the Arab regimes which use them to attack the resistance movement from within. Furthermore, the Arab regimes exploit the contradictions within the resistance

movement . . . What those regimes fear most is the development of a situation in which the Arab masses will wage a people's war against imperialism which would sweep away all those who hesitate to wage a violent confrontation.

Those two factors, in addition to many other secondary ones, have led to the increasing fragmentation of the resistance movement and to the intensification of its contradictions, to the point of open clashes between its various organizations. This has undoubtedly weakened the capacity of the movement to escalate its struggle against the forces of occupation.

The various organizations of the resistance movement should understand objectively the contradictions existing within the resistance movement. The danger lies in the intensification of those contradictions at a time when the resistance movement is facing Zionism and U.S. imperialism in the front, and Arab reaction preparing a showdown in the rear. Such a situation will only provide our enemies with the opportunity they are waiting for. However, attempts to abolish these contradictions by liquidating some organizations and by forcibly taking over others will only lead to new antagonistic contradictions which will be exploited by the forces of counter-revolution.

Such contradictions will become of secondary importance only by the formation of a **national liberation front** which would contain them within the limits of a **minimum national platform** (representing the minimum of what all the organizations agree upon) while each organization preserves the right to independent action beyond the limits of that platform.

The unity of all the patriotic forces and classes is an historical precondition for achieving integral national liberation. It is also necessitated by the prevailing conditions and is a pressing popular demand.

* Introduction to a document presented to the Palestine National Congress - September 1969.

MILITARY OPERATIONS

The following are summaries of two of the most advanced military operations carried out by the Palestinian resistance movement. Operations "Red Line" and "Ho Chi Minh" carried out by the fighters of the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, in addition to other large-scale operations carried out by the various guerrilla organizations represent an important development in the Palestinian struggle towards a new stage; organized and co-ordinated guerrilla warfare.

The Palestine Armed Struggle Command
Military Communique no. 713.

Operation no. 143.

The Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine

OPERATION "RED LINE"

In a single night and on the front line from Lake Tiberias to the Dead Sea, our fighting units carried out 15 co-ordinated offensive operations against 6 Zionist settlements and 14 advanced enemy positions; they wiped out 5 patrols, destroyed 7 armoured vehicles, 4 ambushes and 5 observation posts. They also destroyed long distances of electrified barbed wire, fortifications and a variety of guns causing enemy forces no less than 70 casualties, killed or wounded.

In the "North Jordan Valley" the following attacks were made:

1. Our fighters intercepted a caravan of troop carriers on the "Massada" Ashdot Yaakov" road destroying one armoured vehicle and damaging another.
2. Some of our units overran enemy fortifications and blew up a building in the east side of "Ashdot Yaakov". After inflicting heavy casualties on the enemy, our forces withdrew carrying one dead and two wounded.
3. South of the same settlement, an Israeli patrol of 6 soldiers was wiped out. One of our fighters was injured.
4. Our fighters attacked advanced enemy ambushes north of Zanbagiah Hill. Cover units helped our fighters withdraw under heavy enemy tank and machine gun fire, carrying a wounded comrade.
5. Our fighters overran an advanced enemy ambush north east of "Gisher" settlement.
6. One of our units bombarded "Gisher" with mortars, and penetrated the barbed wire, and fought a three hour battle with enemy forces at the outskirts of the settlement. The unit withdrew without any loss.

7. Another unit ambushed an enemy minesweeper and a track vehicle destroying the latter. Our fighters were surrounded and a company of enemy paratroopers advanced towards them. A long and fierce battle took place. In the late morning our fighters broke through and returned, carrying one dead and three wounded.

8. Our fighters ambushed and wiped out an enemy patrol on the road to Kfar-Rabin.

9. and 10. In the "Central Jordan Valley" our fighters carried out two similar operations destroying an observation post near "Shuwai'er" camp, and ambushing and destroying an armoured vehicle on a road leading to this camp. The enemy force suffered many casualties and all our fighters returned safely.

11. - 15. In the "South Jordan Valley" our forces carried out five operations, one of which was against "Al-Kartina" camp near the Damiya Bridge and came just after an attack by Al Assifa (Al-Fatah's military wing) in the same area. The other four operations include attacking an enemy ambush on the way to Shuwai'er camp; mining the road from Jericho to the Dead Sea where a mine blew up under a landrover; ambushing two enemy engineering units, one near Red Hill and the other in the Suwaimah area. All our fighters involved in these operations, returned safely after causing the enemy heavy human and material losses.

To the Masses of Our People

The daring "Red Line" operation carried out by the heroes of the Democratic Popular Front along the front line with Israel, shows beyond doubt that the Palestine resistance movement is able to escalate its operations and move from limited and small-scale acts to large-scale offensives, quantitatively and qualitatively different. The resistance movement has also become able to address the Palestinian and Arab masses in a truthful manner, free of all demagogic and propagandist glamour.

The D.P.F.L.P. sees that development of the Palestinian resistance movement from its present stage to the next, i.e. "organized guerrilla war" inside the occupied territory as a step towards an all-embracing popular war of liberation, is dependent on the ability of the resistance movement to transcend its subjective conditions, beginning with the internal structure of every group and ending with the objective relations of these groups with each other. This development also depends on the ability of the movement to overcome the static relationships with the surrounding Arab regimes which hamper it. This transition to organized guerrilla warfare cannot be achieved without certain objective conditions, the most important of which follow.

1. A radical revolutionary structure guided by a revolutionary theory and educating the fighters and the masses in the light of this theory, for only then can they sustain a long struggle for national and social liberation.
2. A Palestinian national unity with a radical programme and under the leadership of the most revolutionary classes.

3. Unmasking and exposing all conspiracies to liquidate the Palestinian cause and the resistance movement by the Arab regimes, and the attempts of these regimes to set up a barrier between the Palestinian and Arab masses for fear of the struggle carrying over to their territories. These regimes are working towards the so-called 'peaceful solution' and safe borders with Israel which obviously means containing and liquidating the resistance movement. The D.P.F.L.P. struggles to make all the resistance groups aware of their roles and responsibilities, the problems facing them and how to overcome them and escalate towards a popular liberation war.

The Palestine Armed struggle Command
Military Communique no. 719

Operation no. 144.

The Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine

OPERATION "HO CHI MINH"

The fighters of the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine carried out the "Ho Chi Minh" operation two days after the "Red Line" operation.

- * The D.P.F.L.P.'s forces simultaneously attacked 7 enemy military positions in the "Golan" area.
- * Our forces occupied enemy positions at "Bir Ajam", "Tal al-Ahmar" and "Al-Hamidiyyah" and hoisted the Palestinian flag together with the Red Banner.
- * Our forces paralyzed other enemy positions and inflicted heavy losses on them.

On the eve of 7.9.69 several squads of our forces set out inside the occupied Golan area to carry out operation "Ho Chi Minh" with the purpose of seizing the town of Qunaitra and Bir Ajam village. Our forces took up the positions according to plan without being discovered by the enemy. They succeeded in cutting off all access to Al-Quneitra. The attack was launched at 11 p.m. simultaneously against seven enemy positions. This happened after strong shelling of enemy concentrations at al-Tall, al-Ahmar, al-Mudiriyya, Tall Abu al Dhahab and al-Raqqadiyya with mortars and other weapons. Our fighters paralyzed the enemy troops entrenched in these areas. At the same time, after an hour of shelling another group of our forces launched a heavy attack on the town of al-Qunaitra. The group then stormed enemy fortifications and reached the town outskirts, where a fierce battle was fought and the enemy troops suffered heavy losses of men and equipment.

Meanwhile, the unit assigned to seizing the village of Bir-al Ajam successfully accomplished this task, storming the village and clearing it of all enemy troops. Then our forces hoisted the Palestinian flag and the Red Banner in the liberated village.

Our forces later returned to their bases, having lost two dead and five wounded.

The D.P.F.L.P. fighters present this operation as a salute in reverence and veneration to the spirit of the Vietnamese heroic fighter, comrade Ho Chi Minh who set an admirable example for the struggle of the peoples of the world for national liberation and socialism. The Front, along with other patriotic resistance movements, will follow the path opened up by comrade Ho, and fight a long war of popular liberation, rejecting all bargains and defeatist settlement, until victory is won and the Palestinian and Arab soil is cleared of the last soldier of the Zionist invaders.

- Long live the memory of comrade Ho Chi Minh!
- Long live international solidarity between all peoples fighting for freedom and socialism.
- From Vietnam to Palestine, one struggle one fight.

Published by "Committees for Solidarity with the Palestinian Revolution,
c/o Third World Solidarity Group, Mcr. University Union, Oxford Road, Manchester 13.
Printed by Progress Bookshop (Mc) Ltd., 28 Hathersage Road, Manchester 13.
