

PALESTINE RESISTANCE BULLETIN

In Solidarity with the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine

Number 2

September 1970

15 ¢

Editorial: To Protect the Revolution

"At last, they stopped shooting and started talking"--this is what the newspapers tell us about the Rogers peace proposal.

The U.S. and the Soviet Union are determined to make it work. Their client states, Israel and the defeated Arab regimes, have to follow suit. The aim is to find a way of implementing the "peaceful" solution to the Middle East problem. This amounts to legitimizing Zionist expansionism and perpetuating the imperialist presence in the Middle East.

Clearly, the only party to the conflict which does not subscribe to the political solution is the Palestinian Resistance.

The Palestinian armed struggle is going through the most crucial phase of its evolution. It is confronted with a concerted effort--by U.S. imperialism, Russian revisionism, and their respective allies--to eliminate any obstacles to the implementation of the "peaceful" solution. To stress the urgency of the situation, Senator Fulbright reminded us on August 22 that, in case the Palestinian guerrillas torpedo the cease-fire, "the Security Council has full authority to impose settlement on warring parties who fail to make peace on their own." The inevitable conclusion for the Palestinian Resistance is that the policy of non-interference in the affairs of Arab states is now obsolete. In order that the Resistance not be crushed, it must secure its base in Jordan and counter the dealings of the Arab regimes with the big powers.

The options open to the Palestinian movement are very limited. If it keeps resistance in the occupied territories as its chief task and ignore the continuous buildup of counter-revolutionary forces in Amman, it will soon be exposed to

(continued page 2)

In this issue:

- 0 Lenin and Leninism vs. Zionism : A Historical Study.
- 0 Nasserism and the "Peaceful" Strategy.
- 0 The Reactionary Regime in Jordan Mobilizes Against the Resistance.
- 0 Notes on the Palestinian Class Structure.
- 0 The DPF and the Ansar forces of Communist Parties. (Cont.)

The Regime in Jordan Mobilizes Against The Resistance

Following its acceptance of the Rogers Peace Plan, the Jordanian Regime has been making substantial rearrangements within its army. The recent transfers among high ranking officers reflect the extent to which King Hussein has been preparing to face the resistance movement.

Thus after the reinstatement last week of Zeid ben Shaker [top reactionary general removed after commando ultimatum during the recent June clashes--tr.] as an assistant to the Chief of Staff in charge of operations [!], major changes were undergone in the top strata of the army. These included:

(1) Promotion of Mashhur Haditha, known for his sympathies for the Resistance, to the rank of general as a first step toward his removal.

(2) Transfer of the Second Brigade commander [in the northern region] to a diplomatic post after he took a conciliatory position toward the Resistance in the June crises. Appointed in his place was (continued p. 3)

=====
Palestine Resistance Bulletin
P.O. box 528
Somerville Mass. 02144
=====

Editorial (continued from cover)

bloody repression launched against it by the Hussein regime--backed this time by the joint forces of the Arab ruling class, the US, the USSR, and the Zionist government. This is an ominous prospect which would lead to the liquidation of the Palestinian mass movement. (The present clashes between the Jordanian army and the revolutionary masses, in Amman, Irbid, Zarqa, and Ma'aan---although temporarily overshadowed by the hijacking incidents---only make the above prospect too clear.)

But if the Movement faces the task of ending the dual power now existing in the East Bank, as it must do, the question is how to effectively deal with the reactionary royal regime. It is no longer justifiable--and in the present circumstances even dangerous--to raise objections concerning the administrative burdens that will result from seizing power. The Palestinian organizations can act decisively toward establishing a progressive regime in the East Bank, based on the power of the Popular Councils and the people's militia. Such a regime will truly be the backbone for the war of liberation against Zionism and imperialism. (A coup d'etat, aimed merely at neutralizing the royal regime, as some suggest, will not do and will not last very long under the present conditions.)

A revolutionary people's regime in the East Bank is more than likely to invite US-Israeli intervention on a massive scale (probably in the form of Israeli aerial bombardments of civilian centers where revolutionary control is located). Thus preparation of the masses for an external imperialist onslaught is absolutely essential. Only such a regime, however, can make effective the slogan of an "Arab Hanoi in Amman" and protect the rear-guard of the resistance.

The Editors 10.10. 1970

Senator Fulbright on the Middle East

Because the conflict is a threat to the outside world it cannot be left solely to the humors of the belligerents. I have never fully understood some of our statesmen feel that it would be a heinous crime for external parties to "impose" a solution. Under the United Nations Charter the Security Council has full authority--possibly even the obligation--to impose a settlement upon warring parties who fail to make peace on their own. The very premise of the Charter is that warring nations can no longer be permitted immunity from a world police power....

As to the Arabs and the Israelis...I think it would be a fine thing--a useful step forward for civilization--if, in the absence of a voluntary settlement by the parties, the United Nations were to "impose" a peaceful [!!!] settlement in the Middle East. It would be an equally fine thing if the United Nations could "impose" a settlement in Southeast Asia.

---Washington, August 22, 1970

SUBSCRIBE TO THE PALESTINE RESISTANCE BULLETIN

- () Please send me the next 12 issues of the Bulletin. I am enclosing \$1.50 (Cash only).
- () Send me the pamphlet "Documents from the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine". (50¢, cash only).
- () Please send me Bulletin No. 1. (25¢)

Name.....
Address.....

Send to: PR Bulletin
P.O.Box 59
Somerville, Mass. 02144

Bahjat al-Muhaisen, the former military attache in London--an extreme reactionary known for his open hostility toward the Resistance.

(3) Substantial transfers occurred among all officers "sympathetic to the resistance movement". Over fifty of them were sent in missions to Pakistan, Britain, and the United States.

(4) Several regiments were withdrawn from the Ghor and the Northern regions [areas facing Israel] and placed around Amman and Zarqa, in an attempt to tighten the siege around the capital---exactly what happened during the recent June attempt to liquidate the fida'i movement. Jordanian forces took control of positions previously assigned to the Iraqi regiments under the claim that they were conducting maneuvers [!].

The withdrawal from the Aghwar plains has two main purposes: One, to reorganize the military priorities of the Jordanian regime so that it will be in utmost readiness when ordered to confront the resistance, and two, the implementation of the cease-fire agreement, which--in effect--makes it possible for Israel to cross the Jordan [river] in pursuit of the feda'iyeen.

(5) The arming of the Jordanian forces with light weapons to face the resistance at its level of mobility. It was revealed recently that Britain had supplied Jordan with two large shipments of such weapons (via Beirut), which was quickly transferred to Amman.

All those preparations are taking place now amid a wide political campaign aimed at mobilizing the Jordanian army against the Resistance. One notices particularly the frequent royal directives and public speeches addressed by the King in mass rallies of soldiers and officers--all containing clear incitements against the Resistance, and emphasizing the government's commitment to a position similar to that of the "great sister Arab nation" (i.e. the U.A.R.--tr.). A secret royal message to various leading ranks in the army, and the intelligence services-- after attacking the Resistance--similarly praises the position of the "great sister nation that stood beside us..."

While the Jordanian army prepares for another round a sudden declaration comes from the commander of the Saudi [Arabian] forces stationed in Jordan since June 1967. At the eighteenth anniversary of King Hussein's coronation the commander zealously announced that "the Saudi forces have sworn to God to be [fighting] next to their brothers under the command of King Hussein until the last soldier and the last bullet."

Official Arab support to the Jordanian regime continues to come--whether from Arab reaction, or from "the great Arab sister" and Libya. Meanwhile they have stopped their material support to the resistance movement; an official spokesman in Amman announced that Egypt, Libya, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait have discontinued their financial and military support for the Palestinian Resistance after Cairo and Amman accepted the American proposals.

---al-Hurriah, No. 528
Beirut, August 17, 1970

* ARAB NATIONALS TO JOIN THE RESISTANCE MOVEMENT *
 * The Palestine National Liberation Movement, Fateh, called in early August on Arab *
 * nationals wishing to join its ranks to do so and take part in the armed struggle for *
 * national liberation. The announcement comes in the wake of the success achieved in *
 * the establishment of an Arab commando contingent in order to allow actual parti- *
 * cipation of the Arab masses in the Palestinian Revolution. *
 * Fateh offices have been instructed to accept volunteers and send them to training *
 * camps and fighting areas. *
 * When a Cairo paper last year published a report that Fateh offices in Egypt would *
 * accept applications by those wishing to join the Palestinian Revolution, more than *
 * 70,000 applications were received within a few days. *
 * --Fateh, Vol II, No. 13 *
 * August 21, 1970 *
 * *****

/...
THE LENINIST STRUGGLE AGAINST ZIONISM

(The following article appeared for the first time in al-Sharara-- official organ of the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, in the issue of March, 1970.)

Starting in 1903 Lenin waged a resolute struggle against the narrow nationalist tendencies that took control of the Bund--The National Union of Jewish Workers in Lithuania, Poland and Russia--which was formed in 1897. The Bund was the first social-democratic organization to appear in Russia, and when the first congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Party was convened, the Bund attended and decided to join the new party. But the Bund retracted, and in its fourth congress adopted two resolutions that were the beginning steps toward a break with the Russian workers party. Those resolutions stated that: there existed a "Jewish Nation", and that the Bund was the independent national organization of the Jewish proletariat. Nevertheless the actual break did not take place until the summer of 1903.

This was when Lenin began his long battle against the Bund. He directed a strong attack against the nationalist revisionism in the workers movement and defended the principle of organizing workers on a geographical rather than on a national basis. Referring on several occasions to the idea of the "Jewish Nation", Lenin said in an article published in Iskra in November of 1903: "the concept of the Jewish nation is a Zionist concept", and furthermore, this concept "is absolutely incorrect and essentially reactionary". He went on to present numerous sources showing that Jews did not constitute a nation because they lacked a common territory and language, the two most essential factors determining nationhood. Lenin rejected the view that Jews have common racial characteristics; "... not only national", he stated, "but even common racial peculiarities are not found among Jews by modern scientific investigators...".

Lenin continued to analyze the role played by the concept of the Jewish Nation from a revolutionary standpoint. He insisted that this idea played an utterly reactionary role by instigating the Jews against assimilation and hence, standing in the face of progress in contemporary society. On this question Lenin said that "the idea of a Jewish Nation is definitely reactionary, not only when expounded by its consistent advocates (the Zionists), but likewise by those who try to combine it with the ideas of social-democracy (the Bundists). The idea of a Jewish Nation runs counter to the interests of the Jewish proletariat, for it fosters among them--directly or indirectly--a spirit hostile to assimilation, the spirit of the "ghetto". Lenin also said that "no one opposes assimilation except these reactionary, ridiculous and philistine Jews who want to start the wheels of history moving backwards".

It was natural that Lenin was staunchly anti-Zionist. Zionism had consciously played a counter-revolutionary role against socialism by rejecting any form of a united front against the tyrannical autocratic regimes. While the social-democratic movements were insisting on the unity of workers' struggle regardless of religious belief or national origin, and while they were granting the Jewish proletarian organizations their full freedom in dealing with their special cultural and religious issues, the Zionists were insisting that the interests of the Jewish proletariat and intelligentsia lay somewhere else. While revolutionary workers movements were fighting relentlessly the pogroms caused by anti-semitism, insisting that the oppression of minorities and national groups could not be brought to an end except by a revolutionary transformation of society, the Zionists were content to present those massacres as yet another proof of the permanent nature of anti-semitism and the futility of the struggle against it, and that the only answer was emigration to Palestine. Thus Zionism was the ideology of class collaboration which caused considerable damage to the objectives of class struggle.

5/...

In this respect Lenin said: "The Zionist idea (formation of a Jewish State in Palestine) which is being used to divert the Jewish proletariat from the class struggle is counter-revolutionary, petty-bourgeois, and utopian."

Lenin was also aware of the nature of the relationship between Zionism and imperialism. This becomes clear from the statement he added to the Thesis on the National and Colonial Question which was adopted by the second congress of the Third International held in 1920. The statement stated that "it is essential to continually expose the deception fostered among the masses of the toilers in all nations, and especially in the backward ones, by the imperialist powers and by the privileged classes in the subject countries in creating--under the mask of political independence--various governments and state institutions which are in reality completely dependent upon them. As a striking example of the deception practiced upon the working class of a subject country through the united efforts of the allied imperialists and the bourgeoisie of a given nation, we may cite the Palestine affair of the Zionists, where--under the pretext of creating a Jewish state in Palestine, in which the Jews form an insignificant part of the population--Zionism has delivered the native Arab working population to the exploitation of England!" (Emphasis added)

In 1922 the Third International, under the leadership of Lenin, denied membership to the Paole Zion Party ("Workers of Zion")¹ requiring that the party sever completely all its ties with Zionism. The resolution adopted by the International stated:

The Communist International requires as a condition for membership of the Paole Zion Party to its ranks that the party give up all its nationalist ambitions in Palestine and to dissolve itself so that the communist cadres of the Jewish proletariat can join the communist parties of their native countries.

After Lenin, the Third International remained faithful to the Leninist tradition of militant anti-Zionism until it was dissolved in 1943, and while the International's interpretation of the Palestine question is debatable, its indictment of Zionism is unquestionably clear. Perhaps what angers the Zionists and Arab reactionaries alike is the fact that the Jewish leaders in the Third International (Zinoviev, Bukharin, Radek, etc.) exerted their influence for a more resolute struggle against Zionism. So much that the International required the Communist Party of Palestine to purge all its Zionist members, and to support the national liberation movement of the Arab inhabitants against the British mandate and the Zionist settler colonialism as a condition for accepting them as full members. The international communist movement maintained this line until after WWII when the position on Palestine was changed.

The Leninist Tradition and the Position of the Arab Communist Parties

The Arab communist parties were also faithful to the Leninist tradition of anti-Zionism until 1947. In 1922 the Communist Party of Palestine, whose members were predominantly Jewish, issued a statement opposing the Balfour Declaration (an official statement made by the British Government in 1917 promising leading Zionists to help in establishing a "National Home for the Jews" in Palestine--tr.). In 1936 the cadres of the party picked up arms and joined the revolution (the Arab Revolt in Palestine against the British mandate and Zionist emigration to Palestine. The revolt lasted three years--1936-39--tr.). The program of the party until 1946--in regards to the national question, could be summarized as demanding

he end to the British mandate, the end of Jewish emigration to Palestine, and the establishment of an independent democratic state in Palestine. Other Arab communist parties did not differ in their stand from the Palestinian party. All that one has to do is cast a quick look at the issues of Sawt al-Sha'b ("Voice of the People")--the organ of the largest Arab communist party at that time, the Communist Party of Syria and Lebanon. On the 13th and 14th of August 1944, comrade Farajallah al-Hilou wrote an article in Sawt al-Sha'b under the title of "Down With the Criminal Zionist" in which he said: "Zionism is essentially an imperialist movement which is in contradiction with the aspirations of the Arab people for freedom and independence. Its political aim is to create a strong and secure point of support for imperialist influence in Palestine, and other points of support--or fifth columns--for the imperialists in neighboring countries. ... We have said in the past, and we repeat now, that the struggle of the Arab people in Palestine against Zionism is not a struggle between Jews and Arabs. In other words, it is not a racial or religious struggle...it is rather a political struggle, a national struggle against one of the ugliest forms of foreign imperialism."

Comrade Khalid Bagdash (Sec. Gen. of the C.P.S.--tr.) said in the May Day rally in 1946 held in Damascus: "We are not enemies of the Jews, but we are enemies of Zionism. We are old enemies of it, because it is a reactionary, capitalist, and imperialist movement whose purpose in the West is to sow disunity and sectarianism between Jewish workers and workers of different countries, and to fight against socialism; its purpose in Palestine is to deceive Jewish workers into serving ambitions that are alien to socialism and democracy. Those are the aims of British imperialism and Zionist capitalism which is integrated into British and American capital... Hence the fate of Zionism in the face of democratic progress and correct socialist ideas in the world is decay and extinction..." Bagdash continues to say "...our duty is not to support Palestine (only), but to struggle side by side with the Palestinians against the (British) mandate, against Zionism, and against the 'National Home'. We have to struggle for Palestine's freedom and the establishment of a true democratic government in it..."

The Arab communist parties remained opposed to the partition of Palestine (the plan instigated by the Americans and the British through the U.N. for dividing Palestine into an Arab and Jewish states--tr.) until 1947. In an article titled "The Present Stage in the Development of the Palestine Question" Khalid Bagdash wrote again in Sawt al-Sha'b (August 1, 1946): "The positions of conciliation, or rather the positions of capitulation, have increased the courage of the imperialists and the Zionists against us. They are now openly talking of a plan for partition...and what is worse than all is that their courage has reached the point that they are saying: 'In return for all this, or in return for the new emigration (of Jews to Palestine--tr.) and partition, Britain and America will pay a 100 or 200 million dollars to the Arabs'. When we read this news yesterday..we felt as though the claws were ravaging our insides or that a storm had knocked our heads!!! Imperialists: this nation is not for sale..."

On the 18th of August, 1946, the Communist Parties of Syria and Lebanon held a joint meeting which resulted in a long statement subsequently published in Sawt al-Sha'b (August 22, 1946). The statement said: "The British government is determined to implement its schemes in Palestine through the Partition Plan. This plan is a shameful disgrace to all humanity. Arab public opinion has protested the plan and has expressed its absolute refusal of any partition. This is because (the Partition Plan) is the most vicious imperialist plan that could befall the Arab East, and the biggest danger that threatens peace in all of the Near East."

Nevertheless, the (Arab) communist parties reversed themselves and accepted

7/...

the Partition Plan, thus committing a grave historical error that has caused great damage to the revolutionary movement in the Arab regions, and which left its negative effects--which persist up to this day--on the readiness of the masses to accept revolutionary ideology.

After the June defeat (i.e. the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, tr.), (only one) Arab Communist party, the Communist Party of Sudan, has gone back to the Leninist tradition. In the report of its Central Committee which was adopted by the fourth congress of the party held in October, 1967, the Sudanese party stated that Israel is an entity which was established through coercion and violent seizure of land, and hence, there is no other alternative but to smash and liquidate it so as "to establish a democratic state in Palestine". The party also demanded in the same document that the historic error that some socialist countries committed by accepting the Partition Plan be corrected so that--as the Sudanese party put it--the situation may return to its natural state.

Since June 1967, there is an increasing awareness in the ranks of socialist and revolutionaries around the world, of the basic rights of the Palestinian people to liberate their country. In this respect it is a move back toward the correct Leninist and internationalist position on the Palestine question. All the revolutionary forces in the world are required to take a correct Leninist position and stand on the side of the Palestinian people for their right to self-determination, and to smash the Zionist structure and establish a free and democratic people's Palestine.

Al-Sharara Vol. 1, No. 6
Amman, March 1970

Note:

1. The Paole Zion Party was the social-democratic wing of Zionism. Later Zionism developed a "Marxist" wing. One of the functions of "left-wing" Zionism in the 1930's was--under the guise of appealing to the common interests of the Jewish and Arab masses--to exploit the contradictions between the feudal Arab leaders and the Arab masses to serve the interests of Jewish bourgeois nationalism. (Tr.)

=====

HOW CAN ONE BE A DOVE ON VIETNAM AND A HAWK ON THE MIDDLE EAST ??

Senator Javits--in a recent CBS interview ('Face the Nation'/8.9.70) --provides the answer:

"To wit," he said, "can you be dovish in respect to Vietnam and can you be hawkish in respect to the Middle East, and my answer is decidedly yes. And the reasons are very numerous, but I will give only two, just to save time. One reason is that the strategic situation is completely different. The United States' fundamental national interest, as defined by the President, as defined by NATO, because we're charged with coming to the rescue of the NATO countries, as defined by our economic & commercial interest with three continents at stake--Europe, Africa and Asia, the crossroads of which is the Middle East--our strategic interest is heavily and deeply involved in the Middle East. That is unlike S.E. Asia, where the best that Lyndon Johnson could do is to say we're trying to establish the principle of self-determination for small peoples, and will not allow them to be subject--swallowed up by aggression by a communist-backed state.

"Secondly...in the Middle East you've got the whole energy resources of Europe--80% of Europe's oil comes from the Middle East and 90% of that of Japan. So the economic life of the world is at stake, which the Soviet Union...could hold hostage and succeed in a way (it) never dreamed of, in terms of holding the world for ransom. Now we and the rest we & the rest of the world just can't allow that to happen."

---Free Palestine

=====

NASSERISM AND THE "PEACEFUL STRATEGY"

Two weeks have barely passed since President Gamal Abdel Nasser's speech of June 23, 1970, when it became obvious that all the excuses which were prepared beforehand to pass the American proposal onto the Arab people had been used up. It seems that even before the speech Nasser realized the futility of the excuses he was going to use to picture his acceptance of the peace plan as a tremendous victory which does not affect the Palestinian cause directly or indirectly. From this we can see why he wanted to cover up the first phase of his propaganda plan--which cannot even stand on its own feet--to open up a new approach in which he possesses superior propaganda weapons and in which he knows he can come out victorious over the Arab masses, having diverted their attention from the key issues involved and pushed the masses into the role of spectators to a verbal contest in which he has the upper hand.

In order for the Nasserite regime to conduct this swift change in its propaganda campaign, it was necessary for it to avoid making the Palestinian resistance a party in the dialogue on the peaceful settlement. It is the Palestinian argument alone that possesses the logic to come to a real contradiction with the Egyptian position. Of course this is the very reason why it was necessary to silence the Palestinian and close his voice to the Arab masses, in particular the Egyptian masses. The shut-down of "Voice of Palestine" and "Voice of Assifa" was therefore inevitable. This procedure alone was not sufficient to choke the voice of the Resistance, but the political stagnation in the Jordanian arena provides the Egyptian regime with the appropriate environment--after a short conflict with the Resistance--to make the "gentle" transition to the second phase of the propaganda campaign, namely turning the dialogue on a peaceful settlement into one between it and the Arab regimes that voiced their "refusal" to the American proposal and the U.N. resolution that followed. From this we see how the struggle over the peaceful settlement during this last week has become one between official Arab governments working on grounds they are most at home with.

The battle that begun between the Egyptian acceptance and the Iraqi refusal to the peace proposal is, with regards to the Egyptian regime, an easy dialogue upon which it can embark (as it is now doing) very safely and completely aware that "victory will be theirs in the end".

The Iraqi regime, which has announced its refusal of the peaceful settlement, is no more than a distorted caricature of the Egyptian regime which has not been able to bypass a "peaceful solution" in all areas, political, military and economic. A regime like Iraq's, in which a military bourgeoisie has taken power, whose economy is organically tied to the imperialist oil market and where the people's movement is suffering under tremendous political and class oppression to the benefit of the ruling bourgeoisie, cannot by refusing the peaceful settlement form any essential contradiction to the Egyptian acceptance. The Egyptian position on a "peaceful solution" is in its essence a retreat from a face to face confrontation with imperialism and Zionism and the local ruling classes in the Arab countries which form the political and social bases for neocolonialism in the Arab world. This retreat should also be understood in terms of the benefits to the ruling class in its internal power structure and its external connections. How can the bourgeois state power in Iraq take a course of action which the Nasserite regime (the most successful bourgeois state in the Arab world) has not been able to pursue? What then remains of the Iraqi refusal to the peace proposals other than mere rhetoric?

The only "advantage" that the Iraqi regime has lies in the particular circumstances surrounding it which make it easier for it to take a position opposing the peace proposals. First, it is far away from the responsibilities which could ensue upon refusing the American plan. Second, the regime is in dire need of a problem like the Palestinian one on which to prop itself up with respect to its internal problems. Third,

it is trying to use its refusal of the peace solution to play a new role in rearranging the map of the Middle East politically--after the liquidation of the Resistance movement, this rearrangement will go from the Gulf (Iraq's policies there are well known) through Amman to Damascus.

It is not surprising that during its campaign the Iraqi regime avoided entering into the real reasons for the Egyptian position and into the factors that inextricably tie it to a peaceful solution. These factors are of course fundamentally rooted in the class structure of the regime. What can a regime like Iraq say in such a case? Is it within its capabilities to expose the role played by Egyptian bourgeois interests in imposing the peaceful settlement, while it itself is being controlled by one of the most backward and ruthless bourgeois states in the Arab world? And is the Iraqi regime capable of breaking the facade which hides the real reasons for the Egyptian acceptance--namely its inability to face Zionism, imperialism and its allies in the Arab world--while it is floating on a sea of oil controlled by imperialist interests? Is it possible for it to even hint at the role of the Egyptian ruling class and its control over the Egyptian people (by not permitting a political, economic and military awakening to develop and to play its role in shifting the scale of balance in the Arab-Israeli struggle), while the Iraqi masses are being imprisoned behind gates of terror, far away from participating in all that affects their lives? From here we can see why the procedures used by the regime limit themselves to arguing over what was said in the Summit meetings, accusing the other party (Egypt) of faltering in accepting projects which if adopted would "save Palestine and its people"! It is of course easy for the Nasserite regime to pick up on these arguments and reply to them using the "Voice of the Arabs" to give them strength and importance. So long as the question is one of what happened in the Summit meetings, then it is all too easy to open up all the files and show the masses an argument that avoids the real issues--because that is the purpose, to make the people forget what are the real issues.

* * * * *

WHY DID THE DPF SUPPORT

THE ADMISSION OF THE ANSAR FORCES TO THE UNIFIED COMMAND?

(Continued from PRB No. 1)

The official communist parties in Jordan, Syria, Iraq and Lebanon have formed a new guerrilla organization--the Ansar (partisan) forces. This event represents a change in the official communist stand with respect to the Resistance movement; for after having considered the fedayeen activities as adventurist, these parties are now desirous of participating in the Resistance. Evidently this change in their attitude is due to two main reasons:

1) The Soviet Union and the official communist parties feel it necessary to use all available forces in order to force Israel to give up her unyielding attitude and to accept the political solution. Since, in their view, the Resistance movement is now a force to be reckoned with, it is proper to support the fedayeen.

2) The increasing popular support given to the Resistance movement and its development as an important political force--not only in the Palestinian-Jordanian context, but in the entire region also--made the official communist parties feel they were further and further isolated from the masses.

After the Ansar forces were formed, they asked to join the Unified Command of the Resistance movement. This move was opposed by all the commando organizations--with the exception of the Democratic Popular Front--on the basis that the communist parties accept the peace solution. The Ansar forces then issued a statement in which they

condemned all liquidationist and submissive solutions. But the opposing commando organizations replied that there are two conflicting tendencies within the communist party in Jordan (one supporting the armed struggle and the other opposing it) and, therefore, the statement does not express the party's stand.

The admission of the Ansar forces is still pending a decision.

As for the DPF, it supported from the outset the admission of the Ansar forces, for the following reasons:

1) In spite of our critical view of the reformist politics of the official Arab communist parties, we consider these parties, which have a historical record of liberation struggle, to be part of the Arab national movements. Therefore, criticism to the mistaken attitudes of the communist parties should not become a screen hiding behind it nationalistic feelings and antagonism to communism. "We are with the communist parties against the enemies of communism and with the revolutionary masses against the reformist politics of the communist parties."

2) We recognize at the present time that the official Arab communist parties have reformist attitudes with regard to the peace solution, the Palestine problem, the confrontation with imperialism in the Middle East, and the analysis of class relationships. However, these attitudes are open to change and it is necessary to encourage a tendency in those parties towards a revolutionary stand and a strategy in agreement with the Marxist-Leninist heritage. It is evident that by isolating those parties from the Resistance movement, this tendency will be inhibited; whereas their participation in the armed resistance will have a strong influence in revolutionizing their stand and in bringing pressures from within against the reformist line.

3) If we do believe in the unity of the popular movement, then we should accept the Ansar forces in the Unified Command. In view of the support that the communist party enjoys among the masses in Jordan, the desire of our masses to secure the unity of the Palestinian-Jordanian popular movement makes us request the entry of the Ansar forces.

4) The participation of the official communist parties in the armed struggle will entail, among other things, the support of the Soviet Union to the armed struggle-- which is a factor to be taken into account.

5) If it is true that there are two tendencies within the Jordanian communist party, then it is necessary to support the one that is for armed struggle. This will not be achieved by isolating the Ansar forces from the Resistance movement. Likewise, it is necessary to realize that the struggle of all Marxists in any country should be within a united revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party. In order that the official communist party become part of a united revolutionary party, it has to give up its reformist politics and subscribe to the program that we are offering. Otherwise it will become a marginal force separated from the masses and from any other Marxist party that will grow in this country.

* * * * *

* "THE PRINCIPLE OF FREE CHOICE FOR THE REFUGEES TO RESETTLEMENT OR COMPENSATION *
 * IS IRRECONCILABLE WITH ISRAEL'S EXISTENCE, SECURITY AND CHARACTER." *
 * Golda Meir, Speech to the Knesset, August 4 *
 * * * * *

NOTE ON PALESTINIAN CLASS STRUCTURE

On the eve of the June war, the Palestinian people numbered around 2,350,000, broadly divided into:

<u>Refugees:</u> (with or without UNWRA aid)		57%
<u>Non-Refugees:</u>		43%
Jordan (West Bank)	20%	
Gaza	6%	
Israeli Arabs	12%	
Others	5%	

The overall geographic distribution of the Palestinians was as follows:

Jordan	52%
Gaza	17%
Israel	12%
Lebanon & Syria	13%
Others (Arabian Gulf, US and North Africa)	6%

Any assessment of the social basis of the Palestinian liberation struggle should bear in mind the following:

1. The dispersion of the Palestinian people and the domination of the national question over its life was bound to lead to a relative confiscation of the class struggle among its various social groups. A victim of Zionist colonialist displacement, the Palestinian people's principal goal is the re-integration of its country. The positions of its various social groups are determined by, and refracted through, the national question itself.
2. Inasmuch as there exists a Palestinian bourgeoisie which is integrated into the Arab economies -- as is the case in Jordan and Lebanon -- the position of this bourgeoisie is governed by its subordination to the ruling oligarchies of the two countries. Traditionally, it was the link that subordinated the struggle of the Palestinians to the interests of the Arab regimes. Its present position cannot go beyond that of the official position of those regimes: the implementation of the UN resolution on Palestine (to be borne in mind that the Palestinian bourgeoisie in Jordan has real interest in the re-integration of the West Bank into Jordan since most of its economic interests are concentrated there).
3. The social force with the most consistent interest in the de-Zionization of Palestine as a whole is undoubtedly the refugees, workers and peasants who have nothing to lose in exile but their tents, the competition of local labour and exploitation. They have a whole country to gain. That they constitute the rank and file of the guerilla organizations is hardly surprising.
4. The Palestinian petit-bourgeoisie, which is relatively numerous, plays at present a dominant role in the leadership of the liberation struggle. The blocking of opportunity of employment for Palestinians in most countries of the Middle East, and recently in the Arabian Gulf, has driven many members of this class to join the armed struggle. But, if this class constitutes the main political ally of the refugees, workers and

peasants, it nevertheless is their principal ideological enemy.

If the final victory of the Palestine liberation struggle depends on its alliance with the anti-imperialist forces of the Middle East, the pre-condition for this alliance is to achieve the political leadership and ideological hegemony of the refugees, workers and peasants over a wide national front of all the Palestinian patriotic forces. This requires both politico-military organization and the production of a 'national-Arab' Marxism.

Radical changes have occurred after the June war. The majority of the Palestinian people is now under Israeli occupation: 1,565,000 people or 65 per cent of the total. In Jordan, the proportion of refugees to non-refugees is 2:1. Two pronounced characteristics emerge:

1. Occupation relies on a sizeable number of collaborators: (i) the bourgeoisie of the West Bank which undertakes the carrying trade between 'little Israel' and the West Bank **itself** on the one hand, and Jordan and the Middle East at large on the other; (ii) the old mainstays of the Hashemite monarchy itself (majors, mukhtars, officials, etc.); (iii) the 'labour procurers' of Gaza and the West Bank who provide the Israeli economy with cheap Arab labour from the occupied territories.
2. After June 1967, Zionist colonialism revealed its second nature -- that of the domination and exploitation by a European community over the indigenous population, on the South African model. This is exemplified in Dayan's plan which calls for the economic integration of cheap labour into Israel, while depriving these Arabs of any political rights. This new policy further emphasizes that a radical solution to the Palestine problem is impossible without the destruction of Israeli 'collective' capitalism.

--- New Left Review, April 1969 ('Postscript' by F. Tarabulsi)

(All figures are taken from Malaff A - Qadiya Al-Falastiniya, PLO 1968)

 * NOTE TO OUR READERS: *
 * The march of events in Jordan in the wake of *
 * the counterevolutionary attack on the resis- *
 * tance has been moving at such a rapid pace *
 * that some of the 'news' in this issue might *
 * be outdated by the time it reaches your *
 * hand. The next Bulletin (October) will con- *
 * tain articles analyzing the current crisis *
 * as interpreted by the Arab socialist press *
 * as well as the reaction to the events in *
 * the West. *
