

VICTORY TO THE PALESTINIAN REVOLUTION!

— Selected Writings on the Middle East —



a Ray O. Light publication

“For the proletariat needs the truth and there is nothing so harmful to its cause as plausible, respectable petty-bourgeois lies.”

— V.I. Lenin

(Selected Works, Vol. X, p. 41)

Originally Published October 1983

Re-Issued March 2024

VICTORY TO THE PALESTINIAN REVOLUTION!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JUNE 2003 UPDATE	i
INTRODUCTION	viii
I. THE SETTLER STATE OF ISRAEL, THE U.S.-SOVIET ALLIANCE AND THE LESSONS OF THE JUNE WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST, by <i>Hammer & Steel</i> , June 1967	1
II. REVOLUTION IN JORDAN: FIRST STEP TOWARD VICTORIOUS ARAB LIBERATION, by <i>Stalinist Workers Group for Afro-American National Liberation and a New Communist International</i> , Nov. 10, 1970	7
– The First Battle of Amman	12
– The Second Battle of Amman	15
– Capitulation to Chinese “Cultural” Revisionism	18
– Left Adventurism and the Airplane Hijackings	21
– What Are the Lessons of the Two Battles of Amman? ...	31
– Appendix: Reformism and Individual Terrorism	33
III. ON THE 1976 WAR IN LEBANON AND THE ROLE OF THE CHINESE REVISIONIST THEORY OF THREE WORLDS, by <i>Ray O. Light</i> , July 31, 1978	34
IV. THE ISRAELI SETTLER MILITARY OCCUPATION OF LEBANON: VICTORY OR DEFEAT FOR THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE?, by <i>Ray O. Light</i> , September 1982	38
– Introductory Update: Note on the Beirut Massacre	38
– The Israeli Invasion & Occupation of Lebanon	40
– The Role of U.S. Imperialism: “Peacemaker” or Profit-Hungry Warmonger?	44
– Differences Between U.S. Imperialism and the Settler State of Israel	48
– “Arab Unity” and U.S. Imperialism	51
– The Sadat Assassination and Egypt’s Key Role	52
– Yasir Arafat: Traitor to the Palestinian People	56
– The <i>Guardian</i> Echo of U.S. Imperialism	59
– Conclusion	60
– Appendix: Note on Anti-Semitism	62
V. POPULAR UPRISING AGAINST THE ARAFAT LEADERSHIP: A REAL ADVANCE FOR THE PALESTINIAN REVOLUTION, by <i>Ray O. Light</i> , July 1983	63
APPENDIX: Imperialist Advisor Exposes Yasir Arafat in <i>Foreign Affairs</i> ..	80

JUNE 2003 UPDATE (20 years later)

Dear Comrades and Friends,

Today, in the Middle East, United States imperialism holds a seemingly unassailable hegemonic position. In the past few days, just six weeks after the end of the war with Iraq, under U.S. dictation, the United Nations Security Council, including France and Russia which had vociferously opposed the U.S. pre-emptive war on Iraq, voted 14 in favor and none opposed (with Syria, the one Arab member “not voting”) to lift sanctions on Iraq. Thus, the UN Security Council allowed the resumption of Iraqi oil exports (now that U.S. imperialism will get the profits) and gave their blessings to the United States occupation of Iraq!

Meanwhile, in almost the same breath in which he declared victory over Iraq, Bush threatened to wage war on Syria if this sovereign state continued to support Hezbollah’s attacks on the Israeli regime. The Syrian government promptly obeyed Bush’s commandment. Bush is now calling for “regime change” in Iran. Finally, the Bush regime, which had previously convinced Yasir Arafat to replace himself as the chief spokesman of the Palestinian “Authority” with someone else that Bush (and the Israeli settler government) found acceptable (Mahmoud Abbas), is pushing a “roadmap” for a Palestinian-Israeli “peace” (backed by the UNO, the EU, and Russia and endorsed by Arafat and Abbas) which would perpetuate the existence and domination of the Israeli settler state in the land of Palestine!

As the justification for “pre-emptive war” against Iraq, Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Powell, et al. promoted the “**Big Lie**” among the politically gullible and ignorant U.S. population (infected with imperialist bribery and chauvinism) that Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein had some connection to each other. That lie made the September 11th World Trade Center attack a justification for launching an unprovoked massive war against the people of Iraq. The only historical connection between bin Laden and Saddam is that the careers of both were jumpstarted by the **United States Central Intelligence Agency!!** In reality, the relationship between Osama and Saddam has been one of enemies! Upon his return from Afghanistan, bin Laden was shocked when the Saudi government refused to let him organize new brigades of mujahedeen *to drive the Iraqis out of Kuwait and to overthrow Saddam’s secular regime!* It was this fact that began bin Laden’s rupture with the Saudi government as well as the U.S. government. (See Eric Rouleau’s “Trouble in the Kingdom”, July/August 2002 *Foreign Affairs*)

Another Big Lie told by Bush and U.S. imperialism to justify the naked U.S. aggression against the sovereign state of Iraq was that Weapons of Mass

Destruction (WMD) were there. On this issue, too, even before the U.S.-British imperialists launched their unprovoked attack, it was already common knowledge that the Niger government-supplied “proof” used by U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell to establish the presence of WMD in Iraq was fraudulent. Since then, the Anglo-U.S. military has been unable to produce any evidence of such weapons and the U.S. military government of Iraq has prohibited the return of the UN weapons inspectors to certify that there are no WMD there. Indeed, technically, the UN Security Council could not rescind its economic sanctions against Iraq without certification by these weapons inspectors that Iraq was WMD free, but still Bush has refused to allow the UN inspectors back into Iraq! And the UN Security Council, doing the bidding of Bush and U.S. imperialism, violated their own sanctions policy by voting to resume Iraqi oil exports without prior certification by weapons inspectors!!

“For the proletariat needs the truth and there is nothing so harmful to its cause as plausible, respectable petty bourgeois lies.” Twenty years ago we opened the enclosed pamphlet, entitled *Victory To The Palestinian Revolution*, with these words of Lenin, the great leader of the international proletarian struggle against imperialism. The bitter experience of the Palestinian people and the Arab people in general and the Arab working class in particular in the years since have only served to underscore the profound truth of Lenin’s words. While it is clear that the “Big Lie” tactics of U.S. imperialism are backed by armed force and political and economic domination as well as control of the principal global media corporations, what is less clear is the role played by the “plausible, respectable, petty bourgeois lies” perpetrated by the “international middle class”.

Of course, the most obvious petty bourgeois lie of twenty years ago, that the USSR was an “imperialist superpower” equal to or even more powerful than U.S. imperialism, has been swept away by life itself. But most of the other petty bourgeois lies promoted by the Soviet and Chinese revisionists and other revisionists then in state power, are still being promoted by (mostly) right opportunists in the international communist movement generally, by petty bourgeois democrats in the oppressor nations and bourgeois nationalists in the oppressed nations (with some petty bourgeois “ultra-leftists”), in short, by what we continue to describe as the **“international middle class”**. These lies as well as new petty bourgeois lies which have emerged as objective conditions have changed still resonate among millions of people throughout the world, still creating divisions within and between the working class and oppressed peoples and linking them up with their own enemies, behind all of whom to one extent or another stands today’s main bulwark of world capitalism, U.S. imperialism.

In order to unite the international working class and oppressed peoples and to expose, isolate and defeat U.S. imperialism (and ultimately to defeat the monopoly

capitalist and imperialist system itself) these petty bourgeois lies must be smashed by proletarian truth. It is the task of the communists, through ruthless ideological and political struggle against both “left” and right opportunism, to take the lead in this crucial battle.

What then are some of these “plausible, respectable, petty bourgeois lies” that today cripple the proletarian revolutionary cause in the Middle East, the revolutionary cause of the oppressed Palestinian and Arab proletariat and people?

LIE #1. The United Nations Organization (UNO) is a vehicle for global peace and justice.

TRUTH #1. The absolute impotence of the UNO as evidenced by its failure to prevent U.S. imperialism’s unprovoked war on Iraq has now been exceeded by the Security Council’s 14 to 0 vote to rescind Iraqi sanctions without certification that no WMD are located there. The UN Security Council has violated its own longstanding sanctions ruling on Iraq in its haste to give its blessing to U.S. imperialist occupation and Bechtel/Halliburton administration of the new U.S. colony of Iraq so as to receive some of the imperialist booty!!! While tactical considerations may dictate even active participation in the UNO arena into the future, we must remain clear that it is in fact a vehicle for “imperialist peace”.

LIE #2. “Arab unity” must be maintained at all cost, for it is the key to Palestinian victory.

According to this lie, the Arab League, with the key members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) as its nucleus, is allegedly a vehicle for unity of supposedly sovereign Arab states. On this basis, progressives and revolutionaries are encouraged to uncritically support whatever Arab leaders happen to emerge and the struggle for the hearts and minds of the Palestinian and Arab masses should be suppressed.

TRUTH #2. Yet the Arab League unanimously endorsed the “peace plan” put forward by Saudi Prince Abdullah in March of this year, for the first time formally relinquishing the Palestinian’s fundamental demand for the right of return to the lands stolen by Israel in 1948! Eeyal Benvenisti, writing in Ha’aretz, observed that, “Since its establishment, Israel has waited for an Arab position like this.” He referred to the Saudi peace plan as “an offer we [Israel] must not reject.” And although they refused to *officially* support the Bush-led, U.S. imperialist-led war on Iraq, most of these Arab states gave invaluable cooperation to U.S. imperialism in this criminal war. Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and others allowed their territory to be used as staging areas, military bases, etc. for the U.S. pre-emptive war on their brother Arab state. Without the cooperation of these reactionary Arab regimes the U.S. military conquest and occupation of Iraq would have been virtually impossible. Furthermore, over the past three decades most of the Arab regimes have had close ties to U.S. imperialism at the expense of the *Palestinian* revolution. Indeed, secular regimes surrounding Palestine, such as those in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan have each betrayed the Palestinian masses in cooperation

with the Israeli settler regime, all under the tutelage of U.S. imperialism. The liberation of Palestine is key to the liberation of the entire Arab world. And the road to the liberation of Palestine passes not only through Riyadh and Doha but through Cairo, Damascus, Beirut, and Amman! (The enclosed pamphlet presents conclusive documentation regarding this fact.) In order to achieve Palestinian liberation against U.S.-led international imperialism and the Israeli Zionist settler state, the class struggle of the Arab proletariat for leadership of the Arab liberation movement must be victorious at least to a large extent in defeating the feudalists and compradors currently in power in almost every Arab country.

LIE #3. The state of Israel can and should exist side by side with a viable Palestinian state.

TRUTH #3. The two-state solution in whatever guise, roadmap, etc. is a surrender of the self-determination rights of the Palestinian people. Israel is a state based on land stolen from the Palestinians beginning with the major expropriation in 1948. As a settler state its main mode of rule over the native population is *terror*. Since signing the Oslo Agreement in 1993, the Israeli settler state has more than doubled the number of settlements! Incited by the Bush-led, U.S. imperialist global war of terror on the oppressed peoples, the Sharon-led Likud government has intensified the terror in places like Jenin with almost daily assassination of militant Palestinian leaders, bulldozing of infrastructure in the West Bank and Gaza, destroying housing and jobs and clean water resources, and making Palestinians virtually prisoners in their own homes. Finally, the landslide re-election victory of Ariel Sharon in late January 2003 in the shadow of the looming U.S.-British imperialist war against Iraq can only be understood on the basis of the *settler character of the state of Israel* since the situation of the Israeli population had rapidly deteriorated both economically and in the loss of security during Sharon's first term. While any Jewish people who support Palestinian liberation should be welcome to live in liberated Palestine, such a liberation government would be based on *land and state power for the Palestinians*.

LIE #4. Revolutionaries and progressives in Arabia and throughout the world should support Yasir Arafat and the Palestinian Authority.

TRUTH #4. As we pen these words, according to the Associated Press, a "major obstacle to getting started on the U.S.-backed 'roadmap' [is] ... the disagreement between Palestinian Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas and Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon over how to deal with the [Palestinian] militants ... Abbas wants to persuade militants to lay down their arms, while Sharon insists they be disarmed and arrested." In other words, *both Sharon and Abbas want to disarm the Palestinian masses in the face of the brutal and bloody U.S.-backed Israeli settler state armed to the teeth!!* But this is no surprise at all. The longstanding charade between Arafat and the state of Israel is exposed in the enclosed pamphlet time and again. Sharon and a succession of Labor and Likud governments in Israel have kept Arafat alive both politically and physically. Arafat's connections to the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency go back at least to 1971, as recently reported by

the former Middle East reporter for the *Wall Street Journal*. Indeed, the Oslo Peace Agreement of September 1993 allowed the U.S. and Israel to place Arafat back into the midst of the Palestinian masses and at their helm so that he could be a more effective misleader of the people. In the recent period, Bush has set up a charade of “struggle” against Arafat, “insisting” that Arafat replace himself (!) as the principal Palestinian leader. Mahmoud Abbas has been an Arafat insider for years which is why Arafat appointed Abbas to be Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority. (In fact, Abbas was one of the three Arafat “top deputies” who attended the “first face-to-face meeting Sharon had held as prime minister with representatives of the other side” in January 2002. See “Last of the Patriarchs” by Aluf Benn, *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2002) Both Arafat and Abbas have endorsed the Bush-led “roadmap” which can only lead the Palestinian people on the road to national oblivion!

LIE #5. The worldwide anti-war movement is “the other super-power”. Reportedly well over ten million demonstrators took to the streets in over 600 cities in a hundred countries on February 15, 2003. This popular outpouring was the extremely positive culmination of spontaneous revulsion of the masses of the world’s peoples at the naked and brutal aggression of U.S. imperialism in implementation of their new Nazi-like “pre-emptive war” doctrine. The massive numbers also reflected the mass influence of the other imperialist powers as they tried to resist the increasingly hegemonic aspirations of the U.S. Empire. And, in the flush of apparent success, prior to the U.S.-British imperialist launching of their War on Iraq, the expression “the other superpower”, initially promoted by New York Times editors and other bourgeois journalists, was adopted by leaders of the Workers World Party and other anti-war organizations of Trotskyites, social democrats, etc. both in the USA and around the world.

TRUTH #5. But the tremendous mobilization of popular anti-war forces around the world (including within the USA itself) was not sufficient to stop the brutal U.S. imperialist-led invasion of Iraq. The emergence of a millions strong anti-war movement which is organically connected to the already mass, anti-globalization movement is quite significant. It reflects the **shift of perhaps a billion or more people** of the world away from attraction to and fascination with U.S. imperialist society and culture and monopoly capitalism generally. These people have shifted, instead, toward hatred for this old and dying system and its bestial main bulwark, bloody and brutal U.S. imperialism. This very positive development underscores the importance of the communist-led task of exposing the petty bourgeois democratic illusions about imperialism in general and U.S. imperialism in particular to the millions of these new political activists who are potential anti-imperialist and communist fighters. For Bush and U.S. imperialism do not take “vote counts” to determine their course of action. They are driven primarily by the objective laws of political economy with maximum profit as their goal; they have no respect for human life whatsoever. **“The other superpower” is the international proletariat** which is the only class capable of **organizing** itself globally and allying itself long term with the masses of peasants and other petty bourgeois forces and

even temporarily breaking off sections of the imperialist bourgeoisie in order to isolate and defeat U.S imperialism in the process of vanquishing world capitalism.

CONCLUSION:

The Middle East continues to be of vital strategic importance to imperialism, headed by U.S. imperialism. Likewise, it is of great significance to the world revolutionary movement and to its struggle for national liberation and socialism. At stake is the liberation of millions of Arab toilers including their ability to control their own vast and wealthy natural resources versus the billions of dollars of continued imperialist super-profits centered around control of oil and U.S. imperialist hegemony.

The Palestinian revolutionary movement continues to be at the heart of the Arab people's struggle for liberation from Zionist and imperialist occupation and oppression. The Bush-U.S. imperialist-led "war on terror", with the collaboration of the reactionary Arab regimes, has enabled the Zionist settler state of Israel to unleash a massive onslaught against the militant Palestinian masses in the occupied territories.

Once again the national liberation struggle of the Palestinian masses is being led to defeat by the traitor Arafat and the reactionary Arab regimes and their promotion of imperialist "peace". U.S. imperialism is presenting itself to the world's people as "peacemaker". Arafat (once again discredited among his own people) is being projected as the "heroic" and besieged legitimate leader of the Palestinian masses. The reactionary House of Saud, Arafat's chief financial backer, is trying to broker another reactionary "peace initiative" to quell the revolutionary activities of the Palestinian and Arab masses, and serve their U.S. imperialist masters.

The pamphlet (the writings are between 20-36 years old) represents a proletarian internationalist position on the Palestinian question which we believe is still valuable today. Highlights include:

- The clarity of the role of U.S. imperialism as the principal enemy of all the peoples of the Middle East rather than being some kind of "honest" broker or "peace maker".
- Formulation and projection of a "two-pillar" policy of U.S. imperialism: propping up both the settler state of Israel and reactionary Arab regimes and playing off of them as the key to continued dominance of Middle East Oil, shipping lanes, labor, etc.
- Exposure of Arafat as traitor to the Palestinian people. Exposure of the role of the reactionary Arab regimes from King Hussein

to Saddam Hussein, to Assad, to Sadat, to the House of Saud, on their consistent and criminal betrayal of the Palestinian and Arab revolution.

- Exposure of revisionist treachery, including by Soviet and Chinese revisionists in state power.
- Exposure of the counter-revolutionary role of left-adventurism in the form of airplane skyjackings in the past (*and “suicide bombings” today*) in undermining the revolution.
- Projection of the road to Tel Aviv being paved through Beirut, Amman, etc., through the establishment of revolutionary, liberated base areas in the territory bordering the settler state of Israel.

We hope that the current distribution of this twenty year-old pamphlet at a time where there is renewed contention in the Middle East will help project a proletarian revolutionary way forward in contrast to the massive ideological confusion surrounding the question of Palestine and the Middle East.

In Proletarian Internationalist Solidarity,

RAY O. LIGHT

June 2003

Introduction

The oil rich Middle East is one of the most strategically important areas of the world. The Palestinian people's just struggle to liberate and regain their land stolen from them by the settler state of Israel sponsored by U.S. imperialism is the very soul of the revolutionary movement in all the Arab world, in all the Middle East. During the past 15 years U.S. imperialism has been able to achieve a hegemonic position in the Middle East. This domination and control of the Middle East and its oil has been a key to the ability of U.S. imperialism to maintain its hegemonic position in the capitalist world, despite the economic decline of U.S. imperialism vis-a-vis Western Europe and Japan.

U.S. imperialism has been able to achieve and maintain this position because it has pursued a policy at least since 1970 of backing not only the state of Israel but also the reactionary Arab regimes which by now are the overwhelming majority of Arab regimes. We have called this policy of U.S. imperialism a "two-pillar" policy which replaced what had become the over-reliance of U.S. imperialism upon Israel in the preceding period.

U.S. imperialism has been greatly aided in this two-pillar policy by the Russian and Chinese revisionists. For both of these revisionist forces have not only collaborated with U.S. imperialism themselves (on a bourgeois nationalist "every country for itself" basis) at the expense of the oppressed peoples, but they have both also pushed the bourgeois nationalist line of "non-alignment", a "non-capitalist" third road, "third world", etc., etc. on the proletarian revolutionaries and the masses of the oppressed nations.

Nowhere in the world has this bankrupt revisionist line been more damaging to the cause of national liberation, socialism, and communism than in the Middle East. And nowhere else has U.S. imperialism gained so much ground politically in this period. It has been the Palestinian revolutionary cause and the Palestinian people who have paid the most terrible price for the revisionist betrayal and the success of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East.

Because of the strategic importance of the Middle East not only to U.S. and international imperialism but also to the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples our plans already called for this collection of writings to be produced when *current events* broke loose and made it all the more timely and urgent.

In our July 1983 Newsletter, “Popular Uprising Against the Arafat Leadership: A Real Advance for the Palestinian Revolution”, we projected that if the genuine Palestinian freedom fighters in Fateh were able to defeat the treacherous leadership around Yasir Arafat then even at this tragic and difficult moment for the Palestinian cause, there is a way forward. So many times over the past 15 years, the Palestinian fighters have seemingly risen from the ashes of a crushing defeat brought about by a devastating betrayal by reactionary Arab regimes in collaboration with the settler state of Israel and U.S. imperialism. Sure enough, by the first few days of September 1983, once again this brave and determined people had helped launch a new liberation war in Lebanon, this time on the basis of struggle against the Arafat leadership.

Within the first week of the new liberation war by the Palestinian and Lebanese Moslem forces the *Wall Street Journal (WSJ)* was conceding that, “If the U.S. decides to cut its losses and pull out, the Lebanese government will almost surely collapse.” (9/9/83)*

By September 20, the *WSJ* acknowledged that, “U.S. naval artillery came to the defense of the embattled Lebanese army yesterday in a major escalation of the American involvement in the Lebanon war.” The article continues: “The bombardment marks the first time the U.S. has fired on targets in direct operational support of the Lebanese army, and represented a significant expansion of American support for the Lebanese government against Syrian-backed forces.”

U.S. imperialism is already openly and actively waging war against the Lebanese Moslems and the Palestinians fighting for the liberation of Beirut. U.S. occupation troops are already in place in the Sinai as well as Beirut and air strikes are in the offing. Clearly, direct all-out U.S. war against the Palestinian and Arab masses is on the horizon.

The U.S., British, French and Italian imperialist “peacekeeping forces” are now exposed for what they are—they are there to keep Amin Gemayel in power in Lebanon—the man imposed on Lebanon at the point of Israeli guns, backed

*The same *WSJ* article went on to say that, “The Israeli experience here isn’t encouraging. Like the U.S. the Israelis once had visions of establishing a stable, Christian-led government in Lebanon. They finally gave up Saturday, after more than 500 Israeli combat deaths, and withdrew their forces from Central Lebanon. The Israelis, in effect, decided to cut and run – giving up many of the goals for which they had launched their June 1982 invasion.”

by British, French, Italian and especially U.S. imperialism. The imperialist “peacekeepers” are in Lebanon to wage war against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples in defense of the imperialist oil interests.

Proletarian revolutionaries throughout the world need to give every possible support to the just war of liberation which has now been launched by the Lebanese and Palestinian people against U.S. (and French) imperialism and the Lebanese puppet Gemayel regime. Certainly, key to this new war of liberation being waged jointly by at least several Palestinian liberation organizations and the main Lebanese Moslem sects has been the struggle waged by the “dissident” Fatah guerillas against the treacherous leadership of Yasir Arafat backed by international revisionism as well as international imperialism. In fact, even while trying to place this liberation struggle under the leadership of Syrian President Assad, the *WSJ* admitted by Sept. 14 that “the anti-Arafat rebels appear to have joined in the battle in the Lebanese mountains.” *WSJ* identified these fighters under the new name of Palestinian Forces of Return to Beirut under the leadership of Colonel Abu Musa. Finally, the *WSJ* article admits that the new “Syrian” campaign began earlier this year with “a revolt against Yasir Arafat’s leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization.” (9/14/83)

The common experience out of which this new Palestinian leadership core emerged is a history of betrayal of the Palestinian Revolution by Arafat backed by international revisionism, Arab reaction, Israeli Zionism, and U.S. imperialism.

Eric Rouleau, chief Middle East correspondent of the authoritative French imperialist magazine, *Le Monde*, points out that,

“... almost all had come from the Jordanian army, which they deserted to join the Fedayeen during the 1970 debacle; their ultra-nationalism (sic!) had led them to contest the Palestine National Council’s June 1974 decision to accept in principle a Palestinian state alongside and not in place of Israel; they all opposed the PLO’s cooperation with the conservative Arab states, especially Jordan and Saudi Arabia, and they all favored a strategic alliance with the Soviet Union.” (“The Future of the PLO” by Eric Rouleau, *Foreign Affairs*, Fall 1983, p. 142)

At precisely this moment when U.S. imperialism is openly invading the Middle East, it is a very good thing that the Palestinian revolution has developed a core of leadership with a clear anti-imperialist line. Rouleau recently reported the following:

“Three months before the mutiny broke out, Abu Musa gave clear and precise expression to opinions he said were his own. During a closed door session of Fatah’s Revolutionary Council held in Aden on January 27, 1983, he launched into a veritable diatribe against Fatah policy and, without naming him, against

Yasir Arafat himself. The text which formed the basis of his indictment-which in fact had been drafted collectively by the dissident group and which was circulated after the mutiny was launched-indicated that the rebels were violently opposed to any compromise with Israel and that their objective was 'to liberate all Palestine' in accordance with the PLO charter, which in their view had been violated by a whole series of PNC resolutions and the diplomacy of Yasir Arafat. It stated their opposition to the Reagan Plan, the Fez Plan adopted by the Arab heads of state in September 1982, negotiations with King Hussein, and the contacts established with Egypt and with Israeli pacifists. It proposed the resumption of armed struggle--'the sole road to liberation'--in Lebanon, the Israeli-occupied Golan Heights, and the West Bank (the text specified that the struggle would be launched from Jordanian territory after the overthrow of the Hashemite regime) and the implementation of operations aimed at 'striking and liquidating' American interests in the Middle East and 'ending the U.S. hegemony in the region.'" (*Ibid*, pp. 142, 143)

* * * * *

The five selections presented in this pamphlet were written by *Ray O. Light* and its predecessors over the past 16 years in response to most of the major crises that the Palestinian revolution has experienced. In our opinion taken together these selections reveal the principled proletarian revolutionary political position on the Palestinian revolution that has in essence emerged as the political line of the new organized leadership core of the Palestinian revolution itself.

The one important difference between the Fateh dissidents' political line on Palestine (as described by Rouleau) and that of *Ray O. Light*, is the "strategic alliance with the Soviet Union". For the following pages reveal the crucial role of treachery played by Soviet revisionism in the setbacks for the Palestinian Revolution over these many years making no more than a "tactical alliance" with the Soviet Union a possibility for the advance of the Palestinian revolutionary cause today.

This pamphlet should prove helpful, then, also in strengthening the "dissidents" position of no more than a *tactical* alliance with Syria's Assad who has betrayed the Palestinian revolution and all the Arab masses in 1970, in 1976 and again in 1982!

Indeed the *WSJ* has reported, "that Syria, after months of refusing to discuss what it wants in Lebanon, is currently conducting negotiations with the U.S., Saudi Arabia, and indirectly, with the Lebanese government over its future role here." (9/14/83)

Finally, it should also be clear from these writings that the reason *Ray O. Light* and its predecessors were able to take a consistent proletarian revolutionary stand on

Palestine was because of their consistent struggle against revisionism. Comrade Lenin taught: “the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism.” In this light, we were extremely encouraged to learn from Rouleau’s article that, “Colonel Khaled al-Oumla, reputed to be the [“dissident”] group’s ideologist, espouses a Marxism-Leninism he claims is stricter than that of either the USSR or China.” (*Foreign Affairs*, Fall 1983, p. 142) For, without consistent struggle against opportunism, not only can a consistent proletarian revolutionary line not be developed and maintained but it cannot be implemented in revolutionary practice. Toward this end, there is an urgent and vital need for a new Communist International.

* * * * *

(Document No.1) The June 1967 issue of *Hammer & Steel* Newsletter pinpoints 1956 as the year that the U.S. imperialists supplanted the British and French in their sponsorship of Israel. On the basis of reliance on the *single* pillar of the settler state of Israel, U.S. imperialism was able to become the pre-eminent imperialist power in the Middle East. In the struggle against international imperialism, headed by U.S. imperialism, the June 1967 issue of *Hammer & Steel* Newsletter thus focuses great attention on the brutal nature of and the illegitimate basis for the existence of the settler state of Israel. It was in 1956 also that Khrushchev denounced Stalin and initiated open, Soviet revisionist collaboration with U.S. imperialism. This Newsletter, then, also exposes Soviet revisionist collaboration with the settler state of Israel and with U.S. imperialism, in the brief (week-long) but strikingly successful Israeli June war in 1967 against the Palestinian and Arab masses. It is worth noting the support which the newsletter gives to the Arab countries which were breaking relations with U.S. imperialism around this tragic military defeat for the Arab nation. No Arab regime broke relations with U.S. imperialism in response to the barbaric U.S. sponsored massacres in Jordan in 1970 or in Lebanon in 1976 or 1982.

In the Two Battles for Amman, Jordan in 1970, it became clear that U.S. imperialism had shifted to a *two*-pillar policy to maintain and extend its domination of the Middle East and its oil. (Document No. 2) *Stalinist Workers Group Bulletin No. 8*, “Revolution in Jordan: First Step Toward Victorious Arab Liberation”, published in November 1970, reveals the new relation of forces which today remains the basic situation facing the Palestinian revolution. Thirteen years ago SWG exposed Arafat as a traitor to the cause and projected a new line of struggle for the liberation of Palestine. In analyzing the tragic events in Jordan around the Second Battle of Amman (September 1970), SWG had come to the conclusion that, “The Second Battle of Amman has brought to the fore the *necessity* for the Palestinian masses to *overthrow Hussein* and establish a revolutionary government in Jordan, to make Jordan into a relatively stable revolutionary base area for the Arab liberation fighters in their struggle to destroy the state of Israel and achieve Arab liberation.”

Today, the “dissident group” within Fatah calls for the resumption of armed struggle-“the sole road to liberation” and (according to Rouleau) “specified that the struggle would be launched from Jordanian territory after the overthrow of the Hashemite regime”. (*Foreign Affairs*, Fall 1983, p. 142)

(Document No.3) “On the 1976 War in Lebanon and the role of the Chinese Revisionist Theory of Three Worlds” deals with the tragic defeat of the Palestinian and Lebanese national revolution in 1976 and exposes the depth of the treachery of Syria’s Assad and his sellout to U.S. imperialism. As early as 1970, Assad as Syrian Defense Minister had

“... countermanded his government’s orders and prevented the Syrian air force from coming to the rescue of the Fedayeen, who were backed into a corner and engaged in a life and death struggle against the Jordanian army. In the early stages of the Lebanese civil war, in 1975-76, Mr. Assad, who in the meantime had seized power in Damascus, instructed his army to lend military support to the Christian militias against the PLO and its Lebanese allies – a support which extended to participating alongside the Christian fighters in the obliteration of the Palestinian refugee camp, Tal Zaatar, at the cost of thousands of Palestinian lives. And, finally, the military balance in Lebanon, which President Assad took pains to maintain until the withdrawal of his forces in the summer of 1982, in practice favored the Christian militias of Bashir Gemayel.” (*Foreign Affairs*, Fall 1983, p. 144)

This exposure of Assad is especially valuable today when a tactical alliance has been established between the Palestinian and Lebanese Moslem liberation fighters and Assad and Syria.

This article is also useful because it struck ideological blows on the basis of the tragic experience of Lebanon in 1976 against the “Theory of Three Worlds” projected by the Chinese revisionists at the height of their international influence.

(Document No.4) “The Israeli Settler Military Occupation of Lebanon: Victory or Defeat for the Palestinian People?” was published as *Ray O. Light* Newsletter No. 12 in September 1982. One of the two real comprehensive articles in the collection, it draws the lessons of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon, exposes the U.S. imperialist “peacemaker” role, the pro-U.S. imperialist character of present “Arab Unity”, the significance of the Sadat assassination, the treachery of Arafat, and the use of the Beirut massacre by U.S. imperialism. Its aim is to achieve clarity in the world revolutionary movement that this Israeli victory represented a defeat and not a victory for the Palestinian and Lebanese revolutions—that it represented a defeat and not a victory for the world revolution. For recognition of this defeat was the precondition for future victories.

In order to establish that this 1982 Israeli military victory was a grievous defeat for the anti-imperialist cause, *Ray O. Light* had to struggle in opposition to all the forces of international revisionism which were supporting Arafat and his line that somehow the Palestinians had won a victory there. The emergence of the dissident Fateh leadership in opposition to Arafat, and their initiative in the launching of a new liberation war in Lebanon against U.S. imperialism, Israeli Zionism and Arab reaction is a dramatic confirmation of the theses put forth in this *Ray O. Light* Newsletter.

(Document No.5) “Popular Uprising Against the Arafat Leadership: A Real Advance for the Palestinian Revolution”, took the controversial position of support for the anti-Arafat forces that emerged within Fateh in the Bekaa Valley in the spring of 1983. Even some forces within *Ray O. Light* vacillated on this question. They initially saw the newly emerging struggle against Arafat—which even took the form of armed struggle—as a negative rather than a positive development for the cause of Palestinian and world revolution.

However, as we projected in that July 1983 Newsletter, “Proletarian revolutionaries of Palestine—The Defeat of Arafat is a Pre-Condition for Victorious Liberation of Palestine! Defeat the Leadership of Defeat!” And, fortunately, this is exactly what the heroic Palestinian freedom fighters have undertaken in order to wage and win the just war for the liberation of Palestine.

As we concluded that recent Newsletter, so too we conclude this Introduction —

— **Victory to the Palestinian Revolution!**

— **Death to Israeli Zionism, Arab Reaction and U.S. Imperialism!**

— **Proletarians of the World and Oppressed Peoples Unite!**

— *RAY O. LIGHT*

September 23, 1983

HAMMER & STEEL NEWSLETTER:

The Settler State of Israel, the U.S.-Soviet Alliance and the Lessons of the June War in the Middle East*

June 1967

The Soviet Union voted on June 6th in the U.N. Security Council for a cease fire in Western Asia. It put its seal of approval on the aggression of Israel, U.S. and Britain against the Arab people. It upheld the State of Israel and denied the existence and the rights of Palestine as an Arab nation. It broke its many promises of aid to the Arab peoples in case of attack by Zionist-imperialist aggression.

The vote of the Soviet Union for a cease fire, and all Soviet statements lend support to the control by U.S. imperialists of the oil belonging to the Arab peoples. The *New York Times*' editorial of May 31, 1967 said; "The Persian Gulf area produces 27 percent of the world's petroleum and has proved global reserves of 60 percent. American firms have a gross investment in the region of more than 2 billion and 500 million dollars." The Soviet support to U.S. oil interests is support to feudal relations in agriculture, restriction of water development in vast areas and sabotage of modern industry in Arab countries.

The Soviets do not support the Arabs by breaking diplomatic relations with the U.S. Alliance with the U.S. imperialists is the key to their foreign policy. The unanimous vote in the U.N. Security Council meant the Soviets are facilitating U.S. oil shipments to Vietnam from the Persian Gulf. The U.S.-Soviet Alliance is firmly in control of the U.N. Security Council. The chief function of the U.N. Security Council is to deceive and subjugate the Arab and other oppressed peoples.

Certain contradictions exist in the U.S.-Soviet alliance in the Arab countries. The Russian capitalists have been marketing their consumer and military goods in several Arab countries. The U.S. imperialists have not been overjoyed with this competition. The U.N. vote strengthened the dominance of U.S. imperialism in the U.S.-Soviet partnership.

*Originally published with no title. Title by Ray O. Light.

The Soviet revisionists sided with U.S. imperialism in its efforts to control Arab oil in 1956. They joined the U.S. in curtailing the Israeli-British-French aggression in the United Arab Republic. The following year U.S. imperialism invaded Lebanon. It continued to strengthen the Sixth Fleet.

U.S. imperialism, together with the Soviet revisionists, organized the slaughter of Marxist-Leninists and other anti-imperialist forces in Iraq. CIA and modern revisionists intrigue has helped jail Marxist-Leninists in several Arab countries and made difficulties for others working under illegal or semi-legal conditions. Thus the Soviet revisionists have helped deprive the Arab peoples of Marxist-Leninist leadership. The most important asset for U.S. imperialism and the oil billionaires in the Arab world is control of the Zionist movement and the Israeli state. U.S. imperialism has had complete control of Israel since 1956, displacing French and British control in the imperialist base.

The imperialist propaganda machine in the U.S. works night and day to describe Israel as not only a nation, but a poor little abused nation with legitimate national aspirations and boundaries. The modern revisionists in the CPUSA echo them. In the *Worker* editorial of May 28, the revisionists shed crocodile tears about the Palestinian Arabs but then revealed their real policy: "It is in the interest of the Arab and Israeli people that the Arab states recognize the reality of the state of Israel and that Israel accept the present boundaries."

What is the "reality of the state of Israel"? It was the reality of French and British imperialist interests. It is the reality of U.S. imperialist interests. Nations developed only with the development of capitalism. Stalin defined a nation as an "historically evolved, stable community of [people with a common] language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture." The Israeli state meets none of these conditions whereas the Palestinian Arabs meet all of them. Palestine is Arab land. It is up to them to decide its destiny.

The revisionists point to class divisions in the Israeli state and claim this means nationhood. This cannot be answered without a few words on Zionism. Zionism is based on the view that anti-Semitism and all problems of the Jewish people in all countries can be solved by "creating" a Jewish state rather than by *destroying imperialism*, the source of anti-Semitism. Zionism has always fought the Marxist-Leninist movement, the Socialist countries and national liberation movements. It urged Jews in Europe not to fight fascism in Spain or World War II but to try to survive peacefully under Hitler. The Zionists slandered Stalin when the CPSU moved to save the Jews in the Ukraine during World War II. Ben Hecht, in his book, *Perfidy*, describes how wealthy Zionist leaders escaped from Europe and then helped Hitler destroy the Jewish people.

It would be wrong to equate the war crimes of Ben Gurion, Eshkol and Eban with every Jewish person in Israel. However, the main problem is the widespread

illusions about the workers and farmers in Israel. Every adult in Israel is taught what the Zionists learned from their collusion with Hitler - to admire the Belgian imperialist murderers of the ten million Congolese in ten years, to worship the white supremacists in the Black Belt of the U.S. and to support the U.S. imperialists in Vietnam. Every immigrant to Israel is indoctrinated in the belief that stealing the land of Palestinian Arabs is just, that destroying their culture is good and that committing genocide against them is needed for survival.

All anti-imperialists have hoped that a section of the Israeli workers, farmers and professionals will take steps to destroy the Israeli state and its imperialist masters. But the reality is mass support by the Israelis for the wanton, brutal murder of 15,000 men, women and children in Jordan and the brutal murderous exile now forced on large numbers of Jordanians as it was forced on Palestinian Arabs. The reality is the napalm bombs on defenseless Syrian peasants and the effort of Israeli bombers to destroy Arab cultural institutions in the historic city of Damascus. All these crimes and countless more were committed after the Israelis had pledged in the U.N. to cease fire.

The possibility of the native Palestinian Jews having some form of autonomous rights, when the Palestinian Arabs again control their land, is dwindling rapidly. It is the noble task of all Marxist-Leninists, all anti-imperialists, to destroy the result of the union of Zionism and imperialism — that abortion known as the state of Israel. If the Palestinian Jews continue to support the Zionist agents of Johnson and Goldberg then they have the same future as their imperialist and Zionist masters — destruction by the outraged peoples of the world.

The 1948 decision in the U.N. to establish a form of Jewish autonomy in Palestine was supported by the CPSU headed by J.V. Stalin. It was intended to help the Jewish people survive after their terrible losses and suffering at the hands of Hitler and the Zionists. It was not contemplated that more than a few thousand Jews from outside Palestine would immigrate. But the Palestinian Arabs were not sufficiently consulted or considered. This was in violation of the writings and almost all the practice of J. V. Stalin, the great Marxist-Leninist theoretician and leader on the national question. Chairman Mao Tse-tung has written that the greatest leaders are right only 70 percent of the time. That is also why one man's thought cannot be Marxism-Leninism and why Marxist-Leninists stress collective discussion, collective responsibility and self-criticism.

As the Zionist-imperialist domination of Israel developed and aggression against the Arab peoples intensified, Stalin used his great influence as a Marxist-Leninist leader to uphold the Arab peoples' right to self-determination.

It is not an accident that the 20th Congress CPSU and the all-out efforts of U.S. imperialism in the Arab world began in the same year. The main line of that congress denied the focal contradiction between national liberation struggles

and imperialism, headed by U.S. imperialism. The revisionist line of the 20th Congress CPSU reversed Socialist construction and attacked Stalin, the great genius who mastered and developed Lenin's teachings on internal and external contradictions concerning the first Socialist country. The 20th Congress CPSU line of co-operating with imperialism was a stab in the back to building Socialism, to international Marxist-Leninist solidarity and to the oppressed peoples in all countries including the Arab peoples.

Since the 20th Congress, the CPSU has strengthened the state of Israel, not least of all by sending hundreds of thousands of its Jewish citizens to bolster the aggressive imperialist-Zionist forces. The CPSU has not supported the Palestinian Arabs' right to self-determination. The CPSU has urged conventional warfare and heavy arms on the Arab nations when their struggle required guerilla war and emphasis on *arming the masses* with light weapons. The CPSU leaders are co-operating with U.S. imperialists in the diplomatic, cultural, economic and nuclear fields. It would be strange indeed if they are not in collusion in the field of spying on the Arab peoples.

The editorial board of *Hammer & Steel* holds that the Communist Party of China is the leading Marxist-Leninist Party in the world. Chairman Mao's writings on Peoples War and anti-imperialist coalitions are of great value in this period. We had hoped that the CPC, with its great experience and prestige, with its greatly respected Chairman, would initiate the convening of the world's Marxist-Leninist organizations. The difficult struggle to hammer out a common Marxist-Leninist line in the national liberation struggles of the Vietnamese, Arab, Afro-American, Congolese and other oppressed peoples could then be raised to a higher level.

That the CPC has not fully exerted its leading role is due mainly, in our opinion, to its endorsement of the 20th Congress CPSU at the last congress of the CPC, also in 1956. At that time both the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman of the CPC reversed their correct stand on Stalin and fully endorsed the 20th Congress. Later they agreed to accept it in the 81 Party Statement. This error has not been fully corrected. We raise the question not to indicate that the reactions to the 20th Congress by members of our editorial board were completely correct — they were not. We stress the CPC because of its great influence and even greater potential within and outside of China in the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism.

Recently, S. Rittenberg, a U.S. citizen, wrote in *Peking Review* No. 16 on the Afro-American question. He did not uphold a Marxist-Leninist position on self-determination for Afro-Americans in the Black Belt and strongly implied that those who do so are "slavish" to Stalin. He also lectured Marxist-Leninists on proletarian culture and daring.

The condition of the Afro-Americans and Palestinian Arabs is very similar. Large numbers of both have been driven from their native land by brutal, inhuman

imperialism. Exiles from both peoples are living in terrible poverty: the Palestinian Arabs in desert camps, the Afro-Americans in the city ghettos. If Rittenberg accepts the revisionist-imperialist position on Afro-American liberation, will he have enough culture and daring to uphold Marxism-Leninism on the right of the Palestinian Arabs to self-determination?

On June 1, 1967 the *Australian Vanguard* wrote: "The Palestinian and other Arab people have long seen through the Soviet revisionist ruling clique as the number one accomplice of U.S. imperialism on the question of Palestine." It is true that the Arab peoples have learned about Soviet revisionism, especially in the past few days. But it was their lack of understanding on this question that created the opportunities for the Soviets to betray their just cause to imperialism and Zionism.

If the Arab peoples have "long seen through" the modern revisionists, then there is no need for strong Marxist-Leninist parties in the Arab countries to build an anti-imperialist coalition with the alliance of the workers and rural poor as its leading force. If the *Australian Vanguard* is right, then there is no need for the development of Marxist-Leninist theoreticians and leaders in the Arab nations. That is why the *Australian Vanguard* concluded that one man's thought is Marxism-Leninism. [i.e. "Mao Tse-tung's Thought"] It fails to develop a program for action and to call on the Australian people to support Arab liberation.

The Marxist-Leninist forces have the historic task of leading and uniting all national liberation struggles against their common foe—U.S. imperialism. This is the way to achieve Socialism in the world. *The stage of the national democratic revolution cannot be skipped over.* In the U.S. the main allies of the Arab peoples are the Afro-American liberation movement, the Puerto Rican liberation struggle and other oppressed nationals including the Mexicans and the native Indians. The Afro-American people are waging bitter struggle against U.S. imperialism. This will be of even greater help in the future to the other oppressed peoples just as the future struggles of the Arabs, Vietnamese and Congolese will aid the Afro-Americans.

As U.S. Marxist-Leninists we express to the Arab peoples our deep grief for those who were murdered by U.S. imperialism and its Israeli stooges. We will do all in our power to mobilize our people in order that the criminal aggressors against your people receive just punishment. When the day of reckoning comes, we will not forget those in the trade union bureaucracy, the revisionists and the so-called liberals who sided with the Israelis and the imperialists.

The breaking of relations with the U.S. government by Arab countries greatly aids the anti-imperialist forces in the U.S. We support those Arab forces who urge breaking relations with the treacherous Soviet revisionists and canceling all so-called debts to the partners of U.S. imperialism.

Let the Marxist-Leninists and all anti-imperialists unite in behalf of the Arab peoples' just struggle. Full support to our Arab comrades and all the gallant Arab peoples. Let us help build and strengthen powerful Marxist-Leninist parties in the Arab countries. The Israeli will rue the day they ever won their "victories". ...

Drive U.S. imperialism out of the Arab countries!

Support the just liberation war of the Palestinian Arabs!

Destroy the U.S. imperialist base — destroy the State of Israel!

Smash the Soviet revisionist traitors to Arab liberation!

Solidarity with the Marxist-Leninist movement in the Arab countries!

STALINIST WORKERS GROUP BULLETIN No. 8

Revolution in Jordan: First Step Toward Victorious Arab Liberation

- The Lessons of Two Battles of Amman -

November 10, 1970

As Marxist-Leninists who are also members of U.S. imperialist society, Stalinist Workers Group has a great responsibility to support the national liberation struggles of all oppressed peoples and especially the national liberation struggles of those peoples oppressed by “our own” imperialists, the U.S. imperialists, the main enemy of mankind.

We pointed out in SWG Bulletin No.7:

“Today, the rising Arabian people, with the Palestinian Arabs and Palestinian organizations such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) in the vanguard, threaten to drive U.S. imperialism and the Israeli white settlers out of Arabia. Because, on the one hand, the Arabian masses are rising up so strongly, and on the other hand, because U.S. imperialism needs the strategically important oil of the Arab people,* needs the free access to both Africa and Asia which Arabia links together, and needs the labor of the 80 million Arab people – because of all this, and because U.S. imperialism in collusion with Russian and

*U.S. imperialist oil companies have a gross investment of over 3 billion dollars in Arabia at the present time. According to U.S. imperialist oil expert, Ruth Sheldon Knowles, these U.S. oil companies rake in over a billion dollars a year “favorable net balance of payments” (i.e., superprofits) from their investments in Arabia! Other sources estimate the amount of super-profits that U.S. imperialism reaps from the super-exploitation of Arab workers in oil industry *alone* at as high as \$3 billion annually.

Chinese revisionism has been able to keep Sihanouk and north Vietnamese (DRV) revisionists in control of the Indo-Chinese liberation movement, — *Arabia, and Palestine in particular, is now in the process of becoming the focal struggle in the world.*” [“Fighting Talk on Indo-China: Which Side are Sihanouk and the Chinese ‘Cultural Revolution’ On?”, 10/10/70, p. 2]

Today, the most important task of SWG (and one of the most important tasks of all Marxist-Leninists) is to address itself to the present critical situation in Arabia.

In the past six months, there have been two extremely significant battles in Amman, Jordan, between the U.S.-directed Jordanian puppet army, led by King Hussein, on the one hand, and the vanguard guerrilla fighters of the refugee Palestinian people who make up two-thirds of the population of Jordan, on the other.

In June, the Palestinian people’s forces, under the leadership of the PFLP and Dr. George Habash, won a great victory while suffering relatively few casualties. They forced King Hussein to “dump” two right-wing generals closely identified with U.S. imperialism. (One of them is Hussein’s cousin and the other is his uncle.) Furthermore, they forced Hussein to agree to supply Jordanian army cover-fire for the Palestinian guerrilla operation against “Israel”. A further indication of this victory for the Palestinian people is the fact that 300 U.S. whites were airlifted out of Amman during this battle.

Inspired by the Palestinian people’s victory in the First Battle of Amman, SWG began to write a bulletin supporting the leadership of Habash and the PFLP while warning the PFLP and the Arab masses concerning the nature of the enemy of the Arab people, the nature of the “state” of Israel and the Israeli white settlers, and especially the nature of U.S. imperialism and U.S. imperialist society (the so-called “great American people”), and on this basis warning about the imminent invasion of U.S. troops.

Partly because Habash and the PFLP understood much of this (though Yasser Arafat and Fateh do not recognize any of the above) and mainly because there seemed to be other immediate tasks that SWG needed to carry out with our limited forces, we did not publish this material in July. And now it is no longer sufficient. For the second extremely significant battle of Amman, which took place in September, has resulted in a victory for Hussein and U.S. imperialism and a grievous defeat for the Palestinian masses and for all the Arab people. This defeat was of such magnitude that if a correct approach to the defeat is not quickly adopted by the vanguard Palestinian leadership, this defeat will be the basis for a concrete *setback* for the cause of Arab liberation! If U.S. imperialism is successful in decapitating the vanguard of the Arab liberation movement, the setback in Arabia will seriously setback the cause of communism *world-wide*, and will be paid for with the blood of many martyrs throughout all the oppressed nations of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Afro-America as well as Arabia.

Now SWG and all Marxist-Leninists have the much more difficult, but much more important, task of helping the most advanced Arab leadership (probably Habash and the PFLP) to analyze why this defeat occurred, and on this basis, how to overcome the initial setback and establish the new concrete tasks demanded in the changed situation. This is the proletarian path to the liberation of Palestine – and toward victorious Arab liberation.

The Second Battle of Amman has brought to the fore the necessity for the Palestinian masses to overthrow Hussein and establish a revolutionary government in Jordan, to make Jordan into a relatively stable revolutionary base area for the Arab liberation fighters in their struggle to destroy the state of Israel and achieve Arab liberation.

Hussein's September massacre of 20,000 Palestinian people in Amman, under U.S. imperialist orders, has generated this new situation in Arabia. This is how matters stand now, *after* the two Battles of Amman. In order to substantiate our proletarian revolutionary position, we must begin our discussion of the situation as it existed *prior* to the two battles.

In early July we wrote about the First Battle of Amman. We said:

In recent months, as the oppressed toiling masses in Afro-America, in Indo-China and throughout the rest of Asia, Africa and Latin America have begun to overcome the period of setbacks for the oppressed peoples which have followed in the wake of the Chinese "Cultural Revolution" (since 1966) and especially since Johnson's "Era of Negotiations" (1968), the support among all the Arab masses for the Palestinian guerrilla fighters, as well as the number of Palestinian guerrilla recruits themselves, has been growing by leaps and bounds!

There have been popular mass demonstrations throughout Arabia in opposition to U.S. imperialism and in support of the heroic Palestinian Arab people:

On January 25, 1970, according to *Peking Review*, 500,000 Egyptian people in Alexandria took part in memorial services for Egyptian soldiers who had been murdered by Israeli bombers and paratroopers on Shaduan Island. During these services, the Egyptian masses shouted, "Give us weapons!" and "War against Israel—Down with 'political solutions'!"

This past February when U.S. imperialism sent Secretary of State Rogers to North Africa in an effort to consolidate U.S. imperialist control over Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Mauritania and Libya and to divide these Arab countries from the Palestinian national liberation struggle, there were massive demonstrations and student uprisings in Tunis against Secretary of State Rogers, U.S. imperialist chieftain "Nixon Assassin", and the Bourguiba regime and in support of the Palestinian guerrilla fighters. (And there were smaller demonstrations in all these countries.)

Following the Israeli bombing of a steel factory outside of Cairo in February in which at least 50 Egyptian *workers* were brutally murdered by U.S. imperialism's Israeli stooges, hundreds of thousands of Egyptians took part in demonstrations in Cairo carrying slogans "Down with the enemy – the United States!" and "We will liberate our land!"* The Egyptian people have demanded small arms from Nasser in order to be able to *defend* Egypt from U.S. imperialist aggression and in order to be able to fight alongside of their Palestinian brothers and sisters to liberate Palestine.

In mid-March, there were mass protests throughout southern Lebanon in opposition to a step-up in U.S. imperialist-led aggression against Palestinian guerrillas based in Lebanon. These protests included a *strike* in Bint Jbeil on March 19 and a march of 30,000 in Beirut on March 21. The Lebanese masses expressed their support for the Palestinian guerrillas in their chant "The masses and the Fedayeen are one". And the Palestinian guerrillas, led by the PFLP, launched a rocket and dynamite attack on U.S. imperialist-owned installations in Lebanon,

*On February 2, 1970, exactly ten days prior to the U.S. imperialist-led Israeli attack on the factory, an attack aimed against the political vanguard of the Egyptian masses — the Egyptian industrial proletariat, Chou En-lai, on behalf of the Chinese "Cultural Revolution", sent a letter to President Nasser of Egypt expressing *complete uncritical support* for Nasser and his government *in opposition* to the masses of Egyptian people. The Chinese revisionists supported (and they supported him until he died) this Nasser who had failed to arm the Egyptian masses for self-defense against U.S. imperialist aggression and plunder, and to help drive the Israeli settlers out of Arabia; they supported the same Nasser who had deprived the Egyptian people of their finest and most heroic leaders, especially Egyptian Communists, this Nasser who locked up and tortured the Egyptian revolutionaries in Egyptian prisons where they remain *to this day!* By supporting Nasser, the Chinese "Cultural Revolution" was disarming the Egyptian masses in their ideological and organizational struggle against Nasser, an integral part of their struggle for national liberation, precisely at a time when U.S. imperialism was planning to step up its efforts to crush the rising Egyptian masses and all the aroused Arab people. The Chinese "Cultural Revolution" proclaimed its support for Nasser (and the Israeli attack also occurred) precisely when there was growing criticism from the Egyptian workers themselves of the vacillating Nasser because he had not prepared the Egyptian people for war against the U.S. imperialist puppet "state" of Israel! (One indication of this growing opposition to Nasser from Egyptian workers was that immediately following the Israeli attack on the Egyptian factory workers, large numbers of Egyptian workers criticized Nasser for not preventing this Israeli atrocity!) Exactly one week before the "Cultural Revolution" trumpeted its support for Nasser, U.S. imperialist chieftain Nixon had bragged that U.S. imperialism was going to supply more arms to its Israeli stooges for use against the Arab people. Chou En-lai's letter supporting Nasser was a signal to U.S. imperialism that the "Cultural Revolution" would condone increased U.S. imperialist aggression against the Arab masses and would help undermine and isolate, discourage and intimidate, the political vanguard of the Egyptian people, the Egyptian working class!

damaging the Medreco oil refinery near Sidon and the John F. Kennedy cultural center, the Bank of America, and the American Life Insurance Co. in Beirut!

In April, Palestinian guerrilla fighters led the Jordanian people in mass protests against the scheduled visit of U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco, including an attack on the U.S. Information Center and the American Embassy. These protests were so militant that Sisco canceled his scheduled visit! When Sisco went on to Lebanon to push a “peaceful solution to the Palestine question”, thousands of demonstrators, led by the Palestinian commandoes, marched through Beirut in protest. The slogans of the Lebanese masses included “Revolution until victory”, “Out with the ugly American”, and “*No to peaceful settlement*”!

In late May, U.S. imperialism again stepped up its attacks against the Arab masses in southern Lebanon. U.S. imperialism’s Israeli stooges drove more than 30,000 Lebanese people from their homes in an effort to curb the Palestinian guerrilla operations being launched from Lebanon against “Israel”. In protest, Imam Mousa Sadr, the religious leader of the Shia Muslims, called a one-day general strike demanding that the Lebanese government provide relief and military training for the refugees, and defense of the border regions. An indication of the strength of the Lebanese workers, and of the effectiveness of this strike is that operations at the Beirut airport were curtailed to such an extent that all foreign jets had to be diverted to Istanbul!

Within Jordan itself, prior to the First Battle of Amman, in addition to the growing support for the Palestinian guerrilla fighters from among the *Palestinian* people, the Palestinian guerrillas and especially the PFLP were beginning to mobilize large sections of the Bedouin tribes (and also the other tribespeople of Jordan) to sympathy and support of the Palestinian liberation movement! The tribal peoples of Jordan had been the one base of support for Hussein within Jordan in the past due to their largely nomadic existence and hence backward political position. Thus, Hussein’s regime, rapidly being deprived of its only semblance of popular support, was on the verge of total collapse!

But probably the most important indication of the rapidly growing revolutionary strength of the Arab liberation movement prior to the First Battle of Amman was the tremendous growth and development of the Palestinian guerrilla organizations. Fateh, which is reported in the U.S. imperialist press to be the largest Palestinian guerrilla organization, grew from a few hundred members in the winter following the June War to its present estimated size of more than 20,000 armed commandoes. Furthermore, the most politically advanced of the Palestinian guerrilla organizations is the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine under the leadership of Dr. George Habash, and it is *this* group which was now the *fastest growing* of all the Palestinian organizations!!

And all the above mentioned positive developments in the Arab liberation movement led up to the first *Battle for Amman*.

THE FIRST BATTLE OF AMMAN

In early June, the heroic Palestinian guerrilla fighters (with the support of the Jordanian and the Lebanese masses) and under PFLP leadership carried out a successful uprising against U.S. imperialist lackey King Hussein of Jordan who was attempting to use the Jordanian army to *impede* Palestinian guerrilla operations against “Israel”. One of the reasons that the Jordanian uprising was such a significant step toward victorious Arab national liberation is that the Palestinian guerrilla fighters in Jordan not only directed their attacks against the Jordanian army which was carrying out U.S. imperialism’s commands, but against the representatives of the so-called “great American people” in Amman as well: In the face of Russian revisionism, the Chinese “Cultural Revolution” and the U.S. New Left, which were all singing the praises of the “great American people” and pointing to the U.S. imperialist set-up murder of the “Kent State Four” and the U.S. imperialist-staged student protests held throughout the U.S. this past May as “proof” of the revolutionary nature of U.S. whites, the Palestinian guerrilla fighters, under the leadership of the PFLP, correctly treated *all* the members of the U.S. imperialist oppressor nation in Amman as enemies of the Arab masses! The Palestinian guerrilla fighters justly executed the U.S. military attache, Major Robert Perry, and held eighteen U.S. whites among their hostages at the Intercontinental Hotel in Amman until U.S. imperialism, through its Jordanian lackey government, met some of their significant demands! As we stated above, the Palestinian guerrillas’ struggle resulted in the forced evacuation of 300 U.S. whites from Amman. It also resulted in Hussein’s ouster of two leading U.S.-lackey army generals (Hussein’s uncle and cousin) and in Hussein’s agreement to provide Jordanian army cover-fire to Palestinian operations against “Israel”.

The Palestinian guerrillas, the main enemy of U.S. imperialism in Arabia, had forced Hussein, the chief Arab “puppet” of U.S. imperialism, to agree to support their heroic struggle against the “state” of Israel, the main bastion of U.S. imperialist interests in Arabia! What a victory for the Palestinian liberation fighters and for all the Arab people!

From all the above, leading up to and including the First Battle of Amman, the Arab masses have clearly shown by their actions that they are prepared to carry out whatever struggle is necessary to win their national liberation from U.S. imperialist domination. They are demanding the leadership capable of leading the way. Only an Arab Marxist-Leninist party (or parties) is capable of mobilizing all of the classes of the Arab nation* and leading the mighty Arab people’s war to

*The Palestinian people constitute either an oppressed nation in Palestine or they are an integral part of one or more huge Arab nations in Western Asia and Northern Africa. At this time we are not capable of making a scientific evaluation of this question. Arab Marxist-Leninists in the process of mobilizing the Arab masses for people’s war against U.S. imperialism and its settler state of Israel, as well

(Continued on next page)

victory. The embryo of such a party has already emerged out of the struggle of the Arab masses! We feel that much of this embryo is in the PFLP under the leadership of George Habash.

Following the Palestinian people's victory over Hussein in the June battle for Amman, quite naturally, the PFLP gained many new recruits. These recruits came not only from the inspired Palestinian population but also from the "moderate" Fateh organization in particular. This development took place in spite of the fact that, while PFLP guerrillas do not receive pay, Fateh guerrillas are paid a salary, mainly from money given to Arafat and Fateh by the oil rich feudal kingdoms, notably Saudi Arabia's King Faisal.**

The fact that many guerrillas left Fateh to join the PFLP after this victory indicates further the magnitude of the victory of the Arab masses in Amman in June and it represents still a further victory. It represents the growing strength of the proletarian revolutionary forces within the leadership of the Palestinian guerrilla movement! It is the PFLP to whom Nixon was referring in his major speech of July 1, 1970 as "super-radicals" with great trepidation. And it is the Palestinian Arab masses in Amman, in particular, whom Nixon was worrying about when he said in that speech that the Middle East is now more dangerous (for U.S. imperialism) than Vietnam!

It is the PFLP and the Palestinian Arab masses centered mainly in Amman, the vanguard of the Arab revolution, that Nixon and U.S. imperialism were now determined to crush.

This is essentially what we wrote in July. We went on to discuss the nature of the enemy and the nature of the struggle of the Arab people, i.e., to warn the heroic Arab masses, and the revolutionary Arab leadership, about the bestial nature of the white settler society of "Israel", about the forthcoming increase in U.S. imperialist-led aggression against the political vanguard of the Arab masses, the Palestinian guerrilla fighters, and finally about the great probability of a troop invasion of Arabia by the monstrous citizen-soldiers of predatory U.S. imperialism.

Before going on to discuss the process leading up to the tragic Second Battle of Amman, it is useful to examine a little more closely the dynamic relation of forces in the successful First Battle of Amman and its aftermath.

as against Hussein and other Arab compradors, will be in a far better position to resolve this question. The point here is that the land of Palestine belongs to the Palestinian Arab people and that their fight to regain this land is the heart of the Arab national liberation struggle.

**Habash and the PFLP quite openly admit that they desire the overthrow of such regimes and will not take this money which is tainted with the bloody hands of U.S. imperialist oil companies! Thus, though their families are provided for, the PFLP guerrillas, similar to the popular guerrillas of other people's war struggles, do not receive pay.

Leading up to the Battle, the aroused Arab masses throughout the various Arab countries were rising up in sympathy with the Palestinian guerrillas centered in Amman. Thus, vacillating Arab governments were forced by the Arab masses in their own countries to leave the most openly U.S. imperialist lackey Arab leader Hussein in relative *isolation*. This forced Hussein to rely all the more on U.S. imperialism for his survival and forced him to come out even more in the open as a valuable servant of U.S. imperialism. This forced Hussein to isolate himself from the Bedouin and other tribal peoples (all of whom had experienced some suffering at the hands of the U.S. imperialist settler state of Israel) and provided a broader basis upon which the Palestinian guerrillas were able to mobilize large numbers of Bedouins to the cause of Palestinian and Arab liberation.

By June 1970, Hussein and his royal government were on the verge of total collapse while the Palestinian guerrillas were stronger than ever. The situation was overwhelmingly favorable for the guerrillas to press forward their struggle to destroy the state of Israel and liberate Palestine. This is precisely what the PFLP proceeded to do. And this is precisely what U.S. imperialism directed its chief Arab lackey, Hussein, to suppress. These are the conditions which produced the First Battle of Amman.

But what role did Nasser, the giant Arab leader of “non-alignment,” and Arafat, the chief “moderate” guerrilla leader, play in this Battle? And what role did the Chinese “Cultural Revolution”, the leadership of the world revolution, play in this Battle?

In the face of the favorable situation for the guerrillas, Nasser attempted to reconcile Hussein and the guerrillas on the basis of the status quo with his calls for “Arab unity”, and Arafat flew into Amman from Cairo and signed a cease-fire agreement to that effect! And, a day or so later, the Chinese “Cultural Revolution” leadership published a statement by Yasser Arafat in Peking Review, thus indicating their support for Arafat in opposition to the initiative of the PFLP and of the Arab masses. In other words, Nasser and Arafat were undermining, even, it must be said, betraying the Palestinian guerrilla cause, the Arab people’s cause, in the First Battle of Amman! And the present Chinese leadership using the tremendous deserved prestige of the Chinese people’s and Chairman Mao’s revolutionary past, were supporting this betrayal.

But the Palestinian Arab people of Amman *rejected* Nasser and Arafat, (and thus the Chinese revisionist line and policy); and, under the leadership of Habash and the PFLP, they stood resolute against Hussein and went on to win the First Battle of Amman.

As a consequence of the Palestinian victory over Hussein in the First Battle of Amman, *this* was the situation in Arabia: the Arab revolution was rapidly advancing to fulfill its potential — to the “Judgment Day” of the white settler state of Israel, to the achievement of Arab liberation.

In Jordan, the Palestinian masses, especially in Amman, were exultant in their victory over Hussein and were emboldened and more determined than ever to liberate Palestine and destroy the state of Israel once and for all. The Bedouin masses and other non-Palestinians of Jordan could not help but become all the more closely attached to their inspired, revolutionary Palestinian brothers and sisters. All the Palestinian refugees, the Bedouins, all Jordanians were drawn much closer to the outstanding, bold, and victorious PFLP leadership and to the PFLP's line and policy which includes the overthrow of reactionary Arab regimes as well as ruthless struggle against the main foes of the Arab masses, U.S. imperialism and the settler state of Israel. It is no wonder that the PFLP's dramatic growth in numbers, as well as prestige, was tremendously accelerated in the aftermath of the victorious First Battle of Amman!

The impact of the Palestinian people's victory in the First Battle of Amman extended far beyond the imperialist-established boundaries of Jordan. Throughout Arabia the aroused masses became more militant, more bold, on the question of the struggle to destroy the Israeli white settlers; they became more impatient, more dissatisfied with their own vacillating leaders and governments, and they became more determined to overthrow "their own" Arab governments whenever and wherever these governments became obstacles to the struggle to destroy the state of Israel and to win Arab liberation.

All the people of Arabia were being irresistibly drawn to the leadership of the PFLP, to the heroic and resolute Palestinian guerrillas centered in Amman, to the PFLP line that "the road to Tel Aviv passes through Beirut, Amman, Riyadh, Kuwait and even Damascus and Cairo".

Thus the tremendous revolutionary upsurge of the Arab masses threatened to drown out the voices of vacillation, indecision, and treason in Arabia; it threatened as a tremendous revolutionary sea to drive into Palestine and sweep the bestial, degenerate Israeli white settler occupiers into the Mediterranean.

Such was the excellent revolutionary situation in Arabia in July 1970. This was the mighty force which Nixon and U.S. imperialism recognized as "more dangerous than Vietnam."

THE SECOND BATTLE OF AMMAN

The Second Battle of Amman was such a grievous defeat for the Palestinian Arab people that it may result in a new *setback* for the entire Arab national liberation movement, if the process is not recognized, if the lessons are not learned and acted upon soon.

The following is the essential process which Nixon and U.S. imperialism used to crush the Palestinian masses in the Second Battle of Amman.

U.S. imperialism's task was to isolate and crush the PFLP before the PFLP was able to draw the lessons from Nasser's and Arafat's role (with Chinese revisionist support) in the First Battle of Amman and begin the necessary ideological struggle against Nasser and Arafat and the forces which they represented. For if the PFLP was given the time to begin this struggle, it would have been able to consolidate the great victory for the Arab masses by establishing PFLP leadership of the Arab liberation movement.

However, U.S. imperialism had a big "ace in the hole" to play in its initiative to decapitate the Arab liberation movement. This "ace" was the forces of vacillation in Arabia, inspired, encouraged, and dominated by Russian and Chinese revisionism. These forces, and principally the reactionary Arab governments and Fateh, the moderate Palestinian guerrilla organization, did *not* exult at all in the Palestinian people's victory.

Within Jordan, and within Amman itself, large numbers of the best Fateh forces went over to the PFLP. Because of their vacillating compromising stand in the First Battle of Amman, Arafat and Fateh were losing their hold on the Palestinian people.

Throughout most of Arabia, the Arab governments (including President Nasser of Egypt) were nervously trying to find a way to "contain" the revolutionary enthusiasm of the Arab masses so that they could remain in power.

Nixon and U.S. imperialism took note of the role that Nasser and Arafat had played in the First Battle of Amman, as well as of the support they received from the present Chinese leadership, and counted on using these forces to full advantage in its calculated plan to decapitate the Arab liberation movement and stem the revolutionary tide in Arabia.

Nixon and U.S. imperialism began their "carrot and stick" offensive against the vanguard forces of the Arab liberation movement with U.S. imperialist Secretary of State Rogers' proposal for a ceasefire between the "Israeli" white settler government of occupation and the Arab states. This plan was agreed to, not surprisingly, by King Hussein of Jordan whose regime depends almost as much for its survival on U.S. imperialism as does the state of Israel! However, it was also agreed to by President Nasser of Egypt who was supported by the Russian revisionists, the great collaborators with U.S. imperialism, and even by the Chinese revisionists. Nasser's agreement to the cease-fire provided a "patriotic" cover for Hussein's *and* Nasser's betrayal of the Arab liberation movement. For Nasser, though he was under growing criticism not only from the Palestinian Arab vanguard but from the Egyptian masses as well, still was considered by many Arabs as an important leader of the Arab liberation movement.

Nasser's agreement (with Hussein) to Rogers' cease-fire proposal was a giant basis for turning back the revolutionary tide from King Hussein and mounting

a counterrevolutionary tide against the rising Palestinian masses centered in Amman and their best organizational representative, the PFLP. Nasser's agreement to the cease-fire proposal was the signal that all the Arab governments could now re-establish support for, or at least friendly relations with, Hussein. It meant that *Hussein was no longer isolated!*

Instead, backed by the Arab governments, Palestinian guerrilla organizations (principally Arafat and Fateh) which denounce any program for the overthrow of reactionary Arab governments and the seizure of power now were in a position to help these Arab governments *isolate Habash and the PFLP* whose strategic goals include the overthrow of reactionary Arab regimes.

Nasser's agreement to Rogers' cease-fire proposal broke the political isolation of Hussein and laid the basis for politically isolating the PFLP!!

Largely on the basis of Nasser's agreement to the Rogers' cease-fire plan, U.S. imperialism was able to disarm the Arab people concerning the bestial nature of the white settler state of Israel, as well as the bestial nature of the "great American people" and the U.S. imperialist government whose Secretary of State (Rogers) now appeared to be (with the blessing of Nasser) a powerful and genuine force for "peace". With the nature of the enemy now obscured and distorted to the Arab masses, and the path to liberation being buried under possible peaceful "deals", inevitably, the distinctions among the various Arab leaders, and particularly among the Palestinian guerrilla leaders, became obscured and distorted as well.

And, just as Nixon and U.S. imperialism had hoped, in the midst of the disorientation and confusion caused by Nasser's agreement to the U.S. imperialist proposal, the Palestinian guerrilla organizations became seriously divided over the question of how to deal with Nasser and how to deal with the cease-fire. The most important division was created between Fateh, still the largest and the dominant guerrilla organization, and the PFLP, the fastest growing and the most politically advanced and rapidly developing Palestinian guerrilla organization with a tremendous potential for providing effective and ultimately victorious leadership to the Arab people.

While Habash and the PFLP correctly condemned Nasser for his cease-fire betrayal of the Arab cause from the outset, Arafat and other Fateh leaders, though making some criticism of the cease-fire, remained *silent* on Nasser, and so, in practice, co-existed with the U.S. imperialist-established cease-fire. In this way, Arafat and Fateh not only failed to *prepare* the Palestinian people for the U.S. imperialist and Israeli-Zionist aggression which will come, but actually contributed to the imperialist ideological "peace" offensive against the Arab masses, disarming the Palestinian masses precisely when their immediate task was to prepare the Palestinian people for Hussein's brutal assault.

And the Chinese “Cultural Revolution”, far from criticizing Nasser’s acceptance of the U.S. imperialist cease-fire proposal, sent another letter of uncritical support to Nasser, through Chou En-lai, exactly one day *before* his acceptance, when it was abundantly clear that Nasser, after his nineteen-day visit in Russia, was going to accept the U.S. imperialist proposal! The Chinese revisionists thus indicated their continued support for Nasser’s betrayal of the Arab people’s cause *and* for U.S. imperialism’s ideological aggression against the Arab masses. *Without the okay of Chou En-lai and the present Chinese leadership, Nasser could not have risked accepting U.S. imperialism’s cease-fire proposal!*

It was in this way that U.S. imperialism set the stage for the political isolation of the PFLP and the selective mass murder of the Palestinian vanguard masses, centered in Amman.

Capitulation to Chinese “Cultural” Revisionism

From the outset Habash and the PFLP recognized the undermining subversive role that the cease-fire was playing among the Palestinian refugees as well as among all the Arab people and the Arab governments. Habash and the PFLP recognized, to some extent at least, the real possibility that, with the cease-fire as a starting point, the present Arab governments *and* Arafat might accept a *deal* whereby some of the Arab land seized by the Israeli settlers in the June War of 1967 would be returned to them in exchange for their recognition of the status quo boundaries of the illegitimate state of Israel. In other words, a token amount of Arab land would be accepted by the present Arab leadership as a substitute for the liberation of all of Palestine. What a sell-out of the Palestinian masses this would be; what a victory for U.S. imperialist super-exploitation and plunder of all Arabia this would be!

In this extremely difficult situation, the PFLP was faced with the necessity of waging ideological struggle against almost the entire present Arab leadership in order to mobilize the Arab people for the task of breaking the cease-fire and on this basis to reorient the Arab liberation struggle once again against U.S. imperialism, the state of Israel, and the semi-feudal and corrupt Arab reactionary regimes.

In addition, it was necessary for the PFLP to struggle against almost the entire international Marxist-Leninist movement (which has virtually ceased waging ideological struggle since the Chinese “Cultural Revolution” began in 1966). This is clearly the case because of the fact that Nasser, Arafat and Fateh, the principal forces within Arabia which Habash and the PFLP have to polemicize *against*, have the uncritical *support* of the Chinese revisionist leadership!

However, Habash and the PFLP leadership were not yet capable of struggling against the Chinese revisionist leadership and therefore they were unable to wage sharp ideological struggle against Nasser, Arafat and Fateh in July.

In fact, Habash has called China (meaning the present Chinese leadership) “our best friend.” And an important part of the alternative path which the PFLP chose, following Nasser’s agreement to the cease-fire, was Habash’s visit to Peking!

With Habash’s visit to Peking, the PFLP hoped that Chinese support for the PFLP would be forthcoming and that this support would be so strong that it would, when combined with four “skyjackings”, consolidate the PFLP leadership of the Arab liberation movement. Habash and the PFLP further hoped that the PFLP’s own prestige among the Arab masses (which it thought would be increased by the “sky-jackings”), coupled with the prestige as well as the power of Chinese support, would be sufficient to break the cease- fire.

This initiative of the PFLP reflected a certain disdain for the Arab masses. For instead of having enough confidence in the revolutionary Arab *people* to bring the fundamental ideological and organizational question involved in Nasser’s and Arafat’s activities to the people, Habash and the PFLP chose to *avoid the ideological struggle* against the vacillating Arab leadership and to instead try to resolve the question of Nasser (and Arafat) and the cease-fire on the level of diplomacy, on the level of *leaders*, by having Habash try to persuade the Chinese revisionist leaders to throw their support behind Habash and the PFLP in place of Nasser and Arafat and Fateh.

But just what kind of force was the Chinese “Cultural Revolution” leadership in which the PFLP leadership placed so much confidence?

In April 1968, as Youth for Stalin, we discussed the Chinese revisionist role in the June 1967 war. In that “Cultural Revolution” document, in a section entitled, “The Arab Nation”, we said the following:

“During the course of the ‘Cultural Revolution’, a tremendous setback was suffered by the world anti-imperialist movement in the Israeli-imperialist war against the Arab people. The response of the ‘Cultural Revolution’ to imperialist aggression in the Arab world has been to tail the line of the national bourgeois leaders of the Arab states.

“The ‘Cultural Revolution’ does not advocate the right of self-determination for the Arab peoples of Palestine and of other Arab territory now in the hands of the Israeli ‘white settlers’ (as in South Africa [Azania]) and U.S. imperialism. The ‘Cultural Revolution’ does not call for the destruction of the state of Israel as a necessary part of Arab liberation.

“The ‘Cultural Revolution’ does not call for the *arming* of the Arab *masses* with small arms to carry out people’s war which the present leadership of several Arab countries would not do because they would be immediately overthrown. The ‘Cultural

Revolution' does not call for the release of the Communists and other revolutionaries from the prisons of the United Arab Republic, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and other Arab states. The 'Cultural Revolution' of course does not even mention that Communist Parties should exist in Arab countries let alone *lead* the Arab liberation movement.

"Instead, the 'Cultural Revolution' tells the Arab peoples to 'unite' behind the present leaders who cannot rely on the Arab peoples and have to instead rely on technical assistance and military weapons from the Soviet revisionists and thus led the Arab people to the terrible defeat in June." ("The Role of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the International Marxist-Leninist Movement: The October Revolution vs. the 'Cultural Revolution' ", reprinted by *Ray O. Light*, 1/78, pp. 91-92)

Since April, 1968, the Chinese "cultural" revisionist leadership has continued to give uncritical support to Nasser and to the moderate Fateh Palestinian guerrilla organization, as we indicated above. In July and August 1970, the "Cultural Revolution" leaders (along with Arafat) still supported Nasser who, true to form, signed the ceasefire with Israel (and Hussein), and then jailed Egyptian trade union leaders and closed down all Palestinian guerrilla radio stations in Egypt.

If Habash and the PFLP leadership had taken a principled proletarian approach of ruthless ideological and organizational struggle against all forms of opportunism in Arabia, and especially against Nasser and Arafat, even without understanding the treacherous role that the present Chinese leadership is playing in Indo-China, just by basing itself on what it *knows* has been the role of the Chinese revisionist leadership *in Arabia* these past few years, the PFLP would have had no illusions concerning the possibility of winning Chinese "Cultural Revolution" support for the PFLP. They would not have expected Chinese revisionist support for their ruthless armed struggle against the state of Israel, and for their struggle to *seize power* from U.S.-lackey Hussein in Jordan which has *now* become the most immediate task on the agenda of the Arab People's War!

Tragically, the PFLP did *not* wage ideological struggle against Nasser and Arafat and the Chinese "Cultural Revolution", and *did* send Habash to Peking at the most critical moment of the Palestinian people's struggle in Jordan. Thus when the PFLP was ousted from the Palestine Liberation Organization and when martial law was declared in Jordan and the U.S.-puppet Hussein regime began its brutal slaughter, its selective mass murder, in Amman, Habash, the outstanding PFLP leader, was still out of the country!

* * * * *

Quite often, the forces of imperialism, feudalism, and all reaction utilize *both* right and left opportunist tendencies within the proletarian revolutionary movement

simultaneously, to suffocate the revolutionary initiative of the masses, and “contain” the revolution. The basis of left as well as right opportunism is a lack of confidence in the toiling masses. Both positions reflect a lack of confidence in our revolutionary future, a lack of confidence in the ultimate victory of the revolution.

Right opportunism, avoidance of struggle, peaceful transition, class collaboration, gradualism, liberalism toward other “leaders”, all this is a product of the improved security of a section of the working class; it’s the product of that section of the working class which has experienced a *rise* in their level of prosperity under the old regime. It is the politics of a bourgeoisified working class in the imperialist countries. In the oppressed nations, it is the politics of the newcomers to the proletariat from the semi-proletariat and poor peasantry and of the petty bourgeois forces including that section of the middle peasants, urban professionals, and urban laboring petty bourgeoisie who have experienced a degree of prosperity under the *old* regime.

The right opportunist tendency of the PFLP was manifested in its avoidance of sharp ideological struggle against Nasser and against Arafat and Fateh, especially in light of *their* treachery in the First Battle of Amman. It was expressed in the PFLP’s inability to struggle against the Chinese revisionists who supported Arafat (as well as Nasser). It was expressed in the PFLP’s avoidance of ideological struggle and its adoption of a policy of unprincipled “unity” with the “Cultural Revolution” and unprincipled “unity” with Fateh. It was the right opportunism of the PFLP which took Habash, the outstanding leader of the PFLP, out of Amman after Rogers’ cease-fire between Nasser and Hussein on the one hand and Israel on the other was already in effect, a time when Habash and the PFLP knew that Hussein was going to wage war against them.

Left opportunism, adventurism, putschism, including individual terrorism, is the product of the newcomers to the proletariat from the petty bourgeoisie, including middle peasants, professionals, etc., who have experienced a *decline* in their prosperity, of a sudden, and have therefore jumped from full faith in the system to vehement hatred for the system. These infantile leftists, as Lenin called them, want revenge, destruction of the system, etc., but lack revolutionary experience, experience in labor and struggle. Therefore they want the revolution *today*, otherwise they’ll desert to the counterrevolution. These “leftists” retain their petty bourgeois disdain for the masses, and feel that they and other (petty bourgeois) “leaders” must carry out the struggle on behalf of the masses, that the masses, are powerless, lack initiative, are not creative, etc. It is out of this class environment that adventurism is produced and nurtured. Based on his experience with the Russian terrorists, Lenin said a terrorist is a “liberal with a bomb”.

Left Adventurism and the Airplane Hijackings

On September 6, 1970, while Habash was visiting Peking and Pyongyang, the very dramatic hijacking of four airplanes was attempted by PFLP cadre. (Three were

successful.) According to Leila Khaled, the Palestinian heroine, and a participant in the one unsuccessful “sky-jacking”, the PFLP “sky-jacked” the planes in a desperate attempt to break the cease-fire. Presumably they hoped to reestablish the tremendously revolutionary situation in Arabia and especially in Amman which were developing prior to Nasser’s agreement to the cease-fire with Israel.

These airplane hijackings were adventurist or left opportunist because they reflected a serious underestimation of the enemy forces. The PFLP should have recognized that U.S. Secretary of State Rogers would not have proposed the cease-fire if it had not served U.S. imperialist interests. The “cease-fire” tactic is a large part of the means by which U.S. imperialism keeps its Israeli white settler society of occupation in Palestine, and keeps U.S. imperialist domination in Arabia, which in turn, through control of Arab oil is the key to U.S. imperialist domination of Japan and Europe! Certainly, U.S. imperialism would not consider abandoning such a strategically important weapon as the cease-fire in exchange for a mere four airplanes and their passengers!

But like all adventurist acts, the “sky-jackings” were “left” in form but “right” in essence. Leila Khaled, in a CBS TV interview (a mistake), correctly condemned the United Nations and other such forces who have talked and talked about Palestine but who, she says, will never *give* Palestine back. She further stated that only by victorious armed struggle can the Arab people win back Palestine. George Habash too has correctly condemned such forces. Yet, in the same TV interview, Leila Khaled stated that an important reason for the “sky-jackings” was to dramatize to the people of the world the seriousness of the Palestinian people’s plight. And in a *Life* magazine interview, Habash stated much the same rationale for terrorist acts. He said, “Through sabotage we want to remind the world that a catastrophe has taken place here and that justice must be done.” Both Miss Khaled and Dr. Habash contradict themselves on the question about world opinion etc. when it comes to the issue of “individual terrorism”, e.g. airplane hijackings. In spite of the fact that both of them (and the PFLP leadership as a whole) correctly repudiate forces like the UN, and its illusions concerning the power of world public opinion, etc., the PFLP ends up putting this *right* opportunist line into *practice* in the form of “*leftist*” acts such as the “sky-jackings”.*

The “Sky-jackings” were carried out, according to the PFLP, in order to break the cease-fire. To believe this was possible through “sky-jackings” was to be under the rightist illusions that bury the socio-economic nature of imperialism, its economic interests, standing army, etc. The “sky-jackings” were carried out to arouse “world public concern” for the Palestinian people. *Coordinated national liberation struggles is the real international power which the illusions about “world*

*For more discussion of the PFLP’s “terrorist” program and its reformist essence, see APPENDIX, page 33.

public opinion” serve to keep buried.* These terrorist acts were calculated and planned on the basis of rightist illusions concerning the “democratic” people of the imperialist countries (especially the so-called “great American people”) who have access to news of Arabia, etc.; they are based on the rightist illusions concerning the imperialist controlled press throughout most of the world, and concerning the revisionists and their non-proletarian “international representatives” from the oppressed nations who point to the adventurism of the hijackings as a pretext for refusing to mobilize the oppressed peoples around the Arab people’s struggle in Palestine and in Jordan. The adventurism of the PFLP’s “sky-jackings” paved the way for these right opportunists by alienating proletarian revolutionaries who are willing and able to mobilize *real* fighting international solidarity with the *real* fighting Palestinian cause.

*In the imperialist countries, and especially in the USA, the people *already* know what is going on in Palestine and in Jordan, just as they have known what was going on in Nigeria, and what our citizen-soldiers and our U.S. society have been doing in Vietnam, including the selective mass murder of the people in Hue, and in the villages of Quang Nai Province (the Cradle of Vietnamese Revolution), including Songmy. As long as we U.S. whites are receiving our “crumbs”, our society as a whole will not “care” about tragedies in Palestine. (Unfortunately, when these crumbs are taken away, the “great American people” will choose fascism before the proletarian revolution.)

The oppressed peoples, to the extent that they know what is happening to their Palestinian brothers and sisters, *do* care. Certainly the Azanian masses under the rule of the white settler “South African” regime and society who have been driven onto a tiny and undesirable section of their nation, “the Bantu lands”, and the Afro-American masses many of whom have been driven into the “refugee camps” of the cities in the U.S. (North), having been driven out of their Black Belt national homeland by the white settler southern crackers of the KKK etc. and who are governed both in Afro-America and in the U.S. (North) by the *international* regime of occupation, the U.S. imperialist government, are able to grasp fully the scope of the Palestinian people’s struggle, sympathize with the Palestinian Arab people, and will strongly support their just struggle when each achieves proletarian leadership.

The practical task of the PFLP on the international front is to help lay the conditions for coordinated national liberation movements throughout Asia, Africa, Latin America and Afro-America. Those “leaders” (such as Sihanouk) whom the PFLP leadership meets through the present Chinese revisionist leadership will not inform the (Cambodian) masses about the Palestinian situation and unite them in struggle with the Palestinian people. (In SWG Bulletin No. 7, we discussed why such national bourgeois leaders as Sihanouk in Cambodia are incapable of establishing real international political and military cooperation.) At the same time, genuine proletarian leadership in Indo-China, in Afro-America, in Azania, and elsewhere, will be alienated by the left opportunism of “sky-jackings” and they will be discouraged from establishing such coordination with the PFLP leadership and with the Palestinian people.

Within Jordan, and in Amman in particular, the “sky-jackings” added to the confusion of the most advanced Palestinian guerrillas. Instead of rallying the tremendously revolutionary Palestinian *masses* behind a proletarian program for breaking the cease-fire between the Arab states and the settler state of “Israel”, a program for mobilizing international support, a program forged in struggle against Fateh and Nasser, Habash and the PFLP leadership chose to avoid struggle and attempted to consolidate their leadership and break the cease-fire by “executive order” from Peking on the one hand, and by the individualistic “sky-jackings” on the other.

Thus the “sky-jackings” not only failed to attain the goals for which they were undertaken but these acts became an *obstacle* to the achievement of goals of international support, of breaking the “cease-fire”, and of consolidating PFLP leadership in Jordan.

In the classic Marxist-Leninist text, the *History of the CPSU(B)*, (Stalinist editions), the authors discuss the *disdain for the masses* which was at the root of the policy of individual terrorism adopted by the Russian terrorists, the Narodniks, at the end of the 19th century. They go on to point out the undermining effect of adventurist policy in the peoples’ revolutionary struggle:

“By these assassinations of individual representatives of the class of exploiters, assassinations that were of no benefit to the revolution, the Narodniks *diverted the attention of the working people* from the struggle against that class as a whole. *They hampered the development of the revolutionary initiative and activity of the working class and the peasantry.*” [p. 11, our emphasis, SWG]

The PFLP, in avoiding the struggle against Arafat and Nasser, rendered itself incapable of once again strongly establishing a fighting orientation among the Palestinian masses in Jordan in the wake of the widespread confusion following Nasser’s cease-fire agreement with Israel. The PFLP airplane hijackings and the accompanying illusions only added further to the confusion and disorientation of the Palestinian refugees in Jordan!

The most significant result of the adventurist-capitulationist policy of the PFLP was the PFLP’s relative isolation from the Palestinian masses. The opportunist policy, based on the PFLP’s lack of confidence in the Palestinian masses, resulted in the Palestinian masses’ loss of confidence in the PFLP.

On September 12, 1970, less than a week after the airplane hijackings, Arafat, as head of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) which included almost all the guerrilla organizations, used the adventurism of these acts to oust the PFLP from the PLO. While the ouster of the PFLP is mainly the responsibility of the

treacherous Arafat and other “moderate” guerrilla leaders, the PFLP’s ouster is partially its own responsibility. For the PFLP has disarmed itself, capitulating in the face of Arafat’s and Nasser’s perfidy, rendering itself vulnerable, and then committed the adventurist “sky-jackings” which confused the masses further and provided the pretext upon which the PFLP could be isolated from the rest of the Palestinian high command and from the masses of Palestinians, all of whom had been increasingly attracted to the PFLP prior to Nasser’s agreement to Rogers’ cease-fire proposal with Israel. Thus the PFLP, which was the outstanding, determined vanguard leadership of the Palestine liberation movement, was *isolated* from the operational headquarters of the Palestinian people precisely during the time of greatest danger of attack by Hussein!

Of course, international revisionism played a large role in supporting Arafat’s ouster of Habash and the revolutionary PFLP from the Palestine Liberation Organization. For example, the Korean Workers’ Party, one of the last to be penetrated by modern revisionism, played a particularly insidious role on September 12, 1970. Habash was in Pyongyang, North Korea, and the North Korean representative in Amman threw the Korean Workers’ Party support behind Fateh as “the vanguard of the Palestine liberation struggle”, precisely on September 12 when Arafat and Fateh ousted the PFLP!!

Arafat’s ouster of the PFLP was the signal for Hussein to launch his brutal, concentrated selective mass murder against the vanguard forces of the Palestinian masses in Amman, including especially the stronghold of the PFLP, the Wahadat Camp which included 55,000 men and women and children!!! On September 15, three days after the ouster of the PFLP from the PLO, Hussein declared martial law in Jordan. *The next day* Arafat was named general of all the Palestinian armed forces including the Palestinian guerrillas, the armed Palestinian masses (militia), and the Palestine Liberation Army (PLA)! On the *very next day*, September 17, Hussein launched his bestial U.S.-directed mass murder in Amman!* What coordination, what treachery.

But this is not all! Then Arafat as the head of the PLO, including the guerrilla units as well as the part-time guerrillas in the militia (toiling peasants and workers by day), and of the PLA, regular army units which had been special Palestinian detachments in the Syrian, Iraqi and other Arab armies, ordered the Palestinian commandoes to fire only in *self-defense!* This position was publicized and supported in the *Peking Review!*

*It is important to note that Hussein’s special mercenary forces are made up of Bedouins not from the Jordanian area, but from Syria, Lebanon, etc., so their bloody role in the Second Battle of Amman not only fails to contradict but even substantiates the important fact of growing Bedouin support for the Palestinians within Jordan, of the Jordanian masses’ overwhelming support for the anti-Hussein struggle.

Thus Arafat, the traitor, disarmed the Palestinian fighters, allowing Hussein to concentrate U.S. imperialist-directed mass murder against the vanguard pockets of PFLP resistance. During the massacre, the Arab masses (who were still inspired by the PFLP-led victory in the First Battle of Amman) were aroused and militant, and determined to advance the Arab liberation movement, and fought vigorously. The Palestinian masses, in Amman in particular, displayed tremendous heroism. And so, Arafat's treachery was all the more tragic.

The following is a summary of the Second Battle of Amman as it was waged over the ten days and nights from September 17-27. We feel that the specific information which we have, though much of it is from *Fateh* (Sept. 30, 1970), nevertheless fully substantiates our position that Arafat, the leader of Fateh, is a traitor!

On September 17: In response to Hussein's martial law, the Palestinian and Jordanian *workers* in Amman and throughout Jordan, aroused and defiant, courageous and determined, called for a general strike in Jordan (beginning Sept. 17) to last until the "*fascist military regime*" was brought down. By nightfall, the Central Committee of the Fateh-led PLO took control of already liberated north Jordan and promised to hold it until the "military regime" was brought down. What is the significance of *Fateh's* inclusion of the word "fascist" in describing the workers' position, while omitting it from the Central Committee's (i.e., "their own") position? Already, on the first day, there emerged two lines. The workers, the real vanguard of the people's struggle, under the impetus of the tremendously revolutionary Arab people, and especially the Palestinian masses, and having been influenced by the PFLP's calls for the overthrow of Hussein, emerged with an advanced political line of *overthrowing* the *fascist* regime, whether a purely military regime or one fronted by civilians, etc. It was the workers and the PFLP-influenced masses, who so heroically on the first day of fighting not only liberated north Jordan, but fought house to house, preventing Hussein's troops and armor from blasting their way into Amman. With their heroism, the Palestinian masses upset Hussein's plans for a two-day "blitzkrieg" victory.

The PLO, led by Arafat and Fateh, on the other hand, was pushing a far different line — a continuation of the Fateh line of denouncing and subverting any effort to seize power from Hussein. With the U.S. threatening and planning armed intervention, including open military invasion, and Nasser lauding Hussein's "restraint", Arafat delivered an infamous speech, the essence of which we quote exactly as Arafat's newspaper *Fateh* quoted it:

"Your fellow citizens and your relatives who go with you through these historical and critical moments are your responsibility. Their security and safety is more important than your basic duties. Your honest brethren in the Jordanian Army are on your side and you are on theirs in the battle of destiny against the lackeys, the Zionist enemy and World imperialism. Conspirators

will not be able to split your joint march to achieve the ultimate victory.”

Arafat, the “general commander” ordered his “troops” to put the “security and safety” of their relatives and friends before their “basic duties” – a command unparalleled in the annals of all military history, let alone *revolutionary* military history!! While the people were being destroyed in a well-planned, U.S.-directed attack of Hussein’s well organized Jordanian puppet army, backed by the Israeli Air Force, Arafat justified his “command” by identifying the enemy *in Amman* as merely a bunch of “conspirators”. (“Your honest brethren in the Jordanian army are on your side ... conspirators will not be able to split your joint march.”) (Following the First Battle of Amman, Abu Lotuf, the supposed “brains” behind Fateh, had stated that “Hussein, being an Arab, cannot help being on our side; his interests coincide with ours.” [*Look Magazine*, 6/30/70, p.25])

The first day of the battle already had revealed the two antagonistic lines within the Palestinian revolution — the line of the workers and toiling peasants and the line of the capitulationist Fateh-led PLO “leadership”. The first day thus revealed the tremendous significance of Arafat’s successful ouster of Habash and the PFLP from the PLO, the fact that *in order to emerge victorious, the heroic and tremendously revolutionary Palestinian and Jordanian masses would have to struggle against “their own” leadership — backed by international revisionism, while simultaneously fighting against Hussein’s army and the white settler garrison state of Israel, all backed by U.S. imperialism!* Without a Marxist-Leninist party of the Arab proletariat this was an impossible task. And betrayal by “their own” Palestinian leadership is what ultimately determined the tragic outcome for the Palestinian and Jordanian masses of the Second Battle of Amman.

The revolutionary Arab masses, both in Arabia and throughout the world, throughout the ten-day battle overwhelmingly demonstrated that their hearts and souls are with the Palestinian people’s cause: Already, on the 17th, the Arab people poured out in mass demonstrations throughout the cities and towns of Algeria. And in the Israeli held Gaza area, the Palestinian masses in the refugee camps struck so militantly that the Israeli government declared martial law. By Sept. 18, mass rallies were held in Damascus, Syria, and Baghdad, Iraq; a strike against Hussein was called in Tripoli, North Lebanon, and the Jordanian embassies were occupied by Arab students in Damascus and Baghdad, New Delhi, Moscow and London! On Sept. 19, the unanimity of the anti-Hussein sentiment of the Arab people was reflected in many ways and in many places. In Rome, New Delhi, and Copenhagen, and in Tripoli, Libya, and Rabat, Morocco, the Arab people occupied Jordanian embassies. The South Yemen government called for the protection of the Palestinian Revolution. In Kuwait, 70,000 Arab workers and students marched against Hussein. (It was under this tremendous popular pressure that the Kuwait government suspended its financial aid to the Jordanian government on Sept.

21.) In Algiers and in several cities in both Lebanon and Syria, thousands of Arab people marched against Hussein. Fourteen Arab mayors in Israeli *occupied* Palestine condemned Hussein. And within Amman itself, the daughter of the fascist Jordanian premier Daoud joined the Palestinian Revolution while Jordan's crack Hussein Brigade switched to the commando side in the face of the heroic resistance by the Palestinian commandoes!

In the face of the overwhelming Arab mass support for the Palestinian Revolution and especially in the face of the heroic resistance of the Palestinian and Jordanian masses in Jordan, U.S. Secretary of Defense Laird, according to *Fateh*, said, "it was a fair assumption that U.S. forces would not intervene in Jordan as long as Hussein's army remains in control of the situation." Thus Laird *revealed* completely that Hussein was merely an appendage of U.S. imperialism, an extension of U.S. imperialism in Arabia. The coordination of the Israeli Air Force with Hussein's army was merely a further extension of U.S. imperialism's vast international military machine to suppress the rising Arab masses.

Yet, in spite of Hussein's comprador (traitor) actions which were so openly supported by U.S. imperialism and its lackey state of Israel, *Nasser* treacherously opposed all efforts by other Arab governments to send volunteers or army troops to the aid of the heroic Palestinian and Jordanian masses. For example, *Time Magazine* [Oct. 12, 1970, p. 29] reports that the Libyan and Algerian governments among others (under the impetus of the aroused Algerian and Libyan people) "wanted to send troops to join the guerrillas against Hussein *until Nasser dissuaded them.*" [our emphasis, SWG] Thus the treachery of Nasser, added to the treachery of Arafat, guaranteed that the Palestinian masses were not only being misled into waging a "defensive" struggle, but that they would be left to wage this struggle *alone*.

What role did the so-called "International Communist Movement" play in mobilizing Arab and international support for the embattled Palestinian and Jordanian masses? The Russian revisionists treated the two sides, Hussein and the Palestinian Revolution, as equally responsible for the massacre! In fact, when the Arab students attempted to occupy the Jordanian embassy in Moscow on Sept. 22, the Moscow police stopped them. (Interestingly, the same thing happened on Sept. 22 in fascist Madrid, Spain!) The Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Albanian Party of Labor announced their "support" on Sept. 23 for the Palestinian Revolution, but failed to expose Nasser and Arafat and thereby supported the "defensism" of the PLO "leadership". Finally, on Sept. 24, a whole week after the outbreak of the bloody battle of Amman, the Chinese revisionists, through a *deputy* foreign minister, omitted any mention of the need for international troops, while they explicitly supported Arafat's treacherous "self-defense" policy. In spite of the tremendous spontaneous support of the masses throughout Arabia, it is no wonder, with the treachery of international revisionism, that the Palestinian and Jordanian masses were on the defensive and really *alone*!

On Sept. 22, to stifle the rising people's protest movement throughout Arabia which threatened to send the aroused Arab masses sweeping across Jordan and into Amman itself, Arafat called on the Arab states to "intervene" *diplomatically!* Arafat committed this perfidy behind a smokescreen of indignation over the "unprecedented bloodbath" committed by Hussein. After Nasser and Arafat, working in collusion, called for the Arab governments to intervene in Jordan *not* on the military but on the diplomatic level, *not* as partisans of the Palestinian cause but as mediators between two (equal!) "plaintiffs", (and even more, after international revisionism made it clear that no international aid would be forthcoming and that the beleaguered, heroic Palestinian and Jordanian masses would have to fight on alone) the massive protests of the Arab people outside of Jordan began to subside,* and the tide of battle in Amman itself began to turn against the people!

However, the effective blockage of international support and especially of "Pan Arab" support by international revisionism, as well as by Nasser and Arafat, did not crush the revolutionary spirit of the Palestinian Revolution. From Sept. 20 on, the Palestinian and Jordanian masses continued their heroic resistance in the face of the Hussein-Israeli onslaught: In north Jordan, the Palestinian revolutionaries were able to keep control of the liberated area, repelling every attempt by Hussein's forces to gain entrance into Irbid, Ramtha, or Jarash. In addition, in Madaba in south Jordan, and in Salt in central Jordan, the Palestinian Revolution thwarted all Hussein's army attacks against the refugee camps and commando positions.

But in Amman, the fighting became more and more brutal as the bestial Israeli-Hussein saturation bombings and napalming of the Palestinian refugee camps (especially the PFLP strongholds) began to take a tremendous toll. On Sept. 26, in Cairo, President Numeiry of the Sudan, the head of the Nasser-dominated "Arab summit", "exposed" Hussein's plan for liquidating the Palestinian people and especially the entire Palestinian population of Amman. Simultaneously, Hussein "disbanded" his "military" government, appointing a civilian to "front" for his bloody fascist regime. Now, according to the Arafat and Fateh dominated PLO "line", there was a full basis for negotiating. While on the 22nd of Sept. Arafat had declared that "twenty thousand casualties stand between us", four days later he signed a treacherous cease-fire with *Hussein, the Butcher of Amman!*

By Sept. 27, after ten days of concentrated slaughter, Hussein, in coordination with the settler state of Israel on the one hand, and in coordination with Nasser and Arafat on the other, had carried out the task which U.S. imperialism had assigned to him: i.e., Hussein had committed *selective mass murder* against the people Nixon had called the "super-radicals".

*One notable non-Arab protest did take place, however, as late as Sept. 26, when the *Indian* people in New Delhi, called out by the All India Students Congress, demonstrated outside both the Jordanian *and* the U.S. embassies in international solidarity with the Palestinian Revolution.

Although the Chinese revisionists, the U.S. New Left and Fateh have tried to pass off the tragic Second Battle of Amman as a victory for the Palestinian Revolution, even a cursory glance at the cease-fire agreement gives the lie to this treacherous position. In fact, the cease-fire agreement itself, is a continuation of the treachery of Hussein, Nasser, and Arafat. One key provision is “respect the sovereignty of the state”, i.e., renounce all future attempts to overthrow Hussein, the Butcher of Amman. Another key provision is that the “supreme follow up committee” to oversee the implementation of all the other provisions will be composed of three people: the prime minister of Tunisia, a member to be appointed specifically by Arafat, the traitor, and a member to be appointed specifically by Hussein, the butcher-traitor. Two other key provisions involve “cessation of all military movements and propaganda campaigns” and the return of “the city of Irbid and other cities ... to the previous military and civilian situation existing before the recent events.”

In fact the main reason for the cease-fire agreement was to facilitate Hussein’s effort to crush the Palestinian Revolution’s liberated area of north Jordan; and indeed, immediately after the cease-fire, Hussein’s army was concentrated against this area. A large section of the Palestinian Revolution has opposed the cease-fire, and as yet, much of north Jordan still remains liberated. It may serve well as a base for revolutionary operations for the overthrow of Hussein and the establishment of a Revolutionary Government of Jordan, which will in turn stand as a powerful base for a successful struggle to destroy the state of Israel and liberate Palestine — the key to Arab liberation.

For all this to happen, however, our Arab proletarian comrades will have to face up to the fact that the Second Battle of Amman resulted in the calculated slaughter of more than 20,000 of the best, most advanced Palestinian and Jordanian people, and with the Arab liberation movement all but decapitated. Full recognition of the grievous defeat suffered by the Arab people (and all the oppressed peoples) in the Second Battle of Amman is the only basis for preventing this battle from becoming the giant beginning of a serious setback for the cause of Arab liberation, the cause of international national liberation, and the cause of world communism.

More than 20,000 of the very best Palestinian people, probably including much of the PFLP, have been murdered. This article is being written to help ensure that their lives have not been lost in vain — the causes of the deaths of these Palestinian men, women and children must be found and the correct lessons drawn so that U.S. imperialism will be prevented from repeating such slaughter ever again, so that the U.S. imperialist policy of selective mass murder of vanguard forces in a national liberation struggle will have to be abandoned, and so that the Arab people can march on to victorious Arab liberation.

* * * * *

WHAT ARE THE LESSONS OF THE TWO BATTLES OF AMMAN?

HUSSEIN: over a long period was called on by the Arab people to help drive out the foreign invader, U.S. imperialism, and the imperialist puppet Israeli white settler army and settler society of occupation. Instead, Hussein and his regime have openly and brutally betrayed the cause of Arab liberation. Formerly the most immediate question in the struggle for Arab liberation was: Where do you stand on Israel? Now the most immediate question for the Arab people is: Will you fight to overthrow Hussein? The former question involved all Arabs, including even Hussein, under an umbrella “unity” which ended up being led by Hussein and the most vacillating Arab leadership, by a leadership unwilling and really incapable of arousing, mobilizing, and leading the Arab *masses* to victory over the white settler state of Israel and its master, U.S. imperialism. While this question was foremost, the Arab proletariat never came to the forefront. Now the Second Battle of Amman has changed the fundamental question. The new question involves the new immediate task of proletarian led anti-feudal peasant revolution in Jordan, to defeat the openly *anti-patriotic* comprador King Hussein and all his supporters while exposing and isolating all bourgeois Arab leaders who co-exist with Hussein in one form or another. Now the Arab proletariat and peasant toilers have been forced by Hussein (and U.S. imperialism) to either back down or destroy him in the process of winning victorious Arab liberation. Now the Arab proletarian vanguard has the opportunity to seize leadership of the *patriotic national* struggle from the Arab compradors and bourgeois lackeys of U.S. imperialism.

Objectively, the choice in Arabia is now clear: either co-exist with Hussein, which means co-exist with the white settler Israeli occupiers in Palestine and continue to suffer under the triple domination of Israeli settlers, Arab reactionaries, and U.S. imperialism, or overthrow Hussein and establish a Revolutionary Government in Jordan which is the first step toward the destruction of the state of Israel and the establishment of a revolutionary *Arab* government in Palestine. *Subjectively*, it is the task of the Arab proletarian Marxist-Leninist party to bring the *truth* to the Arab people, to mobilize them with the truth and win the fight for freedom. Only the Arab proletarian party can compel the other class forces to fight for the *revolution in Jordan* and lead the patriotic Arab people to victory against Zionism and U.S. imperialism. Serious preparation for the rural guerrilla warfare and urban insurrection must begin immediately. This is the only appropriate response to U.S. imperialist puppet Hussein’s massacre of more than 20,000 Palestinian people in the Second Battle of Amman.

NASSER: The day after Nasser helped engineer the treacherous cease-fire, Sept. 28, 1970, he died. Whether or not his death was part of U.S. imperialism’s grand plot or merely a coincidence of nature, it was the perfect day for him to die from the U.S. imperialist standpoint! Nasser’s death and the national mourning which followed provided a safe channel for the anger, frustration, and sadness of the Arab masses

in the aftermath of the slaughter of over 20,000 Arab people; it was used by phony Arab “leaders” to try to block out of the minds of the people the deaths of their brothers and sisters. Nasser’s death could also serve as a basis for new unprincipled “unity” of all Arabs [See SWG material on Dr. Martin Luther King] “over the dead bodies” of over 20,000 Palestinian men, women and children. The Chinese revisionists laid out the opportunist path for the PFLP by publishing a key *Peking Review* article dealing with the “tragic” loss of Nasser while conveniently covering up the really tragic loss of over 20,000 Arab people whose flesh was still fresh!!! How could the PFLP send people to Nasser’s funeral! What a shame! Nasser’s death cannot be allowed to wash away the blood of the thousands of Palestinian martyrs; it must not prevent ruthless struggle even against the deceased Nasser. Genuine revolutionaries never put the interests of one man above those of an entire nation. Indeed any Arab leader or government which follows Nasser’s line on Jordan should be dealt with harshly by “his own” people.

ARAFAT: who acts as if he is the feudal monarch of Palestine, has played a role in Arabia very similar to the traitor role that Chiang Kai-shek played in China in 1927 when he butchered the Chinese communists (especially in Shanghai) his allies against the warlords. In 1970, Arafat set up the PFLP and other vanguardists for slaughter in Amman. In China, the communists waged civil war against Chiang until Japan invaded in the early 1930’s, when the Chinese CP correctly re-established unity with Chiang once again. If the new conditions warrant a drastic change in policy, then unity with Arafat may again become correct. But for the present, Arafat must be exposed and fought. To escape this fate, Arafat, immediately after the massacre, accepted the PFLP back into the fold. The fact that the PFLP accepted is disgraceful and extremely troubling. Today, to co-exist with Arafat is to co-exist with Nasser is to co-exist with Hussein is to co-exist with the settler state of Israel is to co-exist with predatory U. S. imperialism.

HABASH AND THE PFLP (and possibly Hawatmeh and the PDF): The key to victory in the First Battle of Amman was the PFLP-led rejection of Arafat and Fateh. The key to defeat in the Second Battle of Amman was their capitulation to Arafat’s betrayal of the Palestinian masses. All the Arab vanguardists must be *self-critical* concerning the Second Battle of Amman. Any Palestinian leader or organization which fails to begin serious preparation for the overthrow of Hussein and the establishment of a Revolutionary Government of Jordan must be exposed, discredited and discarded on the dungheap of history by the Palestinian masses and all the Arab people under the leadership of a genuine fighting Arab proletarian party. Out of this bitter tragedy for the Arab nation, there must emerge a new revolutionary leadership, (hopefully including the PFLP and PDF) which, while uniting all the classes (except for Arab compradors) even including sections of the Arab national bourgeoisie, will never remain silent in the face of opportunism and will retain proletarian independence and fight for proletarian hegemony in the Arab liberation movement. It is Arab proletarian leadership that will carry the mighty Arab people’s war to victory over U.S. imperialism and Zionism, over

Israeli white settler “citizens” who occupy and over the U.S. imperialist citizen-soldiers who invade — ARAB LAND!

* * * * *

Palestinians and all Arab people: To arms against Hussein — avenge the martyrs! Seize power in Jordan! (so that you can) Drive the Israeli settlers into the sea! (and) Achieve victorious Arab liberation! *Arab proletarians:* Struggle for proletarian leadership in Indo-China, Afro-America and Arabia! Coordinate the Arab liberation struggle with the heroic peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Afro-America! *Proletarians and peasant toilers in all oppressed nations:* Unite with your heroic Arab brothers and sisters! Defeat the common enemy — U.S. imperialism and the “great American people”! *Proletarian revolutionaries of the world:* Destroy the white settler state of Israel, and all lackeys of U.S. imperialism! Destroy U.S. imperialism!

PEOPLE OF SONGMY AND AMMAN, WE SHALL AVENGE YOU!

APPENDIX: REFORMISM AND INDIVIDUAL TERRORISM:

The right opportunist, reformist essence of “left” opportunist “individual terrorism” is nowhere better illustrated than in the following excerpts from an interview with George Habash [*Life*, 6/12/70]. “We believe that to kill a Jew far from the battleground has more of an effect than killing 100 of them in battle; it attracts more attention ... You have to be constantly reminded of our existence.” [shades of “world public opinion”!] “Imperialism is too powerful and Israel is too strong ... Brute force is out: this is a thinking man’s game.” [capitulationism and elitism] “To harass, to upset, to work on the nerves ... The only way to destroy them is to give a little blow here, a little blow there; to advance step by step, inch by inch, for years,

EXCERPT FROM LETTER “TO THE COMRADES
OF THE LEAGUE FOR PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION”*

**On the 1976 War In Lebanon
and the Role of the Chinese Revisionist
Theory of Three Worlds**

July 31, 1978

Let us then examine the dogma of the theory of the “three worlds” with the Leninist method, i.e. “in the crucible of the revolutionary struggle of the masses, in the crucible of living practice.” (*Foundations of Leninism*, J.V. Stalin)

A) The Revolution in Lebanon

Comrades, we all know how strategically important the Middle East is both for the revolution and for the imperialists. At stake is the liberation of millions of toilers from imperialist and feudal oppression, and at the heart of the struggle is the liberating of the land of Palestine from the settler state of Israel. To the imperialists, at stake is the continued exploitation and plunder of the labor power of millions of toilers and the wealth of the region (primarily oil). In other words billions upon billions of dollars of super-profits. This is why it is no accident that among the top arm sales of the U.S. imperialists are Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Israel. This is why it is no accident that the Green Berets are now trained in desert warfare. And this is why it is no accident that U.S. imperialism has not only propped up the state of Israel but also the Arab states where the comprador or reactionary bourgeoisie and/or feudal forces are in power (Witness the recent arms sales to Israel, Saudi Arabia and Egypt.)

In Spring of 1976 a mighty revolution was on the verge of victory in Lebanon. On the side of the revolution - an alliance of the Lebanese Muslim toilers and the Palestinians, similar to the alliance six years earlier between the Palestinians and Jordanian masses before the revolution was crushed in Jordan. On the side of imperialism, the Lebanese Maronite Christian rightists, fighting to eliminate

*This letter was “inspired by the new opportunities for the struggle against revisionism sparked by the heroic Party of Labor of Albania”. It was prepared and circulated by a support group of *Ray O. Light* in New England.

the Palestinian presence in Lebanon and protect their privileged existence as the representatives of U.S. imperialism's "Wall Street" in the Middle East. The immediate demand of the revolution was for majority rule for the Lebanese Muslims - a democratic revolutionary demand. This revolutionary demand came right up against U.S. imperialism because 1) Lebanon was the banking center of the Middle East therefore part of their plans of domination and 2) and more importantly because a successful revolution in Lebanon would give a powerful revolutionary base area for the Palestinian freedom fighters to operate from in the freeing of their homeland. The revolution in Lebanon was a direct threat to the settler state of Israel. The imminent revolutionary victory in Lebanon was also a threat to the reactionary bourgeois regimes in the Arab world and their desire to strike deals with Israel and U.S. imperialism be it for land in the Golan Heights or the Sinai, because undoubtedly a revolutionary Lebanon would inspire other Arab toilers to rise up against their own oppressors, and to demand action against the settler state of Israel.

But the revolution was not victorious. U.S. imperialism recruited Syria to do its dirty work and Assad took his place in history with the ilk of King Hussein, the paid CIA butcher of Amman. After the 1973 war Syria's economy became more and more linked with the West through massive economic aid from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. In 1975 and the first six months of 1976 aid from the United States totaled \$200 million. In the beginning of 1976 the economic aid that Syria had become dependent on from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait all but dried up. The imperialists were demanding their payoff — the taming of the revolution in Lebanon.

By January 1976 Syria had clearly intervened in Lebanon on the side of the Right and against the National Lebanese and Palestinian revolutions. They already had a military presence in Lebanon often actively used against the revolution and especially against the vanguard of the Palestinian struggle, the PFLP. Syria cut off all arms to the revolution. And the Syrian regime exerted political pressures by supporting the Christian Right's choice for president rather than the Lebanese Muslim candidate. Yet none of these actions were enough to stem the tide of revolution and when it was clear that the revolution was on the verge of victory, Syria launched a full scale invasion to crush the Lebanese and Palestinian revolutions! What a tragedy — Syria, "the friend of the Palestinian people", fighting side by side with the Lebanese Right which was openly armed by the settler state of Israel, to smash the Lebanese and Palestinian revolutions. From the Bekaa valley to the cities of Beirut, Tyre, and Tripoli, to the refugee camp of Tal az Zaatar, the resistance was heroic as the revolution battled their "new" oppressors. Syria openly invaded Lebanon on June 1st, and it wasn't until five months and 22,000 troops later that the invasion force was able to take Beirut from the revolutionaries. In the end, despite the heroic resistance, the revolution in Lebanon was temporarily crushed.

The U.S. imperialists were elated by Syria's pro-imperialist role in helping to crush the revolution in Lebanon, reflected in articles in the bourgeois press such

as “One Invasion That The U.S. Approves” (*U.S. News & World Report*, June 14, ‘76). Even before the full scale invasion by Syria, Prime Minister Rabin of Israel was gloating that: “Syria is at present in a state of war with Al Fatah and I don’t regret that during the past week its expeditionary forces in Lebanon have killed more Fatah men than the Israeli army had in the past two years”. (*Boston Globe*, May 13, ‘76, p. 17) The U.S. imperialists reacted concretely to their anti-Palestinian and anti-revolutionary friend with \$80 million more of economic aid to Syria in July, and in August, an agreement was initialed in Damascus guaranteeing U.S. private investment in Syria. Saudi Arabia, while previously holding up aid to Syria, resumed aid in August 1976 including a \$75 million long term loan.* This was all payment for a job well done, i.e. the brutal crushing of the revolution in Lebanon.

So what was the role of the CPC in the revolution in Lebanon? How did the theorists of the “three worlds” react to the crushing of the Lebanese and Palestinian revolutions, in a front line state with the settler state of Israel? What was their role in this key situation that had the potential of inspiring revolutions against the other Arab comprador and reactionary leaders and the potential of leading directly to the liberation of Palestine which is at the heart of revolution in the Middle East? (Already in the spring of 1976 the revolution in Lebanon led to large revolutionary stirrings on the West Bank against the Israeli occupation and its brutality, unfair taxation, etc.)

In an article from *Peking Review* No. 27, July 2, 1976 we find our answer. The article entitled “Riyadh Conference-Strengthening Arab Solidarity” supports, in a full page article, a conference between the heads of state of Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait. It is not the PFLP or other genuine representatives of the toiling peoples of Arabia and Palestine but these four heads of state all linked directly to U.S. imperialism that are upheld as the champions of Arab Unity! And this conference was held just weeks after Syria’s full scale invasion into Lebanon!

The CPC in this article puts forth the following view on the situation in Lebanon. “It is only natural that there are different views on and approaches to certain problems and events among Arab countries because of their different circumstances. But there is no fundamental conflict of interests among the countries of the third world to which all Arab states belong.” (page 18)

Comrades, how vulgar and counter-revolutionary can we get! There are no fundamental differences between Syria crushing a revolution on behalf of U.S. imperialism and the Lebanese masses and Palestinians fighting for majority rule and the freedom of their land from imperialist oppression?! All in the name of the “unity of the third world” and the “non-aligned” and against the “scheming of the Soviet Union”, we get the national bourgeois line of the theory of the “three worlds” - translated as *the liquidation of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism*.

*This and previous figures from MERIP Reports, No. 51, page 9.

Does not the CPC position on the Lebanese revolution do just what the comrades from LPR claim to oppose; “raises the contradictions between the third world and the superpowers to an absolute and liquidates class distinctions and class struggle within the third world countries ...”? As the Albanian comrades said in the *Theory and Practice of Revolution*, “... another thing that strikes the eye in this division of the world, is its non-class view of what is called the ‘third world’, its ignoring of classes and class struggle, its treatment of countries which this theory includes in this world, the regimes which dominate there and various political forces which operate within it as a single entity. *It ignores the contradiction between the oppressed peoples and the reactionary and pro-imperialist forces of their own countries.*” (our emphasis)

And subsequent events in the Middle East only further expose the bankruptcy of the theory of the “three worlds” and substantiates the position of the Albanian comrades.

With the election of the open settler and terrorist Begin to head the settler state of Israel, the opportunities to expose Arab misleadership became greater. (At this time almost every Arab leader, and all of the frontline states with Israel, to one degree or another were willing to deal with the settler state of Israel.) The U.S. imperialists had “an ace in the hole” to deal with this new situation, and that was none other than Sadat, one of the “champions of Arab Unity” at the Riyadh conference! Sadat for his “peace plan” was not only rewarded with the sale of F-5 fighter jets but with *Time Magazine’s* “Man of the Year”! And Sadat’s peace plan, translated as continued imperialist domination of the Middle East, “solves” the Palestinian homeland question by creating a Palestinian homeland on the West Bank of Jordan, under the auspices of King Hussein, the Butcher of Amman! In this same period the present Chinese leadership praised Hussein, the known paid CIA agent, as a champion of “national sovereignty” etc.! And this spring, when the Israeli settler state launched a massive invasion into southern Lebanon to crush the resurgence of the Palestinian liberation movement, the Palestinian revolution had been so isolated that this act of imperialist aggression was only met with a whimper of protest from the Arab world. Where was the unity of the Arabs *against* imperialist aggression when it was needed?

Unity with the reactionary and comprador regimes in the Middle East, those of King Hussein, Sadat, Assad, etc. in the name of “nonalignment” and the struggle against “superpower hegemonism”, and the disarming of the Palestinian and Lebanese masses in the face of brutal imperialist aggression: Added all up - the liquidation of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Such are the fruits of the national bourgeois line of the theory of the “three worlds”.

RAY O. LIGHT NEWSLETTER No. 12

The Israeli Settler Military Occupation of Lebanon: Victory or Defeat for the Palestinian People?

September 1982

“For the proletariat needs the truth and there is nothing so harmful to its cause as plausible, respectable petty-bourgeois lies.” (*V.I. Lenin*)

* * * * *

INTRODUCTORY UPDATE: Note on the Beirut Massacre

The “Beirut Massacre” is not being raised primarily by the Palestinian Liberation Movement at this time. It is a revelation being pushed by U.S. imperialism to force its Israeli settler ally to get in line with U.S. imperialism’s plans and goals for Lebanon and the Middle East and to bury the fact that U.S. imperialism set up this massacre with its Habib Plan for the evacuation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) defenders of West Beirut. The “Beirut Massacre” publicity is aimed at forcing the Begin-Sharon bloody Israeli settler leadership to allow U.S. imperialism to prop up a Lebanese Christian and Phalangist government in Lebanon which is loyal to U.S. imperialism but has some “independence” of the Israeli settler regime. It is aimed at forcing the Begin regime to allow U.S. imperialism to prop up the treacherous leadership of Yasir Arafat and the CIA riddled Arab reactionary regimes which should have been totally discredited by now based on their consistent record of betrayal of the cause of Palestinian and Arab liberation and consistent service to U.S. imperialism.

And if the Begin-Sharon leadership does not give up its annexationist designs on Lebanon, then U.S. imperialism will use the Beirut Massacre issue to replace the Begin regime with an Israeli “Labor Party” regime headed by Shimon Peres which will do U.S. imperialism’s bidding as a lackey pillar of U.S. imperialism’s two pillar strategy for domination of the Middle East.

At the same time, the protests by masses of Palestinians on the West Bank, the one hour general strike of Italian workers and other mass protests of the Beirut Massacre have a decidedly positive side and this aspect of the Beirut Massacre issue ought to be deepened while educating the masses on the far more massive massacre which the Israeli military machine perpetrated last June on the Palestinian and Lebanese Moslem masses with the open Israeli invasion and occupation of Lebanon. That massacre, however, had the blessings of the Reagan Administration and U.S. imperialism. It was in line with the Rockefeller-U.S. imperialist plan for increased U.S. domination of the Middle East and control of its vast oil supply. Consequently, that much larger massacre was buried by U.S. imperialism. And the media control of U.S. imperialism is so strong internationally that a virtual silence greeted that massive, totally illegal Israeli military invasion of Lebanon last June.

Protests of the Beirut Massacre of September 1982 should in no way divert the peoples' attention from the much more massive Israeli massacre in Lebanon which began with the invasion in June and continued throughout the summer. On the contrary, protests of the Beirut Massacre should be utilized to spark our movement to deal with the tragic setback to Palestinian and Arab liberation which has occurred in Lebanon over the past four months.

* * * * *

From Leonid Brezhnev who cabled Yasir Arafat hailing a victory through which “the international positions of the PLO have grown considerably stronger,” to the allegedly “Marxist-Leninist” “independent” *Guardian* newspaper in the USA which echoed Brezhnev’s position, to the Fez, Morocco Arab League Summit where Arafat was hailed as a hero by the Arab heads of state and pictured side by side with Saudi Arabia’s King Fahd both making the V for Victory sign, all of these self-proclaimed “friends of the Palestinian people” are pushing the line that the Israeli invasion of Lebanon has resulted in a Victory for the Palestinian people.

Arafat himself has stated that,

“We are the smallest military force in the Arab world. But we fought and stood fast against the mighty Israeli war machine longer than any Arab nation did in previous Middle East wars. *This is a Palestinian victory.*” (AP, 8/17/82, Our Emphasis.)

But Arafat, Brezhnev and the other petty-bourgeois, bourgeois, and bourgeois-feudal and comprador forces listed above are not the only forces pushing the line that the cause of Palestine liberation has won a victory in Lebanon – U.S. imperialism and its mass media have projected and puffed up Arafat’s alleged

“diplomatic achievements” far and wide during these first few weeks of September following his removal from West Beirut.

And indeed Arafat has not only been praised by Brezhnev and the Arab Summit Meeting, but he was the guest of honor of Italian imperialist President Pertini, was welcomed to Greece with full military honors, and has already been invited to meet with French imperialist President Mitterand. Even more dramatically, Arafat has been “blessed” by a private meeting with Pope John Paul II, one of the chief pillars of world capitalism, headed by U.S. imperialism.

Do all these “diplomatic achievements” of Arafat over the past few weeks constitute a victory for the cause of Palestinian Liberation? Or are they a massive well orchestrated cover-up of a devastating defeat suffered by the Palestinian people at the hands of the U.S. imperialist backed bloody settler state of Israel and an effort to prop up the treacherous misleadership of the Arafat ilk which led the Palestinian (and Lebanese Moslem) masses to slaughter?

— The Israeli Invasion and Occupation of Lebanon —

On June 6th the settler state of Israel, backed by the might of U.S. imperialism, launched a massive and brutal invasion of Lebanon, a sovereign Arab state. Leaving death and destruction in their wake, the Israeli settler army, close to 100,000 strong, marched all the way to Beirut, while 7,000 United Nations (UN) “Peacekeepers” stood by. The Israeli settlers crushed the Palestinian strongholds of Tyre, Sidon and Damur before laying siege to West Beirut, the center of the Lebanese National Movement and the Palestinian national liberation movement.

By June 20th the invasion had left in its wake 15,000 dead, 60,000 wounded and 750,000 people left homeless. (*L.A. Times*, 6/20/82). These figures only represent the first two weeks of the war. They do not include the death and wounded toll of West Beirut, nor the toll after disease and famine had set in. Tens of thousands more lie beneath the rubble of destroyed Lebanese cities. International relief agencies have estimated that 90% of the killed and wounded are non-combatants, 60% of them women and children. Doctors reported that 30%-50% of the wounded were dying, double the expected rate in wartime. This was due to the widespread use of anti-personnel weapons, such as cluster and phosphorous bombs being dropped on heavily populated civilian neighborhoods by the Israeli settler war machine.

Particular savagery of the Israeli invasion and occupation was reserved for the Palestinian refugee camps. The Ain Ah Hihwih camp of 80,000 residents outside of Sidon was completely destroyed in a fierce six day battle. All fourteen UN registered refugee camps in southern Lebanon (mostly built in 1948 when the Zionists drove the Palestinians from their homeland) were completely destroyed and the Palestinians made refugees once again by the expansionist terror of the Israeli settler army. Those camps that were not completely destroyed in battle were

leveled to the ground by bulldozers after the Israeli settler army occupied them. As the murderous invasion continued to bloody the Lebanese and Palestinian people and increase the dead and wounded, the Israeli settlers bombed the hospitals and arrested many doctors. The refugee camps around Beirut were attacked with the most intense shelling and bombing throughout the siege of that city. Food, water and electricity were cut off by the Israeli settler army.

Lebanon is where the Palestinian national liberation movement existed in its most organized form, politically and militarily. It was accurately referred to as “a state within a state”. This was the last country where a powerful movement for land and freedom existed on the borders of their homeland — Palestine.* The other border states, Egypt, Jordan and Syria, all have bans on Palestinian military activity.

The Palestinian guerrillas in West Beirut were expelled from Lebanon at the point of Israeli guns. The guerrillas were dispersed to ten different countries, all of whose present governments (with the exception of the Peoples Democratic Republic of Yemen) are hostile to the cause of Palestinian national liberation. For those who survived the U.S. Marine “escort” out of Lebanon, 3,000 or more out of 10,000 PLO guerrillas are being sent to Syria. How are these Palestinian revolutionaries going to be treated in Syria, sworn enemy of the Palestinian cause? An indication is revealed in *Newsweek* (9/6/82) which states,

“The guerillas who arrived by ship to Syria were hustled onto 30 waiting buses and packed off to a bleak Palestinian camp at Dumayr, 45 miles north of Damascus. The facility is next to a Syrian Air Force base and is closely watched from guard towers—less a home then a prison camp.”

What is awaiting the PLO guerrillas sent to Jordan and into the clutches of the publically exposed paid agent of the U.S. CIA, King Hussein, who crushed the Palestinian movement in 1970, drove them from Jordan and murdered 20,000 Palestinian and Jordanian patriots in the process?

A reported 10,000 prisoners have been rounded up and sent to Israeli prison camps (concentration camps). Reliable eyewitnesses have told of brutal beatings of prisoners, some beaten to death. Israel has refused the prisoners POW status —no one knows who has been taken, how many, or what will happen to them. Under Israel’s emergency power their incarceration can be renewed every three months without a trial, indefinitely.

*This is also where the Palestinians and their Lebanese brothers and sisters of the Lebanese Patriotic Movement formed a powerful alliance that almost achieved victory in 1976, which would have provided a revolutionary base of liberated territory from which to wage the struggle for the liberation of Palestine. Only with the intervention of U.S. imperialism’s hatchet man Assad of Syria were U.S. imperialism and Israel able to avoid defeat.

Both militarily and politically the Palestinian national liberation struggle, Lebanese national liberation and Arab liberation have suffered a great defeat with the driving out of Lebanon of the PLO, the imprisonment of more than 10,000 liberation fighters in Israeli settler jails, and the occupation of Lebanon by more than 100,000 Israeli troops who now control more than 50% of the territory of Lebanon.

As part of the same process of disintegration and defeat for the Palestinian and Lebanese Moslem Liberation movements, in late August in a sham election, Bashir Gemayel, representing the Phalangist wing of the Maronite Christians, was “elected” as the new president of Lebanon while the country was occupied by Israeli troops.* (Following Bashir Gemayel’s assassination this month, another sham election was just held in which his brother Amin Gemayel emerged overwhelmingly victorious, representing as he does the strategic interests of U.S. imperialism in the region. The Phalange Party was founded by and is still headed by their father, Pierre Gemayel, who founded the party on Italian and German fascist lines in 1936.)

The settler state of Israel and U.S. imperialism both hailed the “election” of Bashir Gemayel. For Gemayel was the right-wing military commander of the Phalangist Militia, the largest Christian Militia. The Christian Militias (now called the “Lebanese Forces”) are financially well off, receive sizable amounts of money from the reactionary Arab regimes of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia as well as \$1 billion - \$3 billion a year from control of Lebanon’s hashish trade. Bashir Gemayel forged the direct military link with Israel in 1975 and 1976 when he sent hundreds of his officers for training to Israel. He has visited Israel several times. In 1980 alone Israel (financially backed by U.S. imperialism) supplied arms shipments of more than \$100 million to Gemayel and his forces.

To help insure that the Phalangists (and Israeli puppet forces) can actually wield their power, the Israelis have been turning over the authority in the occupied territory of Lebanon to the private, feudal Christian Militias rather than to the Lebanese Army. Many former Moslem and Palestinian strongholds are now being patrolled by forces led by Haddad (the Lebanese warlord who is in the direct pay

*The leading families of the Maronite Christians became extremely wealthy acting as middlemen between Europe and the Middle East during the early part of this century and they established, with the aid of Western imperialism (first French, then U.S.), a huge banking and prosperous service economy centered in Beirut. Beirut became known as the “Wall Street of the Middle East”. In 1958, U.S. Marines landed in Lebanon in defense of the Maronite Christian regime of Chamoun, keeping them in power by putting down a populist movement. “The system that gave the Presidency and the command of the army to the Maronites became a symbol of injustice to the have-nots and the leftists, both consisting largely of Moslem city dwellers.” (*N.Y. Times*, 7/9/82)

of Israel). In this way, the private right-wing Christian Militias will remain more powerful and have more control than the Lebanese Army itself! And on this basis, the Israeli army can remain the predominant military force in Lebanon.

With the driving of the PLO out of Lebanon and the driving of the Palestinian masses out of their homes, the Israeli army has set up the Palestinian masses for slaughter at the hands of the right-wing Maronite Christian forces.

The PLO apparatus (“the state within a state”) not only provided an educational system, medical services, etc., but also provided necessary military protection from the chauvinist Maronite militias who are known for their brutality against the Palestinian and Lebanese Moslem populations.* Bashir Gemayel, who led the Maronite forces in the civil war of 1975-76, personally led in a slaughter of 3,500 Lebanese Moslems in one day, still remembered as “Black Saturday”. Now the Phalange Party headed by the Gemayels, calls for the expulsion of all Palestinians from Lebanon: “Pierre Gemayel was quoted today by the Israeli radio as advocating the expulsion from Lebanon of all the Palestinians.” (*N.Y. Times*, 7/9/82)

Since we first penned these words this bestial policy has been put into effect. Using the pretext of the assassination of Bashir Gemayel, the Israeli settler army in violation of its agreement with U.S. imperialist envoy Habib, stormed into West Beirut and systematically disarmed the last protectors of the Palestinian and Lebanese Moslem communities there.

Next the Israeli settlers brought in their most bloodthirsty Lebanese Christian henchmen including Haddad, the Israeli backed feudal lord of Southern Lebanon, to systematically terrorize and exterminate the Palestinian population in a massacre of Sept. 17-19, known as the Beirut Massacre. At this writing already 1500 unarmed men, women and children are known to have been murdered.

It is clear from the above facts that at the expense of the freedom-loving Palestinian people and their Lebanese brothers and sisters, the settler state of Israel and world imperialism, headed by U.S. imperialism, were greatly strengthened by the Israeli invasion and occupation of Lebanon.

* * * * *

When the tragic loss of Palestinian life and power in Lebanon (and the simultaneous Israeli crackdown in the West Bank and Gaza) is stacked up against Arafat’s “diplomatic achievements” of the past few weeks, it becomes clear that these

*Said Akl, a well known Lebanese Christian poet and the leader of the Maronite armed faction known as the Guards of the Cedars said, “ ‘There is a place for the Palestinians, not on our soil, but under our soil ... I kill him because I have to live’ He said he had killed Palestinians as chief of the Guards of the Cedars, ‘and I will kill others until none are left.’ ” (*N.Y. Times*, 7/10/82)

alleged “international gains” by Arafat are actually a massive, well-orchestrated coverup of a devastating defeat suffered by the Palestinian people and an effort to prop up the treacherous misleadership of the Arafat ilk which led the Palestinians (and Lebanese Moslem) masses to slaughter.

The deafening silence of the so-called socialist camp, the Arab regimes, and almost all the rest of the “progressive forces of world opinion” during the openly illegal and outlaw invasion of Lebanon by the murderous Israeli settler army exposes the *real* international *losses* rather than *gains* for the cause of Palestinian Liberation.

Brezhnev’s cablegram to Arafat alleging that “the international positions of the PLO have grown considerably stronger” is exposed for the big lie that it is by the one initiative taken by the Soviet revisionists at the time of the Israeli military invasion of Lebanon. As pointed out by *Newsweek* (6/28/82):

“The Kremlin broke its diplomatic silence with Israel last week for the first time since it severed ties fifteen years ago. The message, although prompted by Israel’s invasion of Lebanon, had nothing to do with the Soviet Union’s beleaguered allies, Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organization. In a dispatch forwarded by the Finnish Embassy, Moscow demanded only that Israel avoid shelling its embassy in Beirut. Prime Minister Menachem Begin replied personally, assuring the Soviets that they had nothing to fear and explaining Israel’s grievance against the PLO.”

— **The Role of U.S. Imperialism:
“Peacemaker” or Profit-Hungry Warmonger?** —

* * * * *

“The loss of freedom of access to Middle Eastern oil could endanger, for at least one more generation, the economic prosperity and political stability of the Trilateral regions. So it has long been the policy of the Trilateral regions to protect and maintain this freedom of access to Middle Eastern oil ...”
 (“The Middle East and the Trilateral Countries.” [*Rockefeller led*]
Trilateral Commission)

* * * * *

Since last June, when Israel invaded Lebanon, U.S. imperialism has cultivated its image far and wide as the key “peacemaker” in Lebanon.

It is instructive to remember that when the U.S. marines landed in Lebanon in 1958, they were greeted by the armed liberation movement of the patriotic

Lebanese masses. The U.S. marines' first entrance in 1982 as an integral part of the Habib-U.S. imperialist plan for the evacuation of the PLO was as "liberators" of the PLO and protectors of the 1/2 million Palestinians left behind. By aiding the departure of West Beirut's armed PLO defenders, the U.S. marines paved the way for the Israeli settlers to pull off the Beirut massacre.

Now the Reagan Administration with the agreement of the bloody Begin regime in Israel has decided to send into Lebanon the U.S. marines *on an active war footing*, allegedly to stop the Israel-sponsored bloodshed against the Palestinian and Lebanese Moslem masses! In 1982, there has been no mass Lebanese resistance to the occupation of their territory by the U.S. marines!

Yet U.S. imperialism is the proven international hangman of revolutions, including the Palestinian and Arab revolution. In fact, when we look behind the current U.S. imperialist cover of "savior" of the Palestinian people, we find that one of the two main pillars of U.S. imperialist domination in the Middle East continues to be the settler state of Israel.

An article entitled "Uncle Sam Keeps the Wolf From Israel's Door" from the *Christian Science Monitor* speaks loud and clear to the relationship of the settler state of Israel to the U.S.:

"A fragile and quite indispensable economic lifeline connects Tel Aviv to Washington providing at no cash cost the weapons Israel could not buy elsewhere in the world, even if it were able to pay. ... U.S. public aid over the last three years averaged \$3 billion annually, and the 1982 expenditure may once again rise - a rare counterexample to the slashed budgets of the administration's domestic programs: Almost half of U.S. official aid consists of grants or instantaneously forgiven loans. The remainder is added to Israel's rapidly escalating foreign debt which now approaches \$20 billion, equivalent to the unprecedented level of (almost) \$5,000 per capita.

"As a consequence of Israel's worsening economic malaise since 1973, it can service this debt only in the formal sense that installments are paid when due but are in fact funded through new U.S. aid each year.

"Further assistance outside the formal foreign aid structure is the extensive and sustained support for Israeli universities and research institutions that is funded by the Dept. of Education, the National Institute of Health, and other U.S. agencies in the form of grants and contracts. These reportedly aggregate almost \$100 million per year.

"The final tier of economic assistance involves the special concessions in Israel exports to the U.S. ... 96% of its \$1 billion

exports to the U.S. enter free of any tariffs". (*Christian Science Monitor*, Dec. 29, 1981)

And from the *Washington Post*,

"With the exception of some French aircraft and British tanks, almost all the equipment in the Israeli armed forces has been obtained under the U.S. government's foreign military sales program, from which *Israel has received \$15 billion of the \$28 billion distributed worldwide since 1951.*" (*Washington Post*, July 21, 1982, our emphasis)

From the above it is clear that without this kind of massive backing by U.S. imperialism, Israel would not have been in the position to carry out the massive military invasion and occupation of Lebanon.

And what was the relationship of U.S. imperialism to the invasion itself? The imperialist media projects the view that the U.S. government was opposed to the invasion, were caught by surprise by it, and anguished over its brutality. The facts tell a different story.

1) "Probing the limits to which it was safe to go without losing American support, it [Israel] has ventured further and further into the realm of open confrontation with the Arabs. And it has been reassured every time that, at worst, after bombing the Iraqi nuclear reactor or shooting a dozen teenagers on the West Bank or annexing the Golan Heights, the Americans might delay the next shipment of F-16 fighter bombers for a couple of weeks Encouraged, Mr. Begin and his colleagues have gradually raised their sights". (*Manchester Guardian*, June 28, 1982)

2) There was full knowledge on the part of U.S. imperialism that a full scale invasion of Lebanon by Israel was imminent. For example, *Time Magazine* reported in *February* that,

"For months diplomats and military experts around the world have been expecting land and air strikes by Israeli forces against Palestine Liberation strongholds in southern Lebanon. That assault was narrowly averted last week, though perhaps not for long."

The article continued,

"Sharon has been pressing for just such an attack for several weeks. In mid-January, he met with Bashir Gemayel, commander of the Christian Phalange forces in Lebanon, aboard an Israeli gunboat off Jounieh, a port city north of Beirut. The main subject: coordination of efforts between Israelis and Phalangists, in the event of an invasion that would bring Israeli

forces as far north as the edge of Beirut International Airport.”
(*Time*, 2/15/82)

“On February 25th Israel’s new ambassador to the U.S., Moshe Arens stated to reporters in Washington that an Israeli invasion of Lebanon in response to ‘some provocative action by the PLO was increasingly likely. ‘I would almost say it is a matter of time’ he said”* (*Christian Science Monitor*, 7/8/82)

3) “American military aid has jumped sharply in the last few years after being frozen at \$1 billion a year between 1977 and 1980. The new equipment has helped Israel increase its military dominance in the region.” (*Washington Post*, 7/21/82). Furthermore, according to the *Guardian*, “... in the first quarter of 1982 Israel received more than a 40% increase in military hardware over the first quarter in 1981.” Most of the material involved was used extensively in the Israeli invasion.

And since the invasion itself:

4) The U.S. vetoed a UN Security Council resolution condemning the Israeli invasion.

5) The U.S. did not even support a mealy-mouthed mild resolution in the UN calling upon Israel to allow food, water and medical supplies into West Beirut. So much for U.S. imperialism’s “anguish” over the destruction and devastation in Lebanon.

6) “Except for the delay announced by the White House Monday in a shipment of cluster munitions shells while their use by Israeli forces in Lebanon is reviewed, Pentagon and Israeli officials have reported no interruption in the flow of U.S. spare parts, or follow-on support, since the invasion of Lebanon ‘we are conducting business as usual, following national policy’ said a Pentagon official. A formal U.S. letter offering to provide an additional eleven F-15 fighter bombers is being ‘processed routinely’, he said. A total of \$1.5 billion worth of aircraft, self-propelled howitzers and armored personnel carriers is still in the pipeline.” (*Washington Post*, 7/21/82)

*Since the time of a U.S. arranged “truce” in July 1981 between the Palestinians and Israel, not a single Israeli had been killed in northern Israel, and since that time ’til May 9, 1982, not a single PLO rocket had been fired into Israel, according to the UN observers. Yet, “according to the United Nations, from August 1981 to May of this year there were 2,124 Israeli violations of Lebanese airspace and 652 violations of the country’s territorial waters, aside from the several full-scale military incursions, raids and bombings” (*L.A. Times*, 6/20/80) So much for the lies that accompanied the launching of the brutal Israeli invasion demagogically called “peace for Galilee”.

7) The U.S. government has constantly upheld throughout the invasion that it agreed with the goals of the Israelis in expelling the PLO from Lebanon and establishing a “new” “stable” political order.

* * * * *

From the above it is clear that the U.S. imperialists gave the “green light” to the Israelis for the invasion of Lebanon and backed them up militarily and economically as the settler state of Israel carried out its murderous crimes against the Palestinian and Lebanese Moslem people. U.S. imperialism is the chief sponsor of these crimes and the chief beneficiary of the spoils.

It is no wonder, Henry Kissinger, that criminal Rockefeller spokesman of U.S. imperialism, stated in the *Washington Post* June 16th,

“In this particular case [the Israeli invasion in Lebanon], the results were congruent with the interest of the peace process in the Middle East, of all moderate governments in the area and of the United States The fighting in Lebanon ... opens up extraordinary opportunities for a dynamic American diplomacy throughout the Middle East.” (6/16/82)

But does this mean that the interests of U.S. imperialism are *identical* with those of the Israeli settler state? No, they are not.

— Differences Between U.S. Imperialism & the Settler State of Israel —

While Begin’s military invasion of Lebanon in June almost certainly had the blessing of U.S. imperialism, the Israeli military move into West Beirut on the heels of the assassination of Bashir Gemayel in September and the subsequent Beirut Massacre quite clearly did *not*.

For U.S. imperialism had been spectacularly successful both in prettifying the murderous Israeli settler aggression in Lebanon with several months of widely publicized negotiations for the evacuation of the PLO from Beirut (a “humanitarian” gesture by the Israelis), and especially in establishing Israel’s U.S. sponsor as the “peacemaker” in Lebanon. U.S. imperialism had been successful in installing Bashir Gemayel, the most powerful Phalangist leader whose allegiance to U.S. imperialism was virtually complete. At his first Press Conference Bashir said,

“We want a democratic country; we want a Lebanon friendly to the U.S.; we want to help you protect your interests in the area.”
(*Guardian*, 9/1/82)

For Bashir Gemayel was supported both by Israel and the reactionary Arab sheikdoms, precisely by both of the *two* pillars of U.S. imperialism in the Middle

East. But this also meant that Bashir's allegiance to Israel was *not* total. And it is quite likely that his Israeli allies assassinated him when he refused to sign an immediate treaty with Israel and called instead for the removal of Israeli troops from Lebanon (as U.S. imperialism, through President Reagan, was also doing).

For the settler state of Israel, "possession is more than 9/10's of the law". And dazzled and blood-crazed by their own murderous victory in Lebanon, the Israeli settlers were determined that their occupation of Lebanon would yield either all or at least much of Lebanon as new Israeli territory.*

The Beirut Massacre sponsored by the Israeli settler regime and opposed by U.S. imperialism has turned the evacuation of the PLO from Beirut from a

*After every major war with the Arab countries, the Israelis have added to their booty. This time will be no different. Yuval Ne'eman, Minister of Science and Technology, stated, "Israel thus now has an excellent opportunity to establish a new order in Lebanon. ... the Litani River could be exploited by both nations as Israel proposed in the 1953 Cotton Plan It is perhaps also possible that Israel could integrate the strip south of the Litani." (*Jerusalem Post*, 6/24/1982) This plan goes back to the very foundation of Israeli settler state existence. In 1948 Ben Gurion wrote in his diary that the Lebanese Government should be overthrown: "A Christian state ought to be set up there with its southern frontier on the Litani". (Quoted from the *Manchester Weekly Guardian*, 6/27/1982)

"According to (former Foreign Minister) Sharret, Moshe Dayan devised a way to implement Ben Gurion's plan. Sharret recorded in his diary in 1955 that Dayan told him, 'The only thing that's necessary is to find a Lebanese officer, even a major will do. We will win his heart or buy him with money to get him to agree to declare himself the savior of the Maronite population (Then) the Israeli army will enter Lebanon, occupy the necessary territory and create a Christian regime that will ally itself with Israel. The territory of the Litani southward will be totally annexed to Israel.'" (*The Nation*, June 19, 1982)

Furthermore, as the *Christian Science Monitor* has pointed out: The expansionist policies of Israel are connected with their water needs; The West Bank supplies 20% of Israel's water for irrigation and consumption; Israel has launched military attacks to be able to continue to steal Arab water - the Khalad Dam in Jordan was destroyed and Israel blew up the Ghor Canal, the sole irrigation artery to the East Bank of the Jordan Valley; A dam Lebanon planned to build on the Litani River in 1970 for use in the Bekaa Valley was sabotaged by Israel and U.S. imperialism and their control over the international financial institutions; Israel is running short of water; the Litani River looms larger in the picture capable of increasing Israel's water availability between 25-45%. ("Israel's Water Needs May Erode Path to Peace in Region", 1/20/82)

It is striking how accurately these aggressive plans have been carried out in 1982 by the terrorist Begin with the invasion of Lebanon, the subsequent election of the Maronite pro-Israeli rightwinger Gemayel and the occupation of Southern Lebanon by 100,000 Israeli troops.

“humanitarian” gesture by the Israeli settlers and U.S. imperialism into its opposite - into a cynical, imperialist-settler set-up for the massacre and terrorist suppression of the 1/2 million Palestinian refugees remaining in Lebanon. And all U.S. imperialism’s maneuvering and manipulation of the Soviet revisionists, the Arab reactionary regimes, world public opinion, etc. which had led to virtual international silence in the face of the June Israeli military invasion and occupation of Lebanon is threatening to blow up in its face. Already, significant demonstrations by Palestinians on the West Bank have broken out in protest against the Beirut Massacre. Within the present Israeli state boundaries Palestinian Arab uprisings have also emerged.

Of great significance also is the fact that within the other Arab states criticism of the regimes for their support *for U.S. imperialism* has begun to surface.

Israel’s narrow settler actions are thus endangering *both* pillars of U.S. imperialist strategy in the Middle East and is endangering U.S. imperialism itself.

The settler state of Israel was founded in the post WWII period on land stolen from the Palestinian Arab people. During the more than 30 years since, the Palestinian people have unceasingly fought to regain their homeland and thus to win their freedom through national independence. To continue to exist, the settler state of Israel has needed to remain in a constant state of war with the Palestinian masses. Israeli children have been taught from the cradle on up that the Palestinian people are “non-humans”. (Prime Minister Begin himself in the Israeli Parliament (Knesset) has described the Palestinian people as “beasts walking on two legs”.)

It is no accident that in such a settler society, terrorists and butchers such as Menachem Begin and Ariel Sharon would rise to top leadership. It is also no surprise that the approximately 35 year history of Israel (under *both* Likud *and* Labor Party leadership) is a record of aggressive military expansion. The June 6th 1982 naked military invasion and occupation of Lebanon by the Israeli settler army and especially the September Beirut massacre can be understood to a great extent as a product of the illegitimate *settler* character of Israel.

From its very beginnings, the state of Israel has served as the principal watchdog for U.S. imperialism’s vital (oil) interests in the Middle East. Indeed without the massive support which it has received from U.S. imperialism the state of Israel would have long ago ceased to exist. Israel is dependent upon U.S. imperialism.

Hence Israel is caught between fighting for its own narrow and urgent *settler* interests on the one hand and, on the other, subordinating its vital interests in order to serve its U.S. imperialist sponsor which has its own larger strategic goals, i.e. its drive for maximum profits.

The current internal struggle in Israel between Begin’s Likud Party and the Labor Party headed by Shimon Peres is over the question of whether Israel’s illegitimate

“survival” needs (including naked expansion and terror in Beirut) or Israel’s need to remain loyal to U.S. imperialist policies and goals in the Middle East (including stabilizing the Lebanese government behind a pro-U.S. imperialist but not fully pro-Israeli force) will prevail.

Since Israel has been its principal watchdog in the strategically important Middle East over the years, U.S. imperialism has been somewhat dependent upon Israel and thus unable to utilize its far greater capacity for maneuver internationally. U.S. policy for years, was largely restricted by its need to support Israel with its narrow settler outlook and aims. This inability to maneuver posed great dangers for U.S. imperialism — making U.S. imperialism almost as vulnerable as Israel to being driven out of the area. Beginning in 1970, therefore, U.S. imperialism consciously developed a second main pillar for its Middle East policy — consistent, concentrated and powerful support for the regimes of Arab reaction.

— “Arab Unity” and U.S. Imperialism —

“Arab Unity” of the U.S. puppets and reactionary U.S. allies on behalf of the continued domination of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East played a major role in the success of U.S. imperialism and Israel in the brutal invasion of Lebanon.

The deafening silence in the Arab world during the open Israeli military invasion and occupation of Lebanon last June and since that time has been invaluable to U.S. imperialism and the settler state of Israel.

Furthermore, over the past decade it has become public knowledge that King Hussein, the sovereign ruler of the sovereign state of *Jordan* is in the direct pay of the U.S. CIA. So much for Jordanian sovereignty!

Saudi Arabia, hired Richard Helms direct from his position as head of the U.S. CIA to become director of security for the Royal House of Saud. Bechtel Corporation, which now has provided the present U.S. government with its Secretary of State and its Secretary of Defense does a phenomenal business with King Fahd and the Royal House. Saudi Arabia has functioned, seemingly against its own interest, in keeping OPEC prices in line with U.S. imperialism’s aims and desires. (This same Saudi Royal House linked by a thousand threads to U.S. imperialism also provides most of the financial backing to Yasir Arafat and the PLO!! No wonder the Palestinian masses have suffered defeat after defeat while following Arafat’s leadership!)

Syria’s Assad shocked the world in 1976 by intervening on behalf of the Lebanese right, Israel and U.S. imperialism instead of against them! Syrian intervention prevented the Palestinian and Lebanese Moslem masses from winning a free and independent Lebanon six years ago. In 1982 Syria’s “show” of fight against the Israeli invaders of Lebanon and their separate ceasefire, leaving the Palestinians to

face the Israeli army alone, is merely a continuation of Syria's betrayal of Palestinian and Arab interests.

Iraq, which like Syria in the past has been seen as pro-Soviet, anti-Israel, etc. did nothing when its nuclear reactor was bombed by the Israeli air force. But Iraq launched an open aggression against the Iranian regime and continued its war against Iran even while Ayatollah Khomeini was sending troops to aid the Palestinians and Lebanese Moslems in fighting the Israeli occupiers of Lebanon. To add to the confusion in the Iran-Iraq war, Israel has been a major supplier of Iran, while U.S. imperialism has been a major supplier to Iraq!

— The Sadat Assassination and Egypt's Key Role —

The role of Egypt in this pro-imperialist "Arab Unity" deserves special attention.

The terrible defeat of the Palestinian revolution in Jordan in 1970 at the hands of the CIA butcher Hussein, reflected a shift in the policy of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East from one of almost total reliance on the settler state of Israel to a policy relying on the "two pillars" of the settler state of Israel and the Arab reactionary regimes. One dilemma that prompted this shift was the isolation of Israel in the Arab world. By the mid-1970's almost all the Arab regimes and all the "frontline" state regimes were ready to collaborate with Israel one way or another. But with the election of Begin in 1977, it became too risky. Their misleadership would have been too easily exposed.

It was U.S. imperialism's comprador, Anwar Sadat, President of the previously semi-"independent" Egypt, that provided the solution. Sadat became party to the "Camp David" Peace Treaty, which was a U.S. inspired and sponsored "peace" that talked of "Palestinian Autonomy" but upheld the status quo, i.e. U.S. imperialist domination in the Middle East and guarantee for the right of Israel to exist on Palestinian soil, negating the basic right of the Palestinian people to self-determination in their homeland. By signing this "peace treaty" Sadat became the first mainline Arab leader to openly recognize and deal directly with the settler state of Israel. He thus became an open traitor to the cause of the Egyptian, Palestinian and Arab peoples in their struggle for freedom from the yoke of imperialist-settler-feudal enslavement.

This was a tremendous boost for U.S. imperialism and Sadat was rewarded well with the plans for the return of the Sinai Peninsula to Egypt, shipments of modern military equipment (including new shipments of F-5 fighters), and *Time Magazine's* "Man of the Year Award" — translated from the standpoint of the revolutionary movement as "comprador of the year".

But there was a price to pay for breaking Israel out of its isolation in the Arab world — that was the isolation of the Egyptian government in the Arab world. All

the Arab countries were forced to break relations with the openly traitorous Sadat government based on the support of their masses for the Palestinian cause.

By the summer of 1981, with the re-election of Begin over Peres in Israel, the Camp David “peace” process was in its deathbed. For the Begin-led hardliners in Israel were not going to make any real concessions to the Palestinians. Sadat had lost the only way that he could sell his actions to his own people and the rest of the Arab world. He was becoming more and more exposed at home as witnessed by the fact that a month before his assassination he was forced to implement emergency powers and imprison thousands of his opponents. Sadat had outlived his usefulness for U.S. imperialism.

Now Egypt had to be broken out of its isolation for U.S. imperialism to complete its policy shift in the Middle East. Sadat was an obstacle. In October of 1981, Sadat was assassinated. Not one Arab country could even afford to send a representative to Sadat’s funeral! U.S. imperialism shed their crocodile tears sending the three living ex-Presidents to the funeral. Ads were run by U.S. corporations in all major bourgeois newspapers hailing the fallen “Prince of Peace”. Editorials and articles appeared bemoaning this great “loss” to the U.S. and its interests in the Middle East. A blow for U.S. imperialism? That is the line the imperialists pushed.

This is what the opportunists of the Guardian Newspaper pushed! Echoing the line of U.S. imperialism as they often do, the *Guardian* stated, “the last thing that the Reagan Administration needed at this point was to lose Sadat.”

But the facts show that for U.S. imperialism it was “just what the doctor ordered”:

1) Hosni Mubarak, who was Sadat’s Vice-President (and who coincidentally was in Washington a week before the assassination) pledged his commitment to the Camp David “peace” process and to U.S. imperialism. And U.S. imperialism pledged their commitment to him.

2) Yet, despite the fact that Mubarak represented a complete continuation of Sadat’s policies, the process for breaking Egypt out of its isolation in the Arab world started immediately. “Already the Saudis and Jordanians have sent quiet messages of condolence to Mr. Mubarak. Diplomats here see this as a signal that the moderate Arabs are ready to welcome Egypt back into the Arab fold”. (*Wall St. Journal*, 10/14/81) Saudi Arabia praised Mubarak as a leader with “a clean Arab record” and urged Arab countries to give him a year to “put the Egyptian house in order”. Similar views were expressed in Kuwait and even Libya.

On the eve of the return of the Sinai to Egypt in return for their sell-out of the Palestinian and Arab masses the *Wall St. Journal* summed it up this way:

“The ground is already being prepared for a gradual reconciliation with all but the most radical Arab states ... The

signs of reconciliation are everywhere: An Arab journalist's union is planning to meet in Cairo this year; Oman is reportedly drafting a formula that could allow fellow members of the Gulf Cooperation Council — Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, Bahrain, and the United Arab Emirates — to establish ties with Egypt; and Iraq has swallowed its pride and sent a delegation here to negotiate new arms purchases." (4/23/82)

No wonder the *Wall Street Journal* unlike the "radical" *Guardian* carried articles like "Sadat's Death Gives U.S. a Chance to Forge a New Policy in Middle East".

3) Before the Sadat assassination the Reagan Administration was headed for its first significant defeat in Congress over the sale of the AWAC planes to Saudi Arabia. The Sadat assassination snatched the AWAC deal from the jaws of defeat. (Notice the shift in U.S. policy — advanced military hardware as sophisticated as that supplied to Israel was supplied to an Arab country for the first time.)

4) U.S. imperialism whipped up a tremendous war hysteria against Libya. Immediately after Sadat was killed, Henry Kissinger appeared on the radio saying that he *knew* Khaddafi did it. Khaddafi was pushed as "the most dangerous man in the world", etc.

Behind the diversion of the Sadat assassination and the war hysteria against Libya*, U.S. imperialism carried out an already planned huge Middle East military exercise with little notice and almost no criticism:

"One sign of the largely invisible defense posture that the U.S. is developing in the Middle East was operation Brightstar. Upwards of 6,000 soldiers marines and airmen went into the region in November on a month long joint exercise mainly with Egyptian forces but with elements of the Sudanese, Omani, and Somali armies as well. ... Military facilities now available to America's Rapid Deployment Force to counter threats to Persian Gulf oil are being upgraded in Egypt, Oman, Somalia, Kenya and Diego Garcia." (*U.S. News & World Report*, 12/28/81)

5) The role of western imperialism was significantly strengthened in Chad. At the time of Sadat's assassination, the government in Chad was fighting a civil war against French imperialist backed opposition forces. Libyan troops played a role against French imperialism in helping to keep the government of Chad in power. Through the tremendous pressure brought on Libya by U.S. imperialism, and

*On the "homefront", U.S. imperialism whipped up the war hysteria (remember the "Libyan hit squads"?) to divert attention from Reaganism as the working class was beginning to stir against his policies witnessed in the massive Solidarity Day a month before the Sadat assassination. Also the *Wall St. Journal* used Sadat's assassination to call for stronger CIA-Police powers within the USA.

pressure on the government of Chad (by French imperialist offers of economic and military assistance) the Libyan troops were asked to leave and did leave Chad. Hence the hand of western imperialism, led by U.S. imperialism, was strengthened in Chad. Is this significant? Yes. *Chad represents an important part of the "Oil Connection"*. An article from the *Wall St. Journal* entitled "Major Oil Production Finds Are Likely in Middle East and Africa, Study Says" states, "*The report singles out Chad, a country currently having economic and political nightmares, as being 'very favorable' for oil development*". (our emphasis)

6) In relation to the Sudan, we see the "Oil Connection" as well. U.S. imperialism cried, "Khadaffi is massing his troops on the Sudan border, "There is going to an invasion". Bingo — \$100 million of U.S. emergency aid! Bingo — \$220 million from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and \$75 million in additional financial assistance from commercial banks! At about this time Chevron and a consortium of other major oil companies discovered oil reserves in the Sudan that are supposed to rival those of Saudi Arabia! All this behind the Sadat assassination!

Suffice it to say that, it is quite likely that U.S. imperialism murdered its "good friend" who had become an obstacle to continued U.S. domination over Mid-East Oil especially in light of the tremendous gains for U.S. imperialism which resulted, despite *Guardian* claims to the contrary.

Just how important Egypt is in the U.S. imperialist scheme of domination in the Middle East was revealed in this crisis:

"Sharon flew to Egypt to confer with President Hosni Mubarak. The two discussed details of Israel's withdrawal from the last third of the occupied Sinai by April 25th. More important, *Sharon felt he secured from Mubarak an understanding, that, in the event of Israeli action in Lebanon, Egypt would remain on the sidelines.*" (*Time*, 2/15/82, our emphasis)

"Certain preconditions were demanded for launching the large scale invasion The second precondition was the neutralization of Egypt through its separate peace with Israel. In the absence of this agreement, Israel would have had to mobilize substantial forces along its southern border. In the present circumstances [the invasion], reservists for the southern front are sunning themselves on the beaches of Tel Aviv." (*New Statesman*, 6/25/82)

With the assassination of Sadat, U.S. imperialism had finally consolidated its "consensus" policy begun in 1970, i.e. a consensus among the major Arab countries (particularly Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia) who would now work either directly or indirectly with the settler state of Israel to defend the interests of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East.

The fruits of this “consensus policy” can be strikingly seen in the events in Lebanon this summer. First, it was the Israeli settler armed forces that militarily broke the back of the Palestinian movement in Lebanon. Then it was the “Arab Unity” behind U.S. imperialism and the status quo, a “consensus” of the reactionary Arab governments that watched in silence as a fellow sovereign Arab state was occupied.

* * * * *

Within this second main pillar of U.S. imperialism, pro-imperialist “Arab Unity”, the existence of a pro-U.S. imperialist leadership of the Palestinian Liberation Movement, the spearhead of the anti-imperialist freedom movement of the Arab peoples of the Middle East, has been crucial to U.S. imperialism’s ability to go from strength to strength and crucial for the worsening of the Palestinian people’s position from 1970 in Jordan, to 1976 in Lebanon, to 1982 in Lebanon - and a situation where the Palestinian people now have no liberated base area contiguous with the Israeli state from which to launch and win their fight for the liberation of their Palestinian homeland. The U.S. imperialist lackey at the very top of the Palestinian Liberation Movement is none other than Yasir Arafat himself!

* * * * *

—Yasir Arafat: Traitor to the Palestinian People—

Going back at least as far as 1970 in Jordan, Arafat has helped set up and presided over defeat upon defeat for the Palestinian people. Our predecessor, *Stalinist Workers Group*, in a November 1970 document entitled “Revolution in Jordan: First Step Toward Victorious Arab Liberation - the Lessons of the Two Battles of Amman”, exposed the treachery of Arafat:

“By June 1970, Hussein and his royal government were on the verge of total collapse while the Palestinian guerrillas were stronger than ever. The situation was overwhelmingly favorable for the guerrillas to press forward their struggle to destroy the state of Israel and liberate Palestine. This is precisely what the PFLP proceeded to do. And this is precisely what U.S. imperialism directed its chief Arab lackey, Hussein, to suppress. These are the conditions which produced the First Battle of Amman. ... But what role did Nasser, the giant Arab leader of ‘non-alignment’ and Arafat, the chief, ‘moderate’ guerilla leader, play in this battle? And what role did the Chinese ‘Cultural Revolution’, the leadership of the world revolution, play in this battle?

“*In the face of the favorable situation for the guerrillas, Nasser attempted to reconcile Hussein and the guerrillas on the basis of the status quo with his calls for ‘Arab Unity’, and Arafat flew into Amman from Cairo and signed a cease-fire agreement to that*

effect! And a day or so later, the Chinese 'Cultural Revolution' leadership published a statement by Yasser Arafat in *Peking Review*, thus indicating their support for Arafat in opposition to the initiative of the PFLP and of the Arab masses; ... But the Palestinian Arab people of Amman *rejected* Nasser and Arafat, (and thus the Chinese revisionist line and policy) and, under the leadership of Habash and the PFLP, they stood resolute against Hussein and went on to win the first battle of Amman." (SWG Bulletin No.8, p.7 "Revolution in Jordan: First Step Toward Victorious Arab Liberation - the Lessons of the Two Battles of Amman".)

In the same document, while discussing the Second Battle of Amman that ended in defeat for the Palestinians and a victory for U.S. imperialism, Stalinist Workers Group had this to say regarding Arafat's role:

"Arafat's ouster of the PFLP [from the PLO] was the signal for Hussein to launch his brutal concentrated selective mass murder against the vanguard forces of the Palestinian masses in Amman including especially the stronghold of the PFLP ... On September 15, 3 days after the ouster of the PFLP from the PLO, Hussein declared martial law in Jordan. *The next day* Arafat was named general commander of all the Palestinian armed forces ... On the *very next day*, September 17, Hussein launched his bestial U.S.-directed mass murder in Amman. What coordination, what treachery! ... But this is not all! Then Arafat ... ordered the Palestinian commandoes to fire only in *self-defense!* This position was publicized and supported in the *Peking Review!* ... Thus Arafat, the traitor, disarmed the Palestinian fighters, allowing Hussein to concentrate U.S. imperialist-directed mass murder against the vanguard pockets of PFLP resistance. During the massacre, the Arab masses who were still inspired by the PFLP-led victory (in the First Battle of Amman) were aroused and militant, and determined to advance the Arab liberation movement, and fought vigorously. The Palestinian masses in Amman in particular displayed tremendous heroism. And so, Arafat's treachery was all the more tragic." (*Ibid*, p. 16)

Arafat was there in Lebanon in 1976. There, too, it was the PFLP with its base among the toiling masses of the refugee camps that led the struggle in alliance with the Lebanese Patriotic Movement. There too, Arafat sabotaged the struggle. For example, in the spring of 1976 when the revolutionary movement was building toward victory, Syria and Arafat signed a "peace" initiative to stop the fighting! The PFLP wouldn't take part in this kind of betrayal at that time!

Arafat has continued in his betrayal of the Palestinian cause in Lebanon in 1982. As the *Wall St. Journal* pointed out, "The PLO campaign of the last eight years to

restrict terrorism and gather international support — which led to PLO diplomatic missions in 85 cities and recognition from most of the world's nations — didn't stop a single Israeli tank". (7/8/82)

As the principal leader of the Palestinian forces, what did Arafat have to offer the Palestinian and Lebanese masses under siege in West Beirut in 1982? What did he offer as "the key to victory"? This is what Arafat said: "Take up arms and defend what is left of your nation's honor unto death, because *martyrdom is the key to victory*." (our emphasis). Arafat could only offer death to the heroic Palestinian and Lebanese liberation fighters!

No wonder Arafat described the tragic setback for the Palestinian cause in Lebanon as "*a Palestinian victory*" (*Associated Press*, 8/17/82). The settler terrorist *Begin* told the truth and exposed the U.S. imperialist "big lie" when he said "We all wish Arafat a victory like this everyday of his life". (*Newsweek*, 8/30/82)

This lie can only help keep the necessary criticism and self-criticism in the Palestinian liberation movement from taking place as it needs to sum up the bitter lessons of this *defeat*. This lie can only help project U.S. imperialism as a friend of the Palestinian people because it says the U.S. helped the Palestinians gain a victory, rather than helped defeat the Palestinian people. This lie can only help keep Arafat in the "drivers seat" and help to shield from the masses the fact that when Arafat has been driving, he has been a "chauffeur" for the interests of U.S. imperialism.

The U.S. imperialist-Habib plan for the evacuation of the Palestinian guerrillas from West Beirut was largely implemented to preserve the misleadership of Arafat and his PLO machine. As the *Wall St. Journal* said,

"U.S. and Saudi Arabia have *been working frantically over the last two weeks to arrange a settlement that would preserve the PLO's dignity*. The hope is that an 'honorable surrender' — in which the safety of the PLO guerrillas leaving West Beirut would be guaranteed by the U.S. and other Western nations — will bolster the relatively moderate leadership of Chairman Yasir Arafat." (7/8/82, our emphasis)

In light of Arafat's consistent betrayal of the Palestinian people and his loyalty to U.S. imperialism, it is clear why a concerted effort has been made with the Pope, the President of Italy, the Arab Summit, etc. to make it appear that Arafat is a "winner". Arafat's record exposes him as the key misleader within the ranks of the Palestine Liberation Movement holding back the cause of Palestinian freedom, a "loser" propped up by U.S. imperialism and Arab reaction precisely to keep the Palestinian people and ultimately all the Arab peoples from winning their emancipation.

Whoever fosters and spreads the lie that Arafat and the Palestinians won a victory in Lebanon is helping to prop up Arafat and his “loser” leadership of the Palestinians and aiding U.S. imperialism’s effort to continue and intensify its domination of the Middle East.

— **The *Guardian* Echo of U.S. Imperialism** —

Within the USA, the opportunists in and around the *Guardian* Newspaper are just such rotten forces.

The September 8, 1982 *Guardian* includes excerpts from Arafat’s farewell speech before he was “evacuated” from Beirut. Under the title “PLO’s Arafat Bids a Proud Farewell”, Arafat’s leadership is puffed up with *no criticism* from the *Guardian*.

A major editorial in the September 1st *Guardian* entitled “Lebanon War Far From Over” states,

“The military setback they have suffered in Lebanon must be weighed against important political gains registered in the course of their heroic resistance ... They negotiated without being stampeded and when then agreed to withdraw — they did so with guns in hand and heads held high. *During the siege of Beirut the international standing of the Palestinian cause gained significantly*”. (our emphasis)

What a whitewash! The Palestinian cause gains significantly in its international standing?!? The truth is virtually no one came to the aid of the Palestinian cause! And how does the political victory “of guns in hand and heads held high” compare with the political *defeats* such as the installation of Gemayel, Israeli occupation of Lebanon, and the crack downs in the occupied territories! What wishful thinking! What a lie! The opportunists of the *Guardian* are trying to keep the necessary weapon of criticism and self-criticism from the Arab masses.

This becomes abundantly clear as we continue this editorial.

“The prospect exists for the exacerbation of political differences that now exist within the liberation movement. Key to overcoming these potential problems and taking full advantage of new political opportunities will be the maintenance of the strong unity the PLO has shown in the face of Israel’s assault.”

Note comrade readers: 1) To the *Guardian* political differences are potential problems, when precisely what the movement needs is ruthless criticism and self-criticism and the emergence of a genuine proletarian Marxist-Leninist line and leadership through the struggle against opportunism. 2) To the *Guardian* “taking full advantage of new political opportunities” (?!?) requires “the maintenance of the

strong unity of the PLO”, when in fact the most urgent new political opportunity is to learn the bitter lessons of this defeat and drive out the leadership of Arafat responsible for leading the Palestinians down the dead-end path in Beirut. Indeed calling for the strong unity of the PLO at this time, is calling for the status quo and the continued treacherous leadership of Arafat.

The end of the editorial reveals just how pro-imperialist the *Guardian* is:

“... demand the total withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon, and the start of a process of recognition and negotiation that will lead to a genuine peace settlement in the Mideast, one based on the right of Palestinian self-determination.”

Now the cat is out of the bag! The *Guardian* calls for a “process of recognition and negotiation” by all parties! The *Guardian* has called on the Palestinians and Arab peoples to recognize the right of the Israeli settler state to exist on stolen Arab land! Is there any difference between the *Guardian*’s view of the path to peace in the Middle East and Reagan’s “peace” plans now called “Camp David plus”?

— Conclusion —

How much more blood must the Palestinian People shed in their strivings for land and freedom before a revolutionary leadership develops that is capable of leading this freedom loving people to victory?

As comrade Lenin taught, “... the proletariat needs the truth and there is nothing so harmful to its cause as plausible, respectable petty-bourgeois lies”. In opposition to Brezhnev and the Soviet revisionists, to the U.S. “new communist movement” organ, the *Guardian*, and all the opportunists internationally who are pushing U.S. imperialism’s “big lie” that the Palestinians under Arafat have gained ground, the proletarian revolutionaries must face up to and tell the peoples of the world the bitter *truth* that the Israeli military invasion and occupation of Lebanon in 1982 has inflicted a terrible *defeat* on the cause of Palestinian liberation and world revolution.

Based on a recognition of this bitter defeat:

1) Sharp and principled internal struggle within the Palestine Liberation Movement, including extensive use of criticism and self-criticism, is a vital necessity. The Habash-led PFLP, Hawatmeh, etc. need to be forced to take a stand on the Arafat leadership one way or the other. Habash must be asked what his political support for Soviet revisionism in recent years has achieved for the Palestinian people. *Defeat the Leadership of Defeat!*

2) Sharp and principled internal struggle within the international communist movement around its desertion of the Palestinian revolution, around its deafening

silence in the face of the bestial Israeli invasion of Lebanon, is a vital necessity. Both Soviet and Chinese revisionist support for “Arab Unity”, the “Third World”, etc. has to be exposed for the pro-imperialist theory and practice that it is. Every effort should be made to develop a new Communist International which is necessary in order to defeat this bourgeois nationalist revisionism with consistent proletarian internationalism. Every effort should be made by the international communist movement to help lay the conditions for the establishment of Marxist-Leninist Parties throughout the Arab world.

3) In the strategically important Middle East, the Reagan Administration’s ability to initiate the Habib Plan, intervene in the Israeli government, intervene in the Lebanese government, send U.S. marines, etc., especially when contrasted with Soviet revisionist paralysis in the face of the Israeli occupation of Lebanon, makes it crystal clear that it is imperialism, headed by U.S. imperialism, that is the main enemy of the Palestinian and Arab peoples. Focus of the peoples’ struggles should be against this main enemy and its stooges. Along these lines, every effort must be made to link the political isolation of Israel (following the Beirut Massacre) with political isolation of Israel’s sponsor, U.S. imperialism.

4) It is clear that the road to Arab sovereignty in Amman, Beirut, Riyadh, Cairo and Damascus, etc. lies through armed struggle with Tel Aviv. Given the refusal of the reactionary Arab regimes to wage war against Israel in response to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and their indissoluble links with U.S. imperialism, the overthrow of the reactionary Arab regimes and the establishment of anti-imperialist regimes that will provide a revolutionary base area for Palestinian liberation is on the order of the day.

* * * * *

“ ... the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism.”

-V.I. Lenin

* * * * *

LONG LIVE LENINISM — GUIDE TO OUR VICTORIES!
— DEFEAT THE LEADERSHIP OF DEFEAT!

WORKERS OF THE WORLD & OPPRESSED PEOPLES UNITE!
— BEIRUT-WE SHALL AVENGE YOU!

(APPENDIX ON NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX: NOTE ON ANTI-SEMITISM

Events in Lebanon this summer have given rise to a new wave of anti-Semitic attacks in Europe. This anti-Semitism has nothing in common with the emancipation of the Palestinian people, but in fact serves the enemies of Palestinian freedom. According to *Newsweek* France witnessed its bloodiest anti-Jewish attack since World War II this August. A *Newsweek* report of 8/23/82 cited a number of anti-Jewish attacks in Austria, Italy and in Germany, the centers of anti-Semitic fascism in World War II. The most disturbing example was of a recent march by Italian leftists. According to the report, as these leftists marched past a synagogue, they shouted, "Jews to the Ovens." Such chauvinism against Jewish people was the main ideological component of developing fascism 40 years ago. And today anti-Semitism like all other forms of chauvinism still plays the role of strengthening imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism. Indeed such anti-Semitism helps to unite world Jewry behind Zionism and U.S. imperialism, instead of finding the way to break honest Jewish elements worldwide from Zionism and Imperialism.

In the first half of the 20th Century world Jewry played a tremendous role in the cause of world revolution. Out of all proportion to their numbers, Jewish revolutionaries formed much of the backbone of the Russian Revolutions of 1905, and both 1917 revolutions.

Since the establishment of the settler state of Israel on Palestinian land following World War II, U.S. imperialism and international Zionism have attempted to identify the interests of the Jewish people world-wide with the fate of the state of Israel. On this chauvinistic basis, the Arab reactionary regimes have been able to use anti-Semitism to strengthen their own tyranny over the Arab peoples. The imperialist-Zionist-Arab reactionary effort has been largely successful, especially in the USA where two or three generations of revolutionary Jewish workers who spearheaded the communist and labor movements and the anti-fascist movement of the 1930's and 1940's have given way to a generation or two of chauvinistic pro-Zionist middle class Jewish supporters of the U.S. imperialist world empire.

For Jewish radicals who vacillate on the question of Israel, it is important to remember the role of Zionist leaders in selling out the Jewish masses of Europe to German fascism. It is entirely possible that the Zionist rulers of Israel who have hitched their Jewish star to U.S. imperialism will lead those Jewish masses who follow them to a similar fate. For U.S. imperialism, which started with a one-pillar Israeli base in the Middle East but for over a decade has been shifting to a two pillar base including now a base in the Arab reactionary regimes, may well find it expedient in the future to sacrifice its Israeli pillar in order to prop up the Arab reactionary regimes and continue U.S. imperialist domination of the Middle East.

Though only a secondary aim of this newsletter, *Ray O. Light* hopes that by projecting and helping to achieve a sharp, principled proletarian internationalist position on Palestine within the Palestine Liberation movement, that the Palestinian comrades will be able to neutralize some of and even break a section of world Jewry including some of the Sephardic Jews and others within Palestine away from the Zionist butchers. Hopefully, some Jewish fighters will be found in the ranks of the Palestinians thus providing a basis for decent Jewish families to live in the Palestinian nation-state when it is finally liberated.

RAY O. LIGHT NEWSLETTER No. 22

Popular Uprising Against the Arafat Leadership: A Real Advance for the Palestinian Revolution

July 1983

In early May one of the most important political developments of the last decade occurred when a large number of Palestinian frontline freedom fighters who are members of Al Fatah mutinied against the leadership of Fatah chief and Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Chairman Yasir Arafat.

Following an examination of the Israeli murderous invasion and occupation of Lebanon last September, we projected the slogan (directed first and foremost against Yasir Arafat), “*Defeat the Leadership of Defeat!*” We believe that after examining the facts surrounding the present struggle within Al Fatah between the Arafat forces and the “rebels”, the honest revolutionary reader will be encouraged as we are by the open and powerful opposition to Arafat that has inevitably emerged (within his own base organization!) as a necessary force for the advancement of the Palestinian Revolution.

The following questions and answers are aimed at drawing out the stake of the international working class and the oppressed peoples in this new development so as to help enable the revolutionary working class forces in Palestine, the Middle East and the entire world to take an active partisan stand with the “rebels” and against the Arafat leadership of betrayal of the Palestinian Revolution.

Question — What caused the revolt against the Arafat leadership?

Answer — The immediate cause of the revolt was Arafat’s personal appointment of two discredited commanders (loyal to him personally) to the two major command posts in the Bekaa Valley and in Tripoli, northern Lebanon. It was widely known among both PLO fighters and Palestinian refugees in southern Lebanon that the two men, Haj Ismail and Abu Hajim, had deserted their men and fled in the face of Israel’s invasion last summer. Such key appointments clearly signaled Arafat’s unwillingness to wage a serious liberation war against Israel on the only front still available for such a war.

However, as the current *U.S. News & World Report* (*U.S. N&WR*) points out,

“Seeds of dissatisfaction with Arafat’s leadership date from the humiliating defeat inflicted on the PLO by Israel in Lebanon last summer. In the aftermath of the fighting, PLO officers complained that he was a poor commander and was willing to surrender too much for a Mideast settlement. His talks with King Hussein over a Jordanian-PLO connection added more fuel to unrest.” (*U.S. N&WR*, 7/11/83, p.29)

Question — In what lies the significance of this present revolt against the Arafat leadership?

Answer — From the time when Arafat led in forming the Fatah organization in 1959 and especially since merging it with smaller guerilla factions in 1964 under the umbrella group PLO, Arafat has faced a number of threats to his leadership. But most came from other more radical guerilla groups within the PLO or outside it entirely. The current challenge to Arafat’s leadership is so serious precisely because it is emerging from within his “mainstream” Fatah organization which has commanded the allegiance of 80% of the PLO’s fighters and controls almost all the massive Saudi financing of the PLO. It is this Fatah base, which Arafat has always used to defeat the opposition in the past, that is providing the *source* of opposition at the present!

Question — Who were the main forces involved in the initial revolt?

Answer — It is noteworthy that the “mutiny” inside the Fatah organization emerged from among the actual fighters who today face the Israeli army at the last major front, in the Bekaa Valley.

The revolt was led by Colonel Sayid Mousa (Abu Mousa), a veteran Fatah commander who had served as number 2 man at PLO military headquarters in Beirut during the Israeli military invasion and occupation of Lebanon last summer. In fact at the time of the revolt Colonel Mousa was among the two PLO battalions dug in alongside the Syrians and facing Israeli troops in Lebanon’s eastern Bekaa Valley.

Question — What are the demands of the rebels?

Answer — The rebels’ first demand is for the Palestine Liberation Organization to wage a serious struggle against the settler state of Israel for the liberation of Palestine: As Colonel Mousa pointed out, he initiated the rebellion because Arafat began to move the 8,000 to 10,000 Palestinian guerillas in eastern and northern Lebanon to other Arab countries. Mousa observed that, “There can be no armed struggle [against Israel] from Algeria or Yemen.” And further,

“The Israeli army (in Lebanon) is spread out ... The Israeli soldier is not a superman ... He takes hashish, he steals, he trades and smuggles – he is just an ordinary man. He can be fought.” (Mousa quotes attributed by *Associated Press* to British *Guardian* newspaper)

In addition to continuing the Palestinian armed liberation struggle against the settler state of Israel, the rebels have several other key demands. They are demanding that a general congress of Al Fatah be held. At this congress they want a fair hearing given to their criticism of Arafat’s policies toward Israel and to their demands that his authority and control over finances be curbed.*

On Monday, July 4th, a senior PLO official announced that Arafat had agreed to a key rebel demand, i.e. to hold a general congress. Arafat sent a six-man mediation committee from his base in Tunis to Syria to propose formation of a joint committee of Arafat loyalists and rebels to prepare for such a general congress.

But the rebels who seek a ceasefire, a cessation of armed hostilities between themselves and the Arafat loyalists, are not leaping too quickly after just any agreement. As Colonel Mousa put it, “Arafat can give you all the communiques and statements in the world, but he never practices what he says.” (*Associated Press*, 7/5/83) Indeed a cease fire was announced on June 30 but broke down two days later.

Question — What has happened in the two months since the revolt began?

Answer — Following the initial revolt in early May, Arafat tried to transfer Colonel Mousa to official PLO headquarters in Tunis; but Mousa had already developed support among the Palestinian fighters in the Bekaa and refused to leave. Arafat then imposed a blockade on the rebels’ food, water, fuel, ammunition and salaries. The rebels responded by shooting their way into six Fatah warehouses in Damascus.

The unrest spread as Colonel Mousa was joined by Mousa Awad (Abu Akram), a top Fatah official in Lebanon’s eastern Bekaa Valley, and by Nimer Saleh (Abu Saleh), a member of the Fatah Central Committee until last January when Arafat dismissed him. It is worth noting that Abu Saleh was the established leftist critic of Arafat within Fatah, at least from the time of the 1970 massacre of the Palestinians and rout of the PLO by King Hussein and the Jordanian army. (Ray O. Light as well as Abu Saleh date Arafat’s treacherous leadership from that tragic setback for the Palestinian Revolution in 1970.)

*One indication of the anti-democratic character of Arafat’s leadership of Fatah was the response of an unnamed senior PLO official who, according to *Associated Press* (7/5/83), stated that, “We agreed to form a committee to prepare for a general congress and definitely not to lead Fatah. [Arafat] is the commander of Fatah, and *he always will be ...*” (ROL emphasis)

When the revolt began, Arafat insisted that he would easily and quickly handle it. The principal opportunist newspaper of the U.S. New Left, the *Guardian*, as late as its 6/15/83 issue, also called “the challenge to PLO chairman Yasir Arafat undoubtedly exaggerated in the Western press ...” And as late as the end of June, one of Arafat’s key political advisers in the PLO, Khaled Al-Hassan, a man close to the Saudi rulers and to the wealthy Palestinian community in Kuwait, told the *Wall Street Journal* that, “If (the revolt) wasn’t taking place in the Bekaa, it would only take a half hour to finish it off.” (*Wall Street Journal*, 7/1/83, p.19)

Nonetheless, in the two months since it began, the revolt has spread, especially at the Bekaa Valley front. By late June, it had become clear that Arafat had lost the allegiance of the Fatah-PLO fighters at the only important military front against Israel that remains. Clearly the rebels have taken over leadership of the PLO armed forces on the Bekaa Valley front against Israel. And indeed, while the Fatah rebellion against the Arafat leadership is concentrated in the Bekaa Valley, it is spreading throughout the PLO. For example, according to *U.S. News*, at the end of June, “A third of his own [Arafat’s] Fatah commanders boycotted a meeting in Damascus to plan moves against the mutineers.” (*U.S. News & World Report*, 7/4/83, p. 31)

Already, Arafat seems to be trying to find some non-PLO base among the Palestinians to be able to justify his continuation as unofficial “*Monarch*” of Palestine. In late June, a conference of non-PLO moderates was scheduled to take place in Tunisia, where Arafat’s PLO headquarters are located. According to the *Christian Science Monitor*, the purpose of this conference, when originally scheduled for May, was to give “pragmatic Palestinians” a chance to figure out how to get Arafat and King Hussein together, by figuring out a “joint formula for a Palestinian-Jordanian team to negotiate with Israel.” (*Christian Science Monitor*, 6/27/83)

But as the *Monitor* continues,

“Now the conference, postponed until late June, “has taken on a more immediate aspect,” said Palestinian-American Prof. Hisham Sharabi of Georgetown University in a telephone interview. He was referring to the PLO’s internal rebellion and Syria’s ouster of Mr. Arafat from Damascus.

“According to Professor Sharabi, 15 West Bankers — including elected mayors, east Jerusalem notables, and exiled West Bank mayors Mohammad Milhem and Fahd Kawasmeh — along with 20 Palestinians from Western Europe, the United States, Jordan, the Gulf, and elsewhere were scheduled to be invited. None are PLO members and, according to Palestinian sources, PLO officials are not invited.”

Yet this conference, according to the *Monitor* had “Arafat’s approval”! And the *Monitor* speculates that, “The Tunis meeting could ... provide a forum to debate what should be done if the PLO falls under Syrian control.”

Finally, *Monitor* correspondent Robin Wright admits that,

“It appears that only radical concessions will prevent Arafat from losing his grip over Fatah, which makes up 80 percent of the PLO ...

“There is growing concern that the PLO’s future will be charted in the Bekaa Valley.”

Question — What is Arafat’s record of leadership of the Palestinian liberation struggle that has fueled the tremendous spread of revolt against his leadership?

Answer — Arafat became the undisputed leader of the PLO in 1969. In June of 1970, King Hussein’s royal government was on the verge of collapse and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), still today the second largest Palestinian liberation group, was rapidly gaining strength by virtue of having led the Palestinian and Bedouin masses to victory in the First Battle of Amman. In this *favorable* situation for the Palestinian revolution, Arafat had signed a cease-fire agreement with Hussein. Nevertheless the Palestinian masses had rejected Arafat’s ceasefire and had followed the PFLP and its leader George Habash to victory. An indication of how important this victory was for the world revolution is the fact that U. S. President Nixon in his speech of July 1, 1970 characterized the situation in the Middle East as “more dangerous than Vietnam.” And this was at the height of the Vietnam War!

The Second Battle of Amman in 1970 ended in defeat for the Palestinian people and a victory for King Hussein and U.S. imperialism.* Here is how *Stalinist Workers Group* (SWG), our predecessor, described Arafat’s treacherous role in this defeat:

“Arafat’s ouster of the PFLP [from the PLO] was the signal for Hussein to launch his brutal concentrated selective mass murder against the vanguard forces of the Palestinian masses in Amman including especially the stronghold of the PFLP ... On September 15, 3 days after the ouster of the PFLP from the PLO, Hussein declared martial law in Jordan. *The next day* Arafat was named general commander of all the Palestinian armed forces ... On the *very next day*, September 17, Hussein launched his bestial U.S.-directed mass murder in Amman. What coordination, what treachery! ... But this is not all! Then

*For a detailed analysis of this period read Stalinist Workers Group Bulletin No.8, 11/10/70, “*Revolution in Jordan: First Step toward Victorious Arab Liberation, The Lessons of Two Battles of Amman.*”

Arafat ... ordered the Palestinian commandoes to fire only in *self-defense!*"

SWG continued,

"Arafat delivered an infamous speech, the essence of which we quote exactly as Arafat's newspaper *Fateh* quoted it:

'Your fellow citizens and your relatives who go with you through these historical and critical moments are your responsibility. Their security and safety is more important than your basic duties. Your honest brethren in the Jordanian Army are on your side and you are on theirs in the battle of destiny against the lackeys, the Zionist enemy and World imperialism. Conspirators will not be able to split your joint march to achieve the ultimate victory.'

"Arafat, the 'general commander' ordered his 'troops' to put the 'security and safety' of their relatives and friends before their 'basic duties' — a command unparalleled in the annals of all military history, let alone *revolutionary* military history!!"

More than 20,000 of the best of the Palestinian people were murdered by King Hussein's army in coordination with the Israeli air force, all under the direction of U.S. imperialism in the ten days of the Second Battle of Amman in September 1970.

As SWG pointed out at the time,

"the Chinese revisionists, the U.S. New Left and *Fateh* have tried to pass off the tragic Second Battle of Amman as a victory for the Palestinian Revolution ... "

SWG's position was that,

"Full recognition of the grievous defeat suffered by the Arab people (and all the oppressed peoples) in the Second Battle of Amman is the only basis for preventing this battle from becoming a giant beginning of a serious setback for the cause of Arab liberation."

SWG also said that,

"the correct lessons must be drawn so that U.S. imperialism will be prevented from repeating such slaughter ever again ... " [all above quotes from *Stalinist Workers Group Bulletin No.8*]

*

*

*

*

In 1976, in Lebanon, once again the Habash-led PFLP had united the Palestinian masses there with the native Lebanese Moslem masses in a powerful revolutionary movement which was on the verge of overthrow of the reactionary pro-U.S. imperialist Lebanese regime. Here, as in Jordan in 1970, a revolutionary victory would have meant a powerful revolutionary base area from which to destroy the settler state of Israel and liberate Palestine. Here, once again, Arafat sabotaged the struggle.

By January of 1976 it was clear that Syria and its President Assad had surprisingly intervened on the side of the Christian Right and against the Palestinian and the Lebanese national democratic revolution. Yet despite Syrian cutoff of all arms to the revolution, and Syrian support for the Christian Rightist choice for President, the revolution was advancing to victory. In this situation of advancing revolution Syria pushed a “peace” initiative, which Arafat agreed to, thereby dividing the revolutionary force. Following the Syrian-Arafat ceasefire, the Syrian army shockingly invaded Lebanon on June 1st and fought their Palestinian and Lebanese Moslem brothers and sisters for five months until they finally subdued the revolution!

*

*

*

*

In analyzing the bestial Israeli invasion and occupation of Lebanon in 1982, we pointed out the following:

“By June 20th the invasion had left in its wake 15,000 dead, 60,000 wounded and 750,000 people left homeless. (*L.A. Times*, 6/20/82). These figures only represent the first two weeks of the war. They do not include the death and wounded toll of West Beirut, nor the toll after disease and famine had set in. Tens of thousands more lie beneath the rubble of destroyed Lebanese cities. International relief agencies have estimated that 90% of the killed and wounded are non-combatants, 60% of them women and children. Doctors reported that 30%-50% of the wounded were dying, double the expected rate in wartime. This was due to the widespread use of anti-personnel weapons, such as cluster and phosphorous bombs being dropped on heavily populated civilian neighborhoods by the Israeli settler war machine the Israeli settlers crushed the Palestinian strongholds of Tyre, Sidon and Damur before laying siege to West Beirut, the center of the Lebanese National Movement and the Palestinian national liberation movement.

“Both militarily and politically the Palestinian national liberation struggle, Lebanese national liberation and Arab liberation has suffered a great defeat with the driving out of Lebanon of the

PLO, the imprisonment of more than 10,000 liberation fighters in Israeli settler jails, and the occupation of Lebanon by more than 100,000 Israeli troops who now control more than 50% of the territory of Lebanon.”

We said further that,

“Lebanon is where the Palestinian national liberation movement existed in its most organized form, politically and militarily. It was accurately referred to as ‘a state within a state’. This was the last country where a powerful movement for land and freedom existed on the borders of their homeland - Palestine. The other border states, Egypt, Jordan and Syria, all have bans on Palestinian military activity.” (*Ray O. Light Newsletter* No. 12, Sept. ‘82, “The Israeli Settler Military Occupation of Lebanon: Victory or Defeat for the Palestinian People?”, pp. 3,4)

Yet Arafat, the principal leader of the Palestinian Revolution, far from accepting his leading responsibility in this tragedy, actually described it as “a Palestinian victory”!!

What kind of leadership had Arafat offered the besieged Lebanese and Palestinian masses in West Beirut, what did Arafat point to as the “key to victory”?

“This is what Arafat said: ‘Take up arms and defend what is left of your nation’s honor unto death, because *martyrdom is the key to victory.*’ (our emphasis). Arafat could only offer death to the heroic Palestinian and Lebanese liberation fighters!” (*ibid.* p. 19)

No wonder U.S. imperialism loves Arafat’s leadership so!

We went on to quote the *Wall Street Journal* which said,

“U.S. and Saudi Arabia have *been working frantically over the last two weeks to arrange a settlement that would preserve the PLO’s dignity.* The hope is that an ‘honorable surrender’ – in which the safety of the PLO guerrillas leaving West Beirut would be guaranteed by the U.S. and other Western nations – will bolster the relatively moderate leadership of Chairman Yasir Arafat.” (7/8/82, our emphasis)

Then we observed,

“In light of Arafat’s consistent betrayal of the Palestinian people and his loyalty to U.S. imperialism, it is clear why a concerted effort has been made with the Pope, the President of Italy, the Arab Summit, etc. to make it appear that Arafat is a ‘winner’. Arafat’s record exposes him as the key misleader within the

ranks of the Palestine Liberation Movement holding back the cause of Palestinian freedom, a 'loser' propped up by U.S. imperialism and Arab reaction precisely to keep the Palestinian people and ultimately all the Arab peoples from winning their emancipation.

"Whoever fosters and spreads the lie that Arafat and the Palestinians won a victory in Lebanon is helping to prop up Arafat and his 'loser' leadership of the Palestinians and aiding U.S. imperialism's effort to continue and intensify its domination of the Middle East." (*Ray O. Light Newsletter* No. 12, Sept. 1982)

Just as in Jordan in 1970, U.S. imperialism, international revisionism and Arab reaction had all worked to make a tragic Palestinian *defeat*, set up with Arafat's cooperation, appear as a Palestinian *victory*!

* * * *

The blood of thousands of Palestinian, Jordanian and Lebanese Moslem martyrs is on Arafat's hands. No wonder, the *Wall Street Journal* recently commented that "By any normal political logic, Mr. Arafat should have been finished years ago." (*Wall Street Journal*, 7/1/83, p. 19)

One of the most encouraging and inspiring aspects of the current revolt against Arafat is that his massive betrayal of his own people from 1970 in Jordan to 1982 in Lebanon is finally being unmasked. Our call on the Palestinian masses and the international proletariat after the 1982 tragedy in Lebanon to "Defeat the Leadership of Defeat!" is finally beginning to happen! And this *has* to happen in order for the Palestinian Revolution and the Arab revolution to advance to victory over international imperialism, Israeli Zionism and Arab reaction.

Question — Who is it that supports the traitor Arafat as the "leader" of Al Fatah, the PLO, and the Palestinian Revolution?

Answer — Certainly, in the main, it is *not* the Palestinian people.

"Many analysts, Arab and Israeli alike, say the PLO after 19 years of living off Saudi money, resembles any large corporation and has its own corporate interests that are distinct from those of the people it represents." (*Miami Herald*, 6/5/83)

One of the most rotten pillars of Arafat's rule over the PLO is PLO "Foreign Minister", Farouh Kaddoumi, who previously worked in Saudi Arabia as public relations director of ARAMCO, the Saudi-American oil partnership. The Palestinian Revolution and Arab revolution threatens the strategic oil interests of U.S. imperialism in particular. So it is no wonder that the Rockefeller interests would have their own people placed in key spots in the leadership of their opposition.

But why does the Royal House of Saud subsidize a “revolutionary” movement for the liberation of Palestine? So as to protect itself from revolution.

As we pointed out last year,

“*Saudi Arabia*, hired Richard Helms direct from his position as head of the U.S. CIA to become director of security for the Royal House of Saud. Bechtel Corporation, which now has provided the present U.S. government with its Secretary of State and its Secretary of Defense does a phenomenal business with King Fahd and the Royal House. Saudi Arabia has functioned, seemingly against its own interest, in keeping OPEC prices in line with U.S. imperialism’s aims and desires. (This same Saudi Royal House linked by a thousand threads to U.S. imperialism also provides most of the financial backing to Yasir Arafat and the PLO!! No wonder the Palestinian masses have suffered defeat after defeat while following Arafat’s leadership!)” (*ROL Newsletter*, No. 12, p. 13)

In addition, the Arafat leadership renounces the need for the Arab peoples of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, etc. to overthrow their reactionary rulers. And indeed in the current crisis that Arafat is facing, it is none other than the Saudi Arabian royal family who have come out most openly on his side. In the heat of the crisis, King Fahd stated that,

“We are fortunate to have with us today Yasser Arafat, the leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization on whom we pin great hopes.” “We and the PLO are moving within the same framework.” (*Associated Press*, 6/8/83)

Arafat responded:

“We have great hopes that the liberation of Palestine and Jerusalem will be accomplished at the hands of his majesty King Fahd.” (*ibid*)

Reliance on the oppressive Royal House of Saud for emancipation — such is the line of Arafat’s path to freedom for the Palestinian people!

* * * *

But the Royal House of Saud is not the only Arab royalty that is backing Arafat! As Khaled al-Hassan, “the PLO’s leading diplomatic contact with the West,” put it recently, “The possibility with King Hussein is always there.” (*Wall Street Journal*, 7/1/83) King Hussein, in line with U.S. imperialist President Reagan’s plan, needs Arafat in order to make the West Bank and Gaza “a (less than sovereign) homeland” in which King Hussein “would manage their foreign and military affairs while PLO

having achieved 'liberation' will fade away." (*New York Times* editorial, 10/14/82) This would alleviate the pressure on overextended Israel, and help King Hussein keep control of the Jordanian people within his current borders by keeping the politically more advanced and active Palestinians outside his borders.

It must be remembered that King Hussein was exposed in the U.S. media a number of years ago as a direct paid agent of the U.S. CIA! And most importantly that King Hussein butchered the Palestinians in Amman in 1970. No individual leader other than Arafat would have even the remotest chance to deliver the PLO and the Palestinian people into King Hussein's blood-stained hands.

* * * *

Of course, the settler state of Israel and U.S. imperialism itself are backing Arafat though neither one can appear to be doing so without exposing Arafat as the traitor to the Palestinian people that he really is.*

While *Newsweek* (6/13/83), in a caption under Arafat's picture, described "a bloody revolt that could cripple the campaign against Israel", the *New York Times* a few weeks later in a "military analysis" said just the opposite:

"Specialists who think Mr. Arafat is on the way out said they believed that his loss of power would, in time, result in increased guerilla operations against Israeli forces in Lebanon. An American source said the Israelis evidently expected such operations ..." (*New York Times*, 6/25/83, p. 48)

This same strategic article opened with the following admission:

"The challenge to Yasir Arafat's leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization has stirred serious concern in intelligence circles of the United States, other North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries and Israel, too.

"The worst development, some intelligence sources said, would be the ouster of Mr. Arafat by left-wing organizations such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, backed by Syria with the blessing of the Soviet Union."

What a condemnation of Arafat's leadership that the principal enemies of the Palestinian nation, the settler state of Israel and U.S. imperialism, are worried that he might be deposed!!

*"In a striking display of such support for Arafat, Major Haddad, the feudal warlord of southern Lebanon, notorious butcher of the Palestinian people and exposed before the world as an open puppet of Zionism in the direct pay of the settler state of Israel, said, "*He [Arafat] would be safe here ... We offer him political asylum in Free Lebanon*". (Our emphasis, *Reuters*, 6/26/83)

Question — What about the role of Syria in backing the rebels?

Answer — This is an extremely important and also tricky question. Syrian President Assad has thousands of troops occupying northern and eastern sections of Lebanon. At the very least, control over this Lebanese territory gives Assad some leverage in attempting to get back from Israel the Golan Heights seized by the Israelis in the 1967 war. And control of the PLO fighters would give Assad all the more leverage. For this reason Assad has had a stake in opposing Arafat's open treachery as manifested in Arafat's attempt to remove the 8,000 to 10,000 PLO fighters from this last battlefield with Israel. Hence Assad's opposition to Arafat.

But, with all seven of the PLO organizations other than Fatah now based in Damascus, Syria and with the rebel base alongside the Syrian troops in the Bekaa Valley and Tripoli, it is of great importance for the Palestinian revolutionaries to remember Assad's record of betrayal, so as not to become dependent upon the Syrian regime in the struggle against Arafat, Israel and U.S. imperialism.

What is Assad's record?

Last year when the Israeli settler army invaded Lebanon, the Syrian army used the opportunity to strengthen their presence on Lebanese territory as well. But the Syrian army did almost no fighting against Israel and then signed a separate cease-fire with Israel — leaving the Palestinians and the Lebanese Moslems to face the Israeli army alone.

Assad's role in 1976 was even more treacherous. For at that time Syria shocked the world by intervening on behalf of the Lebanese right, Israel and U.S. imperialism — actually preventing the Palestinian and Lebanese revolutionaries from winning a free and independent Lebanon seven years ago.*

*After the 1973 war, Syria's economy became more and more linked with the West through massive economic aid from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. In 1975 and the first six months of 1976 aid from the United States totaled \$200 million. In the beginning of 1976 the economic aid that Syria had become dependent on from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait all but dried up. The imperialists were demanding their payoff - the taming of the revolution in Lebanon.

Assad openly invaded Lebanon on June 1, 1976 and ultimately sent in 22,000 troops to crush the revolution. The U.S. imperialists were elated by Syria's pro-imperialist role in helping to crush the revolution in Lebanon, reflected in articles in the bourgeois press such as "One Invasion That The U.S. Approves" (*U.S. News & World Report*, June 14, 1976). The U.S. imperialists reacted concretely to their anti-Palestinian and anti-revolutionary friend with \$80 million more of economic aid to Syria in July, and in August, an agreement was initialed in Damascus guaranteeing U.S. private investment in Syria. Saudi Arabia, while previously holding up aid to Syria, resumed aid in August 1976 including a \$75 million long term loan. This was all payment for a job well done, i.e. the brutal crushing of the revolution in Lebanon.

Nevertheless, Assad's counter revolutionary record in relation to Palestine liberation should not deter the Palestinian revolutionaries from utilizing the tactical support that Assad's present position affords the revolutionary movement. The rotten record of Syria under Assad should merely serve to keep the revolutionaries vigilant regarding the limits to which they should become allied with Assad and his regime.

Indeed, the Israelis have not forgotten Assad's record.

"An Israeli government analysis added that Syria has not in the past allowed PLO guerrillas to infiltrate Israel from Syrian territory and we are confident that it will not do so in the future, either." (*Miami Herald*, 6/5/83)*

Neither has U.S. imperialism. In the past week,

"Secretary of State George Shultz ... suggested that Syrian control of the PLO might facilitate a settlement in Lebanon. 'The greater the Syrian control, the likelier that if Syria withdraws, the PLO will, too,' he said." (*Newsweek*, 7/11/83, p. 33)

And on July 6 (as this is going to press) U.S. Secretary of State Shultz had a 5 hour meeting with Assad in Damascus.

Question — What role are the Soviet revisionists playing in this dispute?

Answer — Alongside the Royal House of Saud the Soviet revisionists have been the other main force that has *openly* come to Arafat's rescue! As the *Wall Street Journal* projected,

"Mr. Arafat's best hope is that a combination of pressure from the conservative Arab states and the Soviet Union – both of which have some leverage with Syria – will force the Syrians to back down. The Soviets, for example, appear to be unhappy with Syria's recent behavior. But they have been unwilling thus far to risk their prestige by strongly supporting the PLO leader." (*Wall Street Journal*, 7/11/83, p. 19)

What does Wall Street want from Soviet Revisionism?! Andropov and the Soviet revisionists have in fact strongly supported Arafat. In early June, Soviet leader Yuri Andropov sent a message which stressed the need for a "strong and unified position based on the relationship between the PLO and Syria, as well as Palestinian unity under its legitimate leadership headed by Chairman Arafat." (quoted from

*In fact, "Israel's PLO watchers believed Assad might allow Arafat to remain a PLO figurehead so long as he, Assad, controlled the PLO's political decisions." (*Newsweek*, 7/11/83, p.33)

Newsweek, 6/13/83) Andropov subsequently sent at least three telegrams to Arafat personally to help him deal with his political challenge.*

By early June a communique calling for a change in the leadership, was signed by the Libyan-backed Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-general command headed by Ahmed Jibril, the pro-Libyan Popular Struggle Front of Samir Ghoshe and the Syrian-supported Saiqa guerrillas of Issam Kadi. Nevertheless, the second and third largest organizations in the PLO, the PFLP and the DFLP, whose leaders George Habash and Naef Hawatmeh respectively, maintain the closest ties to Moscow, were “circumspect in their public comment on the rebellion, regarding it as an internal Fatah problem.” This lack of principled support for the rebels within Fatah on the part of these veteran Palestinian leftists is no doubt largely due to pressure on them from Russian revisionism.**

Soviet revisionism’s strong support for Arafat *seems* almost amazing given several facts: 1) Arafat has consistently leaned the Palestinian movement to the West to the fullest extent possible, and 2) the Soviet Union has much leverage currently with Assad and Syria, with Moscow having provided two batteries of long range SAM 5’s each manned by 600 to 800 Soviet crewmen —with computers for these missiles “linked by satellite to a Soviet command and control system in Moscow” — according to Western intelligence sources, and with the Syrian missile site off limits to all but the Soviets — even to Syria’s Defense Minister.(see *Newsweek*, 6/20/83, p. 35)

Yet the Soviet revisionist support for Arafat and links with Assad should underscore for the Palestinian rebels of Fatah, their need to remain politically and militarily independent of Soviet revisionism as well as the Syrian regime.

Regarding the Soviet revisionists, on the front of the Middle East as elsewhere in the world, they seem to function more as loyal revisionist collaborators with and

*We can only note with indignation the concern that Soviet revisionism shows for an individual leader of a national liberation struggle who has continually led his people to slaughter. And we contrast this with the silence of Soviet revisionism at the death of the great individual leaders, Cayetano Carpio and Anaya Montes, who were leading their people to freedom in El Salvador!

**As we concluded last September in our document on the Israeli military occupation of Lebanon:

“1) Sharp and principled internal struggle within the Palestine Liberation Movement, including extensive use of criticism and self-criticism, is a vital necessity. The Habash-led PFLP, Hawatmeh, etc. need to be forced to take a stand on the Arafat leadership one way or the other. Habash must be asked what his political support for Soviet revisionism in recent years has achieved for the Palestinian people. *Defeat the Leadership of Defeat!*” (Ray O. Light Newsletter, No. 12, p. 22)

lackeys of U.S. imperialism than even as a rival competitive capitalist or imperialist power.

Question — Is the internal struggle within Al Fatah and the PLO a good thing or a bad thing for the Palestinian Revolution and the world revolution?

Answer — Clearly the fourteen years of Palestinian national “unity” under the comprador bourgeois leadership of Yasir Arafat has been a period of national catastrophe for the Palestinian people. As substantiated above, the current struggle against the Arafat leadership is absolutely necessary for the advancement of the Palestinian Revolution and is therefore a very good thing.

In his great work, *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Lenin depicted the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution as two links in the same chain. In the first stage of the revolution, Lenin taught that “the proletariat must carry to completion the democratic revolution by allying to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to crush by force the resistance of the autocracy and to paralyze the instability of the bourgeoisie.” Elsewhere in the work, Lenin declared that,

“The outcome of the revolution depends on whether the working class will play the part of a subsidiary to the bourgeoisie, a subsidiary that is powerful in the force of its onslaught against the autocracy but impotent politically, or whether it will play the part of leader of the people’s revolution.” (p. 4)

This is the challenge today for the proletarian revolutionaries of Palestine and throughout the Arab world.*

Question — What is the path to Palestinian freedom under the present difficult conditions, as *Ray O. Light* sees it?

Answer — The forces arrayed on the side of Arafat — “the wall of reservations and vacillations” as the great Salvadoran revolutionary Cayetano Carpio put it — are very powerful, in the short run.

Yet even now, there is a basis for real optimism about the prospects for the Palestinian Revolution after Arafat is deposed. The key to this path was raised by

*Proletarian revolutionaries throughout the world would do well to note the tremendous support U.S. imperialism and its lackeys from the Pope to Andropov are giving to Arafat and other democratic bourgeois forces and compradors who have betrayed the democratic revolution against international imperialism. We should learn from the imperialists the importance of support for leadership. For, in light of Lenin’s teachings, it is clear that we cannot afford to remain indifferent to the life or even the death of our proletarian revolutionary leaders such as the recently departed Comrade Cayetano Carpio of El Salvador.

Arafat's lieutenant Khaled al-Hassan when he said that, "if the revolt wasn't taking place in the Bekaa, it would only take a half hour to finish it off." (quoted in *Wall Street Journal*, 7/1/83) For the revolt is based in the Bekaa, in the last military front against Israel available to the Palestinians.

Newsweek conceded recently,

"From his sprawling hillside palace overlooking Beirut, Lebanese President Amin Gemayel's domain extends as far as the eye can see - and not much farther. Despite the Israeli Lebanese withdrawal agreement negotiated by Secretary of State George Shultz ... Gemayel may be forced to cling to his enclave with the help of American, British, French and Italian peacekeeping forces - and to watch helplessly while Syria, Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization draw and quarter the rest of his country."(6/22/83)

The overthrow of the corrupt and sold out pro-imperialist Arafat leadership will spark a great upsurge in the fighting spirit and capacity of the PLO. And the Israeli army is over-extended, facing effective rear guard guerilla actions in occupied Lebanon, in particular. Also, in the first three months of 1983, there were more than 700 incidents of rioting or attack on the West Bank and Gaza, according to the *Christian Science Monitor*.

"The Israeli daily *Haaretz* reported, meanwhile, that between April 1982 and March 1983, resistance actions in the West Bank rose by 69% over the previous year, with the number of disturbances jumping by 79%." (quoted from the *Guardian*, 6/15/83, p. 17)

The aroused Lebanese Moslems in the occupation zones are a strong base for a fighting alliance against Israel.

No wonder there is already a growing anti-war sentiment among some strata of the Israeli population.

Furthermore as we concluded last September,

"4) It is clear that the road to Arab sovereignty in Amman, Beirut, Riyadh, Cairo and Damascus, etc. lies through armed struggle with Tel Aviv. Given the refusal of the reactionary Arab regimes to wage war against Israel in response to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and their indissoluble links with U.S. imperialism, the overthrow of the reactionary Arab regimes and the establishment of anti-imperialist regimes that will provide a revolutionary base area for Palestinian liberation is on the order of the day." (*Ray O. Light Newsletter*, No. 12, p.22)

Once Arafat and his pro-imperialist, pro-Saudi, pro-Israeli ilk are no longer leading the Palestine liberation movement, a strong political appeal by the Palestinian Revolution to the rest of the Arab masses, should help inspire the revolutionary overthrow of these regimes and the establishment of strong and stable revolutionary base areas for the Palestinian Revolution to culminate a successful drive to smash the settler state of Israel, free Palestine, and drive U.S. imperialism out of the Middle East.

* * * * *

Proletarian revolutionaries of the world —

Give No Aid and Comfort to Arafat-the Traitor to the Palestinian Revolution!

Support Genuine Anti-Imperialist Leadership of the Palestinian Revolution!

Proletarian revolutionaries of Palestine —

The Defeat of Arafat is a Precondition for Victorious Liberation of Palestine!

Defeat the Leadership of Defeat!

* * * * *

— **Victory to the Palestinian Revolution!**

— **Death to Israeli Zionism, Arab Reaction and U.S. Imperialism!**

— **Proletarians of the World and Oppressed Peoples Unite!**



Appendix

IMPERIALIST ADVISOR EXPOSES YASIR ARAFAT IN *FOREIGN AFFAIRS*

(Excerpts from “The Future of the PLO” by Eric Rouleau)*

The fact that the mutiny originated not with one of the “extremist” organizations but within Fatah, the core and mainstream of the PLO, made it both more serious (Fatah represents some 80 percent of the Fedayeen and probably a like percentage of the Palestinian population at large) and more perplexing, since the organization had always shied away from ideology. Indeed, the dissidence would have been incomprehensible without the profound changes wrought by Israel’s invasion of Lebanon in June 1982. Yassir Arafat’s boastful claim that the war had ended with a “major victory” for the Palestinian resistance gave rise to a profound malaise in Palestinian ranks, even among his own supporters. ...

The consequences of the debacle nourished the malaise among the military chiefs, particularly of Fatah, which constituted the backbone of the Palestinian forces. In abandoning Beirut, the Resistance lost its “Hanoi”, its sanctuary as well as its operational base” The dispersion of the Fedayeen among nine Arab countries, some of them thousands of kilometers from Israel, meant that the PLO in practice had renounced the armed struggle, since those forces remaining in eastern and northern Lebanon would sooner or later be obliged to evacuate the territory. ...

The massacre of the Palestinian refugees in the Sabra and Shatila camps scarcely three weeks after the Fedayeen’s departure from Beirut added weight to their contention that the slaughter never would have occurred had Arafat not believed the American guarantees for the security of civilians and given the order to evacuate. ...

All his contacts, secret and otherwise, with successive American Administrations and with the Israeli peace movement (these last carried out mainly through Issam Sartawi), as well as his attempts to reach a basis for compromise with the Jewish state, have aroused suspicion and anger in Damascus. During the 1982 war in Lebanon, to go back no further, at least three of Arafat’s initiatives had sorely irritated the Syrian president. In July, Arafat had supported two texts—the first jointly prepared by three internationally prominent Jews, Nahum Goldmann, Philip Klutznick and Pierre Mendes-France, and the second in a draft resolution submitted to the U.N. Security Council by France and Egypt—calling for the mutual recognition of the Israelis and Palestinians as a prelude to a peaceful settlement. In addition, he had made a commitment in writing to the American congressman

*Eric Rouleau is the chief Middle East correspondent and editorialist of *Le Monde* in Paris. These excerpts are reprinted from the article which appeared in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 62 No.1, Fall 1983, pp. 138-156.

Paul McCloskey to subscribe to “all the United Nations resolutions concerning Palestine,” which clearly signified acceptance of the partition of the territory into two states, one Jewish and the other Arab, in keeping with the text voted by the U.N. General Assembly in November 1947.

Finally, the PLO president had launched an appeal from Beirut under siege for the convocation of an international peace conference, thus demonstrating, as Egypt’s President Anwar Sadat had done during the heat of the 1973 October War, his readiness to negotiate peace with Israel. ...

Whatever his calculations, he continued to act as if the “second Palestinian republic in exile” had not died on August 31, the day of his “triumphal departure” from Beirut. Throughout the fall of 1982 and the following spring, he increased direct and indirect contacts with foreign capitals, including Paris and Washington, to sound out whether the “mutual recognition” between Israel and the PLO that he intended to submit to the Palestine National Council for approval would find support among the Western powers. To this end, he initiated a discreet dialogue with Egypt, dispatched emissaries to the United States, officially received in Tunis leaders of the Israeli peace movement (with whom he had himself photographed), declared that the Reagan Plan included “positive aspects,” and, as of October 1982, opened negotiations with King Hussein concerning the creation of a confederation between Jordan and an eventual Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza. ...

... shortly after the first round of talks between the Jordanian monarch and the PLO leader, the Syrian Information Minister, Ahmed Iskander, declared to *The New York Times* that Arafat did not represent the PLO as a whole. The following month, Abu Nidal—Arafat’s mortal enemy who had been carrying out assassinations from his sanctuary in Baghdad for the past decade and whose men assassinated Issam Sartawi in Portugal on April 10, 1983—was authorized to open offices in Damascus. In December, Abu Saleh—the political leader of the future rebellion within Fatah—declared to UPI that the Palestinians had “lost confidence in Arafat” because he had “strayed from the Palestinian consensus” by negotiating with King Hussein. Then in January, came Abu Musa’s indictment of Arafat’s policy. Finally, on February 7, three Syrian-controlled groups belonging to the PLO held a meeting in Damascus—and made no secret of it—to examine the possibility of a split within the umbrella organization.

Yassir Arafat had reached a dead end. Militarily finished in Lebanon (which he knew full well even though he didn’t admit it publicly), he had been unable to make effective use of the increased sympathy toward the Palestinian cause in world opinion. All his hopes of starting up a peace process under conditions favorable to the Palestinians had turned out to be illusory. ...

So on the eve of the PNC meeting last February, at which Yassir Arafat had hoped to announce a diplomatic breakthrough which would strengthen the “moderate” wing of the PLO and partially compensate for the defeat in Lebanon, the impasse was total. During an interview he granted me at the time, he explained that no one would follow him if he proposed, as Washington demanded, unilateral and unconditional recognition of Israel, especially since such an initiative would bring no tangible result. ...

As one of Arafat's close associates explained to a group of PNC members in February. ...

the Palestinians had to take into account the U.S. hegemony in the Middle East and extend or enlarge their channels of communication with the pro-American Arab states, Egypt as well as Jordan and Saudi Arabia, while preserving their ties to the socialist camp and its allies in the region. It was this strategy of "movement within immobilism," as it was called with a straight face, that gained the day at the 12th Palestine National Council.

The conference, humorously dubbed "the conference of the yes-no," was finally held in Algiers from February 14-22 of this year. Addressing the assembly during a closed session, Arafat declared: "It's true that we are being offered nothing of value, but we can't afford to say no to everything. We can't say yes to everything either. So we have to learn to say 'yes, but', and 'no, but'. ..." The resolutions adopted by the PNC were in keeping with the Palestinian leader's wishes. The Reagan Plan was not formally rejected, but deemed "inadequate as a valid basis for a fair and lasting settlement." The Brezhnev Plan, providing for the mutual recognition of Israel and the future Palestinian state, was "supported" but not adopted. Egypt was invited to "distance itself" from the Camp David Accords but not to denounce them, thus allowing the continuation of the dialogue with Cairo. The contacts with all Jewish "progressive and democratic forces" were to be pursued, and no distinction was made between Zionist and anti-Zionist, despite the importance of such a distinction for a large part of the assembly, thus enabling Arafat to meet whatever Israelis he wished.

Finally, the PNC approved the resumption of negotiations with King Hussein concerning the creation of a Jordanian-Palestinian confederation. ...

Immediately after the conference, the PLO president flew to Amman to resume his negotiations behind closed doors with King Hussein, who ended by signing the protocol agreement drafted jointly and amended by Yassir Arafat in his own hand. Determined to keep a free rein, Arafat had been careful not to inform the other Palestinian leaders, including his closest companions in the Fatah leadership, of the substance of the document. And indeed the text contained at least three major violations of the PNC decisions, none of which could have been swallowed: it did not designate the PLO as a negotiating party in eventual talks with Israel; it did not recognize the Palestinian people's right to set up their own sovereign state before joining up with Jordan; and especially—and this on the insistence of King Hussein—it specifically mentioned only the Reagan Plan among the "various projects" which might lead to a settlement.

But at the last minute, Arafat prudently refused to countersign or even initial the protocol and flew to Kuwait to obtain the prior approval of the Palestinian leadership. For the first time in the history of the movement, Yassir Arafat was repudiated first by the PLO Executive Committee and then by the whole of the Central Committee of Fatah, his own organization. ...

* * * * *

Three months before the mutiny broke out, Abu Musa gave clear and precise expression to opinions he said were his own. During a closed door session of Fatah's Revolutionary Council held in Aden on January 27, 1983, he launched into a veritable diatribe against Fatah policy and, without naming him, against Yassir Arafat himself. The text which formed the basis of his indictment—which in fact had been drafted collectively by the dissident group and which was circulated after the mutiny was launched—indicated that the rebels were violently opposed to any compromise with Israel and that their objective was “to liberate all Palestine” in accordance with the PLO charter, which in their view had been violated by a whole series of PNC resolutions and the diplomacy of Yassir Arafat. It stated their opposition to the Reagan Plan, the Fez Plan adopted by the Arab heads of state in September 1982, negotiations with King Hussein, and the contacts established with Egypt and with Israeli pacifists. It proposed the resumption of armed struggle—“the sole road to liberation”—in Lebanon, the Israeli-occupied Golan Heights, and the West Bank (the text specified that the struggle would be launched from Jordanian territory after the overthrow of the Hashemite regime) and the implementation of operations aimed at “striking and liquidating” American interests in the Middle East and “ending the U.S. hegemony in the region.”

Abu Musa's speech, according to witnesses, was greeted with polite smiles and a glacial silence by the other members of the Revolutionary Council, who were far from imagining that the “revolutionary romanticism” they found so totally removed from reality was in fact shared by an underground group of which he was spokesman, or that his speech had been intended as a last, serious warning to Yassir Arafat before they proceeded with an armed uprising. ...

* * * * *

All correspondence including requests for a *Ray O. Light* Publications List and for other information regarding the purchase of *Ray O. Light* Newsletters, pamphlets, bulk rates, etc., please write to:

sunshine_440@hotmail.com

or

Boxholder
607 Boylston St.
Lower Level Box 464
Boston, MA 02116 USA