

ended in 1974, when the Rabat Summit declared the PLO as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. This step is a violation of the Rabat Summit resolutions and aims to put pressure on the PLO to determine its position in negotiations on the basis of the Reagan plan, which has been adopted by the Hashemite Kingdom.

The Arafat-Mubarak meeting was the opening for a series of successive steps, closely linked to the nature and outlook of the party to which this new crossing had occurred, i.e. Mubarak. The most outstanding of these steps are:

Government-in-exile....and campaign against the radicals

Yasir Arafat declared that he endorsed the establishment of a government-in-exile. The chief editor of *Al Ahram*, Ibrahim Nafe, praised this step as «the first positive political initiative by Arafat after the departure». It is well known that Sadat, from 1972, had insisted on establishing a «provisional Palestinian government». Mubarak proposed the idea again during the Israeli siege of Beirut, declaring his willingness that this government «reside in Cairo». On December 29, 1983, he declared to Kuwaiti papers that «Cairo cannot host this government, because Egypt must have its freedom of movement».

This formula of government-in-exile was always proposed by Arab reaction; it has received response from conservative trends in the PLO, who were inclined to reconciliation and compromises; cornered by the constraints of internal «democracy», they sought alternative frameworks to the PLO.

It is rather difficult to separate this idea from «the nature of the next stage of the Palestinian struggle (which) will be determined by political, diplomatic and popular work on the Arab and international levels», as stated by Arafat to the Saudi newspaper, *Al Youm*, on December 23rd. A *Washington Post* correspondent wrote that Arafat said to him that «his attitude this time towards King Hussein will not be as it was last April, when he withdrew from the negotiations table on the Reagan peace plan. Moreover, he will not bow to the pressure of the radical factions in the organization.»!! (*Al Ahali*, January 4.) It is known that the pressures at that time came from inside the Central Committee of Fatah.

Yasir Arafat's emphasis that he will not accept any truce or reconciliation with the «dissidents», and Mubarak's statements that «Arafat promised me to finish the question of the dissidents and to put the Palestinian house in order from the inside, to hold contacts with King Hussein and explore the next stage as soon as possible», confirm the interference of the Egyptian authorities in the «independence of the Palestinian decision». Added to that were Butros Ghali's statements in the People's Assembly, where he didn't hide that «Egypt encourages the moderate faction in the PLO». This means an attempt to split the organization, since Cairo considers all the other factions as radicals and extremists.

The unjustified political campaign against the Soviet Union

It was claimed by Arafat that the Soviet Union had stopped providing arms, a claim which was denied by Abu Jihad and Arafat's supporters. Arafat unjustly claimed that «the Soviet Union took the side of their Syrian ally». Furthermore, his attack reached the extent of a veiled threat when he remarked to *Al Akhbar*, a warning that the Soviet Embassy in Beirut has no protection. He added that «the Soviet presence in the Middle East would disappear if he was defeated in the battle of Tripoli»!! It is very unfortunate that these attacks came from a leader of an organization that receives the greatest political, military and morale support from the Soviet ally. The dangerous implications of these statements lie in that they are indications of retreat, which has always begun by opening a fabricated battle against the Soviet Union.

Shifting alliances

Lifting the ugly face of the subordinate regime of Egypt by expressions of appreciation and praise... To this end, Arafat employed abstractions and generalities which mixed Egypt, the state, with Egypt, the people and their national movement; he mixed between «shanty Egypt» and «palace Egypt», in the words of the Egyptian poet, Ahmed Fuad Nejem.

This is to ignore the alliances of the regime and the strings that bind it, which Arafat accepts submissively. He speaks of «big brother Egypt who leads the area» and that the moment Egypt is absent from the leadership «defeats take place». He expresses his desire to depend on the «weight of Egypt». His spokesman Ahmed Abdel Rahman declares that «the latest battles have proven that there is no ally for the organization (PLO) other than Egypt, and there is no alternative to Egypt». Moreover, he views that «any changes in the Middle East would have to pass first through the Egyptian gate»!! (*Al Watan*, December 30.)

We talk in a different language, for we belong to a different Egypt than the one they mean. The «weight» of Egypt, the state, was and will remain close to the US solution, imperialist hegemony, and liquidating the Palestinian cause and legitimate rights. The Egyptian gate leads nowhere except to Camp David...until further notice when the people of Egypt, our Egypt, have put this regime in its final place of rest.

President Mubarak did not let «the occasion» pass without teaching his guest and all Arabs a hard lesson. Venting his anger, he proudly declared that Arafat's visit served to «confirm that Egypt was always right». He expressed his readiness to «meet with any Arab leader to convince him of Camp David». He advised the Arabs «to help President Reagan» and emphasized that «the point of agreement is to start moving on the basis of the Reagan initiative».

This talk of ours is also directed to some Egyptian oppos-