

# Democratic Yemen Celebrates

October 14th of this year marked the 21st anniversary of the Yemeni revolution. On this occasion President Ali Nasser Mohammad, the Secretary General of the Yemeni Socialist Party together with Comrade George Habash, the Secretary General of the PFLP, inaugurated a hospital and a new popular residential quarters in Aden. Both projects carry the name of the late martyr Wadi Haddad.



responsible for planting the explosives.

Soon, the NATO forces that were expelled from Lebanon were present in the Red Sea (US, Britain, France, Italy). It is no pure coincidence that these four countries that deployed their forces in the Red Sea are the same ones that were in Lebanon as the «international peace keeping force». It is rather a planned cover for US military presence in the area, especially in such times. Normally the US does not need any excuses or permission to increase its military presence in Egypt. But this time it needed to cover up its recent moves in the Red Sea since it aimed at shifting Egypt's role from one of «protecting» the Suez Canal and «securing» free international navigation to one of an open US military base. Hence allowing US imperialism to reach any Arab country in a short time.

The Red Sea incident is a serious event since US imperialist interests in the area are growing and military intervention is their means to achieve them. Here we must recall the 1956 Zionist-French-British joint attack on the Egyptian Suez Canal which aimed at increasing imperialist domination in the area at that time. The 1956 attack took place after President Nasser nationalized the Canal. The aggression was under the pretext of «protecting» the Canal and «securing» it as free international waters. However, a major difference between the two incidents is that Egypt then, had a nationalist, anti-imperialist government that courageously confronted the fierce attack. This is contrary to Mubarak's present regime that advocates the open door policy by collaborating with US imperialism in invading Egypt and the rest of the Arab countries.

An Egyptian engineer who is the head of the opposition Egyptian Socialist Party, Mr. Ibrahim Shukri, stated in the *Middle East Newspaper*,

August 15, 1984, that «'Israel' and the US are indeed part of the Red Sea incident. He mentioned that 'Israel' is planning to dig an alternative canal to Suez (between Elat in the Gulf of Aqaba in the Red Sea and Ashkelon at the Mediterranean Sea).

In the same time the US is planning a project of installing an oil pipe line through Africa. Mr. Shukri warned that, «the entire region is witnessing dangerous events and organized terrorist activities that will decrease the income of the Suez Canal».

The above statement affirms that the US-Israeli explosive steps in the Red Sea are in harmony with the US strategic goals of full domination of the region.

On the level of the Arab reactionary regimes, this incident was to allow them to escalate their attacks on the progressive regimes, mainly Democratic Yemen and Ethiopia. The US also tried to strengthen the «strategic consensus» plans in the area. This was clear in Sudan's call for a security conference which was mainly to centralize the reactionary regimes' activities against these two countries. This conference would have also been the right opportunity to install the President of the Camp David regime as the head of the Arab states. Mubarak enthusiastically prepared the opening statement for the conference and was quite ready to assume the role of leadership. Of course this would have been an important step in paving the way for the return of the Camp David regime to the upcoming Arab summit. Hence extending the Camp David capitulationist agreement to include other Arab countries.

The NATO presence was a way of exhibiting the US military power in restoring «order» and «security» in the region. This is significant since Saudi Arabia failed to convince other Gulf

states in the Murphy plans of deploying US forces in the Gulf and the Arab Peninsula. The US administration needed to reinstate confidence in the hearts of the Arab reaction as its local agents.

Furthermore, this scenario was to show the ability of the US in forcing its conditions on the reactionary Arab regimes. It aimed at convincing the oil producing countries to reroute their oil tankers from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean and to accept the Israeli proposal of using its ports on the Mediterranean. Hence allowing «Israel» to overcome its internal economic and political crisis and to draw the Arab reaction closer to recognizing the Zionist settler state.

The Red Sea hysteria was also to pose a threat to free navigation of the oil tankers in order to alarm the oil exporting countries. This would then allow the US to increase its monopoly of the oil industry.

Finally, it is clear that the US imperialists and Zionist expansionists have created the Red Sea scenario in preparation for a new aggression against the Arab progressive forces and nationalist regimes. In addition to their mutual interests, they both need to regain some of their losses and recover their defeats. The heroic comeback of the Lebanese nationalists liberating West Beirut, the abrogation of the May 17th agreement and the continuing national resistance in South Lebanon, all are victories that our enemies try to topple. Their efforts to further increase their political and economic domination of the region will continue to escalate. This falls within the US cold war policy and the escalation of the arms race which can only increase world tension and threatens world peace and progress.