

# THE PLO IS AND ALWAYS WAS A BRITISH MARIONETTE



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published May 4, 2022*

The Palestine Liberation Organization was founded in 1964 in Jerusalem. Your first clue already. It was founded by the Arab League, whose own history goes back to 1945. If we go to that page at Wikipedia, we find mainstream historians admitting the Arab League “was designed to fail”. It has “shown low levels of cooperation”. Really? Who would design an Arab League with the express purpose of failing? Can you say Israel?

To see who else was behind the Arab League, look no further than its arm the Arab British Chamber of Commerce, established in 1975 in Mayfair, London. Sort of suspicious, no? Even more suspicious is that the Wikipedia page on that conspicuously fails to tell you anything about it, especially the people involved. We find nothing until the chairmanship passes to Sir Richard Beaumont KCMG OBE in 1980. He just happened to come out of the Imperial Defence College. He is in the peerage but is scrubbed of any links by Darryl Lundy. However, we may assume he is related to the Beaumont baronets, linking him to the Hamilton dukes. The Beaumonts were originally close cousins of the Stuarts, being the Earls of Warwick back to 1100. We find the same misdirection on the Arab League page itself, which tells us almost nothing about its founding. Such as, why wait almost two decades to address the Palestinian problem? Shouldn't Palestine have been a central plank of the League from the beginning?



Next, notice what the PLO chose for its coat of arms: a phoenix pretending to be an eagle. They throw it right in your face, as usual, sure you won't be able to read it. Don't think so? Well look at their emblem:



Why is their own flag on fire? Shouldn't they be burning the flag of Israel? No, because that isn't what it means. The emblem goes with the coat of arms, with the coat of arms *above* the emblem. Why? So that the Phoenix can sit on his flames, of course.

And I now think I can tell you why the PLO wasn't invented until 1964. They had to wait until after the success of *No Time for Sergeants*, starring Andy Griffith. No, I'm completely serious. That movie was a big hit in 1958, and in 1964 they made a TV series out of it starring Sammy Jackson. Still not getting it? The big joke in that book and movie was when the lead character, Will Stockdale, a private in the army, racks up so many demerits he is assigned the position of **Permanent Latrine Orderly**. PLO. So when Western Intelligence created this Palestine Liberation Organization, they came up with this inside joke of their own. This is a military sense of humor to a T. After all, the PLO wasn't really a liberation organization, was it? They weren't trying to liberate Palestine from Israel, they were calling for recognition and statehood. It wasn't that Palestinians didn't have any freedom, it is that they didn't have any autonomy or formal recognition. They hadn't disappeared from local laws of freedom, they had disappeared from the map. They weren't slaves or even a conquered people, they were dispossessed and displaced. Dispossessed by international and mainly British dictat. Which of course means the British should have been the primary enemies, or at least a close second after the Israelis. Instead, we

see the Arab League and PLO allying to Mayfair?

Israel was formed out of the 1917 Balfour Declaration, which came out of England, and which was promoted by Lord Rothschild. Article 20 of the PLO charter expressly declares the Balfour Declaration null, so why would the PLO or Arab League ever ally to London?

The first chairman of the PLO was Ahmad Shukeiri, an Ottoman Turk who had come out of the **British** Law College in Jerusalem. Before the war he started out in the Independence Party, which was strictly a British construction. It was founded by Darwaza, allegedly a leader of the Arab Revolt, but after my [paper on Lawrence of Arabia](#), you know what to think of that. The whole Arab Revolt was staged and managed by the Brits, with some help from the French. Darwaza also came out of the Arab Higher Committee, which was led by Haj al-**Husseini**. Hold on to that name, since we are about to see it over and over. As we do, remind yourself the King of Jordan was a Hussein all this time.

After the war, Shukeiri went to DC, where he established a Palestinian office and lobby. Another huge red flag. He was soon chosen as a UN delegate for Syria! That the UN allowed this indicates they knew he was no threat to the US, Israel, or the West. He became head of the Arab League in 1950, and the ambassador to the UN for **Saudi Arabia** in 1957. So this guy was the ultimate insider, not any sort of revolutionary. Especially note his link to Saudi Arabia, which we are about to hit hard.

[I have previously outed Yasser Arafat](#) as a British stooge and Jew in a turban, as usual existing under a fake name. Like Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, Trotsky and many others, he existed under a stage name. His real name was neither Yasser nor Arafat. It was **Abdul Rahman al-Husseini**, linking him to that prominent family of hoaxers, including of course Barack **Hussein** Obama. Do you remember when Arafat died: November 11, 2004. 11/11. His mother Zahwa Abdul **Saud** died in **1933**.

Hit brakes, screech to a halt, let burned rubber smell dissipate. His mother was a Saud? As in the House of Saud, the ruling family of Saudi Arabia? No, no, I will be told, just some downmarket Sauds, move on. But do we have any evidence she wasn't related to them? No, since Arafat's genealogy is scrubbed everywhere. But let's say she *was* a Saud of those lines. What would that mean here? Well, that family arises fairly recently, coming from Ibn Saud al Muqrin, 1<sup>st</sup> Emir of Riyadh in about 1745. Muqrin was a protege of Abd al Wahhab at-Tamimi, who provided military backing. Otherwise the foundations of Saudi Arabia are all mist, and the history books have almost nothing of use to tell us. See the Wiki pages for this, which are all hot air. One is thing is notable, however: that history has been scrubbed of every reference to the West, England, or the East India Company. You would think this all happened in the dark ages, or before the flood, although it was just 270 years ago. Had the British Empire not discovered the Arabian peninsula in 1745? Of course they had. The BEIC had been there since the beginning of course. The branch of the Phoenician Navy that controlled Arabia before about 1800 was called the Ottomans, but we have seen recently they were really Atmans. They were ruled by Sultans with names like Selim and Suleiman, which are just variants of. . . **Solomon**. Jews in turbans, back to 1350.



That's their founder, Osman Gazi, whose biography has been called by historians a “black hole”. No records exist and everything we “know” arose centuries later. Sort of suspicious, ain't it? Did these people have no written language? Did they not know how to use paper or pens? No, because we have Muslim texts before that time. [Koran fragments exist from 1400 years ago](#), or about 600AD. But for some reason the Phoenicians don't want you to know where the Ottomans came from. As with the Vikings, most artifacts have been hidden and stored in places like the Vatican archives or the Smithsonian or various London repositories. But even the few things we are given are full of obvious clues, such as that painting above. Doesn't really look Arab or Muslim, does he? He looks to me like a Jewish Swede.

Which leads us back to that name Osman Gazi, or Atmangazi. Starting to look a little familiar, isn't it? As in Ashkenazi. What is a gazi? It is a variant of *ghazi*, which just means Muslim warrior. Ashkenazi comes from the Biblical Ashkenaz, which appears to be a slur of Asgunza or Asguza, where he was from. This does indeed link us to the city Gaza, which would appear to confirm the link between Gazi and Nazi. Which of course means Osman Gazi's name is yet another clue in the same direction.

More clues come from the fact that they admit the Ottomans came from Bithynia, the southern coast of the Black Sea where the Phoenicians loved to sail. The main city there was Nicomedia, previously Astacus, named for some Astacus going back before 1000BC, perhaps the Astacus of the Seven Against Thebes, around 1200BC. Whichever Astacus we choose takes us back to the Phoenicians, since the Thebans were Phoenicians and so were the early Bithynians. They admit Cadmus, the founder of Thebes, was Phoenician. But we would know it regardless, since the Black Sea was a favorite haunt of the Phoenicians back to the beginning of time. They had sailed into it from the Bosphorus thousands of years before Christ, and long before the Trojan War. They controlled all its major ports by that time. So there is no chance the Ottomans weren't Phoenicians, and no chance the rulers were really Muslim. They ruled over Muslim populations in most places after 700AD, but we can be sure they were children of El, like our rulers now.

But let's return to Riyadh and Saudi Arabia. Most people don't know that the current rulers didn't really


come to power until 1926, after Abdulaziz conquered Hejaz. The Ottomans had retaken that whole area and held it up to that time. Oil wasn't discovered there until 1938. And who did Abdulaziz al Saud depose? Ali bin Hussein. Arafat was really Hussein, remember? So the more you know, the more the whole Arafat story crumbles into dust.



That's Ali bin Hussein, just so you know. That picture tends to confirm everything I am telling you, doesn't it? "These are not the droids you're looking for".




Or maybe:



That's Christopher Lee, aka Saruman. “Always you must meddle, looking for trouble where none exists”.

In 1993 the PLO finally did what it had always been set up to do: torpedo the entire Palestinian movement for good by signing the Oslo Accords. This only gave the Palestinians “limited self-governance” in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, which was a huge step *back* from the 1947 UN partition plan. They would lose about half the lands assigned to them in that original agreement.



Basically, they lost everything in red there, so their own “representatives” in the PLO had just sold them out. The longterm goal of course was to whittle those red and green lands down to nothing, and the Arab League and PLO have been complicit in that from the beginning. The Jews would love to drive all Muslims out of Jerusalem, but they haven't yet figured out how to do that without a major real war. They don't like real wars, much preferring fake ones. I guess they need to expand their vaccination programs in Muslim countries. You may laugh, but they are actually trying to do that. According to mainstream figures, about half of Turkey and Iran is vaccinated, which just shows you who really runs those countries. You would expect a country like Iran to refuse the vaccine altogether, but that isn't what we are told. You would expect the people themselves to refuse Western vaccines, but Islam is a very regimented and disciplined religion, which helps the rulers in times like this. Muslims do not put “question authority” bumper stickers on their vehicles.

Let's return to the Balfour Declaration, which will help us make sense of this. We are told Lord Rothschild was behind it, but that is just the usual smokescreen. That Rothschild was a big dope with no interest in business or politics. He was more interested in riding turtles and having his carriages drawn by zebras. Balfour just wanted the Rothschild name behind his project, which was to set up a permanent British beachhead in Palestine, one that would require constant defense and justify a large military presence—while hiding as much as possible the British element. Why? To protect newly discovered resource interests there, starting with oil.

If the Rothschilds or anyone else had really had any great love of Israel as the homeland, why didn't they live there? Because the place is an ugly desert, and people given a choice would much rather live in Europe or the US. The creation of Israel was never about a Jewish homeland, and at the time of the

Balfour Declaration, the Jews didn't really need a homeland. They were doing fine in the US and most of Europe, even Russia. Before 1917 hardly anyone had ever heard of a genocide or a holocaust, and besides, Jews were already free to move to Palestine if they wanted. Almost none of them wanted to. But as cover for his project, Balfour needed the world to think the Jews were suddenly clamoring for a homeland in Israel. Over the next several decades, Britain would spin every world event to support that claim, though it had no basis in fact. The truth being that Israel was never, and is now not, a Jewish homeland. It is little more than a vast Hollywood set constructed as a front for the military presence there.

You see the British had to make sure that they, and not the Turks, controlled the region in upcoming decades, since they knew the area was stiff with oil and other resources. They had been there “prospecting” for decades before the Balfour Declaration, back to the 1870s. So they had to fake the Arab Revolt with Lawrence and then install their puppets into the “royal” houses throughout the region, including Syria, Jordan, Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia. Yes, the Brits are behind the Saudis and always have been. The Saudi royals and all their wealth are mostly a front. Like the American billionaires—Musk, Bezos, Zuckerberg—the Saudis are manufactured. The numbers are all made up. All these people are set up with huge houses, cars, and yachts to sell the mirage, but behind the glitzy facade they have next to nothing. The Phoenician Navy owns them and takes the bulk of earnings. I already [proved that regarding the Americans](#), and it is the same with the Saudis.

If you don't believe me, just ask yourself this: Do you really think the British Empire would have allowed these goat herders in white robes to own the most important oil fields in the world, soaking off trillions in profits from the Phoenician Navy? Of course not. The Brits fought a World War during that time against Turkey, a far more powerful country, so why would they leave Saudi Arabia alone? They could have conquered it in a weekend. And if they didn't conquer it then, why not conquer it later? The US Air Force could take the entire country overnight. Do you think the Brits and Americans are just too fair-minded for that? Do you think we just went, “well, it was on their ancestral land, so we have no right to it?” That didn't really work for the Native Americans, did it? No, we prefer *not* to openly own Saudi Arabia, because it makes it look like we share the wealth, respect borders, etc. It makes it look like the same people don't own the entire world. It is part of the fiction you call recent history.

Compare it to the Hollywood fiction I am constantly unclocking, where you are supposed to believe all these stars and starlets come from middle class Christian backgrounds. When in fact precisely none of them are. All of them are from upperclass Jewish backgrounds, with close ties to the peerage and to East India Company lineages. But they can't admit that because it doesn't mesh well with the American myth you have been brought up on, that advancement is based on merit and that anyone who works hard and has talent can rise to the top.

I will also point out that this is why they want you to think WWI started with the assassination of some duke in Austria. They need your eyes off Britain's declaration of war against Turkey in 1914. Here is what it says about that at Wikipedia:

**Immediately following their declaration of war on the Ottoman Empire in November 1914, the [British War Cabinet](#) began to consider the future of Palestine; within two months [a memorandum was circulated to the Cabinet](#) by a Zionist Cabinet member, [Herbert Samuel](#), proposing the support of Zionist ambitions in order to enlist the support of Jews in the wider war.**

That should throw up all sorts of red flags, because it doesn't make any sense. Did Turkey have

anything to do with the assassination of the duke? No. And what does the future of Palestine have to do with Turkey? We are supposed to believe Britain declared war on Turkey because it was an ally of Austria. But here they are admitting it had something to do with Palestine. And what does any of that have to do with Jews? Were the Turks murdering all the Jews in Palestine? No, so why was the War Cabinet so interested in Palestine at a time when they would seem to have other more important things to worry about?

I am telling you it is because the Brits already knew about the oil before WWI, and the war against Turkey was about that, not about some duke in Austria. Neither WWI nor WWII was about what you are told they were about. I will keep hitting that topic for years.