

Free Mumia!

Free Jamil al-Amin!
End the Racist Death
Penalty!

Stop the War on Terrorism!



For more information
or to find out how you can help
contact:

**International Concerned Family and
Friends of Mumia Abu-Jamal**

P.O. Box 19709
Philadelphia, PA 19143
(215) 476-8812
ICFFMAJ@aol.com
www.mumia.org

Imperial Wars

Anti-War Commentaries



Part Two

by Mumia Abu Jamal

Table of Contents

A Daily Terror	2
Afghanistan and the Great Game	3
Military Courts and Congress	4
An Imperial War Expands	6
When Nations Attack	7
Mad Dog's Strategy of U.S. Empire	9

International Concerned Family and Friends of Mumia Abu-Jamal
P.O. Box 19709
Philadelphia, PA 19143
(215) 476-8812
ICFFMAJ@aol.com
www.mumia.org

Introduction

Mumia Abu-Jamal, political prisoner, writer, father, activist and rebel has been the voice of resistance since he was 15 years old. He is an award-winning journalist, and his radio commentaries have entranced, thrilled and galvanized countless people world wide.

You are reading the second volume of Mumia's commentaries concerning the aftermath of Sept. 11 and the "war on terrorism" that has so many vital implications for the activist movement, people of color, third world nations and all of us.

Mumia, as always brings his characteristic clear and concise analysis, his eloquent writing and his loving philosophy that places people above profit, always. In a time of rampant and blind patriotism used to fuel the deaths of more innocent people, Mumia's writings are some of the few that is not only questioning, but demanding answers and action.

All of the essays reprinted here are copyrighted by Mumia Abu-Jamal.

Truth is Contagious

The International Concerned Family and Friends of Mumia Abu-Jamal have put out a number of informational pamphlets and zines to educate people on Mumia's case as well as to spread Mumia's voice as far as possible.

Let the Evidence Be Heard:

A collection of new and startling affidavits in Mumia's case, from such key people as Mumia's former lawyer Rachel Wolkenstein, Mumia's brother who was at the scene of the shooting that night, Mumia himself, and the startling new confession by Arnold Beverly to the murder of Officer Daniel Faulkner, proving without a shadow of a doubt that Mumia is an innocent man.

Secret Wars:

This is the first installment of Mumia's war commentaries, ranging from the first one "Why?" written very shortly after Sept. 11, and covering the aftermath of 9/11, the bombing of Afghanistan and the curtailment of civil liberties that is still going on.

**For a small donation you can get these zines, copies of the Arnold Beverly confession on video and other materials on Mumia's case by contacting ICFFMAJ:
ICFFMAJ@aol.com
215-476-5416**

Mad Dog's Strategy of U.S. Empire 2/18/02

When U.S. president George W. Bush launched into his bellicose State of the Union address recently, and called Iran, Iraq and North Korea the "Axis of Evil," Europeans, Asians and people the world over reacted with shock, fear and wide-eyed disbelief of the American implication that these nations were the next targets in the never-ending war against Evil. Many of these erstwhile "allies" (really junior partners) looked at the Americans as if they were crazy. "Were they planning a world war?," many wondered. They did not want this. For who knows where this will end?

American saber-rattling and war-talk may sound like madness, but there's a method to the madness. Indeed, it's more than a method -- it's a policy.

In 1995, the U.S. Strategic Command (the group responsible for the nation's nuclear arsenal) prepared an internal study, called "Essentials of Post-Cold War Deterrence." Here are some excerpts:

Because of the value that comes from the ambiguity of what the US may do to an adversary if the acts we seek to deter are carried out, it hurts to portray ourselves as too fully rational and cool-headed. The fact that some elements may appear to be potentially 'out of control' can be beneficial to creating and reinforcing fears and doubts within the minds of an adversary's decision makers. This essential sense of fear is the working force of deterrence. That the US may become irrational and vindictive if its

vital interests are attacked should be a part of the national persona we project to all adversaries. [See Boston Globe, 2 Mar. '98, p. 5]

This, then, is the method behind the madness, it seems. These crazy Americans!

Drunk on the ambrosia of empire, striking matches in a room reeking of gasoline, shocking the world with bombast and bluster, every bellow like the rage of a rampaging elephant, the US is a power that sends shudders through a hundred capitals on every continent. They shudder because they know, perhaps better than most Americans, the horrific costs that America has imposed on the world in the name of capital. As former CIA station chief John Stockwell noted in Praetorian Guard (1991):

Coming to grips with these U.S./CIA activities in broad numbers and figuring out how many people have been killed in the jungles of Laos or the hills of Nicaragua is very difficult. But, adding them up as best we can, we come up with a figure of six million people killed -- and this is a minimum figure. Included are: one million killed in the Korean War, two million in the Vietnam War, 800,000 killed in Indonesia, one million in Cambodia, 20,000 killed in Angola -- the operation I was a part of -- and 20,000 killed in Nicaragua [p. 81].

These Americans! Like wild cow-boys!

Crazy, No?

A Daily Terror 12/8/01

The power of the media to condition consciousness is vast. For, with the merest mention of a word, say, for instance, "terror," a flood of images roar through the mind, like a well-placed row of dominoes, each falling one into the other, tumbling like a hard, dry, crackling wave: terror, terrorism, the twin towers of midtown Manhattan, planes circling like metallic vultures, plunging into solid rock and steel, flames, smoke, and humans blown into dry dust. Osama bin-Laden; Mullah Omar; Saddam Hussein, (fill in the blanks). Those are the thoughts we have been conditioned to think by the media. We have virtually no choice in the matter.

There is though, another terror that ravages the land. It affects not thousands, but millions. It affects Whites, Blacks, Anglos, Latinos, Citizens, Immigrants, Male, Female, Gay, Straight, Jew, Gentile, Northerner, Southerner, from Maine to Mississippi.

It is the terror of financial failure. The terror of not getting next week's paycheck. The terror of being fired; of being unable to pay rent (or the mortgage); of seeing one's children wracked by hunger.

This is the silent terror; the hidden terror. Indeed it is the invisible terror that is all too real. It is one that the State not only refuses to fight, but refuses to acknowledge.

After the Sept. 11th disaster, at least 800,000 people have lost their jobs. Dishwashers, maids, hotel workers, computer employees, travel agents, booking agents, and the like. But as stunning as that figure seems to be, it is but a mere

percentage of a larger problem.

Before the 11th of September, indeed according to economic indicators since March 2001, at least 8 million people were out of work due to the economic recession.

8,000,000 people!

8,000,000 invisible souls, unemployed, gripped by a terror that almost defies description.

Why is that not a national emergency?

Why no mass mobilization, nor media-orchestrated outrage? Is it because they are poor, and the poor are expendable?

The corporate media, the possession and instrument of the wealthy, has no interest (and sees no profit) in educating either the poor or working poor in the failures of an economic theory or system which works for them yet betrays the poor.

It is not in the interest of the established to show the holes in the "economic miracle." Globalists wish to ignore this ugly reality.

What does the Dow Jones Industrial Average, or the S&P rate, or the latest Nasdaq mean to 8 million unemployed?

A year ago, economists were proclaiming the end of the business cycle, boasting that the only way stocks could go was up. Their boasts came on the eve of a recession.

In a time when the poor are treated like lepers, when their dreams are dashed, a daily terror reigns.

Afghanistan and the Great Game

12/28/01

For millions of Americans, history is a muddling puzzle - and that, American history. When one looks at world history the puzzle only gets larger and even more impenetrable.

For them, Afghanistan, an ancient nation the size of Texas in the heart of Asia, only became 'real' in the dusty, fear-drenched aftermath of 11 September 2001. Except for brief references to the decade of war with the former Soviet Union, most have little idea of Afghanistan's long, martial traditions. This is seen in that nation's role in what is called the Great Game, or imperial conflicts between the British and the Russians dating from the early nineteenth century. At the time, Czarist Russia sought to expand her imperial borders south into what Peter the Great called, "the warm waters of the Indian Ocean."

This area, however, was claimed by the British Raj (or colonial India). In their midst was the kingdom of Afghanistan.

Russia initiated European intervention by pushing the Persian Qajar Shah to attack Herat in Afghanistan's west, seen as "the Gateway to India." The British countermove was to send forces and material to defend the city of Herat. To resist Persian efforts, a fleet of British ships sailed into the Persian Gulf, thus checkmating Russian efforts on the region, around 1837 - '38.

In the next 80 years or so, the Afghans would fight three wars with the British, winning every one. The last Afghan-



Anglo war ended in 1919. By this time, the British turned over much of the imperial duties to the Americans, and the Czar gave way to the Soviets. While the protagonists had changed, the Game remained; albeit one played by the rules of the Cold War.

By the 1980s, the game was again afoot as the U.S. sent in clandestine arms and support to elicit a Soviet military response, and to spring what Carter-era national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski would later call, "the Afghan trap." Afghanistan became the Soviets' Vietnam as it lost tens of thousands in the war, and led to the eventual break-up of the USSR.

average working person in both Iran or the States probably has never left his country (except when forced to do so by his leaders, to fight another people).

There are millions of people in Pennsylvania who have never the left the state of Pennsylvania -- and never will.

Most folks worry about finding, buying, or begging enough food to feed one's family, about getting a decent education for their kids, and perhaps keeping a job that will provide shelter and other necessities for the family. They rarely think of nuclear winter, or National Missile Shields, or what their national GNP is.

Yet, that typical American or Iranian hates each other, even though they've never met. They have been conditioned by nationalism, and their respective media, to react -- Pavlov-like -- to a false stimulus.

The French thinker Voltaire once opined that "Patriotism is the last refuge

of scoundrels," because he lived in a cosmopolitan world.

The people of the world have to determine what is in their own interests, not those of their so-called 'leaders', and develop global associations and relationships that deepen and enrich them. For the leaders, are the leaders, in the interests of the wealthy, the globalists, and those that pay them. They could care less for the poor, the un-influential, the workers, and the non-donor class.

It's possible to think beyond, and act beyond, nations (the world's mega-corporations have been doing this for a generation, at least!).

It's not only possible, but necessary, if the global environment is ever to survive, if human suffering is ever to be addressed, and if we are to have a world worth living in.

We must make it happen.



One hundred victories in one hundred battles is not the most skillful. Subduing the other's military without battle is the most skillful.

-Sun Tzu, The Art of War

When Nations Attack

2/14/02

We live in a world that may be called drunk with nationalism.

But it was not always thus.

Our forebears dwelled in another world, where one's faith, one's class, or one's tribal grouping formed the deepest meanings of the extended self, and where boundaries seemed surprisingly more porous than they do now.

In the mid-Eighteenth century, those who lived in the grand cities of Europe moved easily, and comfortably between Bonn and Paris, or London and Vienna. Those of the elite read in Latin, spoke in French, and addressed waiters in perhaps English or German.

Those of the poorer classes (the vast majority) spoke, rather than read, their local tongue, while the princes of the church or the nobility spoke a quite different one.

During this same time, in quite another world, the Ottoman Empire held sway on three continents, and merchants and scholars traveled between Samarkand to Cairo, or from Cordoba to Timbuktoo, with much the same facility as did their European contemporaries.

They often wrote in Arabic, while speaking in a hundred other languages, from Chinese to Wolof, or Turkish to Urdu. They saw themselves as subjects of a world order, defined by faith, learning, and ability.

When one looks at the agility of these people, the present era, defined by borders and spheres of political influence and rivalry, seems rigid indeed.

This is not to paint those days with a

far-too-rosy picture, for this was also a time of unbridled slavery, serfdom and class oppression.

It is just interesting to view a world that did not concretize the notions of nationalism as the end-all, be-all, of human existence.

Today, when the economic forces of globalism consumes whole societies for the voracious 'market', it is also interesting that this rapacious form of internationalism (and that's what it really is -- the internationalization of capitalist domination) has not spawned an even bigger form of internationalist solidarity and resistance to this new form of colonialization. For the forces behind this new globalism are relatively few, while those who are, and will be impacted by this new expression of exploitation are vast.

I am convinced that the learned ideas of nationalism are impeding the growth and development of this new internationalism of resistance.

When one thinks about it, and looks beyond the barriers of race, of language, and, yes, even beyond nationality, there are billions of people who dwell upon this earth, with far more similarities than dissimilarities.

It has often struck me that there is really far more in common between the everyday American (yes, Black or white) and the average, everyday Iranian, than there is between either of them and their political leaders. Think about it. The average world leader has had far more education, travels relatively widely, and has contacts on an international scale. The

With the entry of the military of the U.S. into Afghanistan to topple the multinational Taliban government, a new round of the Great Game is now in play. With a military strategy of relentless air power and heavy bombings, and ground forces under what is called the Northern Alliance, the Taliban has been overwhelmed in battle. In a matter of weeks they lost virtually every acre of ground.

Yet even this state of affairs is but another stage of the Great Game, with some old players rolling the dice. For the truth is that the Taliban was a client state under Pakistani and Saudi tutelage. With

Kabul and many other major cities in Afghanistan under the control of the so-called Northern Alliance, the Saudis and Pakistanis are displaced, and Russia has its hands on the prize that ten years of war could not acquire.

It is not, as Peter the Great once coveted, "the warm waters of the Indian Ocean" that whets Russian appetites, but the black gold, oil, under the Caspian Sea, that will fuel industrial production for the next half-century.

The Great Game plays on, as ever, for wealth and power.

Military Courts and Congress

12/29/01

In the aftermath of 9/11/01, the Bush Administration has announced plans to form, staff and adjudicate military tribunals to try anyone the U.S. deems a "terrorist." These courts will be presided over by military officers, as will any appeals process, with the final arbiter, either the defense secretary or the president, ending the case.

No civil judge, of any division or rank of the federal judiciary, will ever hear any syllable of appeal from anyone tried before such a tribunal.

So frenzied is the American mood, so supine the liberal elite, and so prostrate the nation's legal community to power, that barely a murmur is heard in protest to this gross, naked power grab by the Administration.

It is not enough that the institution of

such courts are the very antithesis to the grand American claim to "due process." Nor is it sufficient to argue that such war measures are inappropriate in the absence of a formal, congressional declaration of war (this Congress would have no real trouble doing so). This Congress, already jittery in light of reports of anthrax contamination of some offices, rushed through in record speed (with little debate, no public hearing, and neither a committee report nor a conference) the unprecedented, complex, and radically repressive USA Patriot Act.

The presidential decree ordering military tribunals is, on its face, unconstitutional. Indeed, the very provision which grants the president Commander In Chief powers, also limits his powers over judicial matters. Here's what it says:

[Art. II: Sect. 2, Constitution of the U.S.] The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, ... He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate ...; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint ... Judges of the Supreme Court ...

And from Article III; Section 1 of the Constitution:

The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

There it is. The president, acting in concert with the Senate, nominates and appoints Supreme Court judges, and Congress ordains and establishes new courts. Congress can't abdicate this duty to the executive.

The president's order establishes a court, one which has all of its officers under his direct control and command. This is a classic kangaroo court, of the very kind that Americans condemned when the Fujimori regime established them in Peru (interestingly, to fight 'terrorism').

Nor is this meant to heap false praise on U.S. civil courts, which are fundamentally political institutions. Have we all forgotten the trial of Tim McVeigh, the domestic terrorist, where it was later learned that the FBI withheld thousands of pages of documents, until days before his execution? Civil courts merely winked at this violation, as a minor irritation.

And while the government had its way (by executing McVeigh) it was embarrassed by reports of their handling of the case. That won't happen now, will it?

Under the Bush Administration, mili-

tary tribunals serve as an instrument of administrative whim. Under the command structure of the military, each judge, each jury, each prosecutor, and each court officer is a sworn officer of the military, in the sworn service of the Commander in Chief. If they want to further their career in the armed services, even if they ever wanted promotion, they follow their administrative cues. What do you think they would do to a foreign national, who is already tagged as "the enemy"?

With either Bush, the Secretary of Defense, or even another military panel serving as a Supreme Court of Appeals, what would be the result?

But, after all, the accused are (to use the term of popular appeal) 'sand niggers' (the Brits would call them 'wogs'), Arabs, Pakistanis, a few Afghans - so, why care?

The same was said in the '20s when Russian Jews were exiled from the U.S. after the Palmer Raids, or in the '40s when Japanese were thrown into concentration camps; they're just 'commie Jews', or 'slants' - right?

Such events were said to be separate, involving 'others', yet they tainted the judicial process and U.S. claims of fair play, up to the present generation.

Let us fight this madness, or it will return to haunt us all.

An Imperial War Expands

2/14/02

With characteristic imperial arrogance, George W. Bush's 'State of the Empire' speech was a blustering threat to several states that have yet to learn how to kneel properly to the United States -- Iraq, Iran and North Korea.

By calling them the world's "Axis of Evil," the Bush regime is clearly trying to mobilize public support for some sort of militarist adventure in those regions of the world. If they cannot be tied to the acts of 9/11/01, then they are violative of the US edict that no state, except by their leave, may acquire or construct "weapons of mass destruction."

For many Americans still smarting from the blows of 9/11, and unsated by the aerial bombardment and humbling of the Taliban in the dusty ruins of Afghanistan, the challenges of Iran, Iraq, and North Korea may seem tempting.

What makes Washington's charge almost laughable (if it were not so serious) is that at least two of those states were either clients or customers of the U.S., in their drive to become regional military powers. The U.S. was, and indeed remains, the world's pre-eminent arms dealer. When the bloody, 8-year Iran-Iraq war raged on, the U.S. supplied it's then-ally (Iraq's Saddam) with what can only be termed weapons of mass destruction, as in the poisons used by Iraq to liquidate their Kurdish minorities on their border regions. As for the Iranian theocracy, it would not exist today were it not for the U.S./CIA intervention which overturned the Iranian parliamentary democracy of Mohammed Mossadegh of

the early 1950s, and the backing of the autocratic Shah. Were it not for this Western rape of Iranian democracy there would not now be the rule of the clerics in Iran. The Khomeini-led Islamic revolution was, in essence, a reactive movement that strove to purge the nation of the Western and foreign influences pushed by the Pahlevi regime. Why did the US CIA and British M1-5 oppose the Mossadegh government? It had nothing to do with "democracy," for Mossadegh's was, if anything, too democratic for their tastes, for he backed nationalization of British oil, to provide more for the nation. The U.S. didn't back democracy, it backed a neocolonial, repressive autocracy.

From Iran's perspective, where does the "axis of evil" lie? What must they think of a nation that deposed their president, installed a brutal, fascist regime, and then armed their neighboring enemy (Iraq) with conventional and chemical weapons, which led to over half a million dead on both sides? Isn't that "mass destruction?"

But being an empire means never having to say you're sorry; it means telling others what they must do, or else. It means always seeking enemies.

Copyright 2002 MAJ