Palestine: Tanks of Injustice

Israeli Occupation of West Bank and Gaza
Three Main Points
by Bob Avakian
Chairman of the RCP USA

What do we in the Revolutionary Communist Party want people to learn from all that is exposed and revealed in this newspaper? Mainly, three things:

1) The whole system we now live under is based on exploiting and suppressing people around the world. It is completely worthless and no basic change for the better can come about until this system is overthrown.

2) Many different groups will protest and rebel against this system this does, and these protests and rebellions should be supported and strengthened. Yet it is only those with nothing to lose but their chains who can be the backbone of a struggle to actually overthrow this system and create a new system that will put an end to exploitation and help pave the way to a whole new world.

3) Such a revolutionary struggle is possible. There is a political Party that can lead such a struggle, a political Party that speaks and acts for those with nothing to lose but their chains, the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA.

This Party has the vision, the program, the leadership, and the organizational principles to unite with, who must be united and enable them to do what must be done. There is a challenge for all those who would like to see such a revolution, those with a burning desire to see a drastic change for the better, all those who dare to dream and to act to bring about a completely new and better world. Support this Party, join this Party, spread its message and its organized strength and prepare the ground for a revolutionary rising that has a solid basis and a real chance of winning.

As of March 31, 2002, Chairman Avakian (George A. Alexander) has been held in isolation for

9 Years,
150 Days

In October 1992, Chairman Gonzalo—a leader of the Maoist Communist Party of Peru—was sentenced to life imprisonment by a military court under the U.S.-backed regime in Peru. The fascist regime in Peru is holding this revolutionary leader of the Peruvian people under very brutal conditions in an underground concrete dungeon at a naval base. He is being denied visits by lawyers, doctors and relatives and deprived of proper medical care and reading materials. Peru’s former president Fujimori publicly threatened to execute Chairman Gonzalo and boasted of applying psychological torture on him. Fujimori changed Peru’s constitution to remove the death penalty, which could be used against Chairman Gonzalo and other revolutionary prisoners. The Peruvian regime must be presented from killing Chairman Gonzalo through the death penalty or by other means. Fujimori repeatedly claimed that Chairman Gonzalo has made a call for negotiations from prison. In this situation, what possible excuse can the Peruvian government now offer for continuing to deny Comrade Gonzalo independent contact with lawyers, doctors and friendly and neutral visitors from outside the prison in a way that meets the basic international standards of treatment of political prisoners and prisoners of war? It is vitally important for people in Peru and around the world to hear what Chairman Gonzalo’s views are from Comrade Gonzalo himself—directly and unimpeded. This heightens the urgency of the fight to create an international political climate which compels the Peruvian government to grant access to Comrade Gonzalo by his legal representatives and other friends who can meet and talk directly with him.

Support the People’s War in Peru!
Support the Communist Party of Peru!
Defend the Life of Chairman Gonzalo,
Fight to Break the Isolation!
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1. The Party and the Masses
2. Revolution and People’s War
3. Create Public Opinion, Seize Power! Prepare Minds and Organize Forces for Revolution. The Central Task of the RCP, USA
4. The United Front Under the Leadership of the Proletariat Part 1: Why and How the Proletariat Builds and Leads the United Front
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7. Consolidating the New Proletarian Power, Developing Radically New Institutions
8. Proletarian Dictatorship, Democracy and the Rights of the People
9. Internationalization and International Relations
10. Uprooting National Oppression and White Supremacy
11. End Discrimination Against Immigrants
12. The Proletarian Revolution and the Emancipation of Women
16. Proletarian Morality—A Radical Rupture With Tradition’s Chains
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Palestine: Tanks of Injustice

Israeli Occupation of West Bank and Gaza

On March 29, the Palestinian people of Ramallah faced the second invasion within a month by occupation forces, as 150 Israeli tanks rumbled into the West Bank town. Crushing cars and anything else in their way, many of the tanks headed to the offices of the Palestinian Authority (PA) located in a walled compound. The Israeli troops forced their way into the compound, smashing gaping holes in the walls as they fired tank shells and machine guns. Soon the Israeli military had control of the compound, and PA head Yasir Arafat was holed up in a second-floor office—the electricity cut off, a cell phone his only means of communication to the outside world.

Since December, Arafat has been held a virtual prisoner in Ramallah, prevented from traveling outside of the town by Israeli troops. But this latest assault signaled a new and very heavy intensification of Israeli military moves against the Palestinian areas. As we go to press, Israel continues to hold Arafat hostage—and it is unclear how things will develop. Yet it is certain that the new Israeli offensive in the West Bank and Gaza will mean further death and destruction for the Palestinian people—more people cut down in the streets, by overwhelming Israeli firepower, more houses razed to the ground by Israeli military bulldozers, more fly-by murders by U.S.-supplied jet fighters, more electricity cut off, more fly-by murder by U.S.-supplied jet fighters, more homes razed to the ground by Israeli military bulldozers, more houses razed to the ground by Israeli military bulldozers.

The scene in Ramallah—the tank invasion of a town and the siege of the PA headquarters—pointed to the essence of the two sides of conflict in Palestine: occupier vs. occupied, justice vs. injustice, Zionism and imperialism vs. the oppressed people of Palestine. The Israeli action put a glaring spotlight on the real power relations that exist in Palestine. For years, Arafat has worked with the U.S. and Israel in their “peace process” and is basically recognized as a “head of state” by governments around the world. Yet, in Ramallah, Israel deployed its massive military—bristling with powerful high-tech weapons thanks to U.S. aid—to sweep down on the PA offices in a lightning strike and utterly humiliate Arafat in front of the world. It was a naked power move to deliver a gangster-like message: We are the ones in charge here, we’re the ones that occupy this land, and we hold your fate in our hands.

There is another message that Israel’s Zionist rulers are delivering: If there are to be any “truces” or “peace agreements,” it will be on terms dictated by Israel and the U.S. to the Palestinians. Just a few days before the invasion of Ramallah, Israel had prevented Arafat from attending a summit of the Arab League in Beirut, Lebanon. Sharon treated Arafat like a schoolboy, saying that Arafat had not “done enough” to shut down armed Palestinian groups, and refused to guarantee that Arafat would be allowed to return if he traveled to the summit. The U.S. also scolded Arafat for “not doing enough” to shut down the resistance and denied him a chance for a meeting with Vice President Dick Cheney. At the same time, Bush’s special envoy to the Middle East, General Zinni, demanded that the Palestinian agreement to a ceasefire which did not even mention the Palestinian state.

The Arab League summit ended a proposal from the Saudi crown prince which offered official recognition of the state of Israel by Arab League members—in return for Israeli’s withdrawal from areas seized in the 1967 war, establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza with East Jerusalem as the capital. And a solution to the situation of Palestinian refugees. Israeli officials called the proposal a “non-starter.” And by the weekend, they were backing up that stand with tanks aimed right at Arafat.

The immediate justification used by Israeli officials for this invasion was that they were responding to a series of recent Palestinian suicide bombings, especially one in the Mediterranean coastal city of Netanya that killed more than 20 people attending a Passover celebration. But according to reports in the media, Israeli Premier Ariel Sharon and his generals had been discussing possible “broad military action” against the PA a week before the recent suicide bombings.

The Sharon government declared that the invasion of Ramallah and Arafat’s headquarters was only the start of major military operations in the West Bank and Gaza that will go on “without a time limit.” In the Gaza Strip, Israeli forces divided this small area—which is already a prison with 100,000 people living in 15 small sectors. And hundreds of Palestinians were reportedly being rounded up for “questioning” by Israeli troops. Earlier in March, Israeli forces had attacked Palestinian refugee camps and towns throughout the West Bank and Gaza in the biggest Israeli military operation since the 1982 invasion of Lebanon. Now, Israel has launched an even more massive and brutal assault on the Palestinian people.

As the Israeli troops seized control of the PA compound in Ramallah, Colin Powell emerged from a National Security Council meeting to speak to the press. The news footage from Ramallah showed dozens of Israeli tanks surrounding the compound and heavily armed troops streaming over the area, leaving Arafat trapped and helpless. Meanwhile in Washington, D.C., Powell blamed Arafat for bringing on this current “crisis” by not doing enough to stop “terrorism.” Powell said he “understood” the Israeli response and praised Sharon for showing “resolve” in negotiations in recent weeks. But at the same time, Powell declared that Arafat continues to be “the central figure” in these events.

Continued on page 14
India Offers More Support for Counter-revolution in Nepal

At the end of March, Nepal’s Prime Minister Sher Bahadur Deuba went to India for six days with a 100-member delegation. He met with India’s top government and military officials and at the top of the agenda was getting India’s help in combating the popular Maoist insurgency that has been going on in Nepal since 1996.

There were good reasons for Deuba to think he could get help in New Delhi. India has long dominated Nepal and is always watching the growing Maoist insurgency in Nepal with much concern. Soon after Sushma Koirala, Nepal’s Finance Minister, made a point of calling the Maoists in Nepal “terrorists” — a label that had, up to then, not been used by India to describe Maoists in Nepal. Many saw this as a sign that India was laying the basis for getting more directly involved in attacking the World’s War.

Then in November, Deuba’s government declared a state of emergency and official, put the “terrorist” label on the leadership of the People’s War, the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist). The Indian government quickly endorsed the Nepalese government’s “search and destroy” campaign by the Royal Nepalese Army against the Maoists and sent 31 trucks full of sophisticated weapons and surveillance equipment to be used against the Maoists. The Indian government also gave Nepal two CheyTac helicopters.

For the last few months, the fighting between the Royal Nepalese Army and Maoist guerrillas has intensified. And contrary to the government’s initial bragging that it would quickly quell the Maoist insurgency, the fighting has remained very two-sided—with reports of battles involving thousands of Maoist guerrillas, armed with some of the new sophisticated weapons from India that have been captured in battle.

The CPN (Maoist) has always warned about the danger of Indian intervention. Deuba’s trip to New Delhi—the first by a Nepali premier in nearly two years—is indicative of how much the repressive Nepalese government relies on India, economically, politically, and militarily.

Deuba met Indian Prime Minister Advani, External Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh, Defense Minister George Fernandes, as well as India’s Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee. Indian officials came out of these meetings announcing a public pledge to help Nepal with intelligence information, equipment and training to help clamp down on the funding of any group labelled “terrorist.”

A Nepali official, who did not want to be identified, told the press, “We offered to cooperate by way of exchange of information, cooperation between intelligence agencies, improved surveillance, border and offers of equipment and training.” The official did not say what kind of equipment it would provide to Nepal. But it is widely known that the Royal Nepalese Army wants more and better weapons to fight the Maoists. A Junior Foreign Office official told the press that Nepal faced a shortage of “means and resources” in battling the guerrillas and needed international support.

India and Nepal also agreed that each other’s territory should not be used for “terrorism” that includes acts of violence or disruption of essential services carried out with “intent to threaten the unity and integrity of India or to strike terror in any part of the people”—a vague and loose definition that gives the government wide powers to target and arrest anyone they want.

India has long dominated Nepal, both economically and politically. The ruling classes in Nepal have long been subservient to India. And there is widespread resentment among the masses of people in Nepal over Indian domination. This makes Deuba’s request for arms from India’s relatively moderate Maoists in Nepal have pointed out, many of the new and sophisticated arms India sends to the Royal Nepalese Army will end up in the hands of Maoist guerrillas. And increasing intervention by the Indian government could become very unpopular in Nepal, resulting in even more trouble for the government and an attempt to show even more favorable to the People’s War.

India has a long history of dominating Nepal, both economically and politically. The ruling classes in Nepal are long been subservient to India. And there is widespread resentment among the masses of people in Nepal over Indian domination. This makes Deuba’s request for arms from India’s relatively moderate Maoists in Nepal have pointed out, many of the new and sophisticated arms India sends to the Royal Nepalese Army will end up in the hands of Maoist guerrillas. And increasing intervention by the Indian government could become very unpopular in Nepal, resulting in even more trouble for the government and an attempt to show even more favorable to the People’s War.

On March 26, the Indian parliament passed a controversial new “anti-terrorism law”—the Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance. POTO sets new rules for arrest, interrogation and investigation:

- It allows suspects to be held for 30 days without appearing before a court.
- It allows police to detain suspects for questioning for 90 days without charges and an additional 90 days with approval from a special court.
- It allows anyone suspected of giving money, shelter, transportation or other support to “terrorists” to be tried on terrorism charges. People who unknowingly rent a room or car to a terrorist or engage in a financial transaction with them can be arrested as terrorism charges, detained for up to six months without trial and have their home or business seized.
- It provides immunity from cross-examination.
- It gives the police broad powers to intercept telephone and internet communications and use them as evidence in court.
- It gives the government freedom to clamp down on the funding of any group suspected of being “terrorist.”
- It puts the burden of proof on the accused with no mandatory right to compensation for those detained has lost a trial.
- It makes it a crime to not provide authorities with “information relating to any terrorist activity.”
- It provides imprisonment ranging from a minimum of five years in prison to death.

India is following the example of the United States. Using the so-called “war on terrorism,” it is instituting heavy repressive measures that can be used against anyone the government doesn’t like— including genuine revolutionary groups.

POTO specifically targets two revolutionary Maoist groups that are waging armed struggle in the Maoist Communist Centre and the Communist Party of India (ML); People’s War—outlawing them altogether. And as POTO was being passed into law, Indian officials were declaring renewed support for the reactionary Nepalese government’s fight against the popular Maoist insurgency that’s been going on since 1996.

Elements of POTO had already been in force under a presidential decree back in December, but the ordinance was scheduled to lapse in April if not passed into law.

From the beginning, human rights groups opposed POTO, pointing out that the government measures give the government freedom to violate all kinds of constitutional and human rights. Critics of POTO say that in the few months POTO has been in effect, it has already been ruthlessly used to unerringly punish Maoists in any and intensify repression in the disputed Himalayan region of Kashmir. Indian law had prohibited confessions unless they were made voluntarily in court. POTO changes this. The bill allows admission of facts made to police as evidence, and many are fearful this will lead to more “false confessions.”

POTO also gives the police more room to cover up human rights abuses with a clause that gives immunity to security forces that can prove they acted in “good faith” while handling a case.

POTO sets forth a broad definition of “terrorism” that includes acts of violence or disruption of essential services carried out with “intent to threaten the unity and integrity of India or to strike terror in any part of the people”—a vague and loose definition that gives the government wide powers to target and arrest anyone they want.

Ravi Nair, director of the South Asia Human Rights Documentation Center in New Delhi, said, “Because it lets you lock up a person and then cut the key away, the police [are] going to abuse the new law. People don’t want this bill because of their experience with the anti-terrorism law and its abuse. They don’t want a police state.”

For many years, India used TADA (the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Prevention Act, 1987) to detain those it suspected of carrying out “anti-national” activities. It was used to attack political opposition such as Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab and the North East, security forces were given increased powers under other “special legislation.”

And TADA was used to detain people throughout India. Implementation of the act led to widespread human rights violations, and many innocent people were detained. TADA allowed for detention for long periods without charge or trial and individuals were detained pending trial for years at a time without the hope of appeal.

In 1995, following a sustained campaign by human rights organizations, the Indian parliament was forced to not re-authorize TADA.

India basically reinstates a modified version of the notorious TADA—which facilitated tens of thousands of arrests, detentions, and acts of torture in violation of international law, and was used to crack down on political opponents, social activists, and human rights defenders.
Uniting With All Who Can Be United, in the U.S. and Throughout the World

by Bob Avakian

"Uniting With All Who Can Be United, in the U.S. and Throughout the World" is an excerpt from a tape-recorded talk by Bob Avakian, the Chairman of the RCP,USA, in government, focused initially against Afghanistan.

"The New Situation and the Great Challenges." The magazine is available online at rwor.org and at Revolution Books stores and outlets.

In the battle against the heightening repression and in the overall struggle against the imperialist juggernaut, both the importance and the acute contradictions within our "two 90/10s" orientation stand out very sharply. As put forth in our Party's Draft Programme, the "two 90/10s" refers to the strategic orientation of seeking "to win over the 90 percent," whose fundamental interests ultimately lie with the proletariat, revolution, against the "10 percent"—the ruling class and its die-hard supporters—within the U.S. while doing this in unity with the "90 percent" internationally, the great majority of the people of the world who suffer exploitation and oppression under the domination of imperialism and its allies and puppets.

To win people to apply this orientation, and maintain it through all the twists and turns, will of course be a struggle—and this will be true not only in the broader movement but within the ranks of our Party as well. I have seen some reports concerning discussions within the Party, for example, where it has been raised: "How can we really carry out our two 90/10s orientation when we see that in this situation so many people are waving flags or supporting the government?" Or the question is directly raised: "Does this show that our two 90/10s orientation is not correct, or at least that we're not going to be able to carry it out?" Well, it's good these questions are being raised, but it's important to emphasize that, if you go back and read how that is characterized in the Draft Programme, it never presents this—and it would be wrong to present it—as if this is a straight-line, linear process and at every point you're going to have 90 percent of the people with you or that 90 percent can be very easily mobilized around your banner. On the contrary, it is recognized, and emphasized, that this is an acutely contradictory process because, considering things just within the U.S. itself, there are ways in which many people, significant forces in society, are spontaneously and in the short run pulled in the wrong direction: and, as pointed out in the Draft Programme, there is the very acute contradiction between maintaining a bedrock position and activity based on proletarian internationalism and still seeking to unite the broadest number possible and strategically maintaining an orientation of uniting with the 90 percent in the U.S. itself. So what these events are bringing out is precisely the profound correctness and far-sightedness of what's said in the Draft Programme about the two 90/10s. To quote the Draft Programme again:

"It must be recognized that there are significant contradictions involved in these two 90/10s—contradictions which at times can become quite acute. In a country like the U.S., the requirements of upholding and applying proletarian internationalism and acting in accordance with the interests of the '90 percent' of the world's people can, in a number of circumstances, bring the class-conscious proletariat into conflict with the more narrow interests of segments of society, particularly the more privileged strata. In order to correctly handle these contradictions—and the often acute 'tensions' involved—the proletariat vanguard must at all times keep uppermost the fundamental interests of the proletariat and masses of people worldwide and at the same time penetrate, from a strategic standpoint, in its work to win over the broadest number from all strata among the people.

In fact, to build the most powerful movement of opposition, and to link this with and make it serve strategic revolutionary objectives, it is crucial to grasp firmly that at any given time the alignment may be very different than 90 percent of the people on our side. This applies on various levels. In terms of our fundamental program of proletarian revolution, it is clearly not going to be the case that 90 percent of the people (or anything close to that) will be in agreement with this, or even have a stance of 'friendly neutrality' toward it, before a revolutionary situation emerges. Even at "crunch time"—even when the objective basis and the need is acutely posed for the masses to rise up and make revolution—it is unlikely to be the case that 90 percent will be with this right from the start—even then many middle forces will have to be won to the revolutionary camp through the course of actually carrying out the revolutionary seizure of power. This is something that is spoken to and emphasized in our Party's Draft Programme, and it will be important to continually go back to that and reground people in that, especially the advanced revolutionary-minded people at every point, in order to be able to most effectively struggle to bring into being a more favorable alignment, through the course of the whole process preceding a revolutionary situation as well as at the point where that situation does emerge. And, on the level of building the broader movement of resistance, this also applies: at any given point, the alignment may be such that far fewer than 90 percent of the people are standing with—or have a stance of 'friendly neutrality' toward—that movement, and it will be crucial to continue building that movement in a way that "stick[s] to basic principle and still build[s] the broadest united front, keeping in the forefront what it will take to actually stop the whole juggernaut of war and repression vs. getting caught up in sectarian or even simply more narrow and limited interests." (from an internal party document)

Once again, this involves taking up the big challenge of changing the whole political terms and the political terrain, realizing things in society as a whole, achieving a repolarization that is more favorable for the movement of resistance, and doing this in a way that is consistent with and contributes to realizing the fundamental revolutionary interests of the masses of people, not just in the U.S. but worldwide. In that sense, more than the crucial point concerning the need to correctly handle the often very acute—and right now very acute—contradiction between maintaining proletarian internationalism, and at the same time uniting all who can be united within the U.S. itself.
Anthrax spores.

Barbara Hatch Rosenberg is a widely recognized expert on anthrax and biological warfare. She is making some shocking charges against the U.S. government, its military and its FBI investigators.

Dr. Rosenberg insists that the anthrax attacks of last fall were clearly done by someone working within the U.S. government biowarfare projects. She says the FBI quite likely knows who mailed the anthrax letters and asks why the government is afraid to arrest the suspects they have identified. She suggests that the government is holding back because the true story behind these anthrax letters could then become public—damaging powerful forces within the government and the military.

The evidence from the anthrax attacks of last fall leads to the doorsteps of U.S. military laboratories and the CIA. And the FBI appears to be waist deep in a cover-up.

On September 18, a few days after the World Trade Center attacks, someone stashed mailing letters containing anthrax spores. The spores can infect people with a deadly disease. Ultimately, four anthrax letters were recovered. Two had been sent to the Senate offices of leading Democratic senators, Tom Daschle and Patrick Leahy. Two had been sent to media offices in New York—the Post newspaper and Tom Brokaw at NBC News.

The letters did not kill their intended targets, but the anthrax material was so sophisticated that the spores passed through the envelopes and infected people all along their path—including secretaries and postal workers. Five people are known to have died from inhaling spores from these letters, and 13 others were infected but survived. Authorities believe a fifth letter killed a photo editor in Florida, but the letter was never found.

President Bush quickly suggested on TV that the Islamist al-Qaeda organization might be behind the anthrax attack. The Wall Street Journal wrote (Oct. 18): “By far the likeliest supplier is Saddam Hussein.” Everyone remembers how these anthrax attacks were used to fan support for the U.S. war against Afghanistan and Iraq. And this has continued. As recently as March 23 the New York Times ran a front-page story blaming, “U.S. Says it Found Qaeda Lab Being Built to Produce Anthrax.” Such reports have repeatedly proven to be false—no evidence has ever connected these attacks to foreign forces.

Evidence gathered by Dr. Barbara Hatch Rosenberg and her colleagues reveals that the anthrax used in these attacks came from U.S. military stockpiles—and U.S. officials must have known this, almost from the beginning.

EVIDENCE FROM THE ANTHRAX LETTERS

“The weaponized anthrax is made by a highly secret process belonging to the United States, and the material seems to fit that recipe. Their best lead at present is the contractor that worked for the CIA.”

Professor Barbara Hatch Rosenberg, reported by the BBC, December 10, 2001
April Actions for Mumia Abu-Jamal

International Concerned Family and Friends of Mumia Abu-Jamal has called for four days of action April 4-8 to protest the unjust imprisonment of revolutionary political prisoner Mumia Abu-Jamal.

Last December in federal district court in Philadelphia, for the first time in 20 years a court announced it was overturning the death sentence imposed on Mumia. Which was done by Presiding Judge Joseph Yohn. Judge Yohn ruled that the sentencing hearing—which sentenced Mumia to death—was in violation of the law.

But in a deeply unjust decision, Judge Yohn upheld Mumia's murder conviction and refused to consider new evidence in Mumia's case.

The fact that Yohn upheld the conviction is an outrage. Yohn turned down 26 claims in Mumia's petition for habeas corpus which argue clearly and in detail that Mumia was wrongfully convicted. These claims include many instances of misconduct by the trial judge and the prosecution: suppression of evidence, coercion of witnesses, police perjury, forcing a totally ineffective court-appointed lawyer on Mumia, and the refusal of Mumia's right to defend himself or to have assistance from legal counsel of his choosing. Yohn also turned down Mumia's claim that the judge and prosecutor engaged in racist jury selection—which left open the possibility on this one point for later appeal (see April #1133 for more information).

Yohn's court was also Mumia's last chance to introduce new evidence. Yet Yohn refused to hear new evidence or allow oral arguments—despite the emergence of affidavits by Mumia and his brother describing the events the night Philly cop Daniel Faulkner was killed; an affidavit by Arnold Beverly, who stated he was the one who killed Faulkner; and an affidavit by a Philadelphia court employee who overheard the judge in Mumia's original trial. Judge Sabo, say in a conversation "I'm going to help 'em fry the nigger." (A lower court judge also refused to hear new evidence or allow oral arguments—despite the emergence of affidavits by Mumia and his brother describing the events the night Philly cop Daniel Faulkner was killed; an affidavit by Arnold Beverly, who stated he was the one who killed Faulkner; and an affidavit by a Philadelphia court employee who overheard the judge in Mumia's original trial. Judge Sabo, say in a conversation "I'm going to help 'em fry the nigger." (A lower court judge also refused to hear new evidence or allow oral arguments.)

Since Yohn's ruling, more evidence surfaced that proves Mumia was unjustly framed. In a sworn affidavit Yvette Williams declared that Cynthia White told her that police forced her to lie and identify Mumia as the shooter. Williams was in prison with White after the shooting. White was the key eyewitness in Mumia's trial and the only witness who testified she saw Mumia shoot Faulkner.

In Yohn's December ruling, the prosecution was given 180 days to schedule a new sentencing hearing. If they do not, Mumia's sentence will automatically be changed to life in prison without parole. This would be a totally unjust outcome—one that threatens to completely close the prison on Mumia.

The prosecution remains intent on murdering Mumia and has appealed Yohn's ruling to the Court of Appeals. If they win, the death sentence would be restored—and the Pennsylvania governor could immediately announce an execution date. Mumia's lawyers have appealed Yohn's decision upholding the murder conviction to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. And they have filed court papers requesting hearings be held on the new evidence.

*****

Mumia Abu-Jamal was framed because he is a revolutionary who has always spoken out on behalf of the oppressed. From death row, he has continued to do so for the past 20 years, exposing the crimes of this system and shining a light on the lives of the oppressed. In the past few months his weekly columns have included exposing and denouncing the war on terrorism as a war of aggression. Mumia’s case is even more important in today’s political climate where the government is trying to criminalize dissent.

The more closely people look at Mumia’s case the more it becomes clear that the system has carried out a profound injustice. The possibility that the death sentence on Mumia might be restored or that he may be locked up for life poses great dangers—especially given the current climate of repression and intimidation in this country. This situation makes it all the more important for people to fight through to build the kind of broad, diverse and determined movement that can win complete justice for Mumia Abu-Jamal.

No New Death Sentence! Overturn the Conviction! Free Mumia Abu-Jamal!
There are many prisoners and political prisoners that need to get their hands on the Draft Programme of the Revolutionary Community Party. Many of these brothers and sisters behind bars are not part of this discussion and debate. To do this, we ask all people who see the need to spread the vision of a revolutionary program, to contribute to the Prisoners Revolutionary Literature Fund (PRLF). PRLF is also looking for volunteers to help get the RW into prisons.

You can reach PRLF at: 717-227-4096. Send contributions to: PRLF, Merchandise Mart, PO Box 3486, Chicago, IL 60654

The following excerpts are from letters prisoners wrote to the Prisoners Revolutionary Literature Fund after receiving the new Draft Programme of the RCP.

A Thirst for Knowledge

I recently obtained the Draft Programme of the Revolutionary Community Party. I was awed. I have had a lot of ideas about a world that is very similar to what is projected in the minds of the RCP. I am so glad that I do not have much knowledge on Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties and organizations. I do want to learn! I am writing in hopes that you could give me any literature, sources of literature, I think for knowledge. Unfortunately there is not any such literature in China, where I am an imprisoned. I would like to be put on a mailing list. Please! Thank you for putting your Draft Programme in print, it helped me realize that I am not the only person with a need to rebel against capitalist oppression. I now have hopes of proper guidance. Thank you.

Transformation

Salutations comrades! I received your mimeo, only recently due to an ongoing struggle between us and the Gestapo working in the mailroom here. To make a long story short, I opened the parcel and have not seen it since (my captive since) was 15 (12 hours ago) and who has endeavored to transform myself from the "home-owning capitalist" (a product of capitalism) into a revolutionary proletarian (the result of capitalism). I shall be packing in about 13 months, after being down 10 years! And I am trying to make some contacts and build some meaningful relationships so that I can begin organizing, agitating and educating as soon as I touch down. Let me tell you, I've been digging into Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory and scientific socialism in general since almost day one. I blog from the SWP Trotskyist line, the Mexican cultural nationalist line (I speak the Mexican language, Spanish and of course English), the New African revolutionary nationalist line, and a host of others and believe only the RCP and RCP is capable of being the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat in specific and a new revolutionary socialist-communist hegemony in general, within this country. I am confident that given the opportunity, I could contribute significantly to the RCP.

Yeah, comrades, that's a big door I'm knocking on and I hope that you may be able to open it to me and make it possible for me to keep a close look and expose my deepest regrets and concrete solidarity to all!

A New Light

My name is XXX and I would like to thank you and the RCP for opening up my eyes to the world.

I've been reading the weekly newsletter and the Draft Programme and seeing the world in a new light. I never used to notice how censored the American newspapers were until I read the Revolutionary Worker. I like how they don't hold their punches on how they're going to speak their minds. Plus the Draft is in the form of a question and is very informative. It makes me want to read the Draft to be read worldwide. Wouldn't that make the world a better place?

I don't know what I can do to help make a difference, but if you think of anything, just let me know. My family comes to see me once a month and I'm trying to open their eyes. Some of them think that communism is just a dream, but the others are really listening to me. I don't try to beat them over the head with communism, but I just tell them what has capitalism done for you? And the answer is always, nothing. I just try to let them know that they wouldn't have to struggle this hard under communism. It's capitalism that's making their lives hard, they're breaking their back on jobs that have no meaning.

They're being open-minded and realize that when I educate myself more about communism I'll be able to educate them. I can spread communism by word of mouth, I will. I will do anything that I can to help the struggle. I really want to make this world a better place for our women and children.

There are many prisoners and political prisoners that need to get their hands on the Draft Programme of the Revolutionary Community Party. Many of these brothers and sisters behind bars are not part of this discussion and debate. To do this, we ask all people who see the need to spread the vision of a revolutionary program, to contribute to the Prisoners Revolutionary Literature Fund (PRLF). PRLF is also looking for volunteers to help get the RW into prisons.

You can reach PRLF at: 717-227-4096. Send contributions to: PRLF, Merchandise Mart, PO Box 3486, Chicago, IL 60654
Communists, therefore, are on the one
side of every country. In order to break
superficial issues like we need candy bars
of the class-conscious proletariat, the
development which the struggle of the
different countries, they point out and
can goods in a package. That is why
ments as a whole.
resolute section of the working class par-
hand, practically, the most advanced and
working class parties by this only: In the
Communist Manifesto
side of the yard. Or who owes who for "a—
thing that is wrong with the
is printed on bio-degradable paper.
The Draft Programme
reality of the proletariat and are prepared for
great sacrifice, jail, even execution at the
hands of the ruthless enemy." These are
read on page 37. "A truly revolutionary
party is the deadly enemy of the bourgeoisie." All those other so-called
Communist newspapers sugar-coat the
story about how this imperialist society is
destroying people's lives around the
globe. They act as if they are afraid to
speak out against imperialism. But the
Revolutionary Worker and the Party pull
no punches.
I was reading about at the end of page 39,
"To win victory, the Party must be made up
of those who embody the best qualities of
the proletariat and are prepared for
great sacrifice, jail, even execution at the
hands of the ruthless enemy." These are
words that go to the last letter. I look at peo-
ple in prison and many of them realize that
home, that they must die in order to free
ourselves from the clutch of our oppressors.
But everyone is waiting for someone else
to die. Everyone cries loudly for unity and
the Draft Programme clearly states, "But
without the initiative and independent action
of the class-conscious proletariat, the
unity that is built with other class forces
will not be as broad or as powerful as it
be. The proletariat, through its
vanguard party, must strive to lead the united
front" (page 59).
Prisoners have many issues in the
California Prison System. But they spend
most of their time fighting with each other
on racial issues like who will have what
inside the yard. Or who owes who for "a—
you know what I mean." And when the races
do mix up, the identification is for a
superficial issue like we need candy bars
in the cafeteria, or we should fight to
gain goods in a package. That is why The
Community Manifesto says: "The
communists are distinguished from the
other working class parties by this only: In
the national struggles of the proletarians
of different countries, they point out and
come to the common interests of the
entire proletariat, independently of all
2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the
working class against the bourgeoisie has
changed, they always and everywhere
represent the interests of the move-
ments as a whole.
The Manifesto goes on to say, "The
community, therefore, are on the
one hand, practically, the most advanced and
resolute section of the working class part-
ies of every country," in order to break
past those walls of prison inertia created
by the prison administration, the commun-
ists in every prison must quickly seek out
other class-conscious communists and
start holding study groups under the guise
of religion or whatever means of meetings
The Draft Programme will work but we communists must be willing
to exhaust the study of the Programme
and put its policy into practice. Because
the Draft Programme will work. It is based on Marxian-Leninism-Maoism.

"What do you think?"
I like to thank you for your letter dated
1st day of January 2002. Thank the
sponsor for my suit, it will help me keep
up with the struggle. I believe the RCP
Draft Programme needs to give the youth
of the world more rights to control their
own life—e.g. jobs, education, body,
relationships and marriage. That is what is
wrong with the world governments killing
the young people. They can't get a job,
mariage, sex, etc. The world treats them
as property of the parents and/or govern-
ment. What do you think?

Thoughts on Rehabilitation
Greetings to all my brothers and sisters
united in the struggle for revolution and
ultimate freedom. I am reaching out to
you from the belly of the beast—the
ultimate incarnation of political and social
oppression. Not to mention the emotional,
physical, and mental oppression and abuse
inflicted upon prisoners literally 24 hours
day.
On pages 69-70 in the Draft Programme,
title, "Prisoners and Prisoners." This has
caused our "study group" (which must be
kept underground due to prison rules) to
have many interesting and thought-provoking
debates. I am of the view that no crime is
nonviolent. Allow me to explain. Non-
violent crime would mean that no one has
been hurt by the crime. If you take a man's
money in a nonviolent way such as a con-
fidence game or credit card scam or just
steal his wallet, do you deprive him of
the money needed to support his family or
himself? Does this not cause pain? Although
possibly not physical pain, it can
cause emotional pain. It can cause hardship to a family even if only for a
week or two. A nonviolent crime has
casued pain. Let us look at nonviolent drug
offenders. Drugs are a poison and the harm they
cause not only to the user but also anyone
who comes in contact with the user can be
ev ery violent. Speaking from experience
the things I have done to get the money to
buy drugs have caused untold pain and
suffering to not only my family but to
many innocent people who did not even
know me.
Drug dealers perpetuate violence and
pain and misery. Certainly I don't know a
man's hurt but I call it the way I see it. Dealers know what their clientele do
get the money to supply their habits. They
know how the drugs they sell cause to
society. So to consider their crimes non-
vil lent to my way of thinking is ludicrous.
I understand the underlying principles
behind dealing drugs and I know the differ-
ent reasons why a person uses drugs.
However, I don't feel that merely giving
the "lower class" criminal type of individ-
ual the revolutionary outlook is going to
solve substance abuse and all it entails. On
page 69 on the "Lumpen proletariat" the
Draft states, "But winning them to the revo-
utionary cause will be possible only by
exercising an absolutely firm hand and
sharply struggling to instill in them the
revolutionary outlook of the proletariat."
Outrage at Hunters Point

"They keep telling everyone to lock out for this gang and that gang but the most dangerous gang is the San Francisco Police Department. That's the biggest gang and it's illegal for them to do whatever they want to do to us. We're not just about to sit back and accept it and say that's OK."

Gus Meakins, mother of 13-year-old Alema, who was abused by SFPD police in San Francisco. It's the evening of Monday, January 21, 2002—Martin Luther King holiday. Four children, aged 12 to 14, are sitting in a car in front of their home on Kirkwood Street in the Bay View—Hunters Point neighborhood listening to the radio. Their parents had left them up late because it was a holiday.

Bay View—Hunters Point is one of the largest African-American communities in San Francisco (see sidebar). Kirkwood is a quiet street, where children play during the day. It is a close-knit neighborhood where the adults all watch out for the kids. Across the street is the Boys and Girls Club, one of the few recreational centers for youth in this Black community.

Tenisha Bishop is driving home from work with her 6-year-old son in the car. As Tenisha parks her car in front of her apartment, she sees the police surround her car. The four kids were in a banged-up red car. The four kids were in a banged-up red car. The two officers were saying they had come up behind them and pushed them up to take a picture of them.

"Jerome was lying on the ground in a pool of blood. His eyes looked glazed, and it didn't look like he was breathing. As I stared at him, his eyes did blink one time. I thought Jerome was dead."

The police officer just justified this whole attack by saying that they were responding to a tip that two African-American men had been seen with a gun in a red car. The four kids were in a banged-up red car. The two officers were saying they had come up behind them and pushed them up to take a picture of them.

"When Jerome's father described his son's injuries at a meeting of the Police Commission: 'My son was hospitalized that night. No treatment was given him after he was knocked down and his head slammed into the concrete. I witnessed a middle of my son's blood on Kirkwood Road where this happened. I was appalled. When I saw my son in the hospital, he could not even recognize me... Three of his teeth were shoved up into his gums. He had a hole in his jaw. He had to have surgery that night and stitches to close up the wounds. He had a concussion. He didn't know what his name was. He didn't even know he was in the hospital.'"

"Tenisha described, to the Bay View, the next outrage: 'Then I asked why were there so many police out here for these little kids. [The police officer] replied, 'As long as you people are here, we will act like this.' I asked, 'What the hell did you just say?' I said, 'Are we monkeys, baboons, or niggers today?' Inell, Sue, and Leonard said, 'What do you mean, you people?' Then snapped a picture of him with a stupid racist smirk on his face. I said to him, 'How dare you say that... especially on Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday holiday.'"

"Brian's cuffs were too tight he was screaming to the officers to loosen them. So one officer pulled him to his feet by his cuffs and slammed him back down on the ground. Tyrrell, Alema, and Janell were upset at what they had just seen the police do to Brian. They were saying they hated the police. I also heard the kids say that all they had been doing was sitting in the car listening to music, so what was all of this for?"

"As I was crossing the street, Sue and I were asking the police if they could cross the street and be with their kids. The police told them that if they crossed the street they would get shot." The police searched the girls, rubbing them on the breasts, hips, buttocks, and between the thighs. Imagine seeing these helpers, violated, innocent beautiful black babies. Alema, who just made 14 the following Friday, is the survivor of the two. The officers lifted up her sweater because it was tied around her waist and rubbed and fondled instead of searching. The whole while Alema was being searched, her mother was screaming across the street saying, 'That's not right. Y'all can't search my baby like that. Call for a female officer. She is just a baby.'"

"Sue Meakins, Alema's mother, described the police sexually abusing her daughter: 'One of the officers took the palm of his hand and went across my daughter's breast. I started screaming that they needed to get a female police officer out here. The police officer continued to feel down my daughter's breast. He went up between her legs to her cunt and lifted her shirt and felt on her cunt with the palm of his hand. I broke down in tears..."
because of the pain and humiliation my daughter was going through.”

Community Outrage

The Bay View newspaper has played an important role in exposing this attack. And there is a lot of outrage in the community about this incident and about the police brutality and harassment that is a part of daily life for the people, especially the youth.

“The community is very, very angry,” Susan McAllister, the RJF. “And it’s not just this case. It’s other cases too, and how easily it gets swept under the rug. It’s in the closet and that’s it, you don’t hear any more about it. Well, they’re going to continue to hear about this. And I’m going to be in their face until they do something about it. We’re taking our community back. If you’re going to treat us like this we want you out. We can handle our situations ourselves.”

The police have promised an investigation but they have refused community demands that the cops involved in the incident be taken off active duty. Instead, the cops have just been transferred to do their dirty deeds in another part of San Francisco.

“You should not allow these police officers to go into any other community to do these things to other children,” an older woman, from the community told the Police Commission.

In a further outrage, the police have assigned Commander Greg Suh to deal with the community about the incident. Suh was the officer in charge six years ago when a group of cops beat and pepper-sprayed Mark Garcia, placed him facedown on the concrete with their boot on his back. Though the police violated many of their own policies and procedures causing Mark’s death, no cop has been punished.

At the police commission, Mesha Monge-Irizarry described how the police killed her son, 23-year-old Bay View resident Idriss Steffey, outside the Sony Metreon Theatre in downtown San Francisco on June 13, 2001. The police climbed up the cop chain of command while the Mark Garcia case has been swept under the rug. On February 27, some 80 people confronted the San Francisco Police Commission to protest the police attack in Hunters Point. The incident has brought together older residents and youth, community activists, and longtime homeowners who are determined that this police brutality must be stopped.

At the police commission, Measha Monge-Irizarry described how the police killed her son, 23-year-old Bay View resident Idriss Steffey, outside the Sony Metreon Theatre in downtown San Francisco on June 13, 2001. The police fired more than 20 bullets into Idriss, who was unarmed.

An older Black woman who has lived in Hunters Point since 1945 also got up to speak: “Don’t say to me there’s two sides to every coin. Not this one. All these children had never been in any trouble and the only thing the parents asked is why are you doing this. Now I’m the mother of six. I’m the grandmother of 21, great-grandmother of 40. If it was me that night I would have been shot. No ifs, ands, or buts about it. Because it was unacceptable and it still is.”

“A whole situation is fucked up. This takes me back to when I was bent up by the police and there wasn’t no camera back then,” a Black youth told the commission. “You all got to stop coming into our communities and harassing us, beating us up and killing us like we ain’t gonna do nothing about it. That’s fucked up. You motherfuckers better put them motherfuckers on trial and put them motherfuckers in jail or something... and another thing, you talk about it’s a couple of bad apples in the police force. No, it’s the whole system. It’s the way that you’re trained, the way that you handle yourselves out there on the streets. You aren’t there to ‘protect and serve’ us. You all really is there to do what you all are doing. You all are going to stop this shit or we’re going to make you stop it.”

A Short History of Hunters Point

Before World War 2, San Francisco was a segregated city with a Black population of only 3,000. “Whites only” real estate practices kept Black people out of almost all housing and a whites-only job market kept Black people out of most jobs.

In the 1940s, thousands of African-Americans migrated to Hunters Point from Texas, Louisiana, and other Southern states to work in the shipyards building the battleships for the U.S. Navy in WW2. The shipyard workers initially lived in barracks in Hunters Point. Many Black people settled in the Hunters Point neighborhood near the shipyards. The neighborhood lies on a hill in the southwest corner of San Francisco with beautiful views overlooking the San Francisco Bay.

There is a long history of police brutality and resistance in Bay View-Hunters Point. One police officer is quoted in a book on the history of San Francisco on his technique of dealing with African-American youth in the early 1960s: "Get back on the hill where you belong, nigger. If I see your head down here again, I’ll shoot it off!" On September 27, 1966, a rebellion lasting several days broke out in Hunters Point after a white police officer shot and killed a 16-year-old Black youth.

The shipyard was closed in 1974, leaving behind a legacy of unemployment and toxic and radioactive waste. Last August, a fire burned for weeks at a toxic waste dump at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, spewing green and orange-yellow smoke. The Navy did not alert people in the community to the danger, saying that there was nothing dangerous even though a local TV station reported that one carcinogen was 17 times the safe level. The area has some of the highest cancer and asthma rates on the planet, according to the San Francisco Bay View newspaper. The highest incidence of breast cancer for women under the age of 40 in the U.S. is in the Bay View-Hunters Point neighborhood of San Francisco.

Black people are being driven out of San Francisco at an incredible rate by high rents, lack of jobs, racism and police brutality. The number of people in San Francisco who list their race as African-American fell from 79,039 in 1990, to 69,515 last year—a decline of 23%.

“I live here where you can hear the games from the new Giants’ ballpark and everything and you see the lights,” a Hunters Point resident told the New York Times. “And it’s just a beautiful view. If it wasn’t for the toxic waste, they would have taken this hill a long time ago.”
JOHN BOLTON, Under Secretary of State for that he believes to be sufficient to make, the United States to make, the kind used in U.S. military projects. The person (or team) who created the anthrax letters also needed an annual anthrax booster shot, which is only available for people with government connections.

In short, the anthrax attacks almost certainly came from U.S. military or CIA labs. It could not have been done by amateurs, federal governments. Scientists and FBI investigators knew this very quickly after the October attacks. For example, it is known that Iraq's military research uses bontine, as an additive, but this did not prevent the government from continuing to blame Iraq.

Because the anthrax comes from a known strain of anthrax — it is possible to determine with great precision which laboratory the letter attacks came from. The Ames strain has "substrains" that develop over time during research, and only a small number of labs are capable of weaponization.

The Rosenberg report writes, "Contrary to early speculation, there are no more than about 20 laboratories known to have obtained the Ames strain from Fort Detrick... Of these, probably only about four in the U.S. might possibly have the capability for weaponizing anthrax. These include both U.S. military laboratories and government contractors.

Rosenberg skays believes that the FBI knows who sent the anthrax letters — or, at the very least, has a very small number of suspects. Only about 30 people had the know-how to do this. Rosenberg says that, based on discussion with people in the government, she believes that the FBI had a prime suspect in mind since October. Depending on how much has been determined in this case. And the public has been deliberately kept in the dark about the most basic facts. The next question is "why?"

HIDING U.S. GOVERNMENT CRIMES

"Does he [theital] know something that he believes to be sufficiently damaging to the United States to make him untouchable by the FBI?" Dr. Barbara Hatch Rosenberg, Federation of American Scientists

In November at the Review Conference of the Biological Weapons Convention, John Bolton, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, was asked about the anthrax letter attacks.

He said: "We don't know, as I say in the statement, at the moment, or in a way that we could make public, where the anthrax attacks came from." The meaningful words in Bolton's statement are "or in a way that we could make public."

Rosenberg writes: "At first, U.S. officials provided miscellaneous bits of information, some conflicting; then denied some of the earlier information, then clammed up. They now have a great deal of information that has not been made public. ... The Secretary of Health and Human Services said in October that some of the relevant information is classified, and some is restricted by the FBI."

The U.S. has talked for years about "Saddam Hussein killing his own people." Now it turns out that U.S. biological "weapons of mass destruction" were somehow turned against the people within its own borders — including an attempt to assassinate leading Democratic politicians.

If this was widely understood, it would have a profound impact — weakening the credibility of the government and the military at exactly the time when the government wants support for its war moves and domestic security.

In addition, whoever put the anthrax in the mail might have information on the U.S. government's secret anthrax program — and those details could trigger a huge international scandal.

For 30 years, the U.S. government has bragged that it "unilaterally" stopped U.S. biological weapons development in 1969. The U.S. signed the Biological Weapons Convention in 1972, renouncing biological weapons together with 144 other countries.

But in December, a spokesman for the Army labs at Utah's Dugway Proving Ground had to announce that all their stocks of weaponized anthrax are "well protected" and entirely accounted for. (Dugway is where 6,000 sheep died in 1968 after a nerve gas experiment got out of control.)

WHO WAS INVOLVED? HOW HIGH DOES IT GO?

It is remarkable how strictly the discussions of the anthrax attacks avoid any mention of domestic groups, political forces and intelligence networks who could have been involved. The BBC news in Britain (March 14) raised the possibility that a covert CIA operation was involved, but no similar reports have appeared in the U.S. media.

Even people who are exposing the FBI cover-ups and military involvement speak as if this must have been some lone individual taking advantage of "loose security" without the knowledge of his military and CIA superiors.

However there is no reason to assume this "lone individual" theory is true.

The targets of the anthrax letters were leading liberals and representatives of the media — both deeply hated by reactionary forces. The military is reeling with right-wing groups who might want to trigger a war climate and intensified domestic crackdown. The CIA, which admits to having weapons anthrax, is well known to conduct covert operations to influence policy and public opinion.

There has been a massive investigation into these anthrax attacks — involving over 5,000 FBI interviews over six months. The U.S. government has mailed letters to 40,000 scientists asking for information and offering a $2.5 million reward. They have gathered anthrax samples from laboratories across the U.S. And after six months of this, there is a clampdown on the evidence.

Courageous people, like Barbara Hatch Rosenberg, have fought to get some basic facts into the public view — but these facts have always appeared surrounded by the stone-wall denial and disinformation of government agencies.

The evidence shows that the U.S. government conducted an anthrax weaponization program in violation of international treaty, and that anthrax from there was almost certainly used in these attempts to assassinate prominent liberal Democrats.

Now the question becomes what else are the government agents hiding? Who exactly was involved in the anthrax attacks? What were their motives? And how high up in the military establishment and CIA did this operation go?
Hundreds of thousands of immigrants from the Middle East and South Asia live in the New York City area. And if you are Arab, Muslim or South Asian, you have definitely been on edge since September 11. Hundreds have been rounded up by the authorities. Some have just "disappeared." Others were taken away after federal agents raided their homes or workplaces. Racial profiling has created a hate-filled atmosphere. People have been attacked, beaten and in some cases even killed by racists. Many are afraid to leave their homes.

When I first heard about Uzma Naheed I was intrigued. She is a 33-year-old Pakistani woman with four children. Her husband, Anser Mehmood, was detained by the authorities on October 3. Deplete the fact that her own visa had expired and she faced deportation, Uzma Naheed spoke out publicly at protests against these unjust detentions and appealed for the release of her husband. She and her 11-year-old son Harris spoke at the February 20 National Day of Solidarity with Arab, Muslim and South Asian Immigrants. Uzma seemed nervous and simply thanked people for coming out. Harris told me: "I don't know why they're doing this. What they're doing is wrong." Uzma and her family have found themselves caught in the crosshairs of the U.S. imperialists' bloody plans to impose a new world order on people across the planet.

**Usma's Story**

Uzma Naheed's story shines a light on the ugly reality of life in the U.S. for the thousands of Arab, Muslim and South Asian families who have been ripped apart since September 11. George Bush hypocritically claims the system's "war on terrorism" is being waged to defend "freedom"—while U.S. government agencies round up people based solely on their nationality or religion and detain them for months without charging them with any crime.

Uzma Naheed's story begins on the night of September 11. Uzma described her emotions when she finally was able to see Anser after nine weeks: "After so long I managed to see him again, but I couldn't hold back the tears. I had expected to see him through the bars with his hands and legs chained. It was very shocking. I didn't expect to see him like this. He can't move his hands. He can't touch me. I can't touch him. It was terrible.... He was crying. I was crying. He's telling me leave the country. Leave the house as it is. Take the children and go. But how can I leave him here? Who will look out for him?"

**Correct Procedures**

ABC News asked prison officials why it took so long for them to allow Uzma Naheed to see her husband. A prison spokesperson cold-heartedly refused to discuss "specific cases" and blamed family members for not following the "correct procedures." Like so much that comes out of the mouth of the authorities on all levels of government these days, this is nothing but double-speak. Even the Pakistani consulate has been unable to get information about Anser. Foreign diplomats have repeatedly complained to the U.S. government that they are unable to get information about why their citizens are being held or even their citizens names. Human rights organizations have repeatedly been denied access to the detainees. And officials at the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn denied a request by ABC News to interview Anser Mehmood.

Anser Mehmood is one of over 1,200 Arab, Muslim and South Asian men who have been rounded up and detained by the U.S. government. Some have been deported. Others have been released. Close to 500 remain in prison. A small number have been charged with minor crimes. Others are still held on immigration violations. Only one of the 1,200 detainees has been charged in connection with the events of September 11.

On February 27, 20 FBI agents burst into the home of a Syrian family in Bay Ridge, Brooklyn. They arrested Reem Khalil, a 23-year-old biochemistry major at City College of New York, her parents and their three siblings. Two young children who were born in the U.S. were left with neighbors after they watched the rest of their family dragged away in chains.

And as I was writing about Uzma and her family, I learned that on March 11 a Pakistani man named Reem Afzal Iqbal was jumped by at least six cops. They called him "Taliban" and beat him over and over—including after he was hand-cuffed. The cops are from the 70th Precinct in Brooklyn—the same precinct where police used a toilet plunger to sodomize Abou Louizy. Recently, several of these cops had their convictions thrown out by a federal court.

Over 1,200 people have been rounded up, arrested, detained indefinitely without being charged with any crime, beaten and abused, denied the right to practice their religion and access to lawyers or contact with family members. Their attorneys have been ordered not to speak publicly about the cases, court records have been sealed and hearings held in secret. Almost all of those arrested are Arab, Muslim and South Asian men. The largest percentage are from Pakistan, followed by Egypt, Turkey, Yemen, India and other countries in the Middle East and South Asia. And for every one, there is a trail of tears and torn-up lives leading to people like Uzma.

What does this say about the nature of the U.S. crusade in the so-called "war on terrorism"? Where such injustices are perpetuated in the name of "freedom?"

On February 20, 2002, Uzma Naheed courageously stepped into the light to join with others to demand a stop to these roundups. Now, the people will have to carry on this fight for Uzma and so many others.

Uzma was ultimately forced to make a terrible choice by the rules of this system. On February 27, she and her children were sent back to Pakistan. Her children have grown in the U.S. and have been ripped away from everything they've known. Uzma has been forced to have her husband behind, not knowing if she will ever see him again, and has gone back to a country where the future is very uncertain. Anser continues to be held in maximum security, not charged with any crime.
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of working out an Israeli-Palestinian agreement.

The juxtaposition of Powell’s words and the images coming out of Ramallah was almost surreal. What twist of logic is involved in Powell’s insisting that Arafat must “do more” while the U.S. supports Israel’s moves to seriously weaken, if not shatter, the Palestinian Authority? But what Powell said also reveals some realities about the situation in Palestine and the role and maneuvers of the U.S. imperialists.

Powell’s defense of Israeli actions as an “understandable” response to Palestinian “terrorism” is typical of how U.S. officials—and the U.S. mainstream media—are manipulating fact to create a ready-made justification for Israeli actions. A chart that recently appeared in the Chicago Tribune tracked the Palestinian and Israeli casualties in the current conflict. The chart begins with the intifada (Palestinian uprising) in September 2000, as if all the blood that has been spilled since then can be traced back—and blamed—on the Palestinian side. Again, this is typical of how the U.S. government and media discuss the events in Palestine.

But in reality, the Palestinian protest that began in September 2000 were in response to a move by Ariel Sharon, who employed his highly honed skill at reaction provocation by visiting Haram ash-Sharif, a religious site in central Jerusalem, that is of major importance in Islam. At the time, he was not a government official—but would become premier several months later. But he was accompanied by a large security escort of a thousand Israeli soldiers and police. Sharon made a deliberate, calculated move that was certain to touch off widespread outrage among the masses of Palestinian people—who were already deeply angry at the continued oppression and poverty they suffered as the U.S.-backed “peace process” dragged on. And when the Palestinian people did rise up in righteous resistance, the Israeli military used this as justification to gun down people and put the West Bank and Gaza under lockdown. The political fallout in Israel from these developments brought Sharon to power.

This pattern of Israeli provocation and brutality has been repeated many times since September 2000. The Israeli government has an open policy of assassinating leaders of Palestinian organizations, and the Israeli military has “eliminated” a number of Palestinian officials—sometimes gunning them down on city streets and killing bystanders in the process. Sharon and other Israeli officials know full well that such killings provoke retaliatory actions. But their hypothesis—that the deaths of Palestinians signal a need to crush the Palestinian National Authority. This strategy has led to widespread outrage among the U.S. and Israel officials, who continue to support such actions. In the absence of a real revolution, the Islamic fundamentalist groups and secular military associated with national bourgeois forces have their own political agendas in organizing suicide squads. But in the absence of an actual revolutionary strategy for taking on and defeating the occupiers, many youths have taken up this way of killing back against the enemy.

The Zionists and their U.S. backers ask, Why doesn’t Arafat do more to stop this flow of suicide bombers? But what about the deadly flow of jet fighters, helicopters, and billions of dollars in military aid from the U.S., without which Israel would not be able to maintain their brutal occupation of Palestine for a day? It is this unjust occupation that is the real fuel for the fury among the youth of Palestine.

Echoing the “war on terrorism” talk of the U.S. imperialists, Sharon declared that Israel’s new military offensive is aimed at destroying “structures of terror” in Palestine. Powell basically endorsed this justification; the New York Times noted that with his statement on Israel’s move on Ramallah, Powell made clear that combating terrorism remains the centerpiece of the Bush administration foreign policy.

Given this basic U.S. support for the Israeli actions, why did Powell say that Arafat still plays a “central” role in the “peace process” in Palestine? The U.S. imperialists are making a cold calculation that their interests are best served by working out some kind of a “peace settlement” between Israel and the Palestinian national bourgeoisie—at least bringing the possibility of such a settlement. They hope that the idea of a possible agreement will donie the fire of Palestinian resistance as well as anti-U.S. sentiments that could threaten pro-U.S. regimes in the region. But the events in Ramallah have made the nature of this “peace process”—and Arafat’s assigned role in it—very clear; he will either accept the terms of the United States or be crushed.

The Bush administration has recently started talking about a “vision” of a Palestinian state at some point. And they signaled interest in the Saudi “land-for-peace” proposal—in particular the part about formal Arab recognition of Israel. But the U.S. officials are not talking about a genuinely independent state that is free from imperialist and Zionist domination. What they envision—at most—is a mini-state in the shadows of the Zionist state, at the mercy of outside forces economically and militarily.

In short, the U.S. “vision” is of an entire people locked into a giant ghetto (or several ghettos) in parts of the West Bank and Gaza, who will not present a threat to U.S. interests in the region. Clearly, this “vision” has absolutely nothing to do with justice and liberation for the oppressed Palestinian people.}

Los Angeles, March 30—2,000 people march against the Israeli occupation of Palestine.

Cairo, March 30—Egyptian lawyers burn a U.S. flag in protest of the Israeli invasion of Ramallah.

Palestinian families stopped at an Israeli military checkpoint outside Ramallah, March 30.
Protesting INS at LAX

L.A. Airport, March 28.

"Aquí estamos! No nos vamos!" They say "Go away. We say "No way!" Hundreds of voices echoed along the sidewalks of LAX, L.A. International Airport, in a loud, spirited protest of a recent series of raids by the INS (La Migra).

U.S. airports are one of the centers of the "homeland security" program of the U.S. government. In California, they are patrolled by National Guard troops as well as large numbers of airport and local police. As you drive into LAX, huge electronic signs flash the warning: "Unoccupied vehicles will be towed."

It's the gateway into an atmosphere of "racial profiling." Where INS agents check multiple times and passengers as young as three years old are singled out for body searches. The least incident can provoke a "security sweep" where thousands of passengers and employees are herded outside for hours at a time.

Immigrants who work at the airport are routinely harassed. The L.A. head of the SEIU, the union that represents janitors and others, said that 80 or 90 airport employees have had their security badges arbitrarily taken away.

Then on Monday, March 18, agents of La Migra targeted Terminal 1, used by Southwest Airlines, stopping Latino-looking people and asking them for immigration documents. TV news broadcasts showed desperate immigrants dodging through the heavy traffic circling through LAX, trying to avoid capture and deportation. Immigrants who were heading to work in Washington, DC, Phoenix or San Francisco were arrested and deported.

This was the first INS raid at the airport in several years.

"I was enraged," said a woman from the United Farmworkers at the Thursday, March 28 protest. "Nobody should be persecuted as if they're chasing animals. What the INS did was terrorize anybody who's an immigrant in this country, and it was disgraceful about it."

Over 1,000 people gathered for a march and press conference. A bus from the SEIU opened its doors and dozens from Justice for Janitors came out, many of them veterans of the 2000 janitors' strike. There were students, garden workers, ministers and other religious activists.

Signs in English, Spanish and Korean denounced the INS. A special guest at the press conference was a representative of the Muslim Public Affairs Council. James Lafferty of the National Lawyers Guild talked about the stakes for the people: "First they came for Muslims, first they came for the Arabs, and there are still nearly a thousand of them locked away in prison, their identity unknown and no charges for almost six months. Now they are coming for the Latinos.

For over an hour, protesters marched through the airport and circled in front of Terminal 1. There was a huge Mexican flag, a group of Korean drummers, Janitors in their famous red T-shirts, pictures of Emiliano Zapata, a special banner from the jornaleros (day laborers).

The protest was widely covered in the mainstream media. It was the lead story on the Spanish-language news and was covered by college radio stations, Pacifica and the IMC.

A spectrum of mainstream Latino organizations denounced the raids from the beginning. The president of the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) called the racial profiling "intolerable." The executive director of the Salvadoran-American National Network said the raids gave credibility to the idea that "this society is turning into a zona militarizada, a militarized zone," where people who look Latino or Arab are the targets.

The INS held a press conference to try to defend their actions. They said it had nothing to do with the events of September 11, 2001. They said they didn't pick people out because of their race, but because they "looked like" undocumented workers. But a reporter from the Los Angeles daily La Opinion went to the airport and watched as INS agents singled out only Latinos—especially Latinos who weren't wearing a suit and a tie. As news spread on Spanish-language radios and TV stations, many immigrants avoided LAX, even if they had to lose money on their plane tickets. By the end of the week, the INS said they were ending the raids, but arrogantly added that they might resume them at any moment.

Over 100 people were deported in the LAX raids. This is a great injustice. It means incredible hardship for those who must again cross the border to work and survive, and hardship and privation for the many who depend on wages that immigrant workers send back home. Eighteen of those arrested were children, and it's unknown whether they were separated from their parents.

Raids like this are also staged to intimidate and isolate all immigrants, to force them into the shadows. But once again, the system found out that oppression breeds resistance. And their zona militarizada can be turned into a zone of protest and resistance.
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"As can be seen in many ways, including in the major speeches by Bush since September 11, 2001, these imperialists—the U.S. imperialists in particular—certainly have wild ambitions. But they also have a great deal of necessity they're facing. And we need to look at both.

"They have ambitions of essentially reshuffling the whole deck, reordering the whole situation—beginning with the strategic areas of Central and South Asia and the Middle East that are more immediately involved now—but, even beyond that, on a world scale...."

"I want to speak first of all to the strategic dimension involved in the current and developing situation since September 11.... To put it in stark terms, the range of possibilities involves everything from, on the one hand, on the negative side, devastating defeats for the proletariat and the proletarian revolution internationally, of a character that would set us back for decades...and at the same time to very great advances and consolidations by the imperialists, the U.S. imperialists in particular.

"Or, on the other extreme, on the positive side—and this too is possible—the whole course that the imperialists are embarking on could turn into its opposite for them in a profound, and perhaps even an unprecedented, way—it could lead to tremendous advances for the revolutionary struggle of the people all over the globe...."

"I want to emphasize a fundamental point in relation to the war and repression juggernaut of the imperialists: It is good that many people have made statements of opposition and have mobilized, and are mobilizing, in various ways against this; and it is also good that many others are at least raising questions, concerns, and even criticisms; but there is a profound and increasingly urgent need for things to be developed to a qualitatively greater and more profound as well as broader level. What the powers-that-be are already doing and, beyond that, what they are clearly indicating they are planning on doing—both internationally and within the U.S., both in terms of war and in terms of repression—must not only be questioned, must not only give rise to the expression of concerns, must not only be criticized or just opposed. There must be an orientation of actively resisting and of stopping this, through the mobilization of hundreds of thousands and ultimately millions of people.

"We are called on to rise to the challenges that are posed with both a sense of real urgency and with a broad overview."

Kabul, Afghanistan

A U.S. bomber taking off from the aircraft carrier USS Enterprise, October 9, 2001.