

Lies Our Cop Propagandists Told Us

In February 2006, I came across a piece disseminated by the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) criticizing the Federal Appeal's Court's decision to grant Mumia Abu-Jamal the opportunity to appeal his conviction in three points. Even a quick survey showed that that piece, cobbling together a host of old and new writings on the topic, was full of falsehoods that should not go unanswered. While it is in generally impossible to have a debate with organizations such as the FOP, Accuracy in Academia and other such right wing organizations and think tanks since the concepts of truth and argument are alien to them, it is in my view nevertheless important to rebut their rants since they are powerful and have the money to spoonfeed the media with their stuff. People such as Sam Donaldson who produced the notorious December 1998 20/20 program consume their proclamations uncritically, and so we should move in to create some counterweight.

The following is a posting by ex-MOVE sympathizer and present anti-MOVE crusader Tony Allen on his website <http://antimove.blogspot.com>. While Allen's influence is not on a par with the FOP's and other right wing groups, he is now a known quantity in Philadelphia, and his message resonates well with the rabidly anti-Mumia Philadelphia media.

The excerpts from the original FOP piece and my comments on them are in italics. My comments on the FOP piece are in square brackets and marked in blue. My comments on Allen's comments are in square brackets and marked in red.

Michael Schiffmann, Free Mumia Abu-Jamal Heidelberg
German Network to Free Mumia Abu Jamal, March 9, 2006

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2006

Guten Tag Herr Schiff



(Look everyone. Mumia is already free!)

[What a great sense of humor Mr. Allen has. Criticism of Ms. Faulkner for wanting to "fry Mumia" makes him rant and rave, but apparently, in his view, tasteless jokes about a man who has suffered more than 22 years (May 25, 1983, to ?) under the hellish conditions of death row are just funny and wonderful.]

The great masses of the people ... will more easily fall victims to a big lie than to a small one.

-Adolf Hitler

On February 20th the official website of International Concerned Family and Friends of Mumia posted an article by a “long-time supporter of Mumia” named Mike Schiff. [By accident, the friend who originally circulated my comments got my name wrong. Just for the record, my name is Michael Schiffmann.] Schiff, who apparently sieg heils all the way from Heidelberg, Germany and knows all that there is to know about the case of Mumia Abu-Jamal. Apparently in the interest of international solidarity, Schiff has decided to set us dumb Americans straight. [After Germany didn't go to war with the Bushites, a little German-baiting can never hurt if you're, as Mr. Allen is, in the process of linking up with the most reactionary elements in official American politics.]

I would thank Schiff for his contribution to the “debate” concerning Jamal (is there still a debate?), save for the “facts” as he presents them are anything but. So what I did was to deconstruct the mythology Schiff presents as facts mythology.

This can all get a little confusing being that he chose to insert his commentaries in the middle of articles taken from Fraternal Order of Police websites, some of which are many years old. Schiff's comments begin and end with [].

My rebuttal to Schiff's rather poor attempt at propagandizing follows the italicized paragraphs.

Schiff's email is mikschiff@t-online.de

I hope everyone can drop him a line and just let him know how much we all appreciate the way he so articulately parrots already discredited lies and brings embarrassment to his country [It is scurrilous how Mr. Allen identifies individuals with the country they come from.] through his arrogant and ignorant support of a ruthless and remorseless murderer. Then again, people in Germany do have a habit for doing just that.

The attackers' gun was found near him with five spent shells, two of which were in the body of the deceased Officer. [They can't get even the simplest things right. The bullet that hit Faulkner in the back was NOT in his body but never identified. The bullet in Faulkner's brain was NEVER conclusively linked to Mumia's revolver.]

Yet, Schiff fails to explain how or why Mumia's revolver was empty. [I'm referring here to the fact that the FOP can't get the most elementary facts right, and Allen responds by evasions and talking about something else, his typical MO, as we shall see below.] Furthermore, Mumia's own ballistics expert debunked the myth of the bullet being a .44 during the PCRA hearing. The bullet recovered from Faulkner was too damaged to definitively match it to Jamal's weapon, however the bullet was found to be consistent of the type fired by a Charter arms revolver, the type of gun that Mumia was carrying that night.

[The witness who claimed this, Michael Scanlan, was NOT close to the scene, but a good 20 yards away. Moreover, he almost certainly was unable to even see Faulkner's body on the sidewalk, his view being blocked by Faulkner's police car. I invited those of the recipients of this mail who are in Philadelphia to take the drive from Broad to 13th Street on Locust, pick, as Scanlan did, the left lane

before the intersection and then check what they can see on the sidewalk when cars are parked in front of Locust 1234. You may also try it at 4 o'clock in the morning to get an even more realistic picture.]

I used to live and work near Philadelphia and have been to the scene dozens of times. If anyone were to actually read Scanlan's testimony you could see just how damaging it was to Jamal's case. Perhaps that is why, in the testimony, Jamal began to throw one of his notorious temper tantrums.

Scanlan was "two car lengths" away from the scene of the crime [This claim is remarkable once again, since Allen boasts about the number of times he has been there. There are true to scale police sketches of the crime scene that clearly prove that this is wrong, and that Scanlan was AT LEAST 20 yards away. But you don't need the help of a rocket scientist, or a map, or anything else to see that. Just go there. Since



Allen can't disprove my accurate statement about the distance of at least 20 yards that separated Scanlan from the shooting scene, he simply evades the issues or repeats, mantralike, falsities such as the "two car lengths" statement.] and gives an amazing account of what happened that night. He had no reason to lie about what he had seen or not seen. Despite Jamal's supporters best efforts, Scanlan's testimony stands firm. An example follows: [Here again, Allen responds by simply not responding. I argue that Scanlan couldn't see what he claimed to have seen. No answer to this from Allen. I can only repeat: Go check it out, and check out the accompanying photo taken at the intersection of 13th and Locust. Below, Allen argues that cab driver Robert Chobert was also a wonderful witness. Now, here's a definite problem for Allen: Even if he wants to argue that P.O. Faulkner's police car somehow did NOT block Scanlan's view, Chobert's cab certainly would have - had it been there, which it wasn't. More on this below. Allen has to choose: If he wants to keep even a shred of credibility for Scanlan, Chobert's cab CANNOT have been behind Faulkner's RPC and Chobert lied or fantasized, or else, it WAS there and it was Scanlan who lied or fantasized. Moreover, Scanlan himself insisted at the trial that Chobert's cab was not there:

"Page 20.

SCANLAN - CROSS

Q. So, on Locust Street was there any cars behind the police car?

A. I don't believe so, no.

Q. No cars behind the police car?

A. No.

Q. And was the police car right at the corner, was it some distance from the corner?

A. Some distance from the corner.

Q. How much, as best you can estimate? How many car lengths from the corner was the police car parked?

A. One, at the most."

This is taken directly from the source both Allen and the FOP claim to cherish, namely the trial protocols - in the following TP - (June 25, 1982, p. 20.) Scanlan then goes on to repeat his "two car lengths" claim, which a mere inspection of the photograph shows to be wrong. The sole purpose of insisting on it is to put Scanlan closer to the scene, in the hope of making his "observations" more credible.]

Q. Now, you indicated that after the -- you heard the first shot, and then after you saw a man stand over top of the officer and fire two or three times. The officer was down on the ground?

A. That's correct

Scanlan testified that the same man who did what is described above was the same man he observed running from a parking lot. That man was Mumia Abu-Jamal. [Scanlan was then so sure about it being Mumia Abu-Jamal that he mistook the latter for the driver of Billy Cook's VW when he looked at him.]

The jury, multiracial in it is making up, was chosen with Mumia Jamal's personal participation [Given what actually happened, this is just an extremely nasty joke.]

How is this a joke? Mumia himself, struck an African-American from the jury [He indeed did, as compared to eleven African American jurors peremptorily struck by the prosecution. Eleven to one is quite a difference, isn't it?] and it is a fact that he participated in one form or another [He was stripped of the right to question the potential jurors himself, since prosecutor McGill argued that being questioned by a person accused of a heinous crime "frightened" the jurors. The questioning of the jurors was then taken over by none other than the Honorable Albert F. Sabo, known beyond city limits for his "impartiality," and later passed, after a considerable amount of damage had been done, to Anthony Jackson, who functioned against his will as Mumia's backup counsel. Does Mr. Allen think that a person who is frightened by being questioned of a person accused of murder for his/her jury qualifications is the right person to pass judgement on the defendant? That would be an interesting comment on his understanding of the jury system.] in the selection of every single juror. Moreover, according to Jamal's own appeals, the prosecution accepted four black jurors.

As he fell, Faulkner drew his gun and shot Abu-Jamal in the chest. [Physically impossible since the bullet that wounded Mumia in the chest traveled downward, not upward, as this scenario would demand.] Abu-Jamal stood over Faulkner and fired four more shots, [This is a thoroughly discredited lie. Check out the existing photographs of the sidewalk after the Faulkner murder - there is NOT ONE TINY TRACE of the three shots that supposedly missed Faulkner. All the same, the courts, most journalists, and of course the cops keep repeating the scenario like a mantra] one of which hit him between the eyes.

The comment by Schiff in the above paragraph is as grotesque as it is purely fictional. What area of the sidewalk are we talking about anyways? I have seen photos from the crime scene and the sidewalk is in part covered with the blood of Officer Faulkner. [Once again, Allen can't answer, and so he doesn't. I have talked to an experienced ballisticsian at a major German university who has worked with the police for thirty years, and he specifically told me that if you fire two to three shots

into a sidewalk at point blank range, the results are impossible to overlook. The one area that the notoriously corrupt and incompetent Philadelphia police investigated with some amount of care was the area around the entrance of Locust 1234, including the sidewalk, and in terms of the two to three shots into it claimed by “witnesses” White, Chobert, and Scanlan, they found precisely - NOTHING. Since he can’t get around that incontrovertible fact, Allen mumbles something about “what area of the sidewalk are we talking about anyways” and the sidewalk being covered with blood. So Faulkner’s blood somehow chose to run over and cover exactly the area with the two to three traces of point-blank firings into the sidewalk that the shooter had to leave behind if one is to believe the prosecution witnesses, and the cops would never look for those traces even if they allegedly had the testimony of these witnesses within hours after the shooting. This is indeed “disdain for the truth” and “blind faith” in what one is told, in Allen’s case by the prosecution and the Fraternal Order of Police.] I like when Jamal supporters use the term “physically impossible” as it displays their disdain for the truth and blind faith in those that have misled them.

The prosecution’s case never hinged upon exactly how Jamal was shot. [Yes, that’s right since the prosecution had to gloss over the question because it was never able to explain when or how it happened. When someone is shot in the chest just below the nipple AND the bullet travels DOWNWARDS, you need some fairly convoluted scenario to make that fit into the testimony of, e.g., Cynthia White, the only witness who even attempted to give any explanation for the shooting of Abu-Jamal by Faulkner at all. She said that the falling officer “grabbed” for something, i.e., his service revolver. For Allen, it is of course unimportant to explain “exactly how Jamal was shot” since for him what the prosecution witnesses say constitutes gospel truth, even where they contradict each other in the most glaring manner.] In fact, the “prosecution theory” was in fact conjured up by Weinglass and company. The eyewitness testimony indicates that after Mumia shot Faulkner in the back, that Faulkner either was still on his feet or was in the midst of falling when he shot Mumia. [While the first possibility requires some fairly unlikely and unrealistic additional assumptions, the second one should give even Mr. Allen a headache. It is this second possibility, and it alone, that is “supported” by alleged eyewitness testimony, namely the one by Cynthia White.] Jamal supporters cling to such irrelevancies as a means of distracting people from the fact that four people [Who, Mr. Allen, are they? Michael Scanlan mistook Mumia for the driver of the VW and couldn’t say at the trial who shot the cop, and Albert Magilton didn’t see the actual shooting at all. Does that mean that it is also an “irrelevancy” to you whether you have two, three, or four witnesses testifying to something?] observed Jamal shoot Faulkner to death.

"Her morale is good, [wonderful that the hope that a defenseless person will be killed after more than 20 years in a maximum security prison keeps her spirits high] but that's not to say she isn't incredibly frustrated," Burns said. "One thing she's never going to do is give up."

The above statement is regarding the widow of Daniel Faulkner, Maureen. Schiff in his “rebuttal” if you can call it that, seems to either not comprehend the concept of empathy or has no capacity for it. [With regard to her having lost her husband, Ms. Faulkner has all my sympathy and empathy. Her untiring and vicious campaign to have a person killed at a set date and in cold blood is something that may be understandable and should be pitied, but must also be resolutely rejected. Mr. Allen

proclaims to be against the death penalty. All the same, in Mumia's case he does his very best to paint the man as one of the worst of the worst, pushing the door wide open for his execution by the state. All, of course, in the name of "empathy" for the widow - the death of a bound and defenseless human being being a small price to pay for giving consolation and "closure" to Ms. Faulkner.] The death penalty issue aside, Maureen Faulkner has been the target of vicious and unscrupulous attacks by Jamal supporters ever since she publicly affirmed her support for the sentence that the jury in Mumia's case handed down. She has been spat upon and threatened. She has had to endure her husband's memory being tarnished by baseless allegations that he was a whoremonger and was a corrupt, brutal, and racist man. Moreover, she has been accused, again without any shred of evidence, that she has profited from her late husband's murder. Nearly thirty years after the death of her husband she is still the target of Jamal's supporters, even from as far away as Germany. [This is just sheer demagoguery. Ms. Faulkner may or may not have been viciously and unscrupulously attacked by whoever - as for myself, I never did any such thing. I invite readers just to look at what I wrote. If Mr. Allen considers this, too, a "vicious and unscrupulous attack," so be it. As for Ms. Faulkner's late husband, I do add that the evidence shows that he beat Billy Cook bloody while the autopsy of his own body didn't show any injuries before he was shot.]

Shame on you Schiff. [Sure. Condemn people for things they never did, just as you condemn Mumia without evidence. I won't apologize for not sharing Ms. Faulkner's enthusiasm for murdering Mumia, though.]

The witnesses watched as Cook stood over the fallen officer and emptied his gun into the officer's face. Police arrived within moments, and Mumia was caught red-handed at the scene, the murder weapon still in his possession. The witnesses watched as the cold blooded killer was arrested and loaded into the back of a police wagon. [This is all a heavily emotionalized pack of lies, down to the details which I can't go into here.]

Why not "go into" the "lies" Schiff? You seem to have no problem offering your view on nearly everything else that was written. The only emoting that I noticed comes from Schiff, who, when finds himself wandering too close to the truth, reacts to it with an obvious sense of nervousness. [According to an e-mail he sent me personally, Allen has inspected my website www.againstthecrimeofsilence.de. I have a 16-page article there called "Mumia Is Still the Issue." He is hereby invited to check it out. Since I've gone over the lies of the FOP throughout my comments on their posting and throughout my comments here, I won't repeat myself here. Just this: In my comments, I have already argued at length that the prosecution witnesses did not see what they claimed to have seen, since it never happened. Mumia was NOT "caught redhanded," a particularly ironic phrase considering the fact that his hands were never tested (or the test results suppressed).]

Cook was transported to the hospital, since the heroic officer had managed to draw his weapon and return fire before dying. Cook bragged to emergency room staff that he had shot the "pig", [wasn't the term supposed to be "motherfucker"?) and that he hoped he was dead.

Here, Schiff gets it at least partially correct. Mumia did say that he shot the "motherfucker". Even a broken clock is right twice a day. Mumia did brag about shooting Faulkner and a number of people heard it. [Not by accident, Mr. Allen

concentrates on the Black hospital guard Pricilla Durham, ignoring, of course, the scurrilous circumstances of her testimony at the trial. You can read about the murky circumstances of her testimony in *Killing Time* by Dave Lindorff and many other sources. What Mr. Allen entirely evades is, of course, the testimony of police officers to the effect that Abu-Jamal confessed. The first of these is the ranking officer at the scene, Alphoso Giordano, who couldn't be presented at the trial since he was already going down because of his corrupt practices. ALL the other police officers - altogether three, + another hospital guard, see my article quoted above - never reported any confession by Mumia until more than two months after the crime. Is that credible to anyone? Does Mr. Allen need a clearer proof of a conscious frame-up of a defendant?] Priscilla Durham, a black woman, who did not know Jamal stated under oath that

"At this time I didn't know [who he was]... all I did was hear him say, I shot the mother fucker and I hope the mother fucker dies."

The murder weapon was registered to Wesley Cook himself. Ballistics test proved that this gun, recovered at the scene, fired the bullets that killed Officer Faulkner. [A flatout lie. At Mumia's trial, the prosecution's expert testified, that the bullet that killed Faulkner could have been fired by "millions" of .38 caliber weapons in the country.] The bullet removed from Wesley Cook was proven to have come from Officer Faulkner's service weapon.

Which part of this is a "flatout lie"? [The flatout lie is the word "proved." It is characteristic that Mr. Allen is not capable to understand even this simple point. Fingerprinting is "proof," the matching of a bullet to a certain weapon by its peculiar rifling characteristics, even though less reliable than the former, counts a proof, and a variety of other indicators do. The prosecution's specialist at trial said that the bullet in question could have been fired by "multiple of millions" of guns. Oh yeah, read those trial transcripts. It's on page 168-69 of TP for June 23, 1982:

"Page 168.

Paul - Cross

Q. Right.

A. The general characteristics being part of the eight lands and grooves with a right-hand direction of twist, you have a part of that still exposed with sufficient quantity to be able to say that a firearm rifled with eight lands and grooves with a right-hand direction of twist discharged that projectile. But you can't say which firearm with eight lands and grooves fired that projectile. Is that clear?

Q. Yes, I understand, sir. A Charter Arms has eight lands and grooves; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. How many Charter weapons are there? Do you think?

A. Conservatively a million.

Q. A million. How many other weapons are manufactured that have eight lands and eight grooves and I think you said a left --

A. Right-hand.

Q. Right-hand --

A. Would you be satisfied with three right off the bat? Arminius, Firearms Import/Export and Charter Arms are all eight lands and grooves with a right-hand
Page 169.

Paul - Cross

direction of twist.

Q. Tell us how many, approximately, how many millions of guns have eight lands and grooves and how many would provide this bullet?

A. Multiples of millions.

Q. Multiples of millions?

A. Yes.

MR. JACKSON: I have no further questions. Thank you."

Allen seems to think that the difference between "proved" to have come out of a particular weapon and proved to have come out of one of "multiple of millions" of weapons is trivial. Given this, bad as the criminal justice system of the U.S. already is, I'm glad it is at least not Tony Allen who is in charge of it. And it is indeed a very good thing that the - basically American - troops that defeated Hitler in Western Germany by and large introduced the rule of law and not what apparently are the Allensian standards of "proof."] The murder weapon was registered to Mumia. While it is true that the bullet, because of its damaged condition could not be 100% linked to Jamal's weapon, it was concluded that it did likely come from a Charter Arms revolver. ["It was concluded?" By whom? Certainly not by the prosecution's expert at the trial. Mr. Paul stated that it could have come out of Mumia's revolver or out of "multiples of millions" of other guns, period. Even that it "did likely come from a Charter Arms revolver" is a pure invention, an invention Allen needs to build his following "same kind of weapon" rhetoric on. Note that Mr. Paul estimated the number of Charter Arms weapons - he talked about "weapons," not, as Allen's suggestively does, a "revolver" - at "conservatively a million." And this sounds "pretty conclusively" to Allen, another frightening indication of his mindset.] The same kind of weapon found next to Jamal at the scene of the murder. The same kind of weapon of which all of the bullets had been fired and the same kind of weapon that fit the holster that Jamal was wearing at the time of his arrest. Sounds pretty conclusive to me and apparently to the jury as well as to the many judges who have reviewed this case.

The trial was called a "Prosecutor's Dream". Mumia had mountains of evidence [On closer inspection, the mountains turn out to be molehill, and even that molehill has completely collapsed long ago.] and a parade of eyewitnesses [Eyewitnesses who were not there (Robert Chobert), threatened with death (Cynthia White), testified to things they couldn't have seen (Michael Scanlan) or - cops!] stacked against him. There has never been even the slightest doubt that Mumia murdered Officer Faulkner. Not then, not now.

Here we have Schiff going completely off the deep end. Robert Chobert was not "there"? Where does this nonsense come from? [E.g., right out of the mouth of one of Allen's favorite witnesses, Michael Scanlan. See above. And out of the mouth of another prosecution witness, Albert Magilton. See below.] Chobert was there and there is no proof that has ever been offered otherwise. And what did Chobert say he saw back on December 9, 1981? [You have to choose between Chobert and Scanlan. Prosecution witness Albert Magilton also denied having seen Chobert where he claimed to have been (TP, June 25, 1982, p. 86). The only witness at the trial who did claim at the trial to have seen Chobert there, Cynthia White, once again couldn't get it straight and testified that she did not see the cab there until after the shooting. (TP, June 22, 1982, p. 107; see also Lindorff, *Killing Time*, p. 127-28) Also, Allen's wonderful witness Robert Chobert first said the shooter was about 220 to 225 pounds (Mumia was at least 40 pounds less) and ran 30 to 35

steps, then he said it was 30 to 35 feet, and then said it was 10 feet. This is a factor of, not two, three, or five, but ten, n'est-ce pas? To Mr. Allen, 3 yards or 30 yards may seem irrelevant - let's just be happy he's only a private citizen and not yet the public prosecutor he apparently would love to be.]

“Well, I let my fare out and I'm marking down on my pad how much it was, and then I heard a shot. I looked up, I saw the cop fall to the ground, and then I saw Jamal standing over him and firing some more shots into him”

Over a decade later during the PCRA hearings, Chobert affirmed his previous testimony despite the best efforts of Weinglass to discredit him. [And there is an affidavit by a private investigator who swears that Chobert told him during the run-up to said PCRA hearings that he was NOT there. The man's name is George Michael Newman, his firm is Tactical Investigation Services in California. His affidavit is to be found in a variety of pamphlets and on a variety of websites.] Again from Chobert, this time in 1995:

Q. Did you testify at trial under oath and truthfully about what you saw occur on the night Officer Faulkner was murdered?

A. Yes, I did.

As for Cynthia White, she is now deceased, so we cannot, with any degree of certainty, argue that she was threatened. [There are three persons claiming she was either treated, blackmailed, given favors, or all three. These include not only Pamela Jenkins, but also Veronica Jones and Yvette Williams.] Pamela Jenkins testified in 1997 that she had seen Cynthia White and that Mrs. White was “in fear from her life by the police”.

Not surprisingly, there are more than a few problems with Pamela Jenkins and her alleged credibility. She is an admitted career criminal who was facing jail time as she was testifying on behalf of Jamal. [Pamela Jenkins was praised as a model citizen during the 39th police district scandal in autumn 1996 when she testified to having accepted bribes for giving false testimony, but called a liar when she testified she had been offered bribes for doing Mumia in but had rejected to do so. Quite a differential treatment, isn't it?] Furthermore, she claimed to have seen Cynthia White in 1997. Unfortunately for Jenkins and the Jamal “scheme team” Mrs. White died in New Jersey back in 1992. [Even if there were convincing proof that White is indeed dead, which there isn't, a mistaken identification of White after so many years wouldn't prove that the rest of Jenkins' testimony is false. Apply your standard here to your favored witnesses and the multitude of contradictions in their testimony, Mr. Allen, and your whole case unravels in the wink of an eye.]

Sometimes there's a defense..... There is no explanation being offered by the defense as to how anyone other than Wesley Cook, now known as "Mumia Jamal", could have possibly committed the murder. Mumia himself has never denied that he killed Officer Faulkner. [Another lie.] He has hinted that it was self-defense, and has stated that Officer Faulkner was an oppressor of the people and that he deserved to die. Mumia's brother was present and witnessed the shooting, yet even his own brother does not deny that Mumia is the killer. [Still another lie;

already in 1995, Rachel Wolkenstein represented to the PCRA court that Billy had told her that Mumia was not the killer.]

Here I believe Schiff to be intentionally deceitful. The above FOP statement was written before Mumia's affidavit denying his role in the shooting of Faulkner. [It is bandied around as if it reflected the facts of today. Just as you, Mr. Allen, continue to claim on your website that no Mumia support website offers the Mumia trial transcripts while my own website has the fullest offering of the Mumia trial transcripts including files that are published nowhere else, including the Danny Faulkner website. The whole posting I was criticizing was sent around in December 2005, just as if nothing happened in between, pretending to the innocent reader that indeed Mumia "never denied that he killed Officer Faulkner."] At the time it was written, Mumia had only said that he was "not guilty" of the charges that he had been convicted of. It was not until May of 2001 that Jamal actually got around to making a statement about what happened the night of Dec 9, 1981. Yet even in his affidavit there exists a suspicious time lapse [Where is the "time lapse" in "...went down to my knees. I closed my eyes and sat still trying to breathe. The next thing that I remember I felt myself being kicked...", and why should this be "suspicious"?] between the time that he claims to have been shot by Faulkner [Just to get things straight, he doesn't claim to have been shot by Faulkner there, but simply by a "uniformed cop"] and when he awoke to being beaten by the police.

With regards to Billy Cook, what we have in 1995 is strictly hearsay that was presented by Wolkenstein. There was no affidavit presented and no evidence that she and Cook ever had the conversation she recounted. [For Mr. Allen, nothing in the world would make a difference anyway. It is just the wrong people testifying. Whatever they say, if testimony is advantageous to Mumia, it's either hearsay or lies.] Like Jamal, it took Billy Cook till 2001 to present an affidavit (albeit one that is self-discrediting) clearing Jamal and himself in of any involvement in the killing of Faulkner.

There are over 3,000 people on death row today. Some of them have compelling stories to tell. Some of them were convicted under questionable circumstance. Some of them are remorseful. None of that applies to Mumia Jamal. Jamal has publicly advocated the murder of police officers. [Nonsense.] He has never retracted those statements, and has publicly taunted Officer Faulkner's widow. [Another long discredited lie.]

While I have personally never heard of Jamal advocating the murder of police officers, I wouldn't doubt that he has at some point. [This is actually a wonderful summary of Tony Allen's mentality: Whether he has evidence for something or not doesn't matter, as long as he chooses to have no doubts about it. There's a huge body of Mumia's writings by now: several books, hundreds upon hundreds of articles and comments by now; not only should it be documentable if Mumia advocated cop killing in general, but it should also be documentable if he ever did anything like it at all! No one ever came up with anything even hinting at it. Once more, Allen resorts to irrelevant rants, accusing Mumia of supporting "tyrants and murderers" without naming any of these.] In his writings, he has defended tyrants and murderers of every stripe and is an avid supporter of MOVE. MOVE, as you may well know, not only advocates murder, but also seeks the destruction of modern civilization. It is also a group that forces illiterate 12 year old girls to be impregnated and marry male MOVE members much older than them.

Mumia supports child-rapists, something that is far more vulgar than supporting the killing of cops.

And yes, it is a fact that Jamal taunted Faulkner's widow in open court during his 1981 trial. [This was brought up first, not in 1982 but in 1995 in the following bit in the *Washington Post* and the *New York Post*. In these articles, Maureen Faulkner was quoted as saying that a "ballistician" held up the dead Faulkner's shirt, a description that fit Dr. Charles Tumosa, a criminalist for the Philadelphia Police Department who testified on June 26, 1982, when Mumia was not in the court room. P.O. Heftner, who testified during the one other display of the shirt on June 21, was not a ballistician by any definition of the term but simply an ordinary police officer. It was only when the defense brought out the fact that Mumia hadn't been in the court room that the story with the ballistician was dropped and the alleged event was shifted to June 21. This "taunting" event is just another of those Mumia "confessions" that kept cropping up belatedly, this time a full 13 years after it allegedly happened. For a fuller description, see Linn Washington, "'True facts' show Abu-Jamal's trial was unfair," <http://www.iacenter.org/folder04/lwash2.htm>.]

According to the Philadelphia Inquirer "Earlier in the day [6-21-82] Maureen Faulkner, the officer's widow, left the courtroom crying after her husband's bloody shirt was admitted as evidence."

On that day, Jamal was in the courtroom and according to Mrs. Faulkner she began to hyperventilate when Mumia turned and smiled at her after the shirt was put on display. Her trauma was of such a nature that she was compelled to go to the hospital. It is a disgrace that Mumia's acolytes are still trotting out these tired old lies as if they are facts. It is sad and it is pitiful and moreover, it is intolerable.

FACT: Mumia did act as his own defense. Mumia had no legal training and attempted to use the trial to make political statements. Judge Sabo appointed an experienced capital crime defense attorney to sit next to Mumia and advise him. Incredibly, Mumia objected to this. [This defies comment. Mumia's "lawyer," Anthony Jackson, did NOT have experience as a lead counsel in any capital case, despite the cop's oft-repeated lie that he "had more than 20 capital/homicide cases under his belt." The death penalty was reinstated in Pennsylvania only in 1978, and from 1978-81, Jackson had a full-time job at a cop-monitoring organization in Philadelphia, leaving him little if any time to try homicide or capital cases.]

Again, Schiff, what exactly "defies comment"? [What defies comment is that the same stuff about Jackson having had 20 homicide/capital cases under his belt is simply repeated year in year out right next to evidence that flies in the face of it.] The fact is that Mumia, at some early point in the trial decided that he did not want Anthony Jackson as his attorney, or even some radical lawyer like William Kunstler as his attorney. He wanted John Africa (the MOVE cult's leader) and John Africa only. Jamal states this over and over and over again throughout the trial. It could be further argued that it was MOVE members who were guiding and prodding Jamal in his seemingly suicidal courtroom antics.

Initially, Jamal was the one to pick Jackson as his attorney and only after Jamal made this choice did Jackson petition the court to become Jamal's public defender. Before taking on Jamal's case, Jackson had come to the defense of 20

people facing murder charges and he won most of the time. [After all those years, I'm still waiting for a single, let alone 20, of these cases to be named. Allen's new friend in the FOP should have the resources, but it seems to me that using them would just turn out the wrong results. See below.] Some of these cases could have resulted in the death penalty for Jackson's clients, but Jackson had managed to save all of them from execution. This is a fact and while Schiff is entitled to his opinions about Jamal's case, he is by no means entitled to his own set of facts. [Mr. Allen, Mr. Smerconish, and all the others who claim this: Would you please stand up and name all those mythical cases that Mr. Antony Jackson won between 1978, when the death penalty was reintroduced in Pennsylvania, and 1981? Twenty murder cases in three years? While he was working full time as an attorney for a civil rights organisation devoted to the struggle against police brutality, which is why Mumia chose him? This is just preposterous. Once more, to arguments, you are just answering with rants and raves. With your new friends in high places now, again, Mr. Allen: Please produce the names and trial records of all the homicide/capital defendants that were defended and saved by Anthony Jackson!] Jackson did his best to defend Jamal, but it was Mumia who sabotaged his own case and repeatedly belittled and humiliated his own attorney.

[It is indeed unlikely that the cops listened to progressive Black radio shows. All the same, they knew Mumia very well since he reported regularly from the MOVE trials and was for a while stationed right opposite the police HQ.] If they had heard of him, it is extremely unlikely that they would have recognized his face from a radio show. It is nearly certain that none of those street cops [but the ranking police officer at the scene, the corrupt cop Alphonso Giordano, not only made up the first false confession story that was used to set the machinery of death against Mumia into motion, but also constantly referred to Mumia as "Wesley Cook", indicating that he knew very well who Mumia was] were privy to FBI files that named Cook as a former member of the Black Panthers.

How is it that Mr. Schiff from Germany in 2006 knows that the police in Philadelphia in 1981 knew Mumia "very well"? [I know a fair amount of things because I read and interview people widely, and not as selectively as Mr. Allen does. Is it not, BTW, also remarkable that Mr. Allen is so absolutely sure about what happened in the courtroom on June 21, 1982, with Mumia "taunting" Ms. Faulkner? Was he there? I mentioned the fact that Mumia was stationed right across the police HQ; Allen could read about that in a variety of sources, e.g., Terry Bisson's biography *On a Move. The Story of Mumia Abu-Jamal*. This was DURING the MOVE trials, and Mumia was a constant presence there, too, as were the political police and many stakeout officers, e.g., such as Forbes and Shoemaker, the ones that found him on December 9, 1981. It is very well documented that Giordano was involved in fighting the Panthers, of whom Mumia was a leading member in Philadelphia. And even thereafter, there was continued surveillance of Mumia. You might use the right that the FOIA affords any American citizen and request Mumia's FBI files. And certainly, the police in Philadelphia kept additional files on him, as they did with practically everyone who dared to resist.] He doesn't of course. He is just making things up as he goes. It is typical of Jamal supporters to fill in the blanks with paranoid and delusional ramblings.

Schiff mentions Officer Giordano, who did in fact turn out to be a "corrupt cop", referring to Jamal as Wesley Cook. However Giordano did so after Jamal's identity had already been established, making it more than likely that he, much like

everyone else on the scene that night, had no clue who Mumia was. We must keep in mind that Jamal was formerly a radio and newsprint reporter whose face would not be altogether that recognizable especially as a man who had just been shot and was dressed appropriately for the freezing Philadelphia winter. [Oh yeah! But those star witnesses such as Chobert and White who didn't see Mumia from as close up as Giordano undoubtedly did would find his face very, very recognizable! Talk about "making things up" as one goes. As one of the most important officers active in Frank Rizzo's reactionary campaigns to suppress dissent, Alphonso Giordano was certainly likely to know who the co-founder of the Philadelphia chapter of the Black Panther Party was. Allen may want to look up the book by Frank Donner, *Protectors of Privilege. Red Squads and Police Repressions in Urban America*, on this. (Giordano: p. 218)]

So what we have seen from Schiff is just more of the same old tired lies repackaged in a new format. But at the end of the day, Mumia still shot Daniel Faulkner to death and no amount of cherry picked testimony and rhetorical contortionism can eradicate that one principle fact.

This is just another monstrously deceitful piece designed to kill a man who never had a fair shake in court. Just as in his crusade to do a MOVE sympathizer in for the unsolved murder of John Gilbride, Tony Allen's new-found principle for justice is the opposite of what the American principle of justice is supposed to be: "Guiltily until proven innocent."
