



POST OFFICE BOX 110034 BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11211

Updates for October 28th

15 Oct - Giveaway!

The Tarrant County DA has not had enough of losing, so Tex is set to go to trial for a second time on January 12th, 2026. This time, on charges of resisting arrest & interfering in public duties.

MORE:

The transcripts from Tex's first trial are a crucial piece of evidence that will be needed to conduct his second trial and like all else in the (in)justice system must be bought. We need to raise about \$2000 to order the copies of all five days of testimony and we're giving away some goodies to those that can assist.

To enter:

- Make a donation of \$25+ at spotfund.com/story/1263b271-b07d-4894-bb16-8675a3482dea
- Email donation receipt to: freetex@riseup.net

At the conclusion of the fundraiser on 11/16, ten winners will be randomly drawn and receive a shirt hand-made by Tex in the winner's choice of short sleeve or long sleeve block printed on comfort colors plus some other goodies.

Thank you to all who have supported in the innumerable ways. It is truly absurd that this situation is still relevant nearly three years on but the unending well of support has carried us forward to meet these moments of chaos as they come. Please share this everywhere!

15 Oct - Assata Returns To The Ancestors

Please read the latest by Mumia Abu-Jamal.

MORE:

Her name, Assata Shakur, has become an iconic symbol of Black revolutionary resistance to the white nation and American empire. Shot, beaten and threatened with death, Assata lived up to the meaning of her name: "She who struggles." Born Joanne Deborah Byron on July 16, 1947, in Queens, N.Y., she came of age during the tumultuous 1960s, when young Black people joined movements and organizations devoted to Black liberation. She joined the Black Panther Party and later, the Black Liberation Army [BLA], and emerged as one of its best-known and best-loved members.

When three young Panthers were driving south on the New Jersey Turnpike, they were ambushed by state troopers, and a shoot-out ensued. One Panther, Zayd Malik Shakur and a state trooper, were shot and killed. Assata was also shot, under her arm. The third Panther, Sundiata Acoli, also survived the ambush. Both survivors were charged with murder. Assata endured some 10 trials or so, winning acquittal after acquittal. She was convicted once, and the state threatened her with another conviction for killing of Zayd.

A BLA squad went to her jail and set her free. Shortly thereafter, she made it to Cuba, which granted her political asylum. She began teaching in Cuba, wrote riveting poetry, and prayed for social change in America, and of course, freedom for the Black Nation. She served her people and freedom's cause with bravery, beauty and brilliance. She represented her generation as Harriet Tubman represented hers.

In her poem "Affirmations" Assata wrote the following:

I believe in living.

I believe in the spectrum
Of Beta days and Gamma people.
I believe in sunshine.
In windmills, in waterfalls,
Tricycles, and rocking chairs.
And I believe that seeds grow into sprouts.
And sprouts grow into trees.
I believe in the magic of the hands.
And in the wisdom of the eyes.
I believe in rain and tears.
And in the blood of infinity.

I believe in life.
And I have seen the death parade
March through the torso of the Earth,
Sculpting mud bodies in its path.
I have seen the destruction of daylight;
And seen bloodthirsty maggots
Prayed to and saluted.

I have seen the kind become the blind
And the blind become the blind
In one easy lesson.
I have walked on cut glass.
I have eaten crow and blunder bread
And breathed the stench of indifference.

I have been locked by the lawless.
Handcuffed by the haters.
Gagged by the greedy.
And, if I know anything at all,
It's that a wall is just a wall
And nothing more at all.
It can be broken down.

I believe in living.
I believe in birth.
I believe in the sweat of love
And in the fire of truth.

And I believe that a lost ship,
Steered by tired, seasick sailors,
Can still be guided home
To port.

“Affirmations” by Assata Olugbala Shakur. A Black revolutionary, returns to her ancestors after 78 springtime’s. A salute to Cuba for being that “port.”

October 17th - ‘There’s No Space in the American Landscape Where the Shadow of the Prison Doesn’t Fall’

by Janine Jackson (*CounterSpin*)

Janine Jackson (JJ): When our guest turned 71 in April, his organized advocates acknowledged the day with mobilizations around how US constitutional law is “weaponized to repress dissent and create political

prisoners,” with public discussion about activism on campuses around Palestine, and about the importance of public protest and brave speech.

The 1982 conviction of Mumia Abu-Jamal for the killing of police officer Daniel Faulkner followed a trial marked by prosecutorial and police misconduct, purported witness testimony that was shifting and suborned, discriminatory jury selection, and irresponsible and frankly biased media coverage, which hasn’t changed much over years of court appeals and continued revelations. It was and continues to be clear that, for powers that be, including in the elite press, it is important not only to keep Mumia Abu-Jamal behind bars, but to keep him quiet.

It hasn’t worked. Despite more than four decades in prison, our guest has not ceased to speak up and speak out, on a range of concerns well beyond his own story, with the support of advocates around the world. He joins us now. Welcome to *CounterSpin*, Mumia Abu-Jamal.

Mumia Abu-Jamal (MA): Thank you for inviting me.

JJ: Well, you never know what folks are learning for the first time. So, I just wanted to start with noting that you are a journalist. Mumia, listeners should know, was a radio reporter at various Philly stations. He was head of the Philadelphia Association of Black Journalists.

I sometimes think, once you’re a witness and a storyteller, you can’t turn that off, even if you become the subject of the story. Certainly, you have never really stopped doing what you started out to do, have you?

MA: I have not. I guess old habits die hard.

JJ: So, you’ve continued to listen and report and to speak from whatever position you’re in, because a journalist is what you are, yeah?

MA: Yeah. But in a cultural sense, I think of myself as a griot, probably a progressive griot, but a griot nonetheless. In African culture, griots were the people who remembered the history of the tribe, and, really, they served the prince in power, but they served the tribe as well. And there’s an old tradition that’s talked about in Senegal that when a griot dies, you don’t lay him in the ground. You bury him vertically in a tree, so that he and his stories are remembered.

I think about telling the stories of a different kind of tribe here in America, a tribe of rebels, a tribe of people who struggle, a tribe of the poor and the oppressed, because those are the stories that rarely get heard and get reported in much of the world.

JJ: That leads me directly to what I just saw on Wikipedia, which said:
“From 1979 to 1981, he worked at National Public Radio affiliate WHYY. The management asked him to resign, saying that he did not maintain a sufficiently objective approach in his presentation of news”.

And, yeah, it gives me a giggle. And I think that while news media has, in important and life-altering ways, gotten much worse since then, there is, in some places, anyway, a growing recognition that objectivity is a myth, and a harmful one, and that we are all enriched by reporters who can bring their whole selves to the job.

MA: If you’re not bringing your whole self to the job, you’re not doing the job. And I think that this whole objectivity myth began when the art of journalism—I won’t call it a science—but the art of journalism was professionalized.

And before that, of course, the media was a very political entity. I remember reading in a history book, it might’ve been Howard Zinn or something like that, a New York newspaper called the *New York Caucasian*. I mean, think about that. Papers were printed by unions and churches and other kinds of groups,

and it was reflective of the people who printed it, not the people who paid them, because journalism was more of a work that people loved doing than a quote unquote “profession.”

Howard Zinn warned us about the dangers of professional distance in many fields. As an historian, of course, Howard Zinn learned history, not when he earned his PhD at Columbia, but when he was teaching at a Black college during the civil rights years, and he was teaching pre-law, something like that, and he was telling people at the school about how the Constitution protected them, and they had certain rights. They said, “Excuse me, Professor Zinn, what are you talking about?” And he said, “Well, you have the right to do this and do that.” They said, “We don’t have the right to vote down here.” He said, “What are you talking about?” They said, “We go to the voting office, they will beat us up.” He said, “Who will beat you up?” They said, “The cops and everybody else.”

So, Howard Zinn followed his students to the voting place, and he sat and he just looked, and he learned something that he had never learned in college—and this was Atlanta, of all places—that when people tried to register to vote, they were refused. They had these ridiculous tests they gave them, and if they did not walk away, they would be beaten and locked up.

And so, Howard Zinn learned that which the profession did not teach him, that history isn’t always written in these documents or in books. They’re lived by people, and we have to pay attention to how people live in the real world to tell their stories.

JJ: What I get from that story is that an article can tell you the law says this, and that’s not the same thing as telling you how the law is lived out in various people’s lives.

And we have a journalist right now, there are many, but I will just say Mario Guevara, who apparently has an Emmy award, but it’s not enough to prevent his having been detained for over a hundred days now, for the work of live streaming law enforcement activity, including ICE raids. So, we have a journalist doing what a lot of other journalists would say is what they’re supposed to do, and he’s been detained.

So, when people hear generically about “journalism is under attack,” well, no, it isn’t all journalism that’s under attack. It’s a particular kind of witnessing.

MA: That’s actually true, but also think about, in this era, in this time, and I’m speaking right now about the, shall we call it the Kimmel affair, and how everybody is talking about First Amendment rights, the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press. The case you described is the unfreedom of the press, where a journalist is captured and caged for telling stories and streaming stories about government repression. Who do you think gives a damn about the Constitution, the government or the people?

JJ: Let me ask you, continuing with media, I think people read the data point, “Oh, 2 million people incarcerated in the US,” more and more every day being put in detention centers, and they’re shut away from families and friends, by procedure, by distance, but also shut out of public debate and conversation.

And I think there’s a feeling that this is a cost to those people who are imprisoned, but there’s less recognition that there’s a cost for everyone when we don’t get to hear from this ever-expanding and various group of voices. And I think journalists who buy into, wittingly or not, the idea of “out of sight, out of mind”—they’re serving someone, they’re serving something, by excluding the voices of the incarcerated in our public conversation.

MA: Well, yeah, they’re excluding not just the imprisoned, who, as you said, are in the millions in the United States, but also, they’re excluded from thinking about what it means to be truly American, because this is part of that. There is no space in the American landscape where the shadow of the prison doesn’t fall.

And that’s because it is so huge. It is so vast that it impacts those within and without, because everybody in prison has someone on the outside of prison that loves them or they love: their children, their mates, their

parents, you name it. And that shadow falls on all of those people. There are stories that can enrich our understanding of what it means to be human by allowing people in this condition to be heard as full human beings.

JJ: And I blame media a lot. I mean, I'm a media critic, but I also, as a media reader—media disappear people, as well as the state disappears them. Suddenly they move into another column, and are no longer worth hearing from. And I don't know that people understand how much we lose when that happens, and how much media are feeding into this oppressive regime by underscoring the idea that once people go behind bars, we don't even need to think about them at all anymore.

MA: We call the media the fourth estate, don't we? But it's an estate of what?

JJ: Right? For whom?

MA: The estate is part of the state. It's not part of the people. And as long as people think in those terms, those elevated and false terms, then it's difficult for them to relate in a human way to people who are in a distressed situation.

And you can't talk about media without talking about power, because you know and I know that much media is about sucking up to power. I am reminded of, I think it was in the book *Into the Buzzsaw* that I read years ago; it was about forbidden stories that reporters got fired for, all around the spectrum. I mean, Fox News stations, all kinds of newspapers and whatnot. But the real key is that when people began telling stories that their editors and their bosses didn't like, well, they got disappeared. By that I mean, of course, they got fired or threatened with firing.

But one of the things that really touched me in this context was that a reporter was talking about how journalists could never say that the president, for example, was lying. And they said, "Well, why not?" And people from the audience were like, "Why don't you say that?" "Well, we are taught and we're trained never to say that." Well, then what if you hear him, and he's lying, you just act like you don't hear him? You're just carrying his lies. That's the relationship between the media and power. I think that began to crack around the time of the Bush years. But look where we're at right now. We're in a whole new world.

JJ: Just rocketing into the past, just rocketing backwards past so many gains that we thought we had made. And I remember that conversation well, and when the audience started saying, "What do you mean you can't say the president's lying?" the reporters said, "Well, we think it's more powerful to say the president's statements did not comport with information as we have it..." They had this kind of painful, tortured thing that they told themselves was somehow more impactful. So, there's a culture inside newsrooms that gives them, like, 12 degrees of difference between themselves and the truth.

But we know that other folks know what we know, are as irritated and disgusted and seeing through the emperor and his no clothes as we have. And so, we have independent media growing up. And I just wonder, when you see the media landscape, do you see hope in these independent journalistic outfits that are coming up? Do you see Black-owned, some of them Black-centered, journalistic organizations sprouting up? Is that a source of hope?

MA: I think it can be. But the real question is, how will the sandwich taste once everything comes together? And when I think of a great journalist, I think of somebody like Chris Hedges, who was asked to join the *New York Times*. He didn't go the regular route, where most reporters kind of prayed for an opportunity to write for a paper like the *Times*. He was in seminary, and he began hearing about El Salvador, and he went down there and he saw things and he began writing about it, and people were reading his stuff, and the *Times* came and said, "Boy, you're a great writer. Can you write some articles for us?" And he was like, "OK, yeah, why not?"

Of course, all of that changed around the time of, I think it was 9/11 and the Iraq War. And Chris did a speech, and he got up and he talked with people and he was telling them, saying, “Listen, do not let these politicians use your fear to get you involved in a war.” And people began singing “God Bless America” and yelling at him, because they didn’t want to hear it. And it was almost like Chris was seeing which way the wind would blow.

And he got threatened by his editors, like, “Oh, that’s one strike against you, buddy.” I mean, he could care less. Again, he didn’t, like, run and get the job. They ran after him, because of the clarity and power of his writing.

JJ: But then that clarity and power was just what they didn’t want, actually, to hear.

MA: Exactly. Well, I think the scholar Olúfẹ́mi O. Táíwò hit the mark when he said it’s “elite capture.” He had been captured by the *Times*, and they had a tiger by the tail. And Chris really could care less because, in the new media world, he writes online, and probably is more read today than he was when he was at the *Times*.

JJ: Absolutely, and that’s kind of where we’re at, where folks who want to do reporting, who want to witness, but who are not willing to accept the constraints of corporate news media, we haven’t quite built the structures for those folks to have a platform, for those folks to be heard from. So, we’re kind of in transition, in terms of media structures. But I do believe that, in terms of audience, more people are recognizing the failures and the flaws and the constraints of the major news media, and are at least looking for something else.

MA: I think they’re hungry for something else, because here’s the real deal: People who are young people, they don’t read newspapers, they don’t watch TV, because that media is alien to them. So, unfortunately, they might read news updates that someone has assembled, used media sources to assemble, but they don’t go to those original media sources, because they have no trust in those media sources. So, they find out using other means.

But we’re, I think, on the cusp of creating citizen journalists, where, given the technology that now exists, everybody is a journalist. Because they have the potential to use their phones and broadcast to, really, uncounted numbers of people, to tell their stories and to get their word out, and to contact them and to give them insight into the world that they see, and not the world that the media want to project.

You remember George Floyd; it was a 17-year-old girl who was witnessing that, and when she livestreamed it, the world tuned in, and was transformed by that moment. So that’s just a taste of what journalism can do, when it’s at the right place at the right time.

JJ: And I thank you for that, and I think the corollary to the citizen journalism, and to people understanding that they can create their own news and witness and share, I think there is also an understanding that folks, when they’re watching the TV news, or they’re reading the paper, they also maybe are bringing more critical thinking to that, and recognizing that they don’t need to just swallow everything that’s in the *New York Times*. Am I being over-hopeful there?

MA: No, I think you’re absolutely correct. I think that’s part of that youthful vibration that turns kids off the newspaper or the local broadcast or even the national broadcast. I mean, I know quite a few young people who simply don’t watch TV. That’s an alien communications device to them.

JJ: Well, I could talk to you a lot, but I don’t want to take too much of your time. I want to ask you, certainly, before we close, to say anything that you want to say to a listenership of media critical folks. But I would ask—I read a quote from you recently that you said you’ve never felt alone. And I think that is gratifying, and probably surprising for people to hear, because many people, many people walking freely through the streets, are feeling very alone right now, really oppressively alone, for all kinds of reasons. And

it might seem a weird question, but in September 2025, where are you finding hope? What are you looking to?

MA: I do find it in young people who are more open and more receptive, not just to stories, but to struggles. And I think that the gift of repression is that it wakes people up. I mean, people are seeing things that haven't been seen in this country for years, and it's waking people up. And so once you're awake, it's kind of hard to go back to sleep. And think about this: To the right wing, the worst thing you can be is woke. So that suggests that they want everybody to go to sleep. So wake up, be woke.

JJ: We've been speaking with Mumia Abu-Jamal, author of many titles, including *Writing on the Wall*, *Faith of Our Fathers*, *Murder Incorporated* and 1995's *Live from Death Row*, translated now into at least seven languages. Mumia Abu-Jamal, thank you so much for joining us this week on *CounterSpin*.

MA: Thank you, and thank *CounterSpin*. It has been a pleasure.

17 Oct - "Antifa" Protesters Charged With Terrorism for Protected Activity

After shots were fired at a protest against ICE, federal prosecutors pursued guilt-by-association charges against two protesters.

MORE:

by Natasha Lennard (*The Intercept*)

Federal prosecutors are making good on the Trump administration's threat to treat antifa-related activity as terrorism.

On Thursday afternoon, prosecutors in Texas announced that terrorism charges had been filed against two people for alleged involvement in a shooting during a July 4 protest against the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Prairieland Detention Center in Alvarado, Texas, in which a local police officer was injured.

This is the first time federal terrorism charges have been deployed in association with the "antifa" label, just a month after President Donald Trump announced that he was designating antifa a "major terrorist organization" — a designation that does not exist under law for domestic groups.

The Prairieland case is setting a chilling example for how the government will use so-called counterterrorism efforts to crush anti-fascist dissent. Neither of the people named in the indictment are accused of shooting the gun. Instead, Zachary Evetts and Autumn Hill are accused of "providing material support to terrorists" and having "aided and abetted" the alleged attempted murder of government officers.

The federal indictment accuses Hill, who prosecutors dead-named, and Evetts as being part of an "antifa cell."

The terrorism charges are an escalation of government efforts to criminalize protest movements by attempting to attribute collective guilt.

With tactics like using RICO laws built to combat organized crime, the government has made a habit of mass-prosecuting activists for individual, individuated crimes alleged to have taken place in the context of legal protest activity — even when there is no direct link between those charged and the alleged crimes. Though such charges frequently don't stick, the lengthy prosecutions hamper protest movements and chill dissent.

"The framing of the case by the federal government should worry all of us," a support committee for arrested protesters said in a statement on its website. "The glaring inconsistencies in the official narrative

and the alarmist accusations are a clear attempt to bolster the Trump administration's claims that the United States is on the verge of chaos, and to excuse a dramatic increase in militarized police action."

"Investigation by Proclamation"

On the night of July 4, protesters from Dallas-Fort Worth held a noise demonstration and set off fireworks outside the ICE facility. Federal officers called local police to the scene. There was an exchange of gunfire between an Alvarado police officer and one other person, in which the officer was injured. The cop was taken to a hospital and released within a few hours.

In a lengthy preliminary federal hearing in September, an FBI official told the court that he could not say for certain whether or not the police officer shot first.

Nine people were arrested that night in the area, and numerous others were arrested in the days that followed, including during aggressive multiagency raids on homes and community spaces. Seventeen people in all now face a mixture of state and federal charges relating to the event, including state terrorism charges.

Neither of the two people now charged with federal material support for terrorism were arrested at the detention center. Members of a support committee for friends and loved ones of the arrestees fear that further federal terrorism and other hefty charges are in the pipeline.

While there is no such thing as a terrorism designation for domestic organizations, and while there is no centralized formal organization known as "antifa," by associating the antifa label and anti-fascist activism with terrorism, Trump's administration can marshal and direct vast law enforcement powers and resources into investigating and targeting networks of left-wing activists.

Even though there are no designated domestic terrorism organizations, only "Foreign Terrorist Organizations," there are domestic terrorist offenses under U.S. law. The government is attempting to portray the Prairieland Detention Center shooting as one such act.

The "terrorism" label has, after all, always been a tool for the government to categorize ideological enemies and deploy extraordinary resources to target them. At another preliminary hearing in July, prosecutors said that as many as 200 FBI agents were working on the Prairieland case — a massive overreach for a singular shooting incident leading to a minor injury in the context of a protest.

"This appears to be investigation by proclamation instead of investigation by sound intelligence," Thomas Brzozowski, a former Justice Department lawyer working on domestic terrorism, told the *New York Times* on Thursday in reference to the government's treatment of the Texas defendants as an "enterprise."

"That's what happens," he said of Trump's targeting of antifa, "when you open such a broad investigation into what is essentially an idea."

Testing Ground for Repression

The Prairieland case has so far provided a convenient testing ground for state repression.

Gunshots were fired, and a police officer was injured. The government has pitched the activists as "heavily armed" even though, aside from a small number of guns found near the detention center, the guns found were in the cars or homes of the defendants — in Texas!

The case, however, has not been lifted up as a national cause célèbre against Trumpian overreach, possibly because a gun was indeed fired and acts of vandalism were reportedly carried out against ICE property.

Yet the Texas case reveals precisely the strategies the Trump administration will use, with the assistance of state forces, to target whole movements and communities with prosecutorial overreach and a logic of guilt by association. Government action here has been extreme in its treatment of an array of normal First Amendment-protected activity as evidence of terrorism; the blunt force effort to treat anti-fascism as terrorism should worry us all, even those who may want to distance themselves from any notion of protest militancy.

“What happened July 4th was a normal protest,” the support committee noted. “Regardless of what transpired that night, it’s clear that the scale and aggression of the police response is a fear tactic to send a message not only to DFW” — the Dallas-Fort Worth metro area — “but across the country of how this administration will treat anyone standing against their rising authoritarianism.”

During preliminary hearings, prosecutors have pointed to the flimsiest of grounds to describe organizers as a terroristic enterprise, including references to typical and legal activist activities like making zines and using encrypted messaging apps.

Thursday’s indictment explicitly cites the use of encrypted, disappearing messages — a practice that is common for activists and gossiping friend groups alike.

The prosecutors also note that activists discussed bringing firearms to the scene, which is completely legal in Texas. According to the indictment, one message described the plan to bring rifles to the protest as a way to have police “back off” — that is, a defensive tactic. According to the support committee, “the state has provided no evidence that there was coordination to fire at police.”

Draining Resources

Thus far, other significant efforts to collectively prosecute activists have failed. Overreaching RICO charges against 61 participants in the Atlanta-based Stop Cop City movement charges were dismissed by a judge last month; the government’s efforts in Trump’s first term to mass prosecute over 200 “J20” protesters with hefty felony riot charges also fell apart.

As I’ve noted, both these recent examples of failed mass prosecutions illustrate that malicious cases don’t need to be successful to drain movement energies and resources, and spread fear. The Atlanta and J20 examples also highlighted the need for collective defense campaigns.

The same is true for the now grimly precedent-setting North Texas case.

October 22nd - Federal Agents Arrest Another Person in Prairieland Case

In an early morning raid yesterday, federal agents arrested another person in connection with a July 4 protest at the Prairieland ICE Detention Center. More than three months after the protest, Janette Goering was arrested by federal and local police at her home in Carrollton, Texas, on Tuesday, October 21. Goering is being held at Johnson County Jail on a state charge of aiding in the commission of terrorism and has a bond set at \$5 million.

Goering’s arrest continues a trend of escalation by police and prosecutors in a case that now involves 18 defendants. The government is using exorbitant bonds of up to \$15 million to imprison all but one of the defendants. “It’s unbelievable that more than three months later the state is still trying to widen the net in this case,” said a spokesperson for the DFW Support Committee, a group of family and loved ones of defendants. “They’re attempting to prosecute this as an “Antifa” case in order to terrorize the movement in solidarity with immigrants, but it’s not going to work.”

The case has been hailed by the Trump administration as the first legal case against “Antifa.” On October 15, federal charges were formally brought against two of the Prairieland defendants, Autumn Hill and Zachary Evetts; the charges include 1 count of providing material support to terrorists, 3 counts of

attempted murder of officers and employees of the United States, and 3 counts of discharging a firearm during, in relation to, and in furtherance of a crime of violence. FBI director Kash Patel called the defendants “Antifa-aligned anarchist violent extremists,” sharing Fox News coverage of the indictments on X. “This seems like a coordinated political campaign,” said Stephanie Shiver, wife of defendant Meagan Morris. “The feds didn’t do anything for months and then they bring everyone into court just days after Trump designated ‘Antifa’ a priority threat.” On September 25, the White House released the National Security Presidential Memorandum-7 (NSPM-7), which ordered all federal law enforcement agencies to prioritize combating “Antifa” as a domestic terrorism threat.

The Department of Justice (DOJ) has doubled down on the political nature of the prosecution. In a lengthy federal hearing to establish probable cause to detain the defendants, the federal government raised political ideas expressed in group messages, political literature known as “zines,” and even board games found at defendants’ houses. Of significance was commercial printing equipment seized the week prior from the home of two defendants. The DOJ claimed that this equipment and the defendants’ production of left-wing reading materials, including zines and books, were evidence of their responsibility for criminal acts.

“The recent federal indictment makes false claims, mischaracterizes facts, and takes quotes out of context,” said a spokesperson for the DFW Support Committee. “Claims of adherence to a political ideology, whether true or not, are not grounds to charge someone with terrorism and does not belong in an indictment.”

On October 1, the State of Texas indicted 14 people on charges including terrorism, aggravated assault against a public servant, aggravated assault with a deadly weapon against a peace officer, aiding in the commission of terrorism, smuggling of persons, hindering prosecution of terrorism, and tampering with/fabricating physical evidence; the state imposed an additional charge of “engaging in organized criminal activity” for all 14 defendants. A total of 15 defendants have been indicted on state charges, meaning most defendants will be forced to fight concurrent federal and state cases.

Yesterday’s arrest comes just three weeks after criminal charges were filed against Johnson County Sheriff Adam King, whose office is working with the federal government to prosecute the Prairieland defendants. Supporters of the defendants call into question the credibility and integrity of King and the Johnson County Sheriff’s Office. “I’m just worried about the Johnson County Sheriff’s Office respecting defendants’ rights and following the law,” said Irina Popova, member of the DFW Support Committee. King is facing four felony charges, including aggravated perjury, corrupt influence, and abuse of official capacity, casting doubt about the veracity of the Prairieland case.

False accusations by Johnson County law enforcement play a major role in recent developments in the case against Dario Sanchez, the sole defendant released on bond. Sanchez faces state charges of hindering prosecution of terrorism and tampering with / fabricating physical evidence.

“I’ve been arrested and released three times, each one more ridiculous than the last,” said Sanchez. “At times I’ve felt numb or distraught, but more than anything, I’m angry at how my life has been stolen from me. I’m not about to let anyone make me shy away from who I am or what I believe in.” Sanchez was rearrested on September 22, based on a false claim by the prosecution that he violated his bond conditions. The government was forced to rescind the claim when confronted with proof to the contrary. As part of his release, Sanchez is required to submit to GPS tracking and monitoring and restriction of his electronic device usage. The charges against Sanchez simply stem from him removing someone from private group text chats. “The accusation that someone tampered with evidence for removing someone from a group chat is absurd,” said Popova. “The case against Sanchez shows how desperate the state is to criminalize these defendants.”

“This unending criminal investigation should alarm anyone who believes in the right to protest the government,” reflects Xavier T. de Janon, Director of Mass Defense at the National Lawyers Guild

(nlg.org/nlg-stands-with-anti-ice-dissent-calls-for-solidarity-with-the-prairieland-defendants). “We cannot tolerate the dangerous criminalization of a noise demonstration against ICE.”

The Prairieland case has garnered widespread attention and expressions of solidarity. On October 3, the DFW Support Committee called for a Day of International Solidarity. Groups of people from Seoul, South Korea, to Athens, Greece, showed support for the Prairieland defendants in the form of banner drops, letter writing campaigns, and other solidarity events.

With the start of the federal cases, the majority of the defendants were transferred to new jails. Ines Soto, Meagan Morris, Benjamin Song, Autumn Hill, and Zachary Evetts are now held at the Federal Medical Facility in Fort Worth, Texas. Elizabeth Soto, Savanna Batten, Maricela Rueda, Joy Gibson, and Rebecca Morgan are now being held at the Wichita County Detention Center. Family members have voiced concerns about the distance and new restrictions faced by those held at the Wichita County facility. Amber Lowrey, sister of Savanna Batten, said, “We now have to drive two and a half hours just to see our sister, and it’s been really hard to make phone calls work between technical issues or some arbitrary discipline.”

The various cases stem from a noise demonstration in solidarity with ICE detainees at the Prairieland ICE Detention Center in Alvarado, Texas, on July 4, 2025. Toward the end of the demonstration, an officer with the Alvarado Police Department arrived and allegedly quickly became involved in an exchange of gunfire with someone else on the scene. The officer sustained minor injuries, and was released from the hospital shortly afterwards. Ten people were arrested at the scene, and a manhunt ensued in the subsequent days for another defendant. Eight more defendants were arrested in the days and weeks following the protest.

20 Oct - Brief Legal Update on Jorge "Yorch" Esquivel

After multiple delays, the appeal against Jorge's sentence has been resolved.

MORE:

The Court has ruled to overturn the 7-year sentence and has given the judge 3 days to issue a new sentence.

This decision upholds the case brought by the Mexico City government and university authorities, as it does not recognize Jorge's innocence. We therefore call on everyone to express their solidarity for Yorch's complete freedom in whatever way and at whatever time best suits them.

21 Oct - Mahmoud Khalil urges appeals court to reject Trump administration's attempt to re-detain him

Khalil's legal team asked judges to affirm lower court rulings that ordered his release on bail and found government's actions likely unconstitutional

MORE:

via the Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR)

Today, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals heard arguments from lawyers representing Mahmoud Khalil, a lawful permanent resident and graduate of Columbia University who was detained by ICE for over 100 days in retaliation for his advocacy in support of Palestinian rights. Mr. Khalil’s team asked the appeals court to affirm a lower court’s rulings that ordered his release on bail and barred the government from detaining or deporting him based on Secretary of State Marco Rubio’s vague and unsupported assertion that Mr. Khalil’s lawful protected speech would “compromise a compelling U.S. foreign policy interest.”

“The Trump administration is still trying to bring me back to detention and block the federal court in New Jersey from reviewing my case, the same court that ordered my release and ruled that their actions against me were unlawful. Their intention couldn’t be more clear: They want to make an example of me to intimidate those speaking out for Palestine across the country,” said Mahmoud Khalil. “I’m stating unequivocally: I will continue my legal fight in federal courts for my rights, and for everyone’s right, to free speech.”

Back in June, a federal judge granted Mr. Khalil's request for a preliminary injunction after concluding that he would continue to suffer irreparable harm if the government continued efforts to detain and deport him on the basis of Secretary of State Marco Rubio's determination under the "Foreign Policy Ground," a rarely used federal statute, that Mr. Khali's lawful protected speech would "compromise a compelling U.S. foreign policy interest." The court also found that Mr. Khalil was likely to succeed on the merits of his constitutional challenge to his detention and attempted deportation on the Foreign Policy Ground, and it ordered his release on bail after determining that he presented neither a danger nor a flight risk.

"There is no world in which Mahmoud should be torn away from his family for a second time and sent back behind bars," said Brett Max Kaufman, senior counsel in the ACLU's Center for Democracy. "In this country, the government cannot punish people just because they don't like what they have to say, and if it tries, the federal courts have an immediate role to play in stopping that unconstitutional behavior. That's what the district court did here, and the government's arguments for reversal are both weak and wrong."

The Trump administration and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) illegally arrested and detained Mr. Khalil in direct retaliation for his advocacy for Palestinian rights at Columbia University. Shortly after, DHS transferred him 1,300 miles away to a Louisiana detention facility — ripping him away from his then eight-months pregnant wife and legal counsel. During the 104 days he remained in ICE custody, Mr. Khalil missed the birth of his first child.

"Since day one, the Trump administration had no legitimate reason to detain Mahmoud Khalil — it was retaliatory and unconstitutional," said Bobby Hodgson, assistant legal director at the New York Civil Liberties Union. "The law is on our side: in the United States, ideas are not illegal, and government officials can't weaponize a vague immigration law to incarcerate or remove people for expressing opinions with which they disagree."

On Thursday, the magistrate judge overseeing Mr. Khalil's case agreed to lift the strict travel restrictions imposed on him since his release on bail, requiring only that the government be given two days' advance notice of where and how he would travel.

6 Nov - Police Against the Movement Brooklyn Book Launch

WHAT: Book Launch

WHEN: 7:00pm, Thursday, November 6th

WHERE: The Word Is Change - 368 Tompkins Avenue, Brooklyn

COST: FREE

MORE:

Please join us as we help launch *Police Against the Movement: The Sabotage of the Civil Rights Struggle and the Activists Who Fought Back* by Joshua Clark Davis in conversation with Chenjerai Kumanyika.

Police Against the Movement shatters one of the most pernicious myths about the 1960s: that the civil rights movement endured police violence without fighting it. Instead, activists confronted police abuses head-on, staging sit-ins at precinct stations, picketing department headquarters, and blocking traffic to protest officer misdeeds. In return, organizers found themselves the targets of overwhelming political repression in the form of police surveillance, infiltration by undercover officers, and retaliatory prosecutions aimed at derailing their movement.