



POST OFFICE BOX 110034 BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11211

Updates for March 31st

7 Mar - On Cooperators & Their Sympathizers

Please read the following by former George Floyd uprising political prisoner Richard Hunsinger.

MORE:

"A 'rat' is a traitor, a conceiver, planner or physical participator

He doesn't sell secrets for power or cash

He betrays the trust of his team or his family hoping to save his own cowardly ass"

—from "Snitches & Rats" by 21 Savage

Support the non-cooperating Prairieland defendants Autumn Hill, Benjamin "Champagne" Song, Daniel "Des" Rolando Sanchez Estrada, Dario Sanchez, Elizabeth Soto, Ines Soto, Janette Goering, Joy "Rowan" Gibson, Lucy Fowlkes, Maricela Rueda, Rebecca Morgan, Savanna Batten, and Zachary Evetts at prairielanddefendants.com/meet-the-defendants

Meagan Morris is currently supported as well and part of the collective defense effort standing trial, although according to available documents she initially cooperated, requesting interviews with law enforcement and providing information on other defendants that led to their subsequent arrests.

We may say that people cooperate and have the right to, and that we also have the right to exclude them from our supportive efforts. The mutual hostility of right then barely conceals a real antagonism that has not been addressed in practice. When left to the choice of individuals, any ethics of non-cooperation is ultimately left to a matter of moral qualities absent the consideration of the conditions and social relations within which they are cultivated. Without this, the question of whether or not people can withstand the blows of repression has no content beyond their shapeless fears of what is to come.

This then leads the betrayals of cooperators to be excused by any number of factors in the situation, as if anyone would be susceptible to cooperate if they had to endure the experience of the rat. The rat then becomes a tragic figure. Having to face their betrayal tugs on our heartstrings, and the tragedy then merely reflects back a farce upon us. We then cringe from the specter of responsibility that hangs over us. When we flinch before the facts of what must be done, anything becomes excusable, and basic facts of a situation become distorted. What is a typical night in jail for the many people who never talk instead becomes "torture," because we must feel empathy for the coward who cannot stomach their own discomfort. The actions of the state to compel such equivocations from the captured lead to a horror of any means of coercion at all, yet this is precisely the necessity with which we are confronted. It is then not a matter of abstract individuals possessing more or less intrinsic qualities, but the contention of a balance of forces in struggle.

It cannot be said then that the rat deserves "nothing." Such actions require responses for our own protection, for our own longevity. The baseline hatred and disgust for the rat is the ambient recognition of this necessity of survival in a struggle against a society of hostile relations. This task cannot be managed by any mutual respect for the rights of individuals. In a political movement, we simply cannot do whatever we want. For any concerns of authoritarianism, there is no greater assertion of the authoritarian personality than the singular and unilateral declaration that one's own life is worth more than another facing repression and deciding instead to send others to prison to save your own skin. The rat makes a wager: "maybe the state will take less of my life-time if I give them the means of taking the life-time of others." It is the very logic of competition that emanates from the essence of capitalist social relations. The rat then creates a situation in which a contrary force must match this threat. Authority is then not the problem in itself. It is rather a problem of an antagonistic relation that must be confronted.

There is then the necessity of creating the actual means of developing behavior that successfully reproduces revolutionary movements, and suppressing that which threatens this development. The means of effecting this in a conscious and directed manner in our lives and relations is then a clear necessity. Against the asymmetrical force of the state, there is no room to maneuver if the actions of the cooperator are tolerated to any extent. Even the expression of empathy for their ordeal communicates a weakness that will be exploited either immediately or in the near future and simply wastes time that no one has. We then become enamored with the tragedy and turn away from the reasons of those who never cooperated to remain steadfast as they have, an immensely more enriching source of education than can be found in the motivations of a rat. In this very differentiation we find the foundations for a movement that will be resilient to repression.

A movement cannot tolerate any hesitation on this matter. We all must take note of who does balk in the face of the necessity of non-cooperation and insulate ourselves from their presence and influence. The means of support in the face of repression have to cohere into a definite political front and be leveraged to deter cooperation. A rat must not only receive no support, but must be subject to actions that demonstrate to all those who bear witness that betrayal has consequences. Anything less than this fails to recognize that the repression that faces individuals is but a single front in a struggle that pervades throughout the whole of social life. Supporting each other against this very repression negates that which separates us through conscious action upon these interdependent relations. As such, support is then never unconditional, for it creates a series of reciprocal obligations between partisans. Solidarity is the cohesion that arises from the recognition of this necessity put into practice.

13 Mar - D.C. Federal Court Holds Blocking Prison Reform Advocate's Access to Federal Prisoners May Violate First Amendment and Due Process

On April 12, 2025, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia denied the government's motion to dismiss with respect to due process and First Amendment claims made by a federal prison reform advocate whose access to communicate via electronic messaging with prisoners at seven federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) facilities was blocked.

MORE:

by Matt Clarke (*Prison Legal News*)

Pamela Bailey, who co-founded the nonprofit organization “More Than Our Crimes” to advocate for federal prison reform, uses the BOP’s electronic messaging system, which is a part of the Trust Fund Limited Inmate Computer System, or “TRULINCS,” to communicate with prisoners. Using the organization, “Ms. Bailey circulates first-person accounts and advocates for reform via publications, outreach, and events. To do this work, Ms. Bailey relies on personal relationships with inmates, which she develops through communications with them. While Ms. Bailey sometimes speaks to inmates on the phone, she more often uses the prison electronic messaging system.”

According to court documents, between March 2022 and March 2024, “BOP officials at seven facilities took various unlawful actions, including blocking her ability to exchange TRULINCS messages with inmates in the facilities and threatening the inmates with whom she had been communicating.” Aided by D.C. attorneys Feyilana Lawoyin and Joseph Marshall Terry, Jr., Bailey filed a federal civil rights action that includes: claims under the First Amendment for restriction of speech and retaliation, a Fifth Amendment procedural due process claim, two claims under the Administrative Procedures Act, and a claim for declaratory judgment. She sought an injunction restoring her TRULINCS access to all BOP facilities, prohibiting future blocks absent “a specific prior determination of misconduct” and prior court approval, and prohibiting interference with her communications with prisoners or retaliation against them.

The Court granted Bailey a preliminary injunction with respect to her restriction of speech claim at six of the seven prisons. However, it upheld the blocking of her TRULINCS access at the U.S. Penitentiary (U.S.P.) in Big Sandy, Kentucky, because the BOP had submitted proof that, contemporaneously with the

activation of the block, Bailey forwarded prisoners' TRULINCS messages to third parties who were not on the prisoners' approved list for TRULINCS in violation of the service's rules.

The BOP filed a motion to dismiss. The Court engaged in a factually intensive review of each claim at each facility taking the allegations pleaded in the complaint as true for purposes of ruling on the motion.

In September 2022, More Than Our Crimes in collaboration with the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs published Voices from Within the Federal Bureau of Prisons: A System Designed to Silence and Dehumanize. The 76-page report "described in detail 'a federal prison system that is in a state of crisis,' due to [the BOP's] 'abject failure' and 'cultural, entrenched, and systemic' problems." The report featured first-person accounts from BOP prisoners, including some of Bailey's sources, who describe facing retaliation for communication with her about staff misconduct.

The report received nationwide attention and was featured in *The Washington Post*, *Politico*, and a letter from a group of senators to then-Attorney General Merrick Garland and BOP Director Collette Peters about staff misconduct at a BOP facility. Following the report's release, blocks of Bailey's communications rapidly increased from two prisons to the seven that are the subject of her suit.

The Court noted that Bailey's First Amendment restricted speech claim might arguably be subject to either the standard of *Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396 (1974), or *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78 (1987). However, that issue was not decided because, at all facilities except Big Sandy, Bailey could show a likelihood of success under the more stringent *Turner* standard and at Big Sandy she could not do so even under *Martinez*. However, even for Big Sandy, dismissal prior to discovery would be premature.

Although staff at the Federal Correctional Institution (F.C.I.) in Ray Brook, New York,, U.S.P. Big Sandy, U.S.P. Beaumont in Texas, F.C.C. Hazelton in West Virginia, U.S.P. Marion in Illinois, F.C.I. Pekin in Illinois, and U.S.P. Florence-High Security in Colorado threatened the prisoners Bailey communicated with and took a variety of retaliatory actions against them, including threatening multiple bogus disciplinary cases, loss of their prison jobs, and transfers to administrative segregation, super seg, or a higher security prison, the Court held that Bailey's retaliation claim focused on how the retaliation impacted the sources rather than how it impacted her. Therefore, the retaliation against the prisoners could not support Bailey's claim.

The retaliation against Bailey herself—blocking facilities-wide access when the BOP alleged misconduct with only one or two sources and cited incidents that postdated the initiation of the block—supported her retaliation claim. The Court rejected the BOP's arguments of mootness because some facilities had unblocked Bailey and she might have been able to communicate via another, unblocked account as those arguments would require the Court to disregard facts alleged in the complaint, which it was required to accept as being true per *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009).

The Court also rejected the BOP's argument that the blocks at the six facilities, other than Big Sandy, were because she forwarded prisoner's emails and the notifications of those blocks contained no reference to forwarding emails. This "certainly gives rise to the inference that the BOP is merely providing an after-the-fact explanation for its decision."

Nonetheless, the court held that Bailey's retaliation claim was duplicative of her other First Amendment claim and, therefore, must be dismissed per *Nat'l Rifle Ass'n of Am. v. Vullo*, 602 U.S. 175 (2024).

The Court previously held that "Bailey has a protected liberty interest in 'uncensored communication via TRULINCS.'" Thus, the BOP was required to provide her adequate procedural due process. However, the BOP failed to show it had provided her adequate due process pursuant to *Martinez*, which both parties cited as the applicable standard. Bailey alleged that the block notifications contained no specific details about the alleged misconduct, making a successful appeal to the prison's warden impossible—and warden responses

to her appeals were “boilerplate” assertions. Thus, she adequately alleged that the procedures were “constitutionally inadequate” per *Roberts v. United States*, 741 F.3d 152 (D.C. Cir. 2014).

The Court held that Bailey’s claims under the APA failed because “the TRULINCS Program Statement does not provide judicially manageable standards” because it does not limit the discretion afforded the BOP under 18 U.S.C. § 4042(a) and does not set out any standard for determining when a block should be initiated. Review under the APA is unavailable “where agency action is committed to agency discretion by law.” See: *Kondapally v. U.S. Citizenship and Immigrants. Servs.*, 557 F.Supp.3d 10” (D.D.C. 2021).

The motion to dismiss was granted with respect to the First Amendment retaliation claim and APA claims and denied with respect to the First Amendment restricted speech claim and Fifth Amendment Due Process claim. See: *Bailey v. Federal Bureau of Prisons*, 780 F.Supp.3d 96 (D.D.C. 2025).

13 Mar - On the Trail of the Struggle: Lambros Fountas Present

Greece: Please read the following by political prisoners Marianna Manoura & Dimitra Zarafeta.

MORE:

via Athens Indymedia

On March 10, 16 years ago, Lambros Fountas, a member of the Revolutionary Struggle organization, was shot dead by the police. The murder of the anarchist comrade took place during the preparatory action of the organization in Dafni during an armed clash with the police forces.

The anarchist movement from the very first days defended and continues to defend the memory and content of the action of the armed fighter Lambros Foudas through marches, events, actions. The very organization of which he was a member carried out a blow to the Bank of Greece in 2014, dedicating it to his fallen comrade, taking responsibility under the signature “Commando Lambros Foundas”, thus paying tribute to the revolutionary.

Lambros Fountas, as a member of the armed revolutionary organization Revolutionary Struggle, chose to act through the armed proletarian counterattack at a time when the social base was affected by austerity measures. Measures imposed by the local and international elite in order to avoid the bankruptcy of the European banking system. And while politicians and channel managers present the memorandums and contracts as “means of salvation”, we experienced them as salary and pension cuts, as an impoverished today and as an uncertain tomorrow.

The Revolutionary Struggle organization fought against this condition, targeting the economically powerful, vigorously fighting the measures of the memorandums. He chose to create conditions of political instability, making it difficult to bleed the social base, leaving behind a great legacy in the international and domestic revolutionary movement. With actions against predatory “organizations” – Bank of Greece, City Bank, etc. -, the stock market, the uniformed killers of the MAT, he defended the armed social revolution, writing new chapters in the book of revolutionary history.

And maybe comrade Lambro Fouda and I have never met, never met, never fought side by side. But the thread of revolutionary memory bridges exactly this: fighters, movements and struggles that, while they developed in different corners of the planet and in different spaces and times, shared a common anguish and vision for liberation. Thus, the preservation of revolutionary memory is anything but a neutral process. It is a thorn in oblivion and a crack in the history of the rulers. That is why securing it is part of our own struggle, part of the present and the future. That is why, although the past was painted with blood, our dead managed to fill the inkwell of revolutionary history. And even if we hadn’t walked next to them, we had walked alongside them. And even if we hadn’t chosen the same path, we looked at the same skies. Because we shared the same dreams and hopes, experienced the same fears and rages. Thus, their struggle, the way they acted and the way they fell is an invitational struggle, a starting point and an occasion for new cycles of resistance. And as long as we keep the revolutionary memory alive, we also keep our history alive. A

story built on the smiles and companionable looks of our own people, our own friends and our own partners. As did our comrade Kyriakos Xymitiris, who fell fighting almost a year and a half ago on 31.10.24, from the explosion in Ampelokipi. A comrade who envisioned a world of equality and freedom. A just world, built on the ruins of the old.

So for Lambros Fountas, Kyriakos Ximitiris and all the other fighters who saw themselves as part of the revolutionary history and poured themselves into the battle, it is our turn to make their death a cause of war. To stand worthy of our history and responsibilities and to perceive their death as a motivation to continue the struggle.

14 Mar - FCC Releases Final Version of Order Gutting 2024 Phone Cap Regulations

As previously reported in Prison Legal News (PLN), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) had postponed a 2024 rule poised to reduce the financial burden for incarcerated people throughout the country.

MORE:

by Michael Thompson (*Prison Legal News*)

The June 30, 2025 pause was followed by a draft proposal in October that significantly raised prices to nearly double those in the 2024 rule. When the finalized document was released on November 6, it surprisingly contained further changes, which included even more substantial price hikes. Through this new rule, the FCC effectively reversed course on nearly every major provision of the 2024 rule.

The 2024 rule would have saved millions of dollars for people incarcerated in jails and prisons, as well as their friends and families who have been known to pay in the vicinity of \$500 per month for the right to communicate with them. Instead, the November final draft slipped in an additional 6.7% inflation factor over the October draft price hike with no public notice.

At issue is the profiteering off of incarcerated people and their loved ones. FCC Commissioner Anna Gomez made the point well in her critique of the June decision to pause the rule, saying they were “now stalling, shielding a broken system that inflates costs and rewards kickbacks to correctional facilities at the expense of incarcerated individuals and their loved ones.”

FCC Chair Brendan Carr wasted little time in overturning what had been a bipartisan rule. When he announced the October draft, he said the 2024 price caps had led to “negative, unintended consequences.” He claimed the fees were too low to cover “required safety measures” and that the states had not been given enough time to find other revenue sources.

The claim that the previous rate caps were too low to sufficiently compensate providers is challenged by multiple factors. An analysis published by Worth Rises in mid-October found that about three quarters of U.S. prisons were already operating at rates lower than the 2024 caps. In contrast, the new caps will be higher than 94% of all U.S. prisons currently have; only Florida, Kentucky, and Oklahoma are higher. Securus had told the FCC that the 2022 data used to establish the 2024 caps needed an 11.6% adjustment to offset cost changes. They got that and more from the FCC without ever having to show any justification.

Providers such as Securus and ViaPath Technologies have also claimed the 2024 price caps and ban on kickbacks would lead to widespread losses of services, and that this had already happened at a handful of facilities. Yet, we have only seen evidence of that at a single jail—the Baxter County jail in Arkansas, which received a “commission” kickback from Securus, canceled all calls for detainees in March 2025 in response to the now-abandoned rate caps. And while the rules seem to say the same things as the 2024 ban on commissions, Commissioner Gomez claimed that Footnote 278 leaves open the possibility of commissions in excess of “facility cost additive[s].”

The order went into effect on December 5 and raised the effective rate cap to 11 cents per minute at most prisons and between 10 and 19 cents per minute at jails, depending on the size of the facility, with jails detaining less than 50 people subject to the latter rate. Providers have until April 6, 2026, to implement any changes.

Commissioner Gomez remains critical of the changes: “[Incarcerated Persons Communication Service] Providers have these data but fail to submit them, and claim the FCC lacked the data necessary when the decision is not in their favor,” she said. “In their Order, rather than requesting providers to provide sufficient data before setting the new rates, the Commission fulfills their requests without any new data. Again, the Commission rewards bad behavior.”

14 Mar - Dena in prison transfer to Kebon Waru prison

Indonesia: Imprisoned anarchist comrade and rapper, Dena (Madya Dena) a.k.a Apip a.k.a Scoobydoomz, has been transferred to Kebon Waru prison in Bandung from West Java paramilitary police headquarters.

MORE:

via Dark Nights

This has finally occurred due to his charges being filed with the court. Dena is accused of the destruction of Hana Bank in Bandung, along with comrade Adit, who is also accused in the same case and faces trial. Dena is suffering with health condition related to his HIV+ status and in prison it is difficult to consistently obtain the meds, which costs money. Dena had been kept isolated from the rest of Chaos Star comrades. It is expected that Dena and Adit will face two years or less for the property destruction, however Adit also faces 25 years for the bombing of a police outpost, in an adjacent trial, relating to an action in 2024.

16 Mar - Activist detained by Trump admin with no charges finally walks free

A New Jersey activist who participated in pro-Palestinian demonstrations at Columbia University in 2024 has finally walked out of a federal detention facility in Texas after languishing behind bars for more than a year despite never being charged with a crime.

MORE:

by Daniel Hampton (Raw Story)

Leqaa Kordia, 33, was released Monday from the Prairieland Detention Center in Alvarado, Texas, following a judge's order. The move came about a month after Kordia claimed she was chained to a hospital bed following a seizure while in custody, alleging the facility was plagued by filthy and inhumane conditions, The New York Times reported.

An immigration judge ordered Kordia's release on \$100,000 bond, marking the third time the judge had issued such an order. Federal prosecutors repeatedly appealed those decisions, keeping Kordia locked up despite the rulings.

The Trump administration previously was forced to backpedal on its effort to label Kordia a supporter of Hamas after several failed attempts to convince a judge she posed a threat to national security.

Kordia immigrated to the United States from the Israeli-occupied West Bank in 2016 on a student visa. She said she mistakenly allowed her visa to expire in 2022 under a false belief that her mother's visa petition granted her lawful immigration status.

Kordia was arrested in 2024 while at a protest “to mourn dozens of family members in Palestine” that had been killed by the Israeli military, and briefly faced minor charges related to the protest that were swiftly dropped. She was placed into immigration detention after the Department of Homeland Security alleged, she had supported the Palestinian political and military organization Hamas.

17 Mar - New Book Wishlist for Casey Goonan

This wish list comes from Casey directly and will be updated.

MORE:

The list is also prioritized with the most important to Casey starting from the top. If you purchase books through other outlets, please be mindful of the mail rules for Casey's facility. Check out the list at bookshop.org/wishlists/56b98684a2c55d72748aa7fae7dfa536217a1b5f

Casey has also shared this list of interests for other texts:

Beginners chess books; Drums and drummers (jazz, punk, metal, rock, r&b, soul); World history/indigenous histories of "North American" continent; Ohlone and Miwok stories/history (Bay Area Native history); College football and NFL football; MLB baseball; Culinary arts (outside and inside prison); Critical prison studies/carceral studies articles; History of revolutions (international); Palestinian history, political analysis, and literature; Black philosophy and critical theory; Anarchist and anti-state communist analysis and literature; Autonomous marxisms; Arab Marxist texts; Historical fiction (19th and 20th century revolutionaries) & memoirs; Irish national liberation struggle; Analysis of 21st century "abolition" movement; Analysis of George Floyd Uprising; Liberatory pedagogy and teaching methods; History of science; Brain Games (word searches, crosswords, puzzles); Exercise and fitness in prison; Books by Paul Avrich (anarchist historian)

17 Mar - Why We Have to Fight Back Against ICE Protesters' Terror Convictions

Since his first inauguration, Trump has been throwing charges at protesters and seeing what sticks. He always failed — until now.

MORE:

by Natasha Lennard (*The Intercept*)

It started on President Donald Trump's very first day in office in 2017. Over 200 Inauguration Day protesters were mass arrested and charged with hefty riot and conspiracy felonies for simply being present and wearing black at a rowdy demonstration.

Since then, the government has sought and failed to convict left-wing activists on thin, unconstitutional claims of collective guilt.

Just as the J20 prosecutions, as the inauguration cases were known, fell apart, so too did cases accusing dozens of participants in the Atlanta-based Stop Cop City movement of domestic terrorism, racketeering, and conspiracy.

It became a pattern of sorts. Prosecutors on both the federal and state level throwing extreme and overreaching charges at leftists, based on infirm theories of collective liability, aiming to paint antifascist, anti-racist movements as criminal terrorist networks. The evidence marshaled in these cases was consistently no more than typical First Amendment-protected activity, like making protest signs, raising bail funds, or being present at a demonstration. The cases drained movement energies and resources.

Again and again, though, they failed.

This was the pattern repeated in the malign, overreaching cases against protesters in Fort Worth, Texas. The anti-ICE activists had mounted a demonstration at a U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement jail in nearby Alvarado.

There were consistencies with other anti-protest cases. There had been some illegal activity outside the Prairieland Detention Facility last July, and a police officer was shot. The government latched onto these circumstances to build its strategy of criminalizing dissent through guilt by association.

Even in conservative Texas, I didn't think a jury would buy the government's case that these defendants were "North Texas Antifa Cell operatives" — an organization fabricated whole cloth by the Trump administration — who had orchestrated an elaborate ambush of the ICE facility.

Last week, a jury found eight of the defendants guilty of terrorism charges for simply being present and wearing black at the protest. The government scored a resounding victory: A few of the protesters, none of whom had fired any weapons, were acquitted of attempted murder charges, but the Justice Department won on almost all the other charges.

"Most people looking at this case are still stuck on the shooting aspect, but the jury decided the shooting was beside the point," a member of a support group for the defendants told me. "The verdict is that a normal noise demo deserves to be called terrorism and people should spend potentially the rest of their lives in prison. The implications of this are obvious, and people should know that the DOJ is going to try this again."

Grim Precedents

The convictions mark a number of grim precedents. It was the first successful effort in court to paint anti-ICE, antifascist protest activity as not only criminal but also terroristic; the first-time federal terrorism charges have been deployed in association with the "antifa" label; and the first time the Trump government's collective guilt strategy won in court.

The terrorism-related charges in the case were filed just a month after Trump announced that he was designating antifa, which is not an organization, a "major terrorist organization" — a designation that does not exist under law for domestic groups.

It's little wonder that the Justice Department is celebrating the convictions. Trump's Attorney General Pam Bondi said in a statement that the "verdict on terrorism charges will not be the last as the Trump administration systematically dismantles Antifa and finally halts their violence on America's streets."

The prosecution's case was extraordinarily weak — all they really proved was that the activists, some of whom knew each other, planned and attended a late-night demonstration during which certain illegal acts took place.

If that can be sold to juries as the work of an organized terrorist cell, deserving of decades in prison, then Trump's fantasy of rounding up and imprisoning leftists en masse becomes a reality. This was entirely the idea behind Trump's National Security Presidential Memorandum 7, or NSPM-7, released last September, which directs federal law enforcement agencies to target left-leaning groups and activities. One of the defense attorneys involved in the Prairieland cases told news outlet NOTUS that it "wouldn't be a terrorism case if it weren't for that memo."

Throughout the trial, the prosecution treated it as a given that antifascist, anti-government, left-wing sentiment was itself evidence of criminal conspiracy. As The Intercept's Matt Sledge reported, "prosecutors bombarded jurors with images of radical zines" and "anti-government internet memes, drawings of burning cop cars, and a video of an unidentified street brawl between far-left and far-right protesters."

The fact that demonstrators wore black and covered their faces — a reasonable tactic in an era when federal forces are filming and openly harassing legal observers and anti-ICE protesters — was presented as material support for terrorism, for which the jury convicted eight defendants.

Another defendant was convicted for the crime of moving a box of zines and pamphlets.

What should have at most been individualized cases relating to a shooting and minor property damage were instead spun by the government into a delusional story of a planned ambush involving “explosives” — protesters set off retail fireworks — and “terroristic acts,” according to a Justice Department statement.

Whether certain illegal activity took place outside the Prairieland Detention Facility last July 4 was never up for debate in this case. Protesters spray-painted vehicles in the parking lot, and a police officer was shot in the neck by one protester, Benjamin Song. (Song was convicted of one count of attempted murder and could face up to life in prison.)

Keep Up the Fight

The material support for terrorism and related convictions must be challenged in appeal. They are unconstitutional and were obtained in a trial riddled with irregularities.

For one, the Trump-appointed judge, U.S. District Court Judge Mark Pittman, abruptly declared a mistrial during jury selection based on the initial jury pool reportedly showing too little sympathy for ICE.

When the trial restarted, the judge himself took charge of jury selection — a highly unusual move.

Pittman also barred Song from presenting a self-defense argument. In closing arguments, his defense attorney said that Song only shot at the ground after police officers fired first, and that the injured cop was grazed by a ricocheted bullet.

And access to the court for supporters, observers, and the media was also extremely limited.

“All the odds were stacked against the defendants from the start,” Xavier T. de Janon, a defense attorney representing one of the defendants, told Unicorn Riot. “The rulings of the judge, the way the courtroom was closed, the fact that the first jury was declared a mistrial, where this was happening, the very strict rules on who can even take these cases in north Texas, the sanctions that the judge imposed on defense attorneys for filing very normal motions — all of this piled up to end in this result.”

It’s notable, too, that the defense attorneys did not mount a defense in court. Once the prosecution rested its ideology-drenched and inconsistency-filled case, the defense rested too, and closing arguments proceeded.

“We do not know how things would have gone otherwise, but the assumption that the state’s glaringly weak case was enough to convince a North Texas jury pool to vote not guilty was delusional,” a close friend of a number of the defendants who helped with court support efforts told me. “This is not merely 20/20 hindsight, many of the supporters and loved ones of the defendants disagreed with the decision when it happened.”

With the Prairieland defendants also facing state charges, and with appeals processes ahead, there is a clear need to present a robust case against the government’s pernicious and dangerous lawfare. Outside of future trials and court challenges, it is crucial that anyone invested in challenging Trump’s fascist deportation machine understand the stakes of these cases and show solidarity with defendants accordingly.

The Prairieland case, as I’ve previously noted, provided a convenient testing ground for state repression, in part because it has not been lifted up as a national cause célèbre against Trumpian overreach. The reasons why should be obvious: not only were there acts of minor vandalism, but also a police officer was shot — a highly unusual event at these sorts of demonstrations.

No matter how unique, however, 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. In the face of Trump’s escalations, this is no time for anti-ICE

activists to distance themselves from protests where militant activity might occur; this is the chilling effect the government seeks.

It is the nature of contemporary far-right governance to throw everything against the wall, repeatedly, until something sticks to achieve its goals. Anti-trans laws that once roundly failed are now on the books in multiple states; once-constitutionally protected reproductive rights have been decimated.

With brute force, repetition, and relentlessness, Trump and his acolytes hack away at established protections. First Amendment-protected protest activity is no different. The Trump regime has been seeking to criminalize leftist dissent since the president's first inauguration. For years, nothing stuck. We cannot let Prairieland be the turning point.

March 26th - Exclusive: FBI Files Counter Government Argument in Texas "Antifa" Trial

by Adam Federman (*In These Times*)

On the last day of testimony in the federal "Prairieland" trial — wherein nine activists faced charges related to a protest outside an Immigration and Customs Enforcement detention center — the government called its star witness back to the stand. Kyle Shideler, director of counterterrorism research at the right-wing think tank Center for Security Policy, had been key to the prosecution's case that "antifa" — the loose network of activists defined by their opposition to fascism — is a violent, criminal organization bent on overthrowing the U.S. government. Shideler, an imposing figure with a cleanly shaven head and full beard, had attended nearly the entire trial, even sitting in the overflow room during jury selection.

At the stand, Shideler read aloud the government's definition of antifa, as well as an excerpt from President Donald Trump's executive order declaring antifa a domestic terrorist organization — issued in September, less than two weeks after the assassination of right-wing pundit and activist Charlie Kirk. Both documents describe antifa as a shadowy, militant "enterprise" involved in "coordinated efforts to obstruct" enforcement of federal laws through "organized riots," and in perpetrating "violent assaults" against ICE agents and law enforcement officers.

Three days later, on March 13, the jury convicted all nine defendants on a variety of charges, ranging from providing material support to terrorists to attempted murder. The ruling could have far-reaching consequences for activists, protesters and NGOs that have aligned themselves in any way with anti-fascist organizing.

But FBI records obtained by *Type Investigations* and *In These Times* through a Freedom of Information Act request contradict the government's claim that antifa poses an existential threat to national security. And several defense attorneys involved in the trial say the information should have been included in discovery.

MarQuetta Clayton, an attorney representing Maricela Rueda — one of the defendants convicted of providing material support to terrorists, organizing a riot and conspiracy to conceal documents — confirmed that the records were not turned over.

"Coupled with some of the testimony we heard, I feel like that would all be something for the jury to decide whether it was worth anything or not," Clayton said. "They are the tryers of credibility and fact."

The case centered around a noise demonstration on July 4, 2025, in which roughly a dozen activists set off fireworks outside the Prairieland ICE detention center in Alvarado, Texas, about a 45-minute drive south of Dallas. Noise demonstrations are a common protest tactic, sometimes involving fireworks, whistles or megaphones, and a way of expressing solidarity with immigrant detainees or inmates who have little contact with the outside world. At least one protester spray painted a guard shack and a vehicle in the Prairieland parking lot with expletives and anti-ICE slogans and dismantled a security camera. Some of the protesters also had firearms — which in Texas, an open-carry state, is generally legal.

When a police officer arrived on scene and pulled his gun, allegedly pointing it at someone running away from him, one of the protesters fired an AR-15 style rifle in the officer's direction. The officer was hit in the neck and suffered minor injuries. That night, and in the weeks that followed, the FBI and state law enforcement raided activists' homes and arrested 19 people.

The shooter, Benjamin Song, a 32-year-old former U.S. Marine Corps reservist — who remained at large for 11 days — was charged with three counts of attempted murder. Other charges included organizing and carrying out a riot, providing material support to terrorists and conspiracy to use and carry an explosive. Roughly half a dozen activists not at the protest on the night of July 4 were also apprehended and charged with a variety of state and federal offenses, including one accused of conspiracy to conceal documents for moving a box of anarchist zines to a friend's apartment. (The FBI also raided that home, using a battering ram to break through the front door and detonating a flash bang device in the living room, and confiscated all of the occupants' phones and laptops, which have still not been returned.)

In the months since, the Prairieland case became the cornerstone of the Trump administration's efforts to dismantle antifa and crack down on the Left more broadly. In October 2025, when the first indictment in the case was unsealed, FBI Director Kash Patel said it was the "first time" the government had arrested "Antifa-aligned anarchist violent extremists" and charged them with terrorism — despite the fact that antifa is not a formal organization and has no membership list or leadership hierarchy.

Making that charge stick is what prosecutors set out to achieve in court. Along with the administration's crackdown on dissent — its use of ICE agents to threaten and detain student protesters, for example — this case will likely be used to target the Left and launch investigations into anyone with connections, however tenuous, to antifa.

In a statement released a few hours after the verdict, the Department of Justice cited Shideler's testimony and referred to the North Texas "Antifa Cell" nearly a dozen times. Attorney General Pam Bondi reiterated the administration's claim that "Antifa is a domestic terrorist organization" and said the Prairieland case marked the beginning of a broader effort to "systematically dismantle" the group.

Shideler, asked to comment on his testimony in the hallway outside of the courtroom, told Type Investigations and In These Times, "I'm not taking any questions."

But the government did not always consider antifa a serious threat. Records from an FBI investigation out of the Dallas field office that ended in 2018 reveal that, under Trump's first term, the bureau had investigated "Antifa DFW" (and several allegedly related entities, including Dallas Workers Front, Dallas Antifa, Antifa Dallas, Dallas Antifascist and DFW Anti-Fascist League) and found that the group and its affiliates posed no threat to national security. This determination prompted the bureau to formally close the investigation.

"No potential criminal violations or priority threats to national security warranting further investigation were identified," the two-page FBI file states.

The records are at odds with the case prosecutors presented during the three-week trial and indicate that, as of 2018, the top law enforcement agency in the country did not view antifa as a criminal threat. (Around the same time, the FBI also opened a case on Rose City Antifa in Portland, Oregon, suggesting that the agency's mandate to investigate activists involved in the anti-fascist coalition extended beyond Dallas/Fort Worth. It is unclear if the Rose City investigation was closed.)

According to five defense attorneys — three of whom were involved in the federal case and two who are representing defendants facing state-level charges — this information was not included in the discovery evidence that the government provided to the defense teams.

“The prosecution broke the law when it hid this evidence from the defense,” said Texas attorney George Lobb, who is representing one defendant in the state’s case. “This internal FBI document shows the government lied about the defendants, because it presents a position contrary to what the prosecution alleged at trial. The prosecutors should be removed from this case and a new trial should be granted immediately.”

Harmony Scheurman, a defense attorney representing Elizabeth Soto — one of the activists convicted on charges of organizing a riot and providing material support to terrorists, and who was linked by prosecutors to an “Antifa DFW” X account — expressed concern that the FBI’s earlier determination had not been included.

“If we had to try it again,” she said, referring to the federal case, “we definitely would want that, since the government used that against us.”

It is standard procedure for agency investigative records to be turned over to the U.S. Attorney’s office, which then decides if a case should be prosecuted. In a phone interview, Melinda Urbina Garcia, spokesperson for the FBI’s Dallas field office, affirmed that the U.S. Attorney’s office would have been aware that this investigation had taken place, though she added that there has been turnover in the office since 2018.

“If the case was closed and no charges were brought, then obviously it is safe to say that there was a declination to prosecute,” Urbina Garcia said.

The U.S. Attorney’s Office in Texas declined to comment.

The handling of the trial by Judge Mark T. Pittman — a Trump appointee and member of the Federalist Society—raised questions from the very beginning. On day one of jury selection, Pittman declared a mistrial after learning that defense attorney MarQuetta Clayton was wearing a T-shirt featuring images of civil rights leaders under her blazer, which he called prejudicial. Pittman was also reportedly unhappy with prospective jurors’ responses to questions about ICE and law enforcement’s handling of recent protests, and subsequently called a new, smaller jury pool which he questioned himself. He also moved the trial to a smaller courtroom, prompting speculation among media that he was trying to limit press coverage.

Even before the trial began, there were concerns that Pittman—who has a reputation for sanctioning and fining defense attorneys—was trying to tip the scales. In January, Zachary Evetts, one of the defendants charged with material support for terrorism, submitted a motion for additional discovery, including any information used by law enforcement and prosecutors to conclude that the “North Texas Antifa Cell” was a “militant enterprise.” Pittman denied the request and fined Evetts’ lawyers \$500 each for filing what he called “frivolous” motions. (Pittman also granted a motion filed by the government that precluded defense attorneys from making the case that the protesters may have acted in self-defense, which took on greater significance when it was revealed during the trial that the officer pulled his gun first.)

According to their motion, lawyers for Evetts asked prosecutors multiple times about their findings that antifa posed a threat.

“There are matters in the request that I reasonably believe that you have not yet provided, but should,” Patrick McLain, Evetts’ lead defense attorney, wrote in an email to prosecutors in October.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Shawn Smith, one of the lead prosecutors, replied that they had fulfilled their discovery obligations. “The government has not identified any extraneous evidence that is not part and parcel of the charged conspiracy,” he wrote.

But during the trial, McLain told *Type Investigations* and *In These Times*, key pieces of evidence related to the events that took place on the night of July 4 — including the fact that the officer was the first to pull his

weapon — had not been disclosed to the defense. “We did not have evidence that they should have had and should have shared with us,” McLain said.

McLain also noted that the FBI records would be “grist for our appeal,” especially if they choose to challenge the judge’s denial of the discovery motion.

Moira Meltzer-Cohen, an attorney whose work focuses on politically motivated abuse of the legal system, and who was not part of the Prairieland case, said that evidence deemed favorable to the defense must be included in discovery. This encompasses information that could affect rulings on certain motions as well as records in the possession of law enforcement that may, in some way, undermine the charged offense. Failure to share information that could impact the outcome of the case, she said, is a violation of defendants’ constitutional rights.

“The prosecution has constitutional, common law and professional ethical obligations to disclose to defendants any ‘favorable’ evidence within the possession, custody, control or knowledge of any law enforcement personnel acting in the case,” Meltzer-Cohen said.

It’s fair to say that a prior FBI investigation finding that “Dallas Antifa” in fact posed no threat to national security would fit in that category.

Mike German, a former FBI special agent and author of the 2019 book Disrupt, Discredit, and Divide: How the New FBI Damages Democracy, said the 2018 records appear “to contradict the prosecution’s argument that common tactics of anti-fascist protesters are evidence of criminal intent.” He added that the FBI files, along with the underlying investigation, “should have been disclosed so the defense could properly challenge the factual basis of [the] prosecution’s theory.”

The government’s case relied in part on the perception that wearing black clothing to a protest, communicating via encrypted texting app Signal and reading anarchist or anti-fascist literature was part of a wider conspiracy to ambush and attack law enforcement. Or as the Trump administration would have it, to overthrow the government.

German acknowledged that the FBI’s assessment of Dallas Antifa could have changed since the 2018 investigation was closed. If that were the case, though, he suggested that a more comprehensive account of law enforcement’s opinion of antifa should have been aired in court — particularly in a trial that featured testimony from several FBI agents.

David Rudovsky, a civil rights attorney and senior fellow at the University of Pennsylvania’s Law School, who was not involved in the trial, said there is no question the records should have been included in discovery.

“It goes to the core of what the government was saying,” Rudovsky said, noting that while the agency’s views could have changed since 2018, the FBI files still offer a rebuttal to the expert witness’s theory of the case. “To deprive the defense of that, I think, is to deprive them of some pretty core Brady material,” he added, referring to a 1963 Supreme Court case which compels the prosecution to turn over any evidence that might be considered exculpatory or favorable to the defense.

Trump’s DOJ, particularly during his second term, has repeatedly flouted or ignored judicial orders, misrepresented evidence and taken actions deemed to be “arbitrary and capricious,” generally undermining public trust in the rule of law, in the assessment of non-partisan law and policy journal . According to an ongoing project spearheaded by the journal, there have been more than 120 rulings since 2025 in which courts have expressed distrust of government information and representations, including cases where prosecutors have not complied with discovery orders.

The FOIA records obtained for this story are just a small portion of the documents related to the 2018 Antifa DFW investigation. According to the government, in a pending lawsuit brought by this author against the FBI, the agency possesses up to 250 pages of documents that have not been previously released.

When word of the verdict reached family and friends, members of the Prairieland support committee and activists gathered outside of the courtroom on the afternoon of Friday, March 13, there was a palpable sense of shock and disbelief. A smaller group of committee members began drafting a media response. Local television crews lined up outside of the main entrance. Tensions were high.

Joseph Fabbro, an activist working with Fire Ant Movement Defense, who'd come from out of state to help with defense strategy and messaging, said the group had mapped out responses to four potential outcomes. But guilty verdicts on nearly all charges was not one they had accounted for. And Fabbro said the convictions — particularly on material support for terrorism — set a dangerous precedent.

The first Trump administration, Fabbro pointed out, went after the so-called J20 protesters, who'd staged a rally in Washington, D.C., on inauguration day 2017, alleging that they were part of a conspiracy to riot. But the charges were dismissed. State officials in Atlanta have also leveled RICO charges — originally conceived to target organized crime — against activists seeking to stop the construction of a police training facility known as Cop City. Those, too, have failed.

The Prairieland trial marks a turning point.

“Now they have succeeded at making dressing in black together — at the very least in these specific circumstances — a felony: providing material support for terrorism,” Fabbro said. “They’re saying that’s the same thing as me giving bitcoin money to Al Qaeda, which is simply absurd.”

“This case was overcharged,” said Lesa Pamplin, an attorney who was part of Maricela Rueda’s defense team. “This is not a riot compared to January 6. This was brought because Trump wanted it brought.”

But the fate of the Prairieland defendants — and the five protesters who pleaded guilty and cooperated with the government — is far from over. Many still face state-level charges. (Johnson County prosecutor Christy May was present during most of the federal trial.) And appeals and challenges in the federal case will likely come after defendants are sentenced in June.

George Lobb, the Texas attorney representing one defendant on state charges, said the Johnson County District Attorney’s office has told him it has over 20 terabytes of evidence — likely a mix of video, photographs and thousands of pages of files — in discovery but have not turned any of it over.

“We are quickly approaching the one-year anniversary of this case and none of that has been provided,” Lobb said, adding that it could be a violation of his client’s speedy trial rights.

Xavier T. de Janon, the National Lawyers Guild director of mass defense and a member of the People’s Law Collective, who is also representing a defendant in the state case, said the 2018 FBI records raise troubling questions about the prosecution’s handling of evidence in the trial and also undermine Shideler’s testimony. De Janon said that if the state-level case proceeds, he will be requesting records related to the earlier FBI investigation, which he noted could also have implications for the federal case when appeals are filed.

“If the FBI already concluded years ago that there was no criminal concern to DFW Antifa, why didn’t that come up during the federal trial?” de Janon asked. “Did federal prosecutors even know this investigation had happened?”

18 Mar - Prison Dining Giant Aramark Serves Inedible Food to Drive Commissary Sales, Lawsuit Alleges

A federal lawsuit filed by West Virginia prisoners alleges that Aramark Corporation serves inedible, low-quality food in its prison cafeterias to drive customers to its food-for-purchase programs.

MORE:

by Elizabeth Weill-Greenberg (*The Appeal*)

Last year, people incarcerated at West Virginia's Mt. Olive Correctional Complex, along with loved ones of Mt. Olive prisoners, filed a class action lawsuit against Aramark and its subsidiaries, including the prison commissary company, Union Supply Group. Earlier this month, West Virginia prisoners asked the court to reject Aramark Corporation's request to dismiss their lawsuit.

Aramark is the largest food provider in the United States to prisons and jails. Aramark also has contracts with a number of other institutions, such as schools, hospitals, and stadiums. In fiscal year 2025, the Fortune 500 company brought in \$18.5 billion dollars in revenue.

"Aramark extracts a profit on both ends; it saves costs on its daily meals services business by providing less, reused, and poor-quality food, while earning more money from incarcerated consumers' purchases from its food-for-purchase programs," the complaint says.

In its response to the lawsuit, Aramark asked the court to toss the case. The court has not yet ruled on the company's motion to dismiss.

"At best, Plaintiffs' allegations establish that they are dissatisfied with their food in prison," Aramark wrote in its motion to dismiss. "That is a far cry from establishing the type of life-or-death deprivation of 'basic needs' upon which Plaintiffs' theory depends."

When asked for comment on the suit, a spokesperson for the West Virginia Department of Corrections said, "It is our standard practice to not provide comment on active or pending legal matters." The plaintiffs did not sue the department.

The complaint alleges that Aramark's actions violate the state's consumer protection law.

"Longstanding fundamental principles of marketplace fairness embedded in the West Virginia

Consumer Credit and Protection Act and common law are based on consumer choice and seek to prevent the unfairness and exploitation that can occur when powerful companies have exclusive control over captive markets," they wrote in their response to Aramark's motion to dismiss. "These laws apply equally to incarcerated consumers."

For years, incarcerated people, correctional officers, and state officials from across the country have accused Aramark of serving inedible or spoiled food, prepared in kitchens where workers have allegedly found maggots. In one highly-publicized incident in a Michigan prison, an Aramark employee allegedly told an incarcerated worker to serve cake that had been partially eaten by rodents. (Aramark has also been sued for not paying its incarcerated workers.)

In Ohio, maggots were found in multiple Aramark-run prison kitchens. State officials levied \$272,000 in fines against the company for contract violations, including unsanitary food preparation areas. In Kentucky, Aramark's food allegedly led to a prison riot.

"It's over the food," corrections officer Matt Hughes told state lawmakers after the riot in 2015. "The food was slop."

The Mt. Olive plaintiffs allege that since Aramark took over food services in 2019, both the quality and quantity of food have declined.

“When [plaintiff] Mr. [Marcus P.] McKinley first arrived at Mt. Olive, the daily food services included a wide variety of fresh meats, real dairy and eggs, and vegetables,” the suit says, which was filed by the National Consumer Law Center and others. “Now, most of the meat that Aramark serves is in the form of processed pellets, and the eggs are bagged eggs.”

McKinley spends approximately \$50 to \$60 per month on food, more than 70 percent of his monthly income. Another plaintiff, William R. Johnson, who was incarcerated at Mt. Olive from 2009 to 2025, spent “nearly his entire monthly paycheck of \$68 on food from the commissary.”

The Appeal’s investigation into prison commissaries revealed widespread price gouging and financial exploitation, which place high burdens on prisoners earning meager wages.

“When he was first incarcerated, Mr. Johnson and the other people incarcerated at Mt. Olive were provided with fresh vegetables and a variety of unprocessed meats,” the suit says.

After Aramark took over, he and others were served “turkey pellets or ultra-processed patties made from an indiscernible meat.”

Plaintiff Roger D. Smith says that when he worked in the kitchen, he saw workers pick bugs out of gravy that was later served to incarcerated people. He also witnessed “old, frozen food being stored and then served days later to the segregation, mental health, and medical units,” even though they “were not the meals that were on the daily meal menus.”

The plaintiffs say that low-quality food and small portions are part of Aramark’s scheme to “drive people incarcerated at Mt. Olive and their loved ones to purchase food that should be provided for free.”

Aramark runs three food-for-purchase programs: the prison commissary, Fresh Favorites, and iCare.

Incarcerated people can purchase meals directly from the Fresh Favorites program, which, the complaint says, offers items it has “limited the availability of in its daily meals service,” such as “fruit-flavored yogurts, fresh vegetable trays, fried chicken, BLT sandwiches, and baked potatoes.”

The complaint notes that one plaintiff has seen advertisements for Fresh Favorites, “touting fresh vegetables,” while he waits in line for meals. Aramark’s website advertises the program with a photo of a prisoner eating a salad.

“Boost morale with FreshFavorites®, a retail experience that gives inmates the chance to purchase special meals using their trust fund,” the company’s website states.

Aramark’s iCare program is marketed to incarcerated people’s friends and families in the community. The company says iCare “offers justice-involved individuals a tool to stay connected with their loved ones.”

On the iCare website, an “atomic double cheeseburger,” onion rings, cookies, and a Crystal Light packet cost \$16.99, plus an additional \$2.49 “handling charge.” A chicken Caesar salad costs \$5.99.

Plaintiff Sandra Rush has spent approximately \$400 on iCare products for her son “because she knows that he is not receiving adequate daily meals services,” according to the complaint. To afford iCare meals, Rush has had to limit her spending on essential items for herself, such as groceries and cleaning supplies.

The complaint calls Aramark’s practices “acutely oppressive and unscrupulous.” The company is “using a commodity essential for survival as a tool to extort profits off a captive market.”

“Aramark has taken control of every channel people in prison have of receiving food,” they wrote in their most recent legal filing. “Plaintiffs cannot weigh alternative options for buying food—all they have is one option: Aramark.”

18 Mar - Illustrated Guide Version 19.2 Uploaded!

nycabc.wordpress.com/2026/03/17/guide_19_2

MORE:

We’ve finished the latest version of the NYC ABC “Illustrated Guide to Political Prisoners and Prisoners of War” and it’s available for viewing (and download) by visiting the link at the top of this post. This update includes updated mini-bios, photos, and address changes for several prisoners. Amazingly, this edition includes the removal of Peppy. Welcome home, Peppy!

We are also adding Malik Muhammad, who has been incarcerated since the George Floyd Uprising and is now receiving support from the ABCF.

20 Mar - In Contempt #5 Is Out

In Contempt, a monthly roundup of political prisoner, prison rebel, and repression news, happenings, announcements, action and analysis, is out, covering Anarchism & Solidarity on Trial in Texas, Free the Prairieland Defendants, Free Them All!, & More.

MORE:

You can read In Contempt online or download it reformatted as a zine at incontempt.noblogs.org

22 Mar - Mumia's Health Action Alert

As of March 2026, Mumia Abu-Jamal has not received critical treatment for diabetic retinopathy and aggressive glaucoma — two serious eye conditions that if left untreated can lead to irreversible blindness.

MORE:

Mumia was completely blind for 9 months in 2025. When, his post cataract blindness was finally addressed, with a simple inexpensive procedure that takes 5 seconds, his vision in one eye was restored.

During this campaign, the community and legal pressure for treatment, and the retention of an expert for Mumia, revealed that he has serious additional conditions diabetic retinopathy and severe glaucoma; that require immediate proactive treatment.

Every day that passes without specialist care increases the risk that the vision he has left will be lost — possibly forever.

The Pennsylvania Dept of Corrections (PA DOC) and Wellpath its health care provider must get Mumia Abu-Jamal to specialist who can make a treatment plan.

Please resume calls, emails, and letters to SCI Mahanoy (the prison) and the Secretary of the PA DOC this week.

Operation hours are Monday thru Friday 9am to 4pm Eastern Standard Time.

CALL:

SCI Mahanoy Superintendent (Bernadette Mason): **570.773.2158**

PA Department of Corrections Secretary (Dr. Laurel Harry): **717.728.2573** or **717.728.4109**

EMAIL:

PA DOC Secretary email (Dr. Laurel Harry): ra-crpadocsecretary@pa.gov

WRITE:

Bernadette Mason, Superintendent, SCI Mahanoy, 301 Grey Line Drive, Frackville, Pennsylvania 17931

Basic Script:

"Hello, my name is ----- and I'm calling to request that Mumia Abu-Jamal, number AM 8335, be seen and treated by specialists who treat diabetic retinopathy and glaucoma, serious eye diseases that can cause permanent blindness. He also needs to be examined for new glasses. Due to his congestive heart disease, Mumia must have a heart healthy diet, filtered water and regular exercise, indoors and out."

2 Apr - RAPP Teaches a History of Revolutionary Women

WHAT: A Conversation

WHEN: 7:00pm, Thursday, April 2nd

WHERE: Giorno Poetry Systems - 222 Bowery, Manhattan

COST: FREE

MORE:

In the last four weeks alone, there have been three deaths in Bedford Hills women's prison, two by suicide. In this roundtable conversation, RAPP's Vanessa Santiago, Roslyn Smith, TeAna Taylor, and Laura Whitehorn discuss how we got to this moment, looking at the history of vagrancy laws and the criminalization of black women's bodies, connecting the vagrancy arrest of Esther Brown in 1917 to legacies of pushback, including women's bail funds, prison uprisings, and the creation of solidarity networks.

4 Apr - International Day of Solidarity with Prairieland Defendants

WHAT: Letter-writing

WHEN: Saturday, April 4th, 2026 1:00-3:00pm

WHERE: Property Is Theft (P.I.T.) (411 South 5th Street, Brooklyn 11211)

Access: Quick ramp setup; bathroom not accessible

COST: FREE (Donations to cover the cost of stamps greatly appreciated)

MORE:

Join NYC Anarchist Black Cross on the International Day of Solidarity with the Prairieland Defendants, for a letter writing to those who were found guilty on most counts when their less than 3 week trial ended on March 13. All writing materials and vegan snacks will be provided! Learn more and donate at prairielanddefendants.com

7 Apr - Breaking the ICE: Lessons from the Resistance in Minnesota

WHAT: Speaking Tour

WHEN: 7:00pm, Tuesday, April 7th

WHERE: *NOTE:* This event is happening at two places at the same time, one in Queens, the other in Manhattan

Ridgewood Commons - 585 Woodward Avenue, Queens

Woodbine - 414 Broadway (at Canal), 3rd Floor, Manhattan

COST: FREE

MORE:

In April, anarchists from the Twin Cities who have participated in resisting the ICE occupation there will travel the country speaking on their experiences. At each presentation, they will share what they have learned from building rapid response networks, explore how Minnesota thwarted Operation Metro Surge, and draw out lessons about how to defeat fascism.