

NO COLLABORATION

NO COLLABORATION

NO COLLABORATION

NO COLLABORATION

Responses to Fire Ant
Movement Defense

“Nothing for Snitches: For a Revolutionary Anti-Repression,”
July 18, 2026, <https://abolitionmedia.noblogs.org/35212/>

“Learning From the Lines Drawn in the Sand: A Response to
Fire Ant Movement Defense,” July 18, 2026,
[https://anarchistnews.org/content/learning-lines-drawn-sand-
response-fire-ant-movement-defense-and-manufactured-betrayal](https://anarchistnews.org/content/learning-lines-drawn-sand-response-fire-ant-movement-defense-and-manufactured-betrayal)

“No Way Home,” Eric King, July 11, 2026,
[https://crimethinc.com/2026/07/11/no-way-home-an-
anarchist-ex-prisoners-response-to-fire-ant-movement-defense](https://crimethinc.com/2026/07/11/no-way-home-an-anarchist-ex-prisoners-response-to-fire-ant-movement-defense)

“In Defense of Dignity,” Peppy & Krystal, July 12, 2026,
<https://freepeppyandkrystal.noblogs.org/in-defense-of-dignity/>

withwhateverweapons.noblogs.org

with whatever weapons at hand



Contents

Nothing for Snitches: For a Revolutionary Anti-Repression	5
Learning From the Lines Drawn in the Sand: A Response to Fire Ant Movement Defense	19
No Way Home	25
In Defense of Dignity	30

This zine collects responses to Fire Ant Movement Defense's statement "Manufactured Betrayal: A Statement from Fire Ant Movement Defense on Solidarity and Betrayal in the Prairieland Trials" (July 7, 2026).

As part of the US state's recent escalation in (a centuries-long campaign of) counter-insurgency, repression, and terror against revolutionary movements for liberation, some in our movement are compromising and justifying their compromise of basic principles such as non-cooperation.

It's clear that as a movement we collectively failed the Prairieland prisoners. That is precisely why we must sharpen the principles of solidarity that keep us together towards liberation rather than abandoning them out of fear.

The lines are clear. We fight repression by fighting, not by withdrawing from the wider struggle, abandoning the core, beating heart of what moves us towards a future worth living. Free the Prairieland prisoners!

Fire to the prisons!

Support political prisoners:

Anarchist Black Cross Federation
New York City Anarchist Black Cross
In Contempt

Nothing for Snitches : For a Revolutionary Anti-Repression

“The paramount issue is the character and integrity of the movements we are building. We must confront, vilify, and destroy traitors at every opportunity; deal with them as the dehumanized vipers that they are; instill ‘the greater fear.’ The political terms must always be clear: discredit and destroy all traitors.”

— Sekou Odinga, Kuwasi Balagoon, Judy Clark,
David Gilbert, Silvia Baraldini

In the wake of draconian sentences handed down to the Prairieland 8, each ranging from 30 to 100 years, much has been said about the role of Trump’s NSPM-7 in establishing new repressive tools for criminalizing activism. Less discussed has been the critical role of cooperation—by at least 6 of the Prairieland defendants—in securing these devastating convictions. While the terrain of repression is ever changing, what remains evergreen is our most powerful tool of anti-repression: the principle of non-cooperation with the state.

This statement is a call for unity against the forces that would nip any nascent revolutionary movement in the bud by suffocating its most basic survival instinct with equivocation about the need to keep out snitches. From its inception, the DFW Support Committee has chosen to include the cooperator Meagan Morris in its collective prisoner support effort, against the objections and concerns of many in the movement. Despite this controversy, the “anti-repression collective” known as Fire Ant Movement Defense has lent DFW significant media support, helping them popularize the “Prairieland 9,” despite there only being 8 non-cooperating defendants.

On July 7, 2026, Fire Ant published an essay called “Manufactured Betrayal” in CrimethInc. which serves as a justification for their practice. The piece proposes the possibility of an “off-ramp” for snitches, focusing in particular on Meagan Morris as an example of someone who “restore[d] their commitment to struggle” after informing on their comrades. By publishing this snitch apologia—along with Eric King’s rebuttal “No Way Home”¹ four days later—CrimethInc. has presented the question of if snitches should be welcomed back into the movement as if it is a debate with two sides—it is not.

By taking this position, these formations are setting the precedent that people can cooperate with the state and continue to receive the support of collective movement resources. We can only assume that welcoming snitches back into the fold is a position that DFW, Fire Ant, and CrimethInc. will continue putting into practice.

Meanwhile, those of us serious about building a revolutionary movement must unite around a collective commitment to the principle of non-cooperation. As a political, strategic, and ethical practice that prioritizes the collective movement over the individual, it is our only hope of withstanding escalating repression. Compromising on this principle destroys our basic capacity for self-defense. There can be no revolution without solidarity, and solidarity has no meaning without a commitment to non-cooperation.

– The Facts of the Situation –

Fire Ant claims that it is a strategic decision to bring cooperators back into the movement:

“At this moment, thousands of inexperienced new participants are flooding into the fight for liberation. We probably won’t be able to educate all of them before they find themselves in confrontations with the state. Some of them will experience intense repression designed to scare them into cooperating before

they fully understand the political implications, the options available to them, or their basic rights. When they find themselves staring down the barrel of a gun, some may well say something they shouldn't. If we immediately make permanent enemies of everyone who do so, this may further endanger others.”²

This, however, is a complete distortion of the facts of Morris' betrayal, and is the exact opposite of a strategic decision in relation to cooperators. To address the dangerous position of allowing snitches to enter back into the movement that they have betrayed, we must first address how this is a complete minimization of the extent of Morris' cooperation.

According to her statement to law enforcement, Morris joined the Socialist Rifle Association in 2020 and learned of the noise demo from a Signal chat she joined “years ago after attending a protest.”³ In another Signal chat that members suspected of being infiltrated, she stated that “if there are 4 or more liberals in a chat, there's likely law enforcement.” This demonstrates that not only had she been active in movement spaces long before the noise demo on July 4, 2025, but she was also well-acquainted with movement norms regarding antagonism towards informants and agents of the state.⁴

Furthermore, the information law enforcement credits Morris with sharing could only have come from someone known and trusted by others as a comrade. By weaponizing the information she had been privy to in order to save her own skin, she became a willing accomplice in the state's effort to construct a conspiracy narrative, which relies on criminalizing our relationships to each other.

Contrary to Fire Ant's narrative of cooperators caving under “repeated torture,” Morris waived her Miranda rights and began snitching on her comrades within hours of her arrest.⁵ Law enforcement credits her with identifying Autumn Hill, who was her live-in partner at the time and had not yet been apprehended.⁶ Hill was arrested the next day on July 5, 2025, during a raid on the home she and Morris shared.⁷ Morris also helped identify Joy

“Rowan” Gibson and Benjamin “Champagne” Song, who she claimed to have met online and invited to her home before driving the group to the noise demo.⁸

While Song was still on the run, Morris provided additional information which led to their capture. She helped locate Rebecca Morgan—who law enforcement suspected of transporting and sheltering Song—by naming Morgan’s workplace and linking her identity to her Signal handle. The next day, an FBI SWAT team raided Morgan’s home, where they apprehended Song and took them into custody.⁹ However, Morris’ betrayal did not end there.

In a follow up interview Morris requested after her initial statement, she linked the gunshots fired on July 4, 2025 outside the Prairieland Detention Center to Song, claiming that the sound was consistent with a binary trigger he had on his rifle. She also suggested that the shooting was premeditated, and that Song had intended to use the demo as cover:

“I don’t think it was an accident. A person set things up to have cover... I felt disgust and betrayal.”

“My suspicion is Song wanted to do this the whole time. To shoot someone. Have us all there with our guns... [his] jackoff fantasy... and get away.”¹⁰

Not only did she help deliver Song into the hands of the state, she actively contributed to its narrative of “attempted murder” in an attempt to scapegoat her former comrade. Furthermore, her “admission” to the existence of a coordinated plan serves as the linchpin for the state’s conspiracy dragnet, which attempts to link a loose network of comrades, friends, partners, and unaffiliated individuals in a “coordinated ambush” involving the shooting of a law enforcement officer:

“One of the suspects, Meagan Morris, admitted this was a planned protest of the detention facility that was coordinated online [emphasis ours] with numerous subjects bringing weapons, firearms, body armor, ballistic helmets, face shields, tourniquets and extra magazines and ammunition.”¹¹

There would have been no “conspiracy” if not for the cooperators constructing such according to the wishes of the state. Far from a minor misstep which can be reversed via an “off ramp,” Morris’ cooperation was an essential element in the state’s case against the Prairieland defendants, without which her comrades Joy “Rowan” Gibson, Benjamin “Champagne” Song, Rebecca Morgan, and her own partner Autumn Hill might still be free. The extent of the damage she did was only possible because she had been trusted by those engaging in action alongside her. We have nothing to gain and everything to lose by making that mistake again.

– DFW Committee’s Role –

The DFW Support Committee has decided to include the cooperator Meagan Morris in the court and prisoner support efforts, alongside the non-cooperating defendants. The DFW Committee offered no clarity or transparency as to who had cooperated and when they did so until January of 2026, shortly before the trial began. All of this information, however, was already available in the criminal complaints and other court documents released publicly in the early stages of the case. That cooperation had happened was a known fact, as well as the identities of the cooperators, and what specifically they had done. When slogans like the “Free the Prairieland 19” began circulating from the DFW Support Committee while paperwork revealed that 6 had already cooperated, people were left to wonder whether or not the cooperating defendants were receiving support. Fire Ant entered early on into the effort to gather public support for this case, while themselves being silent about the extent of the cooperation, as well as which defendants were receiving support.

While these concerns continued to circulate as more informed parties attempted to address these formations that were generating support, a story began to circulate that Morris had admitted she had made a mistake, and had re-committed to her co-defendants.

When the DFW Support Committee began to attempt to rehabilitate Morris' betrayal just before the trial, no insight was offered into what her reversal actually entailed in practice. It is still the case, however, that Morris' actions before this reversal had already stolen people's lives and aided the construction of the legal fiction of the "Antifa cell" that the state will now use at its will against anyone. The damage cannot be undone.

– No Room for Cooperators –

We have demonstrated that what Morris did was beyond the pale, and that there is no strategic reason for the pro-cooperator position of Fire Ant in the Prairieland case. But what about beyond this case? Can we ever allow someone who has betrayed the solidarity of their comrades to return? Fire Ant offers this answer:

"We must ask ourselves what we can offer defendants who have erred but have yet to decide whether to continue to assist the state. If we cannot offer those who have begun to cooperate any incentive to stop doing so, that all but ensures that once someone starts cooperating, they will become a permanent addition to the state's arsenal against us."¹²

The problem with this, however, is that once someone cooperates, they have already become a permanent part of the state's arsenal against us. Whether through informing on co-defendants, complying with a grand jury subpoena, or helping police identify other targets in order to take the heat off themselves, cooperators hand the state information that can and will be weaponized against the movement indefinitely. Once this is done, deterrence or reversal is not a possibility. In the Prairieland case, the only way to mitigate the damage done by Meagan Morris' cooperation was for her co-defendants to challenge her credibility in court. By maintaining unity with her and standing trial together, they were left with no avenue to discredit her statements, thus compromising their ability to defend themselves.

Furthermore, cooperation is rarely an isolated incident. When police succeed in pressuring someone to snitch even once, whether by interrogation or other means, that individual becomes their first stop any time they seek information. By levying threats against those who wish to keep their initial cooperation a secret, promising them individual leniency, or using some other form of leverage, the state is able to cultivate longtime informants embedded in movement spaces. Thus, if known cooperators attempt to return to the fold, we must block them from doing so at every step.¹³ Not only have they demonstrated that they will betray comrades if given the chance, but we can never truly know if they seek to rejoin with the intent of informing further.

In the case of Prairieland, making a lesson out of Morris and communicating to the broader movement why there is no return from what she did would serve an important function in teaching newcomers that complete social exclusion and disconnection from collective movement resources is the expected minimum consequence for snitching. It would establish clear lines against cooperation and eliminate room for confusion. However, Fire Ant would rather we teach people the opposite lesson:

“We reject simplistic generalizations that frame all mistakes as unforgivable, rendering it impossible to create an off-ramp [emphasis ours] for those who have previously cooperated with the state to change course, make amends, and restore their commitment to struggle.”¹⁴

Instead of offering clarity, the idea of an “off ramp” opens the door to endless ambiguity and hairsplitting around what constitutes a redeemable snitch. It teaches potential revolutionaries that there is a way back into our movement for those who have decided to save themselves by giving the state the means to take away the lives of other people. It undermines our power to enforce any standards and creates an incentive for opportunists to play both sides. Self-interested people could exploit the movement for their own gain, all the while being easy targets for future pressure by the state. Accommodating such

elements would only weaken our movement by cultivating an individualistic logic of cowardice and self-preservation, leaving it defenseless against escalating state repression.

Soliciting cooperation is in fact one of the most powerful weapons the state can use against us, because it undermines the very fabric of solidarity that holds revolutionary movements together. We must prepare all partisans to expect this kind of pressure, and arm them with the knowledge that the only way to protect ourselves and each other is to remain silent and insist on speaking to a lawyer. When we are approached by law enforcement for information, we must immediately inform others publicly of what occurred and what the police are inquiring about, while making clear that we remained silent. When someone fails to do this, they cast suspicion on themselves if the incident is later discovered through court documents or other means, contributing to a destructive atmosphere of paranoia. The only way to protect ourselves against such paranoia is through a consistent practice of transparency and expelling any known cooperators in our midst.

Furthermore, we must teach people to expect that if they choose to join the struggle, jail and prison will always be a possibility. We recognize that what some activists call “torture” is simply the routinized violence of jail, and those who wish to join a revolutionary movement must steel themselves to withstand those conditions, and worse treatment, as Franz Fanon helped revolutionaries do in the past.¹⁵ Any breath wasted on justifying the betrayal of snitches takes our attention away from those prisoners who demonstrate behavior exemplary of a revolutionary in refusing to cooperate. With this comes an understanding of the contempt with which snitches are treated inside prison, and that those who cooperate jeopardize their own safety behind bars as well as the credibility of a revolutionary movement in the eyes of other prisoners. If we are seen as a movement that provides support to snitches, then we will be rightfully treated as enemies by the average prisoner.

Thus, where Fire Ant sees cooperation as an inevitability to which we must accommodate ourselves, we understand that a revolutionary movement must be capable of enforcing a hard line of non-cooperation at every turn.

– Revolutionary Anti-Repression –

This leads us to the question of the role of anti-repression work in the development of a revolutionary movement. We can turn this attack from the state into an opportunity to unite strategically along the political practice of non-cooperation and antagonism to the state and capital. Maintaining the consistency of non-cooperation in practice means that the work of organizing against repression must be conscious of its political character. The logic of the “off-ramp” that Fire Ant proposes is not that of building a revolutionary movement, but of a project of service provision to potential consumers.

Revolutionary anti-repression will not be for everyone. If anyone cooperates, they must receive no support, and be publicly made known to others. In order for anti-repression efforts to be revolutionary, they must be integrated into the effort of building a revolutionary movement. This entails identifying and engaging with cases of repression for political activity and providing support for those defendants. Support can provide material support such as funds for defense, as well as political, by helping coordinate defenses along collective movement principles. Defendants will need to be advised on how to assemble support committees, on the dynamics inside jails and prisons they should understand, and on how the carceral institutions they are engaging with function. This will demonstrate to defendants that revolutionaries can be trusted, and that solidarity is rewarded with solidarity. They will know that they receive this support because they resist becoming a tool of the state. In doing so, they become examples to others who we inform about this case, and to other prisoners inside.

Every political prisoner is a potential comrade. Revolutionary anti-repression must exist in order for defendants to know what their case means practically to the movement supporting them. They must know how the outcome of their case could set a precedent that will affect many others. This must inform the defense strategy that they choose to take. Lawyers cannot be expected to be the source of political clarity. Defendants that work in a tradition of revolutionary anti-repression need to be directly supported enough by revolutionaries to direct their legal representatives to construct legal strategy to accommodate the collective needs of the revolutionary movement. This means that the movement must be organized such that its political lines know how to enhance the efficacy of a defense's strategy.

These points of tactical engagement in revolutionary anti-repression are at the level of dealing with an active case. However, this work cannot be confined to the exigencies of the courtroom, forced to always operate on the terms set by the state. This is what always keeps us on the back foot, unable to maintain any firm position in developing our forces. A defensive position can be made advantageous if an offensive strategy can be developed within the means of defense. What is learned from engaging in and studying the changing landscape of repression will allow us to develop practices of struggle that lead to the development of offensive capabilities that outmaneuver state repression. We must learn how to turn the weight of the leviathan against itself.

The fact that we are experiencing an influx of newcomers into the movement makes it all the more important that we must hold clear and unambiguous lines around snitching to eliminate any room for confusion. In doing so, we build a movement based on who demonstrates the most potential to become committed and trustworthy revolutionaries, if they are not already. That means prioritizing the interests of those who are able to remain steadfast in non-cooperation with their comrades, and having no qualms of casting those aside who cannot. We have no need for them or

their accomplices in this treachery. Simply put, we will find tougher people.

For these comrades who will make up the truly revolutionary struggle, we cannot afford to be ambiguous or cowardly. We will better learn what we must build together to outlast this current wave of repression by preparing ourselves to engage in and enforce non-cooperation wherever we must. There will be cooperators left to fend for themselves in prison, but their own actions have already abandoned the struggle. That is the choice they have made and which has rendered us free of any responsibility to them. We make this choice ourselves because we recognize that the cost of compromise is much higher.

Revolutionary anti-repression cannot end with the support of direct cases of political repression. It begins here in our context, but the objective of state repression is to isolate layers of the population engaged in political activity from the potential mass base that could also become an organized force against the state. The state knows that the conditions for its own existence are those of the antagonistic social relations of capital. They reproduce this antagonism in order to produce capital, and in order to make that process stable, they expand the policing and carceral apparatus to keep the proletarians in line that their society produces, exploits, and oppresses.

Our era of mass uprisings against the police amongst racialized proletarians has shown that this population has revolutionary potential, but the failure of these uprisings to advance further also demonstrates that contradictions exist amongst those very proletarians that are barriers to their development into an organized social force, thus rendering them vulnerable to the eventual crackdowns by the state. These uprisings have emerged amongst specific populations and extended beyond them because of the history of the development of this repressive apparatus against both political movements and the activity of de-politicized layers of these classes. As such, it has

created a value of non-cooperation that exists as an ideal among criminalized segments of the racialized proletariat.

The instinct towards a liberal appeal—forgiveness by the Democratic Party, individual redemption over collective resistance—and away from one of the most basic codes of honor amongst those engaged in illegality, reveals a politics oriented towards individualism, and a composition influenced by middle class values whose intended audience are those who share the same, and not those surviving through proletarian criminality. Needless to say, we are not making an appeal to victimhood or proposing a posture of deference to all who are victimized by capital and the state. We are saying that the normalization of snitches would only amplify the effects of the counterinsurgency that is already devastating radical movements, as well as the criminalized segments of the proletariat where we see an expression of latent revolutionary potential. This culture and strategy of non-cooperation has emerged because it is necessary for the survival of formations that are antagonistic to the state. As comrades have recently said, “the codes revolutionaries live by exist to keep a movement alive long enough to find possibilities of emancipatory horizons.”¹⁶ The development and victory of our revolutionary forces depend upon our solidarity.

— Communists and Anarchists
for Revolutionary Anti-Repression

Notes

1. <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/eric-king-no-way-home-an-anarchist-ex-prisoner-s-response-to-fire-ant-movement-defense>
2. <https://crimethinc.com/2026/07/07/manufactured-betrayal-a-statement-from-fire-ant-movement-defense-on-solidarity-and-betrayal-in-the-prairieland-trials>
3. page 5:
https://prairielanddefendants.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/gov.uscourts.tx.nd_.406323.1.0.pdf
4. <https://prairielanddefendants.com/court-notes/march-4th-federal-trial-day-8/#witness-lynette-sharp-cooperating-witness-in-handcuffs-and-striped-jumpsuit>
5. <https://prairielanddefendants.com/court-notes/march-4th-federal-trial-day-8/#witness-lynette-sharp-cooperating-witness-in-handcuffs-and-striped-jumpsuit>
6. page 2:
https://prairielanddefendants.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/Cofer_Luster_motion-to-exclude-meagans-testimony_2026-01-22.pdf
7. <https://yournews.com/2026/01/21/6233321/two-transgender-defendants-in-texas-ice-protest-case-describe-misgendering/>
8. page 6:
https://prairielanddefendants.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/gov.uscourts.tx.nd_.406323.1.0.pdf
9. page 21:
<https://prairielanddefendants.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/complaint-morgan.pdf>
10. <https://prairielanddefendants.com/court-notes/march-4th-federal-trial-day-8/#witness-lynette-sharp-cooperating-witness-in-handcuffs-and-striped-jumpsuit>
11. page 25:
https://prairielanddefendants.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/JohnsonCounty_Probable_Cause_Affidavit.pdf
12. <https://crimethinc.com/2026/07/07/manufactured-betrayal-a-statement-from-fire-ant-movement-defense-on-solidarity-and-betrayal-in-the-prairieland-trials>
13. See the case of Suzie Savoie in the Green Scare wave of repression and successive attempts that had to be made to continually remove her from related spaces after her cooperation: <https://anarchistagency.com/an-anti-snitch-oral-history-of-the-seattle-wto-protests/>
<https://itsgoingdown.org/snitch-suzie-savoie-swarmed-and-deplatformed-in-southern-oregon/>

14. <https://crimethinc.com/2026/07/07/manufactured-betrayal-a-statement-from-fire-ant-movement-defense-on-solidarity-and-betrayal-in-the-prairieland-trials>

15. For information of Franz Fanon's work in helping prepare revolutionary combatants for withstanding torture, see:

<https://www.parapraxismagazine.com/articles/fanons-revolutionary-gaze>

16. <https://freepeppyandkrystal.noblogs.org/in-defense-of-dignity/>

Learning From the Lines Drawn in the Sand: A Response to Fire Ant Movement Defense

This response is published anonymously and intended to be part of the current dialogue surrounding the harms of talking to the state surrounding the Prairieland cases. Its writers have been active in prisoner support, defendant support, and anti repression for several years, strongly support the DFW Support Committee and have a lot of respect for Fire Ant Movement Defense. If there was no respect present, this response would have been much shorter. Building, maintaining, and supporting infrastructures that can sustain mass anti repression campaigns and support cases like this with many defendants is an extremely important and useful thing, as we have seen in the recent cases in Minneapolis, politically targeted cases like Prairieland are only going to increase in frequency and audacity. Projects like Fire Ant Movement Defense are vital, which is why it is so important that our values regarding anti-repression have strong foundations and consistency.

Regardless of any betrayal felt by the movement at large, the people most affected by the actions of Meagan Morris in the hours and days after her arrest are her codefendants, some of whom may never have been identified or charged without her voluntary disclosures to law enforcement in the early days of her detention. Meagan and her codefendants are still facing state charges, and are currently incarcerated. All communications between them are monitored and it is extremely unsafe for anyone still facing charges to offer a negative opinion, or instructions for others, regarding those who informed on them. The people most affected do not have the ability to speak freely on the topic, and it seems Fire Ant has chosen to speak for them. Other former political prisoners, Eric King, Brian DiPippa, Krystal DiPippa, and Richard Hunsinger, have at this point publicly offered their

perspectives on the forgiveness of those who informed on others, and they are unanimously opposed to the perspective offered by Fire Ant. In the interrogation room, Meagan Morris characterized Benjamin Song's actions as an excuse to shoot people. She also disclosed details about the personal life of her ex partner Autumn Hill. Since we cannot safely ask Song and Hill how they feel about this, it makes sense to defer to comrades who have experienced incarceration and betrayal in the past and can now speak for themselves.

In *Manufactured Betrayal*, Fire Ant Movement Defense points out factually that all of the defendants were tortured and humiliated in a manner designed to break them into pleas and testimony. They do not mention that Meagan was arrested within hours of the Prairieland Detention Center Protest, and that her initial disclosures to investigators happened the next morning. It is without doubt that the hours of her detention leading up to those disclosures were awful, but it is not accurate to paint a picture of weeks of torture breaking someone when it was merely hours for Meagan, followed by an additional request to speak to law enforcement within the next few days.

Manufactured Betrayal, in the piece's efforts to downplay the actions of Morris, compares her voluntary testimony to the non cooperating plea deals taken by Rowan Gibson and Rebecca Morgan, arguing that taking a non cooperating plea deal is similar to voluntarily disclosing information about others to law enforcement. They do not argue that these non cooperating plea deals were damaging at trial. However, Morris's statements to law enforcement in the first days of the investigation were read in court by the investigating officer, and directly contributed to the investigations and indictments against Benjamin Champagne Song, Rowan Gibson, and Morris's ex partner Autumn Hill. It is dishonest at worst and naive at best to compare the actions of Gibson and Morgan to the actions of Morris. The implication is that anyone who might condemn Morris's actions must also condemn Morgan and Gibson. They state that "some in the

movement” have characterized Morgan and Gibson’s plea deals as potentially damaging, while presenting an argument in favor of forgiving Morris that “some in the movement” would likely wholeheartedly reject as well. While Fire Ant concedes that Morgan and Gibson’s plea deals were not used against the other defendants at trial, the idea that they might be is hung out in comparison to Meagan’s testimony, which absolutely was used in trial and in the preceding investigations and indictments. A hypothetical is being used as a comparison to the actual evidence presented at court.

The statement says that “Many people will demand that she (Morris) pay for her choice,” and argues that she is already paying for it with her 50 years sentence. There is no disagreement here that she is paying for it. What does Fire Ant mean when they hypothesize that people will demand she pay? What have we, “the movement,” done to her? What capacity do we even have to punish her? The movement has raised over \$200,000 toward the collective defense of all the Prairieland Defendants. Since there is no public accounting of how that money was used in the defense (we are not arguing that there should be such an accounting, we think discretion is important), it is completely worth assuming that we “the movement” have already significantly materially supported Morris through contributing to the shared defense fund, through printing and sharing support materials that bear her name as well, for holding letter writings across the country (and across borders), and for raising as much awareness as we can for the entire case and all of the defendants supported by the DFW Support Committee. We have not punished her. The state has. It certainly seems implied that the ask is that support for Meagan continue now that the sentencing is over, and now that it is abundantly clear that her decision to eventually stop collaborating did not lessen the harm to anyone. This is different from asking that she not be punished. It is asking that she be rewarded.

It is worth examining the difference between accepting Morris as a supported defendant when she initially chose to stop

cooperating and reject a plea, and arguing now that she receive support as a prisoner. It made some sense at the time that one less cooperating witness at trial could be helpful (from a perspective strictly of legal strategy). We are unaware of a similar circumstance where a collaborator turned their coat twice in a case against anti-fascists. As a legal strategy, it had some merit to accept her back hoping that her not taking the stand could help the remaining defendants. We now know that it did not. Everyone who went to trial got the maximum sentence. Arguing for her continued support as a prisoner despite her collaboration can only logically serve to retroactively justify the decision to support her as a defendant, but laundering this tactical gamble causes us to lose a collective learning opportunity. The lesson here is what Eric King, Brian and Krystal DiPippa, and Richard Hunsinger have already said, there is never a justification for speaking to law enforcement. Meagan Morris has proved through her actions and her trial that there is no going back and undoing the damage of willing collaboration. She tried to undo it and she could not.

Manufactured Betrayal includes this paragraph “But at this moment, thousands of inexperienced new participants are flooding into the fight for liberation. We probably won’t be able to educate all of them before they find themselves in confrontations with the state. Some of them will experience intense repression designed to scare them into cooperating before they fully understand the political implications, the options available to them, or their basic rights. When they find themselves staring down the barrel of a gun, some may well say something they shouldn’t. If we immediately make permanent enemies of everyone who do so, this may further endanger others.” This is a case for tolerance and forgiveness of people who betray others, whether out of fear or ignorance. Why not instead shout the lessons we have learned from these cases as loud as we can to reach as many as we can? Every new comrade must be taught there is no going back from snitching. That is why it is unforgiveable. The existing incentive structure to discourage snitching to save one’s

own skin is called solidarity. Just because a defendant later chose not to benefit from the harm she caused her comrades does not mean she is deserving of the same solidarity offered to those she harmed and those who stayed true.

Manufactured Betrayal, while arguing that taking a plea deal could harm the movement as a whole, pushes a far more harmful suggestion, that we build not only an offramp from collaborating with the state, but also leave the door open to return to the movement. If this suggestion were to be embraced and practiced, our entire immune system of trust would erode. Activist spaces that allow back in those who have betrayed them can never be assumed secure. There is a popular chant “No one talks, everyone walks,” and Prairieland only enforces that generational wisdom. People talked, and no one walked. There is far more value in re-learning this lesson than attempting to justify the legal strategy of accepting her back into support. We just watched that strategy fail.

The piece concludes “We must hurry to adapt to this new era of repression. We must educate as many people as possible about the crucial importance of refusing to answer questions from police or federal agents, we must build awareness about grand juries and how to resist them; above all, we must establish stronger legal support infrastructure, including media outreach, to put at the disposal of everyone who may end up in the crosshairs of the state.” We could not agree more. And that starts with drawing clear lines in the sand about snitching.

Never talk to cops.

Some notes on Abolitionism:

Abolition and Anarchism are not interchangeable terms, despite sharing many of the same ideas and adherents, and though the word abolition is often used in arguments for us to forgive those who have wronged us or our communities, it is important to clarify what the ideological frameworks of abolition are, so we do not misuse these terms to excuse behavior that hurts others. Abolitionism is a framework of critique against the state's carceral systems that challenges us to build a world that does not outsource punishment for harm to cops, judges and prisons. Abolition asks us to consider the root causes of harm and seek avenues of actual repair. Abolition does not mean no consequences for harm. Abolition does not mean blanket forgiveness and acceptance back into the community. It means that individuals who have harmed others do not deserve to be caged and deprived of humanity. We do not believe that Meagan Morris deserves what is happening to her and everyone else. But we did not do this to her, her former partners in the state did. Refusing to embrace someone who has snitched does not violate our abolitionist principles.

No Way Home

by Eric King

I'm writing this response to Fire Ant Movement Defense's recent statement, "Manufactured Betrayal," not as a confrontation but in the spirit of opening dialogue and clarifying the values we stand on. This is not an attack. I'm sharing my personal views that are based on my personal experiences. I am not an expert or an arbiter on revolution, I am simply someone who has been directly impacted by a loose-lip piece of shit and have seen people I love experience the same.

Prison is a truly horrible place. It is a place where people can die, brutally. It is a place that forces violence upon you every second of the day. It is a place that activates your fight or flight reaction to the point where it never stops being fight. It is a place that changes you—how you view the world, how you handle stress, etc. It makes you do things that you cannot forget and have to live with. It takes your families' hearts and smashes them over and over, every day, as they worry if you are OK, if you are still around. I have been free for two and a half years, and I still think about all the circumstances I was forced into and all the trauma that still lives within me to this day.

The Fire Ant statement regarding Meagan Morris felt like an insult to everyone who has ever been impacted by the prison system. It was confusing, enraging, and painful. Fire Ant has done great work in regards to prisoners, which is why this statement confused me so personally and hurt me so deeply.

I will never understand, and I don't want to understand, the need to be a snitch apologist. Meagan Morris having regrets, or anyone who cooperates with the police feeling regrets, means nothing compared to the lives she helped to destroy. The fact that Meagan ultimately chose not to testify means nothing. She gave the state ammunition to use against us, not just the Prairieland

prisoners, but all of us. In every single case against leftists in the future, the state will be able to use her words to portray our friends, our comrades, as violent terrorists, doing the state's job for them. She gave the state information for HOURS. What the fuck are we doing?

As Fire Ant said, many new radicals will join the struggle after the horrendous state repression they are witnessing. And the conversations we are having now are ones that need to be had—but AHEAD of time. What risks are you willing to take? What are the worst possible consequences, even if you think you're safe and no matter how legal those risks are at the time? What will you do if you get caught up? Who are the most vulnerable? Who are the most ready? These are conversations that should be had. But never should we plan to allow snitches back into the community, never should there be a path of understanding, never should there be the justification that they paid their price and their remorse is enough. Honestly, fuck that. As an abolitionist, I do not want snitches or anyone else to be in prison. I do not want them to be hurt or harassed, attacked online, none of that shit. I do not have time for it. But I also will never comprehend the idea that they should be allowed back into radical communities. Why on earth would we risk the safety of ANYONE, just to appease someone else's betrayal and guilt? What is the point of that? That is the line I hold. If my best friend became friends with a snitch because the snitch apologized, I would never talk to that friend again.

Making space for their re-entry means spitting in the face of every single captive and all of their families as well. It means looking at people who dedicated their ENTIRE LIVES to the movement and saying, "I know that someone selfishly destroyed your life and betrayed everything they said they stood for, but they feel bad." Ask yourself, would Kuwasi Balagoon be OK with that mindset? Would Emma Goldman or anyone else? We are living at a moment in time where people who are established and in good graces with the movement are making space for betrayers. Those who snitch are cops. They are prison guards. They are judges and

prosecutors. They took the lives of others in their hands and tore them to shreds. There is no space in any organization or movement I love for people who would do that. It is unfathomable. Would Fire Ant Movement Defense be able to look my family in the face and tell them that the person who assisted in getting me tortured, sexually assaulted, and hospitalized had actually suffered enough? That it wasn't fair to have them removed for the safety of others? That their feelings were more important than the brutality they would allow to happen to all of us?

Imagine if the FBI read that statement (we have to assume they read literally all of them), would they be happy that we were contemplating allowing cooperators back into the fold? They would be elated. 1) They already know that those who flipped are vulnerable to pressure and would probably do it again, but also 2) They could easily see it as a continuous open door, without fear of consequences. How much easier it would be to convince someone to "do the right thing," when they can show folks there are no lasting consequences to their betrayal. It is a complete erosion of trust within our movement as well. How on earth could I ever trust a comrade who has a soft line on something so dangerous? These are life or death decisions they are making. This isn't a small ideological stance, it is putting the entire community in jeopardy. The door to return after even the smallest cooperation needs to remain closed and people need to know that. It's the bare minimum that should happen to those who aid the police in ruining our lives and maintaining their fascist status quo.

I don't understand the thought process behind writing this statement. The "why" of it all makes no sense to me. It hasn't even been two months since the Prairieland sentences and we're already dropping statements of support for the snitches? People can have their own thoughts and live their own lives and I can disagree with that. It was almost triggering, though, picturing the people who alerted the cops to where I was hiding out, and picturing a comrade I cared about and trusted asking me to be the rat's friend again. The scars on my head, the blood in my mouth, the pain in

my heart, would never allow this to happen. Because I have empathy for those whose lives were ruined by snitches, I could never be friends with a snitch. To snitch is to decide that your comrades' lives mean less than your own.

These are my views. I hope I'm sharing them respectfully. But I am hurt. I want to scream, "WHAT WORLD IS THIS?" Some of my closest friends and people I admire and support have been snitched on, and I hope we never see or hear from those rats again. There should never be space for that, in my opinion. It is a betrayal of all I stand for to give them an inch when they took away decades.

Love and respect to everyone who supports prisoners. I've got your back if you've got mine.

Towards Liberation

EK

In Defense of Dignity

by Peppy & Krystal

June 30th, 2026 marked three years since the Feds demanded we turn ourselves in. It was also the day Pep was scheduled to move to Home Confinement. The BOP failed to complete the necessary paperwork to process that transition so he remains in the halfway house until further notice. As we await the next steps in our own situation we remain painfully aware of the continued evolution of the government's attacks on liberatory movements but what's even more troubling is witnessing the degradation of our movement principles by people who proclaim themselves comrades.

This piece is being written because a new wager and political understanding is being developed that threatens the movement by and large. There are those within the orbit of liberation that are actively causing harm through their word and deed. Whose actions and that of their supporters are producing daily new consequences that deviate from long-held traditions and codes of non-cooperation. This threat seeks access to our resources of time, money, and attention. When someone abandons and sacrifices their comrades by offering information to the state, the movement has an obligation to no longer stand in solidarity with that person.

While any one of us may be captured, subject to the great strife of the gavel or noose – to abandon dignity is not just an act of suicide, it drags others down with you. Such consequences demand our attention.

When we think about the political maturation necessary to stay principled under the pressure of federal repression, we think about the hard won wisdom of all the freedom fighters who paved the way throughout history. The people who left lessons and legacies for us to learn from and lean on. Knowing who has traveled this terrain and what they have sacrificed, undoubtedly

provides a lifeline when a raid, arrest, and conviction turn your world upside down.

For guidance, we can turn to the wisdom of movement elders and ancestors like Sekou Odinga, Kuwasi Balagoon, Judy Clarke, David Gilbert, and Silvia Baraldini who issued a statement in 1982 called Destroy All Traitors.

“To minimize the development of traitors we must build movements based on clear principles, deep politicization, a strong commitment to oppressed and exploited peoples... We must teach that the state is our implacable enemy and fight for total noncollaboration as a basic principle.”

The codes revolutionaries live by exist to keep a movement alive long enough to find possibilities of emancipatory horizons. Thus, it is necessary at minimum, to hold the line of non-cooperation of any kind, and at best, raise the bar for what collective protection and defense can look like. Let us be clear: we are not victims of social injustice, we are targets in the cross-hairs of the US War Machine. If we are to survive, we must arm our spirits and stay committed to our convictions.

For those of us who have walked through the great halls of (in)justice, who have been steadfast supporters of those locked up, or who have done time themselves – it is known that the only thing that comes with you is your self-respect, integrity, and moral fortitude. Solidarity is what we receive for such commitment – it is the lifeblood that sustains us. The state has the power to strip everything else away.

In this landscape of war around and upon us, it is our acts of radical care and the fight for others that bolster our ability to win; love is a verb. It is a privilege to hold our comrades secrets and reflect back the best of what our movements have to offer. We lend political defendants and prisoners our hearts and minds because they carried themselves with dignity which honors the

political legacies we walk in and the ones we hope to leave for those to come.

Solidarity with the Prairieland 8.

— K & P

**There were requests to name names in this piece, however our stance is this: Once you are a traitor we no longer know you by your name – the only name we know you by is traitor.*

NO COLLABORATION