

GOT THE HOLLOW POINTS FOR THE SNITCHES

The Persistence of Snitch Culture in Communities of Resistance & How to Defeat It

HOLLOWPOINT

JACKETED HOLLOW POINT





SNITCH

As Anarchists, we fight in the face of what appears to be insurmountable odds; our project of liberation is the natural enemy of the culture of authority and capitalism we now live under. Considering that our revolt against the institutions of domination are not isolated pockets of resistance, and that we do not live separately from the rest of society, our communities are inevitably affected --and perhaps infected-- by the culture we are aiming to destroy.

Snitch Culture is not exclusive to Communities in Resistance, but is one thread of control in the larger social fabric of America. Those in power want people to snitch on each other-- especially those from communities that are targeted in particular by the government and are therefore more vulnerable to Snitch Culture-- because snitching works to create a climate of fear and mistrust that can fragment the populations that threaten the structures of power.

For example, in the war against the poor and people of color --those that fill the prisons of America-- the State promotes snitching as a means to perpetuate crime by creating a 'revolving door' in which low-level drug dealers, addicts, and other petty offenders are arrested and released with orders to provide more information in order to create more arrests in order to fill more prisons. The effects of this cycle of snitch-and-prison are that entire communities are torn apart, families broken up, and the United States has the largest prison population in the world.

In Anarchist circles everyone knows that Snitch Culture breaks solidarity among activists and paralyzes our ability to wage effective resistance. Though there is much complaining and hand-wringing about the divisive role snitches play in our communities, we have engaged in very little constructive action about this serious and persistent problem. This zine is an attempt to educate and foster dialogue in our communities in order to develop effective strategies for dealing with snitches and to forge a resistance that can withstand the attacks of power.

To start, we must realize that Snitch Culture is not a new phenomena or only particular to Anarchists, and that many Communities of Resistance in North America and Europe have come up with a number of different ways --some more effective than others-- to deal with Snitch Culture while maintaining their core values.

There are three components --perhaps of unequal importance-- that re-

sistance groups and others have traditionally used to determine their response to snitches: practicality, the agreeability to the core values of the group, and tactical benefit.

The ultra-militant Red Army Faction (RAF) in West Germany tried to use something called "Revolutionary Discipline" to respond to a growing number of snitches. This discipline drew heavily on the promise of immediate personal reprisals for snitching. Snitches both in jail and out were subject to vicious beatings and in one case, a snitch was blinded. This type of response was practical for the RAF because they had a number of supporters both inside and outside of jail. Most snitches could be easily located and jumped by supporters or actual RAF members. It was agreeable to the RAF because it fit in with their concepts of both Revolutionary Discipline and a glorification of violence. However, it did not prove to be an effective tactic for reducing the impact of snitches. By the end of the RAF's existence, snitches were an important part of the State's efforts to not only disrupt, but to arrest numerous members of the RAF-- including its leadership. The tactics they employed did not seem to reduce Snitch Culture within their own ranks or of other contemporary militant radical organizations in West Germany.

The Weather Underground (WU) also had an extreme but somewhat different strategy when confronting the problem of snitches. The WU used terror as a way to stop the effectiveness of snitches. They required all members to give the names and addresses of close friends and family and were explicitly warned --sometimes while on psychedelic drugs-- that if they snitched, they and their family would be subject to violent reprisals. In one rambling message from the WU --written after an AIM snitch took the stand against former comrades-- published in radical periodicals at the time and believed to have been written by Bernadine Dorn, stated that the WU was not afraid to support the "[Charlie] Manson approach" when it came to "bringing hell on Earth for pig-snitches." It went into detail about how violently the WU would deal with snitches and their friends and family. This approach ended up being completely impractical for the WU because they had neither the members nor the support to pull off such grandiose plans. By the nature of being underground, they were marginalized and had little ability to strike out at snitches in any way. In fact, there is no evidence that any snitch on the WU was ever even bothered by the group. Whether this approach of terror was agreeable to the core values of the WU is hard to say since the WU position on violence and acceptable violence seemed to change

constantly. It was however, consistent with the ultra-violent streak in the core leadership of the group. As a tactic is was counter-productive-- it caused considerable debate in radical circles and most of it was negative. The cops also had little trouble turning folks associated with the WU, and a number of the most rhetorically violent members of the leadership either turned themselves in (thus snitching on themselves), or cut deals.

No resistance group in recent times can compare to the Black Panther Party (BPP) --and its factions-- in terms of being completely infiltrated by snitches as well as law enforcement! The BPP, in the popular mind, is associated with violence and ultra-militancy. The image of a tough leather-clad Black Panther carrying a shotgun is an ever present part of the iconography of the radical left. One would think that the BPP's approach to snitches would be similar to the RAF and the WU; however, they took a completely different approach and relied on community shame as a mechanism for dealing with snitches. This was a somewhat practical approach because they had a number of widely circulating publications and outlets to get information about snitches out. They also were followed closely by the radical left and had access to a staggering number of mediums to report to the broader cultures of resistance. It was certainly agreeable to the ideals of the BPP, which claimed to be the voice of specific communities and saw itself as a community-based organization. Tactically, the record speaks for itself. There were a large number of snitches, many who were not named until well after the fall of the BPP, and the government --which was particularly brutal and repressive in dealing with the BPP-- never had trouble turning members affiliated with the BPP against the organization. In Chicago, for example, the number of snitches was nearly epidemic.

While the above examples are not particularly positive, they illustrate some of the difficulties we face in dealing with snitches today in our own communities --and thus the need for dialogue. However, groups like the Irish Republican Army (IRA), the Basque Separatists (ETA), and namely the WWII French Resistance Fighters (The Maquis), are positive examples of Communities in Resistance that dealt successfully with Snitch Culture. The Maquis, according to Gestapo/Vichy records, show that less than 5% of all detainees were "cooperative". William Volman, in his book, Rising Up and Rising Down, says that the Spanish --and French-- governments have "never been successful in creating a culture of informants". The key is to learn from the mistakes of the past and forge

our own response to snitches that is practical, agreeable to our core values, and tactically beneficial.

To understand why these groups --IRA, ETA and the Maquis-- were successful, we have to look not only at their formal and informal policies regarding snitches, but at the movements as a whole. There is precious little written in English about ETA, but from the few sources available, Clean Hands, Dirty Wars, it seems that ETA has been able to avoid widespread Snitch Culture by the very nature of its resistance. It is heavily family- and community-based; nearly everyone knows everyone else and every Basque community has been affected by the draconian repression of the Madrid-State. Since most Basque are deeply attached to their homeland, even the non-nationalists, the idea of snitching on neighbors and comrades is wrought with practical difficulties. Raising the stakes for squealing, neighbors, co-workers and friends would react negatively to the appearance of a snitch, and so anyone caught snitching would not only have to create a new social circle, but relocate.

The IRA put a tremendous amount of energy into prisoner support. In fact it was estimated by Gerald O'Mann that nearly a 1/3 of all money raised by the IRA was spent directly on prisoner support. The Irish nationalist concept of prison support is more extensive than ours and includes family support, the glorification of prisoners, treating ex-prisoners like returning veterans, as well as in-jail support. An IRA prisoner was even elected to parliament while still in jail! This support seriously diluted the benefits of snitching and the consequences (often violent reprisals) greatly outweighed the benefits. The IRA, more than any other group, was successful in reducing the punitive nature of incarceration.

The Maquis used a combination of violent attacks on snitches as well as "reframing" propaganda. There is much written about the beatings and shootings carried out by Maquis, but the historic record actually shows that the Maquis ability to carry out such attacks was extremely limited. They made use of very public reprisals, in no doubt due to the monopoly on news by the occupiers, which, in turn, increased their effectiveness. However, the use of violence can only be seen as a partial explanation for the success of the Maquis in resisting Snitch Culture. The Maquis used an effective propaganda that was based on the idea that they soon would be victorious, which made less attractive the cooperation with illegitimate authorities that would soon be removed. What is surprising when one reads the memoirs of resistance fighters and the historical ac-

counts of everyday French living under occupation is their firm and unshakeable belief that they would be liberated. In fact, most French not only believed they would be liberated, but liberated by the combined French Resistance forces. This belief gave legitimacy to the Maquis and made crossing them a more consequential prospect, since they believed they would come to power-- which in fact many did.

In our own present Communities of Resistance there seems to be no clear theory or discipline regarding the issue of snitches, however, as Anarchists, our inherent critique of authority and power, knowledge of security culture, and decentralized style of organizing are certainly beneficial in fighting Snitch Culture. That said, the few approaches we have used in dealing directly with snitches have not been very successful. We seem to mainly operate under some loose code somewhat akin to the "Revolutionary Discipline" of the RAF. The idea that 'Snitches get Stitches' is prevalent and agreeable to our politics, however it is impractical in that we lack the sheer numbers --both inside and outside of the jails-- to make this a reality. 'Snitches get Stitches' functions more like the WU idea of terror and with the exact same results in preventing Snitch Culture: absolutely none. Knowing this, communities have also tried the BPP model of shame, but with the recent evidence of government infiltration of radical groups and organizations, former comrades turning into collaborators with wiretaps, and friends arrested or under Grand Jury subpoenas naming names and cooperating with authorities, there is ample evidence that this too is ineffective and unlikely to stem the continuing tide of snitches.

It is easy to look at all of this and grow desperate. Snitch Culture is not a problem that can be easily solved and the very issues at the core of it run right through the heart of everything we are attempting. And perhaps that is the question and answer to this issue: what are we attempting? Why are some groups, like ETA, the IRA, or The Maquis able to successfully deny attempts by those in power to fracture and break their cultures of resistance? Why do Anarchists, with the goals of destroying power and creating a new world of freedom and mutual aid, turn into 'cooperating witnesses' and sacrifice not just their dreams but those of the communities they belong to?

These are the questions we must ask ourselves if we want to build Communities of Resistance that will hopefully, one day, win. We must think of ways to strengthen our communities of autonomous individuals and

build a resistance that is effective and sustainable in the long-term, instead of the current haphazard and reactive scrambling to each and every blow of government repression.

What we can learn from the Communities of Resistance that were successful in defeating Snitch Culture is that they believed wholeheartedly in their struggle. Those that were actively fighting, as well as those who supported them, did not see any choice but to liberate themselves from illegitimate authority and therefore saw themselves individually as part of something larger. This should not be read as a call for individuals to sacrifice themselves on the altar of the collective, but to illustrate that people who believe in what they are fighting for, and identify themselves personally with the success or failure of that fight, are less likely to betray that struggle because that struggle IS them.

However, it must be said that it is probably easier for people to identify intimately with national liberation struggles that have --in a sense-- simpler goals, than with something as complex and far-reaching as Anarchy. The Maquis wanted to overthrow the Nazi-collaborator Vichy government and to oust the German occupiers from France. The IRA wants to kick the English out of Ulster. ETA wants autonomy from Spain and France and to preserve the Basque language and culture. These groups are fighting against one particular source of power, whereas Anarchists are struggling to destroy all power.

Considering the fact that Anarchy is more than just the liberation from one particular illegitimate authority and there as many battlefields as there are stars in the sky, it can become easy to feel disillusioned or ineffective. After all, authority and capitalism still exist and we are drowned in the propaganda that we have reached the End of History; that the Way Things Are will continue unabated, forever. Snitches in Communities of Resistance are often people whose identity with the struggle for total liberation has become fractured, or those who, in the face of the repressive power of the state, betray their communities because they feel there is little chance those communities can win.

If we are to defeat Snitch Culture in our Communities of Resistance, we must refute the propaganda of those in power. It means tearing up the history books because the end is not predetermined by anyone but us. The ways and means of building a resistance that can refute their history and can engage in a sustainable and long-term struggle for freedom,

are the same ones needed to give Snitch Culture the final blow. Clearly, this is not as simple as the suggestion 'Snitches get Stitches,' but is the proverbial open-can-of-worms.

As detailed earlier, there have been plenty of failed experiments in dealing with the issue of snitches and the current epidemic of snitching cannot be stopped through random beatings or through the prospect of terror. While violence against snitches or collaborators may be necessary (the very public targeting of snitches utilized by the Maquis could prove useful) it is generally harmful or useless in ending Snitch Culture. Not only can the State outmatch us in terms of the violence it can expend, rendering moot a wholesale campaign of violent reprisals --as in the case of the RAF-- it also seems counter to our politics of freedom to use the idea of terror to coerce people into line and could put off sympathetic or interested individuals --much like the WU did. This should not be read as a dismissal of the tactic of violence in our resistance, but as strong critique of violence as a useful tool in combating Snitch Culture.

What has the greatest possibility of working --although it currently does not-- is community shame coupled with prisoner support. Community shame has the benefit of not being irrevocable --how can you make amends for shooting or beating someone terribly if it turns out they were wrongly accused?-- as well as providing a powerful disincentive for snitches by denying them friendship and support. Prisoner support is obviously positive in that it helps remove the power of violence that the State holds over people. Prisoners who feel supported and know they will be cared for have less reason to abandon their principles and betray their friends. Coupled together, a strategy of strong communities of autonomous individuals that will not allow collaborators back in, along with a prisoner support in which the benefits of not snitching far outweigh any measure put forth by the State, seems to be the best course of action. Presently, however, these tactics have proved ineffective in the prevention of Snitch Culture. Snitches know that they will be reviled by some, but they can remain in our communities by moving to where they may be anonymous or because there are people who will not ostracize them and allow them to return. And even though our prisoner support is one of our strongest attributes, it fails to be the lynchpin that prevents Snitch Culture, mainly because it is limited in scope.

What this leads us back to is the idea of building stronger communities

capable of long-term resistance to the powers of the State. Community shame and prisoner support lack their necessary bite precisely because our Communities of Resistance are fractured, with no real communication or trust amongst groups. In tightly-knit societies like the Basque, snitches have nowhere to go because word will travel and they would face social isolation wherever they go. Shame only works when communities can communicate in a way that is informative and trustworthy. Without information about snitches, communities cannot take steps to isolate or shame that person; and without trust, communities have no idea if the information is reliable or that others will also take steps to ostracize a snitch.

In terms of prisoner support, our current Communities of Resistance offer a heartfelt support; however, due to our lack of infrastructure and support outside of traditional Anarchist circles, we cannot provide the all-encompassing prisoner support of the IRA. For instance, in most cases, we cannot offer jobs, money to families, or pay for legal representation. Most prisoners are shunted from public view and only a few are known on a national or international basis. On the contrary, IRA prisoners were glorified and at the height of the Troubles, the majority of the murals in IRA neighborhoods were dedicated to celebrating prisoners and their deeds. The culture of prisoner support in the IRA fostered an environment that made it desirable to not snitch, a desire based on a total community support for the prisoner and family. With some exceptions, this is something that we cannot currently provide.

Where this leaves us is on the brink of a solution. While we do seem to utilize the effective tactics in combating Snitch Culture --prisoner support and community shame-- they are not actually effective in stopping it. Snitch Culture is not an isolated problem, as mentioned earlier, but an interrelated issue with other problems facing our Communities of Resistance. It comes as no shock to hear that our communities are fragmented and that there is little communication or mutual aid between them. The same also goes for the lack of infrastructure or support of people not traditionally identified with Anarchists or other radical groups. We must seriously and critically examine our communities and search for ways that we can do things better, not just to defeat Snitch Culture, but to win!

The way to strengthen our communities and increase our resistance to Snitch Culture would begin by practicing real mutual aid. Very few

groups actually work together in a way that is interrelated and that would actually help build our counter-infrastructure. For instance, people interested in identifying and gathering wild edibles could work with Food Not Bombs to provide food for people and lessen our dependence on even the trash of capitalism (trash that hopefully will no longer be around one day!), groups in different cities could pool money and have benefits to pay for the legal costs of prisoners in other places, and those choosing not to work could help provide daycare for working people who have to. The ways in which we can work together and support each other are limitless, and working together on projects and actions is a simple but unrivaled way to build trustworthy lines of communication based on experience-- as well as creating networks of autonomous communities that support each other and would not tolerate a snitch among them.

Infrastructure is important if we are to provide support for people in prison that would actually function as a deterrent to snitching. For instance, we cannot give people jobs --if they want them-- when they are out, or provide for people's families if they are put away. The counter-infrastructure we do have is largely based on entertainment, and while this is a positive thing in our communities, we must move beyond this into other territory. For many obvious reasons, creating an infrastructure that does not rely on capitalism, but is our very own, is absolutely vital to our ability to wage effective resistance.

We must also address the lack of support for our resistance in communities outside of Anarchist circles. One way other Communities of Resistance have been effective is that they had a large network of support in larger society. Besides the obvious, this larger support functioned as a way to propel resistance and created a climate of hope --a climate that Snitch Culture does not function very well in. This lack of support may be due to the fact that our definition of Anarchist culture is rather narrow. Although not true in the least, the image of Anarchists as young black-clad punks certainly does persist and is to an extent perpetuated by Anarchist culture. Anarchists should proudly proclaim themselves, but should also move beyond the stereotype and show our many faces: young and old, queer and straight, crusty and freshly-showered.

It should be clear that there is no simple solution to the persistence of Snitch Culture in our Communities of Resistance. This zine set out to begin a dialog on how we can destroy Snitch Culture once and for all. As we have seen, we may currently be unable to prevent snitches in our

fight for liberation because we lack the community support and infrastructure we need. This does not mean that we should ever, ever condone snitching. Snitching represents the most vile betrayal of one's self and one's community and although we may not be able to prevent Snitch Culture now, this does not mean that we should not continue in the active removal of snitches from our communities at present and withdraw support from all collaborators immediately. But now we know that this is not enough. To eradicate Snitch Culture we must set ourselves upon the task of building a long-term resistance that can withstand the attacks of power, and that will take time and a lot of hard work. We must create strategies that look beyond today and will allow us to proactively deal with State repression, not only to defeat Snitch Culture, but to create a world of our desires.

NO COMPROMISE!

SNITCHPROTOCOL

from No Compromise Issue 21

The following serves as the official statement of No Compromise in regards to snitches within the animal liberation movement.

Since its inception, No Compromise has endeavored to foster a strong grassroots community in which organizations that support the underground can become more effective through networking with like-minded groups. We have always felt it our obligation to provide the activist community with accurate and reliable information regarding animal liberation activities. To this end, No Compromise has strived to serve as a resource that educates our movement about the underground warriors who take direct action against those who exploit and murder animals. We believe these efforts are integral to sustaining an effective, long-lasting movement that aims to end the perpetual bondage and suffering of our animal sisters and brothers. Snitches and collaborators critically undermine these efforts and jeopardize the integrity of our movement. When faced with such a threat from within, there can be no indecision; there can be no ambiguity as to what is inexcusable and unacceptable.

It is worth mentioning that No Compromise has received letters from Justin Samuel regarding his cooperation with government authorities and in-

formation he provided to them about his alleged involvement with Peter past fur farm raids. Mr. Samuel desires that we publish these letters--in part, as an attempt to justify and yet apologize for his actions. No Compromise will not publish these letters. Whatever the circumstances, and however unfortunate they may be, one thing is clear: he provided government agents with incriminating information about Peter Young. Mr. Samuel has served his time in prison. Peter Young is still on the run. Justin Samuel violated one of the fundamental principles of this movement and thus has no place and no voice in this movement. It is that simple, and we will give no credence to the issue.

No Compromise sets forth the following protocol regarding snitches, activists-turned-informants, and collaborators:

First and foremost, a snitch is any person who implicates other activists as having participated in illegal or underground action. Someone who knowingly and intentionally provides information to further a law enforcement investigation into the movement and/or its members--no matter the reason--will be labeled as a snitch.

In this time of government and private interest reprisals against the movement, it is crucial that we come to understand the serious ramifications of cooperation with law enforcement--police officers, detectives, FBI agents, or other government agents operating in a similar capacity. Activists should never, under any circumstances, provide information or names of other activists to the authorities.

Infiltrators, private investigators and law firms hired by animal abusers are emerging as entities seeking information for lawsuits aimed at disrupting the movement. Those of us within the movement should make every effort imaginable to avoid aiding, knowingly or unwittingly, in the witch-hunts conducted by those entities as well.

It is necessary to reiterate that No Compromise and the animal liberation movement condemn those who have turned their backs on the animals in order to save their own skins. Collaboration with the State is unacceptable, and snitches will receive absolutely no support--financial, legal, moral, or otherwise.

It is NEVER acceptable to provide information about other activists to our opposition, no matter how benign such information may seem. The claim

that, "I only told them what they already knew" is a wholly unacceptable and ignorant excuse. When in doubt, it is best to remain silent rather than potentially harm another activist.

Sometimes there is uncertainty as to whether an activist has crossed the line in dealings with law enforcement. Unfortunately, there is no simple litmus test in which activists who inform on others turn from green to red. But the severity of the circumstances cannot simply be avoided because it makes us uneasy as individuals.

More often than not, the collaborator will be a friend--someone once close and trusted. Turning one's back on a friend and casting him/her out is never an easy undertaking. But realize that if one truly believes in animal liberation, a snitch is no friend to the animals and cannot be a friend to the movement. The threat that snitches pose to the movement cannot be overstated, and one's dealings with a snitch cannot be clouded by emotion or personal sentiment.

In such instances where the facts are less than clear, every effort should be made to ascertain the truth through court records, police reports, and through the words and behavior of the activist in question. Condemnation should not come without cautious consideration and deliberation. While the alleged informant should be provided every opportunity to account for his/her actions, deference should be given to the activist or activists who are affected by the words and actions of the alleged informant. Ultimately, the integrity of the movement should be of the utmost concern.

Snitches act out of fear and self-interest. The self-interested individual will undoubtedly clash with the interests of the animals, and in a movement that places innocent life above all else, there can be no acceptance of those whose self-interest jeopardizes the lives of animals and activists alike. A weak movement cannot bring about animal liberation.

Additionally, such activists-turned-traitors will not be welcomed back into the movement with their shedding of crocodile tears. In no way will No Compromise serve as a forum for snitches to "explain" their reasoning or justify their treachery. No Compromise is a magazine and tool of supporters of direct action, not a medium to debate the self-serving actions of snitches.

Furthermore, No Compromise will not list groups "In the Trenches" that allow informants to operate within their organization. One of the requirements for groups to be listed "In the Trenches" has always been that they support the A.L.F., and No Compromise would be doing an incredible disservice to the underground by promoting organizations that harbor informants. To do so would essentially encourage other groups and new activists to work with those individuals who pose a serious and direct threat to the strength of this movement.


In the face of growing government repression, it is becoming ever clearer that we need a strong, solid movement. Allowing an activist environment that overlooks such destructive behavior as snitching will be the demise of the animal liberation movement. There is no place for snitches in a revolutionary movement. There can be no acceptance of those who have turned their back on the animals and their human allies.


The animal liberation movement can only succeed within a security culture. No Compromise whole-heartedly condemns the cowardly actions of those who violate our most basic and fundamental tenets. These principles exist for the express purpose of protecting the freedom of those warriors working directly to end the oppression of animals where illegal direct action is often the only path towards freedom. In their own self-interest, snitches destroy this hope of liberation, and we have no place to excuse their grave offenses.

No Compromise has no desire to create a movement "witch hunt," as doing so would be playing into the hands of our adversaries. At the same time, we ask those who suspect another activist of having cooperated with the State to contact No Compromise directly so that we can properly confirm whether or not the suspicions are founded. In fairness to the accused and to prevent the spread of unsubstantiated and demoralizing rumors, contact No Compromise so that the truth can be obtained quickly and equitably with the least amount of disruption within our ranks.

In order to reinforce our defenses we must locate, isolate, and dispose of the weak links in the chain. Snitches are the weak links in our movement and must be treated accordingly. There can be no room--no tolerance--for those who pose a direct threat to our movement's vitality and our goal of total and lasting animal liberation.

SNITCH GALLERY





On Feb. 15 2001 in Suffolk County, New York, Connor Cash, 19, plead not guilty to charges of arson and arson conspiracy in connection with the Long Island, New York arsons. Also charged with arson conspiracy were Matthew Rammelkamp, 16, Jared McIntyre, 17, and George Mashkow Jr., 17. Conner Cash, of Sound Beach, was charged with conspiring with the others to burn the Mount Sinai homes on Dec. 30 2000. Prosecutors said he procured the gasoline for the incendiary devices and instructed the others to carry out the torching because as an adult, he feared he would face greater penalties if caught. Rammelkamp and the two others were accused of carrying out the Dec. 9 arson of four new homes in Middle Island and plotting to torch a Center Moriches duck farm and a McDonald's in Miller Place. Matthew and Jared were also charged with the torching of the Mount Sinai homes.

Matthew T. Rammelkamp

http://www.myspace.com/veganmatt
AIM SN is dfyg69gogogo

Jared McIntyre

The son of a New York City police sergeant was sentenced to 3 1/2 years in prison and ordered to pay more than $300,000 in than $300,000 in damages. His father was not able to attend the trial because he was in Iraq training their new police force. While awaiting sentencing Jared was beaten so badly by another inmate that he had to be confined to a wheel chair while in Nassau County jail in East Meadow, New York. Before he went to prison he was engaged to be married.

Jared was also charged, along with George, for the Dec. 19 torching of a home under construction in Miller Place. In a plea bargain with prosecutors, George Mashkow and Matthew Rammelkamp, plead guilty as adults and agreed to cooperate with investigations into the ELF and ALF. Jared McIntyre also pleaded guilty to arson conspiracy. In May 2004 a Federal Jury acquitted Conner Cash of all charges.

George Mashkow III

Was the first to turn informant in the case against Conner Cash but did not testify at the trial. He was sentenced to 366 days in prison.

On October 18, 2002, an indictment was filed against Jacob D.B. Sherman and Michael J. Scarpitti (AKA Tre Arrow) charging them with violations of destruction of property by fire. On April 7, 2004, a 14-count superseding indictment was filed against Scarpitti, charging him with destruction of property by fire, interference with commerce by means of extortion, use and possession of incendiary destructive devices, specifically milk jugs containing gasoline during and in relation to a crime of violence. On June 12, 2003, the indictment against Sherman was dismissed. Sherman, who originally faced up to 40 years in jail, signed a plea bargain requiring a prison sentence of only 41 months.



After spending a month in jail awaiting trial, Sherman decided to pin the fire on his former friend Tre Arrow and claim that he acted under Arrow's influence, which allowed him to successfully reduce his sentence to three years. Arrow was not known publicly to be a suspect prior to this and is currently fighting extradition from Canada back to the United States. www.trearrow.org/

JACOB SHERMAN

Jacquelyn Laux

Former girlfriend of Jacob Sherman and the daughter of a deputy Oregon State fire marshal. She turned in Jacob after he admitted to her that he had burned logging trucks.



Harrison David Burrows of Provo, Utah turned snitch on Josh Demmitt www.supportjosh.org/ for the July 8, 2004, A.L.F. arson at Brigham Young University in Utah. He was sentenced to 2 1/2 years in prison. He is expected to be released as soon as September 2006.

JESSICA SANDHAM

In early June 1992, the ALF entered the labs at the University of Alberta (Canada), liberating 29 cats and causing over $100,000 in damage.
Shortly thereafter, Darren Thurston and a friend of his, Grant, were arrested for allegedly participating in the raid. An arrest warrant was subsequently issued for the arrest of David Barbarash.

The three were charged after police contacted Jessica Michelle Charlotte Sandham, who had rented the motel room where the cats were taken after the raid. Police identified Sandham as a suspect in the U of A raid after her name was located in the motel registry and she was determined to be an animal rights activist. During her 4 ½-hour interview with police, Sandham fell for the standard police tricks and traps. In the end, she talked freely about all she knew, including rumors about the U of A raid. She never served any time in jail for her part in the action.

Those she turned on, however, did suffer. Although Grant's charges were dismissed for lack of evidence, Thurston eventually served two years in prison. Barbarash disappeared underground but was later arrested in California and extradited to Canada, where he was found guilty of participating in the raid and served two years in prison. Both Barbarash and Thurston maintain they would have likely never been identified by police if Sandham had not turned snitch.

Robyn Weiner and Alan Hoffman

In the early morning hours of Sunday, March 30th, 1997, five Michigan animal rights activists were arrested for allegedly raiding a Canadian mink farm. According to media reports, at Ebert's Fur Farm, fences were cut, breeding cards were removed from cages and 1,500 mink were released, effectively costing the fur farmer half a million dollars.
Those charged in the mink raid were Patricia Dodson, Hilma Ruby, Robyn Weiner, Gary Yourofsky and Alan Hoffman. All five were charged with breaking and entering, as well as criminal mischief. Robyn and Alan were also charged with possession of stolen property (breeding cards), and Patricia was charged with possession of burglary tools.
Within two weeks after the arrest, two of the defendants–Alan Hoffman and Robyn Weiner– made damaging statements to the police that were read in court. Alan, Youroufsky's uncle, gave an alleged blow-by-blow account of everyone's actions (including the scouting out of farms in the U.S.), and Robyn's statement included the implication of one of the other activists in a previous raid. While Robyn claimed her informing was in everyone's best interests, the reality is that her betrayal seriously compromised her co-defendant's legal defenses.
With 2 of the 5 defendants turned informants, the remaining defendants, "the Chatham 3," continued to fight the case. In the end, Dodson and Ruby pleaded guilty and received 90 days in jail and a $24,000 fine. Yourofsky took his case to trial, where he was found guilty and sentenced to 6 months in jail plus $34,000 in restitution for his part in the raid. As for Hoffman and Weiner, they incurred hefty fines and community service in addition to the scorn of the animal rights community.
Robyn Weiner is, as of this writing, living in Maryland near Washington D.C. where she periodically shows up at animal rights-related events. No information is available on Alan Hoffman, but it is believed he is no longer involved in the animal rights movement.



Jennifer Kolar

jkolar@flyingsails.com, jkolar@speakeasy.net

Jen is a cooperating witness in the ongoing case against the 11 animal rights advocates and environmentalists who are charged with committing a string of arsons in the Pacific North West between 1996 and 2001. She is expected to testify against Jonathan Paul and possibly others at their trial. A trial date has been set for October 31st before Federal Judge Anne Aiken in Eugene, but that date may be changed.

Jennifer is a Washington native, originally from Spokane, and has lived in Seattle 8 years. She has been racing in Puget Sound in the Performance 30 fleet for almost six years, four of those on Manta Ray, an Olson 911 SE sail number 45 she co-owns with Jonathan Reichhold (reichhold@singingfish.com). She has also sailed on other P30 boats in the past.

Jennifer has been the Coordinator of the Performance 30 fleet for the last two years and the chair of the Corinthian Yacht Club (CYC) of Seattle Large Boat Racing Fleet for one year. She is a very active sailor and sails nearly every race in the sound at Shilshole as well as competing in South Sound, Whidbey, Swiftsure, Cow Bay and other area regattas. She was nominated to be a member of the CYC board of Directors for 2006.


Corinthian Yacht Club of Seattle: Leschi Club House
7755 Seaview Ave NW Seattle WA 98117 /Phone: (206) 789-1919 /Fax: (206) 789-5896
Email: cycsea@eskimo.com
Last known employer: Singingfish/1000 Dexter Ave N, Suite 300/Seattle, WA 98109 /Tel: (206) 268-7500/Fax: (206) 268-7793

THE ELLERMAN BROTHERS

On March 11, 1997, ALF activists entered the grounds of the Fur Breeders Agricultural Cooperative in Sandy, Utah. A pipe bomb and incendiary materials were placed inside the co-op, while five pipe bombs were placed beneath commercial transport trucks outside the facility. At approx. 2 am, all six devices exploded, causing $1 million in property damage. There were no injuries. In June 1997, a federal grand jury handed down a 16 count indictment against activist Douglas Joshua Ellerman, who later pleaded guilty to 3 counts and was sentenced to 7 years in prison. In September 1998, further federal indictments were issued in the bombing case against Clinton Colby Ellerman, Josh's younger brother; Andrew N. Bishop; Alexander David Slack; Adam Troy Peace; Sean Albert Gautschy and one other person. The info for these indictments was garnered from statements made to law enforcement by the Ellerman brothers and fellow snitch Kevin Clark.

Colby Ellerman went on to serve six years in federal prison, during which time the three remaining defendants went to trial, and were acquitted.

The Ellerman brothers have been released from prison and are believed to be residing in Utah. The activist community has shunned them.



Anna Davies

a.k.a. "Anna Addison"

Anna is an FBI informant who was paid $75,000 plus expenses over the course of the two years during which she infiltrated various anarchist groups and events. She was a key member of an alleged Earth Liberation Front cell and provided housing for alleged ELF plotters Eric McDavid, Lauren Weiner, and Zachary Jensen, in a cabin which, unbeknownst to them, was rented by the FBI and was specially equipped with audio and video surveillance equipment. Anna also wore a concealed wire in order to record conversations with the three. The three were arrested in Auburn, California, near Sacramento on January 13th 2006. The FBI claims that they were making explosives and that they planned on blowing up a dam, cell phone towers and other targets.

Anna is said to have been a key witness in 12 other anarchist cases. She attended the e Bio-Democracy protests in Philadelphia in June 2005 and attended both the Crimethinc. convergence in Indiana and the Feral Visions gathering outside Asheville.

It was also discovered that this informant made an attempt to get involved with the Pittsburgh Organizing Group (POG) and attended one or two of their meetings ahead of the 2004 Democratic National Convention in Boston. She told POG that she had been involved with the G8 Organizing Committee in Georgia as a direct action outreach coordinator. She wanted to get involved with organizing for the DNC in Boston, and was supposedly talking to various groups about merging "talents and our outreach, [to] put a little more bang in the DNC actions." She also attended the Organization of American States meeting in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.

She often changes her hair by dying it, or with extensions and braids. She has a grim reaper tattoo on her right shoulder blade. She used the email addresses annadavies99@yahoo.com, annaforever9@hotmail.com, and maintained a MySpace account which is no longer active.

If anyone has ever met "Anna", please contact sacprisonersupport@riseup.net so they can direct you to the defense lawyers. Information on the CS will likely be a deciding factor in this case.


Jacob Ferguson was the original notorious "cooperating source" (CS), later known as "cooperating witness 1" (CW1) in the Pacific Northwest Earth Liberation Front case which has resulted in 11 indictments thus far. Six people were originally arrested on Dec. 7th 2005, including Chelsea Gerlach, Daniel McGowan, Bill Rodgers, Kevin Tubbs, Kendal Tankersly, a.k.a. Sarah Harvey and Stanislas Meyerhoff. Meyerhoff began expressing remorse and agreed to cooperate at his first detention hearing and Kevin Tubbs and Kendall Tankersly agreed to cooperate later. Bill Rodgers was found dead in his cell before he could be transferred to Oregon. It is widely believed that he took his own life. Many hold Jake accountable for his death.


Kevin Tubbs

On January 20th the FBI announced a total of 11 indictments in the case. Jen Kolar has admitted to being on of five cooperating witnesses on which the case depends. Suzanne Savoie and Jonathan Paul have since been arrested, but are out on bail as is Daniel McGowan and Kendal Tankersly. Kendal has strict bail restriction. She is living in Arizona and is required to be under the supervision of her mother or another person at all times.


Kendall Tankersly

Jake Ferguson usually wears a hat because he's going bald and has a tattoo on his head. He's put on a lot of weight since those pictures was taken. He is about 300 pounds which is a side affect of Methadone. He has a belly but is not really obese. He has lots of tattoos, maybe sleeves. He's tall. He is driving a new SUV. He lives in Eugene but was evicted after all his windows were busted out when it was revealed he turned snitch. He probably turned informant after he was caught for one of the arsons. There were regular grand juries held in Eugene and there were people who used to be friends with him that testified.



Stanislas Meyerhoff

Jake has a ten year old son that lives with his mom. Jake sees his son often, but no longer has a relationship with his son's mother. She supports the individuals who were arrested and regularly attends court dates as a supporter. Jake has a new girlfriend. As of late January 2006 he was staying at the Eugene Hilton presumably on the FBI's dime. Some have speculated that after all the other trials are over Jacob will go to trial too, but as of now his indictment is sealed and he is kept on a short leash by the FBI.



Jacob Fergusen





Last known address:
Eugene Hilton/ 66 East 6th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon/ 97401-2667
Tel: +1-541-342-2000
Fax: +1-541-342-6661
http://www.eugene.hilton.com/

HEATHER COURTNEY & MAURICIO DE LA VEGA (MO)

Heather was arrested in connection with a Dec 30 2004 protest of Seaboard Securities, Juno Beach, Florida office. Seaboard Securities was a target of the anti-animal testing Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) campaign, but ceased trading stocks in the company shortly after the protest. During the demonstration activists entered the office with leaflets, signs and a bullhorn and became involved in violent confrontation. Heather was arrested and provided evidence against Tim Hitchins, who later turned himself in and pled guilty in a plea arrangement. Mauricio De La Vega a student at the Florida International University was also arrested with Heather and cooperated with prosecutors.

According to Heather's MySpace profile http://profile.myspace.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=user.viewprofile&friendID=19971665&Mytoken=20050820212634 She was born in Belfast, Northern Ireland in late January 1979. It also says that she plays the guitar and drink but does not smoke. She has a Bachelor's Degree from the University of Florida and began attending Parsons School of Design (part of the New School University) in 2004 where she is studying photography. She was last known to be living in New York City and may live in Brooklyn. Her cell phone number is 954-298-5704

JUSTIN SAMUEL

In October 1997, the ALF took credit for raids on five fur farms in Wisconsin and surrounding states. Thousands of mink were released, and it is estimated over one million dollars of damage was caused.

Justin Samuel and Peter Young www.supportpeter.com/ were pulled over by police in the vicinity of the farms after suspicious fur farmers contacted authorities. A vehicle search allegedly yielded animal rights literature, as well as other "suspicious" items. In September 1998, a federal grand jury indicted the duo on charges of animal enterprise terrorism and unlawful interference with interstate commerce. Both Samuel and Young went underground and nothing was heard from the two until September 4, 1999, when Samuel was arrested in Belgium and eventually extradited to the U.S. to face criminal charges.

Despite an enormous outpouring of support from the activist community, on August 30, 2000, Samuel entered into a plea agreement with the U.S. Attorney's office in which he implicated Peter Young (his co-defendant) and promised to "make a full, complete, truthful statement regarding his involvement...in violations in the original Indictment, as well as the involvement of all other individuals known to him regarding the crimes charged in that Indictment. And the defendant agrees to testify fully and truthfully at any trials or hearings."

Samuel served two years in prison and as of late 2005 was free and living in San Diego, California. Despite repeated efforts to reintegrate himself into the animal rights movement, most activists and organizations have shunned him as a snitch welcomed Justin back with open arms, notably David Arganoff who served jail time himself in the summer of 2005 after he refused to testify before a Grand Jury regarding the ELF.

Samuel's cowardice is responsible both for his own conviction as well as Peter Young's. Peter was apprehended in March 2004, after evading authorities for nearly 8 years. Ironically Peter received the same sentence as Justin because some of a US Supreme Court ruling that redefined some of the original charges and had to be thrown out.

SUPPORT POLITICAL PRISONERS!

THEY ARE IN THERE FOR US! SO WE ARE OUT HERE FOR THEM!

Letters are one incredibly easy way to show your support for prisoners. Take a few moments out of your day and write a letter –it will make their day!

Daniel McGowan
Please check web site for most current address.
www.supportdaniel.org

Peter Young
#10269-111
FCI Victorville Medium II
Federal Correctional Institution
PO Box 5700
Adelanto, CA 92301
www.supportpeter.com

Josh Demmitt
#12314-081
Federal Prison Camp Sheridan
P.O. Box 6000
Sheridan, OR 97378
www.supportjosh.org

Chelsea Gerlach
#1308678
Lane County Jail
101 West 5th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401
www.supportchelsea.org

Darren Thurston
#701415
Multnomah County Inverness Jail
11540 NE Inverness Dr.
Portland, OR 97220

Tre Arrow
CS# 05850722
Vancouver Island Regional Correction Center
4216 Wilkinson Rd.
Victoria, BC, V8Z 5B2
Canada
www.trearrow.org

Eric McDavid
X-2972521 4W114A
Sacramento County Main Jail
651 "I" Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Zachary Jenson
X-4198632 7E213A
Sacramento County Main Jail
651 "I" Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
in urgent need of funds



THIS ZINE BROUGHT TO YOU BY THE

SKETCH CREW!