

Memphis jury finds conspiracy in Martin Luther King assassination

by Edward Spannaus

In an historic victory for truth and justice, a jury of 12 ordinary citizens in Memphis has determined that a far-reaching conspiracy, involving agencies of the United States government, was responsible for the 1968 assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. This verdict forever dispels and discredits the “lone assassin” version of events, which has been the official story-line on the King murder for the past 30 years.

The dramatic verdict came in a wrongful-death civil suit, filed last year by the family of the slain civil rights leader. The principal defendant in the suit was Loyd Jowers, a retired Memphis businessman who has said that he hired the actual killer of Dr. King. The suit was also brought against other “unknown co-conspirators.” In 1993, Jowers stated publicly that James Earl Ray did not shoot Martin Luther King, but that he, Jowers, had hired a gunman, and that he had been paid \$100,000 to facilitate the assassination. Jowers also stated that he had been approached by a man named “Raoul,” who gave him a rifle—which was the rifle used to frame Ray.

The evidence presented by King family attorney William Pepper convinced the 12 jurors that the assassination was the product of a multi-level conspiracy, involving the Memphis Police Department and local mafia types, combined with U.S. Army intelligence agencies, the FBI, and elements of the CIA, on the Federal level. Pepper is the author of a 1995 book, *Orders To Kill*, which documented the role of military intelligence, the FBI, and others in the assassination plot. (The book was reviewed in the Dec. 8, 1995 issue of *EIR*.)

At the center of the conspiracy is “Raoul,” the shadowy figure who was the actual controller of James Earl Ray, the drifter who was set up as the patsy in the assassination. Although the anti-conspiracy theorists have always denied that Raoul ever existed, Pepper not only proved beyond doubt that Raoul exists, but he presented testimony that Raoul’s family had stated that they are under U.S. government protection!

Although Pepper did not develop this aspect during the trial, Raoul was in fact linked to the British Intelligence-sponsored “Permindex” assassination bureau, which was prominently implicated in the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Last year, a former FBI agent disclosed that he had found

two scraps of paper in the car abandoned by Ray after the assassination, which had money figures on them and contained the name “Raul” (see *EIR*, April 10, 1998). One of the pieces of paper was a page of the Dallas, Texas phone directory with the number of the night club in Dallas which had been owned by Jack Ruby, the low-level mobster who shot and killed Lee Harvey Oswald, the comparable patsy in the JFK assassination.

Media attacks King family

Within days of the verdict in Memphis, the major news media let loose a vile stream of invective against Pepper and the King family. The *Washington Post* called the trial a “sham.” It termed the verdict “discredited,” called attorney Pepper “a conspiracy theorist,” and accused the King family of “self-deception and an abuse of the legal system.” It called the effort to rewrite the story of King’s death a “deceit of history” comparable to denying the Holocaust.

The *Post* also ran a guest commentary by professional conspiracy-debunker Gerald Posner, who called the trial a “cynical sham,” and threatened the King family that if they persist, this will only “permanently damage their credibility.”

The *New York Times* published a commentary by former Justice Department official Nathan Lewin, who argued that the verdict was worthless, because the defendant Jowers didn’t defend himself; Lewin lied that the King family didn’t call Jowers as a witness, when they could have cross-examined him. (In fact, Jowers had agreed to testify, and later reneged, advising the King family and their lawyer that he would assert his Fifth Amendment privilege and refuse to testify.)

None of the editorials or commentary writers dealt with the evidence actually presented over the four weeks of trial, nor did their papers give any significant coverage to the trial itself. In the interests of making that material more widely available, we include below substantial excerpts from Pepper’s summation at the conclusion of the trial. The summation is preceded by excerpts of an *EIR* interview with attorney Pepper, in which Pepper describes the case, and handily deals with the attacks on him and the King family by the news media.

'We showed there was a government conspiracy'

Dr. William Pepper, the attorney for the King family who tried the case surrounding the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was interviewed on Dec. 13, by EIR Law Editor Edward Spannaus.

EIR: Tell me what you accomplished by holding the trial.

Pepper: It's going to cause history to be rewritten. The jury heard about 70 witnesses over a month, they took one hour to deliberate at the end of a month-long trial, and they obviously found in our favor, that there was an extensive conspiracy—of course, that Jowers was involved, but also an extensive conspiracy by government agents to assassinate Martin Luther King, Jr.

EIR: What did you show in terms of the military, FBI—the elements that you wrote about in your book?

Pepper: We showed that, first of all, the 111th Military Intelligence Group was in Memphis. A Memphis Police Department [MPD] intelligence official had had them in his office. So, that kind of surveillance was going on.

EIR: Did you have testimony to that effect?



Attorney William Pepper and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1967. Pepper is today the attorney for the King family, in their effort to end the cover-up of the assassination of Dr. King.

Pepper: Oh, yes. The guy took the stand, he admitted it. Another former intelligence official, a former MPD intelligence officer took the stand, and confirmed that he had been working with Federal agents in the covert surveillance—which was only conducted by the Army Security Agency, and that they had the Rivermont suite of Martin Luther King bugged.

We put the captain of the fire station on the stand—first time he'd ever testified. He had never been interviewed: police, law enforcement—nobody ever talked to this guy, who was the captain of the fire station. And he confirmed that he had put the two Army psychological operations guys up on the roof, and they photographed everything. It's obvious why they never interviewed this guy—he tells you, that “you've got to go get the photographs.” Those photographs exist, photographs of the whole assassination. . . .

Prof. Clay Carson, who is the head of the King Archives project on the West Coast, who has started to receive my files, my working papers, on the search for the military involvement, took the stand, and he did a Q&A with me on the contents of the documents, a whole set of documents that I sent him, which dealt with my asking questions and obtaining information around a member of the sniper team. And probably the most riveting testimony was from a National Security Council agent, Jack Terrell, who is dying of liver cancer. His deposition was shown, and he confirmed that his best friend had told him in the 1970s that he knew something about the assassination, and provided him with details of the Memphis mission, which he came to realize was aimed at the assassination of Martin Luther King.

EIR: Jowers did not testify?

Pepper: No, he was going to be our next to last witness, and he became ill after the first week, and he wasn't back in the courtroom again.

EIR: So, there originally was an agreement that he would testify?

Pepper: Oh, yeah, agreement or not, we were going to call him. . . .

EIR: That's not been in the papers either.

Pepper: No, of course not. We were calling him; I wanted him on the stand, because I had enough on him to destroy him. But then, we were going to go out and depose him, and he sent word through his lawyer, who said, well, you can come out and depose him, but “he'll just take the Fifth Amendment.” I thought it would be a waste of the court's time. So, I instead introduced

previous testimony, his previous deposition. . . .

EIR: One of the things the media, these hatchetmen, are saying, is that there are inconsistencies in his story, that he has told different stories at different times.

Pepper: Jowers has certainly told different stories at different times. Back in the beginning, he said, “Hey, no involvement at all.” He only came on to start to tell this, when he knew we had enough witnesses to indict him. But since he’s come forward, he met with Dexter [King] and me first, and then he met with Andy [Young] and Dexter, and those two stories are very consistent.

EIR: What is the current status of Raoul, the gentleman you identified as Raoul?

Pepper: He’s still alive, he’s protected, he’ll be protected until he dies. We put testimony on the stand which was staggering. I put a Portuguese journalist up, against her will, grabbed her when she was in the court and subpoenaed her, and put her on the stand, because she had interviewed a member of the family, the family had revealed to her that the only comfort they had, was that the government was giving them protection, they sent agents, giving them advice. . . .

EIR: He was just a plain old auto worker, right?

Pepper: That’s right [laughing].

EIR: What did you show or prove regarding Raoul, in the trial?

Pepper: Who he was, that he did exist, that he was a controller of James, that he was identified by a number of independent people. Wilson’s papers have his name on them, the papers that were found in the car, and of course, he comes forth in the whole Jowers side of the story, as the one who Jowers identified, who came in and picked up some money and gave Jowers a package which was the murder weapon. . . .

EIR: And that identification was through photos?

Pepper: A photographic spread, of six photographs.

EIR: All the media say, “Pepper, this wild conspiracy theorist, FBI, CIA military, this vast conspiracy”—making the whole thing sound ridiculous.

Pepper: Why didn’t the jury find it ridiculous? The jury heard all this evidence, and no matter what they say, they cannot deny the fact that a jury heard this evidence, and a jury disagrees with them. And a jury disagreed with them in about an hour’s time, after four weeks of testimony. That speaks for itself.

EIR: One of the arguments you hear in the media is that they just heard one side, it was a one-sided presentation, so naturally, they found this way.

Pepper: Well, *what is the other side?* I’d be anxious to know

what the other side is to [Fire Department] Captain Weedon’s testimony about how he put soldiers on the roof who photographed everything. And they buried the photographs. What’s the other side to that? I could go through 70 witnesses. . . . The other side was Jowers’s defense counsel, and he tried everything he could to get this case thrown out, he made a motion for a mistrial when Jowers was absent, he made a motion for a directed verdict at the end of the proof, on insufficiency, he made a motion on the statute of limitations. They did everything they could, to have the case thrown out. The judge denied everything. You don’t read that in the papers.

EIR: What kind of jury was it? What was the composition?

Pepper: It was black and white, eight men and four women, six and six, black and white; it was a mixed jury, mixed economically, ranging from bankers to day workers.

EIR: And their verdict was unanimous?

Pepper: Unanimous.

EIR: Even the banker?

Pepper: It had to be. . . .

EIR: How did you finance the trial?

Pepper: We’re still trying to raise the funds. The family helped out some. The expenses at the end of the day will come to about \$50,000. We have recorded now about \$36,000 to \$40,000. We’re probably about \$30-35,000 in the hole. . . .

Documentation

Excerpts from William Pepper’s summation, which he delivered on Dec. 8. Subheads have been added by the editors, and obvious court reporter’s errors have been corrected. Additional transcripts of the court proceedings will be available at the Martin Luther King Center’s website, www.thekingcenter.com.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SHELBY COUNTY,
TENNESSEE FOR THE THIRTIETH JUDICIAL
DISTRICT AT MEMPHIS

CORETTA SCOTT KING, et al., Plaintiffs, Case No.
vs. 97242

LOYD JOWERS, et al., Defendants.

Mr. Pepper: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. . . . You know, you’ve heard a great deal of testimony here. You also have available to you a great number of exhibits that are attached to the testimony that you have heard. . . .

The media are very quick and prompt to say and yell out that such and such is hearsay, second-hand accounts, third-hand accounts. But the media are unable to tell you, of course, what the law is with respect to hearsay evidence. They think because something is hearsay, a person is saying what another person has said, that it is not to be regarded, it is to be dismissed. In actual fact, ladies and gentlemen, if a witness is giving you hearsay, but the hearsay statement is from a person who is speaking against his own interest, saying something that could put him in jail in the case of the defendant here, could have him indicted, then that is to be taken very seriously. It is admissible, because of that exception. There are a range of other exceptions, why you can consider hearsay.

Now, it is my job, my role here this morning, to summarize the plaintiffs' case. It is a case that is divided really into nine sections. . . . Plaintiffs' case began with a section that dealt with the background, the background of all of this, why you are here, why Martin King was assassinated, why he came to Memphis before he was assassinated. . . .

Then we moved with a second area concerned, which was local conspiracy, we called it: what was happening here in Memphis, what events were going on that constituted conspiracy, legally, civil conspiracy under the law. Because that's really what we are asking you to find, is that there was a conspiracy here.

Thirdly, we dealt with the crime scene. What was this crime scene all about? Where was the crime scene? What happened there?

Fourthly, we went into the rifle. This is the murder weapon. We discussed the murder weapon, and asked you to consider all the evidence with respect to the murder weapon.

We move next to a shadowy figure called Raoul. Who is this man who was claimed to have been James Earl Ray's controller? and the role that he played in this case?

Then we move beyond that to what we have called a broader conspiracy beyond Memphis that reached into the higher levels of the government of the United States and some of its agents and officials. . . .

We went beyond that, then, into really what amounts to a cover-up. What was the cover-up activity, and why was it important, and why have these events been shielded from public view, so that only you, you twelve, fourteen here, day after day, and his Honor, alone perhaps in this broad land, have heard this evidence? . . .

Then we considered the defendant's admissions, the defendant—the named defendant in this case—his actual admissions, against his own interest, and what is in evidence with respect to that.

We moved lastly . . . to the area of damages. And there was a fair amount of testimony on damages from the members of the family with respect to what they were looking for, and what their perspective was in terms of any kind of remuneration for the loss that they have suffered. . . .

Now let's look at each of those sections. . . .

The local conspiracy

Now we move to the local conspiracy that related to the death of Martin Luther King. You've heard evidence of a very reputable 40-year-in-business store owner sit up there and tell you that he always bought—every Thursday, he went to Frank Liberto's warehouse . . . on that Thursday, April 4, he heard the owner of that place take the telephone and scream into it, "Shoot the son-of-a-bitch when he comes on the balcony," amongst other things. . . .

Then you've heard two other independent witnesses testify at different ends of the trial, one called as a witness by the defense, Mrs. Lavada Addison, who had this conversation with Mr. Liberto in her cafe when Liberto leaned over the table at a time when the Select Committee hearings were on—apparently something came on the television—and whispered to Mrs. Addison, "I arranged [to] have Martin Luther King killed." She jumped back and was shocked by this. . . . Then comes Mrs. Lavada Addison's son Nathan, who confronts Liberto, and Liberto again confirms the same thing to him. . . .

Then we have from the defendant himself [Jowers] in sessions that are before you, and you've heard testimony from Ambassador [Andrew] Young and Mr. [Dexter] King, about how he was approached and was asked to assist or become involved in this assassination again by Mr. Liberto, and how he was told that he would be visited by a man called Raoul, he would first receive some money . . . he would pass the money to Raoul, he would receive a gun; that he was asked to participate in this endeavor and he should not worry, because there would be no police around; the police would not be there.

We've heard him say that in fact he did these things, and that he received the gun after the shooting. He said he received the gun right at his back door. That's as far as he went in his admissions. . . .

Now, why would anyone say this? Is this something new? No. You heard testimony from witnesses who indicated that Mr. Jowers had said this to them years ago, as much as 20 years ago he had said this; he had said that he knew how Martin Luther King was killed. He had indicated to them that he didn't do it, but he knew how it was done, and in one case he actually told the same story way back then that he is telling now.

So, this is not some afterthought from Mr. Jowers to try to make a movie or become—have notoriety or something like that.

There were two black firemen, the only two black firemen in the fire station; they were removed. They were given orders the night before not to report for duty, but to go to another fire station. . . . Why were they removed?

You heard Jerry Williams, Captain Williams, testify that he had always formed an elite black homicide group of detectives as a bodyguard for Dr. King. The last visit, he was not asked to form that bodyguard. This was the only time he was not asked to form that bodyguard. . . .

You heard that the police were at one point around the Lorraine Motel, and then they were removed, or they just disappeared. They disappeared within a half-hour, 45 minutes of the killing. Why did they disappear? . . .

Then you heard Olivia Catling, who had never been spoken to by anyone. Olivia Catling took the stand and told about a man coming from an alley that was connected to a building that was attached to the rooming house. She saw this man coming through that alley shortly after the killing, some minutes after the killing, and getting into a 1965 Green Chevrolet that was parked on Huling, and then speeding away north on Mulberry Street right in front of the police, burning rubber as he went, with no interference whatsoever from them.

All of these things, all of these events, I submit to you profoundly, are strong evidence of the existence of a conspiracy just at the local level, not even mentioning the fact that the defendant has also indicated that planning sessions took place in his grill prior to the assassination. . . .

Now, are we conspiracy buffs because we find all of this evidence insurmountable? I think not. But you have heard it. The masses of Americans have not. And the media have never put it to them. . . .

The crime scene

The crime scene: . . . We submit that the crime scene, of course, was the back area of the rooming house. It was terribly overgrown with bushes. The bushes were thick, and they were difficult to penetrate; and that they provided an excellent sniper's lair. That's where the crime took place.

Any number of witnesses and evidence in the record indicates that a person or persons was seen in those bushes at the time of the shooting. . . . There is other evidence, again, separate independent evidence, that a person was seen jumping from the wall, jumping over the wall and running up Mulberry Street. As a result of this, we've concluded some while ago, and have tried to provide enough impetus for you to conclude, that the shot came from these bushes, and not from the bathroom window. . . .

Now, the murder weapon itself: Judge Joe Brown heard testimony and evidence in this case for about four years. He paid particular attention to the weapon, and he has had a lifetime of experience, and developed knowledge about weapons, and about rifles in particular. We qualified the judge as an expert. . . .

Judge Brown sat in that chair, and gave you . . . technical scientific reasons why that weapon in evidence is not the murder weapon—very clearly. He said, first of all, the scope was never sighted in. Because it was never sighted in, if you use that scope, to quote him, "you couldn't hit the broadside of a barn with that weapon." Remember that expression, because it was firing to the left and below the target. . . .

He said also that the death slug did not have the same metallurgical composition as existed in the lead of the other evidence bullets that were found in that bundle. . . .

Beyond this, there is evidence that you've heard that this clearly couldn't have been the murder weapon, because the defendant told a taxi driver, James McCraw, to get rid of the murder weapon, and he did so. McCraw, being a close friend of Jowers, a confidant of Jowers, took the actual murder weapon and threw it off the Memphis-Arkansas Bridge. So, it is lying at the bottom of the Mississippi River for over 31 years. The real murder weapon is at the bottom of that river.

Judge Arthur Haynes testified that he was, of course, James Earl Ray's first lawyer, along with his father, and he testified that in the course of their early on-the-scene investigation, they talked to Guy Canipe, who owned the amusement shop in front of which was found the bundle which contained, amongst other things, the rifle. He said Canipe told them very early on, before anyone else apparently had done any kind of tampering with him—told him very early on that that bundle was dropped some minutes *before* the actual shooting. . . .

'Raoul'

Now we come to Raoul, this shadowy figure who the defendant has mentioned, and who James Earl Ray has talked about, right from the beginning, as someone who controlled him. You have a number of independent people, not even knowing each other, who have identified this man from a spread of photographs that they have seen. And they range from an English merchant seaman, whom we had to depose by telephone at some length, who ran into this same Raoul at the same bar James did, up at the Neptune in Montreal.

They range from him to . . . the defendant himself, who identified Raoul from a spread of photographs . . . , and, of course, James Earl Ray, who also identified him.

If that is not enough, we have the British film producer, Jack Saltman, going to the door of Raoul's house, showing a photograph and having his daughter admit that that is the photograph of her father. . . .

Under subpoena, and reluctantly, a Portuguese journalist took the stand. She had conducted an interview with a member of the family. The member of that family had told her that this was a horror, a nightmare for them and for the family, but the one comfort they had was that the government was helping them, that the government had sent people to their home approximately three times or so, and that the government was monitoring their telephone calls, and the government was providing them with guidance. . . .

Can you imagine if anything like that happened to—if any charges were laid against any of us in those circumstances, do you think the government would come around and see us, help us, monitor our phones? . . .

Now, as I understand it, the defense had invited Raoul to appear here. He is outside this jurisdiction, so a subpoena would be futile. But he was asked to appear here. In earlier proceedings, there were attempts to depose him, and he resisted them. So, he has not attempted to come forward at all and tell his side of this story or to defend himself.

The broader conspiracy

As we move into the next area, we're concerned now about a broader conspiracy—a broader conspiracy that is two-pronged, ladies and gentlemen. On the one hand, the broader conspiracy goes beyond a shooter in the bushes who gets away with killing Martin King. It goes from him to a Mr. Jowers, who is involved in facilitating, and it goes back to Mr. Liberto, who you've heard was clearly a part of it; but it goes beyond Mr. Liberto in terms of the Mob side. . . . Carlos Marcello has been the Mob kingpin, was the Mob leader in this part of the country, for a long, long time. So, any contract, any Mob contract on Martin Luther King's life, would come from Marcello through Liberto into the local infrastructure that Marcello had here in Memphis.

Marcello himself was involved in gun running. Part of the evidence in terms of the military involvement is contained in a lengthy article that we put into evidence that appears in March of 1993 in the [Memphis] *Commercial Appeal* by Steve Tomkins. And that article indicated that there was a high-ranking general who had been charged and imprisoned for aiding and abetting the trading in stolen weapons. That deal meant what he was involved in, was the theft of guns from arsenals, armories, and camps, like Camp Shelby in Mississippi—the theft of weapons from those places that went to, were trucked to a Marcello property in New Orleans, and from the Marcello property in New Orleans were shipped around the coast into Houston. . . .

And that is where Raoul and his crowd came into the receipt of those weapons before they went into Latin and South America. . . .

Then we move directly into the government of the United States, their agents themselves. We've learned that the 111th Military Intelligence Group based at Fort McPherson in Atlanta, Georgia, were here. They were in Memphis. . . .

There was another section here that was involved in covert surveillance of Martin King. . . . That was done at the Rivermont, when he was here on the 17th or 18th. You heard a witness say he was one of three people who were effectively a surveillance team. They had Martin King's suite bugged, every room of it bugged, including the balcony. If he wanted to speak privately and went out on the balcony, they would pick it up by relay from the roof. That type of covert surveillance was carried out by another agency, usually the Army Security Agency. . . .

Then there were photographers. Remember those photographers that Captain Weeden talked about? They were on the roof of the fire station. He put them there. Who were they? They were a psychological operations team, and they were there, and they photographed everything throughout that day. . . .

But then there is another group that is more sinister. They are not more sinister because of what they did, because they didn't really do anything, but we know they had a presence. And that was a special eight-man sniper unit that was here in

Memphis. They were all part of the 20th Special Forces Group. They were here, and they were assigned, and they were trained for an operation, for a mission, in Memphis.

You heard testimony by a man who himself was a National Security Council operative who was very involved in Iran-Contra activities, who had been a long-standing operative, if you will, of the government of the United States, and whose best friend was a member of that sniper team. There was no reason in the world for his best friend, other than in a moment of whatever, anguish or burden, desire to relieve himself, to talk about this, this mission that he was on which he was assigned to in Memphis—which was aborted, but he was assigned to it.

With a Q-and-A approach you heard documents of working papers that were used to get information from other—from another source who lives south of the border, and who fled the country in the 1970s out of fear, who was also a part of that unit. So, they were there, and there are three separate sources that confirm the presence. But they did not—it was not necessary for them to do anything. The mission was aborted because the Mob contract was successful in killing Martin Luther King and framing James Earl Ray. . . .

The cover-up

The cover-up activities in this case, ladies and gentlemen, range from murder to press manipulation and distortion, with bribery in between. . . .

The next aspect of cover-up is the drastic alteration of the crime scene. What happened there? You've heard what happened. Seven o'clock in the morning, Inspector Sam Evans called Maynard Stiles, who was a public works administrator, and asked him to get a work crew out there and to cut down those bushes. They cut the bushes down.

Now, normally what one does with a crime scene, at least for quite a period of time, is to rope it off and keep people out of it, and investigate it as it is. You don't go and destroy the crime scene. . . .

There was no house-to-house investigation, ladies and gentlemen. Do you remember Judge Brown on the stand saying that this was the most deficient investigation, criminal investigation, he had ever seen as a criminal court judge?

What that means is that no policeman going and knocking on the door of all of the local residents, and asking them: did they see anything, did they hear anything, because surely if they had, they would have knocked on Olivia Catling's door, wouldn't they? She lived just down the street on Mulberry. She would have told them what she saw. But they didn't. . . .

What about Captain Weeden? My goodness! Captain of the fire station, never interviewed by local police authorities. The man who ran that installation, who was there at the time, never interviewed by the authorities. Forget about knocking on people's doors. Here is an official, he is a senior executive officer of the fire station: They didn't talk to him. . . . Were they afraid that he would have told them about the photogra-

phers on the roof? Because if he had . . . they would have then had to request those photographs. . . .

‘Let the truth reign’

Let me close by saying to you that long after people forget what has been said in this courtroom, all the words that you’ve heard from witnesses and lawyers, . . . they are going to remember what was done here. . . . They are going to remember one thing . . . the verdict of this jury, because you have heard evidence that has never before been put on in a court of law. . . .

That is why your decision at this point in time is the most significant decision that will have been taken in 31 years in terms of this case. Please don’t underestimate the importance of it. . . .

But when you look at the wealth of evidence that has come forward, and you understand how this case has been conducted, and you understand how it has been covered up, and when you see how unresponsive elected officials and government has been, and how complicit they have been, you can come to no other choice. Governmental agencies caused Martin Luther King to be assassinated. They used other foot soldiers. They caused this whole thing to happen. And they then proceeded with the powerful means at their disposal to cover this case up.

This is a conspiracy that involved—and that’s a nasty word. People insult people in this country who use the word “conspiracy.” Nowhere else in the world . . . is it viewed that way. In Italy and France, conspiracy is taken for granted, because they have lived with it so much longer. Remember that there were 39 daggers going into Caesar. . . .

What we’re asking you to do at this point in time, is send a message. We’re asking you to send a message, not just right a wrong. That’s important, that you right a wrong, and that you allow justice to prevail once and for all. Let it prevail!

Let justice and truth prevail, lest the heavens fall. No matter what, let it prevail. Let it come forward. . . .

Ultimately, truth crushed to earth will rise again, and it has risen in this courtroom, ladies and gentlemen. Send that message. You, you twelve, represent the American people. You are their representatives with respect to justice in this case. They cannot be here. The media will keep the truth from them forever. You represent the people of this land. You must speak for them.

[Y]ou have an opportunity to act in a most significant way that perhaps you can ever imagine, because your verdict of conspiracy in this case, your verdict of liability for the defendant and his other co-conspirators, means history is rewritten, means textbooks have to be rewritten, means the actual result of this case and the truth of this case now must come forward formally.

We ask you to find that conspiracy existed, and, once and for all, give this plaintiff family justice, and let’s cleanse this city and this nation of the ignorance that has pervaded this case for so long. Let the truth reign in this courtroom once and for all.

Trilaterals incite China-bashers on Panama Canal

by Carlos Wesley

Did you hear the one about the guy who stayed up all night with his shotgun waiting for an invasion from outer space, and while he had his eyes on the sky, ready to blow away any UFO carrying little green men, his neighbor broke into his house, stole his money, and raped his wife and daughter?

Something akin to that is taking place among conservatives in the United States over the handover of the Panama Canal. Everyone, from Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.), Senate Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), and Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.), to Frank Gaffney’s Center for Security Policy and the John Birch Society, is screaming about an imaginary “Red Chinese” plot to take over the Panama Canal, when the Republic of Panama assumes full jurisdiction of the Canal on Dec. 31, 1999. Meanwhile, the very real threat posed to the waterway by Colombia’s FARC and ELN narco-terrorists, and their countergang, the AUC “paramilitaries,” is being largely ignored.

Ironically, the conspiracy-mongering John Birchers are following the lead of Sir Caspar Weinberger, an alumnus of their old nemesis, the Trilateral Commission, who was knighted by the Queen of England on Feb. 23, 1988.

The U.S. establishment media are treating these ravings with utmost seriousness, feeding into the ongoing hysteria that the Chinese “are stealing our nuclear secrets,” and similar McCarthyite propaganda. Things have gotten so hot, that President Bill Clinton and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright stayed away from the Dec. 14 ceremonies in Panama marking the transfer, leaving it to former U.S. President Jimmy Carter—who negotiated the Canal treaties with Panama’s late Gen. Omar Torrijos 25 years ago—to show the flag.

But, consider the following: On Dec. 12, some 600 FARC narco-terrorists, using mortars, explosives, tear-gas grenades, and small weapons, attacked a police barracks and naval base in the Pacific coast town of Juradó in Colombia, just 10 miles across the border from Panama, and killed at least 23 and maybe as many as 65 Colombian soldiers. Incursions across the border into Panama’s Darién Province are frequent. In May, an estimated 500 narco-terrorists seized the Panamanian town of La Miel; there was a similar incursion in November. The narco-terrorists have gotten so bold that hostages are being taken for ransom in downtown Panama City itself. The narco-terrorists are better armed than Colombia’s Armed Forces, not to mention Panama’s, where there hasn’t been an