Advisory to Banner International and Banner-related Investors 1987 to Present

The recovered criminally-suppressed Banner International Corporate/Financial Records (that were suppressed by Utah Court receivership crimes) now combine with the extensive Roger Bowers' comments from his 2001 interview recordings (not seen by any until recently) about plainly corrupt agents from several FBI offices calling him with gross fabrications made for very evident quite criminal purposes.

The unavoidable conclusions are that a long-term network of criminalized FBI agents has been in place, until the present, and as was first organized by oil billionaire H.L. Hunt and J. Edgar Hoover. Bowers became involved in the Utah Court crimes, as is now concluded, resulting from his own long-term association with the H.L. Hunt family -- and evidently now to be seen with their long-established network of corrupt/criminalized FBI agents. The Hunt/Hoover criminalization of this network of FBI agents was made of court evidence in the 1999 Memphis Trial for the M.L. King family by Dr. William Pepper, whose million dollar investigations proved FBI agent offences in the King assassination-related offences. These derived from the closest possible collaboration of Hunt and Hoover in organizing the MLK assassination -- and that was made clear to the satisfaction in 1999 of the Memphis jury who agreed. Jury verdicts after due process of law are not "conspiracy theories". They represent, as when so established, conspiracy facts.

Apparently, Bowers did not realize that the several agents calling him from diverse FBI offices were corrupt and that all things stated by them were fabrications to assuage his fears for having allied with and assisted the corrupt-FBI faction's organized crimes in Utah to defraud Banner International assets though the Medley Court's receivership "charade" in which Bowers is clearly evidenced and alleged as, knowingly a petty accomplice--- with a "pay-off" now made clear, and now alleged as having committed the best-evidenced and most extensive and serious offences in the Utah judicial frauds in order to strip the assets of Banner International. All this may be seen with the Criminal Complaints now filed against him:
http://www.greatgoldgrab.com/FBI-Legislators%20Complaint%20&%20Advisory.pdf

Now, with these recordings of Bowers as transcribed in the following, it is more than 100% conclusive that a long-established FBI network of corrupt and criminalized agents has been in place since it was created by oil billionaire H.L. Hunt (then the richest person in the U.S.) with J. Edgar Hoover, then the FBI Director. Hoover's (and Hunt's) major criminal associations and alliances with top level Mafia leaders (one of whom, Carlos Marcello, provided the real MLK assassin, as proved in the Memphis Court by Pepper), and also as allied with their corrupt oil magnates, as also long known (with J. Edgar Hoover's pay offs with oil shares).

But the extent of the personal ties between H. L. Hunt and Hoover's FBI has largely been made known only by Dr. William Pepper in his books and in his 1999 Memphis Trial for the Martin Luther King Family in which the jury ruled that, along with other federal agencies' involvement in the M.L. King Assassination, that a major factor in organizing the MLK Assassination was J. Edgar Hoover with his total corruption by H.L. Hunt and with their mutual extensive alliances with major corrupt oil interests, with Military elements, and with the top-most major Mafia criminals, one of whom, Carlos Marcelo, they employed to engage the actual assassin of Martin Luther King. This was conclusively evidenced by 70 witnesses, as the jury then ruled.

Prosecutions in the Banner International case -- just on the facts relating to the Utah Court frauds and asset thefts on Banner International — assuredly must and will be made. The major criminal offences now alleged of Bowers, as involved in the Utah receivership charade to covertly strip Banner assets, with his "pay-off" as indicated as alleged, with the suppression of Banner International corporate and financial records now recovered by William Pepper, and now further evidenced in the recordings made of Bowers with his own *ipso facto* lies and deceptions (however much "coached" by corrupt FBI agents as seem indicated), cannot be eclipsed or overcome by any means.

Now As Also Clear: The Incontrovertible Presence of a Long-term Corrupt FBI Agent Network Active in Utah in 1993 and Ever Since:

As has been noted, the Bowers' recorded interviews about several FBI offices calling him with totally false allegations *can only now be seen to evidence an extensive long-in-place network within the FBI of seriously corrupt/criminalized agents* (who in these instances were demonstrably in the employ of those who had organized, covertly through the RQN law office, the Utah Court Frauds and the theft of the Requa/Hoover Files in the Medley Court frauds and charade. Now many instances of crimes by the FBI can also be so explained, such as those listed at: http://www.greatgoldgrab.com/comm.htm That a pre-arranged criminal FBI agent operation was in existence in Utah in 1993, and ever since may be seen with Agent Collins' efforts to falsify Utah corporations office records on Banner International, seen at: http://www.greatgoldgrab.com/chap_12_13.pdf (with Agent Collins then as Agent X) http://www.greatgoldgrab.com/PDFs_jan_2013/Notice_of_Criminal_Complaint.pdf and with this letter to Utah FBI and U.S. Attorneys by William Pepper: http://www.greatgoldgrab.com/PDFs_jan_2013/REQUA_ATTORNEY.pdf

The purpose of the several FBI agents from several offices with such outlandish fictions and falsehoods to be seen here in the Bowers transcript on them, even with lies about the FBI itself, can only be concluded to have been to re-assure Mr. Bowers that honest FBI agents were not being sought (or even possible to be sought) to investigate all Bowers' own fabrications (albeit surely also coached by corrupt FBI agents), as seen in the interviews. Bowers had been employed as the now-alleged petty accomplice most evidenced for the Medley Court receivership hoax. These had included the now-alleged criminal suppression by Caspar/Bowers of the Banner corporate and financial records (as now recovered by William F. Pepper). *Caspar/Bowers had alleged them not to exist*. Recovering them by Dr. Pepper is the present most conclusive evidence demonstrating that the Medley Court Receivership of 1993 was merely a hoax and charade to cover the stripping of all Banner assets, as then did in fact occur, and by the deceptions now of evidence as alleged by Bowers and Caspar in and through the Medley Court as a cover for their actually being employed by RQN and those behind it (with their evident corrupt FBI offices calling Bowers), and most likely to have included Bowers' long term acquaintances in the H.L. Hunt family.

The very certain long-established corrupt agent FBI network is now unavoidably also to be recognized, as was of historical fact, organized by H.L. Hunt with J. Edgar Hoover. The existence of this is of certain evidence provided during William Pepper's 1999 Memphis MLK Trial for the King Family. Both Hunt and Hoover, as noted below and in the following were deeply allied with "Big Oil" and the top-most Mafia leadership. This is well known to many researches. The critical fact discovered (but little as yet remarked on) was made by William Pepper (as noted in his book excerpts below and in the combined attachments.

The critical fact to explain very much FBI corruption all the way to the present from the time of Hunt and Hoover is that H.L. Hunt had a private dedicated red-telephone line for just himself to J. Edgar Hoover's FBI office. *De facto*, the FBI was being run in any ways desired by H.L. Hunt (then the richest man in the U.S). Only H.L. Hunt and J. Edgar Hoover could have created such an extensive corrupt FBI agent network that is vastly evidenced, that we have seen in crimes against us, and that Bowers' interviews with transcripts about FBI offices calling him with great lies (that he believed) make this all absolutely clear.

This corrupt FBI agent network created by Hunt/Hoover explains some of the evidence provided to the Memphis Jury as contained in the Summary Article, that follows the excerpts from Pepper's book "An Act of State". Some items provided by Pepper to the jury was this from the attached Trial Summary

"They learned of FBI reports that were patently false, and of others pointing in the right direction that had been suppressed -- e.g., witness statements of (patsy assassin James Earl) Ray leaving before the (MLK) shooting."

Thus Banner shareholders (some personally) also did receive patently false statements from corrupt FBI agents *before and after the court frauds* (as now seen that Bowers did too), and that FBI agents had suppressed crucial evidence of crimes committed against Banner International and done with corrupt FBI agent assistance. The extensive network of corrupt FBI agents (not to be denied now with the Memphis Court evidence and a Jury verdict) can now be seen as having been established as *only possible* by Hoover and H.L.Hunt with their resources and combined means. See Utah events narration: with pre-planned FBI agent crimes: http://www.greatgoldgrab.com/chap_12_13.pdf

This network of corrupt FBI agents (established originally with so much available wealth from H.L Hunt, with Hoover's being so engaged), and as assuredly to be seen utilizing their "red-phone" private communication line for daily use. This network of corrupt FBI agents has assuredly survived. It is of evidence and to be recognized as having originated not only the deceptions and lies surrounding the Utah Receivership, but also the same lies/deceptions/crimes *after* the 1993 Court Fraud and R/H Files theft to maintain the cover-up of the RQN theft of the R/H Files -- but also to be evidenced so as to sabotage all efforts investors have made ever since. The falsehoods and lies made to Steven Davis recently, and all the way back to complaints to FBI of with wire frauds in 2010 against one such "asset" employed now to deceive Davis, can be assumed now to have been prompted only with either covert or overt "assets" of FBI corrupt agents. This is all now seen by Utah FBI, with Utah U.S. Attorneys, and Utah State Legislators: http://www.greatgoldgrab.com/FBI-Legislators%20Complaint%20&%20Advisory.pdf

Now with the certain evidence here on Hunt/Mafia/FBI/Big-Oil/Military corruption and their MLK assassination conspiracy (as ruled by the Memphis Court with a jury verdict thus made), the conclusions can be made as above and in the attached.

These below from Pepper's book are with longer following excerpts, and then with the Summary Article on the Memphis Trial that yielded a verdict against the involved corrupt FBI, Military, Hunts, etc. The jury verdict can not now be contradicted. The Hunt/Hoover criminal network clearly established by them in the FBI requires full exposure and eradication, as now mandated by all the Pepper evidence, by the jury verdict, by the extensive

evidence of Banner's suffering from corrupt FBI agents (as made in Complaints), by the total losses suffered by investors then, *and by the investor losses since 1993* from the covert influences and events now seen and to be detailed, as manipulated by corrupt FBI "assets", and as now phenomenally evidenced in Bowers' own words, and as also evidenced as made recently on Steven Davis (in Complaints against Bowers, et.al in above link). The Crimes of 1993 are continuing by the same offenders, *assuredly with corrupt FBI assistance,* but that is no longer possible to be maintained.

In all these events from 1993 to the present they have been covering up for the theft of the R/H Files, for the indicated Hunts and others behind RQN who stole those files and manipulated covertly the Medley Court. As alleged, Roger Bowers, et.al were their primary petty accomplices; and, they have recently been re-deployed, as evidenced and alleged just of late, to avert their exposures and the crimes made in 1993. The crimes of 1993 have continued until just recently but were exposed and made futile.

From "Act of State" by William Pepper:

NEW STRANDS AND CONNECTIONS

H. L. Hunt

Billionaire oilman H. L. Hunt, who had been dead since 1974, had close ties with people and institutions emerging as pivotal players in the conspiracy now unfolding.

I approached his former chief aide John Curington who offered many new revelations on Hunt's close ties to the FBI and the Mafia. Curington had worked for Hunt Oil for 15 years and for nearly 13 of these had worked for H. L. Hunt personally, occupying the office right next to him. He frequently worked 18-hour days, seven days a week, and often traveled with Hunt.

As he explained it, he was basically Mr Hunt's "follow-through" guy. He did whatever was necessary to get a job done. While not directly engaging in the "dirty" work himself, he made the arrangements at the old man's request. According to one of my investigators, at one point he had even referred to himself as Hunt's "bag man," saying that he carried and delivered cash, sometimes in very large amounts, to any number of places, organizations, and individuals in support of right-wing activities. Some went to pay for specific operations.

Curington had participated in many of the illegal activities he detailed and was remarkably frank. While continually referring to documents in

an old brown leather suitcase, the then 67-year-old Texan confirmed that a closer relationship than had ever been publicly known existed between his ex-boss and FBI director J. Edgar Hoover which even included a direct-line red telephone in Hunt's desk drawer. Their asso-

* * *

Curington was present at various meetings between Hoover and Hunt when Martin Luther King was discussed. Usually, Hoover came to the old man's hotel room. While the two men shared a dislike for Dr King, Hoover's animosity was more passionate and obsessive, more personal. Hoover regularly provided Hunt with a considerable amount of documentation and material to be used as ammunition against Dr King in his extreme right-wing, daily nationally syndicated *Lifeline* radio broadcasts. King was a favorite and a regular target of *Lifeline* venom.

Curington recalled one meeting in June 1967 in Chicago between Hunt and Hoover in Hunt's hotel room. Hunt told Hoover he could finish King by constantly attacking him on his daily radio broadcasts. Hoover replied that it would not work. He said the only way to stop King would be to "completely silence" him. After King's murder, Hunt acknowledged to Curington that Hoover had won that argument.

Curington ran this company, which the "old man" had established as a front for funding such political activity.[5] He also acknowledged that his boss and Hoover shared many of the same friends, including several kingpins of organized crime. Not only was Hunt close to gamblers Frank Erickson (to whom he once owed $400,000) and Ray Ryan (who at the same time owed him a large amount), but he associated with Frank

Costello, the mob's liaison to Hoover. Hunt's top-level mob ties also included Carlos Marcello and Dallas boss Joe Civello.

Sometime between March 18 and March 28, soon after this conversation, Jowers was approached directly by produce man Frank C. Liberto, to whom he admitted that he owed a very large debt. For some time, I believed that the debt was a gambling loss. More recently, I have come to believe that it was more sinister. I believe that Liberto got rid of the body of a Mexican Jowers killed after finding him in bed with Betty. This debt would be forgiven, and he would receive a large amount of money if he would help. Specifically, Liberto said: $100,000 would be delivered to him in cash in the bottom of an M. E. Carter vegetable produce box. The money came from New Orleans as did the contract on King's life, and:

- He would be visited by a man who would bring him a rifle – and leave it with him for pick-up at the right time. (Upon consideration, it is not clear that this was the murder weapon.)
- There would be a patsy or decoy to distract attention.
- The police – some of whom were involved – would be nowhere in sight.

Jowers agreed. As Liberto said, a man did come to see him. Jowers thought that he introduced himself as "Raul" or "Royal," and appeared to have a Latin/Indian appearance. He was about 5 foot 9 inches in height and weighed approximately 145–155 pounds. He had dark hair and appeared to be between 35 and 40 years old.

They discussed the plans for the killing. Raul told Jowers that his role would be to receive and hold the weapon on the day of the killing until it would be picked up. After the shooting Jowers would have to take charge of the actual murder weapon and keep it concealed. Jowers was also expected to keep his staff out of the way at all times. He confirmed Bobbi's story that he instructed her not to follow her usual practice of taking food up to Grace Walden.

On the morning of April 4, sometime around 11:00 AM after the rush was over, Raul, according to plan, came into Jim's Grill, bringing with him a rifle concealed in a box which he turned over to Jowers to hold. Jowers said that Raul told him that he would be back later that afternoon

4

NEW STRANDS AND CONNECTIONS

H. L. Hunt

Billionaire oilman H. L. Hunt, who had been dead since 1974, had close ties with people and institutions emerging as pivotal players in the conspiracy now unfolding.

I approached his former chief aide John Curington who offered many new revelations on Hunt's close ties to the FBI and the Mafia. Curington had worked for Hunt Oil for 15 years and for nearly 13 of these had worked for H. L. Hunt personally, occupying the office right next to him. He frequently worked 18-hour days, seven days a week, and often traveled with Hunt.

As he explained it, he was basically Mr Hunt's "follow-through" guy. He did whatever was necessary to get a job done. While not directly engaging in the "dirty" work himself, he made the arrangements at the old man's request. According to one of my investigators, at one point he had even referred to himself as Hunt's "bag man," saying that he carried and delivered cash, sometimes in very large amounts, to any number of places, organizations, and individuals in support of right-wing activities. Some went to pay for specific operations.

Curington had participated in many of the illegal activities he detailed and was remarkably frank. While continually referring to documents in

Éléments sous droits d'a

Loading...
Loading...

an old brown leather suitcase, the then 67-year-old Texan confirmed that a closer relationship than had ever been publicly known existed between his ex-boss and FBI director J. Edgar Hoover which even included a direct-line red telephone in Hunt's desk drawer. Their association went back to the early 1950s. Apparently, they had been poker-playing friends for many years, and their compatible right-wing political views, though differing sexual orientations, made them allies. Hoover had even seconded a trusted FBI agent, Paul Rothermel, to Hunt as his head of security. Rothermel left the bureau in late 1954 and joined Hunt in 1955.

Curington was present at various meetings between Hoover and Hunt when Martin Luther King was discussed. Usually, Hoover came to the old man's hotel room. While the two men shared a dislike for Dr King, Hoover's animosity was more passionate and obsessive, more personal. Hoover regularly provided Hunt with a considerable amount of documentation and material to be used as ammunition against Dr King in his extreme right-wing, daily nationally syndicated *Lifeline* radio broadcasts. King was a favorite and a regular target of *Lifeline* venom.

Curington recalled one meeting in June 1967 in Chicago between Hunt and Hoover in Hunt's hotel room. Hunt told Hoover he could finish King by constantly attacking him on his daily radio broadcasts. Hoover replied that it would not work. He said the only way to stop King would be to "completely silence" him. After King's murder, Hunt acknowledged to Curington that Hoover had won that argument.

In April 1968, *Lifeline* produced a 15-minute daily program, six days a week, on 429 stations in 398 cities across America. Between 1967 and 1968, Hunt spent nearly $2,000,000 on this program alone. Curington revealed that the entire effort, as well as other shadowy often deeply covert political activity, was funded by moneys diverted by Hunt from H. L. H. Products, Inc.

Curington ran this company, which the "old man" had established as a front for funding such political activity.[5] He also acknowledged that his boss and Hoover shared many of the same friends, including several kingpins of organized crime. Not only was Hunt close to gamblers Frank Erickson (to whom he once owed $400,000) and Ray Ryan (who at the same time owed him a large amount), but he associated with Frank

Éléments sous droits d'a

Costello, the mob's liaison to Hoover. Hunt's top-level mob ties also included Carlos Marcello and Dallas boss Joe Civello.

In politics, Curington noted that Sam Rayburn, the former speaker of the House of Representatives, and his protege Lyndon Johnson were both life-long close political assets of Mr Hunt. Curington also said that H. L. Hunt's daily liaison with President Lyndon Johnson on political matters was former FBI agent Booth Mooney, who was personally close to the President. Mooney not only delivered communications between Johnson and Hunt but also wrote over half of the *Lifeline* broadcast tracts, including many of those attacking Dr King.

On April 5, the day after Dr King's assassination, Hunt told Curington to make arrangements for him (Hunt) and his wife to travel to a Holiday Inn resort hotel in El Paso, Texas. For whatever reasons, the old man wanted to be away and inaccessible in the aftermath of the killing of Dr King. Curington said that on the evening of the assassination shortly after the shooting, Hoover called Hunt and advised him to cancel his anti-King *Lifeline* programs, which were to be aired that evening and the morning of April 5. After that call, Curington said he was called to Hunt's home and told to put together a team of secretaries to call the radio stations.

By the end of our session, I concluded that John Curington, 25 years later, still appeared to be in awe of the man who, he said, moved on an entirely different level from "the rest of us."

Sometime between March 18 and March 28, soon after this conversation, Jowers was approached directly by produce man Frank C. Liberto, to whom he admitted that he owed a very large debt. For some time, I believed that the debt was a gambling loss. More recently, I have come to believe that it was more sinister. I believe that Liberto got rid of the body of a Mexican Jowers killed after finding him in bed with Betty. This debt would be forgiven, and he would receive a large amount of money if he would help. Specifically, Liberto said: $100,000 would be delivered to him in cash in the bottom of an M. E. Carter vegetable produce box. The money came from New Orleans as did the contract on King's life, and:

- He would be visited by a man who would bring him a rifle – and leave it with him for pick-up at the right time. (Upon consideration, it is not clear that this was the murder weapon.)
- There would be a patsy or decoy to distract attention.
- The police – some of whom were involved – would be nowhere in sight.

Jowers agreed. As Liberto said, a man did come to see him. Jowers thought that he introduced himself as "Raul" or "Royal," and appeared to have a Latin/Indian appearance. He was about 5 foot 9 inches in height and weighed approximately 145–155 pounds. He had dark hair and appeared to be between 35 and 40 years old.

They discussed the plans for the killing. Raul told Jowers that his role would be to receive and hold the weapon on the day of the killing until it would be picked up. After the shooting Jowers would have to take charge of the actual murder weapon and keep it concealed. Jowers was also expected to keep his staff out of the way at all times. He confirmed Bobbi's story that he instructed her not to follow her usual practice of taking food up to Grace Walden.

On the morning of April 4, sometime around 11:00 AM after the rush was over, Raul, according to plan, came into Jim's Grill, bringing with him a rifle concealed in a box which he turned over to Jowers to hold. Jowers said that Raul told him that he would be back later that afternoon

Elements sous droits d'auteur

A Brief Summary of William Pepper's

An Act of State: The Execution of Martin Luther King

Dick Atlee, January 27, 2011

For a reconstruction of the events of April 4, 1968, see pp. 155-162.

Note -- This summary only covers the tip of the iceberg. [Bracketed numbers] are references to pages in the 2008 (softcover) edition of the book, generally to only one or two of many possible reference in the book to a given piece of evidence. [v] refers to information that may be in the book, but was derived from online videos of presentations by Pepper. See also a list of videos available online.

During Black History month, preceded by Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday, it is useful to be aware a bit of that history which, while known elsewhere in the world, is strikingly absent from our consciousness and media. For it bears heavily on what is happening in our country today, and goes far beyond "black" issues.

A civil trial you probably never heard of

In October, 1978, Dr. King's close friend, Ralph Abernathy, prevailed on another King friend, lawyer William Pepper, to interview James Earl Ray, the alleged "lone-gunman" killer of Dr. King. That meeting [10] set in motion a two-decades-long investigation by Pepper and his staff. The investigation resulted in a trial held in Memphis in late 1999 against those who had been shown by the investigation to have been involved in Dr. King's murder. It was a *civil* wrongful-death trial [98] because the federal and state law-enforcement and judiciary systems had gone to great lengths to prevent a new criminal trial based on the new evidence [88-92]. The trial was held in Memphis. The plaintiffs were Dr. King's family [99]. The trial is described in detail on pp. 107-147.

The purpose of this document is to present a small part of the evidence that led to the trial and that developed as a result of it. Not all of the evidence, for a wealth of it is presented in Mr. Pepper's book, but enough to defuse a perhaps understandable knee-jerk "conspiracy theory" reaction to the situation the evidence exposes. Roles and events are mentioned here, but most names are omitted -- the cast of characters is so large it begins to seem like a Russian novel.

During the almost-month-long trial, the half-black, half-white, four-woman eight-man jury [108] heard the sworn testimony of almost 70 witnesses [147] who were among -- or had direct personal connections to -- the surprisingly large number of players in the drama of that day. At the end, a unanimous jury and the judge found that James Earl Ray, the alleged lone gunman, was an unwitting patsy, and had not been involved at all in the murder [147]. Well, then, who did they decide *was* involved?

The answer to that question is the reason that we are so completely ignorant of what happened before, during, and after that April 4, 1968, when Dr. King was shot while standing on the balcony of the Lorraine Motel in Memphis, on his way to dinner.

Introducing part of the cast -- the Mob and Lloyd Jowers

During the days of that trial, the jury listened to testimony by Lloyd Jowers, the principal named defendant and the owner of a grill separated from the Lorraine by a side street and an area of high, dense brush [117]. Jowers said he had owed a large debt [40] to Frank Liberto, a Memphis lieutenant of the New Orleans Mafia [46]. Various witnesses described how, in the ensuing years, Liberto had told them he'd arranged the execution, noting the planned lack of security, the arranged police cooperation and absence, and a "patsy in place." [40,46,111] Another witness described how, an hour before the event, in Liberto's warehouse, he had heard Liberto shouting into a phone "Shoot the son of a bitch when he comes on the balcony," and telling the caller to collect the money from his brother in New Orleans [13,110].

Jowers told about a number of planning sessions held by members of the Memphis Police Department (MPD) in his grill [111,139], and how, pursuant to these plans, on the day of the execution, Liberto, a vegetable merchant, sent him a vegetable delivery box containing $100,000 [111], to be picked up later by a man named Raul [137,139]. The same Raul dropped off a rifle [38,124] to be picked up later that day by the shooter. Jowers told how he had handed the rifle to the shooter [139] -- not James Earl Ray -- and, after the shot, had taken it, still smoking, back into the grill and hidden it [41,138]. An employee (his mistress) confirmed this [33], and a friend told how Jowers had shown him the rifle [16,95]. The next day Jowers sent a friend to drop it off the Mississippi bridge [119], and Raul came to pick up the cash [124].

A variety of witnesses knew Raul -- eventually identified as Raul Peirera [54,124] -- to be involved in various illegal activities, particularly running guns diverted from the military [124]. He'd been identified by Ray as his handler [122] and had told one acquaintance he'd been involved in King's killing [56,122]. Though Raul had denied any connection to the assassination [60], one witness, a reporter, was told by a member of Raul's family how grateful they were that, once his identity had become known, government agents began monitoring their phones and advising and protecting them [125].

The original "evidence"

The alleged murder weapon, with James Earl Ray's fingerprints on it and a bag containing some of his belongings were "found" in the doorway of a store [9,116]. The state said Ray had dropped them when he noticed a police car parked at the corner [9], though the hedge between the store and the corner would have made that impossible [48]. The store's owner had, on many occasions, consistently placed the time at which the materials had been dropped at about ten minutes *before* the shooting [120,213,228].

The jury heard from a ballistics expert that the death bullet was metallurgically different from the other bullets in that rifle, which were otherwise identical [119]. They learned of a suppressed FBI report [119,133] that the sight on that rifle had never been sighted in, shooting about 4 inches down and to the left [119]. They learned of another suppressed report that a key piece of "evidence" in the state's case, a dent in the windowsill of the bathroom from which the fatal shot was allegedly fired, could not be matched to the rifle [120,133].

They learned of the state's main eyewitness, Charlie Stephens, a man who lived near the bathroom allegedly used by Ray for the shooting and supposedly caught a glimpse of the fleeing man's profile [116]. A cab driver who had stopped to pick him up that afternoon found him drunk in bed [15], too drunk to carry [229]. An MPD officer who interviewed him at the time found him drunk and barely able to stand [116,226], another MPD interviewer that day said Stephens had told him he couldn't identify the man [196]. His wife [157], on the other hand, steadfastly indicated that the person who'd run from the room was not Ray; her statement was discounted [v].

The police and the crime scene

The jury heard testimony about the MPD planning sessions described above [111,139]. They heard from Dr. King's driver, who had seen a man in the bushes come over the wall at their edge [117], and one of the ministers from Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Council (SCLC), who saw smoke rising from the brushy area across from the motel just after the shot; he was never questioned [117]. They heard from a New York Times reporter who had been sent to Memphis by his national editor to "nail Dr. King" and was staying at the motel, who saw a man crouching in the brush [118]; he was never questioned [16]. They heard from a police officer who had found size 13 shoe tracks in the mud leading from the brushy area to an alley and made casts of them; his find was never followed up [117]. They heard from a neighbor who saw a man come out of that alley several minutes after the shooting, jump into a car and speed off past a police barricade that made no attempt to stop or follow him [115]. They heard about a cab driver who had seen a man jump over the wall of the brushy area, run down the street and get into a Memphis police car [52,131,118]. The cab driver, after being interviewed twice by police that night, had been found dead the next morning, thrown out of a car across the river in Arkansas [118]. Subsequent searches for a record of his death turned up nothing [132].

They heard from the then-manager of the Memphis Public Works Department, that he had been tasked at 7AM the next morning by the MPD to have the brushy area behind the grill, and the hedge that would have blocked Ray's alleged view of the police car mentioned above, immediately cut to the ground [131], a clear destruction of evidence and the crime scene [212-213,330]. Although everyone involved knew the high brush and the hedge were there, and spoke of it, the clear-cutting caused it never to show up in official pictures of the scene, and the MPD implied it had never existed. The hedge, however, showed up in a picture of an officer guarding Ray's belongings in the store doorway [48].

Dr. King was heading for dinner [156] at the house of Rev. Billy Kyle, a local black minister who claimed to be a friend. Kyle lied about being with Dr. King during his last hour [194-5], and then in a speech given on the 30th anniversary, made the slip of saying he'd stepped away from Dr. King so "he could have a clear shot," a film of which shocked the jury [142,v].

The security

The jury learned from motel and hotel records that Dr. King had never previously stayed at the Lorraine, in spite of claims to the contrary by the state [188-90]. They learned he'd used the Lorraine as a result of a taunting newspaper article which turned out to have been placed by the

FBI [186-7], and that on this occasion he had been inexplicably moved [113-14] from the originally-reserved secluded ground floor room to a heavily-bugged [127-8] room on the balcony. They learned that virtually every room in the places Dr. King had stayed Memphis had been bugged. They heard from an MPD officer that on that day he'd been in a van being used to monitor the Lorraine bugs [127], apparently staffed by army intelligence officers.

They heard from a black MPD officer with close ties to the community, one of the two officers on the MPD surveillance team that day, that he had been forcibly sent home that day due to an alleged threat on his life [112] that ultimately proved to be phony and provided by a Senate staffer connected to the military [128,234]. They learned that the only two black firemen in the fire station across the street had been ordered that day, at MPD request, to report to stations in other parts of the city, leaving the station undermanned [112]. They learned the police TACT10 squad had been pulled back that morning -- at the request of Rev. Kyle, according to its chief [113]. They learned that a squad of black MPD detectives assembled on each of Dr. King's earlier visits for his protection had specifically not been assembled this time [113], and that the Invaders, a local black armed self-protection group staying at the motel as volunteers to protect King had been ordered to leave, allegedly by Jesse Jackson [109-10], 10 minutes before the shooting.

The FBI and the Justice Department

The House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA) held hearings in the 1970s which illuminated a long history of FBI actions against Dr. King and the SCLC, trying to tie them to Communists, bugging hotels all across the country where Dr. King stayed [11], committing burglaries and dirty tricks [11], managing "friends" in the media, even holding a 1963 meeting to find a way to "neutralize King as an effective Negro leader" [11]. They had a paid informant on Dr. King's staff from 1964, who was in Memphis that day conferring with the special agent in charge [15-16].

The jury heard of a 1967 conversation reported by billionaire H.L. Hunt's personal assistant, in which Hunt's friend J. Edgar Hoover had told Hunt that Hunt's attacks on Dr. King over his radio network would not stop King, that the only way to do that was to "completely silence" him, an argument Hunt later acknowledged Hoover had won [43].

They learned of FBI reports that were patently false, and of others pointing in the right direction that had been suppressed -- e.g., witness statements of Ray leaving before the shooting [116,133], the rifle's non-sighting [119], the non-evidence window dent [120,133].

They heard about the 30-sniper FBI SWAT team that immediately appeared at the prison from which Ray escaped in 1976, with orders to kill him, and how the squad was only removed through intervention of the HSCA chairman via Tennessee's governor who ordered them to leave [134]. They heard of a jail inmate with lethal connections at Ray's prison who said he'd been asked to arrange Ray's murder, but when he called the contact number he'd been given, it was to a suite used by the FBI and U.S. Attorney [134].

Not covered by the trial, since it lasted from 1998-2000, was the Justice Department investigation. Pepper discusses at length its flaws and intimidation of witnesses [218ff]. He also provides a table of 55 pieces of evidence ignored or distorted by that investigation [289ff].

The military

The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights in 1972 condemned the U.S. Army for "massive and unrestrained" domestic surveillance uncovered by its investigations. The most significant increase in this activity was from 1961 to March 1968. From 1967-68 it was heavily involved in the Justice Department's civil disturbance structure [204-5].

The involvement of the military on the day of the assassination was confirmed by at least two witnesses at the trial. One was a police officer in whose office members of the 111th Military Intelligence Group (MIG) conducted coordination of the day's events [128,143,315]. The other was the captain of the fire station across the street from the Lorraine, who testified that that day he'd honored the demand of two plainclothes photographers with U.S. army credentials that they be taken up to the roof of the fire station, and had watched them begin setting up [128]. He was never interviewed. One of the photographers said he and his partner got pictures of the Dr. King falling and the sniper in the bushes (not Ray) lowering his rifle [79-80].

The jury heard from a witness who'd held a series of interviews with a sniper from an 8-man Alpha 184 crisis team from the 111th MIG [129]. The sniper said that his squad was in town that day, and that he and a buddy and another pair had taken up positions on two nearby roofs that day with mug shots of Dr. King and Andrew Young, with orders to shoot the two men upon receiving radio orders to fire [69]. During the day they were in radio contact with the head of the withdrawn MPD TACT10 unit, who told them "friendlies were not wearing ties" [69]. However, they'd heard an unanticipated shot and then been ordered to leave, going to the river and using a boat to reach exit vehicles [70].

The book provides a detailed description of the day according to the sniper [67-71], and a verbatim written Q-and-A from him [299-310].

The jury learned that the man seen kneeling over Dr. King's body checking for signs of life [160] -- and who was not wearing a tie -- was a black undercover MPD officer who had infiltrated the black defense group the Invaders [205]. It turned out he had been detailed to the MPD by the 111th MIG [205], for whom he was working an intelligence informant [74].

And the jury learned that "Eric S. Galt," the identity Ray had been using, was a Canadian with connections to U.S. military intelligence who had a top-secret clearance [116,209].

An interesting piece of the puzzle that developed from the investigation was a large gun-running operation involving the New Orleans mob, military personnel, Louisiana officials and Raul [63,76,79,209-10].

The patsy

The jury heard how Raul had managed James Earl Ray [122] , the "patsy in place," -- how he'd earlier found Ray in a Canadian bar [186], hired him to do various illegal errands [v], had him come to Memphis [v], told him to buy the rifle ultimately used to frame him [v], and used various excuses that day to keep Ray away from the rooming house next to the grill, where he was living [157]. The jury saw the suppressed FBI reports, noted above, of two witnesses who told of seeing Ray's car driving off *before* the shooting [116, 133]. Ray had insisted he'd gone to have his spare tire fixed [157], and when he'd heard about the execution, he'd realized his situation and fled.

The jury learned that Ray had pled guilty (though not under oath [142]) only after being told by his lawyer at the time that he'd get the death penalty if he chose a jury trial. This lawyer, who told a friend that he knew Ray was innocent but had to be "sacrificed" [56], turned out to be the principal lawyer for local mob figures [57] and knew Raul [56]. They learned that Ray had never confessed, steadfastly asserting his innocence. He refused demands that he say there had been no conspiracy [v]. He refused to confess even when offered bribes in exchange: parole [45,134], and cash -- first $50,000 and then $220,000 [134] -- even release (to die) [97]. He died in prison from a liver condition for which the state refused to permit treatment unless he confessed [82-84,97]. The government had gone to great lengths to prevent a new trial based on all the new evidence [88-92].

The conspiratorial conclusion

In short, the jury was shown a mountain of evidence that Dr. King had been executed by a conspiracy involving, among others, officials and members of the MPD, the State of Tennessee, the mob, the FBI and Justice Department, and the U.S. Army. The jury's verdict, arrived at in less than an hour, indicated they understood and fully agreed with this [147]. So did the trial judge, who apportioned 30% of the liability for the murder to Jowers, and 70% to the other co-conspirators [147].

A conspiracy is a conspiracy -- a secret collusion among at least two people to engage in an endeavor, usually illegal or unsavory. The execution of Dr. King was a conspiracy, and its description is not, if it ever was, a conspiracy "theory," but rather a well-documented fact.

But why execute King?

The year before, Dr. King had begun to look beyond the civil rights movement, and to publicly express his belief that the "brotherhood of man" -- and a turning away from materialism [163ff] -- were moral and survival imperatives, and that materialism -- the evaluation of everything in terms of money -- drives out love, leading to inevitably to over-consumption and material scarcity [166]. He saw the Vietnam War as a materialist culture destroying a non-white, ancient traditional culture [7,168], that the divide between the rich and the "invisible poor" was another aspect of that materialism, [180] and that these two situations were connected by the inevitable guns-vs-butter choice that wars create in how to allocate public resources [7].

[176-79] The government was willing to offer the Voting Rights Act as a palliative, because segregation was seen as merely a regional problem [176]. It had the added advantage of indebting civil rights leaders to the government [176-7]. Dr. King's charisma and broad appeal was not a threat as long as he stayed on that reservation. But he was apparently the only figure capable of bringing together the dissatisfied poor and the growing number of anti-war Americans [177]. So his opposition to the war, and his opening of the raw and fundamental issue of economic inequality and the invisibility of the poor, threatened the influence and profits of the firmly entrenched military-industrial complex that President Eisenhower had warned so strongly about, and the power of transnational capitalism [179]. It also threatened other civil rights leaders, who wanted no trouble with the government and spoke out against him. Dr. King was becoming isolated [176-78].

Why then? Why in Memphis?

Because the sanitation-workers strike was so emblematic of the issues he was pursuing, Dr. King had come to Memphis [8]. His advisers were against involvement in Memphis [v], because he and the SCLC were at the beginning of mobilizing the Poor People's Campaign. It was a plan to make the "invisible poor" visible by bringing a half-million of them to Washington, to camp in a tent city on the mall, and to stay there, lobbying Congress and the administration directly and indirectly, until the government addressed the problem of economic inequality [7,180].

There was no way the government was going to take the radical steps necessary to address that problem. Reported conversations in the government at the time reflected the belief that the result of this Poor People's March would be social unrest in Washington spreading across the nation [7]. The year before had seen a 200,000-person peace demonstration in Washington and race riots in cities around the country [177]. The war in Vietnam was taking all the soldiers the military could draft. There weren't enough available in the country to deal with such a situation [7]. And the Poor People's Campaign was the next step after Memphis. There was no time left.

Why don't we know about all this?

The jury in the trial heard testimony about the neurological impact -- on human intellectual functioning and reasoned decision making -- of a story that is told over and over again. It creates a knee-jerk reaction to any contrary story. *This reaction is so strong that, even if a person is on one occasion convinced by evidence that the story is untrue, s/he will soon regress to again believing that story* [136].

The media was notified of the trial. They were well aware of it, and the degree of their absence [108] was remarkable. Exactly one representative of the media attended the whole trial -- a local anchorman. He was threatened with loss of his job for doing so [149] (and was eventually fired), but he was convinced by the evidence. After the first few hours [148] in the wake of the trial, the only mentions of it in the US media were attacks on it as a farce, by people and media outlets who were not present at the trial, had not heard the evidence, and had a remarkable history of misstating and misquoting any and all evidence in conflict with the government's story [136,149]. And Dr. King's family, as they had expected, were widely maligned in the press for being involved in the trial [85,136,149].

Why "expected?" At the trial, the jurors heard an expert presentation on the use of media for disinformation and propaganda. They heard of the revelations from the HSCA assassination hearings in the 1970's -- about the CIA's widespread placement of agents as staff in newspaper and newsrooms positions, and planting of numerous false stories of all kinds [135]. They learned of the FBI's similar widespread dissemination of misinformation through "friendly" press contacts [v]. They saw a completely fabricated story from the *New York Times* about a non-existent FBI investigation into a bank robbery alleging the involvement of Ray and his brother, in which they were not involved [136], and were introduced to a history of distortion and blatant lying characterizing the coverage of the assassination and the King family over the years [135-6].

And this wasn't even new news. The previous most dramatic example of a total U.S. news blackout came earlier, on the 25th anniversary of the assassination in 1993. After all attempts at a new criminal trial had been exhausted, a full-scale mock trial of Ray was arranged, complete with sworn witnesses, impaneled jury, a pugnacious former U.S. attorney as prosecutor and a former federal district court judge as judge. The full scope of the conspiracy had not been fully uncovered at that time, and much existing evidence was excluded, but enough was available to convince the jury that Ray was innocent. The trial was broadcast on British television. No major media outlets in the U.S. reported the verdict [17-19].

Yet another confirmation of blackout occurred in December 1993 when, on ABC's *Prime Time Live*, Lloyd Jowers confessed to his role, provided many details of what actually happened, and cleared Ray. Again, there was virtually no media coverage -- even ABC itself [26-27].

Conclusion

These are things worth thinking about during Black History month. Or whenever you hear about the profits being made in the endless War on Terror, or the power and influence of military contractors and the large financial institutions, or the rapidly increasing wealth of the upper 1% and the shrinking of the middle class -- and you wonder why otherwise well-meaning political leaders seem to significantly change their promised stances on the war and the economy. And as you think about these things, contemplate the "free and unfettered" American press that can be counted on, of course, to tell us "what really happened" whenever things go badly wrong.

An Act of State is available from Amazon in
hardcover (2003): http://www.amazon.com/dp/1859846955/
softcover (2008): http://www.amazon.com/dp/1844672859/

In Maine, it is available from a number of libraries and through the state inter-library loan system --
http://minerva.maine.edu/search~S71?/tact+of+state/tact+of+state/1%2C2%2C2%2CB/frameset&FF=tact+of+state+the+execution+of+martin+luther+king&1%2C1%2C

The Bowers interviews that were not broadcast, and that belatedly surfaced in 2008, finally and conclusively answered many of my questions about the takeover. They gave me what I can now call a rather complete "anatomy of a crime", in that they provided a rather comprehensive set of statements, out of Bowers' own mouth, as to what was happening behind the scenes and who was alleging and doing what.

The sequences can be divided into five categories of comments by Bowers: those that refer to the FBI; those that refer to allegations against me personally that were made to Bowers by others (according to Bowers) and which he unquestioningly repeated (surely these false allegations originated with those involved in the stock frauds); those that relate to the Requa/Hoover Files; numerous false, grossly misleading, and defamatory allegations against me that Bowers made on his own initiative; and equally spurious and conclusively-disproved allegations about the geological work done by myself and Banner International. (More discussion about the various big lies, by Bowers and by others, will follow later.)

Not everything, however, that Bowers said was a lie; the allegations he made about the FBI contacting him many times seem quite true. This I believe because other people whose lies were being spoon-fed to them (such as the Rev. Marsh and Sgt. O'Keefe) had already said similar things about FBI agents contacting them. But nearly all other pertinent allegations by Bowers were lies or gross fabrications, whether he based them on lies from other people or they were lies of his own making. The most important statements by Bowers that evidence very corrupt FBI activities were as follows (interspersed with my commentary):

> In '93 … he [Requa] failed to make a proper payment to the federal government in Reno, Nevada, to keep the mining claims, and of course they sent a certified letter to his post office and he never picked up his mail so he didn't know about it. Once he found out about it he made threats against the government office of the Bureau of Land Management in Reno, Nevada. And they were so frightened about it they increased their security. They refused to talk to anybody. Anybody calling up and mentioning anything about Requa, they immediately contacted the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

This obviously begs the question as to how Bowers found out anything about this if the BLM was refusing to talk. But, more importantly with regard to my alleged failure to make a "proper" payment (a curious word: what is a proper payment?) to the BLM, I can refer to the 1993 cashier's check for $15,000 drawn on January 27, 1993, for the 1993 year, a full 11 months before it was due. A photocopy of this check is still in my possession. Further, how would Bowers in any case know about my not having made a payment (whether proper or not) or that I never picked up my mail? How would Bowers have learned any of these things about the BLM and FBI (or about what mail I did or did not pick up)? He would have no way of knowing any of these things. In other words, these were some of the "party-line" lies of the takeover group. With the BLM refusing to tell him anything, did he get this information from the FBI? Why would the FBI have been so informative to Bowers? One cannot imagine any legitimate (or legal) reasons that they would have. So he must have got these things either from corrupt FBI agents assisting with the party-line lies (a good possibility), or they were just the party-line lies being used by the takeover syndicate and which they then impressed upon Bowers as the lines for him to use.

As for my alleged threats to the BLM, what would I have possibly been threatening them about? And what *were* the threats? Many of these allegations about my supposed threats (verbal or written) came from persons involved in the receivership crimes (for instance, Ralph Requa's allegations with regard to my mother), but *not a trace of evidence* has ever been produced by any of these people. What *is* a matter of record, however, is my Cease and Desist Notice filed at the Washoe County Recorder's office (see Document no. 9). This related to the 1992 payment that they took from me personally in Reno the day before Christmas 1992 but did not credit. As I narrated in Chapter 14, I got their Default Notice on the claims in June 1993 saying the claims had been forfeited for non-payment of the fees. But then I simply went to the Woodside bank and retrieved their stamped receipt. That ended the matter, as they were forced to rescind the Default Notice.

Did my Cease and Desist Notice comprise a threat in their eyes? No threats were required, just the evidence. No important mining claims were lost because of the BLM, so I had nothing to threaten them about. About the 1993 payment of $15,000 that I made in January 1993, I never heard anything from them about that check or about its not being "a proper payment." The receivership intervened. So I had no reason to make any threats to the BLM either in 1992 or in 1993. The BLM Default Notice for 1992 that I received by mail in June 1993 had been revoked. Indeed, if the default had not been revoked, Bowers would never have got any of the claims during the receivership. They would have been made *permanently* void. Bowers' assertions, therefore, are all transparent fictions and blatant lies (whether originating from himself or others) and in any case he cannot claim any alleged special knowledge about these matters except perhaps from corrupt FBI agents. Bowers also says:

> The fact is there are still outstanding warrants for his arrest in California. He is still wanted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for questioning on the Reno bombing and also for some threats he made to other shareholders and to other people. So he is well known. We have had a private investigator talk to [sic], there is an FBI office in London, and apparently they were talking to Scotland Yard. So that's all I can tell you. I have been contacted several times in the past five years by the FBI asking questions about Mr. Requa.

The most instructive observation to make here is that this interview of Bowers was made in 2000, and that on May 16, 2001, not long after this interview, I went to the American Embassy in Dublin, Ireland, and got a new U.S. passport. No mention was made at the embassy of any warrants for my arrest, nor was I interrogated about anything. Obviously, their records were checked as they always would be. If the FBI had wanted me for anything, or for questioning about any bombing or threats having been made to shareholders or otherwise, my passport number and my name would have been flagged. I was also at that time in frequent communication with the London FBI (at the U.S. Embassy's Legal Attaché office) and was actually requesting to see one of their agents —

one Jackie Zapocosta in London — referred to me by Ernie Herbert of the Utah FBI. I sent faxes and received confirmatory responses back by mail. So, clearly, I was not officially wanted for anything. The FBI could have questioned me on many occasions and yet had no interest in doing so; and they certainly knew how to find me. I got mail from them via my solicitor in Birmingham.

Also very telling was the Washington, D.C., FBI office's response (see Document no. 16) to the Freedom of Information request I had made (the response sent to me care of my UK attorney in Birmingham, England, in 2001). As noted previously, they made no mention of warrants, threats by me, or wanting to question me about anything. They in fact said that they had nothing on file under my name — only a name "similar" to mine. Although that statement, as I've pointed out, is patently untrue, the *fact* that the Freedom of Information office denied the files' existence reveals some important truths.

After all the FBI agents I had had dealings with, they must have had stacks of paperwork on me. As mentioned previously, I'd seen the fat and bulging file Agent Christman showed me on his investigation about the BLM bombing when (after the spurious and impossible allegations of my involvement) he finally told me that "no one in this office" thought I had anything to do with the bombing, that the Washington office had still been prodding them to investigate me further, but that in Utah they considered the matter closed. With that comment, he tossed the very thick file on me back onto his desk as if to give added emphasis to his point that there was no case against me.

The Freedom of Information office was, I suspect, just hiding the *false* information they had with which some corrupt agents had doctored up my files — the things that would have seemingly "justified" (to a casual or first-time agent reading it) their very evident intensive surveillance on me. For them to reveal information in the files that was, on second look, demonstrably false would have been a problem for them, to say the least. And that they were following up on such fantasies and taking them seriously would look equally bad.

Above all, what they would *not* have wanted disclosed was the fact that they were creating false information as justifications or explanations for the attempts on my life that were being planned. By alleging I was a crazed lunatic making death threats, they set the stage for plans to shoot me on the Stanford campus or elsewhere. Supportive fictions along these lines were also created to explain why I might disappear or be found dead as a suicide or murder victim. The many false reports to the police and FBI were made so that a justification appeared on record for anticipated shootings, or otherwise to explain my planned death at the Millbrae Travelodge or, later, at the Capitol Motel. By fluffing their files with these fictions, the criminal factions in the FBI that were leaking surveillance on me to the street gangs showed that they would stop at nothing to justify the planned atrocities.

In any case — since there were no plausible *official* FBI records on me that were adverse to me in any way (or at that point to *any* records they were willing to admit to), and since there was nothing at all from either the State Department or the U.S. embassies in London or Dublin indicating that I was being sought by the U.S. government for anything — I was issued a new passport (which I still have) within two hours. And the FBI office at the Embassy in London never showed any interest, either before or afterwards, in seeing me (even given the fact that I had requested to see them).

Then there was the Rev. Marsh's slip of the tongue to my doctor friend that the FBI plans about which she knew, were — "of course" — "secret." Could these "secret" plans have been rooted in the 1974 failed scheme to frame me for the Edelman murder (for which an FBI agent himself might have been responsible or complicit)? I think so. And could the secret plans have to do as well with other murders that were also either committed or contemplated for the purpose of framing me — but which also failed to falsely implicate me after I removed the planted evidence of them in my vehicles in the summer of 1993? That I also believe. In any case, my brother Ralph has reportedly been alleging ever since (up through this book's publication) to others that I murdered *several* people. If Ralph had heard that from anybody else it would of course have been from some criminalized FBI agents.

Contrast the established facts about my communications with FBI offices (faxes and e-mails) and my appearance at the Dublin Embassy with Roger Bowers' videotaped allegation that I was a "prime suspect" of the FBI in the BLM bombing in that same time period:

> It was later, before Stephen fled the country, he made several written threats to that BLM office and I don't know if I've got copies of all of them but I have copies of some of those threatening letters to the BLM. It was shortly after that someone threw a bomb on top of the BLM office building in Reno. This is a federal crime. They actually bombed the building and because of his threats to the BLM, Stephen Requa was one of the prime suspects of that bombing. I don't know if he was actually interrogated but I do know they wanted to interrogate him. I can tell you that I have been contacted by three if not four different offices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation wanting to know about Mr. Requa. They also know that we the receivership recovered some of his personal effects from a vehicle after he was arrested on a weapons charge, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation requested some of his personal items so they could be tested to see if they could match any of the evidence found in the bombing.

Again Bowers refers above to alleged written threats I made to the BLM, for which I would have had no conceivable motive (apparently he was just trying to contribute to the perception that I was insane). If he had had copies of those (nonexistent) threatening letters, he surely would have produced them. His assertions are also contradictory: the BLM was not willing to talk about anything that Bowers miraculously claims to have all the information on anyway; and there is no way he could have gotten any of this information from anybody except persons engaged in crimes. Nothing Bowers has said in these matters is in the least believable, and any discriminating viewer of these interviews could only conclude that his whole spiel is ridiculous. That his interviewer, Johan Eriksson, failed that most basic discrimination test poses many questions.

It is especially interesting here to note that Bowers and the receiver got the truck, courtesy of Judge Veal in San Mateo, in August 1993, yet

the BLM office was not bombed until the end of October. Why would FBI agents want to see if items from the truck could be matched to a bombing that hadn't yet happened — that in fact wouldn't occur until two months after I lost the truck? Again Bowers is willing to say impossible and quite stupid things (stupid for either Bowers or the FBI to say). The answer here of course is that the FBI agents were just making it up. These were *corrupt* FBI agents talking to Bowers, and they just wanted to give Bowers ammunition to use against me — and/or they wanted to establish with Bowers that, basically, the criminal elements of the FBI were intent on neutralizing me by whatever means necessary. They especially wanted Bowers to believe all the other lies that were being spread by criminals both inside and outside the FBI who together were involved in the court frauds.

This was thus a two-pronged operation. Bowers was getting false allegations about me from the fraud artists and securities racketeers, while allied corrupt FBI agents were calling him about other fictitious assertions. Bowers thus appears to have got the (desired and intended) messages from those agents to the effect that he could get away with anything when it came to defrauding Banner International and its assets and defaming me. As seen in his above statements, he was not only being foolish but downright stupid, just a mouthpiece asserting plainly ridiculous and impossible things. We will return to these statements later.

All these matters — beginning with the actual corruption of the BLM office and proceeding to the calls to Bowers by the FBI agents — point to the same conclusion: These crimes against Banner International and myself were organized and instigated by overtly criminalized FBI agents (not just by misled ones but by *real* criminals such as FBI Agent X). They were spreading egregious lies that they knew were lies. And Agent X had been falsifying state records in collaboration with Mike Bean. In the context of the other evidenced lies of FBI agents later being made to people like the Rev. Marsh, and earlier to Commander O'Keefe, and to other reported Banner shareholders — and also in the context of the recorded call to the London media investigator by Agent X (of which I have a copy) — this should all be obvious. This also jibes with my brother Ralph's statement to me in early 1993 that the FBI agent he spoke to (presumably Agent Cross in Utah) said I was "irrational"

with him and that "there was nothing" to my DOC complaints against the stock fraudsters in California.

By the time in 2000 when the FBI was contacting Bowers, the Salt Lake City FBI had long concluded that I could have had nothing to do with the bombing. I had been through that whole line of questioning personally with the FBI in Salt Lake City in October 1993. So the corrupt FBI factions that were contacting Bowers must have also been responsible for the FBI calls to Margaret Hall, must have also exerted the extensive influence on the Rev. Marsh, and must have made the calls to other Banner shareholders and possibly also to Commander O'Keefe. Many FBI agents were, in any case, by this time worried that the long history of organized crime worming itself into the fiber of the FBI that began under J. Edgar Hoover would suddenly and catastrophically (for them) be exposed. Could there be any other explanation?

To be sure, some of the FBI agents were possibly just trying to save the skins of people with the last name of Bush (along with their own skins). These would have been agents of the ilk detailed by Al Martin in his book on the multitude of Iran-Contra scandals in which he had himself been involved on behalf of the Bushes (and consequently about which he knew a great deal). A primary objective of those frauds had been to fund various Republican Party organizations under the Bushes' leadership. Everything I was seeing in 1993 was uncannily like what Al Martin has described in the case of Iran-Contra.

There is essentially one point Bowers made that can and *should* be taken at face value. The FBI on several occasions did contact Bowers as alleged. Most likely they were criminalized FBI agents in the employ of the Bush family. But did Bowers know it was a criminalized faction within the FBI? Possibly not. He knew for sure that he basically had a blank check to collaborate with anybody hostile to me. He also knew what the party-line lies about me were supposed to be. That the FBI faction involved also wanted Ralph Requa to believe the same things is equally and unavoidably to be concluded. In light of the above I would have to assume, therefore, that the FBI agents involved were also the sources of the allegations made to Ralph that I had murdered people, and they had probably told the Rev. Marsh the same thing. That seems to be the *only* explanation for the Rev. Marsh's abject terror of me and her willingness

to blindly acquiesce to the FBI while they were doing the most corrupt and evil things that they could devise for me.

I do believe, as I have stated earlier, that other murders did happen with the intent to frame me for them. These criminals in the FBI were not fooling around. Of course, they were also among the same criminalized FBI agents who were leaking their surveillance information on me to street gangsters in California and Utah — the ones who showed up at the Millbrae Travelodge, at the Capitol Motel, and at all the other places where they showed up from time to time when I made phone calls or used my credit cards. They were all dead-set on nailing me one way or another, but it turned out that they were incompetent and that I outsmarted them. As in the case of Bowers, they were all being downright stupid and filled with their own arrogance, complacency, and very misplaced sense of invulnerability. Stupidity always makes one vulnerable, whether one is a corrupt FBI agent or a yes-man geologist who once worked for H.L. Hunt. And greed always makes one stupid.

* * * * *

In late 2008, an official court report, filed on April 22, 1994, was provided to me that had been submitted by Roger Bowers to receiver Richard Caspar as a part of the Utah court frauds. It was the first time in all of those 14-plus years that I had known of this report's existence. It included the following statement from Bowers about the Requa/Hoover Files in a section of the report called "Condition of the Files":

> Geologic Files recovered from The Vault in Reno, Nevada, were in a state of almost complete disarray. Although there were labelled file folders, the contents rarely matched the label. Many of the bound reports appeared to have been disassembled, were without their indicated maps and figures, and generally appear to have been cannibalized.... Parts of some maps and figures had been torn out and pasted onto other maps and figures.... Several maps had no identifying marks, and it remains unknown as to which property they belong.

The delivery of this report came as a complete surprise. I got it unexpectedly from someone who had got it from Bowers. This report, and the several items noted in this chapter and the following one, at last provide Banner shareholders with documented proof that Bowers was engaged in fraud during the receivership. This forms a powerful basis for litigation against Bowers and against Toriello's and Caspar's Osceola Gold mining company and its principals. It is new evidence never seen before, which legally tolls (extends) the statute of limitations.

First, let's look at the plausibility of such a statement as Bowers made. The Requa/Hoover files were housed in dozens of large multi-drawer file cabinets containing literally thousands of files and reports on individual mining properties, and compiled by my father, who was a meticulous and highly professional record keeper of great repute. For this collection to have been in such a state of complete disarray as Bowers described, after having been so completely and methodically organized, would have required a willful and painstaking effort to reek chaos on them over a period of time — and for what purpose? In fact, all my father's files and records were exactly as I had inherited them. The notes he placed in each file (as described in detail below by Dan McCullar, who also happened to be an excellent record keeper) were notes I had urged him to make during his later years so as to have the benefit of his further thoughts in each file and/or on each property. Over a period of many years he did this on a daily basis for several properties each day. I would often check to see his progress and read his comments. Their enormous value was precisely in their being so thorough, so well-ordered, and so well-maintained throughout his life. For what reason would I have "cannibalized" any of them? We were active only on Osceola and Merritt Mountain. Thus Bowers' "report" to Caspar was as far from the truth as could possibly be imagined. As Harry Truman used to say, "there are liars and damned liars". The comments in that report — along with all the videotaped comments already known to me — proved Bowers to be a "damned liar," and they proved to be part of a systematic effort to cast a smoke screen around the outright theft of the files through the most extreme form of judicial fraud imaginable, as executed by Judge Tyrone Medley in the Utah Third Judicial Court.

In the same April 22, 1994, report, Bowers — ever the "damned liar" — provides his summation of the available technical reports on Osceola, and he even provides a Document Inventory. But nowhere does he list Breitrick's summary memorandum of August 10, 1991 (see Document no. 14), which included the following evaluation based on his work at Osceola over the preceding several years:

> The mapping and sampling I have done at Osceola during the past 4 years have demonstrated that all the favourable geologic criteria necessary for the formation of gold deposits are present. These features are particularly favourable in their juxtaposition with the prior mined deposits at Osceola of both placer and lode gold. My professional opinion is that Osceola is very likely to contain several ore bodies along the Pilot Knob Ridge…Further, the geologic features suggest there could be very high grade vein and breccia pipe ore bodies, replacement gold ore bodies, as well as disseminated gold deposits. Of the many properties I have worked on, Osceola is my most preferred, and the one that has demonstrated the best and greatest potential for long-term, sustained production, and the likelihood of becoming a world class mining district. The surface field work has now been complete, with structures and mineralization indicating the locations of the underlying targets to be drilled.

Most egregiously of all, although Bowers lists the supposed catalogue of reports and data, he excludes the most important and comprehensive report — namely, John Prochnau's full-scale Certified Geological Report of June 16, 1992 (which Prochnau recertified at my request on September 25, 2001). This 18-page document is fully comprehensive in both its evaluation of our own data and the conduct of his own confirmatory investigations and analyses. Prochnau's conclusions in that report reflect a conclusion of his prior letter to me written on November 20, 1991:

> Finally, your efforts of the past couple of field seasons have *dramatically improved* [emphasis added] the technical data base at Osceola and served to clarify targets to the point where your initial drill programs can now be designed with optimum effectiveness (see Document no. 15).

Prochnau's Certified Report *formally* certified the reality of the above statement with full particulars and data from both his own and our analyses, maps, and other data. No one could have suppressed the geological realities and the great likelihood of producing gold deposits at Osceola more efficiently than what Roger Bowers did by suppressing Prochnau's Certified Report — or what filmmaker Johan Eriksson did to suppress all input of Prochnau and McCullar from his so-called documentary while highlighting the views of a gas station attendant whose father had taken what was in effect a $150,000 bribe to assist the court frauds. Everybody involved from 1992 onward knew all about the Prochnau reports on both Merritt Mountain and Osceola. Suppressing them, or knowingly evading discussion of them and not listing them for the court, in my personal view, was a major crime and court fraud deserving of an investigation by a special prosecutor (certainly a direction in which I intend to go).

In his summary report, John Breitrick documented thousands of soil and rock samples that he took (concurrent with his geological mapping) in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Yet Bowers' report issued by his, Toriello's, and Stevenson's Osceola Gold Mining Company, and dated March 1996, states the following:

> Exploration activity since 1979 has been minimal....Limited and sporadic activities continued through 1992, but efforts were minimal compared to the work done in 1974 and 1978. Most of the work done from 1987 to 1992 was designed to fulfil the government's requirements for annual assessment work to keep the claims valid.

Nothing implicates Bowers as a "damned liar" more — or better confirms the truth of the Prochnau and Breitrick reports — than Bowers' *own* letter of April 9, 1991, to the Stanford Placement Service (reproduced in full in Document no. 5) in which he stated:

> I was immediately impressed with the quantity and quality of geologic work that Stephen has done on these properties…. As a geologist, Stephen has done an outstanding job of exploring the two properties. The program under his direction, has included detailed mapping of the

> geology, taking thousands of soil and rock samples for analysis and assay, conducting geophysical surveys, trenching and drilling, and evaluating all results and compiling them into a geological model for each property. By effectively applying the modern techniques and by being at the forefront of geological developments in the industry, he has achieved alone as much or more than most mining companies achieve with large staffs. His geological accomplishments have been impressive to say the least.. It must be noted that Osceola is the site of the largest placer gold deposit in Nevada. Although this deposit had been mined since the late 1880s the "Mother Lode" source of the placer gold had not been identified. The exploration program Stephen has marshalled and managed has led to the geologic understanding which now indicates this "Mother Lode". Stephen has built Banner Exploration into a strong mining company that, I believe, is on the verge of major success. His business acumen seems to come naturally and his professionalism is beyond reproach…..As a professional geologist, I am proud to commend and endorse Stephen Herrick Requa.

Needless to say (and I've elsewhere said it), his own letter, which had been in Stanford University's files, was removed at his request. Thus Bowers chose to dissociate from and suppress every bit of evidence from every source (including himself) that contradicted his subsequent, wholly fraudulent "position." This letter by Bowers, of course, along with Prochnau's and Breitrick's, had also been seen by Johan Eriksson. Naturally, I had shown Eriksson all these crucial things and asked him to call both McCullar and Prochnau. He did not. Since Eriksson certainly had got Bowers' letter and seen the others, one would have thought that Eriksson (like any self-respecting journalist) might have had some pointed questions for Bowers, and would also have wanted to talk with Prochnau and Breitrick, as well as with Dan McCullar. But instead Johan was completely on board with the smear agenda, as indicated by his pleadings with Phil Wunsch, a London metals trader who had expressed interest in possibly investing in the Nevada properties. Johan had filmed him speaking about this possibility early in his filming before Johan's other agendas began to appear. After he showed Wunsch what he was planning on broadcasting — i.e., that it was to be a smear job on Banner and myself — Johan begged Wunsch not to tell me (see Document no. 17).

Much effort in Johan's final product appears to have been expended to evade the truth at all costs. At the top of the list of critical omissions, once again, was John Prochnau and his independent Certified Geologic Reports, filled as they are with data of his own, reviews of our data, and assessments made personally by him on the properties. Wunsch also wrote an affidavit (see Document no. 18) on the about-face made by a local geologist at Merritt Mountain, Jimmy Nyrehn, who I briefly hired to relocate the claims and with whom Wunsch had spoken by phone about the property's merits for investing. At that time Nyrehn was extolling the possibilities for gold deposits and was saying how he too had found gold there and wanted to stake claims there for himself years before, but found out that Banner had them. But he had a very sudden change in his story about Merritt Mountain after Johan visited him for the documentary. In any case, Nyrehn does not make it on any list of notable consulting geologists, whereas John Prochnau ranks right at the top of the world's best-known and most successful. Johan provided the lamest of excuses for the egregious omission of Prochnau — that Prochnau didn't answer his phone when Johan called. (Perhaps Johan thought Prochnau's report wasn't important enough to warrant more than one attempted phone call — or, more likely, he was afraid of what Prochnau might say. He knew what it would be: that Merritt Mountain was a very valid target for gold deposits, with Osceola also at *the top of the list* of desirable targets.)

Another authority who effectively attested to the reality and importance of the files — in sharp contradiction to Eriksson's comments to Bowers in video rushes about my "hype" of the files — was none other than the former Finance Minister of Peru. After all, it was my selections from the real files that I had showed Carlos Rodriguez-Pastor that prompted him to invite me to the ill-fated 1991 meeting with Fujimori. I think the former Peruvian Finance Minister, crook that he turned out to be, was nevertheless fully proficient when it came to detecting hype, and he would not have arranged a private meeting between me and his country's President (also attended by Prochnau) for me to pass on any hype, nor would have he called the files "muy, muy importante" to Fujimori in my presence if they had been mere "hype." In fact, major

players in the world crime scene were extremely interested in the files from that moment on. Eriksson was swallowing Bowers' lies hook, line, and sinker — or pretended to do so.

These files were thus the Holy Grail after which all the criminals of 1993 were in hot pursuit. Finding out what has really happened to those files, where they really are and where they ended up, and who really got them must be our objective in what promises to be one of the most important criminal investigations of the century. Prochnau, in a 2002 filmed recollection, here contextualizes the significance of that private meeting with Fujimori that he had also attended:

> Stephen in 1991 was invited through an associate, Carlos Rodriguez Pastor, who I believe was a former finance minister of Peru, to attend a reception for President Fujimori in San Francisco, and we attended that reception with Steve and several other associates with Banner at the time. Following the reception there was a private meeting with President Fujimori in his suite in the hotel, which was the Saint Francis. We were invited to attend that private meeting. We were introduced to the President and subsequently had a little get-together with cocktails with a number of other San Francisco dignitaries.
>
> President Fujimori and former finance minister Pastor had expressed interest in the Hoover/Requa Files and the extensive information they included and contained regarding certain properties in Central America. President Fujimori was interested in introducing Steve and Banner to a number of Peruvian companies that were interested in investing in that part of the world and utilizing those files as a basis for that.
>
> In the early 1990s the [mining] industry in Latin America had been floundering from lack of investment for some time largely because of political systems that were not particularly favorable to foreign investment. In the 1990s, with the change in the global scene that followed the fall of the Soviet Union, a number of new regimes came into power in Latin America, [which] included Fujimori in Peru, whose policies were more oriented to an open market. So this meant that there was increased interest by the international mining community in investing in countries like Peru and Central American countries that had very great mineral endowment but a lack of investment for some time. *This of course made Stephen Requa and Banner's possession of proprietary information in the Requa/Hoover Files of extreme value.* [Emphasis added] (See Prochnau's full transcript in Document no. 19, and Affidavit in Document no. 20.)

* * * * *

The truth about the immense significance and value of the Requa/Hoover Files — in total contrast to the revisionist fictions of Bowers, Eriksson, and their ilk — has been remarked upon by many people. The following additional quotations about the files are taken from various videotaped interviews. The first quoted comment, made about 2001 by geologist John Prochnau, provides some background on what was for generations a family business run with great integrity:

> Lawrence Requa, who was Stephen's father, was a very well-known mining geologist in Nevada and throughout the world and the third generation of a family of very prominent mining engineers and entrepreneurs that began with the great grandfather — who came to California in the Gold Rush and had a very successful career in developing mines there — and following with the grandfather Mark Requa, who was an associate and very close friend, business associate, and campaign manager for Herbert Hoover, another famous American mining engineer who became President of the United States [from] 1928 to 1932. I met him a number of times in my early career. Lawrence Requa was one of those patriarchs and gurus of the industry that all young geologists went to when they had questions about projects in Nevada or elsewhere where Mr. Requa had worked. I had several such meetings [with him] toward the end of his very long and productive life. By all standards he was both a gentleman and highly respected in his profession with a very excellent record and reputation.

Young geologists went to my father for information on mining properties. He was known to have had information and geological data on most of the known gold prospects and mines in the Western states. He had seen most of them. Getty Oil was a case in point: they retained my father in the early 1970s for his information on the Mercur mining district where Herbert Hoover and my grandfather and father spent about a million dollars in the 1930s on exploration and development. Getty Oil hired my father precisely because he had that hard data (in the

Requa/Hoover Files) that they could get nowhere else. And this was no mined-out mine; it had hardly been mined at all. Contrast this with Roger Bowers' claims in the interviews made with him by Eriksson:

> I don't know whether you have seen it but there is documentation that most of the actual Requa/Hoover files or anything that pertains to former President Hoover, most of the files, and Stephen makes mention of this, two tons or three tons of files, were donated to the University of Wyoming and remained at their library. So most of the files, the historical files, the ones that had true historical value and geological record, were donated by Larry Requa to the University of Wyoming. Basically what's left is the junk that the University of Wyoming apparently didn't want and were given to Steve by his father. They were what was left over from what was donated to the University of Wyoming. So most of the true Requa/Hoover Files are in Wyoming at the library and you can get access to those. So what we have got are the leftovers that either had no value or he just didn't want to give them away.

Again, Bowers is commenting with presumed authority about something on which he had no knowledge at all. Prior to the court frauds in which he immersed himself, Bowers had never seen the files. He knew nothing about them except about my father's reputation and what I told him about them. The actual volume of the papers my father gave to the University of Wyoming was five tons, which he presented to them during the late 1960s while he was still active in geological consulting. The truth, therefore, is obviously the exact opposite of Bowers' allegation: the files my father gave to the University of Wyoming were in fact just the files that he himself had no use for and which would likewise be of no use to me or anybody else in gold exploration. Obviously, he wasn't going to keep the "junk" either for himself or for me. He was *getting rid of* the junk. He kept the files that had potential commercial and geologic value for new exploration whether by himself, for use with his consulting work, and/or for use with me. He was still earning consulting fees up through the mid-1970s. A geologist doesn't consult using his junk files. Prochnau and "all young geologists" (in his words) came to my father for valuable information, not to look through junk.

This is so obvious that it is remarkable that Bowers would make such

blatantly ridiculous assertions. Nobody gives away things of value and keeps what is worthless. But Bowers had to say something to distract from the truth: A mass of very valuable files had been stolen through very serious court frauds in which he, at minimum, was an accomplice after the fact (if not before the fact). All he could say about these matters (for his own purposes and those of his allies) was something completely stupid on its face, so that is what he said. Certainly my father was not going to give away all the valuable files and keep the worthless ones. But what else could Bowers say?

Just as curious is the mental inertia of the interviewer, Johan Eriksson, who listened to this with a straight face and then commented about my supposed "hype" on the files. The reality, history, and value of the files were well-known among the most illustrious of gold geologists for many decades. If anything, Roger Bowers would have much less ability to judge those files than the top experts in the field — and more to the point — he has demonstrably lied in an organized effort of disinformation and fraud. He has done so, it would seem, in tandem with FBI agents. At least that's what he says himself.

The real content and value of the files just prior to their being stolen through the Utah court frauds are detailed by geologist Dan McCullar in a recorded interview in 2001 (see Document no. 21). McCullar has over 30 years experience in the field, and as an international consultant, is a true expert; here is the relevant part of what he said in that interview:

> In the late 1980s Steve would come by my house on numerous occasions. He spent the field seasons, the summers, in Nevada collecting rock samples and trying to map out the conceptual models that he would develop over the winter from all the data he would collect over the summer. He would also bring by files that he would find in the database his father had left him, the Hoover/Requa Files. There was always something of great interest that he would find. He spoke of the enormity of their volume and how he had just begun to scratch the surface of these files. Some of these files would be typed [sheets of] paper, some bound volumes. I remember seeing handwritten notes from his father, some in pencil, some in pen, maps, [with] lots of exclamation points, underlines, and identifying marks that would indicate that certain files were of extreme importance — that their prospective nature was of high value.

> I remember specifically files from Central America and Honduras, the fact that Honduras was heavily forested and his father has spent an enormous amount of time travelling the rivers and hiking up the river valleys, mapping the outcrops, describing the mineralized areas that would not be easily seen by air photos. There were also volumes of files from Nevada, Idaho, and California, Arizona, and New Mexico. The varied nature of these files and the wide geographic range just spoke of the prolific nature of his grandfather's and father's investigative methods.
>
> In 1991 I had an opportunity to visit Stephen in his apartment in Woodside and saw the files. He had moved them into a series of fireproof vaulted filing cabinets that were extremely heavy. I remember Steve having strained his back at one time, having a very painful back injury [and] trying to move one of these filing cabinets. They took up an entire wall of the apartment. I remember there being quite a lot of concern that anybody else would even know the existence here of these files as Stephen discovered the value of the large number of important files…
>
> He pulled open numerous drawers. We spent several hours looking through many files. They were all very carefully categorized by geographic regions. He would pull out some files that had the most amazing things written by his father, notes attached, some paper-clipped attached, some typewritten pages, descriptions of individual areas, some hand-drawn maps, some published maps with handwritten notes on the maps that identified geologic features on the maps. There was no question that there was a huge amount of data present and that it was not easy to move this volume of data from place to place.
>
> It was clear that the real value of the company was in the files and that once we could get the mines in operation in Osceola and/or Merritt Mountain, that the real value for our company's future was in trying to exploit some of the data that had never been investigated with modern mining technology.
>
> It was a very exciting time. We were certain that the company had a very bright future, and we were looking forward to quite a prosperous and exciting future in the mining industry based on the files that Stephen had inherited.

John Prochnau, who had met previously with my father on several occasions and had received valuable information from him and from the files, made the following comments at about that same time (see Document no. 19):

> Steve Requa showed me the Requa/Hoover Files. They were stored in his office in the Bay Area. There was a very large room full of filing cabinets and Steve showed me several of these that contained files on various properties that his father has examined in the past…. These files were documented over a period of years by his father and grandfather and during their venture with Herbert Hoover during the twenties and thirties…. In my view, that kind of information is of extraordinary interest and value…. I think the real value of those files is that they provide information that's not available from any other source.

The statements by these geologists require little commentary by me. These individuals have nothing to gain by any false statements (they saw what they saw and reported it), whereas Rogers Bowers did have something to gain. He was not only in possession of at least some of the files but, notably, also ended up in possession of some of the claims at Osceola that Osceola Gold — the fraudulent company set up by the receivership to receive them — assigned to him when it was dissolved. That was one of the benefits to Bowers for his services rendered.

Even more pertinent and compelling in this context are the impressive 2008 successes of my new companies (those I'd set up to succeed the destroyed one) in Central America. These companies *very quickly* identified some gold showings with high values in both gold itself and in the trace elements (mercury, arsenic, and antimony) that often point to associated gold deposits lying at a depth below them. Indeed, the values of gold (and/or the trace elements) that were reported by assay labs were extremely high. Locating these gold showings — finding their specific locations in the field in Honduras — was only made possible by my understanding of — and by my detailed and specific recollections of — the data contained in the stolen Requa/Hoover Files, which I spent 20 years studying with my father. These are undeveloped properties — *not* old mined-out deposits (as would falsely be alleged by Roger Bowers) — and I was able to direct from Europe our new field crew to the *exact* locations of the gold showings based on my prior familiarization with the now-stolen files (a familiarization acquired via countless hours spent

examining the files with my father). I should emphasize that this was also information I gleaned from the files *after* my father gave the five tons of data to the University of Wyoming. I never went through any of the data donated to the university; it wasn't even stored in his working files! This conclusively proves both the value of the files, particularly of the large portion of the files *not* donated, contrary to the false allegations of Roger Bowers; and my detailed knowledge of these now-missing and stolen files. On every account except for his statements about the FBI calling him, Bowers has thus been shown to be a purveyor of lies.

Not only was it important to shroud the theft of the files in the various fictions generated by Bowers and others; it was also critical for similar reasons to allege that I had never really met President Fujimori, in view of his likely being one of the prime instigators of the takeover with Carlos Rodriguez-Pastor. In light of all the crimes that were to follow, why else would Carlos have gone to the extent of getting Fujimori and me together in Fujimori's private hotel suite? To be sure, Fujimori's having been interested in the files and having wanted to meet me about them only confirmed their great value. In addition, Fujimori's interest posed some questions as to who was involved in stealing the files and for what reasons: possibly to assist in laundering money through gold mines? Bowers claims in the interview that he was "informed" by some of those present at the Fujimori occasion that I never personally met Fujimori at all, that I was just present at a large banquet. There were, in fact — exactly as Prochnau has stated in his recorded interviews and in an affidavit (see Document no. 20) — only four other people present with me at the private meeting, besides a very few Fujimori aides, who included the ugly lawyer who forced his way into the picture. Those four were Carlos Rodriguez Pastor, John Prochnau, and the pair whom I have referred to in this book as Smitty and Santos. Bowers of course (deficient as he was in any exemplary gold exploration accomplishments) was *not* there.

* * * * *

During the videotaped interview Bowers also repeated quite a phe-

nomenal litany of defamatory comments about me personally. Most of these were also pure hearsay on his part and originated, he claimed, from other investors who called him. I could think of no investors who were not a part of the Stevenson/Smitty/Santos/Kiernan schemers who would have called Bowers for any reason.

In any case, Bowers made the following allegations based purely on what other people allegedly told him: (1) that at Osceola on the mountain I once stripped naked and importuned "the spirits" to show me where to drill for the gold (this one is beneath my commenting on); (2) that I had told investors that we had mining operations going on at both Nevada sites (I would have been found out right away if I had said that!); (3) that according to the "receiver" I had taken $200,000 of company funds for myself just before the receivership, presumably in cash or checks (to which I would ask, where could such amounts have gone?); and (4) most significantly, that I was "threatening" everyone — the BLM, shareholders, almost everybody. Concerning item (3) above, I certainly didn't have such funds while I was being a house renovator and builder in Europe; and the fact is that the receiver squandered the $400,000 in the accounts, paying for such things as exorbitant lawyers' fees among the accomplices. Concerning item (4) about my threatening people, that is what David Enright alleged to Sgt. O'Keefe and what he alleged in court. The absurdities of these allegations have already been pointed out.

Ralph too was alleging to many that I was threatening both him and my mother. He alleged this to Margaret Hall and her daughter Joy Vega, as they stated in an interview with Johan Eriksson. Joy Vega was alleging in that interview that I was threatening her. Supposedly, many people were alleging that I was threatening them after my false arrest — so it was said by the judge and others. But no one was ever willing to come in during the court hearing or the later hospital hearing to assert those false allegations or try to offer any proof for them. Hence the hearing officer let me go. Ralph, as I learned in 2008, was also alleging that I and a friend had moved into my mother's room at the retirement home in 1993 and we were sleeping on her floor. That, of course, is also a very far-fetched lie. The one thing all these people had in common, it would seem, is the

backdrop of some nasty criminals in the FBI egging them on. Hence the "courage" of each of them to spout blatant lies. They knew they were being protected by the FBI. Whether they could distinguish "real" (i.e., honest) FBI agents from FBI agents who were criminals is another matter.

Sorting out this spaghetti tangle of lies is seemingly a daunting task. But those lies began to unravel by my determination and accomplishments, along with the stupidity of the criminals, after the takeover and theft of the files. Specifically, (1) I managed to recover the most important claims at both Nevada properties because Bowers hadn't maintained them properly, nor did he even cover the most essential areas with his new claims after defaulting on Banner's claims (e.g., the Collapse Breccia and the Cumberland Ridge); (2) I discovered a big new "Main Root Vein" at Merritt Mountain; and (3) I located and signed a contract in Central America on a high-grade gold mine that I knew of from my father's files.

In addition, there are three overarching factors that I believe are evident that simplify the task of understanding this strange phenomenon of mass delusional lying. The first is that the corrupt FBI agents were manipulating people with fear. They were alleging, basically, that I was a lunatic and a homicidal maniac, besides being a mad bomber. I think this is especially evident in the recorded telephone call with the Rev. Marsh. Her great fear (of me) is clear. But I had personally given her no reason for such fear.

The second factor is that there are/were some big-money interests in the background. People were repeating the FBI-approved lies (and originating others) to ingratiate themselves to the big-money people who were behind the FBI corruption. People wanted to believe the lies because that was the ticket to this party — the party that was being hosted by Ralph Requa and Roger Bowers to please some rich people and their hired criminalized FBI agents.

The third factor is that everybody thought they could get away with all their lies — along with the big crimes they were assisting — because the FBI agents were protecting them or at least were on their side. Given

that all those involved in the securities racketeering would have been very determined to discredit me any way they could, such a campaign of lies to Bowers is easy to understand and is to be expected.

But Bowers also said several things, and also wrote some things that first came to my attention in late 2008, that were likewise outright lies originating with him — statements he made with sure knowledge that they were lies. One big lie was that he had met me at the airport in Dallas when I was on my way back from negotiating with Toriello in 1992. I did meet Bowers then, but it was not at the airport. It was at his home to conduct a shareholders' meeting for which I had made a legitimate notice to all shareholders. The meeting was to ratify what we were negotiating with Toriello. Bowers served as the secretary of the meeting and wrote the minutes. He would not have wanted to admit that because later the allegation was that I was deranged and not following corporate procedures. Bowers said he met me at the airport for two hours and that I "did not appear to be myself." This is another outright and complete lie by Bowers. So he was not just mouthing the lies of others. He was making up his own, knowing full well that they were plain and simple lies.

* * * * *

And now here is, I trust, the *coup de grace* for Mr. Bowers. In one of the taped interviews, Bowers says this:

> So it [Banner International] was that type of operation: lack of good science…In the files we found probably four or five thousand sample assays, but there were no maps or charts or notes showing where those samples came from. So he spent thousands of dollars alone on laboratory tests but it's totally useless data because we have no idea where these samples came from.

As Roger Bowers knew very well, virtually all the samples were taken by John Breitrick, our field geologist, who did almost all the work during those years. Bowers even hired Breitrick as a field geologist *after* the receivership. Bowers also saw all that data — from all those thousands of samples plotted not only on Breitrick's own field sheets and maps, but

also on the compiled maps I myself did based on Breitrick's samples. All that data and all those maps were then seized and plundered by the receiver and then by Bowers. They also could have got all that data from Breitrick. They assumed, therefore, that they had been able to rely on that data being *criminally suppressed*. Unfortunately for them, however, in late 2008 I was able to recover *all* of it: *all* the data and *all* the maps that show *exactly* where *all* the samples were taken. I have copies of all the data in my possession.

These results and these many maps provide the reason why John Breitrick wrote the following (taken from his summary memorandum of 1991 quoted previously in this chapter (see Document no. 14):

> Of the many properties I have worked on, Osceola is my most preferred, and the one that has demonstrated the best and greatest potential for long-term, sustained production, and the likelihood of becoming a world class mining district. The surface field work has now been complete, with structures and mineralization indicating the locations of the underlying targets to be drilled.

The maps and data also provide the backup evidence for Roger Bowers' April 9, 1991 letter to the Stanford Placement Service (quoted previously and reproduced in full in Document no. 5), in which he praises my work on Osceola and Merritt Mountain and concludes that "[b]y effectively applying the modern techniques and by being at the forefront of geological developments in the industry, he has achieved alone as much or more than most mining companies achieve with large staffs. His geological accomplishments have been impressive to say the least." Bowers wrote similar substantiations for the work, especially Breitrick's, in another letter (see Document no. 13).

Since interviewer Johan Eriksson had a copy of that letter, one would think that he might have asked Bowers to explain the total, mind-boggling contradiction between what he then wrote and what he was now saying for Eriksson's cameras. One would have naturally thought this, but for some reason both Bowers and Johan seemed oblivious to any concern that they might be called to account for these gross differences.

In the interviews Bowers briefly alleges that I had altered his past written conclusions (meaning his Stanford letter), but this is impossible. *All* the letters to the Stanford Placement Service are *only* original signed

documents. That's all they accept. Altering these letters is totally impossible. They are the only ones that have the originals.

In other words, from all these combined items of evidence we have conclusive proof that Roger Bowers (on all fronts except for his comments about the FBI) became after the takeover a complete and systematic liar. It is no surprise that he was able to get some of the Osceola claims assigned to him after the court fraudsters dissolved Osceola Gold. The instigators had got what they wanted — the files themselves — and were happy to let Bowers have his reward with some of the claims. These claims assignments would have been with the approval of Lionel Toriello, who was CEO of Osceola Gold, and Phil Stevenson, who was also a director. All the major crimes of the takeover — at least all the ones identified to date — imply, indicate, or demonstrate a close connivance between Toriello and Stevenson, an abject racketeer.

I also showed to two people who are knowledgeable about the files the interview of Bowers alleging that what was in the back of his pick-up truck was "essentially all" the files. The first was Dan McCullar, whose comments about the files that he had seen have been noted above. In another interview in late 2008, as we looked again over the many maps Dan had seen before, when they were being compiled, he comments about Bowers' later assertions as compared to those in his earlier statements (including the Stanford letter):

> Clearly he's contradicted himself in the film with Johan. It's [the] complete opposite from what he had written about you in the years leading up to the takeover. You collected volumes of data…and clearly what's represented in these geological maps is an extraordinary amount of work. It would have taken a team of graduate students many years to have accomplished what you did out there with John Breitrick and a few others. I remember meeting with him [Bowers] before the take-over, and he couldn't say enough good things about you. Then I remember meeting with him in Arlington [after the takeover] and he clearly tried to influence me into thinking you were somehow … mad or criminally deranged. I remember talking to him about the outcome and the conclusions and how to drill and it had nothing to do with this data here [the recovered data]. Talk about a waste of resources. You did much more with far less than what he had to work with and he threw it away.

Notably, what McCullar says is quite similar to what Bowers had said and written *before* he was very evidently persuaded or induced to lie on a grand scale. I also showed the interview of Bowers to my niece Ann Requa, who saw the files in my father's office not long before he died. To Bowers' assertions that the few boxes in his small pickup truck comprised essentially all the files, Ann's comment serves as a simple and apropos conclusion to this chapter: "What a liar!"

In the next chapter we will follow the stench of the Eriksson "documentary" back to its sources as we continue to uncover the trail of lies and corruption and look at the unintended revelations.