CHAPTER FOUR ORGANIZED CRIME

Just what has the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 got to do with any Indian Tribal Issue? None! As long as no Indian issue or right is used, yet innocent Indians are being imprisoned by the use of this law in which the attorneys conceal : the Indian issue.

I had the privilege to meet former Missouri State Representative John Conley Jr. of United States v. Conley(8th.Cir.)74-1251(1974), 75-1017(1975). In late 1976 he filed a writ that I had helped with in which the 8th Circuit and the Supreme Court denied any relief. Under the exact concept written in this book. The accusation of perjury committed on all counts of the indictment, making a defective indictment that the Supreme Court judged that no conviction could stand. There were 34 pages of current case history quoted. The United States Attorney's response did not deny the accusation of perjury committed. He further did not deny that perjury was committed at all levels including testimonies of F.B.I. agents, D.E.A. agents, A.T.F. agents, informants and operatives. That all the evidence was manufactured right down to the wrong drugs, wrong drug containers, the pictures presented at the trial of Conley were his picture showing the Sun's shadow in one direction while the background in the picture the Sun's shadow was in the opposite direction, and the photographer's testimony admitted the pictures were taken at a later date. This man has an 18 year sentence and at his age he will never see the outside alive.

The Supreme Court denial for any relief had made other political prisoners resign themself to do their full sentence, except the author who now set out to find out why. In mid-1977 when the Author was preparing for his new trial, it was discovered in United States v. Schwanke, (E.Dist.Okla.) 77-54-1-CR. that when the trial judge issues a grant of Immunity under 18 USC. 6001-5, the immunity stands till the accusation of perjury committed

ORGANIZED CRIME '

Just what has the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of

1968 got to do with any indian Tribal Issue? None! As long as no Indian issue or right is used, yet innocent Indians are being imprisoned by the use of this lawin which the attorneys conceal .l the Indian issue.'

I had the privilege to meet former Missouri State Representative John Conley Jr. of United states v. 751017(1975) . In late 1976 he filed a writ that I had helped with in which

the 8th Circuit and the Supreme Court denied any relief. Under the exact

concept written in this book. The accusation of perjury committed on all counts of the indictment, rjxáking a defective "indictment-¿that the Supreme

Court judged that no conviction could stand. There were Bh pages of

current case history quoted. The United States Attorney's response

did not deny the accusation of perjury committed. He further did not deny that perjury was committed at all levels including testimonies of. F.B.I. agents, D.E.A. agents, A.T.F. agents, informants and operatives.

That all the evidence was manufactured right down to the wrong drugs,

wrong drug containers, the pictures presented at the trial of Conley were his picture showing the _Sun's shadow in one direction while the background in the picture the Su,,n's shadow was in the opposite direction, and the photographer's testimony 'admitted the pictures were taken at a later date.

This man has an 18 year sentence and at his age he will never see the outside alive.

The Supreme Court denial for any relief had made other political prisoners

fesign thernself to do their full sentence, except the author who now set

out to-find out why. in mid-1977 when the Author was preparing for his new

trial, it was discovsred in United States v. Schwanke, (E.Dist.0lcla.)

thatwhen the trial judge issues a grant of Immunity under À

13 USC- the inimunity stands till the 'accusation of perjury committed