Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA 2 CHARLOTTESVILLE DIVISION \* 3 4 ELIZABETH SINES, ET AL., CIVIL CASE NO.: 3:17CV72 OCTOBER 28, 2021, 9:08 AM JURY TRIAL, DAY 4 5 Plaintiffs, 6 VS. 7 Before: HONORABLE NORMAN K. MOON 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE JASON KESSLER, ET AL., WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA 9 Defendants. 10 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* 11 APPEARANCES: 12 For the Plaintiffs: 13 ALAN LEVINE, ESQUIRE COOLEY LLP 14 1114 Avenue of the Americas, 46th Floor 15 New York, NY 10036 212.479.6260 16 DAVID E. MILLS, ESQUIRE 17 COOLEY LLP 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, 18 Suite 700 Washington, DC 20004 19 202.842.7800 20 21 22 Court Reporter: Lisa M. Blair, RPR, RMR, CRR, FOCR 255 West Main Street, Suite 304 23 Charlottesville, Virginia 22902 434.296.9284 24 PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY; 25 TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY COMPUTER.

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 APPEARANCES CONTINUED: 2 For the Plaintiffs: MICHAEL L. BLOCH, ESQUIRE ROBERTA A. KAPLAN, ESQUIRE 3 Kaplan Hecker & Fink LLP 350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 7110 4 New York, NY 10118 212.763.0883 5 KAREN L. DUNN, ESQUIRE 6 WILLIAM A. ISAACSON, ESQUIRE JESSICA E. PHILLIPS, ESQUIRE 7 Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP 8 2001 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20006 9 202.223.7300 10 For the Defendants: DAVID L. CAMPBELL, ESQUIRE 11 Duane, Hauck, Davis, Gravatt & Campbell, P.C. 12 100 West Franklin Street, Suite 100 Richmond, VA 23220 13 804.644.7400 CHRISTOPHER CANTWELL, PRO SE 14 #00991-509 15 USP Marion 4500 Prison Road, PO Box 2000 16 Marion, IL 62959 17 BRYAN J. JONES, ESQUIRE Bryan J. Jones, Attorney at law 18 106 W. South Street, Suite 211 Charlottesville, VA 22902 540.623.6952 19 20 JAMES E. KOLENICH, ESQUIRE Kolenich Law Office 21 9435 Waterstone Blvd., Suite 140 Cincinnati, OH 45249 22 513.444.2150 23 WILLIAM E. REBROOK, IV, ESQUIRE The ReBrook Law Office 24 6013 Clerkenwell Court Burke, VA 22015 25 571.215.9006

```
Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021
  APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
1
2
  For the Defendants:
                              JOSHUA SMITH, ESQUIRE
                                Smith LLC
 3
                                807 Crane Avenue
                                Pittsburgh, PA 15216
                                917.567.3168
 4
 5
                                RICHARD SPENCER, PRO SE
 6
                                P.O. Box 1676
                                Whitefish, MT 59937
 7
8
  ALSO PRESENT:
   Dillon Hopper, appearing via Zoom
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	Sin	es,	et al.	v. Kes	ssler,	et a	1., 3	:17CV	72, 1	0/28/	2021	
1					ΙN	D E 2	X					
2	Opening	Stat	tements:									
3	Ву	Ms.	Dunn			• • • • •						26
4	Ву	Ms.	Kaplan.					• • • • • ·				68
5	Ву	Mr.	Kolenic	h		• • • • •		• • • • •				87
6	Ву	Mr.	Spencer	`				• • • • • ·				93
7	Ву	Mr.	Cantwel	1				• • • • • ·				.114
8	Ву	Mr.	Campbel	1				• • • • • ·				.144
9	Ву	Mr.	Jones					• • • • • ·				.147
10	Ву	Mr.	ReBrook	: <b></b>		• • • • •						.151
11	Ву	Mr.	Smith			• • • • •		• • • • • ·				.163
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												
21												
22												
23												
24												
25												
ı	I											

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 1 (Proceedings commenced, 9:08 a.m.) 2 THE COURT: Good morning. Would the clerk call the 3 case, please. THE CLERK: This is Civil Action Number 4 5 3:17-cv-00072, Elizabeth Sines and others versus Jason Kessler and others. 6 7 THE COURT: Plaintiffs ready? 8 MS. DUNN: Yes, we are, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Defendants ready? MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, Your Honor. 10 11 MR. KOLENICH: Yes, Your Honor. 12 MR. JONES: Yes, Your Honor. 13 MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. 14 MR. CANTWELL: Yes, Your Honor. 15 MR. SPENCER: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: All right. Before we begin, I will 17 remind everyone that under Standing Order 2020-12 and 2013-8 18 the Court's prohibition against recording and broadcasting 19 court proceedings remains in force. Attorneys, parties, and 20 their staff and members of the public or press accessing this 21 proceeding today may not record or broadcast it. That means no 22 photography, no using any video or audio recording device, no rebroadcasting, live streaming or otherwise disseminating any 23 24 live or recorded video or audio in this proceeding.

Do we know where Mr. ReBrook is?

25

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I saw him right outside when I was coming in. We were in line together. He walked away for a second and I haven't seen him since. He might be on his way up.

THE COURT: All right. We forwarded a set of preliminary jury instructions. I did make one substitution this morning. I don't think there's any question about the law as stated. After I sent the initial packet I thought the instruction I substituted would be more helpful to the jury.

Are there any other matters that require the Court taking up this morning?

MR. CANTWELL: Judge, I have motions in to exclude the plaintiffs' Discord exhibits as undisclosed. And there's been some dispute about the stipulations on these things. I understand that they're going to plan on introducing -- they plan to introduce those exhibits during their opening statement, and I thought it would be worth bringing this up before they got started so I don't interrupt them.

THE COURT: Did you all meet yesterday and confer regarding what might be used in the opening statement?

MR. CANTWELL: I have received this binder moments ago with what the plaintiffs intend to introduce in their opening statements. And try though I might, I don't think I'm going to be able to get through it before we get started.

THE COURT: All right. Well, is there anything --

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 1 did you all not confer, are you telling me? 2 MS. DUNN: Judge, we --3 MR. CAMPBELL: David Campbell for Defendant Fields. We did confer and work out any issues that counsel had with --4 5 plaintiffs' counsel -- defense counsel had with plaintiffs' --6 THE COURT: All right. 7 MR. CANTWELL: I spoke to Mr. --8 THE COURT: The opening statement is not evidence. 9 I'm going to tell the jury that. And unless it's some egregious sort of -- something that would be so prejudicial, 10 11 this Court doesn't normally interfere with the opening 12 statement. I'll just tell the jury the opening statement is not evidence. 13 MR. CANTWELL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. 14 THE COURT: Anything else? 15 16 MS. KAPLAN: One other housekeeping matter, Your 17 Honor. This morning I was able to speak to Mr. Campbell and 18 Mr. Kolenich. Sorry, can you not hear me? 19 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I just was not hearing you. 20 MR. SMITH: I don't think the mic is picking it up. 21 MS. KAPLAN: Can you hear me now? 22 This morning, Your Honor, I was able to speak to 23 Mr. Campbell and Mr. Kolenich about ways to expedite trial so 24 that if there's some time at the end of the day and it doesn't make sense to get a witness into the courthouse with all the 25

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 logistics, we could not waste time. 1 2 One of the things we thought to do was, for example, 3 Defendant Azzmador, who Your Honor has issued a number of orders against, we would like today, depending upon how things 4 5 go, or tomorrow, to read in -- to admit certain exhibits, to read in portions of them that have already been admitted just 7 to kind of expedite things and fill time that way. And I think that defendants agree with that. 9 And to be clear, Your Honor, we would never read the 10 whole exhibits. We would obviously move to have them --11 they're already admitted, but read portions of them. Again, 12 it's a good way to kind of make things go smoothly. 13 THE COURT: All right. Is there any problem with 14 that? Seems okay. 15 MR. KOLENICH: Not from counsel, Your Honor. 16 MR. CAMPBELL: No, Your Honor. 17 MR. SMITH: No, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. ReBrook, did you 19 have any issues -- anything you need to bring up? 20 MR. REBROOK: No, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: I'm glad to see you back. 22 MR. REBROOK: Thank you, Your Honor. 23 MR. SMITH: I received a message from Mr. Spencer. 24 He is going through security and is going to be up momentarily.

Okay.

THE COURT:

25

MR. KOLENICH: Your Honor, if I could bring just one matter up. I was -- I did not receive the email with the new jury instruction this morning. So I'm just seeing it now. I just want a couple of minutes to review it.

THE COURT: Okay. You can look at it. It was in the -- I think it was -- it's an instruction I give in every conspiracy case. I usually give it in the final package, but I think it's appropriate to give it here.

MR. KOLENICH: Yes, sir. Can I go ahead and read it for a few minutes.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. KAPLAN: I'm so sorry. One more thing, Your Honor. As Your Honor graciously agreed, we have the plaintiffs downstairs who are ready for openings when Your Honor is ready. We just have to figure out when you want them up and I understand they will be sitting behind us in the jury box.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. Call juror number 207.

I was told juror 207 reported yesterday that he may have seen something reported that the trial was going to start yesterday, and if he saw it on the news, I want to be sure he didn't see anything else, other than that.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: Do you want him in here now?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: All right, sir. Before you sit down,

```
Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021
 1
   would you stand and be sworn, please.
 2
              (Juror sworn.)
 3
             THE COURT: Have a seat, please, and take off your
          Sir, I understand that you came in yesterday having
 4
 5
   heard that the trial might -- was going to start yesterday
   morning. Can you tell me where you heard that?
 6
 7
             MALE JUROR: Where I heard the trial would start
 8
   yesterday morning?
 9
             THE COURT: Uh-huh.
10
             MALE JUROR: No, they told us to come in.
11
             THE COURT: Who told you?
12
             MALE JUROR: It was on the phone to come in -- they
13
   called me on the phone and told me to come to the courthouse.
             THE COURT: All right. Have you -- have you read or
14
15
   heard anything on the television about the case?
16
             MALE JUROR: No, I haven't.
17
             THE COURT:
                         Television or anything else since then?
18
             MALE JUROR: No, sir, I haven't.
19
             THE COURT: All right. Okay. But it was your
20
   understanding from the message you got on the telephone?
21
             MALE JUROR: Yes.
22
             THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You may go back
23
   to the jury room.
24
              (Juror out.)
25
             THE COURT: All right. Are we ready to call the
```

```
Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021
 1
   jury?
 2
             MR. KOLENICH: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
             THE CLERK: Do you want the plaintiffs to be brought
 4
   up, Your Honor?
 5
             THE COURT: Yeah, the plaintiffs can come on up.
 6
             MS. KAPLAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
 7
             THE COURT: Let the plaintiffs come in.
 8
             Have defendants agreed upon the order in which you're
 9
   going to appear?
             MR. JONES: Yes, Your Honor.
10
11
             MR. KOLENICH: Yes.
12
             MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.
13
             MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.
    (Jury in, 9:20 a.m.)
14
15
             THE COURT: All right. You may be seated. Are the
16
   plaintiffs on the way?
17
             THE CLERK: Are the plaintiffs on the way?
18
             MS. KAPLAN: Yes, they are.
19
             THE COURT: Please come forward. Please come on in
20
   and take a seat.
21
             All right. Would you call the jury, please?
22
             THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor. Juror 164, juror 168,
23
   177, 207, 210, 212, 213, 233, 243, 265, 275, 288.
24
             THE COURT: You may swear the jury.
25
             THE CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen, would you please
```

rise. Would you please raise your right hands and be sworn.

Do you and each of you solemnly swear that you will well and truly try the issue joined between Elizabeth Sines and others and Jason Kessler and others and a true verdict render according to the law and the evidence? You do?

You may be seated.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, as I told you yesterday, except when one is speaking, we will all wear a mask over our nose and our mouth. And I will do so when I quit speaking.

This is a civil suit. The plaintiffs are Elizabeth Sines, Seth Wispelwey, Marissa Blair, April Muñiz, Marcus Martin, Natalie Romero, Chelsea Alvarado, Devin Willis, and Thomas Baker. At times in these instructions and during trial these individuals will be referred to collectively as "the plaintiffs."

The defendants are Jason Kessler, Richard Spencer,
Christopher Cantwell, James Alex Fields Jr., Vanguard America,
Robert "Azzmador" Ray, Nathan Damigo, Elliot Kline, also known
as Eli Mosley, Identity Evropa, Matthew Heimbach, Matthew
Parrott, also known as David Matthew Parrott, and
Traditionalist Worker Party, Michael Hill, Michael Tubbs,
League of the South, Jeff Schoep, and National Socialist
Movement. They may be referred to individually as a defendant
or collectively as "the defendants."

During the proceedings you may notice that not all the plaintiffs will be physically present in the courtroom for every day of the trial. You must not consider this fact at all during your deliberations or while evaluating the credibility of any witness. As a necessary means to reduce the risk of the spread of COVID-19, I restricted the total number of persons from the plaintiffs' side who may be present in the courtroom at any given time; that is, except this morning during the opening statements, I'm allowing the plaintiffs to sit in the jury box. As a necessary means -- as a necessary means to spread reduce the spread of COVID-19, I made these restrictions. You must not hold that fact against them.

The Court has also permitted any party, including defendants, to participate remotely in the trial under some circumstances, also to reduce the spread of COVID-19. And you must not hold that against any party if they are not physically present in the courtroom for every day of the trial.

It will be your duty to find from the evidence what the facts are. You and you alone will be the judges of the facts. You will then have to apply to those facts the law as I give it to you. You must follow that law whether you agree with it or not. Nothing I may say or do during the course of the trial is intended to indicate or should be taken by you as indicating what your verdict should be.

Now, I wish to say a few words about the burden of

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 proof which exists in this case.

In this civil case, plaintiffs each have the burden of proving their claims against each defendant by what is called the preponderance of the evidence. This burden applies to all plaintiffs' claims except their claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress, which will be discussed later. In the same vein, the defendant has the burden to approve any affirmative defenses that they may advance by a preponderance of the evidence. I will explain this more after you have heard all the evidence. But, now, keep in mind that if you conclude that a party who has the burden of proof on an issue establishes his or her position by a preponderance of the evidence, you must decide that issue for the party.

The term "preponderance of the evidence" means evidence which, as a whole, shows that the fact sought to be proven is more probable than not; in other words, a preponderance of the evidence means such evidence that persuades you that a fact is more likely true than not.

In your mind, you may think of this as 51 percent more likely than not. In determining whether any fact and issue has been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, you may, unless otherwise instructed, consider the testimony of all witnesses, regardless of who may have called them, and all exhibits received in evidence, regardless of who may have produced them.

You may have heard of the term "proof beyond a reasonable doubt." That is a stricter standard that is applicable in criminal cases. It does not apply in civil cases such as this. You should therefore put it out of your mind.

I wish to give you an overview of this case.

Now, as I said, this is a civil lawsuit brought by multiple plaintiffs against multiple defendants, including individuals and organizations, based on events that occurred in Charlottesville, Virginia in August of 2017. The plaintiffs in this case claim that the defendants and others conspired to commit racially motivated violence at an event the defendants called Unite the Right, which was held in Charlottesville on August 11 and 12, 2017.

Plaintiffs allege that the defendants helped to plan, promote, or carry out racially motivated violent acts during that event, and in doing so caused plaintiffs physical, emotional, and monetary harm. Such acts include a violent torch march on August 11 and various acts of violence on August 12, including a car attack that drove through a large crowd of people which, plaintiffs assert, injured seven of the nine plaintiffs in this case.

Some of the plaintiffs raise additional claims, including that certain defendants subjected them to acts of intimidation, harassment, violence, and vandalism based on plaintiffs' race, religion, or ethnicity, and that defendant

James Fields committed assault, battery, and intentional infliction of emotional distress.

Defendants dispute these claims, deny that they conspired with anyone to commit violence, and contend that they should not be held liable for these alleged actions and they are not responsible for any injury or damages suffered by plaintiffs.

This summary of the plaintiffs' position is intended only as background information to help you understand the nature of the case. It is not evidence and may not be considered as such.

The plaintiffs' and defendants' attorneys will have an opportunity to make what is called an opening statement.

Opening statements are neither evidence or argument. An opening statement is an outline of what a party intends to prove, offered to help you follow the evidence. What the attorneys say in their opening statements is not evidence.

After each party has had an opportunity to make an opening statement, plaintiffs will present their witnesses, and defendants may cross-examine those witnesses. Then defendants have an opportunity to call their witnesses and present their evidence. Plaintiffs may cross-examine any of defendants' witnesses. After the parties' main case is completed, plaintiffs may be permitted to present rebuttal evidence.

Once again, I instruct you that your duty is to

consider the evidence and find what the facts are. The evidence from which you will find the facts will consist of the testimony of witnesses, documents and other things received into the record as exhibits, and any facts that the parties agree are not disputed or such matters as I may instruct you to find.

During the trial, it may be necessary for me to confer with the parties and their lawyers out of your hearing, or to conduct a part of the trial out of your presence. I will handle these matters as briefly and conveniently for you as I can, but you should remember that they are a necessary part of any trial.

My general procedure is to take a morning break, a lunch break, and a midafternoon break; however, the trial schedule is not written in stone. If you become uncomfortable and need to take an immediate break, please let the court security officer know, and we will make accommodations. We want to make sure you are comfortable so you can concentrate on what is being said and properly consider the evidence as it is received.

The evidence from which you find the facts will consist of the testimony of witnesses, documents and other things received into the record as exhibits, and any facts that the lawyers agree to or stipulate to or I may instruct you to find, as I've already said.

Certain things are not evidence and must not be considered by you. I will list them for you now: One, statements, arguments, and questions by lawyers are not evidence; two, objections to questions are not evidence.

Lawyers have an obligation to their clients to make objections when they believe evidence being offered is improper under the rules of evidence. You should not be influenced by the objection or by the Court's ruling on it. If the objection is sustained, ignore the question. If it is overruled, treat the answer like any other. If you are instructed that some item of evidence is received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction.

Testimony on any matter that the Court has excluded or told you to disregard is not evidence and must not be considered.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. You are to decide this case solely on the evidence presented here in the courtroom.

There are two kinds of evidence: Direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is direct proof of a fact, such as testimony of an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is proof of facts from which you may infer or conclude that other facts exist. I will give you further instructions on these, as well as other matters, at the end of the case. But keep in

mind that you may consider both kinds of evidence.

You may also draw all reasonable and legitimate inferences and deductions from the evidence.

As judges of the facts, it will be up to you to decide which witnesses to believe, which witnesses not to believe, and how much of any witness's testimony to accept or reject. This part of a jury's responsibility is referred to as determining the credibility of witnesses.

Among the factors you may properly consider in deciding whether a particular witness is credible or believable are: One, whether the witness has any motive or reason for being either truthful or untruthful; two, any interest the witness may have in the outcome of the case; three, whether there is any appearance or indication of bias or prejudice in the witness's testimony or conduct; four, the extent to which other evidence supports or contradicts the testimony; five, whether the witness is likely to recall or have knowledge of the facts about which the witness is testifying.

Now, a few words about your conduct as jurors.

Excuse me. I'm going to go to Instruction 12 and read 11 at the end.

I know that many of you use cell phones, the internet, and other tools of technology. You must not talk to anyone at any time about this case or use these tools to communicate electronically with anyone about the case. As I

said, this includes your family and friends. You may not communicate with anyone about the case through any means, including your cell phone, through email, text messaging or Snapchat or Twitter, or through any blog or website, including Facebook, Google, LinkedIn, or YouTube. You may not use any similar technology or social media, even if I have not specifically mentioned it in here.

I expect you will inform me as soon as you become aware of another juror's violation of these instructions. A juror who violates these instructions jeopardizes the fairness of the proceedings and a mistrial, which could result, which would require an entire trial process to start over.

Depositions may be received in evidence. A deposition is a witness's sworn testimony that is taken before trial. During a deposition, the witness is under oath and swears to tell the truth, and the lawyers for each party may ask questions. A court reporter is present and records the questions and answers. Deposition testimony may be accepted by you, subject to the same instructions that apply to witnesses testifying in open court.

Some of the deposition testimony that you may hear will be a video recording of the deposition. Some of the deposition testimony that you may hear will be read out loud by an attorney. If the deposition testimony is read out loud, you should not place any significance on the behavior or tone of

the voice of any person reading the questions or answers.

As I explained to you earlier, plaintiffs allege that the defendants in this case engaged in a conspiracy to commit racially motivated violence in violation of federal law 42 U.S.C. 1985(3), and also in violation of Virginia law.

I will give you more detailed instructions on the legal requirements to prove these claims after the close of the evidence, but before the parties begin their opening statements. I want to provide you with a view general instructions regarding the law of conspiracy to help you understand the applicable legal principles.

First, a conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to join together to accomplish some unlawful purpose. It is a kind of unlawful partnership in which each member becomes the agent of every other member. While the plaintiffs must prove that the conspiracy -- that the alleged conspiracy had an unlawful objective, the plaintiffs need to prove that the conspiracy had only an unlawful purpose -- I'm sorry. Strike that.

Plaintiffs need not prove that the conspiracy had only an unlawful purpose. Co-conspirators may have legal, as well as lawful, objectives. A conspiracy may have several objectives, but if any one of them, even if it is only a secondary objective, is to violate the law, then the conspiracy is unlawful.

Plaintiffs do not need to prove that the alleged conspirators entered into any formal agreement or that they directly stated between themselves all the details of the scheme.

Plaintiffs are not required to produce written contracts, or even produce evidence of an express oral agreement, spelling out all the details of the understanding. An informal agreement may be sufficient. All plaintiffs must show is that an overall unlawful objective was shared.

Plaintiffs are not required to show that all defendants they allege as members of the conspiracy were, in fact, parties to the agreement, or that all of the members of the alleged conspiracy named were named or alleged in this lawsuit, or that all of the people whom the evidence shows were actually members of the conspiracy alleged to all of the means or methods set out in the complaint.

By its -- by its very nature, a conspiracy is clandestine and covert, thereby frequently resulting in little evidence of such an agreement. Therefore, plaintiffs may prove a conspiracy by circumstantial evidence.

Circumstantial evidence tending to prove a conspiracy may include evidence of a defendant's relationship with other members of the alleged conspiracy, the length of such -- any such association, the defendant's attitude and conduct, and the nature of the alleged conspiracy.

Second, to prove a conspiracy, the plaintiffs will have to show that at least one of the defendants took an overt act in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy.

So what is an overt act? The term "overt act" means some type of outward, objective action performed by one of the members of the alleged conspiracy which evidences that agreement. An overt act may be an act which is entirely innocent when considered alone, but which is knowingly done in furtherance of some object or purpose of the conspiracy.

Finally, because there are multiple defendants in this case, you will also need to consider which of the defendants, if any, was a member of the alleged conspiracy.

One may become a member of a conspiracy without knowing all the details of the unlawful scheme or the identities of all of the alleged conspirators. If a person understands the unlawful nature of a plan or scheme and knowingly and intentionally joins in that plan or scheme on one occasion, that is sufficient to prove that he or she was a member of the conspiracy, even though the person had not participated before, or even though the person played only a minor part.

As discussed above, this is a federal civil action.

In this type of case, parties are entitled to the disclosure of all relevant, non-privileged evidence the other side possesses or controls, including relevant documents and electronically

stored information. This pretrial process is known as discovery.

During the discovery process in this case, I found that defendants Elliot Kline, Robert "Azzmador" Ray, Vanguard America, National Socialist Movement, and Matthew Heimbach failed to comply with their discovery obligations, and as a result, I will issue appropriate sanctions against each of them. The Court will instruct you at a later time with respect to the particular nature of those sanctions.

You are cautioned, however, that each party is entitled to have the case decided solely on the evidence that applies to that party. Each -- any sanction against these parties I have mentioned have no bearing on the other parties, and in any event does not relieve plaintiffs of their burden to prove by a preponderance of the evidence the conduct committed by the other defendants in the case.

Some evidence may be admitted for a limited purpose only. When I instruct you that an item of evidence has been admitted for a limited purpose, you must consider it only for the limited purpose and for no other.

Now, finally, a few more words about your conduct as jurors.

First, I instruct you that during the trial you're not to discuss the case with anyone or permit anyone to discuss it with you. This includes your family, friends, and those

with whom you work, as well as your fellow jurors. Until you retire to the jury room at the end of the case to deliberate on your verdict, you simply are not to talk about this case.

Second, do not read or listen to anything relating to this case in any way. If anyone should try to talk to you about it, bring it to the Court's attention promptly.

Third, do not try to do any research or make any investigation about the case on your own.

Finally, do not form any opinion until all the evidence is in. Keep an open mind until you start your deliberations at the end of the case.

If you wish, you may take notes during the trial, but, if you do, leave them in the jury room when you leave at night, and remember that they are for your own personal use.

Be careful not to get involved in note-taking that you become so -- that you become so distracted and miss part of the testimony. Your notes are only to aid your memory; and if your memory later differs from your notes, rely upon your memory.

Do not be unduly influenced by the notes of another person. A juror's notes are not entitled to any greater weight than the recollection of each juror concerning testimony.

Recalling the evidence is very important because this is not -- this is not a situation where -- sometimes you might see on TV or something, where you will have a transcript of what went on in the courtroom. You're going to have to rely totally upon

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 the memory of the -- collective memory of the jury when you decide this case. 2 3 All right. Are plaintiffs ready to start the opening 4 statement? 5 Let me say -- I'll probably interrupt you at some time to take a break. You could maybe go about --6 7 MS. KAPLAN: Sure. My friend and colleague Karen 8 Dunn is going to start, and then I will pick up at the very end. 9 Thank you. 10 THE COURT: Okay. You may. MS. DUNN: 11 Thank you, Your Honor. We would like a 12 second just to move the podium. 13 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 14 MS. DUNN: 15 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, can you hear me? 16 Thank you. 17 Good morning. My name is Karen Dunn, and today, 18 along with my partner and friend, Robbie Kaplan, we are going 19 to be presenting to you the plaintiffs' opening statement. 20 The purpose of the opening statement, as Judge Moon 21 just explained, is for us to give you a sense of what this case 22 is about and to show you what our evidence in this case is 23 going to show. And I want to warn you from the beginning that 24 some of the evidence that you'll see is graphic and will

25

contain some disturbing images.

This case is a case about violence and intimidation that was planned for months and culminated in a tragic and violent weekend, August 11th and 12th of 2017, right here in Charlottesville, Virginia.

(Video playing.)

MS. DUNN: Your Honor, I think we're having an audio problem. So, with the Court's indulgence, if Mr. Spalding can work that out.

(Video playing.)

MS. DUNN: On August 11 of 2017, hundreds of white nationalists from across the country came to Charlottesville.

As you will hear, they met up in darkness on UVA's college campus. They chanted: "You will not replace us." "Jews will not replace us." "Blood and soil," a phrase that you will hear originated in Nazi Germany.

From there, you will see and hear that the white nationalists climbed the steps of the Rotunda at UVA and descended upon 20 to 30 peaceful, unarmed counter-protesters, most of whom were students at UVA. They had gathered at the base of the Thomas Jefferson statue, and you will see that they linked their arms.

The evidence in this case is going to show that the white nationalists encircled the counter-protesters over ten people deep, that they maced and physically attacked the counter-protesters, that they screamed racial slurs at them in

their faces, and that they threw unidentified liquid at them while wielding lit tiki torches. You will hear in this case how after the violence, Defendant Richard Spencer -- he's sitting right over here -- the most prominent white nationalist leader in the country, climbed up on the Thomas Jefferson statue and declared victory.

The evidence will also show that the next morning

Defendant Spencer emailed his followers via his listserv

declaring that what happened at the torch march on August 11

was only the prequel. And you will come to learn, ladies and

gentlemen, that he was right about that. There was, in fact,

much more to come. And the defendants in this case knew that

because their plans had been secretly in the works for months.

The evidence will show that the next morning, on August 12th, the white nationalists came prepared to commit violence. They wore riot gear. They marched in formation.

They carried shields that were later used to break through the counter-protesters, and they carried flag poles that were later used as weapons. And then this happened.

Your Honor, it seems we're having some audio problems with the video. I think it's so important that the jury be able to hear, as well as see, that we'd like a moment to fix it.

THE COURT: Well, can you fix it?

MS. DUNN: Mr. Spalding is saying he thinks it's on

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 1 the Court's end. 2 Your Honor, do you think it makes sense to take a 3 break while this is fixed or should we wait? THE COURT: Okay. We'll take a -- we'll go ahead and 4 5 take about a 20-minute break at this time and try to work this problem out. 6 7 MS. DUNN: Thank you. 8 THE COURT: We'll let the jury go out first, please. Let me remind you, though, do not discuss the case 9 amongst yourselves. Do not carry on any discussion about the 10 11 case. (Jury out, 9:58 a.m.) 12 13 (Recess.) 14 THE COURT: All right. I hope we're ready to 15 proceed. I hope now maybe we can finish the plaintiffs' 16 opening statement before lunch. 17 MS. DUNN: Yes, Your Honor. It's a silver lining. 18 (Jury in, 10:21 a.m.) 19 THE COURT: All right. Be seated, please. You may 20 proceed. 21 MS. DUNN: Thank you, Your Honor. And thank you, 22 ladies and gentlemen, for your patience. Obviously unexpected 23 things are going to happen during our time together. 24 Because we feel it's so important that you see and 25 hear the evidence, we're going to replay the video that we

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 1 showed you from August 11. 2 (Video playing.) 3 (Technical interruption.) THE COURT: Heidi, I think maybe this may be the 4 5 problem up here. I'm trying to figure out -- maybe I hit something. Do you know how to correct it? 6 7 (Discussion off the record.) 8 MS. DUNN: Should we try that one again? 9 (Video playing.) 10 MS. DUNN: As we already discussed, ladies and 11 gentlemen, this is what Defendant Spencer declared to be only the prequel. The next day, August 12th, there were many 12 incidents of violence, as we'll discuss, and then this 13 happened. 14 15 (Video playing.) 16 At approximately 1:41 p.m. on August 12th, Defendant 17 James Fields, who had marched that day with another defendant, 18 Vanguard America, wearing the Vanguard America uniform and the 19 Vanguard America shield, got into his Dodge Challenger and 20 intentionally drove it into a group of peaceful 21 counter-protesters, killing a 32-year-old woman named Heather 22 Heyer and injuring many of the plaintiffs in this case. 23 It is our privilege, ladies and gentlemen, mine, 24 Robbie's, and our colleagues whom you'll meet, to represent 25 nine people who were victims of the violence on August 11th and

We represent people like Marcus Martin. The evidence is going to show that Marcus was hit directly by the car, as you can see in this graphic photo. He's the one circled in red. The evidence will show that Marcus's leg and ankle were shattered when he pushed his fiance, Marissa Blair, out of the way of the car. And Marcus is going to tell you that while his physical injuries may heal, his emotional injuries will not.

We represent people like Natalie Romero, whom you will meet today. Natalie had just returned from her first year of college at UVA when she was struck by James Fields's car. The impact of the car fractured her skull, lacerated her face, and forever changed her life. And Natalie is going to tell you that every day when she wakes up and she looks at her face, she is reminded about a nightmare that she can never forget.

In just a short while, Robbie is going to introduce you to all of the plaintiffs, all of whom are here in court today, sitting in the jury box. Even though it's going to be extremely difficult for them to come and tell you what happened to them, they are going to tell their stories directly to you, because, as they are going to explain, they believe the truth about what happened in Charlottesville must be told.

So while, as I said at the beginning, this is a case about violence and intimidation, for these plaintiffs, they will tell you this is also a case about justice and about

accountability; accountability for those defendants who planned and perpetrated this violence, thinking that they would get away with it. And so on behalf of our plaintiffs, we want to tell you how deeply we appreciate your service on this jury.

We know, and, listening over the past few days of jury selection, really understand how hard it is for you to take time away from your families, away from your jobs, and away from your lives. But your service on this jury, ladies and gentlemen, it is so important.

As Judge Moon explained to you this morning, you are the finders of the facts. The verdict in this case will be your verdict and your verdict alone. And at the end of this case, our plaintiffs and we are going to ask you to hold the defendants accountable.

As you've already heard this morning, Judge Moon will instruct you on the law. And he is going to instruct you in this case about when a conspiracy to commit violence motivated by racial hostility and hatred violates the laws of our country. And your job as the jury is to listen to that law that Judge Moon instructs and apply it to the evidence that you will see with your own eyes and ears in this case. And we are going to show you quite a lot of evidence.

We are going to show you evidence like this text exchange between Defendant Christopher Cantwell and Defendant Richard Spencer, both of whom are sitting right here in this

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 courtroom today.

This text exchange is from August 7th of 2017, just four days before the violence in Charlottesville. Defendant Cantwell says to Defendant Spencer: "I'm willing to risk a lot for our cause, including violence and incarceration. But I want to coordinate and make sure it's worth it for our cause."

And Mr. Spencer responds: "It's worth it. At least for me."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is defendants' own communications in this case that are going to show you that the violence of August 11th and 12th was no accident; that the defendants planned for violence, that they executed violence, and that they celebrated and ratified and owned the violence after the fact. And that is what we are going to prove to you.

Now, before I introduce the defendants to you, there is one thing I want to say at the outset. And I want to be very clear about this. The plaintiffs in this case did not sue the hundreds of white nationalists who came to Charlottesville to march, to speak out about white nationalist beliefs, or to have a rally. And we want to stress: There is nothing wrong with that. Everyone is entitled to their beliefs, no matter what they are or who they are.

The plaintiffs in this case belief firmly in the

First Amendment, so much so that the evidence is going to show

that the reason that they were at some of these events on

August 11th and 12th is because they had come to peacefully

exercise their own First Amendment rights. So this is something we believe in.

The plaintiffs in this case only sued the leaders and the organizers who planned the violence and the most violent foot soldiers who carried it out.

The defendants in this case may want to focus this case on politics, but that is not what the plaintiffs' case is about. Our case is about the planning, execution, and celebration of racially motivated violence. And I want to be very clear about this: Our case and our plaintiffs do not condone violence by anybody.

The evidence is going to show you, ladies and gentlemen, that many of the defendants were key players in the white nationalist movement. The evidence will show that many of the defendants wanted to build a white ethnostate, a country only for white people. And that could only occur after a violent race war. So the evidence is going to show that they wanted to build an army of white nationalists for what they themselves named "the Battle of Charlottesville."

Now, there are a lot of defendants in this case, 20 individuals and organizations. Believe it or not, during the course of this trial, you are going to get to know all of them very, very well. You will learn how they are connected to each other and how they are connected to the violence.

The judge has already instructed you on some of the

law of conspiracy. Here's what he told you this morning. He said a conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to join together to accomplish an unlawful purpose. Plaintiffs need not prove that the conspiracy had only an unlawful purpose. A conspiracy may have several objectives, but if any one of them, even if it is only a secondary objective, is to violate the law, then the conspiracy is unlawful.

Judge Moon told you that the plaintiffs do not need to prove that the alleged conspirators entered into any formal agreement, or that they directly stated between themselves all the details of the scheme. Plaintiffs are not required to produce a written contract or produce any evidence of an express oral agreement spelling out all the details of the understanding. Even an informal agreement may be sufficient. All plaintiffs must show is that an overall unlawful objective was shared.

Judge Moon also told you -- and you'll understand why this is important when you see the evidence -- that, by its very nature, a conspiracy is clandestine and covert, thereby frequently resulting in little evidence of such an agreement; and, therefore, plaintiffs can prove conspiracy by circumstantial evidence, which may include evidence of a defendant's relationship with other members of the conspiracy, the length of any such association, the defendant's attitude and conduct, and the nature of the alleged conspiracy.

And Judge Moon told you that you can become a member of the conspiracy without knowing all the details of the unlawful scheme or the identities of the other alleged conspirators. If a person understands the unlawful nature of the plan or scheme and knowingly and intentionally joins in that plan or scheme on one occasion, that is sufficient to prove that he was a member of the conspiracy, even though that person had not participated before, and even though he played only a minor part.

Let's talk about the conspiracy we will prove in this case.

The conspiracy in this case began when Jason Kessler, a white nationalist activist from Charlottesville, reached out to the three other men you can see on the screen: Richard Spencer, Eli Kline, who also went by Eli Mosley, and Matthew Heimbach. The evidence will show that Mr. Kessler knew that Mr. Spencer, the most prominent white nationalist in America, would help attract an army for the Battle of Charlottesville.

Mr. Kessler also reached out to Matthew Heimbach, the founder of the Traditionalist Worker Party, who has described, as you'll hear, Adolf Hitler as an inspiration. The evidence will show that Mr. Kessler specifically asked Mr. Heimbach to invite violent skinhead groups to the event, and that Mr. Heimbach complied.

Mr. Kessler also worked very closely with Eli Kline,

who was also very close to Mr. Spencer. And Mr. Spencer, you will hear, deputized Mr. Kline to make decisions for the both of them. Eli Kline, you will hear, literally wanted to exterminate the Jews.

You will learn that the judge has already found that Mr. Kline conspired to commit racially motivated violence, as we will discuss. And Mr. Kline and Jason Kessler, as the evidence will show, communicated frequently and worked full-time on planning the events of August 11th and 12th.

THE COURT: Excuse me. You said that the judge had found that Mr. Kline conspired -- what we have decided -- what I decided was that Mr. Kline, because he has not cooperated in the case, given any evidence, he is deemed to have -- and that doesn't mean that he conspired with any other defendant or anything else, but by law Mr. Kline is deemed to have conspired. And the plaintiff has to prove that he conspired with somebody else. But just because he conspired, that doesn't -- because I have deemed him conspired because he failed to comply with the law that he was -- with regard to this case, it doesn't mean that he conspired with anyone else that is a defendant in the case.

It's very important you separate and understand that.

It will come up with regard to other defendants. Other defendants also who did not cooperate, they will by law be deemed to have conspired. It doesn't mean that I'm saying they

actually conspired. I hope that's clear.

But, anyway, go ahead.

MS. DUNN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Mr. Kline and Mr. Kessler worked full-time to plan the events of August 11th and 12th. Mr. Kline brought along his white nationalist group called Identity Evropa, and had weekly calls with Identity Evropa's founder, Defendant Nathan Damigo. Identity Evropa -- you'll hear about this group -- they're known for recruiting on college campuses.

You will see that Mr. Heimbach worked closely organizing the event not just with Mr. Kessler and Mr. Kline, but also with his long-time best friend, Matthew Parrott, a computer programmer who, you will see, later encouraged anyone associated with violence in Charlottesville to destroy evidence.

Now, Mr. Heimbach then enlisted another group called League of the South and its leaders, Michael Hill and Michael Tubbs. You will see evidence in this case, ladies and gentlemen, that Defendant Hill posted on the League of the South website his own Pledge of Allegiance, which stated: "I pledge to be a white supremacist, a racist, an anti-Semite, a homophobe, a xenophobe, an Islamophobe and any other sort of 'phobe' that benefits my people, so help me God!"

Now, Eli Kline and Matthew Heimbach also reached out to another group you'll hear about called Vanguard America.

Vanguard America is another organization that believes America should be a nation only for white people.

James Fields, the defendant we talked about who drove the car that killed Heather Heyer, has admitted that he was inspired by Richard Spencer and others to go to the Battle of Charlottesville. And you will see that, on that day of the car attack, he marched with Vanguard America, wearing the Vanguard America uniform and shield.

During the planning for Charlottesville 2.0, Dillon Hopper, who you see in the center of the screen, was the leader of Vanguard America and had communications with both Mr. Heimbach and Mr. Kline.

Thomas Ryan Rousseau, who you see on the screen to your left, also had communications with Mr. Kline and took control of Vanguard just before Charlottesville 2.0 and led the troops on the ground on August 12.

Mr. Heimbach from Traditionalist Worker Party also connected Mr. Kessler, one of the lead organizers, to Defendant Jeff Schoep, founder and commander for 25 years of the National Socialist Movement, which describes itself as "America's Nazi Party." Mr. Schoep offered Mr. Kessler, for the Battle of Charlottesville, men who were battle-tested in the streets.

You will hear that those four organizations, National Socialist Movement, Vanguard America, League of the South, and the Traditionalist Worker Party, and their leaders, Defendants

Heimbach, Schoep, Hill, Tubbs, Hopper, and Rousseau, formed an alliance called the Nationalist Front to further their common purpose and plan. And all of these groups, ladies and gentlemen, including Identity Evropa, are defendants also in this case. The defendants are both the groups and the individuals.

Now, Defendant Kessler, the evidence will show, also contacted Defendant Christopher Cantwell, a white nationalist who, the evidence will show, was known for advocating violence on his podcast to an audience that he will say contained armed extremists.

And the evidence will show that Mr. Kline, who wrote for the neo-Nazi publication called Daily Stormer, wanted to involve more of the Stormers and their leader, Robert "Azzmador" Ray, who was a prominent writer for the website.

Mr. Ray traveled to Charlottesville with Mr. Rousseau from Vanguard America. And Mr. Ray, who also refused to participate entirely in this litigation, is similarly situated to what Judge Moon just told you about Mr. Kline.

You will see evidence, ladies and gentlemen, that leaders of this conspiracy inspired foot soldiers to carry out the violence; not just inspiring James Fields, but also other violent white nationalists like somebody you'll hear about called Ben Daley and Vasilios Pistolis, both of whom you will hear invoke their rights not to incriminate themselves under

the Fifth Amendment when we ask them about the violence in Charlottesville.

As the evidence comes in, you are going to see, ladies and gentlemen, all of the connections in the conspiracy. You will hear that the defendants met in person. You will hear that they held weekly phone calls. You will hear that they communicated on a private chat platform called Discord; that they communicated via other social media, through emails, letters, through phone calls and texts. And you will hear how they celebrated each others' racially motivated violence.

By the time that we speak to you again in closing, you will be able to make all of these connections that you see on the screen yourself based on the evidence that we are going to present to you in this trial.

So let's take a closer look at the conspiracy.

As I said, plaintiffs are going to prove that violence was planned, that it was executed, and that it was celebrated by the defendants. So let's start with the planning.

The evidence in this case is going to show that defendants planned the conspiracy mostly through private channels. As we heard this morning, conspiracies tend to be clandestine and secret.

This is an email on the screen now that you will see from Defendant Michael Hill, the leader of League of the South.

On May 17th, he issued this directive to his people. He called it an "Official Call for Resistance." And he gave them instructions on how to communicate. He said: "I want no discussion here or elsewhere online of any resistance strategies, tactics, logistics, plans, operations, or after action reports. Those all will be handled through secure channels."

You will come to understand day by day, ladies and gentlemen, that the defendants never expected their planning communications to see the light of day, much less the inside of a courtroom.

You will also learn in this case about a private chat platform called Discord. And we are going to show you that the majority of the planning occurred over this chat platform called Discord. You will also hear that many of the defendants' private Discord chats were unexpectedly made public about four years ago, just prior to the time when plaintiffs filed this lawsuit.

Now, defendants established what was called a Charlottesville 2.0 server on Discord. And that requires me to explain that there was a Charlottesville 1.0 that we'll talk about. That event occurred earlier in 2017.

Within the Charlottesville 2.0 Discord server, you are going to see many channels. And channels are just like chat rooms within the server where people can communicate. And

what you see on the screen right now are some examples of the channels that you will see where the defendants communicated to plan Charlottesville 2.0.

Now, Charlottesville 2.0 wasn't the only server where this planning went on, but it was one of the main servers. And so some of the channels you can see here have to do with leadership meetings and discussions, with chants, with gear and attire and other things. But you'll also see, ladies and gentlemen, that most of the groups who are defendants in this case had their own channels on the Charlottesville 2.0 server where some of their planning went on. And you can see on the screen the names Identity Evropa, League of the South, Traditionalist Worker Party, and Vanguard America. That's the group that James Fields marched with.

To really understand what happened here in Charlottesville on August 11th and 12th, we do need to go back at least as far as April 15th of 2017.

Plaintiffs are going to show that a defendant named Nathan Damigo -- he was head of Identity Evropa; he also went by the Discord name "Fashy Haircut" -- punched a counter-protester at an event in Berkeley, which made him somewhat famous in the white nationalist movement. Here's a picture that you're seeing, and that you'll see in this case, of that punch. This event became known -- it was April 15th of 2017, and it became known as "the Battle of Berkeley."

You will hear what Richard Spencer said in April of 2017 after the Battle of Berkeley.

While they work on that, I will just tell you what he said, because it's on the screen.

He said: "We have entered a new world. We have entered a world of political violence, and I don't think anything is going to be the same."

You will also see evidence, ladies and gentlemen, of Charlottesville 1.0, which I mentioned, when five of the defendants -- Richard Spencer, Nathan Damigo, Eli Kline, Jason Kessler, and Matthew Heimbach -- all gathered together on May 13th, 2017 in Charlottesville. They held a torch march, just like at Charlottesville 2.0. They gave speeches like this one, where Richard Spencer talked about a meme that he was born at the right time for the race war, after which the crowd erupted in applause. And that's what went on publicly.

But you will also see evidence from a private afterparty on May 13th, following Richard Spencer's speech and the torch march, where Defendants Spencer, Kline, and Heimbach engaged in a chant of "Sieg Heil," which was the phrase used to salute Adolf Hitler in Nazi Germany.

I would like to play you the video of that.

It's playing, but you can't hear it.

THE CLERK: Matt, the IT guy said you need to stop for a minute.

MS. DUNN: Can we get the video and the audio together?

(Video playing.)

MS. DUNN: So as you will see, ladies and gentlemen, the defendants in this group, which included Defendants

Spencer, Kline, and Heimbach, they don't know that this video is being taken. And what they say and do privately behind closed doors is going to tell us a lot about their true motives and plans in this case.

The evidence will show that the planning for Charlottesville 2.0, the Battle of Charlottesville, began shortly after Charlottesville 1.0.

This is a text exchange between Jason Kessler and Richard Spencer from June 5th of 2017. Mr. Kessler writes, "We're going to start the promotional material for Charlottesville 2: Unite the Right: Battle of Charlottesville," and asks Mr. Spencer if he's going to be one of the headliners for the events. Mr. Spencer verifies the date, August 12th, asks about the attendance of Mr. Damigo, and then says, "I'm there." He agrees. And in response, Mr. Kessler says, "We're raising an army my liege. For free speech, but the cracking of skulls if it comes to it."

So we are going to ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to remember communications like this if the defendants tell you that they didn't plan violence in Charlottesville.

On the very same day that Defendants Kessler and Spencer were discussing raising an army for the cracking of skulls, Defendant Matthew Heimbach exchanged messages on the Discord server with Dillon Hopper, who went by Discord name White-PowerStroke (Dillon), and you'll recall was the leader of Vanguard America. Defendant Heimbach writes, "Yep, so now basically we've got 90 percent of the real orgs in America together. With the leadership being you, me, Jeff" -- that's Jeff Schoep -- "and Dr. Hill." That's Michael Hill of League of the South.

Dillon Hopper, of Vanguard America, writes back, "Now all we need is Spencer" -- Richard Spencer -- "and Damigo" -- Nathan Damigo. And Mr. Heimbach responds, "Well, this is where Charlottesville comes in. We're all doing it together."

"We're all doing it together."

You will see very powerful evidence of conspiracy in this case.

And even though we expect that at this trial the defendants are all going to point fingers at one another and say someone else was to blame, there will be no question that at the time, they were all doing it together.

The evidence will show that on this very same day,

June 5th, Eli Kline committed to Jason Kessler that he would

help with the rollout. That's the top text you see on the

screen. On the bottom text between the two of them he wrote,

"You and I should get used to speaking daily now. Now that this is my full-time job, I'll be much more available to you."

And you will see evidence that the two of them were the lead organizers of this event.

Two days after describing his work to plan the Battle of Charlottesville as his full-time job, you will see that Mr. Kline posted on Discord about his continued planning and coordination efforts. He wrote, "I've been working heavily with VA guys for a while now, and we should have a conference with some leadership on some stuff, including Charlottesville."

VA you will come to understand stands for Vanguard America. And you will learn during this trial, as you will see in the picture on the right of this screen, Defendant Kline and Defendant Fields were together on August 12th where Defendant Fields is wearing the Vanguard America uniform, holding the Vanguard America shield, shortly before he drove his car into a crowd of people, including some of the plaintiffs that you see in this courtroom today.

As the Judge has already told you, this case is about a conspiracy to commit violence motivated by racial animus or hostility. And that includes racial and religious minorities and their supporters. We are going to show you in this case that defendants came to Charlottesville with a plan for violence, and with racial and religious hatred, and that they used racial and religious hatred to motivate others to join.

For example, we will show you that Mr. Kline referred to himself as the Judenjäger. That means Jew hunter, and it's also a Nazi phrase. You will learn that incredibly,

Mr. Kline's actual job was working for an exterminator. And

Mr. Kline's girlfriend at the time, who lived with him while he planned these events -- her name is Samantha Froelich -- she will testify via video for you that Mr. Kline wanted to kill Jews instead of cockroaches, that he was excited to kill Jewish people and that he would gas the kikes forever. "Kikes" is a slur for Jewish people, and the phrase "gas the kikes" is sadly something that you will hear quite a lot in this case.

We will show you this letter, ladies and gentlemen, where you can see Defendant Matthew Heimbach sent to his many followers about August 12th. These are to all the members of the Traditionalist Worker Party: "We need to scare these people, and the way to achieve that is with numbers, discipline, and determination. We must send a message to the Jewish oligarchs and their hordes of minions that we will not go silently into the night as they desire. No, we will fight them, we will defeat them, and we will secure our people's destiny."

Adolf Hitler famously said -- he quotes Hitler in his letter -- "Those who want to live, let them fight, and those who do not want to fight in this world of eternal struggle do not deserve to live."

And he closes this letter by saying, "So be there, August 12th in Charlottesville, and let us tell the entire world with a mighty and triumphant voice, we will not be replaced."

You will hear audio evidence like this from Defendant

Chris Cantwell -- he's sitting right over there. This is from

his podcast of January 2017.

(Video playing.)

And you will see social media posts like this one by Defendant Michael Hill, the leader of League of the South. He says via tweet, "If you want to defend the South and Western civilization from the Jew and his dark-skinned allies, be at Charlottesville on 12 August."

You will see, ladies and gentlemen, that the planning documents from the organizers and leaders are filled with racial hatred and that they fully anticipate violence.

James Fields, as part of his criminal case, acknowledged in court documents that he expressed and promoted his view that white people are superior to other races and peoples, expressed support of the social and racial policies of Adolf Hitler and Nazi era Germany, including the Holocaust, and espoused violence against African Americans, Jewish people, and members of other racial, ethnic and religious groups he perceived to be non-white. And Mr. Fields admitted that he also expressed these views directly in interactions with

individuals known to him.

So plaintiffs are not going to lack for evidence of a racially motivated conspiracy in this case.

The evidence will show, ladies and gentlemen, that not only did defendants and their co-conspirators plan violence, they specifically discussed the tools of violence for the Battle of Charlottesville. And you will learn and come to understand that they knew they couldn't show up in Charlottesville with visible weaponry, so instead they weaponized things like mace, which they refer to as "gas," their fists, shields, flag poles, and a car. Things that we don't usually think of as weapons.

And you will come to understand that that was entirely the point: plausible deniability. Just like mace and shields and flag poles was a tool of this conspiracy.

Plausible deniability is when you set up a situation in such a way that you can claim later you had nothing to do with it. We expect that is exactly what you will see and hear from the defendants in this case.

Now, first let's talk about mace as a tool of violence, which the evidence will show defendants also called "gas," that you'll come to understand was another reference to Hitler killing Jews.

Here are two private Discord posts you will see from the summer of 2017. In the top post, Dillon Hopper, the leader

of Vanguard America, the group that Fields marched with, says that at Charlottesville he will give a six-word speech: "Gas the kikes, race war now."

Beneath that you will see that Defendant Robert

"Azzmador" Ray uses the exact same language, several weeks

later, about two weeks before August 11th. He says, "I just

got done with an hours-long chat with some of the event

organizers and I feel better about the thing. The plan is the

same: Gas the kikes."

You will be able to tell that this was not a random phrase or a one-off or a joke. This was a plan discussed for hours with the organizers of the Battle of Charlottesville of August 11th and 12th.

And you will see, ladies and gentlemen, that the defendants also planned for street brawls as a tool of violence. You will see Eli Kline, who also goes by Eli Mosley on the Discord, you will see what he said: "I think we are going to see some serious brawls at Charlottesville next month too, and we'll see blood on some of those white polos LOL."

The white polos that you see Mr. Kline talking about, that's a reference to the dress code for Charlottesville 2.0, which were white polos and khaki pants worn by many, including by James Fields and others in Vanguard America. And you'll see that in video and in photographs of the day.

Now, just like mace and street brawls, the conspiracy

planned to use flag poles as tools of violence. You will see posts like this one by Michael Chesny. He went by the Discord handle, Tyrone. And we are going to prove that he was a co-conspirator. He was assigned to organize transportation for the event. You will see in posts like this where he is posting on the flags, banners and signs channel in the Charlottesville 2.0 server, somebody named Kurt says, "Impaling people is always the best option, TBH," to be honest. Then somebody named Krystal.Night says "There are some really nice hard wood poles that are two piece, but also cheaper ones that won't be very useful to double as spears, LOL."

And Tyrone, Michael Chesny, who we'll prove is a co-conspirator, says, "Agreed, @Kurt." That's the first poster in the chat.

So we talked about mace, talked about flag poles.

Let's talk about shields, using shields as weapons. This is a post by Defendant Ray in the general chat channel. This is just two days before the event. And when he's saying here — he says "@everyone," message to everyone: "I couldn't possibly be more proud of you guys or happier with the way these shields turned out. I will be both elated and humbled to stand with you men and address the media and fight the hordes of filth and scum. This is our day. Charlottesville will be ours. Texas will be ours. The world will be ours."

So mace, street brawls, flag poles and shields.

Let's talk about cars. While watching somebody run over counter-protesters may seem shocking for most of us, you will come to understand that it was reasonably foreseeable as a result of this conspiracy that a car could run over counter-protesters. You will see this post on the screen right now from Defendant Heimbach. This is from nine months before James Fields drove his car into a group of counter-protesters. He says, "Leftist protesters blocking the road with weapons, threats and violence while making you fear for your life? #hitthegas."

You will see this post by Defendant Cantwell: "Hey communists, remember this like your life depends on it, because it does: Blocking traffic is not peaceful protest, and every person who reminds you of that without using his car, is giving you more slack than you fucking deserve."

And you will see posts like this by Michael Chesny.

He went by Tyrone. We just talked about him a few minutes ago.

He was the one in charge of transportation. He posts in the

Charlottesville 2.0 server in the channel about shuttle service

information this fake advertisement for a multi-lane protester

digester. And he says, "Sure would be nice."

So just like the other defendants, you will see James Fields posted about driving his car into a group of protesters, not once, but twice in May of 2017. He says, "You have the right to protest, but I'm late for work."

And you, ladies and gentlemen, have seen and you will see the photos of the actual car attack on August 12th in 2017.

And so you are going to be able to see how eerily similar these posts were to the car attack that happened just three months later.

So now that we've spoken about the planning and about the conspiracy, I'd like to speak with you specifically about the execution of the violence, first on August 11th, and then on August 12th.

This is a map of UVA's college campus that we hope will help you understand what happened on Friday night, August 11th. The evidence will show that while plans for a rally on August 12th were public, the defendants kept their plans for the Friday night torch march a secret, at least from the people of Charlottesville and from the University of Virginia. The hundreds of white nationalists who showed up from out of town, however, they were in on the plan. They all obtained their torches in advance and gathered under cover of darkness at a place called Nameless Field on the UVA campus. That's all the way to the right of the screen.

Now, you can see on this map that the most direct route from Nameless Field to the Thomas Jefferson statue is to walk down this road called University Avenue. And remember, Mr. Kessler is from Charlottesville. He and Mr. Spencer both went to UVA. So they knew the grounds. The evidence will show

that this is not the route that the white nationalists took with their torches. Instead, they took this long, more winding route marked on this map by the yellow dots. They passed the library, the student union, the bookstore, a residential college, the amphitheater, and eventually they walked straight up what's called The Lawn. And that's that patch of green you see in the upper left-hand corner of the slide.

And that's where students and faculty live. And it's considered the heart of the UVA campus. They marched right down The Lawn to the Rotunda, which has steps that descend down to the Thomas Jefferson statue.

You will see pictures of the scene around the statue that night where approximately somewhere between 2- to 500 white nationalists surrounded about 20 to 30 counter-protesters, which were mostly students, including plaintiffs here today, Devin Willis and Natalie Romero.

You will see with your own eyes, ladies and gentlemen, that the students carried this banner which said "VA students act against white supremacy," and that they kept their heads down and their arms linked, unarmed, and you will hear, terrified.

The evidence will demonstrate that the defendants in this case engaged in violence. In this photo you can see

Defendant Robert Ray. He is the man in the hat with his left arm outstretched, spraying someone with mace. And you will

hear Mr. Ray, who went by "Azzmador," on video the next day saying proudly that he personally gassed half a dozen kikes on August 11.

Now, also in this photo you can see Defendant

Christopher Cantwell. And it is a little bit difficult to see what he is doing here. Here is a closer-up view of

Mr. Cantwell on that same evening, also with his arm outstretched, also spraying mace in someone's face.

Now, you will come to understand that other members of the conspiracy did not walk away from the violence. They embraced it. They owned it. They promoted it. And they celebrated it.

This is a post that you will see on Twitter by Jason Kessler. You will see that he called the violence and intimidation of August 11th, what Robert "Azzmador" Ray called the gassing of kikes, "an incredible moment for white people."

You will see that James Fields also tweeted about
August 11th. He retweeted Dr. David Duke, and that this was
also a celebration of the violence, saying that on August 11th,
"our people on the march," asking, "will you be there
tomorrow?"

And you will see this text between Eli Kline and

Jason Kessler telling each other what great work that they had

done, and looking ahead to the next day. Mr. Kline says at

11:15 that night after the violence at the Thomas Jefferson

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 statue, "Great work. Rest easy." And Mr. Kessler responds, "You've done excellent work too. Let's knock this out of the park tomorrow."

Now, August 12th, as you've heard, was the long-scheduled Unite the Right event which was to take place in what's called today Emancipation Park. It had formerly been called Lee Park, and that's the yellow box you see in the top left of the slide. This slide shows you some of the important places that you will hear about related to events of August 12th.

On the morning of August 12th, the evidence will show that one group of the defendants gathered in McIntire Park and took vans to Emancipation Park. Another group of defendants met up and coordinated at the Market Street garage -- that's a parking garage -- and headed west on Market Street towards Emancipation Park. You are going to hear evidence and see evidence that members of the two groups coordinated with each other throughout the day. And we've also marked on this map for you the intersection of Fourth and Water, because that's where James Fields drove his car into the group of counter-protesters.

You are going to see videos from August 12th. You're going to see a lot of videos from August 12th. You will see this video, which is one of Defendant Kline directing the first group of his troops, including members of Defendants Identity

Evropa and Vanguard America, dressed in the uniform we talked about of white polos and khakis.

(Video playing.)

You will see in videos and photographs, ladies and gentlemen, Eli Kline leading men whose fists are taped up like they're boxers. And as predicted by Mr. Kline in the Discord posts you saw earlier, you will actually see blood on the white polos, including his.

Now, one of the people that Mr. Kline is leading on August 12th, the evidence will show, and we will prove is a co-conspirator, is a man named Benjamin Daley. And he's the blond individual with the sunglasses that you can see on the screen. You will hear that when we asked Mr. Daley whether he choked a counter-protester and whether Mr. Kline and he threw her off the sidewalk, he invoked his right under the Fifth Amendment not to incriminate himself.

Front defendants, that's Traditionalist Worker Party, League of the South and National Socialist Movement, who were walking west on Market Street, encountered counter-protesters standing in the street. You will see this video start with Defendant Heimbach standing shoulder to shoulder with Defendants Hill and Tubbs, and you will hear him give an order, "shields up," to the troops. You will see that shields were used as weapons and not for protection.

(Video playing.)

You will hear, ladies and gentlemen, that after the National Front defendants smashed their way through the counter-protesters with shields, Defendant Tubbs led a charge where one of the co-conspirators in this case rolled up his flag and beat counter-protesters with it. You can see photographs of that on your screen.

The evidence will show that Vasilios Pistolis was asked whether he brought that flag to use it as a weapon, and he, too, invoked his rights under the Fifth Amendment not to incriminate himself.

Ladies and gentlemen, you will also see this upcoming tragic video from the Market Street garage that we talked about where Defendant Tubbs watched as members of the Traditionalist Worker Party and League of the South brutally attacked and beat with flags and shields a 20-year-old special education aide named DeAndre Harris.

(Video playing.)

As we told you, ladies and gentlemen, some of the evidence in this case is truly difficult to watch.

You will hear that not only did the defendants in this case plan and execute violent acts, but you will see they ratified the violence, they owned the violence, and they celebrated the violence.

The evidence will show that the leaders of this

conspiracy were very proud of what the Battle of
Charlottesville had accomplished. They declared the event a
huge success, as you will see over and over, including what's
on the screen right now, which is the National Front's report
of what happened. They called that an after-action report.

And as you will see, on August 13th, the day after the violence occurred, Defendant Richard Spencer declared it to be a huge moral victory in terms of the show of force.

You will see this post by Defendant Jeff Schoep, the commander of the National Socialist Movement, NSM: "It was an honor to stand with you all in Charlottesville this weekend.

National Socialist Movement, Nationalist Front, Traditionalist Worker Party, League of the South, Vanguard America."

And you will see this post by Michael Hill, leader of League of the South: "The League of the South had a good day in Charlottesville, Virginia. Our warriors acquitted themselves as men. God be praised!"

And you will see this post, ladies and gentlemen, by Defendant Christopher Cantwell, who will speak with you later today. He says: "If you think the alt-right is insignificant, you might want to ask the bleeding commie filth we sent to the morgue and hospitals how insignificant we are."

Ladies and gentlemen, the evidence will show that not only did the defendants celebrate and ratify the violence generally, they specifically celebrated the car attack. So, in

case Mr. Cantwell tells you during this trial that he believes in peaceful protest, you will see this post is what he thinks democracy looks like. This is the picture of Mr. Fields driving his car into the crowd of counter-protesters at Fourth and Water.

He and other defendants supported Defendant James
Fields in many other ways, too, that you'll hear about. They
called him in jail repeatedly. They wrote him letters of
solidarity and comfort. They sent him Christmas cards. They
put money in his account at the prison. They asked him to put
them on his visitors' list. And you'll hear that Mr. Kessler
attended Mr. Fields's criminal trial.

And so if the defendants get up here and they say how sorry they are that all this violence happened and how it was just James Fields's fault all alone, we will show you their own words, their own posts, like this one from lead organizer Jason Kessler. On August 18th he posted: "Heather Heyer was a fat, disgusting Communist. Communists have killed 94 million.

Looks like it was payback time."

Now, you may hear Mr. Kessler say something different than this during this trial, but this post is not even from the day of the car attack. This was six days later, after he had time to think about it, and this is what he has to say: "It's payback time."

So, as I said earlier, ladies and gentlemen, we are

going to show you a lot of evidence of this conspiracy; of the planning, of the execution, of the celebration of the violence that happened here in Charlottesville. And we only have so much time this morning, and so we can only show you some of the evidence. And as the jury, as we've talked about, your job is to consider that evidence.

But you will also be able to consider that there was evidence that you can't see, because in this case there is evidence that went missing, or fell in the toilet, literally, like Jeff Schoep's phone.

You will learn that eight of the defendants in this case destroyed or refused to produce evidence. And as I already talked about, you will see that Defendant Matthew Parrott, who is here with us in the courtroom today, posted publicly on social media encouraging everyone involved in violence in Charlottesville to delete the evidence.

For example, Vanguard America, as you've heard about over and over -- the group that Eli Kline worked with so closely, and the group that James Fields marched with immediately before the car attack -- Vanguard America produced no materials in this litigation. You are going to see so much evidence in this case. They produced nothing.

We will ask you to think about, ladies and gentlemen, whether it is believable to you that Vanguard America, a group with an entire channel on the Discord server, that marched in

formation with pre-made shields, that they had no documents relevant to this case.

The Court is going to instruct you about what conclusions you can draw about the destruction of evidence.

You're going to see a lot in this case.

You will also be able to consider expert testimony in this case. I want to tell you about an expert that we will present named Professor Peter Simi. He is one of the country's leading experts on violent extremism and on white supremacy. Professor Simi will testify that, in his expert opinion, the defendants used strategies of plausible deniability to avoid accountability for what they had done.

They used doublespeak, which is language that is designed to mean one thing to people on the inside and something different to everyone else on the outside.

They talked in code, and Professor Simi will help you decode their words.

They used humor. Remember the post we saw that says "LOL," laugh out loud. They ended threatening posts with humor and "LOL," so that later, they could say, as they might today, and for sure will say during this trial, "We were just joking. This is all a joke," as if somehow this could be a joke.

And they acted one way in public and another way in private. And this is something that Professor Simi is going to call front-stage/backstage communication. Remember the Sieg

Heil video. Front-stage/backstage communications.

So we do expect, ladies and gentlemen, that defendants will be able to show you some communications where they're not using racial slurs, where they're not being violent, because that's purposeful, you will see. And we hope that you will pay close attention to whether the defendants knew they were being recorded, knew that their chats would come out. In other words, is what you're saying a front-stage or is it a backstage communication?

And I talked earlier about a woman who you'll hear testimony from whose name is Samantha Froelich. And Samantha Froelich lived with Eli Kline while he planned this. She used to be a member of the white nationalist movement. She left the movement. And her testimony is an insider's perspective for you about what was going on. And she is going to tell you how optics were so important. She is going to tell you that, rather than use racial slurs in public or do Nazi salutes, you should wear loafers and slacks, so, for example, white polos and khakis.

She is going to tell you also about plausible deniability. She doesn't know Professor Simi. She is going to independently tell you that a strategy of plausible deniability is what was going on here. After you see all the evidence in this case, that strategy is going to leap off the page, ladies and gentlemen.

Now, I also want to talk about one other thing that Professor Simi will discuss with you, which is the tactic of baiting and provoking targets to attack, something also called triggering. What you're seeing right now on the screen are two Discord posts from two different defendants in the summer of 2017, Defendant Kessler and Defendant Ray.

On July 11th, Mr. Kessler says -- by the way,

Mr. Kessler also went by the name MadDimension. So that's why

it says "MadDimension." But that's Mr. Kessler. He says: "If

Bellamy shows up we talk shit and try to trigger a chimpout."

Wes Bellamy is the former vice mayor of Charlottesville, and he's black.

Defendant Robert Ray posted on August 3rd -- very close in time -- he says, talking about the upcoming Battle of Charlottesville: "I'm looking forward to BLM" -- that's Black Lives Matter -- "more than Antifa. Blacks are the easiest people on earth to trigger. I predict some gloriously hilarious chimping."

So ladies and gentlemen, you will see two nearly identical posts just a couple of weeks before, right before August 11th and 12th, using the exact same racial slurs and using the exact same language about triggering.

This is just the tip of the iceberg, ladies and gentlemen.

There's other evidence that you will see which is

consistent with Professor Simi's expert opinion. You will see a style guide posted by The Daily Stormer, the most well-known white supremacist website in the country, which took its name from the Nazi Party's newspaper called Der Stürmer. The Daily Stormer style guide is very important to look at. And it will be admitted into evidence during this trial. There's a lot in it. Some of it is on the screen in front of you.

The style guide says: "Generally, when using racial slurs, it should come across as half-joking -- like a racist joke that everyone laughs at because it's true." It goes on to say that: "The unindoctrinated should not be able to tell if we're joking or not. There should also be a conscious awareness of mocking stereotypes of hateful racists. I usually think of this as self-deprecating humor. I am a racist making fun of stereotype of racists, because I have don't take myself super-seriously. This is obviously a ploy and I actually do want to gas kikes. But that's neither here nor there."

So if you hear defendants say that they don't really mean they will gas kikes and many other people, and that they don't really mean that they are trying to trigger black people, something they refer to as a "chimpout," or they don't really mean for people to run over counter-protesters with cars, you will see the evidence yourself that shows you that that is what they meant, because that's what actually happened.

So we expect that, when the defendants stand up here

today, they are going to continue this strategy of plausible deniability, of saying this case was not about their planning, their execution, or their celebration of racially motivated violence.

But at the end of the day, it is going to be the evidence in this case, which is defendants' own words, their own Discord posts, their own posts on other social media, their own texts, their own audio, their own communication, photos and videos, and tapes of their conduct on August 11th and 12th.

And that is what's going to show you, ladies and gentlemen, what is true and what cannot be denied in this case.

And let me just take one example involving Defendant Richard Spencer, who is sitting right over here. This is what he said when he thought no one recording him on the night of August 12th, after the torch march, after the threats, after the beatings, after the mace, after the shields, after the flagpoles, after all the violence and the car attack that killed Heather Heyer and injured so many other people. This is what he had to say.

(Video playing.)

Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to ask you to hold them accountable on behalf of these plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Ms. Kaplan, how long do you anticipate you'll be?

MS. KAPLAN: I speak way too fast, Your Honor, but I

assume about a half an hour.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, can you sit another half an hour? Then we'll go to lunch.

MS. KAPLAN: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you have just heard Karen tell you about what the defendants did on August 11th and 12th, 2017. I'm now going to tell you about what the plaintiffs were doing that same weekend.

The conspiracy to commit racially motivated violence at issue in this case did not happen in a vacuum. It devastated the lives of many, many people, including our plaintiffs. As Karen mentioned, they are all sitting right here in the courtroom today. And I'm going to name them:

Marcus Martin, Marissa Blair, Elizabeth Sines, Thomas Baker, April Muñiz, Chelsea Alvarado, Devin Willis, Natalie Romero, and the Reverend Seth Wispelwey.

These are the nine brave plaintiffs who we have the great privilege to represent. I'm going to describe them to you now based on the timeline of what happened and based on their connection to the key events.

Natalie Romero and Devin Willis were about to start their sophomore year at the University of Virginia when the defendants came to town on August 11. Devin was then 18 years old, and Natalie was 20.

Natalie attended UVA on an academic merit-based scholarship awarded to individuals with extraordinary

leadership potential. She was the very first person in her family ever to go to college. Before she started at UVA, she was a member of the Army Reserve Officer Training Corps, or ROTC. She had been awarded the Legion of Valor award, an honor awarded to only seven cadets in the whole country. In her freshman year at UVA, she did well academically. She was selected to lead -- and was selected to lead a peer mentoring program. Ten days before the Unite the Right rally, she got married.

Devin Willis also received scholarships to attend

UVA. He quickly emerged as a leader on campus. His freshman

year, he worked as a university tour guide and was involved in

a number of student groups, including the Black Student

Alliance, a group dedicated to supporting students from diverse

backgrounds. The summer after his freshman year, Devin stayed

in Charlottesville while working at an internship at UVA about

environmental conservation.

On August 11th, Natalie and Devin were at a spaghetti dinner at the home of one of their professors when they learned that white nationalists were planning to march through campus that evening. Natalie and Devin drove to campus in a car with a bunch of their friends who had attended the dinner. Their plan was to counter hate and stand up for their own school and their own community.

Since they had heard that the white nationalists were

focusing on the Thomas Jefferson statue, that's where they went. They walked over to the statue and joined a group of other students holding a sign that said, "VA students against white supremacy."

At first, when they got there, the white nationalists had not yet arrived, and so they and the other students were standing there alone. Natalie and Devin, who had been assigned to be each other's buddy for the evening as a safety precaution, held hands, and, with the other students, began to chant: "No Nazis, no KKK, no fascist USA."

(Video playing.)

That's Devin in the pink and white shirt, and that's Natalie holding his hand.

Soon, after a while holding hands at the statue,

Devin and Natalie heard voices growing louder and louder and

louder from the other side of the Rotunda on the map that Karen
showed you. As the voices grew louder, the sky around the

Rotunda literally began to glow from the flames of tiki

torches. That's when Natalie and Devin saw approximately 300

to 500 men, many of them wearing white polos and khaki pants,
holding lit tiki torches, approaching.

And if you look here, you can see Devin -- Natalie, it's hard to see -- and the other students around the statue.

And you can see in this video, as we're going to show, how they were quickly surrounded.

As you can see, they have their backs to the Thomas Jefferson statue, and their heads are down.

Within a matter of minutes, the scene looked like this. Again, you can see Natalie and Devin -- better, Devin -- around the statue. Natalie and Devin at this point are trapped against the Thomas Jefferson statue. They were among a very small group of UVA students of color there, face-to-face with a crowd of torch-bearing men who screamed at them, made monkey sounds at them because of their skin color, and told them to go back to where they had come from.

Natalie and Devin are each going to testify soon in this case, and they will each tell you that at that moment they were completely terrified. Devin will testify that he literally believed that he was going to die. Their fears were justified, since soon, the men physically attacked them. The men with tiki torches threw lighter fluid and lit torches at the students. Natalie and Devin were doused with pepper spray. Devin was kicked and punched repeatedly. They each remain haunted by what happened to them that night.

As Karen told you, after the defendants terrorized Natalie and Devin, they celebrated. The photos I just showed you depicted what Jason Kessler called "an incredible moment for white people."

Next up is Reverend Seth Wispelwey, who grew up in Charlottesville. He's a hometown boy, and at the time was a

local minister and a peace activist. He had arranged for an interfaith service to take place at St. Paul's Memorial Church on the evening of August 11th, before the planned rally the next day. St. Paul's, of course, is just across University Avenue from the Thomas Jefferson statue, just shouting distance away from where we last saw Devin and Natalie.

On August 11, Reverend Wispelwey was leading a service at St. Paul's Church with other faith leaders who had gathered in Charlottesville from all over the country. They had come together to support each other and their community, understanding that the next morning their town could well be full of white nationalists. They wanted to celebrate love and peace in the face of the defendants' hate and calls for violence.

Seth was there with his 7-year-old daughter you can see in the photo on the right. From inside the church, Seth and the other congregants heard the other white supremacists chanting "Jews will not replace us" as they marched across campus.

Now, I know you have all heard the old adage, "A picture is worth a thousand words." Take a look for yourself at the expressions on the faces of the people in the church that night. You can see for yourself how worried, how scared, how terrified they were as they heard the chanting outside.

Seth barricaded the doors to the church to keep the people safe

and they sheltered in place, waiting and praying for the white supremacists to leave.

I want to turn now to Elizabeth Sines, who at the time was a law student at UVA. Liz grew up in Garrett County in western Maryland, which is in the Allegheny Mountains. Her father was a police officer and a veteran and her mom worked for the state unemployment office. Liz chose to go to law school at UVA because she loved the town of Charlottesville.

On the night of August 11th, Liz learned on Twitter about the torch march that was already happening on campus.

She and a law school classmate were shocked, and they went to the main lawn to see things for themselves.

Liz tried to record things she saw as best she could to make sure that people in and outside of Charlottesville knew what was happening on her campus that night. In order to do so, Liz starting recording a video on her iPhone as the white nationalists marched past her.

(Video playing.)

Liz then walked to the top of the steps of the Rotunda, as Karen showed you earlier, and looked down.

Remember, Devin and Natalie are among the students encircling the Thomas Jefferson statue.

(Video playing.)

Although the video that she took on her iPhone is dark, Liz will tell you here in this courtroom that she then

watched the tiki torch-bearing crowd drag several students one by one away from the base of the statue, punch them, push them to the ground, kick them, and hit them with tiki torches.

(Video playing.)

In addition to Natalie, Devin, Seth, and Liz, you will hear in this courtroom from two other witnesses who were there at the Thomas Jefferson statue that night: Dean Allen Groves, and another UVA student, Diane D'Costa. They too will tell you what they saw with their own eyes and what they heard themselves.

August 12, the next day, started out as more of the same, but then became far, far worse.

Natalie and Devin had both planned to attend peaceful counter-protests the next day, although they obviously each had second thoughts after what happened on August 11. They decided to go because they were determined to show solidarity with their friends.

Devin began the day at McGuffey Park, about two blocks away from Emancipation Park, where the defendants had planned to meet. Counter-protesters met there, played music, made speeches, and chanted things like "no justice, no peace," and "love, not hate."

Devin and others stopped a few hundred feet away from the entrance to Emancipation Park. Karen told you -- you probably heard her tell you and remember -- that a group of

defendants gathered in the Market Street garage, walked down

Market Street to Emancipation Park, and violently broke through

a line of counter-protesters standing in the street.

Devin was in that line.

For the second time in less than 24 hours, Devin was assaulted again by a group of white nationalists, who kicked him, punched him, and pepper-sprayed him directly in the face.

Natalie had gone to Emancipation Park separately. When she got there, she saw crowds of white nationalists with helmets, body armor, weapons, and she saw people with pictures of Adolf Hitler on their T-shirts. While Natalie was at the park, she was approach by a group of white men who spat in her face and told her to go back to her country. Then those same men charged through her group, and Natalie was thrown on the hood of a car. Tragically, that was not the only physical contact that Natalie had with a car that day.

Seth Wispelwey, who we saw last night at St. Paul's Church, also planned to peacefully counter-protest on August 12th, as he had promised his interfaith community he would. He got up early that morning to lead the community in prayer at a sunrise service in downtown Charlottesville. He gathered with dozens of other clergy members and people of faith to stand up for justice and against white supremacy.

Reverend Wispelwey formed a line and linked arms like this with other clergy members as they kneeled and prayed

together in protest. But then they, too, were attacked. White supremacists shoved Seth and the other clergy while spitting at them and screaming: "Kill the faggot priests."

But, as it turns out, the violence that Natalie and Devin and Seth experienced on the morning of August 12th was just the tip of the iceberg.

Chelsea Alvarado and April Muñiz each came to downtown Charlottesville on August 12th to peacefully protest as well.

Chelsea -- you can go to the next slide -- had recently graduated from Sweet Briar College. She was living in Richmond, and she was working as a crisis counselor with people suffering from trauma and mental illness and struggling with homelessness.

On the morning of August 12th, Chelsea met up with Natalie and walked to Emancipation Park. Chelsea had a large blue drum that she wore across her body that she wore to play along with the songs and chants during the counter-protests. You can see the blue drum in that photo.

At approximately 1:41 in the afternoon, Natalie and the other counter-protesters, including April, headed toward Water Street.

April had lived in the Charlottesville area for more than 30 years. In August 2017, she was working full-time as a manager at a research firm. She's a former Peace Corps

volunteer who loves to take photographs.

April went into town on August 12th to document what was happening in her community. She parked her car and walked over to the Downtown Mall. At around 1:41 in the afternoon, she joined up with a crowd heading toward Water Street and she decided to follow them. That crowd was celebrating because they mistakenly assumed that the white nationalists were on their way out of town.

Marcus Martin and Marissa Blair were both born and raised in Virginia. Marcus is from Shipman and Marissa is from Amherst. They grew up near each other and they began dating in 2016. On August 12th, 2017, Marissa was working as a paralegal at a law firm here in town. Heather Heyer also worked at that same law firm and they had become close friends. At the time, Marcus was working as a landscaper.

Marcus and Marissa had been invited by Heather to join the counter-protest on August 12th. Marcus and Marissa met Heather at a McDonald's parking lot near Fourth and Water Streets. In the early afternoon, Marcus, Marissa, Heather and their friends were on Water Street. They too believed the white supremacists were on their way out of town and they felt an overwhelming sense of relief.

(Video playing.)

Marissa and Marcus began walking with the crowd up Fourth Street. The time, again, was 1:41 in the afternoon.

The woman walking right in front of Marissa who you can see with the black T-shirt and the braid swishing from side to side was their friend, Heather Heyer.

Thomas Baker works in conservation and ecological planning, and at the time of August 12th he had just moved to Charlottesville with his wife several months earlier. At that time he was working as a horticulturist at a local nursery. On August 12th, Thomas felt compelled to go downtown to support his new community. When he got there he walked around for a while until he joined a group of people walking up Water Street. He noticed the crowd's positive energy and followed them as they turned left on Fourth Street. He ended up right next to Marcus and Marissa. Again, it was approximately 1:41 p.m. in the afternoon.

Meanwhile, Liz Sines had had a morning meeting with career services at UVA law school, but she decided to go join the protesters after the meeting was over. Shortly before 1:41 p.m, she too joined the crowd walking along Water Street.

You've heard me say 1:41 p.m. a lot, and that is because at 1:41 p.m. on August 12th, 2017, Defendant James Fields paused for a moment in a gray 2010 Dodge Challenger at the top of Fourth Street. He then stepped on the gas, just like the tweet that Karen showed you from Matthew Heimbach, and he plowed directly into the crowd of counter-protesters that had converged at Fourth and Water Streets in front of him. By

the grace of God he barely missed April, Liz and Marissa.

Natalie, Marcus, Chelsea and Thomas were not as lucky. They were all hit by his car. Natalie was struck by the Dodge

Challenger with such force that she flipped through the air and landed on the ground. Someone pulled Natalie to safety on the sidewalk and out of the path of Fields' car just before he reversed it in order to run into the counter-protesters again.

This is Natalie minutes after the car attack.

Natalie lost consciousness at the scene and woke up in the hospital in full traction. The first thing that she asked the nurses was: Will I ever walk again? Her skull was fractured and her face was lacerated. She sustained a traumatic brain injury, which continues to affect her memory and attention, among other things. And you will hear directly from Natalie about this herself later today.

Natalie has regained the ability to walk, but not without difficulty. When she was finally released from the hospital, she had to use a wheelchair for over a month. Then she walked with a cane for two more months. That whole time, even in her home, she had to sleep in a hospital bed because she couldn't get in and out of a regular bed herself. She missed the next semester of school. For months she had to go to seven doctors' appointments a week just to regain basic functioning: Physical therapy, occupational therapy, treatment for ringing in her ears, appointments with neurologists and

Natalie continues to live with scars on her face that, as Karen has told you, remind her every single time that she looks in a mirror of the absolute horror of what she experienced that day.

Chelsea was playing that large blue drum that she was wearing on her chest when James Fields hit her with his car.

She was thrown backwards onto the concrete curb. She barely managed to maneuver out of the way as she saw Fields put his car into reverse. Chelsea's body was covered with cuts and bruises, and her knee immediately swelled up to three times its normal size.

When the car hit the drum that Chelsea was wearing, the drum slammed against Chelsea's side so that she had abrasions and bruises and the outline of the drum strap against her body. Chelsea also sustained a severe concussion and continues to suffer from injuries to her brain. She continues to struggle with severe anxiety, depression and other emotional difficulties caused by what happened that day.

Here is -- here is Chelsea's drum next to a pool of blood that was Natalie's blood on the street that day.

The man in the red and white sneakers with his body in the air is Marcus Martin. Just before the impact, Marcus had the wherewithal to push his fiancee Marissa out of the way of the car. Fields hit Marcus with such force that Marcus's

body, as you see in this Pulitzer Prize-winning photo, flew

2 into the air and over the car and then fell to the ground.

Marcus scrambled to get out of the way and prayed to God that

Marissa was okay.

underneath it.

Marcus's shoe was knocked off his left foot when he was hit by Defendant Fields's car. Look at these photos.

Remember, a picture speaks a thousand words. Look at these photos. As Fields reversed the car up the street, you can see Marcus's shoe stuck in the front grille of the car and then

These are the shoes that Marcus was wearing that day.

They're a lot stronger than human body parts because they

actually look not too bruised.

Marissa couldn't find Marcus immediately after the car attack. She understandably panicked, wandering desperately through the crowd looking for him until she found him crumpled on the sidewalk.

(Video playing.)

Marissa finally found Marcus on the ground, unable to move. Marissa helped him stand up and get him into an ambulance. Marcus's leg, which was completely crushed by the car, was obviously horribly injured. His fibula was broken and the ligaments were torn across his whole ankle and throughout his leg.

At the hospital together, Marcus and Marissa learned

for the very first time that their close friend, Heather Heyer, had been killed. Marcus and Marissa have struggled to deal with their pain and their injuries, both physical and psychological, for the past four years. Marcus's physical recovery has been brutal. For seven months he could barely walk, which also meant he was unable to work. Marcus and Marissa got married after August 12th. They struggled to manage Marcus's physical care, and the pain and trauma he experienced obviously put a heavy strain on their relationship. Ultimately, the car attack cost them their marriage as well.

This is Thomas Baker. While standing on Fourth

Street on August 12th, a newcomer to town, Thomas first heard

screaming and loud thumps. Those thumps turned out to be the

sounds of other bodies getting hit by the car. The car struck

Thomas's legs and his body was thrown over the hood. His head

and upper body hit the windshield, causing him to flip over the

top of the car before he slammed to the ground.

This is what Thomas looked like in the hospital. He tore a ligament in his left wrist, cartilage in his right hip, severely damaged his femur and his hip socket, and of course sustained a concussion. Thomas had cuts and bruises all over his body, as you can see. For months afterwards Thomas was in so much pain that it hurt even to lie down. He had difficulty moving around and he struggled to meet the physical demands of his job. He tried physical therapy and he tried rehab, but

ultimately he had to undergo surgery to try to repair at least some of the damage to his hip from August 12th.

Today Thomas walks with a limp and struggles with chronic pain. He can't run or play sports anymore, and he has been told that he'll need a hip replacement in the future.

In addition to the physical pain, Thomas obviously has suffered emotional difficulties that have impacted him and his relationships severely. And every single time that he sees a car go by, even when it isn't even close to him, he struggles with flashbacks from August 12th.

The near misses were also devastating. April and Liz were each nearly hit by Fields's car. April walked with the crowd and turned onto Fourth Street about a minute before the car attack. She was walking up the right side of the street when Fields came speeding down. She jumped out of the way, and God willing, the car barely missed her. She then saw the car backing up towards her and went into a state of complete shock. She fled into a vestibule on Water Street. April remembers weaving between people injured, lying on the ground and bleeding. Eventually someone was able to bring her over to a medic tech. April's work, her long-time relationship, and her mental health have suffered tremendously as a result of what she experienced on August 12th.

Liz Sines was also inches away from getting run over by Fields's car. You can see Liz in the red circle on that

photo. Here's what she experienced in real time that day.

(Video playing.)

As you can see in that video and as you'll hear from Liz herself in this courtroom, she struggled to record that video, but she wanted to make sure that people both in and outside of Charlottesville saw the truth of what had happened that day. And she is here today in this courtroom for that very same reason.

Since August 12th, Liz has had anxiety, panic attacks, insomnia, nightmares and difficulty focusing. The trauma she experienced that weekend still impacts her both personally and professionally.

Although Devin and Seth weren't hit by the car, the emotional impact of August 11 and 12 continues for them as well. When they heard the news about the car attack, they each rushed to Fourth and Water Street. What they saw there was utter devastation, destruction and chaos, blood and bodies everywhere, people covered in glass, medics administering CPR and other life-saving treatments.

Seth helped clear the area for the medics and provided support and assistance to those at the scene. Devin went looking for Natalie, but she had already been taken to the hospital. The next day Devin went to the hospital to see her, where she was still in traction and unconscious. Devin was afraid that she was going to die.

It will be very difficult, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, for the plaintiffs to recount for you what happened, but you're going to hear them tell you about some of the very worst moments in their lives. When you do, remember what Karen told you, that the defendants planned for violence, executed violence, and then celebrated the violence, as she showed you in those tweets and Discord posts from earlier today.

and what they said. Were plaintiffs really associated with violent members of Antifa, as I'm sure you will hear from at least certain of the defendants? Or were they peaceful protesters bravely committed to standing up for peace who were terrified by what was happening and who were horribly injured as a result?

Our plaintiffs have waited four long years for this day. In that time they've tried to move forward with their lives as best they can. Some have graduated from college.

Some have moved away. Some have started new relationships.

Some have gotten new jobs. But no matter what they do and no matter how far away from Charlottesville they go, they continue to carry with them the pain and trauma of what they experienced those two days.

That's why you are here, so that this community, a jury of their peers, can finally hear the truth about what happened on August 11 and 12, 2017. As Karen said, while this

case is about violence and hatred, it is also about justice and accountability; accountability for those who planned and perpetrated and celebrated the violence, and justice for the plaintiffs who have lost so much.

The evidence you will see in this courtroom over the next few weeks will be overwhelming. By the end of the trial it will be clear that the defendants conspired to commit racially motivated violence and devastated the lives of our clients. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. At this point we're going to recess for lunch for one hour. Operating on that clock, at 12:15, we'll resume at 1:15.

And at this point, ladies and gentlemen of the jury,
I have to remind you, do not discuss the case with anyone at
lunch, even amongst yourselves. Of course do not do any
research, do not remain within hearing of anyone discussing the
case. I'm going to allow you to file out now to return at
1:15. Just follow the marshal.

## (Jury out, 12:13 p.m.)

THE COURT: Okay. I'll ask the plaintiffs to remain and defendants may proceed.

All right. The plaintiffs may proceed. Thank you.

MS. DUNN: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. KAPLAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Recess.)

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 1 THE COURT: Call the jury. 2 (Jury in, 1:28 p.m.) 3 THE COURT: All right. Be seated, please. Members of the jury, sorry that we're late calling 4 5 you back. All right. Counsel for the defendants may begin. 6 7 Mr. Kolenich? 8 MR. KOLENICH: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 Good afternoon. As you remember, I represent Jason 10 Kessler, Nathan Damigo, and his organization, Identity Evropa. 11 This case, ladies and gentlemen, is a conspiracy 12 The plaintiffs want you to believe and find that anybody case. 13 who had anything to do with the Unite the Right leadership 14 conspired to damage them in some way or other. 15 Now, at no time in this case will you hear Jason 16 Kessler or Nathan Damigo or his organization deny that these 17 plaintiffs have been injured; in many cases, very badly 18 physically injured. Some of the other lawyers have a job to do 19 and they have to look into those injuries, but my clients are 20 not going to do that. 21 Moreover, my clients are not responsible for how 22 these other defendants choose to put in their case. They will 23 put in their own case through their attorneys. And that bears

a great similarity to the fact that they are not responsible

for what other leaders of Unite the Right chose to do on

24

25

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021

August 11th and 12th, 2017.

You heard it from the plaintiffs' own mouth:

"Antifa. Antifa." Now, why would they bring that up? Because these Antifa, these anti-fascists, are a big part of this case.

Why is Antifa a big part of this case? Because they don't like Jason Kessler. They don't like his message. They don't like what they call fascists or Nazis.

Very well. Nobody likes fascists or Nazis. If you haven't learned not to like my clients before you came in here today for this case, you're going to learn throughout this trial that the rhetoric they use, the positions they advocate, are not likable things. And in many cases, the people involved in this are not likable people. But that, ladies and gentlemen, is 100 percent legally irrelevant. Better lawyers than I will ever be have stood before juries and pointed out -- and judges -- and pointed out that, if the First Amendment does not protect the most reprehensible, the most disgusting, of speech, then it doesn't protect anything.

Now, at no time in this case are Kessler and Damigo or his organization going to tell you that the First Amendment protects a conspiracy to commit a crime or a conspiracy to do violence. That is not our argument. But you heard the plaintiffs say this event had been planned for months. But what was being planned?

The evidence in this case will show that, in the mind

of Kessler, in the mind of Damigo, and the official acts of their organization, the authorized acts of that corporation, they were planning a political rally.

Yes, they planned for the possibility of violence.

There is no getting around that. There will be no denials of that from my clients. But what violence were they planning?

They were planning for the possibility that the Antifa would physically attack them on August 11th and 12th, 2017, as had happened before. You will learn in this case that the anti-fascists go wherever the alt-right goes and they do what they can to physically stop them from expressing their reprehensible ideas, and they are not afraid to use violence to do that.

The plaintiffs showed you a picture of Nathan Damigo, my client, punching a female in the face. Now, at opening argument, we can't do anything with that. That's the way opening is. During the trial, we can show you the rest of the story. When you see an exhibit, when you see a piece of a deposition, any sort of demonstrative evidence, think: What is the rest of the story? That is our job, to show it to you.

In Mr. Damigo's case, the evidence will show that that female was physically attacking protesters with a broken glass bottle, and he acted to defend those people. And in point of fact, in point of fact, in Berkeley, California, which may well be the most liberal, anti-alt-right place in the

country, he was not charged with a crime for doing that, even though the whole world knows he did it.

Moving on, ladies and gentlemen, this case is about rhetoric. That's all it is about from my clients' perspective. It is about the First Amendment right to say whatever you want and to hold whatever opinions you want.

It is very true that you cannot do whatever you want. Now, these people said -- they hold opinions, and they express those opinions, of utterly ridiculous things. And you're going to hear these things repeatedly throughout the trial. They did say them. They did advocate for them. But that is all my clients did.

Okay. You say: No, no, no. No, I remember the plaintiffs' presentation. I remember the texts. I remember the tweets. Mr. Kessler spoke with -- Mr. Kessler spoke with Mr. Spencer, or Mr. Damigo spoke with someone. But what were they doing? Why were they speaking to him? What were they trying to accomplish? They were trying to put together an alt-right rally that could not be beaten down by these Antifa.

Jason Kessler, ladies and gentlemen, was scared. He was afraid of his event being ruined, but also of his own person being assaulted. He did the best he could, within the limits of his abilities as Jason Kessler, to stop that from happening. He worked with the police, the Charlottesville police, to protect this event. He got a permit. He did not

sneak into Charlottesville with a bunch of knuckleheads from out of town and tear up the town. He got a permit. He begged the police to protect his event. You all know the story. This was not the Charlottesville police's finest day. And in the immediate aftermath of this event, the evidence will show, the community thought so, too. The community blames the police for what happened.

Yes, they blame Kessler. Yes, they hate Kessler.

And yes, in some moral sense, Kessler has some responsibility.

But bringing the Nazis to town and all the damage that happened in the wake of that was not foreseeable to Mr. Kessler. He could not have known that this out-of-towner that he never met was going to run into a crowd of people.

Nathan Damigo could not have known that anybody was going to use a car and attack somebody.

And when you pay attention to the planning that was made of this event, they aren't talking about a car or a gun or a grenade or a bomb or anything that you would know would kill somebody and was made for the purpose of killing somebody.

They're talking about signs. You saw the plaintiffs' exhibits.

Picket signs and other such accountrements of a rally.

Yes, they brought mace. Many people carry mace to protect themselves from physical assault. Yes, it turns out carrying mace is illegal in the state of Virginia, at least the kind of mace they were carrying. But these kind of

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 technicalities are not the plaintiffs' case.

The plaintiffs must prove to you that my clients intended to hunt down and physically injure some persons who were counter-protesting in Charlottesville, or at least were in Charlottesville.

Now, at no time are you going to hear my clients claim these plaintiffs are Antifa. That is not part of our defense. What they are are innocent victims that were caught in between Antifa and the alt-right, and the tragedy occurred. You're going to hear an awful lot about their injuries. As I said, we're not going to attack the source of their injury, which is the car, or the validity of their injuries, which is medical evidence that you will see.

Our case is entirely this: Rhetoric, language, is protected.

Now, you heard the Court's instruction to you this morning: A conspiracy is an agreement. You have to have made some agreement with other members of the conspiracy to do the general thing that was done.

Now, if you agree to yell at people and annoy them and insult them and offend them, how is that an agreement to run them over with a car? Or if you agree to spit in their face, how is that an agreement to kill somebody? There is a giant chasm between anything that you could possibly find Kessler or Damigo or his organization agreed to and what

actually happened that day, and what actually injured these plaintiffs.

There is more to the defense than that for the organizational defendants. There are technical legal defenses that we will lay out the factual predicate for throughout the trial as far as the group Identity Evropa.

I thank you for listening. When we come to closing arguments, you will find that there is a very notable lack of evidence of an agreement between Kessler or Damigo and any of the people who actually are responsible for the violence of August 11th and 12th, 2017.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. SPENCER: Good afternoon.

Anyone need only say the words "Charlottesville rally," or "Unite the Right," or maybe even "August 2017," or just "Charlottesville," in order to evoke very strong emotions, and, in fact, quite a bit of pain, disappointment, anger, and regret on all sides of the issue. And that includes myself.

I have certain regrets about being involved in the rally. I have learned certain lessons. But we are now here, four years after the event, and emotions have subsided, and we are in a position to revisit the matter, look on it with clearer eyes, and apply the law accurately and fairly.

The purpose of an opening statement is to tell you what this case is all about. And I think I should -- before I

do that, I think I should tell you what it is not about.

The Charlottesville rally raises many important questions for all of us, about statues of Confederate generals, about the Civil War and how we remember it, about highly controversial, sometimes stupid and disgusting, speech, and how dissidents should be treated. It has raised very important issues about policing and the right of protesters and counter-protesters and the duties of authorities to remain -- to maintain a safe, but also free, society.

These subjects should be debated by us. They should be talked about by journalists, academics. They should be talked about by each and every one of you, whether it's in your local paper or at your local coffee shop or on social media.

These are important things.

But this case and this process is not about Robert E.

Lee. It is not about the Civil War. It is not about my
extremely controversial, though sincerely held, beliefs, which
I imagine most of you disagree with, and maybe vehemently
disagree with. This case ultimately is not about the
scattered, often stupid ramblings and insults of the alt-right.
This case isn't about Donald Trump. And this case isn't even
about who is ultimately responsible for the chaos and violence
that occurred across Charlottesville.

Sometimes in life there are things that are black and white. That very important question, which should be debated,

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 is quite gray.

We should remember that the Charlottesville rally,
Unite the Right, that I agreed to attend and speak at, at the
invitation of Jason Kessler, was preempted before anything had
been done or a word had been said. A state of emergency was
declared before a single person took the stage or said a single
thing. What was then called Lee Park and is now Emancipation
Park was evacuated by the police. I was forcibly pushed out of
the park and maced by the police.

Both sides -- or I probably should say "all sides" of this rally, because there are more than two -- were funneled together onto Market Street, almost as if creating chaos was the objective. And that chaos descended into downtown Charlottesville, where it reigned, and many people suffered and were injured.

That -- those actions that led to that event are actually not what this case is about. Before I talk about that, I'm going to talk a little bit about what this case might mean to you.

Your deciding one way or the other, for the plaintiffs or the defendants, or perhaps a complicated combination of those two, says nothing -- absolutely nothing -- about what you sincerely believe. I doubt the plaintiffs will say this explicitly, but it's more or less implied, that you are either on the side of the angels or you're on the side of

the devil incarnate, bad old Richard Spencer and the Nazis.

No. Your decision is about the rational and fair application of law. Your sincerely held beliefs in your mind and in your heart cannot be touched by this case, and they cannot be affected by anyone. Those are yours. You are here to make a rational application of the law, to apply the law where it applies and nothing else.

Deciding on my behalf says absolutely nothing about your feelings towards my sincerely held beliefs, towards my failings of character. You can go out and bash me on Twitter after this is all done; that's basically what I'm saying. And you might.

But this case is really about something very difficult in society. It's something that we attempt to do, and I don't think is really attempted anywhere else in the world, or the whole universe, and that is to defend the rights of someone you vehemently disagree with, to defend the indefensible, to treat someone who you might find despicable with fairness, to give a bad guy a fair shake. That's hard. And that is the challenge that you all -- that we all face in this Court.

The plaintiffs are going to imply that this is an up-down vote about what you believe. It is absolutely not.

So what is this case about? Well, the short answer is that it is about whether I was involved in a malign

conspiracy to commit, direct, or in some way inspire racial violence and the denial of civil rights. In the plaintiffs' view, the Charlottesville rally wasn't really about the statues at all. It wasn't about all those things that the planners worked on tirelessly for weeks and for months. All of that was a ruse or bait. It was really about getting people together so their civil rights could be violated or they could be harmed or injured in some way.

Now, getting more specific, you have been told, and you'll learn again, that this is about the application of Sections 1985 and 1986, Count 1, 42 of the US Code: Whether I myself, who was not involved in the logistical plannings of the rally, and some of my co-defendants, who very much were, should somehow be held accountable, somehow held liable, for injuries that the plaintiffs sustained.

And I would second Mr. Kolenich in the sense that I don't deny that they have been injured and that they have suffered.

This isn't a criminal trial. So the critical issue is not guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

It should be noted that over the past four years since August of 2017, I have not been charged with any crime, by the police, by the FBI, related to this matter. I certainly could have been detained and arrested on August 12th or the night before in Charlottesville by the police. I wasn't. The

police, or any other law enforcement agency, could have used

Section 1985 to try me criminally. They have not. I have not

been questioned by these authorities.

THE COURT: Mr. Spencer? Excuse me.

I have ruled that it's not relevant whether anyone else was arrested in this case.

MR. SPENCER: Fair enough.

And thus, we are at a civil trial, at which the bar is seemingly lower. It's a preponderance of the evidence and not guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

The essence of Section 1985 is to prevent a conspiracy to deny civil rights. This is defined as two or more persons who conspire for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of equal protection under the law.

The plaintiffs are going to have to demonstrate that to you. And tough talk by me, bold words, that is simply not enough. We had to be aware that someone was going to commit these acts, attempting to deny civil rights or attempting to injure someone. We had to want to do that ourselves. We had to want to engage in some kind of malign event for which a rally was a mere ruse.

They will present many things that are shocking, saddening -- no question -- sometimes embarrassing. But they won't present anything that demonstrates that I entered into a

conspiracy to commit civil -- to violate civil rights or commit violence. And that is what it is all about.

A conspiracy in itself is not malign. We all conspire to go to the movies or start a small business; or, in this case, we can conspire to host a rally of a highly controversial nature on a political event of the day to be held in Charlottesville. And I certainly was involved in that. But for the plaintiffs' case to hold water, they need to show some kind of concerted impulse, if not outright directives, for violence in the denial of civil rights. Tough talk, bold words, claims like "we're going to build an army for free speech and crack some skulls if we have to," as Mr. Kessler said, that is not nearly enough. That's tough talk. That's childish -- maybe childish stuff. That does not indicate anything like a concerted plan to attack people.

Another strategy of the plaintiffs is to lump us all together. Thus, I'm responsible for what he said; he's responsible for what I said. After all, they're all in on it; they're all in cahoots.

There are 23 defendants in the plaintiffs' amended complaint. Over the relevant period, I had no correspondence whatsoever with 14 of them. That's 60 percent of the people that they claim I was in cahoots with. The sporadic communication I had with other defendants never involved logistical planning of the rally. I was an invited guest. And

it never involved the denial of civil rights nor an attempt to injure someone. This assertion -- and it is an assertion that is not grounded in evidence outside of tough talk -- that I was involved in a 24-person conspiracy for violence and mayhem is thus dubious from the outset.

Jason Kessler had become an acquaintance of mine since late 2016. He was not a friend. Over the course of the year of 2017, Mr. Kessler and I shared some 26 instances of direct communication via iMessages. We participated in seven phone calls totaling 27 minutes. I imagine you probably talked a lot more with your car mechanic than Jason and I ever discussed this malign conspiracy.

Christopher Cantwell, also an acquaintance, not a friend. We shared a few text messages, seven instances in total, one phone call. We ate lunch one time.

Nathan Damigo and Eli Mosley were, you could fairly say, friends of mine at the time. There was plenty of communication, which I have -- I participated in this process, I delivered to the plaintiffs in the discovery process. Very little of it was about logistics. Very little of it was about Charlottesville, in fact. None of it involved inspiring violence or violating civil rights.

Matthew Heimbach, one message, one brief phone call.

Michael Hill, Michael Tubbs and the League of the

South, no communication.

Jeff "Scoop" or Schoep is a man I only became aware of due to this trial. Needless to say, we never communicated and I didn't know of his existence.

The National Socialist Movement, the Nationalist Front, I knew nothing about. Nada. The Fraternal Order of the Alt-Knights, nothing.

You can't build a 24 -- or 23-entity conspiracy on this.

Defendant Jason Kessler was the chief organizer of the Unite the Right rally. And he is a critical figure in determining whether any kind of malevolent conspiracy existed at all or if I were a party to it. Mr. Kessler aspired to be a spokesman or leader for the alt-right movement. And during the summer of 2017 organizing this rally was his full-time job.

The initial advertisement for Unite the Right, which was shown to me in mid June of 2017, did not include me as a speaker. I agreed to speak on June 16th after the permit for an above-board legal rally had been filed and after Mr. Kessler informed me of the, in his words, full cooperation of the police.

I also expressed some wariness about participating in the rally. I had become -- by that time I had become a notorious figure. I knew that if I were there, Antifa would want to come. Antifa had attacked me physically on multiple occasions and I was a bit wary of that, though I did agree.

And I was excited about it. I was excited to go to a rally that was clearly getting interest from the whole alt-right movement. I was excited to speak before everyone, excited to feel like a star, excited to say something powerful and bold, excited to participate in the whole process.

I had been doing that over the course of 2016 and 2017. I had spoken at multiple college campuses. In fact, the Texas A&M event was larger than Charlottesville, had a larger counter-protest. We took up -- or went to a football stadium. I had spoken at other colleges. We had hosted a free speech rally in Washington, DC.

Yes, Antifa would sometimes show up. Yes, harsh words were said. You could certainly find instances of pushing and shoving. But nothing like Charlottesville occurred in all of those instances.

What was unique about this one? Certainly not my involvement. Certainly not the involvement of some of the co-defendants who attended those things. What was unique about the Charlottesville event was the policing strategy of the municipality and in fact the state. In all of those other instances I said bold things, I pissed some people off, you could say. But the police protected speech and they protected order. And for such a controversial speaker in such a hyper-polarized time, it was remarkable the degree to which those events were, in fact, safe.

What was different about Charlottesville was not my participation or the participation of some of the co-defendants. What was different was the policing and security strategy. That is what directly led to the chaos first on Market Street, which then flowed into downtown Charlottesville. That strategy of the police is what is ultimately responsible for the suffering and injury of the plaintiffs, for which I have a great deal of empathy, and for which I too am saddened.

That is absolutely not what I wanted. I did not suffer in the way that they did, but I was physically harmed in Charlottesville. I have been attacked regularly in broad daylight, beginning in that year, 2017.

The plaintiffs played one clip from a podcast in which I said that we are now living in an age of political violence. I meant that. And that was true.

That's a now-notorious image of me being punched in the head by a member of Antifa while I was speaking to the press. It became a meme on social media. And it was actually the subject of a sort of public debate. This is an article in the New York Times in which this idea of: Should we feel bad if a Nazi gets punched or, wink-wink, should we punch them ourselves. This was hotly debated among liberals and leftists and Antifa and beyond.

When I said we're entering a realm of political

violence, this is what I am referring to. Did I fear something like that was going to occur at Charlottesville? Absolutely.

Now, I did not myself carry a shield. I did not carry a flag.

I did not carry anything resembling a weapon outside of a pocket knife. But I understand why many who attended desired to do so. I understand why many who attended thought, if we do this thing, if we speak our mind, if we stand up for our beliefs, they're going to come after us.

By June of 2017, Discord had become a very popular discussion platform. It was very popular on the alt-right and other places as well. It became a kind of central hub for Unite the Right. It was the communication vehicle for prospective attendees, and organizers used it for logistical concerns. There was, in fact, a leadership channel on this Discord server, as you will learn, with Mr. Kessler designated as events coordinator.

This was it. This was the central hub. I did not participate whatsoever in the Charlottesville 2.0 Discord server, nor was I invited to. I wasn't invited to the leadership channels. I wasn't invited to any channels. This is made manifest by the Discord archive, which you will see.

I was absent during every designated leadership phone call on Discord and planning sessions for both the torchlight march on Friday and for the aborted Saturday rally. My role in this event was, at least in terms of logistics, entirely

dispensable. I was invited to speak. I brought my fame or infamy, depending on your perspective. I certainly made sure this event would be talked about in the New York Times, but I played no role whatsoever in logistical planning of the rally or any type of conspiracy to deny civil rights that potentially might have occurred.

And so what we see with the plaintiffs' case against me is an effort at lowering the bar. This doesn't have anything to do with any criminal accusations or arrest, as we already discussed. You can lower the bar. They will not show you anything that could plausibly be interpreted as a directive or order for violence or unlawful acts. Let's lower the bar.

Was Richard Spencer involved in logistical planning of this event? Did he originate Unite the Right? No. Let's lower the bar.

Did he intend to speak and in some ways inspire outrage? Well, there we go. My attendance, my intention to speak boldly, this is implied -- it is implied that this led to chaos, that I am somehow liable for injury and suffering by my mere presence at the event. Apparently through osmosis or something my ideas were going to get out there and harm people.

That is not fair. That is not an accurate application of the law. And to be honest, on some level that is simply not serious.

This case -- and I agree with Mr. Kolenich on this --

really is about speech. It's about shutting down the most awful speech you could possibly imagine -- and I'm sure there will be plenty of examples of that. It's also an attempt to silence more idealistic and articulate speech, not just me at my worst moments but me at my best moments, when I sincerely talk to the world about what I believe in. This is an attempt to use both of those things in order to claim that I am somehow liable for injuries that I had nothing to do with.

The Supreme Court has been very clear about where that type of thinking -- that is the logic that lies at the heart of the plaintiffs' case -- leads. Justice Anthony Kennedy said -- and he said this about speech that was absolutely awful, in this case directed towards Asian Americans -- "A law that can be directed against speech found offensive to some portion of the public can be turned against minority and dissenting views to the detriment of all. The First Amendment does not entrust that power to the government's benevolence. Instead, our reliance must be on the substantial safeguards of a free and open discussion in a democratic society."

Members of the jury, you are those safeguards. This kind of logic can be used in all sorts of ways. It might very well right now be used against people you don't like and you wouldn't like to associate with. You might like to tell us to shut up, which is of course your right. That same logic can be

applied to all sorts of speech that is unpopular. Over the summer of 2020, many people sincerely took part in BLM -- Black Lives Matter, that is -- protests. Many of those eventuated in vandalism, looting, violence, you'd probably call some of those things riots.

THE COURT: Mr. Spencer, I'm going to have to ask you to try to stick to the facts of this case and not argue the case at this point. You can argue at the summation.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. Skip ahead.

The poet Robert Burns said that the best laid plans of mice and men often go awry. When I look back on Charlottesville, I feel absolutely that my best laid plans went awry. I wanted to go and speak. I view Charlottesville, though it might be a kind of moral victory, as I said, in the sense that we fought back in an extremely difficult situation, I do view it as a kind of disaster and learning experience.

In a recorded rant that I engaged in that was played to you that occurred after the event, I was in a state of absolute frustration. And I said things that are shameful and embarrassing, and that I might never really live down. Those are indicative of a man who felt that everything had gone awry that day. Our plans for a rally, our plans to speak had been spoiled. And we were left with chaos and violence and just a bad feeling all around.

The plaintiffs claim that that was the whole purpose

of the rally, that all of my plans had actually been fulfilled. That was a great success. It absolutely wasn't. And my state of mind of extreme frustration at that moment evinces a man who felt that everything had gone wrong. The conspiracy to host a controversial rally had been destroyed and I was immensely angry and frustrated. That doesn't sound at all like a person who planned for any of these things to take place.

Now, I'm going to talk briefly about the decision that you need to make, and then I'm going to talk -- I'll finish my remarks with the big picture.

myself. I remain agnostic about my co-defendants and their status. You are tasked with something quite difficult, or you might be; and that is to separate the defendants. Now, the plaintiffs have tried to tie us all together in a kind of string board of a conspiracy. As Judge Moon has said, you might need to make fine distinctions. Deciding for the plaintiffs on one matter need not imply that you decide for the plaintiffs vis-à-vis me, and vice versa. You have to look at my situation as it is and make a decision: Was there a conspiracy, a malign conspiracy to deny civil rights at all? If you decide there was, was Spencer a part of it? Could he have possibly been a part of it?

I will show you one matter -- this will of course be introduced later. The plaintiffs in a way want to have it both

ways. They want to take things literally and figuratively.

When someone says something very harsh, they want you to take that in the worst possible way possible. In Kessler's words, an army for free speech. That must have been a real army to attack people. When someone says something jokingly or in a kind of sophomoric or teenage fashion, well, we need to take -- that's just a code for something else. That's all figurative.

This is what I tweeted, again, at the height of my notoriety in August 2017 at 12:38, I believe p.m. This is while I saw Charlottesville descend into chaos. This is before the accident with the car and James Fields that led to death and many of the injuries of the plaintiffs. I tweeted this out. This was seen by 70,000 followers. I have no doubt that it was seen by thousands more. "My recommendation: Disperse. Get out of Charlottesville city limits. State of emergency has been called."

Now, I guess the plaintiffs could call that plausible deniability. I don't know how that possibly makes sense. I was not in any kind of direct communication with James Fields whatsoever or countless other people who engaged in violence. I had no way to tell them, ah, this is all a sham. No. I was saying what I meant and I meant what I said. Charlottesville went wrong. The authorities had declared a state of emergency. It is time to get out of Dodge. That is the only context in which a tweet like that makes sense. Why would I do that

otherwise? Why would I try to prevent more chaos and violence and injury? Why would I do that if I were part of this malign conspiracy against the plaintiffs? Why?

The fact is, I was not. I was disturbed by the chaos that I saw unfold. I did not want anything like what happened to have occurred, and I have been disturbed by it ever since.

Now, let me say one thing in closing on the big picture. Yes, this is about Sections 1985 and 1986, but I think it's actually about something much bigger. It's about justice itself. Justice, that word, we use it every day, but we don't dwell on it enough and think about it seriously enough.

For the purpose of this exploration, I'm going to talk about two concepts of justice. The first one we could call rational or constitutional justice. That is the fair and reasoned application of a law, a clearly expressed law, in a place where it is appropriate. That is all of your challenge. That's why you're here. That is what this process is about.

But there's another kind of justice. And I'm afraid that type of justice is, in fact, much bolder than this rational justice I just mentioned. And I'm afraid that it has a much stronger hold on us as human beings. It is all too --

THE COURT: Mr. Spencer, I hate to interrupt you, but you're arguing again. You'll have an opportunity --

MR. SPENCER: This is a big-picture --

THE COURT: I know it's a big-picture thing, but this is a case between these plaintiffs and these defendants. And the plaintiffs -- we're not sending a message here. The question is: Do the plaintiffs prove what they must prove to hold the defendants liable. And I want the jury to understand they're not here except to make that decision. And that's -- the evidence and the law is what should control the decision, not the bigger picture.

MR. SPENCER: I agree with you. What I'm trying to warn them is about not doing that. Could I finish that?

THE COURT: I'll warn them about that. You tell them about your defense and that's what you're entitled to do, the evidence you're going to put on in your defense. And you can argue at the end of the case.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. That's fair enough.

Over the course of this trial you will see evidence of how I was invited to participate in the Charlottesville rally, how I was excited about this prospect that had gained so -- generated so much excitement in the alt-right movement. It was clearly going to be something big. You will not see anything approaching a directive towards violence or the denial of civil rights. You might, I'm sure, if the plaintiffs do their job, see me at my worst moments, see me painted in such a fashion you might very well dislike me intensely. But you will not see anything resembling evidence that justifies the

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 application of Sections 1985 and 1986.

I would urge you to resist any impulse to make this about anything other than the law, to make this about scapegoating or purging bad feelings. I would urge you to make this about whether a directed, coordinated conspiracy actually existed. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Spencer.

Members of the jury, I don't like to interrupt the lawyers during their statement, but I will remind everyone I made rulings. I'm going to ask everyone to adhere to the rulings I made.

There was mention that -- you may have a seat.

There was mention that no one was arrested, or that Mr. Spencer was not arrested, or anyone else. That's totally, totally irrelevant. Whether persons are arrested or not has nothing to do with the civil case. Even if a person is brought into court in a criminal case and convicted, that doesn't necessarily decide the civil case. It's an entirely different matter.

And I'd ask you to focus on what I will tell you the plaintiffs have to prove in order for the defendants to be held liable. And that's what you should be focusing on during the case.

I'm told we need to take a break.

Take about 15 minutes.

```
Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021
 1
    (Jury out, 2:26 p.m.)
 2
              (Recess.)
 3
              THE COURT: One of the jurors handed the marshal a
   note that said: "Do we have to make a judgment for or against
 4
 5
   each defendant individually?"
 6
             I think all of you have covered that.
                                                     I quess I
 7
   could say so -- say it again. I'll give the note to the clerk.
   It was Juror 275.
 8
 9
             MS. DUNN: Your Honor, our concern is that it might
   be somewhat suggestive if you say that after this opening
10
11
   statement, and maybe Your Honor could fold it into some more
12
   general instructions later.
13
              THE COURT: I'll wait until the end. I think I told
14
   them in the voir dire and it came up in the opening statement.
15
   Mr. Kolenich mentioned it in his statement. But I'll wait
16
   until the closing.
17
             MS. DUNN: Thank you.
18
             THE COURT: I'll wait until we're finished with the
19
   opening statements.
20
             All right. Who's next?
21
             Mr. Smith, are you next?
22
             MR. SMITH: I think it's actually Mr. Cantwell.
23
             MR. CANTWELL: It's me, Judge. Mr. Cantwell.
24
             THE COURT: Oh. Mr. Cantwell.
25
             Well, remain until the jury -- call the jury.
```

## (Jury in, 2:45 p.m.)

THE COURT: Have a seat, please.

All right. Mr. Cantwell?

MR. CANTWELL: Thank you, Judge.

Check, check. Can everybody hear me okay?

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you all so much for being

7 here.

I'm not used to this stuff, and I was really nervous about the jury selection thing, but I think that this went pretty well. I'm reasonably happy with the outcome. I think you all are reasonably smart people, or better, and I think before we're done here you're going to realize that I'm not just blowing smoke at yous.

The plaintiffs are going to tell you that we're a bunch of mean racists who take some perverse joy in harming people because we believe that, deep down, our political goals will be served by chaos and violence. Now, if any of you have ever had the intellectual curiosity to read *Mein Kampf*, or if there's a conservative who is well enough informed to know the difference between Marxism and National Socialism, you already know that this is Mother Jones-level ideological nonsense.

We're talking about right-wingers here. This is the Unite the Right rally. Mainstream Republicans may wish to distance themselves from us on the subject of race, due in part to meritless lawsuits like the one here.

But make no mistake about it: This was a right-wing event.

Right-wing ideology is characterized by a desire for order, tradition, stability, and rules. The use of force is prohibited in all but defense of person and property and by duly authorized agents of the government to enforce the law.

And if you've ever been involved in a violent, chaotic situation before, then you understand that there is no paradox in saying that these rules, the coercive powers of the state, are in place to preserve our freedom. I call this the ordered liberty which is characteristic of Western civilization. The plaintiffs call it white supremacy. And the difference between me and your favorite respectable Republican is that I will defend that way of life by any name. I won't run away from it just because some lunatic calls it racist and threatens to hit me, which is exactly what happened at the Unite the Right rally in August of 2017.

How does one go about uniting the right, if you bother to think about that for a minute? When we hear from the plaintiffs' experts, they're going to tell us that the very name of the event, "Unite the Right," was about white supremacy. But if any of you have ever casted a vote for a Republican, you know that that's complete nonsense. Do you unite the right through violent crime? No. And anyone who says otherwise is insulting your intelligence.

What is the principal divide on the ideological right? From our view, it's race.

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are people, some of them quite well-meaning, who continue to take literally the demonstrably false idea that all men are created equal. Now, don't get me wrong. That's a fine legal concept, that we treat all of our citizens fairly and according to the same set of rules. But if all men were literally created equal, the world would be an exceedingly dull place. Sure, there would be no Down's syndrome, there would be no retardation, there would be no birth defects or racial differences, if all men were literally created equal. But then we would lose that which the ideological left claims is our greatest strength: Diversity. We wouldn't have it. wouldn't be any such thing. If we were all born the same, then we truly would be the interchangeable machine parts they try to make of us with their collectivist programs. But the reason these ideas always result in mass murder is because they are contrary to the nature of the human organism.

We don't want to hurt people because they are different from us. A man is not equal to himself from one day to the next. "I am not equal to my co-defendants," you'll keep hearing all of us say. I am not looking for uniformity; just order, stability, and a government which organizes policy in tune with the nature of our existence. Give me this and I will live in peace with my neighbors, as I expect that all of you

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 likewise desire.

But if the people who want to insult me over my political views call themselves a racial interest group, that doesn't give license for them to break the law. It doesn't make their racial group better than mine. And it doesn't entitle them to relief from the laws at work in this case.

Black Lives Matter is an -- openly Marxist and openly violent. They can't hide behind race in this court.

I don't know my co-defendants well enough to speak for them, but that's a fine summary of how I see things. And since what I'm talking about in terms of biological reality cannot be changed through ideology, it is my idea that, to unite the right, Republicans need to stop fearing the accusation of racism.

A very wise man once told me that to solve the problems in the black community, it's going to, quote, "require that white people grow some backbone and courage and stop fearing being called a racist." His name was Walter E. Williams, and you'll hear that name again before we're done. That's how you unite the right, not with violent crime.

Violent crime unites the left. That's why leftists say things like ACAB. "All cops are bastards" is what that acronym stands for. At the one-year anniversary of the Unite the Right rally, on August 12, 2018, their celebration over the victory -- their victory over truth, leftists marched with a

sign that said: "Last year they came with torches. This year they come with badges." They were comparing us to the police. And before we arrived in Charlottesville in August of 2017, they chanted: "Cops and Klan go hand in hand," equating the KKK with their local police department, because to them, we're just like the cops. And on that point I hope you agree with them. And there's going to be a lot of evidence to that effect in this case.

The left-wing lexicon is a fascinating subject. When Blee and Simi, their experts on the white supremacist movement, use the terms "doublespeak" and "strategies of deniability," remember Plaintiff Wispelwey's favorite catchphrase:

"Diversity of tactics."

"Diversity of tactics." That's a key phrase I really want all of you to remember throughout the course of this trial.

You see, there are peaceful tactics and then there are violent tactics, and then there are diverse tactics, which, like all diversity, is the left's greatest strength. The diversity of tactics makes this lawsuit possible, because right-wing rallies only turn violent when leftists attack the right-wing ralliers. But courts don't help confessed rioters. You need somebody like Reverend Wispelwey to play the sympathetic victim. He says, "Oh, I'm the peaceful religious figure illegally blocking a public roadway with my friends in

the revolutionary Communist Party. If you hit me, you're mean."

And then, as Reverend Wispelwey told Slate magazine,
"battalions of Antifa" show up with, quote, "community defense
tools." That's what Plaintiff Wispelwey told Slate magazine in
an interview after these events.

So see how this works? "Diversity of tactics" is a left-wing euphemism for political violence which is given cover by ostensibly nonviolent co-conspirators.

If you watched the news in the end of 2020, you heard about another one of those words: "Mostly peaceful protests."

The only time that you heard plaintiffs' counsel mention Antifa in the course of their entire opening statement was to deny any attachment to it. And before we're done here, you're going to know that that was a lie, and that should really upset you.

News flash: That's not how peaceful protest works.

If you tolerate the violence of your demonstration, it's a

riot. That's how it works.

This famous image came out last year of Jim Acosta in front of a burning building with the lower third of the scene said "Fiery but mostly peaceful protest." A lot of you saw that. No. That's called arson. And it's illegal.

Another left-wing euphemism --

THE COURT: Mr. Cantwell, I hate to interrupt you,

```
Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021
  but an opening statement is basically to tell the jury about
 2
   your defense, and not to make, you know, a speech about --
 3
             MR. CANTWELL: The "diversity of tactics" line is a
   phrase from Plaintiff Wispelwey, which I expect him to testify
 4
 5
   to --
             THE COURT: You can tell them what you're going to
 6
 7
   tell them about your beliefs --
 8
             MR. CANTWELL: I expect --
 9
             THE COURT: -- and what you can prove about someone
   else --
10
11
             MR. CANTWELL: I expect Plaintiff Wispelwey --
12
             THE COURT: -- other plaintiffs. All right?
13
             MR. CANTWELL: That's all right.
14
             THE COURT:
                         Thank you, sir.
15
             MR. CANTWELL: When Mr. Wispelwey takes the stand, I
16
   intend to ask him about a term called "community defense."
17
   Now, that sounds nice, doesn't it, folks? Almost borders on
18
   Republican sloganeering. Defense, community? Where do me and
19
   Ted Cruz sign up? But remember what Reverend Wispelwey told
20
   Slate: Antifa had community defense tools, as in weapons. And
21
   community defense is something very different from
22
   self-defense, otherwise they would just call it self-defense.
23
   Community defense is the use of physical violence in advance of
24
   what advocates say are undesirable political outcomes.
25
   these people speak, they will gain power. They will use it in
```

ways I disagree with. So I will defend my community by using violence to prevent them from speaking. That's what community defense is.

And you're going to hear Mr. Simi and/or Ms. Blee testify that we use double-speak. That's hypocrisy.

Let me move on to something that's probably already painfully obvious. I'm not a lawyer. But contrary to the popular cliche, neither do I have a fool for a client. There's no such thing as a public defender in civil court, and I'm poor. So I'm the best attorney that I can afford. And I didn't even stay at a Holiday Inn Express last night. As a matter of fact, I'm going to let you in on a little secret. I don't have to tell you this because it's actually not really relevant to the details of this case. But last night I stayed at the Central Virginia Regional Jail. And when this case is over, I'm going back to a federal prison, win, lose or draw. I'm a fairly recently convicted felon because my mouth gets me into trouble a lot. And last year I was convicted of threatening a Nazi on the Internet because he wouldn't leave me alone and he threatened the woman I wanted to marry.

I didn't have to tell you that, but there's like 100 different ways you might find out, and I don't want to step on a landmine before we're done here and you think I was trying to snow you.

I'm sorry. Sometimes it's going to look like I don't

know what's going on, because I don't. One of the ways I could have stepped on that landmine is by coming out about some of the difficulties I've had trouble preparing for this trial. So I'm going to ask you to bear with me while I find my way through this thing. And since I don't figure any of you are in the habit of being jurors, I think that we're kind of in this thing together. And if I'm lucky, you're going to feel that way too by the time we're done.

Here's one thing I do know: I did not conspire to commit racially motivated violence in August of 2017 or any other time, and I didn't conspire to do any of this other crap, either. There's a few guys who were convicted of conspiracy to riot. And you'll notice before we're done here that those guys are conspicuously absent from the courtroom. I think only one of them have been deposed, and in the testimony you're going to see from him, the plaintiffs don't even ask the guy about our relationship because they knew before they asked him that there wasn't one.

I didn't invite those guys. I don't think I ever met those guys. And let me tell you: That makes it hard to conspire.

There's a bunch of other people who should be in prison for this thing. We'll usually refer to them as Antifa, Communists, Reds, that kind of thing. You may recall, as I said, the only time they mentioned this was to deny any

involvement with them. And you're going to know that that's a lie before we're done.

I really, really, really don't like these people.

And I'm toning it down right now because we're in polite company. I told you before that my mouth gets me in trouble.

And before we're done here, you're going to see how that might turn out to be the case. The plaintiffs are going to go through every nasty thing I've said for the last decade and that's why this thing is going to take a month. There's really just that much of it.

And that's partly because I'm a professional entertainer. It's what I do for a living. I'm a very talented and dare I say good-looking host and producer of a live, uncensored, open phones talk show called the Radical Agenda. I made a brief attempt at standup comedy a few years back, I started doing the YouTube thing, and then I was invited to be the cohost of a nationally syndicated broadcast talk radio show called Free Talk Live, which was nationally syndicated on over 160 FCC-regulated stations across this country.

Then my mouth got me in trouble. Some left-wing activist on Twitter, who happened to be black, tweeted at me with some identity politics nonsense about feminism, like that was going to intimidate me. And to make the point that this was not going to work on your humble correspondent, I gave him a three-word answer. And that answer was "shut up, nigger."

That's what I said to him.

And there's a lot more to it. There always is. And we don't need to get into the weeds on this. But depending on how you calculate, you might say that that began the journey that caused you and I to meet. I got banned from Twitter. I got fired from the radio. It made the news, and the publicity got a lot of new people to check out my uncensored,

Internet-only entertainment product called the Radical Agenda.

On August 11 of 2017 this was how I made 100 percent of my income. I'm very good at my job, in part because I don't care who I upset as long as I entertain my audience. Though largely based on true stories, the show is marketed as fiction because it prioritizes entertainment value and shock value in particular over accuracy. That is a calculated business decision, as well as a matter of artistic integrity.

And to this you might say isn't it a contradiction of terms to prioritize integrity over accuracy? And to this I would respond absolutely not. Not in art. That's not how art works and I am an artist. In art, anything is possible.

Things like common sense extremism, which is the tag line, the catch phrase of my product, the Radical Agenda. Of course "extreme" and "common" are contradictory terms. It's either or, a binary choice, it's like male or female. It's impossible to be both common and extreme.

So when I start the show and I say it's a show about

common sense extremism where we talk about radical, crazy, off-the-wall things like yada, yada, that's me having enough faith in you, the listener, to know that this is a gag.

I'm pretty sure the plaintiffs are going to play for you a clip where I added sort of a disclaimer to the show intro where I say specifically that, quote, "The listener is hereby warned to interpret as fiction anything" --

(Reporter clarification.)

MR. CANTWELL: That's my radio voice and it doesn't work for the reporter. I apologize, ma'am.

The quote was, "The listener is hereby warned to interpret as fiction anything they are not able to verify in a more reliable fashion." That's the quote.

Ma'am, if I -- if I do that again and I just repeat it slowly afterwards, would that work for you? Because I kind of want to get the idea across: There's a theatrical component to it. I don't think I have a whole lot more of that anyway.

I made that decision right after this lunatic Bernie Sanders supporter named James Hodgkinson tried to gun down the Republican Freedom Caucus in Alexandria, Virginia. Some of you might remember that story. It was right before the events at the heart of this dispute.

That thing really bothered me for a number of reasons, not the least of which, it was sort of a crescendo to a lot of the political violence that was going on at the time.

And as I said, it was in close temporal proximity to what we're doing here.

I went to Charlottesville, Virginia in August of 2017 with that terrible event fresh in my mind. The plaintiffs want you to think that I added that disclaimer to my show because I was planning to commit a crime, and this was my way of covering it up or some kind of nonsense like that. But before we're done here, you're going to know that I'm not an idiot, and since you're not either, I don't think you're going to buy it.

I'm going to do my best to make this fun for everybody here. If I can make plaintiffs' counsel laugh at jokes they shouldn't be laughing at, like it's involuntary, I'm going to consider myself very proud of myself. But of course here for our side anyway, accuracy matters more than entertainment in this courtroom. But then again, you've probably noticed that most comedy, most art, most entertainment, even the purest fantasy productions feature monsters, wizards and ghosts, have enough truth in them to make them real to us.

It's not a chore to suspend disbelief because we can relate, whether it's a boy seeking a girl's affection, conflict over scarce resources, or civilizational scale warfare, all of our entertainment products -- books, movies, TV -- all involve a plotline, a plotline with a conflict, a conflict which appeals to our deepest Darwinian survival and reproduction

instincts. And that is what the Radical Agenda is.

If you were paying any attention at all to what was happening between 2014 and 2017, it should come as no surprise at all to you that entertainment products emerged which challenged and capitalized on the prevailing left-wing narratives about race in America. I am the host and producer of one of the most commercially successful such products ever created. And that is why I'm being sued instead of the hundreds of nobodies who came and risked their lives to see me say something in public.

I'm not going to ask you for anything that I wouldn't ask you to give a pornographer or a gangster rapper. You don't have to agree with me or like my artwork. The truth is, you don't even need to believe I'm particularly trustworthy, although I'd like to think I am, and obviously that would be ideal. All you need to do is pay attention to the evidence in this courtroom and do what Judge Moon tells you to do, and I'm going to win this thing, no context. It's not even going to be close.

I am accused of participating in a racially motivated violent criminal conspiracy, not hate speech, which for the time being is still perfectly legal in the United States. And whatever they tell you, they would very much like that to change. I told you I was glad you were smart because I need you to be. The plaintiffs are going to try to trick you. They

will show you racism and they will show you violence and they will say, aha, gotcha, Nazi, racially motivated violence.

But smart jurors are going to notice a couple of things conspicuously absent from that equation, most notably a link between the racism and the violence. A lot of these plaintiffs look as white as me, and for the non-white plaintiffs, with the exception of Mr. Fields's guilty plea, you'll find no connection between the violence and the racism. And I don't think that Mr. Fields's guilty plea is very credible, actually, personally.

The other big glaring hole in this story is the conspiracy. If I show up in Charlottesville to say Nazi things and some nutcase decides to commit a hate crime, I'm not legally responsible for that, unless I enter into an agreement with a co-conspirator to make this happen.

But there's not just holes in the story, there's also a giant elephant in the room. The plaintiffs are like racism, violence, pay no attention to the armed communists who started the fight or you're a racist too. You might have noticed weapons and protective gear and communist symbols in some of the plaintiffs' opening exhibits. So not only am I lucky that you're smart, I'm also exceedingly fortunate that you're not a bunch of sniveling cowards who would betray your civic duty to avoid being called a racist.

Come to think of it, I'm also probably pretty

fortunate that you're not a bunch of closet racists, because this way you don't need to hide your true views by throwing me under the bus.

No matter how the plaintiffs or their parade of partisan Democrat swindlers tries to frame it, this case is about hate speech. The plaintiffs are going to try to shoehorn size 12 hate speech allegations into size 5 conspiracy heels.

They have to do this because the Constitution of the United States gives them no other way to punish the people whose speech they want outlawed.

They tell you they believe in freedom of speech.

You're going to know that's not true before we're done here.

And it should piss you off that they lied.

They've hired some very well-paid people to complicate things, but at base, like I said before, this is pretty simple. Here's racism, here's violence. Blame the racists for the violence and give us lots of money from this guy who can't afford a lawyer. That's a trick and you shouldn't fall for it.

Beyond the fact that you're smart, I don't think you're going to fall for this because there's actually a lot of evidence to the contrary, it turns out. You see, I'm smart too. I don't think you're going to fall for this. I'm sorry. I knew there was going to be Antifa there. And while most of America only heard about them in 2020, me and my associates

have known about them for many years. They hunt us like animals, and they are violent and they are dishonest.

So when I came to Charlottesville, I wore a body camera. You might have noticed it when the plaintiffs showed a picture of me wearing the Radical Agenda T-shirt. You might have seen it clipped to my collar. You're going to see at least two videos from that during this trial.

Let's start with the obvious: Why does the guy who traveled across state lines to commit the crime wear a body camera? Why do his co-conspirators let him do something so reckless?

Conspiracy, the judge told you, involves an unlawful purpose. The plaintiffs tell you that we came here planning to get away with this. Why am I recording video of the whole thing? I'm not a cop. This wasn't a secret. The plaintiffs didn't have to drag this evidence out of me. It wasn't found in a search warrant. I wore the body camera and recorded because I was afraid that somebody might try to hurt me, and I'd have to defend myself, and I wanted to make sure that nobody had to take my word for what happened.

Again, I don't expect you to trust me. That's the whole entire point here. I'd certainly prefer to earn your trust, but one of the things you're probably going to hear me say in several different interviews that gets played here, because I say it all the time, is that I knew long before I

showed up in Virginia that I'm going to be a profoundly unsympathetic defendant in a courtroom if I get charged with a crime.

So I brought the body camera to protect myself. And as you're going to see before we're done here, it's a very fortunate thing that I did. It's also a good thing I saved the videos before I went to University of Virginia on August 11th, because the plaintiffs' co-conspirator, Lindsey Elizabeth Morris, an Antifa criminal from Philadelphia, stole it from me. And I should be able to show you two different angles of that theft, from other cameras that picked it up. More on that later.

The first body camera video takes place in the Walmart parking lot in Charlottesville on August 11, 2017 at something we called the Radical Agenda listeners meet-up. This was the only event of the weekend that I could accurately be described as having organized, and despite the best efforts of Antifa, there was no violence at that event.

One of the ways I used to make money on the Radical

Agenda -- there's a premium content subscription service called
a paywall. For a monthly fee, users gained access to

members-only, exclusive bonus content. Since I was afraid of

Antifa, but I wanted to meet my listeners before the event, I

disabled news silence on the website and announced the meet-up

details behind that paywall so that only existing paying

customers could see it. You couldn't find out I was going to do it and then quick pay the ten bucks, okay? Which tells you something in and of itself: I'm trying to avoid the people who say I'm conspiring to attack them.

You're going to see a lot of that nonsense in this case, and it's obviously ridiculous. The plaintiffs told you in their opening statement that the torch march of the evening of August 11 was supposed to be a secret. Okay. So we had a secret rally that was designed to attack a bunch of innocent students. Really? Is that what they want you to believe? You should be insulted by that.

I've got some printouts from my website to show you how that paywall feature works. It works very well actually. But that didn't stop Mike Longo, Jr. and Paul Minton and some other Antifa criminals from confronting us in the Walmart parking lot. The logical conclusion is that they were paying me money before this went down so that they could spy on me and my listeners. Who is conspiring against who here? Huh?

But it gets worse than that. You're going to see on that video, I pull up to the Walmart, I get out of my car, I wait for my listeners to show up. They quickly do, we all get to shaking hands. We're having a fine time. And then Antifa shows up. They're all white, as usual, but we know it's them just because they've got that kind of scumbag look to them.

You know the type.

Now, I was legally carrying a gun at the time, a Glock 19 semi-automatic pistol in my waistband in the small of my back. I tucked my shirt in behind the holster to let these violent criminals know that violence was not going to be a viable option for them that day, but I did not take it out of the holster, point it or threaten them or any of the other lunatic crap that they ran and told the 9-1-1 operator immediately afterwards.

In the video you're going to see the cops show up, and they question us, and they say hey, we got a report of a guy that pulled a gun on someone. And I say to the cops, hey, I got a body camera right here. I did nothing of the sort. So you go ahead, take this. I'm happy to cooperate with you. We got nothing to hide.

But the cops didn't take my camera because the guy who called in the false report didn't want to take credit for making a false report. The complainant didn't show up and the police sent us on our way.

From there it was on to an interview I had scheduled with a reporter from Vice News Tonight on HBO. HBO, the company that gave you The Sopranos and Game of Thrones and stuff. Great entertainment products, let's say. I expect the plaintiffs to play some choice clips from that slickly edited Emmy Award-winning production from the Home Box Office company. If necessary, I've got the full unedited audio of the two

interviews I did with that reporter in two different states because I was concerned that she would take me out of context. So I brought my own pocket audio recorder with me to make a complete unedited recording.

So now, remember what I asked you to think about when I told you that I had a body camera. Ask yourself again: Why is the guy who is plotting to commit a crime hanging out talking to reporters and creating unedited recordings for his own release on his website? Why are his co-conspirators going along with all of this fame whoring? Obviously this is the behavior of an activist and a performance artist, not a criminal conspirator.

But wait. There's more. Like a Billy Mays commercial. After the first Vice News interview, my co-defendant Jason Kessler and someone who is conspicuously not a co-defendant, who called himself Kurt Vandal, invited me to a so-called leadership meeting. You'll have the opportunity to see those messages, I think, but it's just an undisputed fact that I was invited at sort of the last minute.

Which brings us to an important point which you've heard some of my co-defendants say, and I should touch on briefly. I don't really know my co-defendants that well. As a matter of fact, I noticed -- pardon me, Richard. I noticed Richard has like a stuffed animal in his bag there, and it occurred to me, I didn't know that Richard had kids. And if

you think that I'm going to enter into a criminal conspiracy, risk going to prison, for a guy I don't even know if he's got kids or not, you're out of your mind. I wouldn't to that.

That's insane.

I really don't know my co-defendants. I knew them even less on August 11, 2017. I shouldn't speculate too much about what you're going to see regarding that, but you're not going to see the kind of closeness that a conspiracy such as the one alleged by the plaintiffs requires. There's a lot of "nice to meet you" type stuff going on here.

As a matter of fact -- pardon me while I try to piece this all together here. To the best of my knowledge, I have never met Michael Hill and Michael Tubbs. The first time I met James Fields, I was in jail, and so was he. The first time I med Azzmador was at that leadership meeting on August 11. The first time I met Tom Rousseau was at the same meeting. I saw Jeff Schoep, or "scoop," whatever his name is, once before C'ville at an event in Pikeville, Kentucky. I might have shaken his hand. I don't really know if I did, to tell you the truth.

I texted Matt Heimbach in Charlottesville. "This is Cantwell." And it was just before -- I forget if it was August 11 or what it was. I think it was August 11. Because before that day, he wouldn't have recognized my phone number to receive a text from it.

The plaintiffs have told you that the majority of planning was on Discord, but you might have noticed for all their talk about me, they didn't show you any of my Discord messages. That's because they were thoroughly uninteresting.

And I only actually joined the Charlottesville 2.0 Discord, I know it was in the month of August. Let's just say August 1st. It might have been later than that actually. I was not an administrator of the chat server. I was not in any of the leadership channels. I think I posted to it maybe 13 times and I had joined that month.

So not to throw the organizers of the event under the bus or anything, but I just wasn't one of them. It's just a fact of this case. I didn't conspire to hold a legal event, much less commit a crime. I was invited to speak by a defendant by the name of Augustus Invictus, who has defaulted on this suit, who isn't here. So, you know, I don't know what to say about what he did.

But I was only invited to the so-called leadership meeting at the last minute after the location had changed.

Now, leaders make decisions like this, about changing the location of the meeting. They don't get informed of the meeting's existence after the other guys' plan goes to pot.

But I did go to the so-called leadership meeting. And the plaintiffs allege that we conspired at that meeting to commit racially motivated violence. As a matter of fact, they didn't

mention that in their opening statement, which was kind of interesting because they mentioned it in their complaint.

When I was -- when they served us with this lawsuit, they didn't know I had that body camera video. Now, I can tell you that I -- spoiler alert: I have a video of the meeting. I deny that I conspired to commit racially motivated violence anywhere, much less at this meeting. So they say there was a racially motivated violent criminal conspiracy hatched at the meeting. I say there wasn't. And guess what, there's a video of the whole thing.

You will have the chance to judge for yourself who is telling the truth, and more importantly, who is lying to you, based on that video.

Now, you might be asking yourself, how did they get this video? Was it an undercover cop, a snitch, hot mic? No. It's my body camera tape. I wasn't surreptitious. It wasn't accidental. I was afraid that Antifa might try to hurt us, so I was recording for my own protection.

And here we find ourselves facing nearly precisely such a false accusation. It's a good thing I never expected you to take my word for it because we have an objective record of the entire nearly two-hour meeting so you can judge what happened without trusting anybody.

Since the plaintiffs allege a criminal conspiracy, what's most important about this video is what you don't see.

Same thing for the Walmart parking lot video. So when it's my turn to go here, if they let me, which I think they're going to, we're going to watch this whole thing from front to back, from beginning to end, because they say it's a violent criminal conspiracy. Let's see when I get out of my car and when I get back into my car and you tell me when the crime happens.

Now, you will hear a couple of racist jokes. We're sort of notorious for these things. You'll hear us talking about pepper spray, firearms, armor. You'll even hear some brief mention of running people down with a vehicle and getting in a gun fight. But what you won't hear is a conspiracy to commit any crime, much less a violent one.

You'll also hear me tell Jason Kessler, quote, "If we're going to do it at all, I want the cops involved," end quote. You'll hear Jason agree, and Defendant Kline, who has abandoned this litigation, but is on the video, he tells us that the police are indeed on board. Well, I guess this conspiracy goes pretty deep, huh? The cops are in on it now?

So after a long day of being conspired against but conspiring against nobody, I go back to my hotel room without my co-defendants, and the next time I see them is at the University of Virginia. I should be kind of careful about what I say here because I don't actually know how much I'm going to be able to get into evidence, but I am sure -- you've already seen it. They played it in their opening. You see a picture

of me pepper spraying a guy. And the plaintiffs are going to say aha, gotcha, Nazi. There's our hate crime. But if you paid any attention, you might have noticed that the guy I pepper sprayed -- pretty white for a hate crime. So I'm lucky that you're smart. Smart jurors ask questions like: Hey, I thought that guy Chris was all right. Why did he pepper-spray that guy? And then you're going to be able to look at the video. And you're going to be like: Wait a second. That guy was fighting before Chris pepper-sprayed him. Aha. I knew Chris wouldn't pepper-spray a guy for no reason.

And you're going to notice, as I said: Hey, wait a second. If this is some kind of racist conspiracy, why isn't Chris pepper-spraying those black guys? And the simple answer to that is: They weren't the threat. They weren't fighting.

A fight broke out. I wasn't happy about it. I did what I thought I had to do. All the people fighting turned out to be white. If the blacks fought, I'd have fought the blacks. I'm an equal opportunity guy. I had nothing against those white people for being white.

Now, you can imagine the body camera video of this was pretty intense. But, unfortunately, I don't have it. The camera got stolen during the fighting by Lindsey Elizabeth Moore, who is a Philly Antifa. You're going to see two different angles of video that this happened. And then I get pepper-sprayed by the same guy you saw me pepper-spray in the

plaintiffs' opening statement. And then I'm out of the fight and it's basically -- it's basically over.

Now, that fight was pretty busy: A lot of people, a lot of different angles of video, a lot of action. I'm going to try to show you as much of it as I can. Some of it is pretty amazing, but I still don't totally get the rules of evidence, so I'm not going to make a bunch of promises right now, in case I can't keep them.

I can tell you what you're definitely not going to see. You're not going to see me pepper-spray a Jewish man named Christopher Goad or a transgender Asian calling himself Emily Gorcenski.

The plaintiffs are going to tell you that I pleaded guilty to two counts of misdemeanor assault and battery, one on each of these two names. And it's true I pleaded guilty to those two charges. But that does not prove the plaintiffs' claims. They just told Mr. Spencer it doesn't matter that he wasn't charged. It doesn't matter that I was. As a matter of fact, I sued Goad and Gorcenski for malicious prosecution, and to avoid liability for filing a false report, Goad and Gorcenski signed a mutual release of all claims with me, so they are not parties to this suit. Neither is the guy that I pepper-sprayed, by the way. They are not parties to this suit. They never were. I can't sue them and they can't sue me.

That's the terms of our agreement.

What I actually pleaded guilty to wasn't actually even an attack on either of these individuals. They changed their stories a few times. But ultimately, they say that they were affected by my overspraying when I pepper-sprayed the guy you saw in the picture during plaintiffs' opening statements, the guy we talked about before. An accident, in other words. That's what I pleaded guilty to.

Now, I could have gone to trial, but I was facing

40 years in prison if convicted. And I was offered a plea
agreement: Plead guilty to the misdemeanors and go home right
now, or go to trial and risk it all. Ladies and gentlemen, I
am no coward. But I am not stupid, either. And with all due
respect to the process we're in the middle of, I don't trust
the system that much. So if you tell me to choose between a

100 percent chance of going home right now with my Second
Amendment intact or the possibility, no matter how slim, that I
do 40 years in prison, I'm going home. And anybody that don't
like it can kiss my ass. You'd do it, too.

Now, the only reason I'm telling you this is because it's true. My conviction is not evidence of a racially motivated violent conspiracy, and it wouldn't be even if it was for something I actually did. So that's August 11th in a nutshell. Long day, let me tell you. Hell of a thing. The main event was scheduled for August 12th. What a weekend.

Now, the thing about August 12th is I actually don't

know a whole lot about August 12, because I got pepper-sprayed by Mike Longo, Jr. first thing in the morning, same guy who confronted me at the Wal-Mart parking lot, same guy you'll see in video on August 11th at UVA. First thing in the morning, I get pepper-sprayed as I'm literally walking to the park. I'll tell you what: That kind of cramped my style a little bit.

Twice in as many days.

So after I got out of that park and my eyesight recovered, I went back to my hotel room and found out about the car wreck the same way most of you did. Sad thing, let me tell you. Girl dead. Bunch of people hurt. Innocent man spends the rest of his life in prison. That was not nice. It's enough to make a man cry, matter of fact. Made me cry. The whole thing, not the wreck itself. The media gave me a nickname. There's a video of me that became rather famous, of me in tears. They called me the Crying Nazi. Literally adding insult to injury. Fucking vultures.

So what I've told you here is what I can prove, at least this much, to you. I have higher ambitions for this trial. The easiest thing for me to do is come in here and say I didn't do what they're accusing me of. There's just no evidence. I don't have to do anything. I don't have to go through this spiel. I don't have to show you what happened. I can sit in that chair and I can ask people: Did I hurt you? Did I conspire with you? And everybody is going to say no,

because there's no evidence I conspired with anybody.

But what happened that day was important. And what's happening here is important, too.

My website is christophercantwell.net. When this is over, I hope you all become die-hard fans and together we can try to save the country. But for now, just try to find -- real hard, try to find the part where I enter into an agreement with a co-conspirator to commit a crime. These guys are going to waste a month of your life on that goal, and they're going to fail, because it's not true, and they know it's not. And that should piss you off almost as much as it pisses me off, even if you share their ideological viewpoint. And I say that with all sincerity, because as much as I don't want our politics going any further left, I genuinely appreciate diversity of opinion and lively debate.

Did I -- oh, that mic. Sorry.

A lively debate -- I should skip that paragraph after -- there are changes this country is going through. Anybody who refuses to engage in an honest debate is going to be left out of the conversation. If you don't want me and my associates ruling this country unopposed, you need to send a very clear message to the violent Communists and the corrupt elites that caused us to meet today.

Calling somebody a racist is not an excuse to use violence. If you want to avoid fascism in America, you'd do

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 well not to censor and disarm your populace.

Calling somebody a racist is not an excuse to abuse the legal system. And it's certainly no excuse to steal a month from decent people like you.

Thank you very much for indulging me. My name is

Christopher Cantwell, and I'm looking very much forward to your

verdict, unanimous or otherwise. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Campbell?

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please the Court.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is

Dave Campbell, and I represent James Fields in this lawsuit.

I'm not here to defend hate. I'm not here to defend white supremacy. I'm here to defend James Fields to the extent that is possible.

In that regard, I'm not going to attempt to get you to believe that Mr. Fields did not intentionally drive his vehicle into a crowd of people, as you've seen in the video multiple times, and will see many more times, I'm sure.

Similarly, I'm not going to try to make you believe that Mr. Fields did not attend Unite the Right, that he did not march with members of Vanguard America, or that he was not given a shield of that same organization. At the end of this case, primarily, I will be asking you to be fair.

Now, the case against Mr. Fields is significantly different from the co-defendants'. Primarily, they all will argue and present evidence to say that, yes, they conspired to have the event, but that they did not conspire to commit racially motivated violence.

As to Mr. Fields, pursuant to a federal plea agreement he entered into, there is no question that he committed racially motivated violence. The defense as to Mr. Fields is he didn't conspire.

I don't believe, despite a mountain of discovery and a mountain of evidence that will be presented to you over the course of four weeks, or nearly four week, that you will see any communication, any email, any agreement between Mr. Fields and any co-defendant. In fact, I don't think you will hear from any witness that anyone knew who James Fields was before August 12th of 2017.

I ask that you look through the evidence that's presented and see if any co-defendant, any organizer or alleged organizer of Unite the Right, had any direct communications.

There's going to be a lot of evidence and -- sorry about that.

Can you all hear me okay without the microphone?

Again, I don't believe that evidence will be there.

So as to Mr. Fields, I believe this case has three parts, okay?

The first part is compensatory damages for people

that Mr. Fields entered into a federal plea agreement that he did intentionally drive into and strike with his vehicle. As to that, you will not hear any argument from me. All of those plaintiffs are entitled to compensatory damages. Your mere job here, in that regard -- and I don't mean to minimize the job you have by saying "mere" -- but your only job in that regard is to assess a fair amount of damages. And that's entirely up to you. There won't be any argument in that regard from me.

The second portion of the case as to Mr. Fields is conspiracy. There, as we briefly discussed, I ask that you keep your eyes on the evidence. It's your decision. If you feel the plaintiffs have met their burden and proved a conspiracy between Mr. Fields and anyone else you believe is an organizer of the rally to undertake the acts that he undertook, by all means, find on a conspiracy count for the plaintiffs.

If not, we ask that you find for the defense.

The third portion as to the case for Mr. Fields is, because we've already discussed you will be finding a compensatory damage amount as to anyone struck by his car, anyone actually injured by his acts, without a doubt, you'll also be asked to award what are called punitive damages to Mr. Fields. Now, those are beyond compensating people who are injured, medical bills, pain and suffering, loss of wages, that sort of thing. You'll be asked for -- to award more by way of punitive damages. And I think you will probably be asked to

award that not just as to Mr. Fields, but probably to others.

And in that regard, I would simply point out to you that, unlike all of the other co-defendants, you won't hear from Mr. Fields here this week. Unlike all the other co-defendants, Mr. Fields is in federal prison for life, and actually has 30 life sentences.

So to the extent that you are asked to punish

Mr. Fields, I simply will submit to you at the end of the case
that he's been punished.

Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. JONES: Every one of us in this courtroom has a difficult job to do, from defense attorneys to Judge Moon to plaintiffs' attorneys to the court reporter trying to keep up with everything. But I think your job is the most difficult because you have to you have to treat each individual party -- you have to treat each party individually.

There are nine plaintiffs and there are 20 defendants. You have to look at all the evidence in the case and apply it to each individual differently.

So what I would like to do is, for the three clients that I'm representing, Michael Hill, Michael Tubbs, and the League of the South, is provide some suggestions for how you can focus your energy over the next couple of weeks.

My name is Bryan Jones, by the way. I practice here

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 in Charlottesville, Virginia.

The first thing to consider as you're listening to evidence over the next couple of weeks is: What do Michael Hill, Michael Tubbs, and the League of the South have to do with James Fields?

As you're hearing tweets that Michael Hill posted, text messages or emails -- as you're listening to the evidence today, tomorrow, for the next couple of weeks, ask yourself:

What does that have to do with whether Michael Hill, Michael

Tubbs, and the League of the South were in a conspiracy with

James Fields and whether his car attack was part of that

conspiracy?

You saw the plaintiffs present their evidence on that point. It was a photograph of Eli Mosley or Elliott Kline, whatever he goes by. He was talking on the phone and walked past Mr. Fields. That's the evidence they have to show there was a conspiracy and Mr. Fields was a part of it and his car attack that was a part of that conspiracy: Somebody walking past Mr. Fields with a telephone. That doesn't prove a conspiracy. That doesn't prove Michael Hill, Michael Tubbs, and the League of the South were part of that conspiracy. Just because James Fields wore a white shirt and khakis and held a shield doesn't make him part of this conspiracy.

The second suggestion I have is the torch march. As you're hearing evidence about the torch march, ask yourselves:

If Michael Hill and Michael Tubbs didn't attend the torch march, did they conspire to commit violence at the torch march?

We know they weren't there and we know they didn't conspire to commit violence there because, a few minutes before the torch march, one of the other members of the League of the South sends an email to Michael Hill. He said: "Apparently Antifa has found out about the timing, the location of the torch march. If the League of the South is going to be there, be careful." This is before the torch march had even occurred. And Michael Hill responded: "Thanks, but this is not our game. We are sending two observers."

Michael Hill lives in Alabama. He was born in 1951.

That makes him 70 years old this year. He's the oldest by far of any of the defendants. He's a retired college history professor. He founded the League of the South in 1994 to promote the ideals of the Confederacy.

Around 2017, there was a lot of debate about historical monuments and whether they should remain or whether they should be taken out. And Michael Hill and the League of the South traveled around the south, held rallies at the sites of these various historical monuments.

As a Confederacy-sympathizing organization, of course, they were in favor of keeping the monuments where they were. That's why they came to Charlottesville. Michael Hill, Michael Tubbs, and the League were there for August 12th for

the rally at Emancipation Park in front of the statue of General Robert E. Lee.

Michael Hill drove straight from Alabama to

North Carolina to carpool with another member of the League and drove straight to Madison, Virginia. They had a campsite retreat where they stayed the night. They didn't stop in Charlottesville. Didn't attend the torch march.

Michael Tubbs is 61 years old this year. He's from Florida. He joined the League of the South in the year 2000. He drove up from Florida on August 11 and went straight to Madison, Virginia, where the League of the South members were staying that night. He didn't stop in Charlottesville for the torch march. They were there for the rally at the Robert E. Lee statue the next day.

The League of the South was worried about Antifa, much like the other defendants. You've heard about the Battle of Berkeley. You've heard about the clashes between Antifa and the violent -- and other violent protest groups. So they prepared themselves -- prepared to defend themselves at the rally in Charlottesville. That's why they used secure communications to try to prevent Antifa from finding out their plans, finding out where they were.

So as we're listening to the evidence, remember those two things. What does that have to do with James Fields and Michael Hill, Michael Tubbs, and the League of the South? What

does that have to do with whether they're responsible for the violence that happened at the torch march that they didn't even attend?

The evidence is going to show that, basically, what the plaintiffs have done in this case is thrown out a net into the ocean, one of those commercial shipping nets that drags along the ocean and picks up everything. They've dumped it right in front of you, and they're trying to tell you it's all -- they're trying to tell you that everything that they've ensnared in their conspiracy theory is good.

They're partly correct because they have, of course, James Fields. They have whoever committed the violence at the torch march. That's partly correct. But Michael Hill and Michael Tubbs and the League of the South don't belong there. And at the end of this case, I'm going to ask you to find them not responsible for the plaintiffs' injuries.

Thank you.

MR. REBROOK: May it please the Court, Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Good afternoon. My name is Eddie ReBrook. It is my opportunity, honor, and privilege to give you my opening statement.

In fact, this will be the last time I ever give an opening statement as a member of a defense team. We'll both be making history in this case, for good or for bad.

Who am I? I am a lawyer. I am a soldier, a former

soldier. I'm a father of a little girl, and I'm a thrice-vaccinated Democrat. I cut for an odd defense attorney for this group of people. I know that. But these defendants also cut for very odd conspirators, which I hope to show you through the evidence we present in this case.

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not envy your position today. We all have places we'd rather be, myself included. In fact, I think it's pretty much everywhere I'd rather be than here. You all saw what I saw this morning, and it certainly had an impression on me. I'm disgusted by a lot of what I saw.

About ten years ago, while still a fresh-faced law student, I took trial advocacy as an elective, and one of the first lessons we learned regarding opening statements was to attempt to humanize defendants, to try to make a jury see themselves in those people that they are meant to judge.

I'm not going to do that. I think it would be a waste of your time, and it would be a waste of my time, for me to try to humanize people who harbor beliefs that most of us would spend our last breath opposing, for too much of this case has focused on who these people are already, both in the news and in the court of public opinion. And, frankly, by doing so, we're giving them exactly what they want every time they throw a rally: Attention. Little people seeking attention.

The plaintiffs will spend the majority of this trial repeating nasty, racist, and hateful hyperbole that the

defendants spewed back and forth at each other in internet chat rooms. You won't emerge from this trial liking these defendants. So why bother trying to get you to like them now? It would be pointless.

If you want to like somebody, look at Heather Heyer.

If you have want to feel sorry for somebody, look at her

mother, who lost her only child when James Fields drove his car

into a crowd of people and killed her. That is a fact. And

it's undisputed. And I'm not going to try to dance around it.

I'm not going to try to pretend that the victims aren't

victims. They are.

But this case isn't about who we like and dislike.

No. Ladies and gentlemen, this case is about vengeance and assigning blame.

We're brought here today in this civil case -- not a criminal case; that's been pointed out more than once to you -- because of the fallout of the Unite the Right rally and the conditions that made that fallout happen.

The defendants have been accused of intentionally conspiring to incite violence, a crime. But as I just told you, this isn't a criminal proceeding. The standard here is lower in a civil case than it is in a criminal proceeding.

There's a reason for that. But make no mistake, the stakes have never been higher, not just for my clients, not for the victims of Charlottesville, but for our republic, because I

will agree with some of the co-defendants that this case, despite what has been said, is, in fact, about free speech.

Now, last night while preparing to write this, I looked up some of my favorite speeches from Hollywood movies, from the internet, from history, trying to find a way to encapsulate what it is I wanted to do in this case, where I want to take you with the evidence, questions I want you to ask and things I want you to keep in mind. I don't know if any of you have seen The American President, where Michael Douglas says: "America is not easy. It's advanced citizenship. You have to want it. You want free speech? Let's see you acknowledge a man who makes your blood boil, who is standing center stage and advocating at the top of his lungs that which you would spend a lifetime opposing at the top of yours."

This case is about a question of collective guilt. Should all be blamed for the independent actions of others, many who are unnamed, many who will never be inside this courtroom? You're going to hear from plaintiffs' witness Professor Simi, a mind reader, who is going to come in here with a crystal ball and tell you that people didn't mean what they said and what they wrote, but that they mean these other things that we're inferring that they said and that they wish that they had written.

The evidence will prove that defendants got a permit for their hate rally. Odd behavior indeed for persons trying

to break the law. One would think that would-be criminals would want cops to not be around, but a permit would guarantee that they would. Unfortunately, a permit did not guarantee that the police would do their duty. Whether they weren't prepared for the numbers, or whether they just didn't care about the fallout, the fact is they did not protect and serve.

I want to point out to you, and I must remind you throughout this case, that a conspiracy by its very definition involves more than one person. So even though it is an undisputed fact that James Alex Fields ran his car into a crowd of people causing irreparable harm, that is not in and of itself a conspiracy.

In this case I don't represent all of the defendants.

I don't represent James Alex Fields and I don't represent

anyone you see in this room. My clients are probably the most

nefarious and notorious clients in this case, other than James

Alex Fields.

I represent the former commander of the National Socialist Movement, Mr. Jeff Schoep, and I represent the National Socialist Movement itself. What the evidence will show you is that these particular defendants were not present for the torch march, weren't even there. It will show they weren't present for James Alex Fields running his car into a group of people. They had already left and were heading back to their hotel.

They heard about it the same way we heard about it:

On the news. The evidence won't prove that there's any

connection between James Alex Fields and the other defendants,

that he acted alone.

Many years ago, before I became an attorney, before I went to law school, I was a cadet at West Point, and I tried to guide my ethics and my moral choices by what I learned in the cadet prayer. And if I could quote from it briefly, it's to help us choose the harder right over the easier wrong, and to never be content with a half truth when the full can be won.

We're going to be asking you, upon presenting you this evidence, to make a choice. You can choose the harder right. It's an unpopular choice and it's going to earn you the scorn of the media, the press, many of your friends, and this beautiful city. It will require you to set aside the natural human desire for vengeance and the desire to spread blame as far and wide as possible. I can tell you as the father of a little girl, if a political person of any variety were to kill my daughter, there is no length I would not go to to cause pain to that person. I get it.

Regardless, you can make a different choice. You can make an easier choice, and that's the choice that the plaintiffs are going to ask you to make. It will earn you more than a few attaboys. To make this choice will require you to make inferences that the facts and the evidence do not support.

And ladies and gentlemen, I can't blame you if that's the way you go. We're all humans and we're all guided by our emotions. But we're asking you to do something that is not particularly easy to do. We're asking you to set those emotions aside. I'm having a hard time doing that right now. But that is your duty, to set those emotions aside, look at the facts, and ask yourself: Can people that weren't even around be blamed for the actions of another? And if they can, how much further can we spread the blame? And will this type of attitude and approach be limited to this case or will it set a new precedent? Because I can't guarantee you that the next time we have a hearing like this that it will be against Nazis and white supremacists. It might be against people you agree with. It might be against people you support.

anything but have the plaintiffs or will the plaintiffs prove the elements they must prove to recover against the defendants. It's not for the greater good. The only good that can come out of this case is justice. And justice will be that you decide this case according to the law and based on the facts you hear in the courtroom. You set aside your preconceived notions and focus on those issues. Thank you.

MR. REBROOK: Judge Moon is absolutely correct and I cannot ask anything more of you.

But -- but if you do choose the easier right, it will

be difficult for me to say that it won't have consequences.

I'm not going to ask you to forget the disaster that happened here or to feel empathy for some of the least empathetic people I've ever met in my entire life. What I do ask you to do is to set aside their ugly beliefs and not allow attorneys from another state, from New York, to come down here to Virginia and whittle away at the First Amendment for the purposes of vengeance.

MS. KAPLAN: Your Honor, may I speak? We've really hesitated to say anything during openings. You can see us sitting here and really not trying to object. But you just instructed Mr. ReBrook not to talk about things outside the case, and Mr. ReBrook just said it was about lawyers from New York who come down here to whittle away the First Amendment. I think he just violated what you just told him he couldn't do.

MR. REBROOK: Forgive me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me read it.

That's improper argument. This is -- go back to what I just said. This is about the plaintiffs. It's not the lawyers' case. It's not anyone's case but the individual plaintiffs and the individual defendants and what is proven in the case from the evidence here. The lawyers are not on trial. Thank you.

MR. REBROOK: The evidence will show, ladies and gentlemen, that this city was failed by those whose duty it was

to protect and serve. If you choose -- if you choose to believe the plaintiffs' evidence, you will be forcing white nationalists more than to just their parents' basements.

You'll be forcing them underground.

And personally, I have to agree with Brad Pitt's character from the film *Inglourious Basterds*, Lieutenant Aldo Raines, when he said he likes his Nazis out in the open, he likes them in uniform. That way you can identify them, just like that.

That won't be the case if they're underground. You must ask yourself where will they be more dangerous, in front of you --

THE COURT: Mr. ReBrook, you're continuing to -- I don't know why you don't understand what I instructed you.

This -- you can confine your remarks to the defense you're going to present, and your defense may not be that something will happen or some message will be sent that will be the wrong message, or anything to do with outside of what the Court is going to instruct the plaintiff -- the jury that the plaintiff has to prove in order to recover a verdict. And to ask the jury to consider other things, results other than what a proper verdict ought to be, ramifications of the verdict, have nothing to do with the jury's consideration. Nothing whatsoever. And I hope the jury knows it.

This is a suit for money damages. And the plaintiffs

have to prove they're entitled to it and they have to prove, if they're entitled to money, how much. And that's it. That's the only message you are to send here, is whether an individual plaintiff is entitled to money and how much, and whether any individual defendant is liable to the plaintiff for that amount of money.

And so, I'm asking you to just put out of your mind that this case is about some other principle or some other problem. Obviously, the rule of law is important. If you violate your duty, then you hurt the rule of law. But if you do your duty, follow the Court's instructions and try this case solely according to the law and the evidence you hear in this case, that is the greatest thing you can do.

The principles of this government have been set for a long time. And it's only when we adhere to those principles that we help our system. And it does not help if we individually try to come into court and throw some -- send some message, because if we do that, then we're not doing what the founders decided the courts were supposed to do. I mean, this is a very important thing; that you decide the case solely according to the law and to the evidence you hear in the courtroom, not because you're trying -- you have some political goal or some message you're trying to send somewhere.

So please proceed and adhere to my ruling.

MR. REBROOK: Yes, Your Honor. Apologies.

I actually think Judge Moon put it best. To do your duty is really all I can ask of you to do. I have nothing further. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Who else? We have Mr. Smith. Will there be anyone after Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: How long will you be?

MR. SMITH: I don't know, but it might be a good idea to take a break first.

THE COURT: I just wanted to know how long you were going to be. If you're going to be five minutes, I don't need to take a break.

MR. SMITH: I was thinking somewhere around 20 minutes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Why don't we take a stretch break and take about 10, 15, no more than 15 minutes. When the jury is ready to come back, we'll come back and we'll hear Mr. Smith and then we will adjourn for the day.

Let me say this: I know how to keep time, if nothing else. And don't ask for breaks unless it's absolutely essential, because if we take a break -- if we go for an hour and a half and take a 30-minute -- a 20-minute break and then go another hour and a half for lunch and do the same in the afternoon, we'll finish on time. If we take a break now, we're taking 15 minutes, maybe, to save 30, you know? And it's

```
Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021
 1
   just -- it's not cost-effective.
 2
             MR. SMITH: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I thought that's
 3
   what Your Honor was getting at.
             THE COURT: I know, but we took one earlier. That's
 4
 5
   what I mean.
 6
             MR. SMITH: I understand, Your Honor.
 7
             THE COURT: And I did not have it scheduled.
 8
   thought it was some emergency.
 9
             MR. SMITH: No. No.
                                   No.
10
             THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry. Go ahead now.
11
    (Jury out, 4:08 p.m.)
12
              (Recess.)
13
             THE COURT: Ms. Kaplan, unless you've got a witness
14
   that's going to be real quick, I might adjourn after we hear
15
   the opening statements.
16
             MS. KAPLAN: I'm very glad to hear that, Your Honor,
17
   because I told the witness she was excused for the day. The
18
   witness who is up next is not a short witness so I told her
19
   that she probably wasn't getting on.
20
             THE COURT: I don't want to go past 5 o'clock.
21
             MS. DUNN: Your Honor, we could start with this
22
   witness today. We would not finish, but we could get her on
23
   the stand and start with the examination if you would like.
24
             THE COURT: Okay. All right.
25
             MS. KAPLAN: Would you prefer that, Your Honor?
```

THE COURT: Have her ready, but we'll see how long Mr. Smith takes. Bring the jury back.

# (Jury in, 4:21 p.m.)

THE COURT: Could we have the witness outside the door?

All right. Mr. Smith, you may proceed.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, good afternoon. My name is Joshua Smith. I represent David Matthew Parrott, who is seated over here, Matthew Heimbach, and Traditionalist Worker Party, which is the political party that they formed together.

There's a weird idea in this country about the First Amendment, this idea that it's like a literal shouting contest, like you have one side talking and the other side can try to drown the other side out, or sort of force them to be quiet, and that's how the First Amendment works. It isn't.

Let's say that I were to get a permit for some event with the city. I apply for a permit. I get the permit. There isn't some sort of right, First Amendment right to counter-protest that permitted event by, say, standing outside of it and throwing stuff in to disrupt it or, again, drowning it out so that they can't -- so that no one can hear what's being said in that permitted event.

In fact, when somebody gets a permit, it's really fundamentally the job of the police to make sure that that

permit is enforced and that the people that applied for the permit aren't denied their First Amendment rights by those who seek to disrupt whatever event they would like to hold and they've been granted a permit for.

In this particular case, what we end up having is the exact opposite of what the plaintiffs allege. The plaintiffs allege that the defendants conspired to deprive the plaintiffs of their civil rights under the law. And that's what gives rise to a 1985 or 1986 action.

The thing is, what we know and what the evidence will show is that when some of the attendees to this rally attempted to get in -- and there were only two entrances to this park, one on each side -- and everything else was blocked off so there was no other way to get into the park where this permitted rally was supposed to be held.

And in fact, by the way, it wasn't as if the city didn't try to squelch this permit already. They did. They said we're going to move this to another park. That was a problem because, well, as we know, the rally was about a statue that was in that particular park. So moving it to another park really wasn't that good of an idea. It took a federal lawsuit to get a federal judge to say, no, you have to honor this permit, City of Charlottesville.

And you'd think that would be enough to get the police to do what they needed to do to make sure that those

rally-goers were able to exercise their First Amendment rights safely.

Instead, we have a situation where, in addition to the police sort of not doing a very good job that day, we have at least one of the plaintiffs, Mr. Wispelwey, who wasn't, by the way, involved in the James Fields car incident,

Mr. Wispelwey and his associates agreed that some of them in his church, that some of them would go over to other permitted events that were occurring that weekend.

There were permits taken out for a couple of other events for a left-wing audience in various other parks around Charlottesville. It seems like a nice city; they have several parks, and, you know, you can -- there are various permitted events you can have at any of them. So people had permits for other events in other parks that day. And the thing is, they were very far away from each other, which is really what you'd want because, again, the First Amendment is not a shouting contest. I can't just piggyback off of your permit by standing outside and saying, "I have a permit to counter-protest your event." You have to get your own permit. You can't assemble a group of people together without a permit. So if you want to get a permit to counter-protest some other permitted event, you have to get your own permit.

THE COURT: Well, wait, Mr. Smith.

Counter-protesters did not have to have a permit to be there.

```
Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021
 1
   There was no law -- I mean, what -- what --
 2
             MR. SMITH:
                         Well --
 3
             THE COURT: No, I'm saying, Mr. Fields got a permit,
 4
   but other persons have a right to protest.
 5
             MR. SMITH: Oh, I understand, Your Honor.
 6
             THE COURT: And they don't have to have a permit to
 7
   protest.
 8
             MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, the problem here --
 9
             THE COURT: Okay. I've ruled that they didn't have
10
   to have a permit to protest.
11
             Proceed.
12
             MR. SMITH: So even if you don't have to have a
13
   permit to counter-protest --
14
             THE COURT: Just -- it's over.
15
             MR. SMITH: I understand.
             THE COURT: I've ruled. Go on to another matter.
16
17
             MR. SMITH: Okay.
18
             Mr. Wispelwey has admitted to blocking the entrance
19
   to the park with some of his associates that chose not to go to
20
   those other events at other parks, but rather to block the
21
   entrance to the permitted event, thereby -- and, again, he
22
   agreed with his associates to do this. So that seems like an
23
   agreement or a conspiracy to deprive the rally-goers, some of
24
   whom are defendants here, of their civil or First Amendment
25
   rights.
```

That's exactly what the plaintiffs are accusing the defendants of doing. That's weird. Talk about unclean hands.

But more to the point, I represent three of the defendants in this case. I don't represent them all.

Obviously, James Fields has an attorney, and he's said what he has said about that situation. We're not here to defend James Fields. I'm here to defend David Matthew Parrott, Matthew Heimbach, and Traditionalist Worker Party. And the thing is, as much as plaintiffs would like to claim that the evidence shows some sort of conspiracy on their part or having involvement on their part with Unite the Right, the reality is that Mr. Kessler asked them to attend the event. And they did.

They brought their political party, which is an FEC-registered political party, or was at the time. I don't believe it's in existence still, but at the time it was an FEC-registered political party, and they had 75, 100 members in various states. And -- sorry, my voice is just -- sorry about that.

Thank you so much. Sorry about that. Starting to get a little raspy there.

So just to fast-forward to the point here, Trad
Worker and Mr. Parrott and Mr. Heimbach are accused of
participating in this conspiracy. Well, there's this torch
march, right? We're told about this torch march.

The thing about it is, they didn't know about this

torch march. They were never told. They found out a couple of hours before it was supposed to happen. And when they did -- and by the way, that torch march was not a permitted event.

There was no permit obtained for that, unlike the Saturday,

August 12th event, okay? And when Mr. Parrott, who runs TWP,

along with Mr. Heimbach, when they heard about this, they said,

"Absolutely not. We are not going to this. We did not agree to this. Trad Worker is not to go to this, and none of its

members are to attend this or have any part of it in any way."

The reason he did that is because, from the very start, Mr. Parrott was extremely concerned about not just everyone's safety, because Trad Worker and its members have been attacked at other events that they've held, successfully, but they've been attacked at these events numerous times, and their state of mind was such that they knew that if they're going to have any event whatsoever, they need to come prepared, and that means defensive items like shields, helmets. These are important because, well, the political opposition is known for throwing things that could hurt somebody if they got hit in the head with it, all of these political tactics that you see on the -- you know, on the news. People talk about them.

It's -- you've probably seen this a lot. You have to be careful of these things these days.

I think Mr. Spencer may have had a point when he said we are entering sort of an era of political violence and that

it's somehow now become acceptable. We've gone from this idea that, even if you don't like someone's message, you still need to let them speak, because that's the kind of civil society we have -- we've gone from that to, use violence to shut down the speech you don't like. And that's extremely -- an extremely bad place for any republic like ours to be.

Now, Mr. Parrott, again, very concerned about everybody's safety, but also very concerned about making this a peaceful event. So he sent out a series of emails to the members of Trad Worker, and this was the only -- really the only messages that the members were receiving. This was their source of information from Trad Worker about how this rally was supposed to go or -- well, again, they were attending it, but how they were supposed to attend it, the conduct that was expected of them, okay?

And of course -- I believe for this rally there were speakers planned. There would probably be some socializing.

And then the plan is, of course, after all the speakers are there and they speak and you have some socializing, everybody just goes home. That's the idea. It's a political rally.

Everyone knows what that is.

Mr. Parrott made it very clear to his members that they weren't to have any part of any kind of violent behavior.

And, again, this set of emails that he sent out really just goes to show that quite a bit.

```
Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021
 1
             For example, let's look at this one. It was sent out
 2
    on -- his first email was sent out on August 3rd, 2017, which
 3
   was about nine days before the rally.
             Now, I should point out, you won't be able to see
 4
 5
   this very well. I just want you to see that there is, in fact,
   an email.
 6
 7
             MS. KAPLAN: Your Honor, if this was produced in
 8
   discovery or if it's an exhibit, we'd like to be able to look
 9
   at it. We can't see what's on our screen.
10
             MR. SMITH: I thought you already had it. It's hard
11
   to see on the screen because it just seems to be coming up
12
   blurry. Would you like to --
13
             MS. DUNN: Is there an exhibit number?
14
             MS. KAPLAN: Don't you have an exhibit number?
15
             MR. SMITH: I don't know which exhibit it is of
16
   yours.
17
             MS. KAPLAN: Oh, it's one of our exhibits?
18
             MR. SMITH: It may be one of your exhibits, but I'm
19
   not sure which order it was produced to you guys. I know it
20
   was produced, but --
21
             THE COURT: What is it? Is that a message or
22
   something?
23
             MR. SMITH: Yes, it's -- it's an email; series of
24
   emails from Mr. Parrott to --
25
             THE COURT: Whoa, whoa, whoa.
```

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 1 MS. KAPLAN: Your Honor, maybe we should come to side 2 Would that make sense? 3 MR. SMITH: Apologies, ladies and gentlemen. 4 moment. 5 (Side bar.) 6 MS. KAPLAN: Your Honor, we cooperated with defense. 7 We gave them examples of our exhibits. You know, we gave them 8 notice. We didn't get any notice from him. 9 I have no problem showing him a document, if it's a 10 document that's been produced in the case, but we can't see on 11 the screen. I have no idea what it is. I don't know if he 12 produced it. I don't know if it's on our exhibit list. 13 THE COURT: What is it? MR. SMITH: Your Honor, the first thing is that my 14 client informed me that this was produced in discovery. I 15 16 don't know exactly when it was produced because, as Your Honor 17 is aware, I'm on the case rather recently. 18 THE COURT: What is it? You can't seen even see what 19 it is. 20 MR. SMITH: It's just a series of emails in which 21 Mr. Parrott tells his members, "Here's what's expected of you 22 at the event, and we want this to be a safe event, and we want 23 this to be a peaceful event," which is central to their case,

THE COURT: Well, I know that. But, I mean, has it

24

25

Your Honor.

```
Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021
 1
   not been produced or what?
 2
             MS. KAPLAN: I can't read it.
 3
             THE COURT: Well, okay, but he proffers -- he's
   proffered what it is.
 4
 5
             MS. KAPLAN: I think Mr. Bloch has more.
 6
             MR. BLOCH: So it's been produced, but I don't
 7
   believe it's on our exhibit list. I have to check that.
   they don't have an exhibit list.
 8
 9
             MR. SMITH: But it has been produced, right?
10
             MR. BLOCH: It has been.
             MR. SMITH: And we did say it was going to be used in
11
12
   the integrated pretrial order. We did make reference to that.
13
             MR. BLOCH: I don't know about that, but I know they
   have new exhibit lists.
14
15
             THE COURT: I'm going to let him --
16
             MS. KAPLAN: Do you have a copy of it that we can
17
   read it while you're talking about it?
18
             MR. SMITH: Yeah, I can -- well --
19
             MS. KAPLAN: Not with you? Okay.
20
             Go ahead. Sorry, Your Honor.
21
             MR. SMITH: You'll get it in evidence later.
22
   whole thing will be there. For now, we'll just read it.
23
              (Side bar concluded.)
24
             MR. SMITH: Okay. Sorry about that.
25
             Like I was saying, Mr. Parrott was very concerned
```

about safety for this event. And so you see, for example -- sorry.

So you see, for example, in this first email he says -- and again, if you can't see this, we'll be introducing it later; I just wanted to sort of indicate that this is the part that says it, and I'll read it to you. "This is a peaceful event, and we ask that you think it through before you carry your arms" -- because Virginia is an open-carry state -- "into the event grounds. We are trying to not only be peaceful, but to give that impression to all gathered. There will not be chanting of any sort or exchanges of vulgarities with Bolsheviks or neoliberals. We will not devolve the rally into a shouting match."

This isn't the kind of thing that a conspiracy to commit racially motivated violence looks like.

Let's look at the next email, which was sent four days later, on August 7th, to TWP members. There, we see this: "As a reminder to all attendees, if the enemy comes to oppose us, we must under all circumstances follow the law and work to deescalate conflict. Do not bring any weapons, tools, or implements that are illegal. Comrades who have concealed carry permits that are valid in Virginia are allowed to carry. If we are attacked, we will follow the laws and defend ourselves and our comrades, but under no circumstances will we aim to provoke or incite conflict. This means that we will not

be screaming at, cursing, insulting, or name-calling Antifa while at the event."

That sounds pretty restrained to me: "If we are attacked, we will follow the laws."

They weren't there to commit crimes. They worked with the police to ensure their security at the event. Unless what the plaintiffs are saying is that the police also conspired with the defendants, then I don't see how you really can prove that somebody wanted to commit racially motivated violence if they're working with the police to make sure their legally permitted rally and court-ordered rally goes according to plan.

Now, my clients worked with the police specifically to make sure that their group was able to arrive and leave safely. Of course, that's not what happened, ultimately.

In the next email we see this: "Our intel suggests at this moment that our numbers will be strong enough and law enforcement will be numerous enough that the event will only have some isolated scuffles, if anything. Be safe. Use the buddy system, and watch your back before and after the event, as that's where our intel is suggesting the most safety risk right now. We're necessarily preparing for the worst, but don't be alarmed by all the tactical planning."

Again, Trad Worker and its members have been attacked before, viciously, at several of their previous rallies. And I

should mention that, other than that, all of the rallies went without incident.

Finally, we have this email, which was on

August 11th. This is the fifth email that was sent to the

members. It says: "We've received numerous reports, many

confirmed, of violence breaking out already today. It's vital

that you avoid any confrontation before the event, both for

your personal safety and because we need you with us at the

rally."

Trad Worker was interested in putting on a successful rally, which was about a cause that they believed in, the statue in the park and what that represents. They weren't looking to turn this into anything other than a political rally.

This isn't the language of racially motivated extremism.

Conspiracy theories can be a lot of fun. Did we ever really land on the moon? We can talk about this stuff all day, right? It's fun to think about. But in this case, the plaintiffs' conspiracy theory doesn't come close to being an actually legally actionable conspiracy.

The situation with James Fields is, of course, very unfortunate. It would be ridiculous for us to stand up here and say that people that were, on video, hit by a car don't have serious injuries. I mean, cars do serious damage. So

that makes sense. We're not here to dispute the nature or extent of those injuries. But that is only because my clients, Matthew, David Matthew, and Trad Worker, didn't have anything to do with anything related to James Fields.

It turns out that James Fields not only didn't know any of the defendants in this case -- no idea; he might have heard of somebody on television, maybe, but there is no evidence that he knew or communicated with any of these defendants, ever. And I know that my clients, and, I can probably say, none of these defendants, even knew who he was.

Nobody knew who he was.

You know, if you're one of those people that goes for government conspiracies -- and I don't, personally -- it is kind of weird that -- here's this guy nobody has ever seen before. Nobody knows who he is. He comes to this rally for the first time. He decides he's going to go to a rally and stand up for his political beliefs. He wears a uniform of an organization that put out publicly, here's what our uniform is, and he wore this uniform there, but my understanding is that the organization didn't know who he was. And this happens, the situation with the car. This happens.

Of course, from that, the alt-right and the far right in general is defamed because of this. They're connected with this in some way. Well, the thing is, there is no evidence that connects James Fields to any of these people. It's kind

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 of weird.

You know, we see there's movies like The Omen or -Final Destination, I think, is another one. It's almost like a
movie trope. You have these movies where there's all these -there's a weird sequence of events, and it ends in something
where somebody ends up dying. This is a movie plot that -there's several of them out there. And it's just supposed to
be: How -- what are the odds of that happening? How do these
circumstances come together to create this bizarre situation?
Well, here, what we have is one of those kinds of situations.
The legally permitted rally-goers are not able to access the
park, and fighting breaks out.

The police -- and it turns out this was really the objective of the police all along, was to let the parties fight so that they can step in, declare an unlawful assembly, and shut the whole thing down. They knew that these groups don't like each other, and they just wanted to let them go at it so that they could declare an unlawful assembly and shut it down.

And what happened was when they -- when that happened -- because, I mean, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure out how that's going to go if you put those groups close to each other. And this is why it's such a failure of local and city government here, because why didn't you just keep the groups separate? Why would you let them come anywhere near each other?

You have this group that's permitted to go to this rally. Why let anybody else near that, if you had any suspicion that their intentions were impure? Okay? Let the people have their rally and let other people have their events, and we can avoid this kind of violence. But the police didn't do that.

And then when they were clearing the park, they pushed the legally permitted rally-goers directly into their political enemies, who were sitting right outside the park, waiting for them. The police pushed them right into their political enemies.

And, of course, violence breaks out. Well, that's certainly predictable. But what isn't predictable is that, once the unlawful assembly is declared, they're pushed into the other people and there's more violence, and all chaos is breaking loose, and then the James Fields situation. And in all that chaos and everybody sort of, you know -- all the disorganization, we end up with a situation where James Fields ends up running into some people, killing one.

It's just bizarre how that happens because, if even one tiny thing was different, even something like if the police had declared an unlawful assembly a few minutes later, none of this would have happened. His car wouldn't have been in that place at that time. They -- the people that were on that street that the car collided with, they wouldn't have been

there. Nothing like this would have happened.

It takes a lot of moving parts to end up with something like this. And there isn't just one group of people to blame here. We'll talk more about it throughout this trial. We'll talk more about who those groups are, but there isn't just one group to blame.

But remember that fundamentally, the defendants, the rally-goers, they had the permit. That was supposed to be honored.

I'm reminded of some images -- when I was a child, I remember seeing these. They're from, like, the 1950s, I think. It's images after the Brown v. Board of Education decision of the Supreme Court. There was, of course, a lot of social unrest about integrating the schools. And the Supreme Court, you know, required the schools to be integrated. Some places in the south were not abiding that. And so there are images of soldiers, military soldiers, United States, holding young -- or perhaps I would say teenagers, high school students, at gunpoint to march them off to school.

MS. KAPLAN: Your Honor, I'm really -- it's late in the day, so I apologize. I'm really trying, but I don't understand how anything about the implementation of the Brown v. Board decision and police officers holding guns with children has anything to do with this case, or --

MR. SMITH: It's the --

```
Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021
 1
             MS. KAPLAN: Please. Please.
 2
              (Overlapping speakers.)
 3
             MS. KAPLAN: -- or is consistent with --
             THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Lawyers don't talk to each
 4
 5
   other in court.
 6
             MR. SMITH: I understand. I'm sorry.
 7
             THE COURT: You talk to me and so forth.
 8
             MR. SMITH: I was going to say, the point is to show
   that our law enforcement knows how to enforce court orders,
 9
   Your Honor.
10
11
             THE COURT: Okay. But you're talking about something
12
   in Arkansas somewhere. Talk about this case.
13
             MR. SMITH: Okay.
14
             THE COURT: Talk about this case and the issues in
15
   this case.
16
             MR. SMITH: Of course, Your Honor. Yes.
17
             THE COURT: All right.
18
             MR. SMITH:
                         I'm almost done. And by the way, I'll be
19
   going last throughout the trial. So, you know, when you see
20
   me, you know that you're almost on the -- just one more to sit
21
   through. Sorry about that.
22
             As Mr. Spencer said, it's really time to revisit this
23
  whole Charlottesville matter. It's been four years. Tempers
24
   have cooled. It's time to look at this with a clear head,
25
   because I know that, since the event happened, I can't get
```

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 beyond some very fundamental premises.

For example, the defendants in this case were the ones that had the permit. Why weren't their First Amendment rights protected? It wouldn't have been that hard to do. It would have just taken some people that wanted to make sure that their rights were protected. That's fundamentally the job of the police and of government. And they failed here.

Now, again, this isn't about -- this isn't about politics, you know, sort of in general, or any political issue. This isn't about Trump or Biden or anything like that. It's not like that. This is fundamentally about one of the most important things that makes our republic a civil republic: Freedom of speech and the protection of that right. Because if you don't protect it, it's absolutely worthless. It's not worth the paper it's written on.

With a lot of these other defendants, you're going to hear they weren't really connected to some of these things, like my clients weren't connected to the torch march in any way, like you saw in those emails. When he heard about the torch march, Mr. Parrott said, "Nobody is going, absolutely not," and they did not go. Now, if that doesn't show that David Matthew, Matthew, and Trad Worker weren't extremely intent of making sure they followed the law and the rules, I don't know what would.

And finally, when the police did declare unlawful

assembly and sent everybody home, the thing is that David
Matthew, Matthew, and Trad Worker, all the members, they just
went home. They did what they were told. They were nowhere
near the area of any of the events. They were already on their
way home when the James Fields incident happened. That is
important to keep in mind. Again, it's a weird set of
circumstances that ends up with somebody being hit by James
Fields's car, but that doesn't make those defendants, at least
many of them, responsible for that.

You're going to be tasked with one of the toughest tests that you've ever had to go through here. It's very hard to look at a case like this and not feel emotional about what happened to the plaintiffs. Some of the injuries are really bad. It's very easy to do that. Anyone can do that. Anyone can be emotional about that. But the issue here is whether those defendants are responsible for those injuries. And there's no connection between those plaintiffs and these defendants. Neither of them have any idea who the other is.

The evidence will show that some of these plaintiffs never even heard of my clients. Not even that they knew them and they didn't like them; they never even heard of them. They didn't even know they existed.

Something bizarre is happening when people that have no idea who each other are somehow find themselves on opposite sides of a lawsuit.

1 Perhaps this is an issue that is best sorted out in 2 the political arena, and not one in which we use the courts to 3 settle political disputes. And in this case, I think what we may have is that at these kinds of rallies, there's always this 4 5 fighting between these two groups, and one group decided, "We're just going to use the courts to crush the other group 6 7 because we know that we can't actually take away their First Amendment rights." 8 9 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Smith, I just don't know where you were when we have had the arguments this afternoon. 10 11 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: This is the same issue I've interrupted 13 umpteen people over. MR. SMITH: 14 I'm sorry. I got you. I'm done. all done. 15 16 THE COURT: Okay. Well. Just don't do that. 17 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. 18 THE COURT: You're through, you're saying? 19 MR. SMITH: Yeah. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. SMITH: I look forward to proving everything I've 22 said to you here today in the coming weeks. Thank you. 23 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the 24 jury, it's now five minutes to 5, and we're going to stop.

I think we've said enough, many times today, this is

25

a case in which individual plaintiffs have to prove that they are entitled to damages from are individual defendants. You try this case each person involved. We're talking about a conspiracy.

You're going to be given full instructions at the end of the evidence, but basically, every party in the case, you look at their responsibility and their liability separately.

And I think we made that clear.

But overnight, do not discuss the case with anyone.

Do not remain within hearing of anyone discussing the case. Do not read anything about it in the newspapers or any other media. Do not watch television or if it's -- I know -- if it comes on, go away, cut it off. Just please do not try to acquire any information about the case except what you hear in the courtroom for the next four weeks.

So you are excused at this time to follow the directions you've been previously given concerning when to appear tomorrow.

#### (Jury out, 4:54 p.m.)

THE COURT: I don't know what sort of exit plan is outside the door. Just need to give the jury time to get off the third floor.

MS. DUNN: Your Honor, we wanted to flag one issue and just to let the Court know we'll be submitting a letter overnight. Today in the openings we did work very hard to not

Sines, et al. v. Kessler, et al., 3:17CV72, 10/28/2021 interject during the openings and extend the same courtesy that we were extended in our opening, but there were numerous 2 3 misrepresentations about the law, both of conspiracy and the First Amendment. There was one violation of one of Your 5 Honor's motions in limine. 6 So what we'd like to do is look at the transcript to 7 figure out exactly what was said and we'll submit a letter with an appropriate request for the Court to consider overnight. 9 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, if I could be heard very quickly. We'll also be submitting a letter. During the 10 plaintiffs' opening I did hear the phrase "white supremacist" 11 used once, which Your Honor had commented he was not interested 12 13 in hearing. It's inflammatory and it was used. We didn't 14 interject at the time but we'll be submitting a letter to note 15 that for the record. 16 MS. DUNN: Your Honor, just to respond to that, we 17 were very careful about this. We did use the word "white 18 supremacist" to describe the expertise of Professor Peter Simi, 19 who is in fact an expert in that. 20 MR. SMITH: That wasn't it, Karen. 21 THE COURT: Okay. You write your letter and you 22 respond to his letter. 23 MS. DUNN: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor. 25 (Proceedings concluded, 4:56 p.m.)

#### CERTIFICATE

I, Lisa M. Blair, RMR/CRR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings reported by me using the stenotype reporting method in conjunction with computer-aided transcription, and that same is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

/s/ Lisa M. Blair

Date: October 28, 2021