

Rev. Jones Was CIA Agent, Suit Alleges

15 OCT 81 LAT/1/16

SAN FRANCISCO (UPI)—Survivors of the Peoples Temple tragedy and relatives of the dead followers of the Rev. Jim Jones sued the federal government Wednesday, claiming it conspired in the deaths of more than 900 cult members.

The suit for personal injury and violation of civil rights charges that former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and former CIA Director Stanfield Turner participated in a conspiracy with Jones to control temple members who held socialist beliefs.

The suit alleges that Jones was an "employee, servant, agent or operative" of the CIA from 1963 until his death along with 912 other temple members in a mass murder-suicide in Guyana.

The suit charges that the CIA knew "that they had commissioned James Warren Jones to embark upon a plan to control and to ultimately massacre members of the Peoples Temple."

Jonestown Survivors Sue

Jones Called CIA Agent

By Erica Goode

A group of Jonestown survivors and the parents of a 19-year-old Guyana victim filed a \$63.4 million suit against the federal government yesterday, charging that People's Temple leader Jim Jones was a CIA agent.

The suit, filed in U.S. District Court, also accuses U.S. government agencies and officials of conspiring with Jones in a macabre plot to control political dissidence. Government officials knew about Jones' plans for the mass murder-suicide of his followers as early as seven

months before the November 1978 tragedy, the suit charges.

"I want some disclosure, I want some changes," said Robert Bockelman, the attorney who filed the suit for the group. "Jonestown occurred, and a thousand people died and nothing changed in our society."

The seven plaintiffs seek \$50 million in compensation for violations of their civil rights and another \$13.4 million in personal injury damages.

From 1963 until November 18, 1978, the suit alleges, "James Warren Jones was an employee, servant, agent, or operative of

the... Central Intelligence Agency."

The suit also charges that former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and former CIA director Stanfield Turner took part in a conspiracy to "enhance the economic and political powers of James Warren Jones," in order to gain control over "persons tending toward a socialist perspective."

Vance, Turner, the U.S. State Department, the U.S. Department of Justice, the U.S. Customs Service, the House of Representatives and several other past and present government officials are named as defend-

ants in the action.

Attorney Bockelman, conceding that the evidence he has collected against the government is mostly circumstantial, said he hopes the suit will bring to light previously hidden information about the government's complicity with Jones.

Monica Bagby, who was wounded in the ambush at the Port Kaituma airstrip that left San Mateo Congressman Leo Ryan and four others dead, claims in the suit that she was "falsely imprisoned for three months in Jonestown," and that she was "the victim of fraud and deceit..."

Bagby was a witness in the recent trial of Larry Layton on charges of conspiring to murder Ryan.

San Francisco Chronicle 7

Thurs., October 15, 1981

You can obtain a copy of the actual lawsuit by sending \$1.00 to:

AFRO-LEGACY RESEARCH
AND PRODUCTIONS
P. O. BOX 3385
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93105

Who's Behind John Lennon's Assassination?

By Murv Glass

The recent assassination of world-renown musician John Lennon by so-called "lone nut" Mark David Chapman already has many suspicious overtones to it. The first thing anyone notices about the assassination is that Chapman is already being depicted in the same vein as other infamous alleged assassins of the last 20 years. Chapman has been labeled a "kook" a "wacko" and "deranged" by unnamed New York Police Department (NYPD) officials. He also supposedly came to New York alone (i.e. "no conspiracy") with money that he *borrowed* (i.e. wasn't financed — "no conspiracy") from his friends in Hawaii.

This description is strikingly familiar to other "lone nut" assassins such as Lee Harvey Oswald,

Sirhan Sirhan, James Earl Ray, Marcus Chenault (killer of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s mother), and King Faisal's "deranged" nephew. In each of these cases, the accused was very quickly labeled by both officials and the media as being "deranged" and "lone nuts". Then there is the constant repetition (again) that this was a "senseless act of violence" (i.e. "no conspiracy").

One of the procedures that any criminal learns in deciding upon a *modus operandi* (method of operation) for his/their crimes is that once they find a successful technique, to use it again and again and again, until it is no longer successful. And by contrast, any detective or investigator who attempts to solve a crime is trained to look for patterns and similarities. The obvious similarities in this case should speak for themselves.

A look at what is known to date about Lennon's assassination is as follows:

- 1) After shooting five shots (which officials say caused seven wounds) into Lennon, Chapman stood over Lennon with a dazed look, not even attempting any type of escape.

- 2) Though only in town for two weeks, police claim that they knew who Chapman was. It is based on this so-called knowledge of Chapman that police have labeled him a "kook" and a "wacko".

- 3) Police, though not able to stop Chapman from shooting Lennon, were able to show up "quick enough" to rush Lennon to the hospital. Did they perform mouth to mouth resuscitation or any other medical techniques to try to save Lennon's life?

- 4) As of December 10th, police state that there still is "no motive" for the shooting. The media, as usual is simply broadcasting whatever the police say, instead of investigating for themselves.

- 5) On December 10th, it was reported that the last thing Chapman remembers was being in Hawaii! (more on this in a moment)

In 1958, a novel was written entitled "The Manchurian Candidate". The book was about hypno-programming subjects to commit political assassinations by a command or cue. Though

written as fiction, evidence exists to show that such techniques actually exist today, and have existed for some time. "Operation Mind Control" by Walter H. Bowart, documents CIA drug and hypnosis experiments used to alter people's behavior through mind control techniques. Bowart documents case after case of CIA/military experiments on people who were hypno-programmed to perform tasks the subjects *could not even remember performing* after doing them! The book also explores the very real possibility that Oswald, Sirhan, and James Earl Ray were all hypno-programmed patsies to be in the "right" place at the "wrong" time. Some of the chapter titles of this book worth reading are: "Another Hypno-Patsy", "The 'Lone Nuts'", "Confession by Automatic Writing" and "The Patriotic Assassin". (Published in 1978 by Dell Publishing Company; Address — 1 Dag Hammarskjold Plaza, NY NY 10017. This book should be read by *everyone* who wants to fully understand how real the hypno-programming approach to assassinating people really is.)

Chapman's standing over Lennon in a daze and the blank spots in his very recent memory are very similar to the actions of Sirhan Sirhan after he supposedly killed Robert Kennedy. Bowart cites evidence to prove that Sirhan was nothing more than a hypno-programmed patsy. Chapman was then held after his arrest by NYPD officials for close to 24 hours, without much explanation about anything to the public. Did they interrogate him? Are their notes of the interrogation available, or have they been destroyed (as was the case with Oswald)? Has Chapman now been re-hypnotized and *re-programmed*? For one flaw (and maybe the only flaw) that Bowart exposes about the hypno-programming approach is that the only way the subject can remember his acts is when he is *put under hypnosis*. It is in this state that the subject's subconscious mind will reveal details that the conscious mind has been hypnotized to forget!

Of course the intricate knowledge of this technique and the technology to perform it is only available to the most sophisticated and covert elements of our society.

Why would anyone want to have John Lennon killed? After all, he was "only" a musician who hadn't even cut any records until very recently. The answer to this may be found in the context in which his killing occurred, after remembering who John Lennon was. John Lennon was a member of the most famous group (the Beatles) of our time. As such, he and the group had a great influence over millions of young people around the world. His influence continued after the Beatles split up and he went out on his own. During the height of the Viet Nam war, the Beatles took a stand for world peace — "give peace a chance". As we enter the 1980's, it looks as if the U.S. is itching to get into another war anywhere to help bolster the sagging economy, and to stop all those countries from becoming liberated.

With this being the case, world-recognized "peacenik" John Lennon, already on the rise again in influence with his newly-released album, can be viewed as an obstacle to any impending (and then ongoing) war plan the U.S. has.

We must remember that we are all little subjects who beg the officials above for morsels of information as to the facts behind Lennon's assassination. Experience and common sense should have taught us by now that we are only being told what they want us to know, when they decide we should know it (i.e. "no motive yet").

There will of course, be attempts by the same sophisticated covert elements to discredit this information and the people associated with it. That is to be expected from 1984 Orwellian types who, in their attempts to control history, concede only the obvious (i.e. finally "conceding" the JFK assassination involved more than one person, so there must have been two "lone nuts" present in Dealey Plaza!).

Someone is sure to attack these points by claiming that the aforementioned can never be proven in a court of law. The rest of the reasoning to this angle is that if it cannot be proven in a court of law, then it did not happen. Studies have shown the hardest cases to prove under the "beyond a reasonable doubt" requirement are *conspiracy* cases. This is the chief reason why New Orleans businessman Clay Shaw was acquitted for conspiring to assassinate President Kennedy. Shaw had been indicted by New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison (now a judge) for conspiracy in the JFK

assassination. (It was discovered much later that Shaw was in fact a *CIA contact*, and that the CIA conspired to covertly obstruct Garrison's prosecution of Shaw. See Victor Marchetti's "The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence" and "A Heritage of Stone" by Jim Garrison, which oddly enough is no longer being printed, but should be available in most libraries.)

Lennon's assassination must also be viewed as a "trial run" for future assassinations of musicians. The social and political impact of music, which cuts across all geographical, social and racial barriers, cannot be overlooked. Whether or not you personally liked John Lennon or the Beatles, the grave implication of his assassination must be realized. Consider a scenario in which others are assassinated, and Lennon's assassination is cited as the incident which causes other "lone nuts" to follow his lead. Who would be next? Stevie Wonder? Bob Marley? Gil Scott-Heron?

The *value* of Mark David Chapman cannot be underestimated. In closing, consider what Walter Bowart wrote about the significance and value of the framing of Lee Harvey Oswald as a "lone nut": labelling Oswald as such provided the rationale and climate for acceptance by the public of this same cover story for the two other major political assassinations of the 1960's of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King. And by failing to uncover and expose this explanation in time, gave the green light to the cryptocracy to proceed with these assassinations. Let's hope we don't make the same mistake again.

—Open letter to Sen. Barry Goldwater—

Senator Barry Goldwater
 Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence
 Room G-308, Dirksen Senate Office Building
 Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Goldwater:

I ask your help in ending an improper U.S. intelligence agency domestic activity. The program is long term, and apparently its initial goal was to develop me as an intelligence agent. The program recently became unmanageable when I began to speak publicly about it. Now the agency's main concern seems to be to prevent further disclosure. This letter may be difficult to believe. I know, but the American intelligence community is well known for its unusual practices. To understand the program, you must know its background.

I. Programs of this kind are possible because of the mind set of their operators. Intelligence work is a ruthless profession. There are many good intelligence officers, but the good ones tend to be compartmentalized and excluded from questionable clandestine activities; in the long term the bad operators tend to move into positions of power.

These bad operators are often misfits and "true believers"—cold calculating men who believe that might makes right. In their eyes, lies, torture and death are trivial sacrifices in the service of a higher good.

Bad operators tend to be antidemocratic and interested mainly in power and control. B.F. Skinner's writings potently distill their view. The average man is a child who needs to be "led to happiness," according to Skinner. Society is best managed by experts. "We not only can control human behavior, we must," Skinner says, and control is the essence of the clandestine mentality.

II. The clandestine methods of the American intelligence community are "ugly, mean and cruel," according to the *New York Times*.

Preventing disclosure is the primary concern in any secret operation. In the intelligence community, strange and unusual practices which are easily deniable have become common. These practices include, for example, dispersing crowds with bomb threats and incapacitating a target with virulent flu virus or tranquilizing drugs. (A target may be discredited by administration of a tranquilizing drug prior to an important interview. Giving drugs to unwitting subjects is a well-refined technique that is difficult to avoid. Identifying an unknown drug in the blood serum can be almost impossible.)

It is also standard operating procedure to bug a target's home, office and car; sift through his garbage, and, as time passes, to plant an amiable succession of informers in his path. This is routine. It is common as well to disrupt a target's marriage, his job, business contacts and friendships.

It's a hard game. A target, or even an operator, who steps too far out of line may pay for the indiscretion with his life. Someone who, because of publicity can't be eliminated through an "accident" or "suicide" may be "extracted" by deliberate inducement of a slow acting terminal illness.

III. Communist penetration of the American intelligence service is an extremely sensitive issue, great effort is expended to prevent it. The counterintelligence measures used to prevent or expose penetration are of vital interest. When the exposure of one double agent could save lives and millions of dollars, the most trivial counterintelligence tool may be diligently sought and used. In order to deter Communist expansionism, and protect America, some sacrifices may seem justified.

The Clandestine Officer Development Program is one of the intelligence community's most secret and sensitive long-term projects. Its purpose is to select, surveil and "develop" young people for intelligence service. (Development involves actual intervention into the daily life of a subject.)

Training in this experimental program aims to develop loyalty skills and a high tolerance for the pain and misery of an agent's life through manipulation and control of the trainee's environment. Part-, and full-time government informers, acting as friends, may suggest books to read, provide suitable encouragement at key junctures in a subject's life, and, it is hoped, "plant the seeds" of future political conviction. The program goes even deeper than this, though. Desirable friendships are encouraged while "unsuitable" relationships are undermined. If a broken family is the best climate for developing a high tolerance of pain and misery, this may be arranged.

IV. At least fifteen years ago, the agency began a three phase, long term agent-development program with me as the target. The program initially focused on basic agent development with only a modest investment in time and money. When I graduated from college in 1976, a second phase began—I was offered a job in intelligence service. I carefully researched the agency for over six months and then declined. My friends turned cold and a process of clandestine coercion began. "We'll pester you until you join."

This "encouragement" crescendoed after five years when I was told my family or myself could be "hurt or killed" if I didn't cooperate. Why force in a new recruit? The recruit, as a person, is not important, his training is all that counts. The practice of "forcing" in new recruits is uncommon. However, Victor Marchetti, former CIA executive assistant to the Deputy Director, said in a television interview that American citizens are at times forced into government service using clandestine methods of coercion. Marchetti concluded: "It usually doesn't work out too good."

The agency prefers to select officer candidates from the population at large, especially recent college graduates. The agency knows that misfits are attracted to the agency, and tries to avoid this problem: ideally, the agency recruits honest people

—Open letter to Sen. Barry Goldwater—

Senator Barry Goldwater
 Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence
 Room G-306 Dirksen Senate Office Building
 Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Goldwater:

I ask your help in ending an improper U.S. intelligence agency domestic activity. The program is long term and apparently its initial goal was to develop me as an intelligence agent. The program recently became unmanageable when I began to speak publicly about it. Now the agency's main concern seems to be to prevent further disclosure. This letter may be difficult to believe. I know, but the American intelligence community is well known for its unusual practices. To understand the program, you must know its background.

I. Programs of this kind are possible because of the mind set of their operators. Intelligence work is a ruthless profession. There are many good intelligence officers, but the good ones tend to be compartmentalized and excluded from questionable clandestine activities; in the long term the bad operators tend to move into positions of power.

These bad operators are often misfits and "true believers"—cold calculating men who believe that might makes right. In their eyes, lies, torture and death are trivial sacrifices in the service of a higher good.

Bad operators tend to be antidemocratic and interested mainly in power and control. E. F. Skinner's writings potently distort their view. The average man is a child who needs to be "led to happiness" according to Skinner. Society is best managed by experts. "We not only can control human behavior, we must," Skinner says, and control is the essence of the clandestine mentality.

II. The clandestine methods of the American intelligence community are "ugly, mean and cruel" according to the New York Times.

Preventing disclosure is the primary concern in any secret operation. In the intelligence community, strange and unusual practices which are easily deniable have become common. These practices include, for example, dispersing crowds with bomb threats and incapacitating a target with venereal disease or tranquilizing drugs. (A target may be discredited by administration of a tranquilizing drug prior to an important interview. Giving drugs to unwitting subjects is a well-refined technique that is difficult to avoid. Identifying an unknown drug in the blood serum can be almost impossible.)

It is also standard operating procedure to bug a target's home, office and car; sift through his garbage, and, as time passes, to plant an amiable succession of informers in his path. This is routine. It is common as well to disrupt a target's marriage, his job, business contacts and friendships.

It's a hard game. A target, or even an operator, who steps too far out of line may pay for the indiscretion with his life. Someone who because of publicity can't be eliminated through an "accident" or "suicide" may be "extracted" by deliberate enucleation of a slow acting terminal illness.

III. Communist penetration of the American intelligence service is an extremely sensitive issue; great effort is expended to prevent it. The counterintelligence measures used to prevent or expose penetration are of vital interest. When the exposure of one double agent could save lives and millions of dollars, the most trivial counterintelligence (CI) may be diligently sought and used. In order to deter Communist expansionism and protect America, some sacrifices may seem justified.

The Clandestine Officer Development Program is one of the intelligence community's most secret and sensitive long-term projects. Its purpose is to select, surveil and "develop" young people for intelligence service. (Development involves actual intervention into the daily life of a subject.)

Training in this experimental program aims to develop loyalty skills and a high tolerance for the pain and misery of an agent's life through manipulation and control of the trainee's environment. Pain- and full-time government informers, acting as friends, may suggest books to read, provide suitable encouragement at key junctures in a subject's life, and it is hoped, "plant the seeds" of future political conviction. The program goes even deeper than this, though. Desirable friendships are encouraged while "unsuitable" relationships are undermined. If a broken family is the best climate for developing a high tolerance of pain and misery, this may be arranged.

IV. At least fifteen years ago, the agency began a three phase, long term agent-development program with me as the target. The program initially focused on basic agent development with only a modest investment in time and money. When I graduated from college in 1976, a second phase began—was offered a job in intelligence service. I carefully researched the agency for over six months, and then declined. My friends turned cold and a process of clandestine coercion began. "We'll pester you until you join."

This "encouragement" cranked up after five years when I was told my family or myself could be "hurt or killed" if I didn't cooperate. Why force in a new recruit? The recruit as a person is not important; his training is all that counts. The practice of "forcing" in new recruits is uncommon, however. Victor Marchetti, former CIA executive assistant to the Deputy Director, said in a television interview that American citizens are at times forced into government service using clandestine methods of coercion. Marchetti concluded: "It usually doesn't work out too good."

The agency prefers to select officer candidates from the population at large, especially recent college graduates. The agency knows that misfits are attracted to the agency and tries to exploit this problem. Ideally, the agency recruits honest people who are carefully introduced to clandestine methods in basic training at "the farm." The initially street-wise are considered poor security risks; they may cheat the cheaters.

Some candidates for sensitive jobs go through many years of pre-employment surveillance. The agency doesn't like to take "no" for an answer from these "coddled" misfits.

Exasperated, I finally spoke personally to my U.S. Congressman, sought legal advice and published a description of my experience, naming some of those responsible. After this, the third and current phase of the operation began—the agency's attempt to prevent disclosure.

I earned the grade of A- on a full course-load during my first year of post-graduate study at UCSE. I spoke out about agency impropriety during the summer break, though, and the following fall was forced out of the university through an insane program of clandestine coercion.

The operation started small and grew larger in its final stages. Initially modest "training" outings became a substantial investment when I was finally targeted as a security risk—"He knows too much and he's started to talk." Like a poker game, the stakes grew bigger and larger until the agency "went all in" on the exposure, painted itself into a corner. It can no longer "walk away from the issue."

The operation is a gross violation of my constitutional rights and gives substantial grounds for both a criminal complaint and a civil lawsuit. A court victory could lead to the punishment of those directly responsible, as well as jeopardizing illegal agent-development operations and significantly damaging the agency's reputation.

The agency seems to want to put a lid on an operation which has escalated out of all proportion. It presently is attempting to invalidate information and names which I have already revealed and to prevent further disclosure. For now, this probably means keeping me as quiet as possible, but the long-term solution may be to permanently destroy my credibility; to wear me down; to make me appear off-balance, or perhaps, as promised, to frame and jail, or even execute me.

I have four choices:

- 1) I can fight back. This means lobbying for a Congressional Committee inquiry, filing a lawsuit and also engaging in regular public discussion which will diminish the chance of severe reprisal (low-key reprisal is almost certain). A civil suit will cost approximately \$40,000, and may take two to four years to conclude.
- 2) I may continue my education in a country where the U.S. intelligence bureaucracy cannot act freely. I love my country; this would be a hard choice.
- 3) I may run and hide.
- 4) I may do what I am told. This would only tighten the noose around the neck of others who are in a similar position.

V. I am not interested in making a vindictive attack on the intelligence bureaucracy. If the agency is forced to acknowledge the program's existence, however, the operation may end. I will compromise and not press for legal sanctions (if appropriate, I will sign a waiver) if the agency will simply acknowledge its activities, apologize and stop.

What is the agency? From the age of twenty, only one agency was ever discussed with me—the Central Intelligence Agency. Senator Grasson and Representative Lagomarsino both asked the CIA's director if the CIA was responsible. CIA legislative counsel Frederick R. Hill responded that "relevant agency records were examined and no information whatsoever concerning [me] was found." Mr. Lyman Kirkpatrick, former executive director of the CIA, has a reputation for honesty that is rare in the intelligence profession. In a personal letter he said the CIA did not know me.

A Santa Barbara attorney, with intelligence ties, advised recently that 1) The intelligence community is a team. Accountability can be evaded by shifting records from one agency to another. 2) Recruitment and preliminary employment discussions often are conducted under "cover" of a different agency.

The agency responsible for this operation has identified itself as the CIA, but this may be false. If the parent agency is not the CIA then what is it? I can only speculate, but it seems almost certain that the Intelligence Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation knows of the operation's existence. I respectfully request that you forward this letter to the assistant director in charge of the Intelligence Division at the FBI (4026JEM) and ask him to confirm or deny the activities I describe.

I am publishing this as an "open letter" in the Santa Barbara News and Review. I will forward your response to the News and Review, and also to the Santa Barbara News Press.

Thank you very much sir.
 Subject identification: social security number 554-80-1935.

AFRO-LEGACY RESEARCH
AND PRODUCTIONS
P. O. BOX 3385
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93105

*Received with letter a
number 1/19/82*

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 12
Frederick, Maryland

