

Jim -

I know that some will feel that I split because I was afraid of dying in the situation - or for my children to do so. While the latter is somewhat true my main motivation was not that at all. I always expected that this particular aspect - the immediate threat of arrest of John and for yourself would be resolved. I left because I am no longer willing to live in a situation of weekly or bi weekly crises, and the atmosphere of anxiety, hysteria and depression that exist with it.

I am unwilling to live in that sort of environment for several reasons: 1) my nerves just won't take it now - I am too best; 2) It is impossible to build anything in that sort of atmosphere because building requires lots of planning and continuity of effort and application - the continuity is destroyed by the chaos crisis mentality; 3) because I feel that the crisis environment is to some extent created and maintained by your state of mind and ~~methodology~~ ^{methodology} - though I know, of course, that the problems we have faced, and continue to face are very real.

ONE of your messages indicated that you have known for some time that I think you are crazy. Not so. What I think is that you suffer from a lack of balance - both of perspective and behavior. I expect that the etiology is a combination of metabolic conditions, fatigue and reactiveness to years of punishment. Still, from my viewpoint it exists and has severe ramifications.

Throughout the years, in the U.S.A., it was necessary, at least to some extent, to create and maintain an conspiratorial atmosphere and the impression among the

people that we were under attack almost continually in order to motivate them to work at adequate ~~work~~ levels and maintain some organisational cohesiveness.

I think that both of these factors have tended toward a pattern of overreaction or perhaps overemphasis is a better word, which in recent months has gotten out of hand and can have serious ramifications - not the least of which is surely the continuity of "stop and start" development.

The situation with John is an illustration. I readily agree that it was both most serious and painful to you (and also others like Maria K who are most attached to the child). You had assurances from Dr. Reid on the matter. He sent his personal deputy. We have always heard and experienced that he is a man of his word. So far, so good. He and Fred Willis were out of the country for the signing of the new Panama Treaty. One of the new Judges signed some dumb, illegal orders. There was cooperation on some levels by Government - some police, process servers, G.D.F. alone. Obviously Reid was not in control of the situation altogether at that moment. Without doubt, from the perspective of an head of state, plagued with strikes and internal party dissention and disloyalty ~~this~~ ^{your's} was not a major problem, but one that would be taken care of in time in true Guyanese fashion. You could have waited till one of them got back and straightened out the mess because it would have been damn hard to arrest you out in the bush, or you could have had Luckhoo arrange for surrender and bail, spend 15-20 minutes in custody, put up some small money and let Luckhoo fight it out in court for months while you went about your business - giving Reid time to do his work. Either of these things could have been done without disruption

of the program or ~~interfering~~ ^{alarming} with large numbers of people. However the whole thing immediately rose to the level of hysteria. Countless calls on the radio, obviously hysterical, countless calls to carry culminating in a futile and totally unnecessary trip to Chicago - ~~UNDEC~~ ^{UNDEC} & a threat of some sort of mass suicide or other kind of blood bath. (Incidentally he told me on the phone, and contrary to your message, that he thought your strategy "dumb, stupid shit"; had lived through a 24 hour nightmare; and felt your behavior to be totally unleader-like; - he thought my decision to split and return to the states was wise - that maybe it would bring you to your senses.) Charles is a good man - lots of problems, sure, I am not in love with him, but he is the best man we can get for our job there, and I am sure, now, that he has lost tremendous respect for you. Marcelline freaked out, which she does frequently, but she ~~does not~~ ^{did} need ^{the added anxiety} with her health. Officials all over the U.S. and Georgetown were importuned; our private affairs broadcast, "ultimatums" were presented to government which can only serve to make us look hysterical and immature to governments, causing diminished respect and therefore diminished power and influence here; work - the whole project ^{was} ~~was~~ ^{topped} both in U.S. and here, all plans halted with ^{resulting} ~~resulting~~ loss of time momentum and money, and in great frustration. And what happened? They came back on their schedule and are taking care of the matter on their schedule in the normal course of their business. All of the above totally unnecessary and highly wasteful and destructive. A relatively modest and ultimately controllable incident was made, by you, into a catastrophe of major proportions involving the full expenditure of such goodwill

and energies as we have available? Hindsight? I don't think so, just reasonable analysis. The whole thing has been handled in an hysterical and destructive fashion. Jim, what are you going to do when they try again - when Grace comes and they file for custody over the line? Are you going to demand that she be summarily evicted from the country and pound on the Prime Minister's door to try and get it done? I am not being sarcastic - but realistic. The game is likely not played out, and having escalated to this ~~last~~ level over a modest attack what are you going to do when they make a full scale attack for the boy? Do you believe that the Burmese Government can afford to deny a U.S. citizen access to the country and judicial system for the redress of grievances? There are over 500,000 Burmese living in the U.S. - all have family and friends here - what if the U.S.A. should reciprocate and treat Burmese that way! Undoubtedly she would ultimately lose in court, politically arranged, but there must be the impression of fairness and of access to the judicial process. Would you go through the months of litigation in the faith that Burma wants us and would ultimately protect us or will you again send out emergency-life-or-death calls to Angela, Huey ~~etc.~~ etc. to find another country? Do you really expect that in the last resort we would have a better position here, or be treated more favorably, than an esteemed Burmese citizen? Could they afford to put us (Yankee foreigners) in a special class of elite - even if they wanted to? Reid has always supported us - but in indirect ways, wame out front because he could not afford it politically -

-4-

© I try, as I see it, a strong rather a weak methodology of yours. I do not feel it is good - did good with something, for example, but I feel that you no longer use it effectively.

and still can't. Out front demands on him must create problems for him. Obviously there are those among his camp who support us, and those who don't, and he has to live with all of them. Forcing him to take increasing public positions for us also serves to polarize the opposition against us. As you know, these positions among the younger ministers can be critical to our future. Were all of these points considered? I doubt it. Not because I wasn't there to raise them - they are all fairly obvious and I am not that bright or sensitive, especially right now. I think your immediate reflexive response was to call out all of the "troops" at once - a sort of "if you give an inch they will take a yard" philosophy.

I did appreciate talking with Mike and Joyce, and the message you sent. I believe, sincerely, that you do care about me, and, to some extent your belief that my thinking now is affected by my health is correct. However your attempt at self justification over how this most recent affair was handled left me very cold because it tells me that you are really not willing, or able, to see how badly you have acted. The "see, it worked" commentary was hardly appropriate. It was not the polemic, threats, or the importuning that worked - rather, it was that they do want us here because we are an inspiration for an emerging Socialist nation.

Beyond my current fatigue, etc I have substantially lost confidence in your leadership, because of this type of thing. I question whether you have the openness and insight to see ~~it and correct~~ this pattern in yourself and correct it ~~or whether you will~~. If you don't, you will ultimately alienate all of your friends and tear the organization and people apart. This is the point I wished to make
5.

and could not make strongly enough to be heard except by doing what I have done. It could not be done in a Tete-a-tete because if I were to demand a private conversation anyone could; it could not be done in a council because I who would not care to be so frankly critical and also because you would at once be defended by a clique of "yes people" because they would feel it their duty to protect and defend you. At least this way I know you will read this with some concern.

I hate to write - seems as how the ideas never get fully expressed or organized the way I mean them to be - fully expressive of my thoughts. Talking to you would be ~~even~~ worse. You could sell snow balls to the Eskimos. Best talker I ever met. I'm tired of being "sold," Jim. You say what you feel you have to ~~do~~ in order to keep somebody in, I know that - it is an organizational necessity. I do not wish to be subjected to it just now. //

This was written between 5 and 8 AM Tuesday morning. I'll re-read it, annotate and correct later... I am sure I left out half of what I wanted to say.

Afternoon.

I re-read these notes. There is nothing I wish to change. In summary: I think you have gotten so "up tight" that you use bullets to kill bumble bees, but that you only have so many in your pocket and when the tigers come you will have none left to fire at them. I think this has become reactive on your part.

I know that your blood pressure gets out of control, you have insulin problems, you suffer from chronic excess fatigue. What I feel you ~~are~~ ^{are} not sufficiently aware of is how much all of this affects your judgement and actions. Since you seem not to take the medically indicated steps to alleviate the condition (due to problems to be dealt with) this also becomes a question of your judgement. Your leadership ability - when functioning well - is by far the greatest asset the group has. ~~When~~ When you impair it (and it is impaired) in the problem solving you ultimately create more serious problems for the group in the future.

I would like to tell you why I question your ability to see this condition and correct it. First, I think - rather have the impression - that you come from an "I'm OK. you're not OK" position. Therefore I am afraid that you will read all of this with an eye to understanding Charkin's thought so that you can best straighten Charkin out, rather than really considering its application to you on the presumption that my observations about you might have some objective validity. Second, I feel in some way it might interfere with the reassurance you seem to need. (I am not mocking this, everyone needs to give and receive reassurances). Example: your periodic calls for pledges of loyalty from R.C. You know that the responses were partly hypocritical. Is it only the psychological mechanism of maintaining attitudes by affirmation? I don't think so. I think it was, and is, simply need fulfilling. Likewise

your ~~need~~ "request of the group for you and your son" filled your need for support and approval, and, under more extreme circumstances might well have been appropriate - but objectively the position was nowhere ^{near} ~~near~~ that critical at that time. I think that to some extent you use the "crisis mentality" to get positive reinforcement and approval. If so, then these comments must serve to interfere with that - and will not be well received.

Some general comments:

I detest being lied to and manipulated. You have, over the years done a lot of both. The "great gun theft" is a classic case in point. I am sure that you remember when I left the locker open in my office, Tami took the guns out, I reported them missing - you announced the theft from the culprit. There have been a score of other such incidents. How would you feel if I had ever (and I never have) knowingly gave false factual reports or false legal opinions to you in order to manipulate your behavior? Would you find that conduct acceptable ~~to~~ in me on the grounds that: ① my goal was pure ② the ends justified the means ③ I understood the situation better than you? Hell no you wouldn't - you would be totally pissed when you found out.

Even in the present situation when I asked for the children you lied to me - said you would send them out, but held off till Phyllis could get

here so that you would have some basis for hanging on, and I am sure that after she does arrive you will send them out. I would rather be told straight out than "put on". What I do at this juncture depends to a considerable extent on my belief that you will do what you say - and this does not help.

One final thought and I will stop. I was hesitant to come down this time - I am not sure why. My main purpose in coming was to try to cut through some of the hysteria and get you to see that the situation was not so severe as to warrant your reaction to it. When I arrived and saw that the whole thing had progressed to a point where I couldn't do anything about it - and felt that there was just nothing I could do to quell that response to this situation, and that there would be nothing I could do in the future to quell that same anticipated response to all the like situations I can foresee arising in the future - I felt totally helpless to alter the situation - that is left.

one final point: ^{your} ~~some~~ of this is predicated upon evaluation of objective circumstances. My evaluation was skewed by Clarke, Luckhoo, and Berry, to name the first few that come to mind.

Karen made the unqualified commitment to me that (from you) you would send the children out. Mike said the same thing. Just this morning I got your message from Joyce that "If you had known my changed position" you would have put the children on the plane. 3 people, 3 sources all saying they come direct from you. Now the tape denying all of it, saying you will not send them. It seems as I softened my stance in an effort at reason you made yours more rigid. So, in fact, it is all a game on your part, and with that self righteousness that can admit of no error or mistake.

You so misunderstand me. You think my concern is with a "nuclear family" life. Not so. My concern is with stability that would make development possible on a sane, rational basis, stability that all of the children need, and that depends on the stability of your head. After all, you have seen me, as I have seen you, loose control of yourself on many occasions and require physical restraint. It is not that I do not understand it, I do, it is that you do not admit it.

~~to~~ You "don't know why I can't come in to Jones Town" - when 3 people, at different times tell me that you will send the children - as a message from you - and you deny it, I obviously can't trust anything you say. You leave me little to have confidence in. Your word is no better than the expedience

that motivates you to utter it. Joyce Parks even looked depressed when she gave me the tape, she knew damn well you had contradicted yourself in the same day. I knew what it would be before I played it; essentially told her so.

you leave me very few choices. Phyllis will come in tonight and I suppose we will talk.... but I think you and I now have very little to say to ~~each~~ each other.