## Section 6

6. Transcript of sentencing hearing before Chief Judge Peckham, 3/3/87

A complete transcript of the sentencing hearing. It includes the pleas of both the defense and the prosecution in regard to sentencing, and the court's final determination.

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT F. PECKHAM, CHIEF JUDGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

PLAINTIFF,

VS.

LAURENCE JOHN LAYTON,

DEFENDANT.

CR-80-0416 RFP



SAN'FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1987

## APPEARANCES:

FOR PLAINTIFF:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
D. MICHAEL NERNEY,
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
450 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94102

FOR DEFENDANT:

ROBERT R. BRYAN, ESQ. THOMAS W. JACKSON, ESQ. 2020 UNION STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94123

REPORTED BY: ROBERTA L. ROGERS, CSR, CP, CM

COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION BY XSCRIBE

## TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1987

1.

THE CLERK: CR-80-416 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA VERSUS
LAURENCE JOHN LAYTON FOR HEARING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS IN
ARREST OF JUDGMENT, FOR NEW TRIAL AND FOR SENTENCING.

MR. RUSSONIELLO: JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, WITH ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY MICHAEL NERNEY, YOUR HONOR.

MR. BRYAN: ROBERT R. BRYAN ON BEHALF OF MR. LAYTON AND ASSOCIATE COUNSEL THOMAS W. JACKSON.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

THE CLERK: LET THE RECORD SHOW THE DEFENDANT IS ALSO PRESENT IN COURT.

THE COURT: THE DEFENDANT IS PRESENT. TODAY THERE HAS BEEN SET DOWN SEVERAL MATTERS. ONE, THE RULING ON THE MOTIONS FOR NEW TRIAL SUBMITTED BY FORMER COUNSEL. I AM PREPARED TO RULE ON THOSE AND I WILL DO SO IN A FEW MOMENTS.

SECOND, THE FURTHER MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL ON ADDITIONAL GROUNDS SUBMITTED BY MR. BRYAN. THERE ARE TWO GROUNDS SET FORTH IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL OR SECOND MOTION. WE DISCUSSED THOSE LAST THURSDAY AT A STATUS CONFERENCE. WE EARLIER HAD DISCUSSED THOSE GROUNDS AT THE TIME THE CASE WAS ORIGINALLY SET DOWN FOR SENTENCING.

WE DID NOT PROCEED WITH THE SENTENCING OR WITH THE RULING ON THE MOTIONS ON THAT DATE BECAUSE MR. BRYAN HAD JUST COME INTO THE CASE. MR. LAYTON INDICATED THAT HE WANTED HIM TO

REPRESENT HIM, AND MR. BRYAN HAD NOT HAD SUFFICIENT TIME, THOUGH
HE WAS WILLING TO DO SO, HE DID NOT HAVE SUFFICIENT TIME TO
PROCEED WITH THE SENTENCING ON THAT DATE.

FURTHER, THE MOTION WHICH HAD BEEN FILED HAD BEEN DONE SO WITH VERY LITTLE TIME FOR PREPARATION, AND HIS REQUEST FOR AN OPPORTUNITY TO SUPPLEMENT OR TO AMPLIFY THAT MOTION WAS MADE TO US AND WE GRANTED THAT.

SUBSEQUENTLY, WE HAVE RECEIVED HIS PAPERS AND HIS MOTION. WE DISCUSSED MORE RECENTLY LAST THURSDAY THAT WE WOULD PROCEED WITH THE FIRST ROUND WITH RESPECT TO THE ADVICE OR CONVERSATIONS WITH THE DEFENDANT BY HIS PREVIOUS COUNSEL WITH RESPECT TO THE MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCE AND DEFER AS A 2255 MATTER THE SECOND GROUND UNTIL AFTER THE SENTENCING.

WE HAVE HAD FURTHER OPPORTUNITY NOW TO GO OVER THIS
MATTER AND IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE SHOULD PROCEED THIS MORNING IN
THE FOLLOWING WAY: I WILL PROCEED TO RULE, AS I INDICATED, ON
THE FIRST MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL. I AM DENYING THAT MOTION FOR
THE REASONS THAT I WILL STATE. AND THEN WE WILL PROCEED WITH
THE SENTENCING.

WE WILL THEN SET DOWN FOR A HEARING--AND WE WILL DISCUSS THIS WITH COUNSEL--A HEARING AND TREAT BOTH OF THE SECOND MOTION GROUNDS AS A 2255 MATTER.

WE WILL HAVE A FURTHER STATUS CONFERENCE, BUT WE WILL SET TODAY A DEFINITE TIME FOR HEARING AND WE WILL SET ASIDE A FULL DAY AND PERHAPS A SECOND DAY. I HAVE SOME COMMENTS ABOUT

THAT THAT MIGHT BE USEFUL TO YOU.

I DO NOT FEEL THAT IT WILL BE NECESSARY TO CALL ALL OF THE WITNESSES AS IF THE DEFENSE WAS BEING PUT FORWARD. I THINK THERE WILL BE A NEED FOR CERTAIN WITNESSES. I THINK THAT WE WILL NEED A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF TIME FOR THAT HEARING, WHICH WE WISH TO PLAN AND ALLOW.

THE REASON I DON'T WANT TO PROCEED IN A BIFURCATED WAY

AS WE DISCUSSED ON THURSDAY IS THAT I NOW FIND THAT, AS WAS

EVIDENT ON THURSDAY, THAT THESE ARE INTERTWINED AND IT IS NOT

EFFICIENT TO PROCEED IN THAT FASHION.

SO I THINK THE MOST EFFICIENT WAY IS TO RULE ON THE GROUNDS SET FORTH IN THE FIRST MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL, PROCEED WITH THE SENTENCING, AND THEN HAVE FURTHER HEARING AS IF IT WERE A 2255 MATTER ON BOTH THE GROUNDS RAISED IN THE SECOND MOTION.

SO THAT WILL BE HOW WE WILL PROCEED.

NOW, I WILL PROCEED WITH THE RULING ON THE EARLIER
GROUNDS. THE DEFENDANT HAS FILED MOTIONS AS FOLLOWS: FIRST, A
MOTION IN ARREST OF JUDGMENT BECAUSE THE COURT LACKS
JURISDICTION. SECOND, MOTION TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT ON
SPEEDY TRIAL AND DUE PROCESS GROUNDS. THIRD, MOTION FOR NEW
TRIAL BECAUSE THE COURT ERRED IN ADMITTING THE PREARRIVAL
SPEECH, THE GARRY STATEMENT, THE KANSINALLY STATEMENT, AND THE
DEFENDANT'S CONFESSION, AND BECAUSE THE COURT IMPERMISSIBLY
AMENDED THE INDICTMENT BY CHARGING THE JURY THAT THE DEFENDANT
COULD BE FOUND GUILTY FOR CONSPIRING WITH PERSONS WHETHER NAMED

IN THE INDICTMENT OR NOT. AND FOURTH, MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL NOTWITHSTANDING THE VERDICT BECAUSE AS A MATTER OF LAW THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTED A REASONABLE INFERENCE THAT THE DEFENDANT DID NOT HAVE A SPECIFIC INTENT TO COMMIT THE CRIMES CHARGED.

NOW, FIRST, AS TO THE MOTION IN ARREST OF JUDGMENT.

THE DEFENDANT MOVES FOR ARREST OF JUDGMENT ON THE GROUND THAT

THE COURT LACKS JURISDICTION OVER THE OFFENSES CHARGED. THIS

COURT HAS ALREADY FULLY CONSIDERED THE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUE AND

CONCLUDED THAT CONGRESS INTENDED EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION

TO APPLY UNDER THE STATUTES APPLICABLE HERE.

HOWEVER, THE DEFENDANT POINTS OUT THAT, SUBSEQUENT TO OUR OPINION ON THE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUE, CONGRESS AMENDED THE STATUTE TO ADD THE FOLLOWING CLAUSE: "THERE IS EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OVER THE CONDUCT PROHIBITED BY THIS SECTION."

TITLE 18 UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 351(1).

AS THE GOVERNMENT POINTS OUT, THIS AMENDMENT IS IN NO WAY INCONSISTENT WITH OUR PRIOR ORDER, AND WAS ADDED BY CONGRESS SIMPLY TO REMOVE ANY EXISTING AMBIGUITY OVER THE EXTRATERRITORIAL APPLICATION OF THE STATUTE. THE HOUSE REPORT ON THE AMENDMENT STATES THE FOLLOWING:

"SUBSECTION (I) TO SECTION 351 PROVIDES THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OVER AN OFFENSE UNDER SECTION 351. WHILE SECTION 351 MAY ALREADY HAVE EXTRATERRITORIAL APPLICATION, THE

ASSOCIATED FEDERAL REPORTERS, SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 415-863-4211

COMMITTEE BELIEVES THAT EXPLICIT LANGUAGE IS NECESSARY
TO ELIMINATE ANY AMBIGUITY IN THE LAW. FOR INSTANCE,
IN UNITED STATES VERSUS LAYTON, 509 F.SUPP. 212,
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, APPEAL DISMISSED,
CITE, CERT. DENIED, CITE, THE DEFENDANT ARGUED
UNSUCCESSFULLY THAT THE UNITED STATES HAD NO
JURISDICTION UNDER SECTION 351 IN A PROSECUTION FOR
THE KILLING OF CONGRESSMAN LEO RYAN IN GUYANA.
DESPITE THE CONGRESS'S FAILURE TO EXPLICITLY STATE
THAT SECTION 351 APPLIES EXTRATERRITORIALLY, THE COURT
INFERRED SUCH APPLICATION.

WHILE THE TERM 'EXTRATERRITORIAL

JURISDICTION' IS NOT DEFINED IN TITLE 18, THE

COMMITTEE INTENDS THAT ITS MEANING IN THIS BILL BE

THAT GIVEN TO THE TERM BY NUMEROUS COURTS. SEE, E.G.,

UNITED STATES VERSUS LAYTON."

THAT CONCLUDES THE QUOTE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY.

IF ANYTHING, THIS EXCERPT INDICATES CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF

OUR PREVIOUS DECISION, AND THUS CANNOT PROVIDE THE BASIS FOR

REVERSING OURSELVES.

NOW, TWO, AS TO THE MOTION TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT.

THE DEFENDANT MOVES TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT ON SPEEDY TRIAL

AND DUE PROCESS GROUNDS. WE HAVE ALSO PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED AND

RULED AGAINST THE DEFENDANT ON THIS ISSUE. THE ONLY NEW

ALLEGATION THAT THE DEFENDANT MAKES IN SUPPORT OF HIS ARGUMENT

IS THAT HE WAS PREJUDICED BY HIS INABILITY TO LOCATE CLEMENT LILADRIE, WHO COULD HAVE IMPEACHED MORTIMER KANSINALLY'S TESTIMONY THAT LAYTON WAS HEARD TO SAY: "I SHOT THE MOTHERFUCKERS."

THE DEFENDANT ALSO CONTENDS THAT LILADRIE AND DURGA

PERSAUD, IF AVAILABLE, WOULD HAVE TESTIFIED TO LAYTON'S MENTAL

HEALTH AT THE TIME OF THE OFFENSE.

AS NOTED BY THE GOVERNMENT, THE DEFENSE ITSELF HAS ARGUED THAT THE STATEMENT, "I SHOT THE BLANK," IS MINIMALLY PROBATIVE OF LAYTON'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONSPIRACY CHARGED.

THUS, IT IS HARD TO IMAGINE EXACTLY WHAT PREJUDICE THE DEFENDANT SUFFERED BY NOT BEING ABLE FOR IMPEACH THAT TESTIMONY.

FURTHERMORE, THE COURT HAS GONE OUT OF ITS WAY TO ACCOMMODATE THE DEFENSE'S CONCERNS IN THIS REGARD BY PERMITTING THE PREVIOUS TESTIMONY OF LILADRIE IN GUYANA TO BE READ TO THE JURY.

FINALLY, BECAUSE KANSINALLY HIMSELF WAS SUBJECT TO CROSS-EXAMINATION, THERE ARE NO CONFRONTATION CLAUSE PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN ADMITTING THIS TESTIMONY.

WITH RESPECT TO THE ISSUE OF LAYTON'S MENTAL STATE,
THIS COURT HAS ALREADY FULLY CONSIDERED THE ABSENCE OF DURGA
PERSAUD IN ITS OPINION ON THE DEFENDANT'S SPEEDY TRIAL MOTION.
THE DEFENDANT MAKES NO NEW CONTENTIONS IN THIS REGARD THAT NERIT
RECONSIDERATION OF THAT OPINION. AND SO THAT MOTION IS DENIED.

MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL WE NOW ADDRESS. WITH RESPECT TO

THE PREARRIVAL SPEECH, THE DEFENDANT CONTENDS THAT THIS COURT IMPROPERLY ADMITTED THE PREARRIVAL SPEECH ON THE THEORY THAT IT WAS IN FURTHERANCE OF A JOINT VENTURE OR SECONDARY CONSPIRACY TO COVER UP THE CONDITIONS AT JONESTOWN.

THE DEFENDANT CONTENDS THAT THE FEDERAL RULE OF
EVIDENCE 104(A) REQUIRES A FINDING OF A CONSPIRACY BY A
PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE AS A PREDICATE TO ADMISSIBILITY.
AS WE HAVE PREVIOUSLY NOTED, THIS ARGUMENT IS INCONSISTENT WITH
THE STANDARDS REPEATEDLY AND CONSISTENTLY APPLIED BY THE 9TH
CIRCUIT, WHICH REQUIRES ONLY PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF THE
CONSPIRACY. THE DEFENDANT ALSO ARGUES THAT THE SPEECH SHOULD
HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED UNDER FEDERAL RULE OF EVIDENCE 403. WE HAVE
ALREADY ADDRESSED THIS ISSUE AND THERE IS NO REASON TO
RECONSIDER OUR PREVIOUS RULING.

WITH RESPECT TO THE CHARLES GARRY STATEMENT, THE
DEFENDANT ARGUES THAT GARRY'S TESTIMONY REGARDING JONES'S
STATEMENTS TO HIM WERE IMPROPERLY ADMITTED AS A DECLARATION
AGAINST INTEREST. ACCORDING TO THE DEFENDANT, THIS COURT FAILED
TO APPLY THE PRESUMPTION OF UNRELIABILITY FOR STATEMENTS AGAINST
INTEREST WHICH INCULPATE ANOTHER. SEE LEE V. ILLINOIS, A
SUPREME COURT CASE, 106 S.CT 2056, JUNE 30, 1986.

THIS ISSUE WAS BRIEFED, ARGUED AND DECIDED DURING THE TRIAL, AND WE FOUND THAT THE PRESUMPTION OF UNRELIABILITY APPLIES ONLY TO CUSTODIAL CONFESSIONS AFTER ARREST, BECAUSE IN THAT SITUATION THERE EXISTS A MOTIVE TO SHIFT BLAME TO ANOTHER.

THUS, LEE IS INAPPLICABLE HERE.

THE DEFENDANT FURTHER CONTENDS THAT HE WAS NEVER ACCURDED A RULE 104(A) HEARING TO DETERMINE THE FACTS UPON WHICH ADMISSIBILITY OF THE JONES STATEMENT WAS BASED. THE DEFENDANT CONTENDS THAT HE MIGHT HAVE DEMONSTRATED AT SUCH A HEARING THAT THE STATEMENT WAS NOT IN FACT AGAINST JONES'S INTEREST WHEN MADE. HOWEVER, AS THE GOVERNMENT POINTS OUT, THIS COURT HAD THE BENEFIT OF HAVING HEARD THE EVIDENCE AND CROSS-EXAMINATION AT THE FIRST TRIAL. ON THE BASIS OF THAT TESTIMONY AND THE NINTH CIRCUIT'S DECISION REGARDING THE GARRY STATEMENT, THE COURT PROPERLY CONCLUDED THAT THERE WAS NO REAL NEED FOR A 104(A) HEARING TO DETERMINE ADMISSIBILITY.

NOW, WITH RESPECT TO THE KANSINALLY STATEMENT. THE DEFENSE CONTENDS THAT THE COURT SHOULD HAVE EXCLUDED ON CONFRONTATION CLAUSE AND RULE 403 GROUNDS HIS STATEMENT THAT LAYTON SAID: "I SHOT THE BLANK." THE CONFRONTATION CLAUSE HAS CLEARLY NOT BEEN VIOLATED BECAUSE THE DEFENSE HAD FULL OPPORTUNITY TO CROSS-EXAMINE KANSINALLY.

FURTHERMORE. AS NOTED ABOVE, THE COURT WENT OUT OF ITS WAY TO ACCOMMODATE THE DEFENSE BY ADMITTING THE PREVIOUS TESTIMONY OF LILADRIE AND PERSAUD IN GUYANA TO IMPEACH KANSINALLY'S STATEMENT. HAVING ADMITTED THAT PREVIOUS TESTIMONY, THE PREJUDICIAL NATURE OF THE STATEMENT WAS MINIMIZED AND THE COURT PROPERLY REFUSED TO APPLY RULE 403.

> WITH RESPECT TO THE DEFENDANT'S CONFESSION: THE

24

25

1

2

3

7

B

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DEFENSE ARGUES THAT THE COURT IMPROPERLY REFUSED TO GRANT A
HEARING BEFORE THE JURY ON THE VOLUNTARINESS OF HIS CONFESSION
WHEN THE CONFESSION WAS INTRODUCED DURING THE GOVERNMENT'S CASE.
ACCORDING TO THE DEFENSE, THE DEFENDANT IS DEPRIVED OF THE
STATUTORY RIGHT IN TITLE 18 UNITED STATES CODE SECTION 3501 TO
HAVE THE JURY HEAR EVIDENCE ON THE VOLUNTARINESS ISSUE IF HE
DECIDES TO REST ON THE WEAKNESS OF THE GOVERNMENT'S CASE.
HOWEVER, THERE IS NOTHING IN TITLE 18 UNITED STATES CODE SECTION
3501 TO SUPPORT THIS NOVEL ARGUMENT AND IT SHOULD BE REJECTED.

THE DEFENDANT CITES NO AUTHORITY FOR THE PROPOSITION

THAT A MINI-HEARING ON THE VOLUNTARINESS OF A CONFESSION MUST BE HELD IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY DURING THE GOVERNMENT'S CASE IN CHIEF.

NOW, WITH REGARD TO AMENDMENT OF THE INDICTMENT BY JURY INSTRUCTIONS. THE INDICTMENT IN THIS CASE CHARGED THE DEFENDANT WITH CONSPIRING WITH NAMED PERSONS, AS WELL AS WITH PERSONS BOTH KNOWN AND UNKNOWN TO THE GRAND JURY. IN THE INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY, THE COURT STATED THAT THE JURY COULD FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY IF IT FOUND THAT HE CONSPIRED WITH PERSONS WHETHER NAMED IN THE INDICTMENT OR NOT.

THE DEFENDANT ARGUES THAT THIS INSTRUCTION DEPRIVED HIM
OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO BE TRIED ONLY ON THE INDICTMENT
OF A GRAND JURY. HE CONTENDS THAT THE BILL OF PARTICULARS
IDENTIFYING ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE CONSPIRACY IS INSUFFICIENT
TO OVERCOME THE CONSTITUTIONAL DEFICIENCY BECAUSE A BILL OF

PARTICULARS DOES NOT AMEND THE INDICTMENT TO SUPPLY A FINDING OF PROBABLE CAUSE NECESSARY TO MEET CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS. SEE RUSSELL VERSUS UNITED STATES, 369 U.S. 749.

HOWEVER, THE DEFENDANT'S ARGUMENT IN THIS CASE WOULD MAKE IT VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR A DEFENDANT EVER TO BE CONVICTED FOR A CONSPIRACY INVOLVING MEMBERS WHOSE IDENTITIES WERE NOT ALL KNOWN TO THE GRAND JURY.

FURTHERMORE, ON THE EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE, IT CANNOT PLAUSIBLY BE ARGUED THAT THE TRIAL JURY FOUND LAYTON GUILTY OF A CONSPIRACY TO MURDER RYAN AND DWYER OTHER THAN THE ONE THAT THE GRAND JURY HAD IN MIND. THERE SIMPLY WAS NO EVIDENCE OF ANY CONSPIRACY TO MURDER RYAN AND DWYER INDEPENDENT OF AND UNRELATED TO THE CONSPIRACY CHARGED BY THE GRAND JURY.

FURTHERMORE, THE INDICTMENT IN THIS CASE SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED A NUMBER OF OVERT ACTS, AND THE JURY WAS INSTRUCTED THAT IN ORDER TO REACH A VERDICT OF GUILT, IT HAD TO FIND ONE OF THESE OVERT ACTS TO HAVE BEEN CARRIED OUT IN FURTHERANCE OF THE CONSPIRACY FOR WHICH LAYTON WAS CHARGED.

UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, IT CANNOT REASONABLY BE ARGUED THAT LAYTON MIGHT HAVE BEEN CONVICTED FOR A CONSPIRACY OTHER THAN THE ONE FOR WHICH THE GRAND JURY FOUND PROBABLE CAUSE TO EXIST. THE MOTION IS DENIED.

MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL NOTWITHSTANDING THE VERDICT. THE DEFENSE CONTENDS THAT THE JURY'S VERDICT MUST BE SET ASIDE BECAUSE, AS A MATTER OF LAW, THE EVIDENCE WAS

CONSISTENT WITH THE REASONABLE INFERENCE THAT LAYTON DID NOT HAVE THE SPECIFIC INTENT TO COMMIT THE CRIMES CHARGED.

THE DEFENDANT POINTS OUT THAT THE JURY WAS INSTRUCTED
TO ADOPT THE INFERENCE OF INNOCENCE IF THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL
EVIDENCE WAS EQUALLY SUSCEPTIBLE TO REASONABLE INFERENCES OF
BOTH GUILT AND INNOCENCE. HE REQUESTS THIS COURT TO HOLD AS A
MATTER OF LAW THAT THERE WAS AN EQUALLY REASONABLE INFERENCE
FROM THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE THAT LAYTON LACKED THE SPECIFIC
INTENT TO COMMIT THE CRIMES CHARGED.

ALTHOUGH THE DEFENSE ARGUED AT TRIAL THAT THE EVIDENCE WAS REASONABLY SUSCEPTIBLE TO AN EQUALLY PLAUSIBLE INFERENCE THAT LAYTON HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OF THE CONSPIRACY TO MURDER RYAN, THAT ARGUMENT WAS APPARENTLY REJECTED BY THE JURY. IN ORDER TO GRANT THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT NOTWITHSTANDING THE VERDICT, WE WOULD HAVE TO FIND THAT THE JURY WAS UNREASONABLE IN SO CONCLUDING. BASED UPON THE EVIDENCE ADDUCED AT TRIAL, SUCH A CONCLUSION IS NOT WARRANTED AND THE MOTION SHOULD THEREFORE BE DENIED.

IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE AS A FOOTNOTE THAT THIS

GROUND OF THIS MOTION IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE CONTENTION OF THE

DEFENDANT'S PRESENT COUNSEL THAT THE EVIDENCE AGAINST LAYTON WAS

SO OVERWHELMING THAT ONLY GUILT COULD BE INFERRED. THAT IS IN

SUPPORT OF THE ARGUMENT THAT THE DEFENSE SHOULD HAVE PUT ON

FURTHER EVIDENCE.

SO THAT CONCLUDES THE RULINGS ON THE MOTIONS. WE NOW

PROCEED TO THE SENTENCING. AND I UNDERSTAND THAT, MR. BRYAN,

YOU HAVE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO READ THE PROBATION REPORT AND ALL

OF THE ATTACHMENTS AND YOU HAVE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO STUDY THE

TRANSCRIPT OF THE TRIAL, AND WE NOW CAN PROCEED WITH THE

SENTENCING. DO YOU DESIRE TO ADDRESS THE COURT AT THIS TIME?

MR. BRYAN: YES, I DO.

THE COURT: CERTAINLY. YOU MAY.

MR. BRYAN: YOUR HONOR, IF IT MAY PLEASE THE COURT,

MR. BRYAN: YOUR HONOR, IF IT MAY PLEASE THE COURT,
THIS IS A VERY UNUSUAL CASE. I THINK THE COURT WILL RECOGNIZE
THAT THERE NEVER HAS BEEN A CASE LIKE THIS I DON'T THINK IN THE
ANNALS OF AMERICA JURISPRUDENCE.

PROCEDURALLY, JUST AS A MATTER OF LAW, WHAT I SEE IN
THIS CASE SINCE I HAVE COME INTO IT I CONSIDER RATHER UNIQUE.

CONCERNING SENTENCING, NORMALLY A COURT SITTING IN THE POSITION
YOU ARE THIS MORNING WOULD HAVE BEFORE IT AN ENTIRE TRIAL
RECORD, WHICH WOULD INCLUDE DEFENSE EVIDENCE. IN THIS CASE---

THE COURT: OF COURSE NORMALLY, 90 PERCENT OF THE CASES
WE DISPOSE OF ARE ON PLEAS OF GUILTY.

MR. BRYAN: THIS CASE IS DIFFERENT. THIS CASE WENT TO TRIAL BEFORE A JURY, YOUR HONOR. UNFORTUNATELY, NO DEFENSE WAS PUT ON SO A LOT OF EVIDENCE---

THE COURT: THAT WE ARE GOING TO ADDRESS AT A HEARING
THAT WE ARE GOING TO SET.

MR. BRYAN: I UNDERSTAND THAT, YOUR HONOR. BUT EVEN
THOUGH THERE IS A LACK OF DEFENSIVE EVIDENCE BEFORE THIS COURT,

1 TH 2 PR 3 EQ 4 S1 5 PR 6 PC 7 CC 8 WC

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE PRESENTENCE REPORT SUBMITTED BY MR. BUDDRESS OF THE PROBATION OFFICE, I WOULD SUBMIT, IS I THINK VERY CLOSE TO BEING EQUIVALENT TO A WELL WRITTEN BOOK. IT SEEMS TO COVER THE ENTIRE SITUATION FROM NOT ONLY THE DEFENSE PERSPECTIVE, BUT ALSO THE PROSECUTION PERSPECTIVE VERY ADEQUATELY. AND I THINK IT POSTURES BOTH POSITIONS. MR. BUDDRESS HAS PRESENTED TO THE COURT EVEN SUMMARIES OF PSYCHIATRIC TESTIMONY WHICH OTHERWISE WOULD NOT BE BEFORE THIS COURT. HE HAS POINTED OUT TO THIS COURT——

THE COURT: THE REPORTS ARE ALSO BEFORE THE COURT.

MR. BRYAN: YES. THERE WERE OVER 60 LETTERS RECEIVED BY THE PROBATION OFFICE CONVEYED TO THE COURT WHICH ASKED THAT MR. LAYTON NOT BE IMPRISONED. THEY ASK FOR LENIENCY. WHAT IS UNUSUAL ABOUT THE LETTERS RECEIVED BY THE COURT, I SUBMIT, IS NOT ONLY THE LARGE NUMBER, BUT ALSO THAT HIS HONOR HAS BEFORE HIM LETTERS FROM MEMBERS OF THE JURY, PEOPLE WHO WERE ON THE JURY WHO IN ESSENCE FELT THAT EVEN THOUGH THEY HAD NO CHOICE BUT TO FIND MR. LAYTON GUILTY—AND I BELIEVE AT LEAST ONE EVEN INDICATED THAT HAD THERE BEEN SOME EVIDENCE PRESENTED AS TO MENTAL STATE AND HIS SANITY PLEA THAT THAT JUROR WOULD HAVE VOTED DIFFERENTLY. THE POINT IS THAT EVEN PEOPLE WHO SAT ON THIS JURY HAVE ASKED THIS COURT TO BE LENIENT; TO BEAR IN MIND THAT LARRY LAYTON IN THIS CASE WAS AS MUCH A VICTIM AS THOSE 914 PEOPLE WHO DIED ON NOVEMBER 18, 1978.

AND I DO NOT ENVY THE COURT IN THE POSITION AND

DECISION YOU MUST MAKE THIS MORNING. IT IS A VERY DIFFICULT

ONE. THE COURT SHOULD BEAR IN MIND THAT THE DEFENSE DOES NOT AT

ALL UNDERESTIMATE THE SERIOUSNESS OF THIS CASE. THIS IS A CASE

IN WHICH MR. LAYTON IS ACCUSED OF CONSPIRING TO KILL TWO PEOPLE.

ONE OF THOSE PEOPLE WAS A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS,

CONGRESSMAN LEO RYAN, AND HE DIED, APPARENTLY FROM WHAT WE KNOW,

A VERY BRUTAL DEATH.

EVEN THOUGH THE PROSECUTION HAS NOT CONTENDED THAT

MR. LAYTON—AND OF COURSE THE EVIDENCE IS TOTALLY TO THE

CONTRARY—THAT MR. LAYTON ACTUALLY KILLED CONGRESSMAN RYAN, THE

POINT IS THAT THE MAGNITUDE OF THE TRAGEDY IN THIS CASE IS

ALMOST BEYOND COMPREHENSION. THE FACT THAT SO MANY PEOPLE DIED

APPARENTLY BY SUICIDE, SOME PEOPLE WHO KILLED THEMSELVES IN A

VERY BRUTAL MANNER, SUCH AS SHARON AMOS, PEOPLE WHOSE THROATS

WERE CUT. ONE PERSON WAS HEARD ASKING HER MOTHER, "CUT HARDER.

CUT DEEPER."

IT IS DIFFICULT TO IMAGINE, YOUR HONOR, IN THE SURROUNDING OF THE TRANQUILITY OF THIS COURTROOM HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO WHAT LIFE MUST HAVE BEEN LIKE IN GUYANA IN JONESTOWN UNDER JIM JONES.

IN REACHING A DECISION IN THIS COURT I SUBMIT THAT THE COURT MUST FIRST LOOK AT LARRY LAYTON AND HOW DID LARRY LAYTON COME TO BE IN GUYANA IN NOVEMBER OF 1978. WHAT LED HIM TO THAT POINT, WHAT KIND OF PERSON IS LARRY LAYTON.

THE COURT, I SUBMIT, ALSO NEEDS TO LOOK AT JIM JONES

AND WHAT KIND OF PERSON HE WAS AND WHAT AFFECT HE HAD ON THOSE MANY TRAGEDIES THAT OCCURRED THAT DAY IN 1978. AND THEN I SUBMIT THAT THE COURT MUST DECIDE WHERE DO YOU DRAW A LINE. HAS MR. LAYTON BEEN PUNISHED ALREADY? IF HE HAS, TO WHAT DEGREE? AND THEN AT WHAT POINT DO YOU DRAW THE LINE AND SAY HE HAS SUFFERED ENOUGH.

LOOKING AT MR. LAYTON, YOUR HONOR, I WOULD ASK THE
COURT TO BEAR IN MIND THAT HE COMES FROM A FAMILY THAT IS A
FAMILY THAT I THINK WE ALL WOULD ENVY. HIS FATHER IS A
NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED SCIENTIST, VERY WELL THOUGHT OF IN HIS
FIELD. HIS MOTHER WAS A JEWISH REFUGEE WHO FLED EUROPE WHO CAME
TO THIS COUNTRY. LARRY WAS RAISED IN A QUAKER FAMILY, IN A
PASSIVIST ENVIRONMENT. LARRY WAS RAISED IN AN ENVIRONMENT, A
FAMILY THAT FELT VERY STRONGLY ABOUT THE EVILS OF RACISM AND
BIGOTRY AND OPPRESSION OF PEOPLE OF ANY TYPES. AND THIS IS THE
ATMOSPHERE HE GREW UP IN.

OUTSTANDING, YOUR HONOR, AS IS SET OUT IN THE PROBATION REPORT.

THEY HAVE ALL DONE VERY WELL. TWO OF THEM--- ONE OF THEM AND

HER HUSBAND WERE AT ONE POINT IN PEOPLES TEMPLE AND THEY HAD THE

STRENGTH TO FINALLY GET OUT. AND SO THEY ARE HERE TODAY RATHER

THAN BURIED AS THOSE MANY OTHER PEOPLE WHO DIED IN JONESTOWN.

LARRY LAYTON WENT TO COLLEGE, U.C. DAVIS. HE WASH'T AN OUTSTANDING STUDENT. HE WASH'T A TERRIBLE STUDENT. HE WAS AVERAGE. BUT LARRY LAYTON'S EARLIER LIFE WAS MARKED BY A LOT OF

FAILURE. IT SEEMS THAT HIS TWO SISTERS AND HIS BROTHER WERE ALL STARS, VERY BRIGHT PEOPLE AND, AS I SAID, VERY SUCCESSFUL. HIS BROTHER IS A HARVARD GRADUATE. HE IS A PH.D. ME IS ON THE FACULTY OF A UNIVERSITY HERE IN THE BAY AREA. ME HAS A SISTER WHO IS A FINANCIAL PLANNER. HE HAS ANOTHER SISTER WHO IS VERY OUTSTANDING, SHE AND HER HUSBAND. AND APPARENTLY THAT WAS THE WAY IT WAS WITH THESE SIBLINGS AS THEY WERE GROWING UP, EXCEPT FOR LARRY. LARRY EVEN FAILED THE FIRST GRADE, WHICH IS INCREDIBLE FROM MY EXPERIENCE HOW ANYBODY COULD FAIL THE FIRST GRADE.

HE FINALLY GOT SOME HELP FROM A MEMBER OF THE FAMILY AND HE BEGAN TO GET HIS LIFE STRAIGHT. BUT IT SEEMS LIKE HIS EARLIER LIFE WAS MARKED BY FAILURE, SURROUNDED BY PEOPLE WHO WERE ALL SUCCESSFUL; AN UNUSUALLY TALENTED MOTHER, A VERY TALENTED FATHER, SISTERS AND A BROTHER WHO ALL WERE VERY OUTSTANDING.

SOMETHING. HE WANTED IN HIS LIFE TO MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO DO SOMETHING WORTHWHILE WITH HIS LIFE. HE MET A LADY WHO HE FELL IN LOVE WITH AND HE MARRIED—CAROLYN. CAROLYN'S FATHER WAS A MINISTER. IT SEEMED LIKE A VERY GOOD THING, AND THEY MOVED TO NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, UP IN THE NORTHERN PART OF THE STATE, AND THERE HE CROSSED PATHS WITH JIM JONES, THE PEOPLES TEMPLE.

THIS WAS DURING THE VIET NAM ERA. LARRY, BEING A

PASSIVIST, ONE RAISED IN THE QUAKER TRADITION HAD HAD DIFFICULTY

ASSOCIATED FEDERAL REPORTERS, SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 415-863-4211

SEEKING CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR STATUS. JIM JONES CAME ALONG AND ALMOST WITH A SNAP OF THE FINGER ACHIEVED WHAT APPEARED TO BE IMPOSSIBLE AND SUDDENLY AT THAT POINT IN LARRY'S EYES HERE WAS A PERSON WHO COULD DO JUST ABOUT THE IMPOSSIBLE, A PERSON WHO WAS A FATHER——WHO BECAME A FATHER TO HIM, AS HE DID TO MANY OTHER PEOPLE IN THE TEMPLE.

LARRY SUDDENLY HAD A FAMILY THAT ACCEPTED HIM, THAT
CARED ABOUT HIM. AND, MOST IMPORTANTLY, WHAT ATTRACTED LARRY
WAS THE FACT THAT JIM JONES PREACHED THE THINGS THAT LARRY WAS
RAISED TO BELIEVE WERE VERY IMPORTANT, AND LARRY AT LAST HAD AN
OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE HIS MARK IN LIFE; AND THAT WAS TO DO
SOMETHING IN FIGHTING RACIAL INJUSTICE AND INEQUALITY AND
INEQUITIES IN OUR SOCIETY. THAT WAS ALL OFFERED BY PEOPLES
TEMPLE.

I THINK IT IS INTERESTING TO BEAR IN MIND THAT LARRY
WAS ONLY ONE OF MANY, MANY, MANY PEOPLE INFLUENCED AND PUT UNDER
THE SPELL CAST BY JIM JONES AND THE PEOPLES TEMPLE. HIS HONOR
MIGHT RECALL THAT LATER WHEN THE TEMPLE MOVED TO SAN FRANCISCO
THAT THERE WERE PEOPLE, LIKE THE LATE MAYOR GEORGE MOSCONE WHO
WAS A SUPPORTER, THE MAYOR OF LOS ANGELES BRADLEY, TOM BRADLEY.
EVEN A VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. THE WIFE OF A
PRESIDENT WAS A SUPPORTER. WILLIE BROWN WAS A SUPPORTER. THE
LIST ALMOST SEEMS ENDLESS OF PEOPLE WHO WE CONSIDER PROMINENT IN
OUR SOCIETY WHO WERE ALSO DUPED BY JIM JONES.

EVENTUALLY WHEN THE TEMPLE MOVED TO GUYANA, LARRY

REMAINED HERE IN THE STATES WORKING IN THE BAY AREA. ONE NEEDS
TO BEAR IN MIND THAT THROUGH ALL OF THESE MANY YEARS THAT
EVERYTHING LARRY MADE, HIS INCOME, ALL WENT TO PEOPLES TEMPLE.
HE WAS GIVEN AN ALLOWANCE BACK. AND APPARENTLY THIS WAS THE
MODUS OPERANDI OF THE PEOPLES TEMPLE WITH MANY, MANY, MANY OF
ITS MEMBERS.

MORNING WAS DOWN IN GUYANA. DEBRA IS VERY DIFFERENT FROM LARRY
IN THAT SHE IS A VERY OUTGOING, A VERY DYNAMIC TYPE PERSON WHERE
LARRY IS A MUCH MORE PASSIVE, QUIET, HUMBLE TYPE OF INDIVIDUAL.
DEBRA BEGAN TO SEE SOME THINGS AND REALIZED THAT SHE NEEDED TO
GET OUT. SHE BEGAN TO SEE JIM JONES FOR WHAT HE WAS. SHE
FINALLY WAS ABLE TO ESCAPE.

WHEN SHE CAME TO THIS COUNTRY, AS THE COURT IS PROBABLY AWARE, SHE SUBMITTED AN AFFIDAVIT TO CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS. SHE ALSO WAS IN CONTACT WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT. SHE PREDICTED THE TRAGEDY THAT WOULD OCCUR IN JONESTOWN. BUT THE GOVERNMENT WOULD NOT LISTEN. HER PLEAS WERE NOT TAKEN SERIOUSLY. THEY WERE IGNORED.

FINALLY CONGRESSMAN LEO RYAN, AFTER BEING CONTACTED

AGAIN AND AGAIN BY FAMILY MEMBERS OF PEOPLE WHO WERE DOWN IN

JONESTOWN, DECIDED TO GO DOWN. BY THIS TIME LARRY LAYTON WAS IN

GUYANA BECAUSE WHEN HIS SISTER LEFT, JONES SENT OUT THE WORD FOR

LARRY TO LEAVE HIS JOB IN THE BAY AREA AND COME DOWN TO

JONESTOWN. AND OF COURSE THIS WAS, AGAIN, A PART OF REV. JIM

JONES METHOD OF OPERATION, AND THAT WAS TO KEEP A MEMBER OF THE FAMILY ALMOST, IF YOU WILL, HOSTAGE, TO HAVE SOME CONTROL OR A LOT OF CONTROL OVER THE REST OF THE FAMILY AND THEIR CONDUCT.

DEBRA LEFT. SO LARRY CAME DOWN. HE WAS THE SUBSTITUTE FOR DEBRA.

WHEN LARRY ARRIVED IN JONESTOWN HE FOUND THAT HIS
MOTHER WAS DYING OF CANCER. HE DISCOVERED THAT AND WAS LED TO
BELIEVE BY JIM JONES THAT THE REASON HIS MOTHER WAS DYING—AND
IT IS A VERY PAINFUL DEATH THE WAY SHE DIED—WAS BECAUSE OF
DEBRA, BECAUSE DEBRA HAD DEFECTED, BECAUSE SHE HAD LEFT AND,
THEREFORE, JONES HAD LOST THE POWER. HE COULD NO LONGER HEAL
HER AS HE DID PREVIOUSLY. AND SO SHE WAS DYING THIS HORRIBLE
DEATH.

IN THIS CASE LARRY'S MOTHER DIED. THERE IS AN OVERWHELMING
AMOUNT OF EVIDENCE FROM PEOPLE WHO WERE THERE THAT AFTER HIS
MOTHER DIED THAT LARRY WAS IN EFFECT A ZOMBI; THAT HE BECAME
LIKE A VEGETABLE. THAT PEOPLE WOULD SEE HIM JUST SITTING AROUND
TOTALLY IMMOBILE FOR GREAT PERIODS OF TIME.

IT IS OBVIOUS FROM HIS PSYCHIATRIC REPORTS, WHICH ARE REFERENCED IN THE PROBATION REPORT, PRESENTENCE REPORT, THAT THE DEATH OF LARRY'S MOTHER, MRS. LISA LAYTON, HAD A DEVASTATING EFFECT UPON HIM. MIX WITH THAT THE FACT THAT JIM JONES HAD PLACED LARRY ON NARCOTICS, ELAVIL, A NARCOTIC WHICH AFFECTS NOT ONLY ONE'S CONTACT WITH REALITY, BUT EVEN HAS A BEARING,

1 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT, UPON ONE'S MEMORY RECALL.

ALREADY IN THAT BREW IS THE FACT THAT LARRY HAD BEEN UNDER THE CONTROL OF FATHER, GOD, JESUS, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS JIM JONES, FOR MANY YEARS. AND HE WAS STILL UNDER HIS SPELL. LARRY WAS NO DIFFERENT THAN HUNDREDS AND HUNDREDS OF OTHER PEOPLE TRAGICALLY AT JONESTOWN.

IT SEEMS, YOUR HONOR, THAT JIM JONES WAS THE ULTIMATE EVIL PERSON. THE EVIL HE CAUSED, THE HARM HE CAUSED TO SO MANY PEOPLE--I CAN'T HELP BUT THINK OF THE HUMILIATION THAT LARRY WENT THROUGH AT TIMES WHEN JIM JONES WOULD BE URINATING AND HE WOULD HAVE LARRY HOLDING A CUP. THE HONOR OF LARRY BEING ABLE TO CARRY OFF THE CUP AND DISPOSE OF JONES'S URINE. THE DEGRADING--THE MANNER IN WHICH HE DEGRADED LARRY AND SO MANY OTHER PEOPLE.

THE FACT THAT LARRY'S FIRST WIFE CAROLYN WAS TAKEN AWAY
FROM HIM BY JIM JONES. HIS SECOND WIFE KAREN WAS TAKEN AWAY
FROM LARRY BY JIM JONES. AND WHEN LARRY WOULD COMPLAIN, JONES
WOULD TELL HIM AND THE OTHER PEOPLE IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE
TEMPLE WOULD TELL HIM, "WELL, IT IS NOT JIM JONES WHO IS DOING
ANYTHING WRONG. IT IS YOU. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO HAS THE
WEAKNESSES. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO IS INFERIOR. YOU NEED TO
STRAIGHTEN YOUR LIFE OUT."

BY THE TIME LARRY LAYTON ARRIVED IN JONESTOWN WE HAVE A PERSON WHO HAD A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF GUILT, WHO WAS SEEKING TO GAIN ACCEPTANCE BY FATHER, JIM JONES, AS WAS SO MANY OTHER OF

THOSE TRAGIC FIGURES. IT SEEMS THAT LARRY WAS NO MORE THAN A PAWN ON A CHESS BOARD, YOUR HONOR, TO BE MANUEVERED AROUND BY JIM JONES AND HIS LEADERS.

IT IS INTERESTING THAT EVEN PROSECUTION WITHESSES,

PEOPLE WHO TESTIFIED AT TRIAL, FEEL THAT LARRY IS A PERSON TO BE

PITIED. TOM BOGUE SAID: "HE WAS JUST AS MUCH A VICTIM, IF NOT

MORE SO, THAN WAS I. IF I WERE IN HIS SHOES, I PROBABLY WOULD

HAVE DONE THE SAME THING."

HAROLD CORDELL SAID: "I THINK HE," REFERRING TO LARRY,

"HAS PAID FOR WHAT HAPPENED TO HIM. I BELIEVE HE WAS MORE A

VICTIM THAN A PARTICIPANT."

AND, OF COURSE, MR. CORDELL, AS SO MANY OTHER PEOPLE, REALIZED AND VIEWED LARRY AS A FOLLOWER, NOT A LEADER.

EVEN MR. DWYER MENTIONED THAT THE TRAGEDY AT JONESTOWN AND WHAT HAPPENED AT THE AIRSTRIP WOULD HAVE OCCURRED WITH OR WITHOUT MR. LAYTON. AND MR. DWYER REFERRED TO LARRY AS A VERY SMALL COG IN A BIG WHEEL.

VERNON GOSNEY TOLD US THAT IT WAS A CLOSED COMMUNITY.

AND THAT HE, MR. LAYTON, WAS EXTREMELY—VERY MUCH IN NEED OF THE APPROVAL OF JIM JONES. MR. GOSNEY SAID THAT "I SEE HIM AS A TOTALLY BASICALLY DESTROYED PERSON. AND I DON'T FEEL THAT HE IS A THREAT TO ANYONE."

OF COURSE, THERE ARE MANY, MANY OTHER PEOPLE WHO SAY

BASICALLY THE SAME THING ABOUT LARRY; THAT HE WAS A SMALL COG IN

A BIG WHEEL.

THERE IS, AS I MENTIONED, A WEALTH OF EVIDENCE THAT HIS WHOLE STATE OF MIND DURING THE PERIOD IN JONESTOWN WAS THAT MARKED BY A LACK OF CONTACT WITH REALITY, TOTALLY SUBMISSIVE, AS WAS SO MANY OTHER PEOPLE, AS WAS INDICATED BY THE MASS SUICIDE, TOTALLY UNDER THE CONTROL OF JIM JONES.

WE ARE TALKING ABOUT A PERSON WHO IT APPEARS HARDLY HAD ENOUGH SENSE TO GET OUT OF A SHOWER OF RAIN DURING THAT PERIOD. IT SEEMS IF THERE WAS ONE STRAW THAT BROKE THE CAMEL'S BACK IT WOULD HAVE BEEN HIS MOTHER'S DEATH. OF COURSE, AS I MENTIONED, STIRRED INTO THAT BREW THE DRUGS AND YOU HAVE A VERY DISORIENTED HUMAN BEING.

PSYCHIATRISTS AT TRIAL, THEIR REPORTS HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED AND MR. BUDDRESS HAS REFERENCED KEY PORTIONS OF THEIR REPORTS FOR HIS HONOR'S BENEFIT.

ONE PSYCHIATRIST, DR. TANAY, EXPLAINED THAT LARRY'S

LIFE HAD BEEN DOMINATED BY TWO FATHERS--HIS NATURAL FATHER AND,

OF COURSE, THE OTHER, JIM JONES.

MANIPULATING PEOPLE. AND HE TALKED ABOUT THE FACT THAT LARRY LAYTON HAD LOST THE CAPACITY OF JUDGMENT, HIS REALITY TESTING WAS UNDERMINED AND HE ACCEPTED THE MOST IRRATIONAL EXPLANATIONS AS REASONABLE. WHEN ORDERED TO PROCEED TO JONESTOWN SUBSEQUENT TO HIS SISTER'S DEFECTION, HE DID SO WITHOUT ANY PROTEST. "I CONCLUDE IN STATING THAT I AM OF THE OPINION AT THE TIME WHEN HE

COMMITTED THE CRIMINAL ACTS HE SUFFERED FROM A DISEASE OF THE MIND WHICH RENDERED HIM UNABLE TO APPRECIATE THE WRONGFULNESS OF HIS BEHAVIOR AND UNABLE TO ADHERE TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAW."

DOCTOR JOHN CLARK, ANOTHER PSYCHIATRIST, SAID THAT

MR. LAYTON, BECAUSE OF A MENTAL DISEASE, LACKED A SUBSTANTIAL

CAPACITY TO CONFORM HIS JUDGMENT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAW

OR TO APPRECIATE THE WRONGFULNESS OF HIS CONDUCT.

IN OTHER WORDS, LARRY LAYTON, IN HIS OPINION, NOT ONLY FROM A MEDICAL VIEWPOINT, AS DR. TANAY, BUT FROM A LEGAL STANDPOINT, WAS LEGALLY INSANE ON NOVEMBER 18, 1978. HE SAID: "HONESTLY MR. LAYTON WAS UNABLE TO APPRECIATE THE WRONGFULNESS OF HIS ACTIONS. HE DID NOT THINK ABOUT RIGHT OR WRONG."

AND, OF COURSE, DOCTOR CLARK, AS THE OTHER—SOME OF THE OTHER DOCTORS WENT THROUGH LARRY'S ENTIRE BACKGROUND, THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR STATUS, THE MIRACLE PERFORMED BY JIM JONES IN GAINING THAT FOR LARRY LAYTON AND HOW THAT AFFECTED LARRY LAYTON. AND HE TALKED ABOUT LARRY LAYTON'S LOW SELF—ESTEEM AND SENSE OF BEING A FAILURE AND HIS CHRONIC DEPENDANCY ON OTHERS TO GIVE HIM FEELINGS OF SELF—WORTH.

IN ESSENCE, AS DOCTOR CLARK SAID, JIM JONES OFFERED LARRY LAYTON SOLUTIONS TO MANY, IF NOT, ALL OF HIS PROBLEMS.

AND, OF COURSE, DOCTOR CLARK STATED WHAT IS OBVIOUS, I THINK, TO US ALL, BUT I THINK IT IS GOOD TO BEAR IN MIND NOW, AND MAYBE TU REPEAT IT, THAT THE SUICIDES AND MURDER OF OVER 900 MEN, WOMEN

AND CHILDREN TESTIFIED TO THE FACT THAT LARRY LAYTON'S FOCUSED STATE OF MIND WAS NOT UNUSUAL IN THE PEOPLES TEMPLE. JIM JONES TOLD THOSE HUNDREDS OF PEOPLE THAT DAY DIE, AND THEY DIED.

THAT LARRY LAYTON WAS SUFFERING A SEVERE IMPAIRMENT OF CONSCIOUS FUNCTIONING; THAT HIS NORMAL TEMPORAL ORIENTATION WAS DISTURBED SUFFICIENTLY TO RENDER HIM INCAPABLE OF ANALYTIC REASONING. HE SAID HE WAS SUFFERING FROM A SEVERE STATE OF REACTIVE DEPRESSION THAT AFFECTED HIS DAILY FUNCTIONING AND CONSTITUTED A MENTAL DEFECT. HE SAID THAT LARRY LAYTON WAS AN UNWITTING CAPTIVE OF THE TOTAL ENVIRONMENT CREATED BY JIM JONES. HE TALKED ABOUT MASS PARANOID DELUSIONS. AND LARRY WAS ONLY ONE, AS WE ALL KNOW, OF HUNDREDS OF PEOPLE WHO WERE CONTROLLED BY THIS MASS PARANOID DELUSION.

WE ARE TALKING ABOUT DISTORTION OF REALITY, YOUR HONOR, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT MASS PSYCHOSIS UNPRECEDENTED.

HE OPINED, AS DID OTHER PSYCHIATRISTS, THAT LARRY
LAYTON WAS NOT ABLE TO APPRECIATE THE WRONGFULNESS OF HIS ACTION
AND HE LACKED SUBSTANTIAL CAPACITY TO CONFORM HIS PUBLIC CONDUCT
TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAW. HE TALKED ABOUT THE FACT THAT
LARRY HAD SUFFERED A BREAKDOWN IN HIS MENTAL CAPACITY, WHICH OF
COURSE AFFECTED HIS ABILITY TO APPRECIATE THE WRONGFULNESS OF
ANY OF HIS ACTIONS.

JONES AND HIS LIEUTENANTS HAD DECIDED THAT RATHER THAN LARRY

DYING THERE DRINKING THE POISON WITH THE HUNDREDS OF OTHER PEOPLE THAT HE WAS TO DIE IN THAT SMALL AIRPLANE.

EVEN A PROSECUTION PSYCHIATRIST, DOCTOR MICHAEL P.

MALONEY, STATED AND CONCLUDED THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS NOT—HE

SAID THAT AS A RESULT OF—HE FELT THAT EVEN THOUGH THE DEFENDANT

WAS NOT SUFFERING FROM MENTAL DISEASE, HE, HOWEVER, SAID THAT HE

WAS INCAPABLE OF KNOWING AND WILLFULLY BECOMING A MEMBER OF A

CONSPIRACY TO KILL CONGRESSMAN RYAN AND ATTEMPT TO KILL

MR. DWYER. AND THAT'S THE PROSECUTION PSYCHIATRIST.

WE ALSO HAVE A PSYCHIATRIC AUTOPSY OF REV. JIM JONES BY DOCTOR OTTO BENDHEIM, A PSYCHIATRIST. HE TALKED ABOUT HOW JONES LIED TO THE TEMPLE MEMBERS, HOW HE CHEATED THEM, HOW HE MANIPULATED THEM, HOW HE EXPLOITED THEM, HOW HE SADISTICALLY BRUTALIZED THEM, AS LARRY COULD ATTEST TO, AND THEN IN THE END HE KILLED HIM.

DOCTOR BENDHEIM'S NOTED THAT JIM JONES BECAME

EVERYTHING THAT HE CONVINCED HIS FOLLOWERS HE WAS SAVING THEM

FROM. HE BECAME WHAT THEY FLED--THEY THOUGHT THEY WERE FLEEING

FROM THE UNITED STATES, HE BECAME THAT.

HE NOTED THAT EVEN THOUGH JONES ESPOUSED A PHILOSOPHY

OF RACIAL EQUALITY, THAT IT SEEMS THAT MOST OF HIS CONFIDANTS,

HIS LIEUTENANTS, WERE WHITE. HE TALKED ABOUT HOW JONES

GLORIFIED THE NOBLE CAUSE THAT HE AND HIS SUPPORTERS WERE

SUPPOSEDLY FOLLOWING, BUT LED HIS FOLLOWERS TO A GRIM AND

IGNOBLE DEATH THAT STANDS ONLY AS A MONUMENT TO MAN'S GROTESQUE

INSANITY. HE TALKED ABOUT JIM JONES, THE MAGIC HEALER, THE
IMPROVED JESUS CHRIST, THE REINCARNATED BUDDHA AND LENIN,
FATHER, DAD, AND THE TREMENDOUS INFLUENCE HE MAD OVER THOSE POOR
PEOPLE; HOW HE CONVINCED THEM THAT IT WAS A NOBLE AND RIGHT
THING TO COMMIT WHAT HE REFERRED TO AS MASS REVOLUTIONARY
SUICIDE.

AND I DON'T THINK THERE ARE MANY ADULTS ANYWHERE IN THE UNITED STATES WHO DOES NOT RECALL SEEING THOSE PHOTOGRAPHS OF THOSE HUNDREDS AND HUNDREDS AND HUNDREDS OF PEOPLE LYING THERE, MANY OF THEM EMBRACING EACH OTHER IN DEATH. THEIR BLOATED BODIES, ALL OF THAT CAUSED BY ONE MAN.

IT SEEMS THAT JIM JONES, EVEN THOUGH PHYSICALLY HE IS DEAD, HIS SPIRIT LIVES ON. IT SEEMS TO LIVE ON HERE IN THIS COURT.

EVEN THOUGH I WAS NOT THE ATTORNEY AT TRIAL, OF COURSE, WE HAVE BEEN THROUGH ALL OF THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS AND IT SEEMS THAT THE HATE THAT ACTUALLY LURKED WITHIN JIM JONES, THE EVILNESS THAT LURKED WITHIN HIM SEEMED TO EXIST IN THIS TRIAL AS I READ OF COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS BY THE PROSECUTION. AND I KNOW THEY HAVE A JOB TO DO, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT TO THEM, BUT THE AFFECT THAT JONES HAS EVEN UPON THOSE PEOPLE I THINK IS INCREDIBLE. THAT THEY HAVE SPENT SO MUCH TIME. THEY HAVE SPENT SO MUCH OF THE GOVERNMENT'S MONEY GOING AFTER THIS ONE LITTLE MAN.

THERE WERE OTHER PEOPLE THEY COULD HAVE GONE AFTER, BUT

THEY CHOSE HIM. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE MOTIVE IS, AND THAT IS NOT THE ISSUE BEFORE THIS COURT. THE ISSUE IS WHAT IS TO BE DONE WITH LARRY LAYTON.

I SUBMIT THAT THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD BEAR IN MIND THAT

LARRY LAYTON, AS SO MANY PEOPLE HAVE RECOGNIZED, INCLUDING

PEOPLE WHO WERE THERE AT GEORGETOWN, PROSECUTION WITNESSES,

PSYCHIATRISTS, IT SEEMS LIKE PEOPLE ON BOTH SIDES AGREE THAT

LARRY LAYTON WAS, I GUESS NOW, THE ULTIMATE VICTIM OF JIM JONES.

LARRY LAYTON SPENT TWO YEARS IN JAIL IN GUYANA UNDER PRISON CONDITIONS THAT VANISHED FROM THIS COUNTRY CENTURIES AGO--HORRIBLE CONDITIONS. LARRY LAYTON THEN SPENT OVER A YEAR IN JAIL HERE, AND I BELIEVE AS OF TODAY OR TOMORROW IT WILL BE A YEAR AND 49 DAYS INCARCERATED HERE IN THE UNITED STATES. SO WE ARE TALKING ABOUT OVER THREE YEARS OF IMPRISONMENT.

WE ARE TALKING ABOUT A PERSON WHO, YOUR HONOR, HAS AN AMOUNT OF REMORSE THAT IS UNFATHOMABLE BY ME; A PERSON WHO HAS TO LIVE DAY IN AND DAY OUT KNOWING THAT HE WAS PART OF A CHURCH SUPPOSEDLY—A SUPPOSED CHURCH IN WHICH SO MANY PEOPLE HE LOVED AND CARED ABOUT DIED, IN WHICH A MEMBER OF CONGRESS, WHOM HE RESPECTED, DIED; IN WHICH MEMBERS OF THE NEWS MEDIA, GREG ROBINSON, BOB BROWN, DIED FOR NOTHING. THERE WAS NO PURPOSE IN ANY OF THIS, OTHER THAN TO SATISFY THE INSANITY OF JIM JONES.

ONE OF THE THINGS, YOUR HONOR, THAT IMPRESSED ME THE FIRST TIME I TALKED WITH LARRY LAYTON IN THE SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY JAIL LAST MONTH-OR IN JANUARY WAS THAT I DON'T THINK I

1 HAVE EVER TALKED WITH A PERSON, A POTENTIAL CLIENT, WHO SEEMED TO BE IN 50 MUCH ANGUISH, IN SO MUCH INNER PAIN. AND IT WASN'T THE TYPE OF PAIN "WELL, LOOK I NEED OUT OF JAIL." THERE WAS NEVER ANY TALK LIKE THAT FROM LARRY LAYTON.

2

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IT SEEMED TO ME THEN AND IN THE MANY, MANY CONVERSATIONS I HAD WITH HIM SINCE THAT DAY IN JANUARY THAT I HAVE NEVER SEEN A PERSON WHO SEEMS TO BE SUFFERING SO MUCH ON THE INSIDE. REGARDLESS OF WHAT THIS COURT DECIDES TO DO WITH HIM TODAY, LARRY LAYTON'S ENTIRE LIFE WILL BE IN PRISON BECAUSE HE HAS BUILT A PRISON FOR HIMSELF, A CELL WITHIN HIMSELF IN WHICH HE MUST SHARE IN THAT CELL PAIN, SUFFERING, A REALIZATION THAT HE WAS PART OF SOMETHING THAT WAS VERY GROTESQUE, VERY HORRIBLE.

THERE HAS BEEN SO MUCH HATE, YOUR HONOR, THAT STARTED LONG BEFORE MR. RUSSONIELLO BECAME INVOLVED IN THE CASE, OR BEFORE ANYONE IN THE U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE OR THE FBI BECAME INVOLVED. THERE HAS BEEN SO MUCH HATE THAT STARTED WITH JIM JONES AND THE EVIL THINGS HE DID IN THE NAME OF EQUALITY AND FAIRNESS AND WHAT IS RIGHT. THERE HAS BEEN--THAT SPIRIT OF HIS OF HATE OF HURTING PEOPLE, ABUSING PEOPLE, SEEMS TO CONTINUE TODAY. WE DO KNOW THAT JIM JONES WAS TERRIBLY UPSET AND DISTURBED OVER THE DEFECTION OF DEBRA LAYTON, LARRY'S SISTER. WE DO KNOW THAT HE WANTED TO GET EVEN WITH HER.

IT SEEMS THAT US BEING IN COURT TODAY, LARRY HAVING GONE THROUGH THIS PROCESS NOW OF COURTS FOR EIGHT YEARS, THAT JIM JONES IS GETTING HIS ULTIMATE REVENGE ON DEBBIE LAYTON.

FROM MEMBERS WHO SAT ON THE JURY AT THE TRIAL WHO ONLY HEARD ONE SIDE OF THE CASE, BUT EVEN THEY HAVE ASKED YOU TO BE LENIENT.

THEY APPARENTLY REALIZED THAT AT SOME POINT THIS VERY PASSIVE,

SMALL COG, WHAT HAPPENS TO HIM MUST STOP. AT SOME POINT THE

JUDGE PECKHAM, THAT WE DO NOT UNDERESTIMATE ONE IOTA THE SERIOUSNESS OF THIS SITUATION. AGAIN, THAT IS ANOTHER FACTOR THAT IMPRESSED ME WHEN I FIRST TALKED WITH LARRY WAS NOT THE SERIOUSNESS OF HIS SITUATION, BUT THE GRAVITY, THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE MAGNITUDE OF THIS ENTIRE SITUATION. THE FACT THAT A MEMBER OF CONGRESS DIED. THE FACT THAT NEWS PEOPLE DIED AND OTHER PEOPLE DIED, THAT CHILDREN DIED, THAT WOMEN DIED, THAT SENIOR CITIZENS DIED. IT IS A HORRIBLE THING. IT IS A NIGHTMARE, AS I SAID, UNPARALLELED.

PEOPLE TALK ABOUT--THE ONLY THING THAT I HAVE BEEN REMINDED OF THAT MIGHT EVEN COMPARE TO THIS WOULD BE WHAT HAPPENED IN 73 A.D. AT MASADA. BUT EVEN THAT WAS DIFFERENT, VERY DIFFERENT FROM THIS. AND THE TRAGEDY THERE IS VERY DISTINGUISHABLE FROM THIS.

WE HAVE HERE--- WELL, YOUR HONOR HAS MEARD MANY OF THE TAPES. YOU HAVE HEARD MANY OF THE THINGS THAT WENT ON IN JONESTOWN. YOU HAVE HEARD THE LAST HOUR TAPE. AS JIM JONES

CONTINUED MUMBLING AND RAMBLING ON, THE RAMBLING OF A VERY 1 INSANE HUMAN BEING, A VERY SICK PERSON, A VERY EVIL PERSON. AND AT FIRST IN THE BEGINNING OF THAT TAPE WE HEAR A LOT OF PEOPLE. WE HEAR CHILDREN IN THE BACKGROUND, AND THEN AS THE TAPE CONTINUES, THE NOISE BECOMES LESS AND LESS BECAUSE THEY WERE ALL DYING.

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I OFTEN THINK WHAT A MIRACLE IT IS THAT LARRY LAYTON IS EVEN SITTING HERE IN COURT TODAY; HOW HE DID NOT DIE THERE; HOW HE DID NOT DIE AT THE AIRPORT; HOW JUST BY CIRCUMSTANCES HE DID NOT DIE AT JONESTOWN.

I ASK THE COURT TO DO TODAY WHAT HAS NOT HAPPENED TO DATE IN THIS SITUATION, AND THAT, IS TO DRAW A LINE AT WHAT POINT DOES FURTHER PUNISHMENT CEASE SERVING THE BEST INTERESTS OF SOCIETY? AT WHAT POINT DOES PUNISHMENT CEASE TO SERVE REHABILITATING A DEFENDANT? AT WHAT POINT DOES IT BECAME GROTESQUE OR CHOULISH TO CONTINUE THE PUNISHMENT? I SUBMIT, YOUR HONOR, THAT WE ARE AT THAT POINT.

I REALIZE THAT COUNT 2 CARRIES A MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCE. HOWEVER, WE ARE ALSO AWARE THAT THERE IS A STATUTORY PROVISION THAT PERMITS THIS COURT TO RECOMMEND AN EARLY PAROLE. I WOULD ASK, AS I REQUESTED IN THE SENTENCING MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED YESTERDAY, THAT AS TO COUNTS 1, 3 AND 4. THAT MR. LAYTON BE GIVEN A ONE YEAR SENTENCE WITH CREDIT FOR TIME SERVED. THAT AS TO COUNT 2, WHICH IS THE MANDATORY SENTENCE OF LIFE IMPRISONMENT, THAT THE COURT DESIGNATE AND RECOMMEND

IMMEDIATE PAROLE ELIGIBILITY AS PROVIDED IN 18 USC 4205(B)(1).

I ALSO ASK THAT THE COURT CONSIDER ORDERING THAT THE SENTENCING BE SERVED CONCURRENTLY; THAT, FINALLY, IF MR. LAYTON MUST SPEND TIME IN PRISON, THAT THE COURT DESIGNATE THE PLACE OF CONFINEMENT AS BEING PLEASANTON IN DUBLIN.

OF COURSE, WE HAVE ALREADY REQUESTED THAT THE COURT
RULE THAT COUNT 2 DOES NOT INVOLVE A MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCE.

IF THE COURT SO RULED, THEN WE WOULD IN THAT EVENT ASK THAT
COUNT 2 ALSO BE A ONE YEAR SENTENCE WITH CREDIT FOR TIME SERVED
AND BE CONCURRENT WITH THE OTHER THREE COUNTS.

YOUR HONOR, JUST A FEW MORE THINGS WHICH I THINK IS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO THE COURT. I MENTIONED TOMMY BOGUE, WHO WAS A PROSECUTION WITNESS. THE COURT HAS HIS LETTER IN WHICH HE PLEADS, THE PROSECUTION'S OWN WITNESS, THAT LARRY LAYTON NOT GO TO PRISON.

THE COURT HAS THE LETTER FROM JAMES COBB, WHO WAS A WITNESS AT THE FIRST TRIAL FOR THE GOVERNMENT. HE STATES THAT LARRY LAYTON MIGHT HAVE BEEN CONFUSED, BUT HE IS NO KILLER. HE SAID—AND I THINK THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT—MR. COBB SAID JONESTOWN DOES NOT REST ON HIS SHOULDERS. HE TALKS ABOUT THE SELF—IMPRISONMENT OF LARRY LAYTON THAT IS CREATED BY HIS GUILT, HIS STRONG SENSE OF REMORSE OVER WHAT HAPPENED IN GUYANA. HE SAID THIS—HE SAID: "SOME MAY QUESTION WHY." HE SAID, "I TAKE THE VIEW—I TAKE THE VIEW I DO WHEN—BEARING IN MIND THAT MANY OF MY RELATIVES DIED IN JONESTOWN. AFTER ALL, SOMEONE MUST PAY.

ASSOCIATED FEDERAL REPORTERS, SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 415-863-4211

HAVEN'T ENOUGH LIVES BEEN LOST ALREADY?"

AND AS I SAID, IT SEEMS THAT LARRY LAYTON AND US BEING HERE TODAY SO MANY YEARS AFTERWARDS IS JIM JONES ULTIMATE JOKE, HIS ULTIMATE AND FINAL REVENGE, HOPEFULLY.

PEOPLE HAVE TOLD THIS COURT THAT THEY FEEL THAT LARRY LAYTON COULD BE A VERY PRODUCTIVE MEMBER OF SOCIETY. WE KNOW THE FIVE YEARS BETWEEN THE FIRST TRIAL, JUDGE PECKHAM, AND THE SECOND TRIAL THAT HE WAS A MODEL CITIZEN. HE WORKED THROUGHOUT THAT PERIOD. HE GAINED HIS REAL ESTATE LICENSE. HE FELL IN LOVE WITH A BEAUTIFUL YOUNG LADY, WHO HE WOULD LIKE TO MARRY. THERE IS NOT ONE DEFECT IN ANY OF HIS CONDUCT ANYMORE THAN THERE WAS ONE BEFORE THAT DAY IN JONESTOWN.

THIS COURT HAS A LETTER FROM JEAN BROWN. HER NAME WAS
JEAN BROWN AT THE TIME DOWN IN JONESTOWN, WHO WAS A MEMBER OF
PEOPLES TEMPLE AND WAS IN JONESTOWN AS LATE AS OCTOBER 1978,
LESS THAN A MONTH BEFORE THE TRAGEDY. SHE SAID THAT LARRY IS A
HUMBLE, PEACE-LOVING MAN, WHICH I DON'T THINK ANYONE COULD
DISPUTE. SHE SAID, "HIS ACTIONS WERE I BELIEVE INCONSISTENT
WITH HIS CHARACTER AND WERE PRECIPITATED BY A VERY UNBALANCED
MENTAL STATE." SHE BROUGHT OUT THE FACT AND POINTED OUT HE HAD
BEEN A MEMBER OF PEOPLES TEMPLE FOR AT LEAST TEN YEARS. SHE
MENTIONED, AS I HAVE ALREADY BROUGHT TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION,
THAT HIS MOTHER HAD JUST DIED; THAT HIS SISTER HAD BROKEN FAITH
WITH THE TEMPLE; THAT THOSE TWO FACTORS MUST HAVE ADDED GREATLY
TO HIS MENTAL STRESS AND DEPRESSION. SHE SAID THAT BASED UPON

HER OBSERVATIONS OF HIM DOWN THERE--WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT A DOCTOR YEARS LATER WHO GIVES AN OPINION BASED UPON INFORMATION FROM OTHERS, BUT SOMEBODY WHO SAW HIM IN JONESTOWN, WAS AROUND HIM A LOT. SHE SAID, "I BELIEVE HIS SENSE OF REALITY WAS SO ALTERED THAT HIS ACTIONS WERE AS MANAGED AND MANIPULATED AS HIS THOUGHTS." THEN SHE SAID, "LARRY UNDOUBTEDLY WILL, AS I KNOW I WILL, SPEND THE REMAINDER OF HIS LIFE WONDERING HOW HIS BEST INTENTIONS LED HIM IN TOUCH WITH HORRIBLE EVENTS." SHE SAID, I THINK, AS SO MANY PEOPLE HAVE INDICATED, THAT SHE WAS CONVINCED MR. LAYTON WOULD MAKE THE MOST OF A SECOND CHANCE AS WELL. SHE TALKED ABOUT HIM BEING A MORAL PERSON WHO THE DOMINANT CONCERN OF HIM SEEMS TO BE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF FAMILY, OF FRIENDS.

B

APPARENTLY, ON THE DAY OF THE MASS SUICIDE LARRY WAS

LED TO BELIEVE THAT IF HE DID NOT COMMIT THE ACTS WHICH HE

COMMITTED THAT THE CIA, THE ARMED TROOPS, WOULD PARATROOP INTO

JONESTOWN; THAT THE CHILDREN WOULD BE MURDERED.

HE WAS LED TO BELIEVE, AS THE OTHER PEOPLE THERE, BY JIM JONES THAT THE SENIOR CITIZENS WOULD BE HORRIBLY TORTURED AND THAT HE HAD TO LAY DOWN HIS LIFE FOR HIS FELLOW MAN AND FELLOW WOMAN. IT WAS ALMOST AN ULTIMATE ACT OF SACRIFICE.

AND THE IRONY IS IN HIS BELIEF, BEING TOLD THAT THIS

WAS A SACRIFICE HE SHOULD MAKE--LAY DOWN HIS LIFE FOR HIS

BROTHERS AND SISTERS--THAT JONES THEN LATER ORDERED THEM TO DIE

ANYWAY.

1 THINK IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE FROM THE INFORMATION

BEFORE THIS COURT FROM THE TAPES THAT APPARENTLY WELL AFTER

LARRY HAD GONE TO THE AIRPORT, JONES, IN THIS CONFUSED, BIZARRE

MENTAL STATE HE WAS IN, DECIDED THAT THEY HAD TO ALL DIE, THE

PEOPLE.

THIS COURT HAS A LETTER---

THE COURT: I HAVE READ ALL THOSE LETTERS, COUNSEL.

MR. BRYAN: YOUR HONOR, THE LETTERS ALL SEEM TO ATTEST
THAT, AS I SAID, THE PUNISHMENT HAS GONE FAR ENOUGH. I ASK THE
COURT TO HEED WHAT PEOPLE NOT JUST FROM THE DEFENSE SIDE, BUT ON
BOTH SIDES OF THE CASE HAVE ASKED, AND THAT IS, THAT THE COURT
BE UNDERSTANDING, TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE SUFFERING, THE
PUNISHMENT LARRY LAYTON HAS ALREADY RECEIVED AND THE FACT THAT
HE WAS NOT A PRINCIPAL ACTOR IN WHAT HAPPENED. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: MR. RUSSONIELLO.

MR. RUSSONIELLO: YES. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. YOUR HONOR, IT IS SOMEWHAT PRESUMPTOUS FOR ANY COUNSEL TO STAND BEFORE THIS COURT AND TALK ABOUT THE FACTS OF THIS CASE. THIS COURT HAS LIVED WITH THIS CASE SINCE DECEMBER OF 1980.

BUT SINCE THE SENTENCING PHASE OF THE CASE IS AS

CRITICAL AS ALL OF WHAT HAS GONE ON BEFORE, IT WOULD BE

CERTAINLY RECKLESS OF THE GOVERNMENT, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF

SOME SUGGESTIONS THAT THE EVIL OF JIM JONES HAS BEEN TRANSFERRED

TO THE PROSECUTION TEAM FOR PURPOSES OF THIS CASE—A BIZARRE

NOTION AT BEST—IT WOULD BE SOMEWHAT RECKLESS FOR US, SINCE THIS

COURT HAS BEEN SO CAREFUL IN STEADYING THE SHIP IN ITS SEARCH

FOR TRUTH THROUGH RATHER TORTUROUS WATERS, TO ALLOW THAT NOW TO BE BEACHED ON ROCKY SHOALS AT THE TIME OF SENTENCING.

THE GENIUS AND BRILLIANCE OF OUR SYSTEM CLEARLY IS THAT AN EVENT AS WRENCHING AS WHAT WE SAW HAPPEN IN GUYANA IN NOVEMBER OF 1978 CAN HAVE A LIFE AFTER IT IN THAT THOSE WHO ARE PARTICIPANTS IN IT MUST STAND BEFORE THE BAR OF JUSTICE TO HAVE DETERMINED THE EXTENT, IF ANY, OF THEIR PARTICIPATION IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY.

COUNSEL STARTED IN HIS REMARKS TO THE COURT BY
SUGGESTING THAT THE FACTS ARE REALLY INCONTROVERTABLE AND THEN,
NO DOUBT A REFLECTION OF HIS EXUBERANCE FOR HIS CLIENT'S
POSITION, BEGAN TO RECITE A STATEMENT AND SERIES OF EVENTS THAT
REALLY BORE NO RELATIONSHIP AT ALL TO WHAT WAS PLAYED OUT IN THE
TRIAL OF THIS CASE.

AND AGAIN, FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRYING TO CAST HIS CLIENT IN THE BEST LIGHT POSSIBLE BEFORE THIS COURT NOW AT SENTENCING, HAS PORTRAYED HIM AS NOTHING MORE THAN A VICTIM, PERHAPS THE ULTIMATE VICTIM OF THE DIABOLICAL AND SINISTER JIM JONES.

THERE IS NO QUESTION BUT THAT THIS CRIME, THE CRIME OF MURDER, IN EFFECT REPRESENTS ONE OF THE MOST HEINOUS OF CRIMES THAT WE KNOW IN OUR CATALOG OF INHUMANITY ONE HUMAN BEING TO ANOTHER IN WESTERN CIVILIZATION.

AS I MENTIONED IN OUR SENTENCING MEMORANDUM, WHAT MAKES

IT EVEN MORE UNFORGIVABLE IS THE FACT THAT THE KILLING OF A

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES IS—WHICH

STRIKES AT THE VERY HEART OF OUR DEOMOCRACY--IT IS A REPUDIATION
IN A SENSE OF OUR WHOLE SYSTEM. AND THIS IS WHAT LARRY LAYTON
IS. LARRY LAYTON IS A REBEL.

THE STORY OF THIS YOUNG MAN, THE YOUNGEST OF SIBLINGS, WHO SUFFERED SOME FRUSTRATION WHEN HE SAW THE SUCCESS OF BROTHERS AND SISTERS AND HE EXPERIENCED FAILURE. AND I WONDER IF SOCIETY IS TO, AS A RESULT OF THAT, TO SUFFER IN SILENCE THESE TANTRUMS AND FRUSTRATIONS AND EXCESSES OF SUCH SELF-INDULGENT SIBLINGS AS LARRY LAYTON IS PORTRAYED BY HIS ATTORNEY.

HE IS A FAILURE, BUT HE IS A PERSON WHO SEIZES FROM HIS OWN DIFFICULTY OPPORTUNISM. HE IS A VERY PRIVILEGED PERSON.

ALL THROUGH HIS LIFE, EVEN UP TO THIS POINT, BECAUSE HE IS STILL ALIVE AND BEFORE THIS COURT, HE IS AGAIN DEMONSTRATING THAT HE IS A PERSON OF PRIVILEGE.

HE HAD OPPORTUNITIES HANDED TO HIM AS A YOUNGSTER IN THIS SOCIETY THAT YOUNG PEOPLE—MANY YOUNG PEOPLE TODAY WOULD ENVY WITH GREAT LUST, AND HE HAD THESE PRESENTED TO HIM.

MINDFUL OF COUNSEL'S SUGGESTION THAT HE SAW AN

OPPORTUNITY TO AVOID MILITARY SERVICE BY TAKING ADVANTAGE OF THE

LAW TO TAKE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR STATUS, HE WAS FRUSTRATED

THAT HE WASN'T ABLE TO OBTAIN THAT PRIVILEGE FOR HIMSELF. BUT

WHEN JIM JONES WAS ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH IT FOR HIM HE BECAME AN

OVERNIGHT CONVERT AND DISCIPLE OF JONES, BECAUSE JONES IN EFFECT

HAD BEEN ABLE TO ONCE AGAIN PROTECT HIS POSITION OF PRIVILEGE.

AND WHAT WAS HE IN PEOPLES TEMPLE? THE WITNESSES WHO TESTIFIED ABOUT LARRY LAYTON TESTIFIED, AS IT WERE, THAT FOR A SIGNIFICANT PERIOD OF TIME LAYTON SERVED ON THE SECURITY FORCE, OR AS PART OF THE INNER CIRCLE, AS IT WERE, WHEN IT FIRST STARTED IN REDWOOD VALLEY, AND EVEN WHEN IT MOVED TO SAN FRANCISCO.

THERE WAS SOME CHANGE IN HIS RELATIONSHIP TO PEOPLES
TEMPLE AFTER THE MOVE TO JONESTOWN. BUT IT IS A FACT, ISN'T IT,
THAT FOR THE TIME THAT LAYTON IN HIS EARLY YEARS WAS A MEMBER OF
PEOPLES TEMPLE HE BENEFITED PERSONALLY THROUGH THIS PRIVILEGE BY
HIS ASSOCIATION WITH JONES.

THE EVENTS AT JONESTOWN ARE CLEARLY HORRIBLE. BUT TO PORTRAY LARRY LAYTON AS A VICTIM OF THE INFLUENCE, THE OVERWHELMING INFLUENCE, OF JIM JONES, A PERSON WHO WAS COMPELLED BY DISAPPOINTMENT OR BY TRAGEDY IN HIS OWN FAMILY, EXACERBATED BY THE USE OF DRUGS AND BY THE OVERWHELMING FORCE OF A MONSTER LIKE JONES IS IN A WAY NOT TO BE FAIR AND CANDID IN WHAT REALLY HAPPENED AND HOW LARRY LAYTON, AS A THINKING, BREATHING, ACTING HUMAN BEING, MADE HIS WAY, SURVIVED, IN THE ENCAMPMENT AT JONESTOWN.

LARRY LAYTON WAS A FELLOW AT JONESTOWN WHO IN A SENSE
HAD MANY OF THE PRIVILEGES THAT WE SUGGEST WERE RESERVED FOR THE
INNER CIRCLE. IT APPEARED THERE WAS MANY WITNESSES WHO SAID
THAT HE HAD ACCESS TO PEOPLE WHO WERE CLOSE UP TO JONES, WHICH
WAS A KIND OF WAY OF DETERMINING WHERE YOU STOOD IN THE

HIERARCHY AS ANY OF THE MORE PROMINENT ADMINISTRATORS OR INNER CIRCLE PERSONS DID.

WE KNOW THAT ON THE DAY OF THE EVENTS OF THE 18TH OF NOVEMBER THAT THAT WAS CERTAINLY TRUE. THE EVIDENCE DEMONSTRATED LARRY LAYTON IS IN THE PAVILION AREA, SEEMS TO HAVE FREE ACCESS. HE IS CLOSE INTO CONVERSATIONS THAT ARE TAKING PLACE WHEN THEY ARE TAKING PLACE INVOLVING WHAT TO DO ABOUT THE DEFECTORS.

IT IS SUGGESTED THAT HIS MOTHER'S DEATH ON OCTOBER THE 30TH WAS A KIND OF LAST ACT WHICH TOTALLY DESSEMINATED HIM AND THAT DESTROYED HIM AND THAT THERE WAS NO FURTHER THAT HE COULD GO DOWN IN TERMS OF HIS FEELING.

AND YET THERE SEEMS TO BE SOME CONFUSION ABOUT HOW HE CONDUCTED HIMSELF FOLLOWING HIS MOTHER'S DEATH. HE REPORTS TO US NOW THAT HE USED ELAVIL AND THAT THIS DRUG WAS NECESSARY BECAUSE HE FELT SO DESPONDENT ABOUT THE DEATH OF HIS MOTHER.

PSYCHIATRISTS THERE SEEMS TO BE SOME DISPUTE HERE. WHEN LAYTON TESTIFIED AT--FROM THE DOCK IN GUYANA HE SAID THAT HE HAD, AT THE MOTION TO SUPPRESS HEARING, HE SAID THAT HE HAD BEEN GIVEN THREE TABLETS OF ELAVIL THE DAY OF THESE EVENTS AND THAT IT WAS THE FIRST TIME THAT HE HAD TAKEN IT. HE SAID IN HIS STATEMENT THAT HE HAD TAKEN SIX ELAVIL. HE TOLD ZIMBARDO THAT HE HAD TAKEN ELAVIL TEN TO FIFTEEN OF THESE A DAY.

AND I BELIEVE -- I WILL HAVE TO CHECK MY NOTES ON

THIS-BUT I BELIEVE IT WAS IN HIS STATEMENT TO DOCTOR LUNDE THAT
HE SAID THAT THE DAY OF THE EVENT WAS THE FIRST TIME HE HAD
TAKEN ELAVIL.

WHAT IS ELAVIL. ELAVIL, ACCORDING TO THE PHARMACOLOGY,
IS IN A SENSE A REVERSE OF VALIUM. IT TAKES A PERSON WHO IS IN
DEEP DESPONDENCY OR DEPRESSION AND RAISES THEM TO A LEVEL TO BE
ABLE TO CONDUCT HIS NORMAL AFFAIRS.

IF, AS THE DEFENSE WOULD HAVE US BELIEVE, THE DEFENDANT WAS ALMOST COMATOSE AND ALMOST REGRESSED TO A CATATONIC STATE FOLLOWING HIS MOTHER'S DEATH, THAT WOULD NOT SQUARE WITH THE INSINUATION THAT HE HAD TAKEN ELAVIL REGULARLY OR HAD IT PRESCRIBED FOR HIM SINCE HIS MOTHER'S DEATH. BUT IT WOULD SQUARE THAT HE HAD ONLY TAKEN IT ONCE. AND ON THE DAY OF THESE EVENTS, IT WOULD SQUARE WITH THE CONDUCT THAT WAS OBSERVED BY JACKIE SPEIER ON THE MORNING OF THE KILLING WHEN SHE SAW HIM IN THE PAVILION AREA IN COMPANY WITH KAREN WHEN HE WAS LUCID, WHEN HE WAS STRAIGHTFORWARD, WHEN HE SEEMED TO BE VERY CANDID, CLEAR EYED AND GAVE NO SIGN OF ANY DEPRESSION OR UPSET.

WELL, THE ONLY SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS IS THAT ELAVIL HAS
NEVER BEEN PORTRAYED NOR IS THERE ANY EVIDENCE IN THE CASE TO
INDICATE THAT IT OVERCOMES A PERSON'S MIND OR OVERCOMES A
PERSON'S WILL. BUT WHAT IT DOES DEMONSTRATE IS THAT FOR A
PERSON LIKE LARRY LAYTON, WHO DESCRIBES HIMSELF TO ONE OF THE
PSYCHIATRISTS—AGAIN, I BELIEVE DOCTOR LUNDE—AS THINKING THAT
HE WOULD BE A HERO TO JONESTOWN IF HE WAS ABLE TO CARRY OUT THE

1 MISSION OF SHOOTING DOWN THE PLANE, IT DOES SQUARE WITH HIS NEED
2 FOR SOME ENCOURAGEMENT, SOME SORT OF EXTERNAL FORCE TO
3 INVIGORATE HIM AND GIVE HIM THE DETERMINATION TO CARRY THROUGH
4 ON WHAT MUST HAVE BEEN A VERY DIFFICULT ASSIGNMENT FOR HIM.

AND THAT ASSIGNMENT, IT IS CURIOUS ENOUGH, SHOULD BE EXAMINED CLOSELY BECAUSE IT DOES REFLECT THE FATAL FLAW IN THE SUGGESTION THAT LARRY LAYTON WAS OVERCOME AND OVERWHELMED BY THE POWER OF JIM JONES AND IT WAS JIM JONES WHO COMPELLED HIS ACTION.

ALL OF THE DOCTORS WHO HAVE EXAMINED LAYTON AND, IN FACT, LAYTON'S OWN STATEMENT TO THE PROBATION OFFICER MAKE IT CLEAR THAT HE DIDN'T GET ANY INSTRUCTION FROM JIM JONES ON THE 18TH. HE GOT HIS INSTRUCTION—HE GOT THE SUGGESTION FIRST FROM MARIA KATSARIS. MARIA KATSARIS IS THE ONE WHO SAID TO HIM, YOU KNOW, "IF THESE PEOPLE LEAVE HERE AND ARE ABLE TO MAKE THEIR WAY TO THE UNITED STATES THEY ARE GOING TO DESTROY JONESTOWN." HE TOLD EVEN HIS OWN PSYCHIATRIST, PHILIP ZIMBARDO, THIS.

AND IT WAS CAROLYN LAYTON—AGAIN NOT JIM JONES—IT WAS CAROLYN LAYTON WHO HAD SUGGESTED TO HIM THAT HE MIGHT BE THE ONE WHO COULD CARRY OUT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF SHOOTING DOWN THE PLANE.

HE GOT THE GUN FROM MARIA KATSARIS, HE TOLD DOCTOR LUNDE, BUT BECAUSE THE GUN WAS REGISTERED TO MARIA KATSARIS, PONCHO JOHNSON GAVE HIM ANOTHER GUN, TOOK BACK THE GUN THAT MARIA KATSARIS HAD GIVEN HIM.

IN HIS PRESENTENCE REPORT HE MAKES IT CLEAR AS WELL
THAT IT WAS MARIA KATSARIS WHO HAD SUGGESTED OR PLANTED THE IDEA
IN HIS MIND ABOUT THE NEED TO DO SOMETHING AND THE DANGER OF THE
DEFECTORS AND OTHERS MAKING THEIR WAY TO FREEDOM. AND THAT IT
WAS CAROLYN LAYTON WHO IN EFFECT HAD IMPORTUNED HIM TO BE THE
ONE. AND IT WAS KAREN LAYTON WHO ENCOURAGED HIM BY SAYING THAT
SHE WOULD ADMIRE HIM GREATLY FOR HIS COURAGE AND DETERMINATION
TO CARRY OUT THIS MISSION.

IT WAS ONLY AFTER HE HAD DECIDED TO BE THE HERO, THE BIG SHOT, TO SAVE JONESTOWN, TO SORT OF LIVE UP TO THE FAITH THAT HAD BEEN INVESTED IN HIM THAT HE WENT THEN TO JONES AND ASKED FOR HIS BLESSING.

AND WHAT WAS IT THAT DOCTOR LUNDE TELLS US ABOUT THIS MEETING? WELL, LARRY LAYTON, THIS PERSON WHO IS OVERCOME, WHO IS OVERWHELMED, WHOSE WILL HAS BEEN PREDETERMINED BY THE FORCE OF JIM JONES, THIS LARRY LAYTON TELLS DOCTOR LUNDE THAT ORIGINALLY HE, LARRY LAYTON, SUGGESTED USING DYNAMITE TO TAKE THE PLANE DOWN; DYNAMITE BECAUSE HE KNEW THAT DYNAMITE WOULD BE MORE EFFECTIVE THAN BEING ABLE TO CARRY OUT THE MISSION OF DESTROYING THE PLANE AND ITS OCCUPANTS THAN A GUN MIGHT BE. AND HE WAS THEN TOLD TO SORT OF STAND OFF WHILE THEY HAD SOME FURTHER DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THE EFFICACY OF CARRYING THAT OUT.

THAT IS HIS ROLE IN THIS. HIS ROLE IN THIS IS NOT A SORT OF MOPING, DOWNCAST CREATURE OF LITTLE OR NO WILL. HE IS A PERSON WHO, EVEN WHEN CONFRONTED WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF THE

FRUSTRATED MISSION, HE IS A PERSON WHO DIDN'T HAVE THE
INTESTINAL FORTITUDE, THE GUTS THEN, YOU KNOW, TO AT LEAST CARRY
OUT THE SORT OF LAST BOLD HEROIC MISSION THAT HE KNEW OTHERS OF
JONESTOWN WOULD DO TO TAKE THEIR OWN LIVES FOR THE REVOLUTION.

YOU KNOW, HE HAD IN A SENSE NOT EVEN BEEN ABLE TO LIVE UP TO THE EXPECTATIONS OF ALL OF HIS FRIENDS AND ALL OF HIS ASSOCIATES AND ALL OF THESE OTHERS FOR WHOM HE HAD SUCH GREAT LOVE—HE COULDN'T TAKE HIS OWN LIFE. FACED WITH THE FRUSTRATION OF THIS FAILED MISSION, HE STARTED SHOOTING AT THESE INNOCENTS IN THE SMALL PLANE TO AT LEAST KILL THEM. AND THEN HE STRUGGLED TO MAKE HIS ESCAPE WITH ONE OF THEM—WITH ONE OF THESE SURVIVORS, STRUGGLED TO ESCAPE. SUCH A BRAVE HEROIC CHARACTER.

WELL, WHAT IS TRUE, AND WHAT COUNSEL HAS SAID IS THAT
THIS IS A VERY, VERY SERIOUS CASE WITH CHARGES THAT ARE THE MOST
SERIOUS THAT CERTAINLY CAN BE BROUGHT AGAINST AN INDIVIDUAL--THE
TAKING OF ANOTHER LIFE, OF ANOTHER HUMAN LIFE. AND THE MOTIVE
FOR TAKING OF IT IS IN MOST CASES SENSELESS. IT IS INANE. IT
CAUSES US OR REQUIRES US TO REACH DEEP INSIDE OURSELVES TO TRY
TO FIND SOME POSSIBLE JUSTIFICATION FOR WHY THE PERSON WOULD
HAVE ACTED SO.

HERE THE MOTIVE, THE PURPOSE, THE INTENT WAS CLEAR.

LARRY LAYTON SAW HIS PARTICIPATION IN THIS KILLING AS AN

OPPORTUNITY FOR HIM, IN THE DISTORTED WORLD OF JONESTOWN AND

PEOPLES TEMPLE, TO BE ELEVATED TO HEROIC STATUS, AND HE SAW

HIMSELF, TOO, AS PERFORMING A HEROIC ACT.

HE GAVE NO THOUGHT OR CONSIDERATION TO THE POSSIBILITY

AND THE PROBABILITY THAT INNOCENTS—THAT BY ANY DEFINITION THE

PILOT OF THE PLANE, THE ELEVEN—YEAR OLD TRACY PARKS AND PERHAPS

ANY OTHERS WHO MIGHT HAVE BOARDED THAT FIRST PLANE, THAT

INNOCENTS WOULD HAVE TO BE SACRIFICED, THEIR LIVES WOULD ALSO BE

SNUFFED OUT FOR NO APPARENT REASON IN ORDER FOR HIM TO ACHIEVE

HIS HEROIC STATE, HIS PLACE OF IMPORTANCE FOREVER.

HOW DO WE REWARD SUCH CONDUCT? HOW DO WE DEAL WITH IT? DO WE SAY, WELL, LET'S MAKE SURE THAT WE PUT HIM IN A PLACE WHERE HE CAN BE CLOSE TO HIS FAMILY BECAUSE WE DON'T WANT TO INCONVENIENCE THEM. AFTER ALL, THEY SHOULDN'T HAVE TO TRAVEL SOME DISTANCE IN ORDER TO SEE THIS FELLOW. LET'S SEE IF WE CAN'T PAROLE HIM TOMORROW. SURELY THE LAW SAYS IT IS A MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCE, BUT WE CAN GIVE A REALLY STRAINED READING AND VIOLATE THE SPIRIT OF A MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCE BY SUGGESTING THAT SINCE THE COURT HAS THE DISCRETION TO GIVE AN EARLY RELEASE DATE IN A TERM OF YEARS SENTENCE, EVEN IF IT IS A MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCE, WE SHOULD USURP THE AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD OF PAROLE AND SET AN IMMEDIATE RELEASE DATE. THAT WILL SORT OF CLEAR THE AIR AND IT WILL PERMIT US TO PUT THIS EPISODE, THIS TERRIBLE, TERRIBLE EPISODE WHICH HAS STAINED THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA AND OTHERS FOR SO LONG BEHIND US. AND IT WILL PERMIT US TO SORT OF FORGET THAT JIM JONES IS NOT A CREATURE OF HIS OWN FORCE.

JIM JONES IS A CREATURE OF OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM. HE IS

1

2

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

A PERSON THAT IN A SENSE WE ALL MADE INTO THE MONSTER THAT HE BECAME. WE ENCOURAGED HIM. WE SAW POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY WITH JIM JONES. WE SAW A CHANCE TO GET HUNDREDS OF VOLUNTEERS WHO COULD HELP IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS. YOU KNOW, AS LONG AS HE COULD SERVE US IN OUR POLITICAL AMBITION, HE WAS A WELCOME ADDITION TO THE BAY AREA.

WHY CHARLES GARRY TOLD US THAT THEY WERE EVEN PLANNING SOME GALA EVENT THE WEEK FOLLOWING THE KILLINGS. HAD IT NOT BEEN FOR THE KILLINGS, THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN A GALA CELEBRATED IN THE BAY AREA WITH POLITICIANS OF ALL STRIPE, ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT, ATTENDING TO PRAISE AND HEAP GREAT GLORY ON THIS MAN JIM JONES.

IT WOULD BE TOO EASY FOR US ALL TO MERELY REWARD IN A SENSE OR TO VIEW ALL OF THIS PAST EPISODE AND MR. LAYTON'S PARTICIPATION BY CLEARING THE SLATE AND PROVIDING FOR SOME EARLY RELEASE DATE, SOME RELEASE DATE THAT WOULD INSURE THAT HE WOULD BE FREE TOMORROW.

WE THINK, TOO, THAT THE NOTION THAT MR. LAYTON HAS BEEN ABLE TO SPEND THE LAST FIVE YEARS AT LIBERTY AND HAS LED A RATHER EXEMPLARY LIFE, THOUGH I FIND THE SUGGESTION THAT HE HAS LIVED WITHIN THIS SELF-CONTAINED PRISON DURING ALL OF THIS TIME, GIVEN THAT HE HAS BEEN IN REAL ESTATE SALES, SOMEWHAT INCONSISTENT AND DIFFICULT TO FASHION IN MY OWN MIND, BUT THE SUGGESTION THAT WE SHOULD TAKE THE LAST FIVE YEARS OF HIS LIFE WHERE HE HAS LIVED AN EXEMPLARY LIFE AS EVIDENCE THAT HE IS NOW

ENTITLED TO BE FREE IS UNACCEPTABLE.

THE GOVERNMENT RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS TO THIS COURT
THAT IT IMPOSE THE MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCE ON COUNT 2, WHICH IS
THE AIDING AND ABETTING THE KILLING—THE FIRST DEGREE MURDER IN
COLD BLOOD, AS IT WERE, OF RYAN, CONGRESSMAN RYAN; THAT IT
IMPOSE A TERM OF YEARS OR LIFE SENTENCE ON COUNT 3, WHICH IS THE
CONSPIRACY TO KILL ASSISTANT DEPUTY—OR DEPUTY CHIEF OF MISSION
DWYER; THAT IT SENTENCE HIM TO LIFE ON COUNT 1, WHICH IS THE
CONSPIRACY TO KILL RYAN, AND RUN THAT CONCURRENTLY WITH COUNT 2;
THAT IT SENTENCE HIM TO 20 YEARS ON COUNT 4 AND RUN THAT
SENTENCE CONCURRENT WITH COUNT 3. THAT THE SENTENCE ON COUNT 2
AND COUNT 3 BE CONSECUTIVE AND THAT IN EFFECT THE COURT SET A
PRISON TERM THAT WILL INSURE THAT HE SERVE A MINIMUM OF 20 YEARS
BEFORE HE IS ELIGIBLE FOR PAROLE.

IN FACT, WE RECOMMEND AND SUGGEST TO THIS COURT
RESPECTFULLY THAT IT HAS THE POWER UNDER THE MANDATORY LIFE
SENTENCE TO SET A MINIMUM PAROLE TERM OF 20 YEARS ON THE BASIS
OF THE CASES WHICH WE HAVE CITED TO THE COURT WHICH SUGGEST THAT
IF LIFE OR A TERM OF YEARS WERE OPTIONS THAT THE COURT HAD,
SENTENCES OF 150 YEARS WITH A MINIMUM OF 50 FOR PAROLE,
SENTENCES OF 90 YEARS WITH A MINIMUM OF 30 YEARS BEFORE PAROLE,
ARE PROPER. THAT SINCE THIS OFFENSE, COUNT 2, IS SO MUCH MORE
SERIOUS, AS IT IS VIEWED BY THE COURTS BECAUSE OF THE MANDATORY
NATURE OF THE LIFE SENTENCE THAN SENTENCES THAT ARE OPTIONAL
WITH THE COURT, THAT THE COURT CERTAINLY HAS THE INHERENT

AUTHORITY TO SET A MINIMUM TERM OF 20 YEARS BEFORE PAROLE ELIGIBILITY.

AUTHORITY FOR THE DEFENDANT BEING ENTITLED TO ANY TIME THAT HE HAS SPENT IN CUSTODY IN GUYANA. THAT THE ONLY TIME THAT HE IS ENTITLED TO CREDIT FOR IS THE ONE YEAR AND TWO DAYS THAT WERE SERVED UP UNTIL THE TIME THE TRIAL STARTED, AND WHATEVER TIME HE HAS SERVED, AND I UNDERSTAND TO BE 47 DAYS SINCE HE WAS COMMITTED FOLLOWING HIS CONVICTION. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: ARE THERE ANY APPELLATE DECISIONS ON THE MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCE? IT HAS BEEN, AS YOU POINTED OUT IN YOUR BRIEF, ADVOCATED BY SOME DEFENSE COUNSEL IN OTHER CASES THAT IT DID NOT APPLY, AND I BELIEVE ONE OF THE JUDGES ACCEPTED THAT. BUT I WONDERED IF IN THE INTERIM THERE HAVE BEEN ANY APPELLATE DECISIONS.

MR. RUSSONIELLO: I UNDERSTAND, MR. NERNEY MAY BE ABLE
TO SPEAK TO THAT. HE SPOKE WITH MR. SVETCOV, AND MR. SVETCOV OF
OUR OFFICE SHOWED HIM AN APPELLATE DECISION WHICH MADE IT CLEAR
THAT 1111 WAS MANDATORY LIFE SENTENCE. I, UNFORTUNATELY, WAS
NOT PRIVY TO WHAT THAT CASE WAS. PERHAPS HE CAN TELL US OR TELL
US WHAT THAT CASE WAS.

MR. NERNEY: THAT IS A CORRECT ASSESSMENT.

THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. RUSSONIELLO.

THE COURT: WE WILL TAKE A BRIEF RECESS IN THE INTEREST OF COURT REPORTER.

(RECESS)

THE COURT: MR. LAYTON, I MUST TELL YOU THAT YOU HAVE
THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TO THE COURT, TO SAY ANYTHING THAT YOU
WISH THAT IS MATERIAL TO THE SENTENCING, ANYTHING IN MITIGATION,
ANYTHING ABOUT THE OFFENSE OR ABOUT YOUR BACKGROUND, OR YOUR
FUTURE PLANS, ANYTHING THAT WILL PERSUADE ME TO BE LENIENT.

DO YOU DESIRE TO SAY ANYTHING BEFORE JUDGMENT IS
IMPOSED?

MR. BRYAN: YOUR HONOR, MR. LAYTON WOULD LIKE TO MAKE SOME COMMENTS TO THE COURT.

THE COURT: CERTAINLY. HE MAY.

THE DEFENDANT: YOUR HONOR, I WILL SPEAK SIMPLY AND FROM THE HEART TO POINT--I WILL SPEAK THE TRUTH. I FEEL A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF GRIEF AND REMORSE OF THE TERRIBLE EVENTS THAT HAPPENED BOTH AT PORT KAITUMA AND AT JONESTOWN.

I WANT TO EXPRESS MY MOST SINCERE REGRETS AND REMORSE
TO THE FAMILIES OF GREG ROBINSON, CONGRESSMAN RYAN, BOB BROWN,
PATTY PARKS AND MANY, MANY PEOPLE AT JONESTOWN WHO PARISHED.

I KNOW IT WAS A HORRIBLE THING THAT TRANSPIRED THERE
THAT SO MANY PEOPLE WERE LURED INTO PEOPLES TEMPLE AND LURED TO
GUYANA. I--I ONLY WISH THERE WAS SOMETHING I COULD DO THAT
WOULD SOMEHOW EASE THE PAIN OF THOSE PEOPLE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AS I BELIEVE HAS BEEN INDICATED EARLIER, THE COURT HAS HAD THE OPPORTUNITY OF AN EXCELLENT PROBATION REPORT AND A THOROUGH PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION.

ACCOMPANYING THE REPORT HAS BEEN THE REPORTS OF THE

PSYCHIATRISTS, BOTH DEFENDANT'S AND THE GOVERNMENT'S, AND WE

HAVE HAD THE LETTERS THAT HAVE BEEN SENT TO THE PROBATION OFFICE

COMMENTING UPON THE SENTENCING OF THE DEFENDANT, LARRY LAYTON.

WE HAVE ALSO HAD THE SENTENCING MEMORANDA OF BOTH PARTIES, MR.

LAYTON AND THE GOVERNMENT.

WE HAVE HEARD THE COMMENTS OF COUNSEL THIS MORNING
STATING THEIR RESPECTIVE POSITIONS AND NOW IT FALLS TO US TO
PASS JUDGMENT IN THIS CASE.

THE FOUR COUNTS ON WHICH LARRY LAYTON NOW STANDS

CONVICTED, AS HAS BEEN STATED EARLIER BY THE PROSECUTOR, STRIKE

AT THE VERY HEART OF A REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY AND CARRY

POSSIBLE SENTENCES THAT REFLECT THEIR SEVERITY. CONGRESSMAN

RYAN ALONE WAS UNWILLING TO IGNORE THE REPORTS OF INTOLERABLE

CONDITIONS EXISTING IN JONESTOWN, AND HE ALONE HAD THE COURAGE

WITH HIS PARTY TO TRAVEL TO GUYANA TO SEE FOR HIMSELF WHETHER

JONESTOWN WAS THE IDYLLIC PARADISE DESCRIBED BY JIM JONES. HIS

DEATH WAS A TRAGIC LOSS TO HIS FAMILY, TO THE CONGRESS, AND TO

THIS NATION. HIS COURAGE AND CONVICTION HAS BEEN LOST TO US AND

HIS LEADERSHIP HAS BEEN SILENCED AND IS SORELY MISSED.

IN ADDITION TO THE TRAGIC DEATH OF CONGRESSMAN RYAN,
THE EVENTS AT PORT KAITUMA AIRSTRIP ON NOVEMBER 18, 1978
RESULTED IN THE BRUTAL DEATHS OF THREE NEWSMEN AND PATTY PARKS,
A PEOPLES TEMPLE MEMBER ATTEMPTING TO ESCAPE THE HORROR OF
JONESTOWN WITH THE HELP OF CONGRESSMAN RYAN.

THE TERRIBLE EVENTS OF THAT DAY ALSO RESULTED IN
SERIOUS INJURIES TO NUMEROUS OTHER INDIVIDUALS, INCLUDING DEPUTY
CHIEF OF MISSION RICHARD DWYER AND NOW-ASSEMBLY WOMAN JACQUELINE
SPEIER. FINALLY, VERNON GOSNEY AND MONICA BAGBY, FORMER PEOPLES
TEMPLE MEMBERS, ALSO ATTEMPTING TO ESCAPE JONESTOWN, WERE
THEMSELVES SHOT AND SERIOUSLY INJURED BY THE DEFENDANT. THESE
PEOPLE WILL CARRY THE HEAVY BURDEN OF THIS TRAGEDY WITH THEM FOR
THE REST OF THEIR LIVES.

IN MOST CONSPIRACY CONVICTIONS, IN MOST MULTI-DEFENDANT CRIMINAL CASES, THE COURT HAS BEFORE IT A NUMBER OF CO-CONSPIRATORS, DEFENDANTS, AND IT MUST ASSESS THE RELATIVE CULPABILITY OF EACH OF THE DEFENDANTS AND SENTENCE THEM ACCORDINGLY.

IN THIS CONSPIRACY, HOWEVER, ONLY ONE DEFENDANT STANDS
BEFORE THE COURT BECAUSE NONE OF THE OTHERS SURVIVED. THIS
UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCE DOES NOT RELIEVE THE COURT OF ITS
OBLIGATION TO ASSESS THE DEFENDANT'S RELATIVE BLAME FOR THE
CRIME. THERE CAN BE NO DOUBT THAT JIM JONES IS HIMSELF
PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEATHS AND SERIOUS INJURIES
INFLICTED AT THE PORT KAITUMA AIRSTRIP ON NOVEMBER 18, 1978.
ALL AGREE TO THIS FACT.

FURTHERMORE, THE COURT IS ALSO CONVINCED THAT AFTER
HEARING ALL THE TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE THAT LARRY LAYTON'S ROLE
IN THE CONSPIRACY TO MURDER CONGRESSMAN RYAN AND DEPUTY CHIEF OF
MISSION RICHARD DWYER WAS LESS SIGNIFICANT THAN THAT OF A NUMBER

OF THE OTHER CONSPIRATORS. SIGNIFICANTLY, LAYTON WAS NOT HIMSELF AMONG THE PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY SHOT AT THE CONGRESSMAN AND HIS PARTY. FURTHERMORE, THE COURT IS NOT CONVINCED, AFTEK HEARING THE EVIDENCE, THAT LAYTON WAS HIMSELF AN ACTIVE LEADER IN THE PLANNING OF THE MURDERS. ALTHOUGH LAYTON COMMITTED A SERIOUS AND UNPARDONABLE CRIME IN SHOOTING TWO INNOCENT PEOPLE AND ATTEMPTING TO SHOOT A THIRD, HIS ROLE IN THE CONSPIRACY FOR WHICH HE HAS BEEN CONVICTED WAS NOT AS SIGNIFICANT AS THAT OF MANY OF THE OTHER CONSPIRATORS.

NOW, MENTION HAS BEEN MADE THIS MORNING TO THE OVER 60 LETTERS THAT WERE SUBMITTED TO THE COURT REGARDING LARRY LAYTON. EVERY ONE OF THEM REQUESTED THAT THE COURT BE LENIENT IN PASSING JUDGMENT. THE COMMON THEME TYING THE LETTERS TOGETHER WAS THAT LARRY LAYTON WAS AS MUCH A VICTIM OF THE HORRENDOUS CIRCUMSTANCES IN JONESTOWN AND OF JIM JONES' MANIPULATION AS WERE THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PEOPLES TEMPLE WHO ULTIMATELY KILLED THEMSELVES AND THEIR CHILDREN.

OF PARTICULAR SIGNIFICANCE TO THE COURT ARE FOUR
CATEGORIES OF LETTERS, LETTERS FROM JURORS. I DON'T RECALL A
CASE IN WHICH I HAD RECEIVED AS MANY LETTERS FROM JURORS IN A
CRIMINAL CASE AS I HAVE IN THIS ONE. TWO, LETTERS FROM
PROSECUTION WITNESSES. SOME OF THESE HAVE BEEN ALREADY CALLED
TO OUR ATTENTION. STATEMENTS FROM THE VICTIMS ON THE SMALL
PLANE, AND LETTERS FROM PEOPLE WHO HAD EITHER BEEN IN JONESTOWN
OR WHO HAD LOST RELATIVES IN JONESTOWN. MANY OF THESE LETTERS

ARE POWERFUL AND MOVING TESTIMONY TO THE MADNESS OF JONESTOWN
AND TO THE SPELL CAST OVER THAT COMMUNITY BY THE DOMINATING AND
AUTHORITARIAN PRESENCE OF JIM JONES.

THE COURT RECEIVED FOUR LETTERS FROM THE JURORS. THE FIRST JUROR WROTE:

"I REALIZE LARRY LAYTON IS GUILTY OF TAKING PART IN A HORRIBLE CRIME, BUT AT THE SAME TIME I BELIEVE HE IS AS MUCH A VICTIM AS A PARTICIPANT. AND I WISH YOU WOULD GIVE SOME THOUGHT TO MY POSITION OF HIS BEING VICTIMIZED AND SHOW LENIENCY IN YOUR JUDGMENT."

ANOTHER JUROR:

"ALTHOUGH WE THE JURY DID FIND MR. LAYTON GUILTY OF
THE CRIMES CHARGED, WE DID DISCUSS THE FACT THAT
MR. LAYTON DID PLAY A VERY SMALL PART IN THE
CONSPIRACY. MANY OF THE JURORS, INCLUDING MYSELF, DID
DISCUSS THE FACT THAT HE SHOULD BE PUNISHED. BUT WE
DO NOT FEEL THAT HE SHOULD BE PUNISHED SEVERELY. WE
DO FEEL THAT THE CIRCUMSTANCES WERE ALMOST UNBEARABLE.
MR. LAYTON HAS ALREADY PAID AND SUFFERED A GREAT DEAL.
HE WILL CONTINUE TO PAY CARRYING THIS TRAGIC NIGHTMARE
WITH HIM THE REST OF HIS LIFE. I CERTAINLY DO NOT
BELIEVE THAT HE IS A THREAT TO SOCIETY. MY VERDICT OF
GUILTY COMES ONLY WITH A FEELING OF JUSTICE, IF THE
SENTENCE GIVEN IS MINIMAL."

ANOTHER JUROR:

"I AM READY TO PLEAD FOR LENIENCY IN SENTENCING LARRY LAYTON. I FEEL MY GUILTY VERDICT WAS LEGALLY CORRECT, BUT IN NO WAY MORALLY JUST. I WAS MAUNTED BY THE LARGER MORAL QUESTION, WAS LARRY LAYTON FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS ACTIONS. BUT IN MY MIND HE IS NO DIFFERENT THAN ANY OTHER VICTIM OF JIM JONES. THE VAST NUMBERS WHO DIED ARE TESTIMONY TO THE EXTRAORDINARY POWER OF THAT EVIL MAN. I BELIEVE LARRY LAYTON HAS ALREADY BEEN PUNISHED AND WILL FOREVER BE HAUNTED BY HIS PAST, WHETHER HE SITS IN JAIL OR IS ALLOWED TO HEAL BY BECOMING A CONTRIBUTING MEMBER OF SOCIETY."

AND THE FOURTH JUROR:

"I BEG FOR MERCY FOR LARRY LAYTON. I PLEAD LENIENCY BECAUSE HE SPENT YEARS IN A CLOSED ENVIRONMENT THAT REVOLVED AROUND JONES AND THE PEOPLES TEMPLE."

THE COURT RECEIVED THREE LETTERS FROM WITNESSES FOR THE PROSECUTION; HAROLD CORDELL, THOMAS BOGUE, AND MICHAEL CARTER.

NOW, HAROLD CORDELL STATES:

THE TIME OF THE JONESTOWN MASSACRE AND FOR A YEAR OR SO AFTER I WAS VERY ANGRY AND BITTER THAT MY FIVE CHILDREN, RELATIVES AND HUNDREDS OF GOOD FRIENDS WERE SENSELESSLY AND BRUTALLY PUT TO DEATH. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO DOUBT IN MY MIND THAT THE MASSACRE OF JONESTOWN AND THE MURDER OF THE CONGRESSMAN WOULD HAVE

TAKEN PLACE NO MATTER WHAT LAYTON HAD DONE AT THE AIRSTRIP. NO ONE HAD THE POWER TO STOP JONES. IT WOULD NOT IMPRESS ME THAT JUSTICE WAS DONE TO KNOW THAT LAYTON WAS SENTENCED TO PRISON. I PLEAD, YOUR HONOR, FOR LENIENCY FOR LARRY LAYTON SO THAT HE CAN BEGIN TO MEND HIS LIFE WHICH WAS, LIKE MINE, TORN TO SHREDS BY JIM JONES."

TOM BOGUE: "LARRY IS NOT A CONSPIRATOR OR A MURDERER.

HE IS A VICTIM JUST LIKE THE REST OF US. AT THAT

POINT IN TIME HE HAD HIS OWN WILL VERY SYSTEMATICALLY

BROKEN DOWN TO WHERE IT NO LONGER EXISTED, HIS ACTIONS

WERE NOT OF HIS OWN CHOICE. TO BE QUITE HONEST WITH

YOU, SIR, IF I WAS IN HIS SHOES--THANK GOD I WASN'T--I

DON'T KNOW THAT I WOULDN'T HAVE DONE THE SAME."

MICHAEL CARTER: "LARRY HAS ALREADY SUFFERED

TREMENDOUSLY AND IS NOT A PERSON WHO DESERVES TO HAVE

ANY MORE OF HIS LIFE TAKEN AWAY FROM HIM SIMPLY

BECAUSE HE WAS DECEIVED BY A MAN WHO ENJOYED

MANIPULATING AND USING PEOPLE."

AND NOW FOR THE VICTIMS IN THE SMALL PLANE WHO WERE OF COURSE THE DIRECT TARGETS OF THE DEFENDANT LARRY LAYTON.

REMARKABLE COMPASSION IS EXPRESSED BY THEM UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

MONICA BAGBY STATES:

"I FEEL THAT THE ACTION BEING TAKEN TO SINGLE OUT

OF MY RELATIVES DIED IN JONESTOWN. AFTER ALL, SOMEONE MUST PAY. BUT HAVEN'T ENOUGH LIVES BEEN LOST ALREADY?

I BELIEVE LARRY CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE, CAN BE A

PRODUCTIVE MEMBER OF SOCIETY. I BELIEVE HE CAN LIVE A

CONSTRUCTIVE AND POSITIVE LIFE OUTSIDE OF PRISON.\*

11:

PSYCHIATRISTS. THE GOVERNMENT PSYCHIATRIST AND THE DEFENDANT'S PSYCHIATRISTS, WHILE DIFFERING AS TO THE SANITY OF LARRY LAYTON AT THE TIME OF THE COMMISSION OF THE OFFENSE, THERE ARE EMINENT PSYCHIATRISTS ON BOTH SIDES ON THAT ISSUE. THE GOVERNMENT PSYCHIATRIST, WELL-KNOWN IN THE PROFESSION AND IN CALIFORNIA, STATED THAT HE WAS LEGALLY SANE AT THE TIME—THEY CONCLUDED THAT HE WAS LEGALLY SANE AT THE TIME OF THE COMMISSION OF THIS OFFENSE, AND THE OTHER PSYCHIATRISTS SUBMITTED BY THE DEFENDANT TOOK THE OTHER POSITION. THEY BOTH AGREE ABOUT THE DOMINATION OF JIM JONES IN THIS SETTING.

DOCTOR OTTO BENDHEIM REPORTED IN HIS PSYCHIATRIC

AUTOPSY OF JIM JONES THAT JONES INITIALLY ATTEMPTED TO DO GOOD

FOR PEOPLES TEMPLE MEMBERS, BUT THEN LIED TO THEM, CHEATED THEM,

MANIPULATED AND EXPLOITED THEM, SADISTICALLY BRUTALIZED THEM,

USED THEM FOR SEXUAL PLEASURE AND, IN THE END, HE KILLED THEM.

DOCTOR BENDHEIM DOCUMENTS AT LENGTH THE MANY TECHNIQUES

OF COERCIVE PERSUASION USED BY JIM JONES, INCLUDING CONSTANT

DISCUSSION OF MASS REVOLUTIONARY SUICIDE, PHYSICAL INTIMIDATION

AND PSYCHOLOGICAL COERCION AIMED AT DESTROYING FAMILY TIES,

1 PROHIBITING MEMBERS FROM LEAVING GUYANA AND DEPRIVATION OF 2 PRIVACY, SLEEP, FREE SPEECH AND FREE ASSOCIATION.

IN ADDITION, MEMBERS OF PEOPLES TEMPLE WERE SUBJECT TO DEGRADING PUNISHMENT AND PUBLIC HUMILIATION, FOOD DEPRIVATION AND HARD LABOR.

IN THE END JIM JONES DESTROYED ANY INDIVIDUAL WILL TO LIVE THAT REMAINED IN JONESTOWN, AND CAUSED OVER 900 PEOPLE TO TAKE THEIR OWN LIVES AND THE LIVES OF THEIR CHILDREN. ALTHOUGH NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE CONSPIRACY FOR WHICH LARRY LAYTON HAS BEEN CONVICTED, THIS FINAL ATROCITY IS ESSENTIAL TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH HE LIVED, IT IS OUR VIEW.

NUMEROUS JONESTOWN SURVIVORS HAVE WRITTEN TO DESCRIBE THE DESTRUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL WILL THAT OCCURRED IN JONESTOWN, AND TO EXPRESS THEIR OPINIONS THAT LARRY LAYTON WAS ALSO HIMSELF A VICTIM. ALTHOUGH LARRY LAYTON MUST BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS ACTIONS, THE COURT IS CONVINCED THAT A JUST SENTENCE ALSO REQUIRES CONSIDERATION OF THE ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH LAYTON AND OTHER MEMBERS OF JONESTOWN WERE VIRTUALLY IMPRISONED.

IN HIS STATEMENT TO ME IN WRITING, AND TO SOME DEGREE HERE IN THE COURTROOM A FEW MOMENTS AGO, HE HAS EXPRESSED GREAT REGRET, GREAT REMORSE, AND STATES THAT HE HAS GREAT CONCERN ABOUT THOSE WHO SURVIVED, THE ONES WHO WERE GUNNED DOWN AND WHO DIED FROM POISON IN GUYANA.

IT MUST ALSO BE NOTED THAT THE DEFENDANT LARRY LAYTON

1 HAS ALREADY BEEN INCARCERATED FOR THREE YEARS. HE SPENT TWO
2 YEARS UNDER VERY HARSH CONDITIONS, ALL AGREE, IN THE JAIL IN
3 GUYANA. HE HAS SPENT A YEAR AND 49 DAYS, I UNDERSTAND, IN
4 FEDERAL CUSTODY. UNDER THE LAW HE MUST BE CREDITED WITH THE ONE
5 YEAR AND 49 DAYS THAT HE WAS HERE IN OUR FEDERAL JAILS. HE,
6 HOWEVER, IS NOT BY LAW TO BE CREDITED FOR THE TWO YEARS THAT HE
7 SPENT IN CUSTODY IN GUYANA. HOWEVER, THE COURT IN THE
8 FASHIONING OF THE SENTENCE IS GOING TO TAKE THAT PERIOD INTO
9 CONSIDERATION.

I RETURN TO WHERE I STARTED, AND ALL AGREE THIS IS A VERY GRAVE CRIME AND IT CANNOT BE CASUALLY REGARDED. AND I DON'T SUGGEST THAT ANYONE HAS BEEN ADVANCING THAT. BUT IT IS A CRIME FOR WHICH THE DEFENDANT STANDS CONVICTED AND THAT HE MUST BE SENTENCED.

HAVING IN MIND THE CONSIDERATIONS AND THE COMMENTS THAT

I HAVE MADE, IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THIS COURT THAT ON COUNT 1

THE DEFENDANT BE SENTENCED TO A TERM OF 15 YEARS; THAT SECTION

4205(B) (1) BE INVOKED AND THAT PAROLE ELIGIBILITY BE FIXED AT

FIVE YEARS.

ON COUNT 2, IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT THAT THE DEFENDANT BE IMPRISONED FOR A TERM OF LIFE, AND THAT THE SECTION 4205(B) (1) BE ENVOKED AND THAT PAROLE ELIGIBILITY BE FIXED AT FIVE YEARS.

ON COUNT 3, IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT THAT THE DEFENDANT BE COMMITTED TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, OR HIS

DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE, FOR A TERM OF 15 YEARS, AND THAT
UNDER SECTION 4205(B) (1), THAT PAROLE ELIGIBILITY BE FIXED AT

FIVE YEARS.

ON COUNT 4, IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE ÇOURT THAT THE DEFENDANT BE REMANDED TO THE CUSTODY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR A PERIOD OF 15 YEARS, AND THAT THE PAROLE ELIGIBILITY BE FIXED UNDER SECTION 4205(B) (1) AT FIVE YEARS. THESE SENTENCES WILL RUN CONCURRENTLY.

IT IS NOW MY DUTY UNDER THE RULES TO INFORM YOU,

MR. LAYTON, THAT YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO APPEAL; THAT YOU MUST FILE

YOUR NOTICE OF APPEAL WITHIN TEN DAYS. AND THAT YOU HAVE A

RIGHT TO A LAWYER TO REPRESENT YOU ON APPEAL. AND YOU CAN

CHOOSE YOUR LAWYER. IF YOU CANNOT AFFORD A LAWYER, ONE WILL BE

FURNISHED WITHOUT CHARGE TO YOU TO REPRESENT YOU ON APPEAL.

THAT CONCLUDES THIS HEARING. MR. XAVIER IN HIS ABLE FASHION HAS REMINDED ME THAT WE ARE TO SET THE HEARING ON THE 2255 ISSUES AT THIS TIME.

MR. CLERK, WOULD YOU SUGGEST A DATE APPROXIMATELY THREE WEEKS AWAY OR A MONTH AWAY, WITH AN EARLIER DATE FOR A STATUS CONFERENCE.

MR. RUSSONIELLO: MR. TAMBURELLO'S COUNSEL INFORMS ME
HE IS GOING TO BE OUT OF THE COUNTRY FROM MARCH 12TH TO APRIL
12TH.

THE COURT: MARCH 12TH THROUGH APRIL 12TH.

MR. HEWITT: I WILL ALSO BE GONE AT THE END OF MARCH.

1 I HAVE A MEETING.

THE COURT: THEN IT WILL BE IN APRIL AFTER THE RETURN

3 OF MR. TAMBURELLO.

MR. RUSSONIELLO: HE WILL PROBABLY NEED SOME TIME TO GET BACK INTO HIS OFFICE.

THE COURT: AS LONG AS IT IS THE LATTER PART OF APRIL.

WE HAVE HEARINGS OUTSIDE--EXTENSIVE HEARINGS OUTSIDE OF THE

DISTRICT IN A CLASS ACTION MATTER THAT I HAVE TO PRESIDE AT.

MR. CLERK, WHAT ABOUT THE LAST WEEK IN APRIL?

THE COURT: HE RETURNS THE 12TH OF APRIL?

MR. RUSSONIELLO: YES.

THE COURT: WHAT ABOUT APRIL 21ST?

MR. RUSSONIELLO: FINE WITH THE GOVERNMENT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: APRIL 21ST.

MR. BRYAN: YOUR HONOR, JUST A MOMENT. LAST BUT NOT LEAST, LET ME CHECK MY CALENDAR. YOUR HONOR, I HAVE ONE PROBLEM WHICH I JUST WANT THE COURT TO BE AWARE OF—YOUR OFFICE TO BE AWARE OF IN CASE YOU GET A CALL FROM ANOTHER JUDGE. I AM SUPPOSED TO START A CAPITAL MURDER TRIAL IN ANOTHER COUNTY IN CALIFORNIA BETWEEN NOW AND THEN. OBVIOUSLY, ONCE WE START THAT IT IS GOING TO BE A VERY LENGTHY TRIAL. I AM GOING TO ASK THE COURT IN THE OTHER CASE TO DEFER BEGINNING OF THAT TRIAL UNTIL WE FINISH THAT HEARING.

THE COURT: WHEN DOES THAT CASE STARTS?

MR. BRYAN: SCHEDULED TO START IN MARCH, MARCH 17. BUT

WE ARE HAVING SOME WITNESSES BROUGHT IN FROM SOME OTHER STATES,

A NUMBER OF WITNESSES. SO I AM GOING TO ASK THE COURT--SO THIS

COURT WILL BE AWARE, I AM GOING TO ASK THIS COURT TO PUT THIS

OVER UNTIL AFTER THIS HEARING. YOUR OFFICE MAY BE GETTING A

CALL ON THAT.

THE COURT: I DON'T LIKE TO INTRUDE ON ANOTHER COURT.

FOR WHAT MAY BE A THREE DAY HEARING AS I ENVISION THIS--I KNOW

YOU DISAGREE--I DON'T LIKE TO SEE--IT IS A MONTH AND A HALF

AFTER YOUR TRIAL IS TO COMMENCE THAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THIS

DATE. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE EITHER OUGHT TO HAVE THIS FOLLOW

YOUR TRIAL OR---

MR. BRYAN: IF IT FOLLOWS OUR TRIAL, WE ARE TALKING
ABOUT OVER THE SUMMER, YOUR HONOR. I WOULD REALLY LIKE TO SEE
THIS LITIGATED. I'M SURE HIS HONOR WOULD. I WOULD SUGGEST WE
GO FORWARD WITH THE DATE SUGGESTED. ARE WE GOING TO HAVE
ANOTHER DATE BEFORE THAT TO MEET WITH THE COURT?

THE COURT: YES, WE ARE GOING TO DISCUSS IT. HAVING GIVEN FURTHER STUDY—AND I WILL GIVE YOU OUR VIEWS AT THE STATUS CONFERENCE—THERE IS NO NEED TO PUT ON THE ENTIRE DEFENSE CASE AS IF THERE WAS THE ACTUAL TRIAL IN PROGRESS. AND THE MATTER CAN BE PRESENTED UNDER THE TEACHINGS OF THE SUPREME COURT, I WOULD SAY, IN NO MORE THAN PERHAPS A DAY, I WOULD SAY TWO DAYS, AT THE OUTSIDE THREE DAYS.

SO, MR. CLERK, WILL YOU GIVE US A TIME. I WOULD SAY
APPROXIMATELY AN HOUR, A LITTLE LESS.

MR. TAMBURELLO: IF I MIGHT SUGGEST, IF THAT'S THE

CASE, IF IT IS GOING TO BE OF THAT DURATION, I AM NOT LEAVING

UNTIL MARCH THE 12TH. SO IF THE COURT HAS ANY TIME BETWEEN NOW

AND THEN.

THE COURT: THAT IS ONLY A WEEK ACTUALLY, ISN'T IT, A

LITTLE OVER A WEEK. TODAY IS THE 3RD. SO THAT WOULD BE ABOUT

NINE DAYS. WE ARE IN THE MIDDLE OF A TRIAL.

MR. BRYAN: I WOULD ALSO SUGGEST THIS IS TOO SERIOUS A MATTER TO BE RUSHED INTO JUST THAT QUICKLY. I THINK I KNOW, AT LEAST ON BEHALF OF MR. LAYTON, WE WOULD WANT MORE TIME THAN THAT. SO I WOULD SUGGEST WE GO ON THE DATE SUGGESTED.

THE COURT: APRIL 21ST. THAT WILL BE THE ORDER. AND THEN THE DATE FOR THE STATUS CONFERENCE, MR. CLERK. JUST COUNSEL WILL BE PRESENT. THE WITNESSES WILL NOT HAVE TO BE PRESENT. IT SHOULD BE IN ABOUT A WEEK OR TWO.

THE MARSHAL: DO YOU WANT THE DEFENDANT, YOUR HONOR, AT THE STATUS CONFERENCE?

THE COURT: YES.

THE CLERK: MAY I SUGGEST A DATE OF MONDAY, MARCH THE 16TH AT 3:00 P.M.

THE COURT: SO ORDERED. THAT WILL BE THE STATUS

MR. BRYAN: 3:00 P.M. MAY I ASK ONE THING. I JUST REALIZED, GOING BACK TO THE SENTENCING ISSUE FOR A MINUTE, DOES THE COURT HAVE ANY RECOMMENDATION REGARDING WHERE MR. LAYTON IS

TO BE INCARCERATED? I DON'T KNOW IF THE COURT HAS GIVEN ANY 1 THOUGHT---THE COURT: I THINK YOU ARE MISTAKEN IN THE SECURITY 3 LEVEL AT WHICH YOU PLACE---5 MR. BRYAN: I DID. I MADE AN ERROR ON THAT, THAT'S 6 CORRECT. 7 THE COURT: I THINK THE LIKELIHOOD WOULD BE PLEASANTON 8 OR TERMINAL ISLAND, IF WITHIN THIS AREA. I WOULD CERTAINLY RECOMMEND THAT HE BE WITHIN THE AREA. 10 I AM VERY SENSITIVE TO THE PROBLEMS OF OVERCROWDING IN 11 THE INSTITUTIONS AND THE FACT THAT THE BUREAU OF PRISONS DOESN'T 12 HAVE THE FLEXIBILITY THAT IT ONCE DID WHEN OUR PRISONS WERE LESS 13 CROWDED. SO FOR THAT REASON I HAVE NOT IN RECENT TIMES MADE RECOMMENDATIONS ALONG THESE LINES. THEY DON'T HAVE TO BE, OF 14 15 COURSE HONORED, AS YOU KNOW. 16 MR. BRYAN: MAY I ASK THAT THE COURT CONSIDER ORDERING 17 THAT HE REMAIN HERE IN THE COUNTY JAIL SINCE WE HAVE THIS 18 HEARING PENDING AND IT WOULD CERTAINLY FACILITATE THINGS FOR THE 19 DEFENSE. 20 MR. RUSSONIELLO: THAT IS EVEN WORSE A PROBLEM. 21 MR. BRYAN: I ADMIT IS NOT A LOVELY PLACE. 22 MR. RUSSONIELLO: THAT IS NOT THE QUESTION. 23 THE COURT: I DON'T THINK WE HAVE ANY MORE BEDS SINCE LAST WEEK. 24 25 MR. BRYAN: OH.

THE COURT: SO IF HE STAYS IN LOCAL CUSTODY, HE WILL BE IN FOLSOM, IN COLUSA, OR POSSIBLY---MR. RUSSONIELLO: OR ARIZONA. THE COURT: ARIZONA OR DOWN IN TERMINAL ISLAND. JAIL SITUATION IS A CRISIS. I THINK THAT'S WHAT YOU HAD REFERENCE TO. MR. RUSSONIELLO: THAT'S WHAT I WAS REFERRING TO, YES, YOUR HONOR THE COURT: SO THAT'S HOW WE WILL LEAVE IT, THANK YOU. (HEARING CONCLUDED) 

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

1, ROBERTA L. ROGERS, OFFICIAL REPORTER FOR THE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, 450
GOLDEN GATE AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY
CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPTS, PAGES NUMBERED 2
THROUGH 64, INCLUSIVE, CONSTITUTES A TRUE, FULL AND CORRECT
TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES TAKEN AS SUCH OFFICIAL
REPORTER OF THE PROCEEDINGS HEREINBEFORE ENTITLED, AND REDUCED
TO TYPEWRITING TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY.

ROBERTA L. ROGERS, CSR