

PART V

EXCERPTS FROM THE  
FEDERAL FILE OF  
JOSEPH A. MAZOR VS.

CALIFORNIA ADULT AUTHORITY

X-4-f-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION  
BACKGROUND TO INVOLVEMENT OF JOSEPH A.  
MAZOR WITH THE FORMER MEMBERS OF  
PEOPLES TEMPLE
- II. EXCERPT FROM THE FEDERAL FILE "JOSEPH A.  
MAZOR VS. CALIFORNIA ADULT AUTHORITY, ET. AL"

x-4-f-2

# INTRODUCTION

We have found the "investigative" work of Mr. Joseph Am Mazon to be most questionable. He has been hired by a number of people who are former members of Peoples Temple and antagonistic to the church.

He has made several television appearances and submitted his copy to the local press. He has called the Ambassador to the United States from Guyana trying to cause trouble. His remarks are inflammatory and without basis in fact. We question his role in this "investigation." The excerpt from his file included here speaks for itself.

x-4-f-3

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

9-22-77 230 P.

IDENTIFICATION DIVISION

The following FBI record, NUMBER 521 470 D, is furnished FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

CONTRIBUTOR OF FINGERPRINTS	NAME AND NUMBER	APRINTS OR RECEIVED	CHARGE	DISPOSITION
Westchester Co Putnam Police Lawthorne NY	Joseph A. Mazor #3-1218	3-29-57	AWOL (U.S. Army) poss switchblade knife (1897 PL)	resp sent & turned over to Military Authorities
USA Support Center Chgo Ill	Joseph A. Mazor #---	6-14-60	inquiry	
PD Ormond Beach Fla	Joseph A. Mazor #642-20	11-26-60	WC 2 counts	TOTC 7th JP Volusia Co Fla
SO De Land Fla	Joseph Mazor #28242	11-27-60	#1 wrthls check #2 wrthls check	restit & costs of 6 mo
Chgo Ill Lawrence Ave Chgo Ill (Dund prnt rest) Cook Co Jail Chgo Ill	Joseph A. Mazor #25754	1-9-61	fraud chcp 33-25 IRS	
PD Park Ridge Ill	Joseph A Mazor #61-30	5-12-61	Bogus Checks	
Cook Co Jail Chgo Ill	Joseph A Mazor #281252	10-9-61	False pretence	own recog
PD Los Angeles Calif	Joseph A Mazor #4 634 330-3	11-5-62	4761 PD (checks not sufficient funds) & etc (L.A. CRS 771516	180 d-7-63 L.A. CR 771516 L.A. CR 771516
SO Los Angeles Calif	Joseph Allen Mazor #4-926628	1-23-63	checks non sufficient funds bond surrender	

Information by \* ARE NOT BASED ON FINGER PRINTS IN FBI FILE. The information is based on the records of this Bureau concerning individuals of the race or similar names or other and are not to be used as a basis for any investigation.

X-4-f-4a

9-22-77 230 K.

IDENTIFICATION DIVISION

CONTRIBUTOR OF FINGERPRINTS	NAME AND NUMBER	ARRESTED OR RECEIVED	CHARGE	DISPOSITION
Fairbank Calif	Joseph Allen Mazor #52133	1-22-63	NSF checks 476a PC	Prison
San Francisco Calif	Joseph A Mazor #A 77153	3-19-63	NSF 3 counts conc (476a PC)	6 mos to 14 5 cts conc 6-18-64 par
Los Angeles Calif	Joseph Allen Mazor #B-936623 C-216712	4-1-65	Parole Viol	
San Francisco Calif	Joseph A Mazor #A 77153 A	7-7-65	fictitious check concurrent with present term (476 Penal Code)	6 mos to 14 cts conc 6-18-64 par
San Bernardino Calif	Joseph A. Mazor #267001 WES	3-4-69	viol of par	
San Francisco Calif	Joseph A Mazor #A-77153-A	5-15-69	PV	to finish to Los Angeles 2/15/70 Par
San Anaheim Calif	Joseph Allen Mazor #60633	11-30-70	parole recalled	rel
San Francisco Calif	Joseph Mazor #B 48735	12-1-70	3053 PC (viol parole)	
San Francisco Calif	Joseph Mazor #A 77153A	1-25-71	Parole Violator	to finish term 1-25-74 Parol to San Francisco 1-25-74

[illegible]
$$x = 4 - 7 - 46$$

DAVID B. FECHHEIMER

1803 Laguna Street, San Francisco, California 94115

Telephone (415) 922-9819

Cable: DAVFECH

October 4, 1977

Charles R. Garry, Esq.  
Garry Dreyfus McTernan Brotsky  
Herndon & Pesonen Inc.  
1256 Market Street  
San Francisco, Ca.

RE: PEOPLES TEMPLE

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

A confidential source in the California Adult Authority reports that Joseph A. Mazor's wife's brother is the leader of La Nuestra Familia.

This information has not been confirmed. Please advise if you wish further investigation.

  
David B. Fechheimer

x-4-f-5

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. Conviction; Parole and Revocation

Petitioner is presently incarcerated in the California Medical Facility at Vacaville pursuant to the Judgment and Commitment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County entered on June 25, 1965, sentencing him to state prison for the term prescribed by law (6 months to 14 years), following conviction on his plea of guilty to violation of Penal Code section 476 (Fictitious checks).<sup>1/</sup> Exhibit A. Petitioner was parole on May 22, 1967, with his term set to expire on July 7, 1970. This parole was suspended and his term reset at maximum on May 2, 1969 and he was returned to prison where parole was revoked on June 27 1969. See Exhibit C (Summary of Sentence Data - 1965 Conviction)

On November 19, 1969, petitioner's term was reset at seven years, to expire on July 7, 1972, and on February 15, 1970, petitioner was paroled to the Riverside Unit, Los Angeles County. See Exhibit C. Petitioner was released to a parole program which included employment as a research law clerk for John C. McCarthy of the law firm of Young, Henrie and McCarthy in Pomona, California. Petitioner's parole release had been advanced from March 10, 1970, to accommodate the needs of this employer. See Exhibit D at 2. At his initial interview with petitioner the parole agent explained to petitioner that he could neither open a checking account nor sign any contracts without permission. Petitioner informed the agent that he intended to divorce his wife and continue his relationship with Madelynn Beth Boyum, also known as Mazar and Williams. Id. at 3. The parole agent's

1. This offense was committed while petitioner was on parole for a 1963 Los Angeles County conviction for violation of Penal Code section 476a (insufficient funds check). The sentence on this conviction expired as fully served in March, 1968. See Exhibit B (Judgment and Summary of Sentence Data - 1963 Conviction)

X-4-f-6

1 continuing summary (2-19-70 to 6-30-70) indicates that peti-  
2 tioner received an interlocutory decree of dissolution April 16,  
3 1970.

4 The report further notes that petitioner was, at one  
5 time, considered near totally blind but had received eye  
6 refraction and could read with little or no difficulty.<sup>2/</sup>  
7 Petitioner changed his employment to the law firm of Jaffee and  
8 Mallory on May 5, 1970, and Mr. Jaffee indicated he would sponsor  
9 petitioner in taking the bar exam. Id. at 5. The agent's  
10 summary (7-1-70 to 12-14-70) discloses that petitioner was  
11 arrested on November 30, 1970, at the request of the parole agent.  
12 Id. at 6.

13 On December 16, 1970, a parole violation report was  
14 submitted, recommending parole suspension and revocation on  
15 the basis of eleven charges as follows:

16 1. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 10 of the  
17 Conditions of Parole as evidenced by his obtaining a  
18 passport without the knowledge or permission of the  
19 Parole Agent.

20 2. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 10 of  
21 the Conditions of Parole as evidenced by his making reser-  
22 vations on a United Airlines flight to New York, without  
23 the knowledge or permission of the Parole Agent.

24 3. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 10 of the  
25 Conditions of Parole when he bought a 1965 Jaguar without  
26 the knowledge or permission of the Parole Agent.

27 4. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 12 of the  
28 Conditions of Parole as evidenced by his forging the  
29 signature of his fiancée to her income tax refund check

30 2. It should also be noted that petitioner obtained an  
x-4-f-7



1 in the amount of \$693.62.

2 5. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 12 of the  
3 Conditions of Parole by making a fictitious automobile  
4 purchase draft in the amount of \$450.00.

5 6. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 12 of the  
6 Conditions of Parole by writing and depositing a \$300.00  
7 check on a closed account.

8 7. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 12 of the  
9 Conditions of Parole by attempting to sell furniture which  
10 he had rented from another firm.

11 8. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 12 of the  
12 Conditions of Parole by drawing welfare assistance while  
13 he was employed.

14 9. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 12 of the  
15 Conditions of Parole by misrepresenting an automobile, and  
16 consequently causing his employer a loss of \$1,795.00.

17 10. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 11 of the  
18 Conditions of Parole as evidenced by his being charged by  
19 the District Attorney's Office with failure to provide  
20 (270 P.C.).

21 11. Joseph Allen Mazor violated Condition 13a of the  
22 Conditions of Parole by establishing numerous credit  
23 accounts without the knowledge or permission of the Parole  
24 Agent. Id. at 9/10.

25 The report also set forth supporting evidence for each charge,  
26 Id. at 10-13, a resume of parole adjustment, Id. at 14, and  
27 reasons for the recommendation, Id. at 15.

28 On the basis of this report, petitioner's parole was  
29 suspended and his term reset at maximum on January 8, 1971. See  
30 Exhibit E. Petitioner was returned to prison on January 14, 1971.  
31 and was received at the California Medical Facility at Vacaville

1 on January 25, 1971. See Exhibit C. On March 5, 1971, peti-  
2 tioner appeared at a parole revocation hearing. The panel then  
3 found him guilty of charges 5, 6, 7, and 11, dismissed charges  
4 1, 2, 4, and 9, and submitted charges 3, 8 and 10 for investi-  
5 gation. See Exhibits F and G. On March 10, 1971, additional  
6 information was submitted pursuant to this investigation. See  
7 Exhibit H. In addition this report provided supplemental  
8 information indicating that petitioner cashed a check indorsed  
9 by the named payee and himself, but the named payee returned  
10 the check to the firm which cashed it, denying by affidavit,  
11 that she had indorsed it; and that petitioner had purchased a  
12 typewriter on a 90-day conditional sales contract, had paid no  
13 money (one year had elapsed), and was believed to have sold the  
14 typewriter. See Exhibit H at 2.

15 Subsequently, on April 14, 1971, while at the California  
16 Institution for Men at Chino, petitioner made an unscheduled  
17 appearance before an Adult Authority Panel.<sup>3/</sup> As a result, his  
18 case was submitted for review on April 20, 1971. No change was  
19 made in his status, the Authority resolved the three charges  
20 which were submitted, finding him guilty of charge 8, and dis-  
21 missing charges 3 and 10, and his case was scheduled for con-  
22 sideration again by the entire board on May 17, 1971. Documents  
23 relevant to this meeting are, or will be when received, attached  
24 as Exhibit J.

25 B. Medical Condition and Treatment.

26 As stated above, petitioner was returned to prison on  
27 January 14, 1971, and on January 25, 1971, was received at the  
28

29 3. We have been informed that two Deputy Attorneys General  
30 from the Los Angeles Office were observing Adult Authority hear-  
31 ings conducted at Chino for informational purposes. They had no  
particular interest in nor any connection with petitioner's case.  
Petitioner was informed that they were visitors and gave his consent to their presence. X-4-f-9

1 California Medical Facility at Vacaville. By letter dated  
2 January 26, 1971, Riverside General Hospital forwarded a summary  
3 of petitioner's examination and treatment. The report recom-  
4 mended an investigation by neurology staff and consideration  
5 for angiogram studies. The "final diagnosis" set forth in the  
6 report is "Rule out Leptomenigeal cyst, meningioma, vascular  
7 disorder." See Exhibit I.

8 Reports dated March 1, 1971, (Dr. Prout) and March 2,  
9 1971 (Dr. Wright, Consulting Neurosurgeon), see Exhibit I, reveal  
10 that petitioner was under the care of the medical staff almost  
11 immediately upon his arrival at Vacaville. For instance, skull  
12 x-rays were taken on January 27, 1971, an EEG was made, an  
13 ophthalmolgist was consulted on February 10, 1971, and a neuro-  
14 surgical consultation took place on March 2, 1971. Dr. Prout's  
15 letter notes "Our consulting radiologist, R. F. Chambers, M.D.,  
16 interprets the recent skull x-rays of January 27, 1971, as  
17 "abnormal skull evidence of atrophy involving the right hemisphere  
18 with probable vascular malformation. Contrast studies would  
19 probably be informative." Subject had contrast studies in  
20 Fall, 1970, at UCLA Hospital but refuses to sign a release for  
21 these records upon advice of his attorney." Dr. Wright's report  
22 also indicates that petitioner refused to make the September  
23 studies available to the doctor despite being told no meaningful  
24 opinion could be rendered without them. Petitioner also refused  
25 to consent to angiography in the institution. Dr. Wright recom-  
26 mended further tests. A report dated March 4, 1971, indicates  
27 that Dr. Prout concurred in this recommendation. See Petition,  
28 Exhibit A.

29 By letter of March 22, 1971, to the California Supreme  
30 Court, Dr. Carter Noland of Riverside General Hospital stated

1 that, "We have since learned that further studies have shown a  
2 need for immediate surgery in order not to endanger his life."  
3 Petition, Exhibit B. By letter dated April 1, 1971, addressed  
4 to the chairman of the Adult Authority, Dr. Prout indicated that  
5 neurological studies should be undertaken, that they could be  
6 performed within the Department of Corrections, but only with  
7 petitioner's consent, which he refused to give, and that peti-  
8 tioner was willing to be hospitalized at Riverside General  
9 Hospital. Out of concern for petitioner's health status, the  
10 doctor recommended that the Adult Authority review his parole  
11 status and reinstate parole to permit petitioner to return to  
12 Riverside General Hospital. See Exhibit I; Petition, Exhibit C.

13 No change was made in petitioner's parole status, but  
14 after consultation, the Department of Corrections, pursuant to  
15 Penal Code section 2690, arranged for his treatment at Riverside  
16 General Hospital, and on April 9, 1971, transferred him to the  
17 California Institution for Men at Chino, where he was housed in  
18 the institution hospital. Petitioner was available for whatever  
19 studies or surgery staff at Riverside General Hospital wished to  
20 undertake.

21 The report of the studies conducted at Riverside  
22 General Hospital indicates that petitioner was uncooperative  
23 during the physical examination, and, refused to release to the  
24 hospital the angiograms done at UCLA. The report shows that  
25 SMA, CBC, and EKG tests or studies were within normal limits.  
26 Skull films reveal multiple radiolucent defects in the right  
27 cranial vault, and subtle abnormality, but no gross abnormality.  
28 Apparently, further surgery was unnecessary because petitioner  
29 was discharged with the recommendation that skull films be done  
30 in two years. The report is attached, or will be when received,  
31 as Exhibit K.

X-4-f-11

1 Petitioner was returned to Vacaville on April 27, 1971.  
2 He is presently under a "medical hold" which means that he cannot  
3 be transferred to an institution without medical clearance. He  
4 will be transferred back to Chino when approved by that insti-  
5 tution's medical officer as space becomes available.

6 ARGUMENT

7 PETITIONER'S PAROLE WAS PROPERLY REVOKED  
8 AND THERE HAS BEEN NO DENIAL OF ADEQUATE  
9 MEDICAL TREATMENT; THUS, NO CONSTITUTIONAL  
10 QUESTION IS PRESENTED.

11 Petitioner has filed in this Court a petition for writ  
12 of habeas corpus which, although emphasizing his physical con-  
13 dition and apparently objecting to the medical treatment afforded  
14 him, seeks only a determination that California procedures for  
15 revoking parole are unconstitutional, in that <sup>in</sup> his parole  
16 revocation, he was denied counsel, the right to confrontation,  
17 the right to present witnesses. See Petition at 12. <sup>4/</sup>

18 From the facts as stated above, it is obvious that there  
19 is no present issue concerning petitioner's treatment. Petitioner  
20 does not even suggest what test or procedure is presently necessary  
21 and unavailable. There is simply no federal question presented.  
22 Cf., Haggarty v. Mainwright, 427 F.2d 1137 (5th Cir. 1970).

23 It is also clear from the records submitted herewith  
24 that no federal question is presented by Adult Authority action  
25 in revoking petitioner's parole. There is no right to counsel, to  
26 confrontation of witnesses, or to call witnesses. All that is  
27 constitutionally required is cause for the revocation. See  
28 Allard v. Nelson, 423 F.2d 1216 (9th Cir. 1970); Mead v.  
29 California Adult Authority, 415 F.2d 767 (9th Cir. 1969); Dunn  
30 v. California Department of Corrections, 401 F.2d 340 (9th Cir.  
31 1968); Eason v. Dickson, 390 F.2d 585 (9th Cir.), cert. denied,  
32 392 U.S. 914 (1968). Ample cause is shown here.

4. On March 26, 1971, petitioner filed a nearly identical petition  
in the California Supreme Court. The Court denied the petition on  
April 22, 1971. The Court had been informed that petitioner had  
been transferred for treatment pursuant to Penal Code section 2690,  
and had available the documents submitted herewith as Exhibits A-I.

1 Petitioner was found guilty of five of the eleven  
2 violations charges. The supporting evidence provided for these  
3 charges discloses conduct clearly in violation of parole. (Ex.D 10-13;  
Ex. H.)

4 Petitioner alleges that he was unable to present  
5 documentary evidence of his innocence because of his blindness,  
6 that the Adult Authority would not consider this evidence and  
7 that counsel now have possession of this documentary evidence  
8 of his innocence of all charges.

9 We submit that this record clearly shows that the  
10 Adult Authority did consider most carefully the evidence pre-  
11 sented to it including petitioner's story and his documents,  
12 if any. At the time of the hearing four of the charges were  
13 dismissed. Three charges were submitted for further investi-  
14 gation. This conclusion is supported, even by petitioner's  
15 allegation that Mr. Valachi stated, "I hate this damned paperwork.  
16 We cannot support the charges and we will investigate." See  
17 Petition at 5. It is a mere conclusion unsupported by facts that  
18 because the panel returned the documents they did not consider  
19 them.

20 Although petitioner claims that he has documentary  
21 evidence that he is not guilty of any of the charges, he has not  
22 provided this Court with this evidence nor indicated what it is  
23 or to which specific charges it may be relevant. Moreover,  
24 although the Adult Authority will not permit counsel to be present  
25 at a revocation hearing, counsel is free to present written  
26 argument and documentary support to the Adult Authority for their  
27 consideration. Apparently, no effort has been made even to do  
28 this.

29 Finally, The Adult Authority is routinely provided with  
30 a Readmission Summary which includes a medical report. The report  
31 in this case, we are informed, included information on both

1 petitioner's blindness and possible brain tumor.

2 CONCLUSION

3 It is obvious from this record that the allegation of  
4 the imminence of petitioner's death is overstated, as is the  
5 allegation of total blindness. His claim of denial of due  
6 process in his parole revocation hearing lacks both legal and  
7 factual substance. In fact, the record shows that petitioner  
8 has had a most thorough consideration and review of both his  
9 condition and his status. In the circumstances shown, no  
10 federal question is presented. We respectfully request that  
11 the petition for writ of habeas corpus be denied, that the order  
12 to show cause be discharged, and that the proceedings be  
13 dismissed.

14 Dated: May 10, 1971.

15 EVELLE J. YOUNGER, Attorney General  
16 of the State of California

17 EDWARD P. O'BRIEN  
18 Deputy Attorney General

19 (Mrs.) GLORIA F. DeHART  
20 Deputy Attorney General

21 Attorneys for Respondents.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

x-4-f-17

*For*  
*Home*  
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JUDGMENT

Department No. 100

June 25 19 65 Present Hon. DAVID W WILLIAMS Judge

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, vs

JOSEPH A MAZOR *216-712*

304175

Deputy District Attorney James Johnsen and Defendant with counsel  
Deputy Public Defender L. Schoenheit present. Probation denied.  
Sentenced as indicated.

Whereas the said defendant having duly pleaded  
guilty in this court of the crime of ISSUING FICTITIOUS CHECK (Sec 476 PC), a felony,  
as charged in the information

It is Therefore Ordered, Adjudged and Decreed that the said defendant be punished by imprisonment in the State Prison for the term prescribed by law.

It is further  
of Los Ang  
nia State

6 CAD 111-1-11

1965 JUL -7 AM 11:38

C I M

x-4-f-15



IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

G.C. ADMITTANCE  
JUDGMENT

Department No. 100

March 8 1963 Present Hon. DONALD R. WRIGHT Judge

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

v. 20y+21

JOSEPH A MAZOR

Deputy District Attorney Malcom Harris and the Defendant in propria persona, present. Each count: Probation denied. Sentenced as indicated.

Whereas the said defendant having duly pleaded guilty in this court of the crime of ISSUING CHECK WITHOUT SUFFICIENT FUNDS (Sec 476a PC), a felony, as charged in each of the Counts 1, 2 and 3 of the information

It is Therefore Ordered, Adjudged and Decreed that the said defendant be punished by imprisonment in the State Prison for the term prescribed by law, on said Counts. Sentences as to Counts 1, 2 and 3 are ordered to run CONCURRENTLY with each other.

It is further Ordered that the said defendant be committed to the custody of the Sheriff of Los Angeles County, California.

correct copy of the

Deputy

By

Signature

x-4-f-16

CAROL MCCOY'S VISIT WITH MAZOR: 10:00 - 10:45 a.m. 10/24/77

M: YOU HAVE TWO CHILDREN IN GUYANA?  
C: NO, FOUR CHILDREN

M: WHAT ARE THEIR NAMES & AGES?  
C: PAT-13 Lowell- 11 La Ann- 8 Marcy- 7

M: YOU DID NOT GIVE PERMISSION FOR THEM TO GO?  
C: NO

M: WHEN DID THEY GO TO GUYANA?  
C: JULY

M: WHAT IS YOUR MOTHERS NAME?  
C: EDITH CORDELL ( HE STOPPED WRITING AND LOOKED AT ME FOR A COUPLE OF SECONDS AND SAID  
OH! IS THAT HAROLD OR RICKS WIFE?) ( I SAID NEITHER, ITS THEIR GREAT AUNT)

M: YOU SAID YOUR MOM HAD GUARDIANSHIP OVER THE CHILDREN. WHAT KIND OF GUARDIANSHIP?  
C: WHAT DO YOU MEAN?

M: WAS IT FILED IN COURT?  
C: I GUESS I LEFT THAT UP TO TIM (STOEN)

M: WHO DID THE GUARDIANSHIP?  
C: TIM STOEN- THAT'S WHY I DIDN'T WORRY ABOUT IT OR THINK ANYTHING ABOUT IT

M: WHO NOTARIZED IT?  
C: I DON'T KNOW. IT WAS DONE IN HIS OFFICE

M: WAS ANYONE ELSE IN THE OFFICE? THE D.A.'S OFFICE?  
C: I THINK HIS SECRETARY

M: JUNE CRYM?  
C: NO, I KNOW JUNE, IT WASN'T HER

HE PAUSED FOR A WHILE AND WE STARED AT EACH OTHER, THEN HE ASKED ME IF I HAD READ THE  
C  
GUARDIANSHIP PAPERS AND IF MOM HAD PERMISSION TO SEND THE KIDS OUT OF THE STATE?

I TOLD HIM THAT I GLANCED AT IT BUT DON'T REMEMBER WHAT IT SAID BECAUSE I REALLY DIDN'T  
CARE. I TOLD HIM THAT I HAD TRUSTED <sup>TIM</sup> ~~HER~~. HE SAID THAT THAT WAS HOW THE TEMPLE GOT THE  
HOLD ON SO MANY CHILDREN AND OTHER PEOPLE AS WELL. ~~HE~~ SAID THERE WAS SEVERAL THINGS THAT  
COULD BE DONE. THE FIRST THING WAS TO FIND OUT IF THE GUARDIANSHIP HAD BEEN FILED.  
(HE DOUBTED THAT IT HAD). IF IT HADN'T THEN THE NEXT MOVE WOULD BE TO NOTIFY THE  
STATE DEPARTMENT IN WASHINGTON AND GET PAPERS. HE SAID THE ONLY WAY I COULD GET THE  
KIDS BACK WAS TO PRESSURE JIM WITH ABDUCTION CHARGES. IF THE PAPERS WERE FILED THEN  
THE FIRST STEP WOULD BE TO RESOLVE THEM AND GET BACK MY RIGHTS. I TOLD HIM I DIDN'T

*Not a transcript  
- notes Carol  
wrote out upon  
returning to  
Mazor, Dia*

*x-4-f-17a*

WANT TO HURT MOM, AND THAT I HAD AN OUTSIDE INVOLVEMENT THAT KNEW NOTHING OF THE CHURCH OR WHERE MY LCHILDREN WERE, AND THAT I WAS HOPING TO GET THEM BACK WITHOUT MUCH FUSS. HE SAID THAT WOULD BE HARD TO DO: THAT I DIDN'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT HITTING THE FRONT PAGE OF THE PAPERS, BUT THAT I WOULD HAVE TO HURT MOM, THAT IT COULDN'T BE AVOIDED.

HE SAID THAT IF PAPERS WERE FILED ( SINCE I DIDN'T READ THEM) THERE MIGHT BE SOME CLAUSES IN THEM THAT GAVE MOM PERMANENT CUSTODY, AND IN THAT CASE I WOULD HAVE TO GO TO CIVIL COURT AND THEN I STILL WOULDN'T GET ANYWHERE UNTIL I PRESSED CHARGES OF KIDNAPPING AGAINST THE TEMPLE. I ASKED IF MOM WOULD BE ARRESTED, AND HE SAID NO, THAT IT WOULD BE JIM. HE SAID THAT IT WOULD FINALLY COME DOWN TO JIM BEING TOLD TO SEND THE CHILDREN BACK OR FACE EXTRADITION FOR ABDUCTION. HE SAID JIM WOULD SEND THE CHILDREN BACK FIRST.

HE SAID PARENTS HAD GONE OVER ON THEIR OWN AND HAD NOT GOTTEN PAST GEORGETOWN. ( IN TELLING IT, CAROL SAID HE MENTIONED A FATHER WHO HAD RECENTLY GONE, AND HAD FIXED IT SO THAT ~~HE WOULD NEVER SEE HIS CHILD AGAIN~~ <sup>HE WOULD NEVER SEE HIS CHILD AGAIN</sup> ~~HE HAD RAISED SO MUCH HELL AND~~ <sup>HE HAD RAISED SO MUCH HELL AND</sup> HAD BEEN UNSUCCESSFUL. TA) HE SAID THE GOVERNMENT IS VERY PRO-JONES NOW, BUT THERE ARE A FEW WHO HAVE DOUBTS. HE SAID FOUR CHILDREN HAVE BEEN SENT BACK, AND THE LAST ONE WAS A WEEK AND A HALF AGO. ( THAT'S WHEN I TOLD HIM I HAD THOUGHTS OF GOING OVER THEIR ON MY OWN, BUT FIGURED I WOULD GET NO WHERE SINCE AS FAR AS I KNEW NO ONE HAD GOTTEN THEIR CHILDREN BACK.) HE SAID THAT'S NOT TRUE, THAT IT'S HARD TO GET THEM BUT THERE IS HOPE. HE SAID JONES WAS SMART, AND FOR MOST OF JONES' MOVES HE (MAZOR) MOVES BACKWARD TO AVERT THEM, AND HAS BEEN PRETTY SUCCESSFUL AT DOING THIS.

HE SAID THAT THERE WAS A PERSON IN GUYANA THAT HAS ACCESS TO IMMIGRATION PAPERS AND WHEN NAMES COME UP THIS PERSON KEEPS A CLOSE EYE OUT. MAZOR SAID THAT HE ALREADY HAD MY NAME. HE SAID HIS CONTACT DOES THIS SO THAT MAZOR CAN BE NOTIFIED RIGHT AWAY OF TROUBLED CHILDREN LEAVING THE COUNTRY. IF JIM SHOULD PULL THEM OUT.

x-4-f-17b

HE SAID THAT IT WOULD TAKE A LOT OF MONEY IN ORDER TO GET MY CHILDREN BACK. HE SAID HE WOULD NOT TRY TO ENCOURAGE OR DISCOURAGE ME. BUT IT'S GOING TO COST, AND THERE'S ALWAYS A CHANCE I MAY NOT GET THEM. " I THINK YOU STAND A GOOD CHANCE, THOUGH. ABOUT A SEVENTY PER CENT CHANCE OF IT." HE WOULDN'T QUOTE ANY PRICES. HE SAID THAT THAT WOULD BE ACCORDING TO WHAT HAD TO BE DONE.

HE SAID THAT SEVERAL PASSPORTS HAVE COME UP MISSING. AND THAT THEY THINK ~~HE~~ IS SELLING THEM ON THE BLACK MARKET. HE SAID THAT SOME HAVE ALREADY TURNED UP IN TIBERIA (UNSURE OF THIS NAME) AND SOME OTHER PLACE.

HE SAID THEY HAD HAD THOUGHTS OF GETTING A PLANE LOAD OF PARENTS TOGETHER AND GO DOWN THERE AND DEMAND THE CHILDREN TO BE GIVEN BACK. BUT IT WAS ABANDONED BECAUSE THEY WOULDN'T GET FARTHER THAN GEORGETOWN AND THE MONEY WOULD BE SPENT USELESSLY. HE SAID ONE FATHER TRIED IT JUST RECENTLY. HE (HAZOR) HAD TOLD HIM NOT TO GO, BUT HE DID ANYWAY. AND GOT NOWHERE AND AS A RESULT WILL PROBABLY NEVER SEE HIS CHILD AGAIN. HE SAID THAT PICTURES OR MOVIES ARE TAKEN OF PORT KAITUMA; OF AN AGRICULTURAL MISSION OWNED BY THE GOVERNMENT. HE SAID HE HAS SIGNED AFFIDAVITS OF A PHOTOGRAPHER THAT TOOK THE MOVIES. HE SAID THE CHILD THAT JUST CAME BACK SAID THAT THERE WAS NO SCHOOL THERE. SO THEREFORE THERE ARE NO EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES THERE. HE SAID HE HAD TAPES OF HAROLD AND RICK THREATENING PEOPLE AND ASKED ME IF MY MOM KNEW ABOUT ANYTHING LIKE THAT. I SAID I WAS SURE SHE DIDN'T.

HE GAVE ME A LECTURE ABOUT HOW THE KIDS WERE AMERICAN CITIZENS. AND IF I DIDN'T FIGHT TO GET THEM BACK THEY WOULD LOSE THAT: THAT THE GOVERNMENT WAS <sup>is</sup> APOLITICAL. AND <sup>Today they might be friendly + tomorrow night be a dictator</sup> THAT THEY COULD CHANGE AT A MOMENT'S NOTICE. HE SAID HE LOOKS FOR JONES TO GET TIRED OF ~~ALL~~ THOSE THOUSAND PEOPLE THERE AND PICK UP AND LEAVE WITH THE MONEY AND LEAVE THEM STRANDED WITH NO PASSPORTS OR ANYTHING. I TOLD HIM HE HAD CERTAINLY GIVEN ME SOME THINGS TO THINK ABOUT AND THAT IT WOULD TAKE A FEW DAYS.

x-4-f-17c

I TOLD HIM I WOULD SEE IF MOM HAD A COPY OF THE GUARDIANSHIP PAPERS AND IF SHE DID I WOULD GET THEM. HE SAID IF I COULD GET A HOLD OF THEM TO CALL HIM. THAT HE WOULD BE BACK IN HIS OFFICE AFTER 4:30 AND THAT HE COULD TELL ME HOW MY CHANCES STOOD.

HE DID SAY IT WOULD TAKE A LOT DEEPER BACKGROUND TO GO IN TO THE CASE IF I DECIDED TO GO AHEAD. AND HE FELT I WOULD BE DEEPLY WRONG IF I DIDN'T. HE SAID HE'D GET STARTED RIGHT AWAY. HE SAID EVERYTHING HAD TO BE DONE LEGALLY. THAT DOING IT ANY OTHER WAY WAS NO GOOD.

HE DID IN THE COURSE OF THE CONVERSATION SAY SOMETHING ABOUT GOING IN AND KIDNAPPING THE CHILDREN. I ASKED HIM HOW COULD ONE GET IN THERE WITH THE GUARDS AND WIRE FENCE AND ALL THAT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE THERE. HE SAID " OH, THERE'S A WAY. BUT IT HAS TO BE DONE LEGALLY".

HE SAID JIM MAY STAY AND TAKE OVER THE COUNTRY SOME DAY. <sup>he may get shot down,</sup> DR. SOMEBODY MAY END UP SHOOTING HIM. THEN THE PEOPLE WOULD BE WITHOUT A LEADER. AND THEY WOULD WAKE UP TO NOTHING.

x-4-f-17d