COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

CHURCH UNIVERSAL & TRIUMPHANT, INC., A MONTANA CORPORATION,

PLAINTIFF, CROSS-DEFENDANT AND APPELLANT;

ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET,

CROSS-DEFENDANT AND APPELLANT,)

VS.

GREGORY MULL,

DEFENDANT, CROSS-COMPLAINANT AND RESPONDENT.

SUPERIOR COURT NO. C 358191

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

HONORABLE ALFRED L. MARGOLIS, JUDGE PRESIDING

REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL

APPEAR ANCES:

FCR THE PLAINTIFF, CROSS-DEFENDANTS AND APPELLANTS:

FOR THE DEFENDANT, CROSS-COMPLAINANT AND RESPONDENT:

COPY

VOLUME 9 OF 12 VOLUMES PAGES 1855 TO 2141, INCL.

RIORDAN & MC KINZIE
300 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 2900
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
TELEPHONE: (213) 629-4824

LAWRENCE LEVY, ESQ.
14724 VENTURA BOULEVARD, SUITE 704
SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA 91403
(818) 905-5971
-AND-

LYLE FRANCIS MIDDLETON, ESQ. 2500 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 810 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90057 (213) 381-2277

KATHLEEN H. ADAMS, CSR #2853 BRIDGET F. GEORGE, CSR #6148 CELESTE HALE, CSR #1310 ERMA DE MAR, CSR #2117 OFFICIAL REPORTERS

1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1986 *				
2	9:35 A.M.				
3	DEPARTMENT 50 HON. ALFRED L. MARGOLIS, JUDGE				
4	(APPEARANCES AS HERETOFORE NOTED.)				
5					
6	THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYBODY.				
7					
8	ANNE COURTRIGHT, +				
9	THE WITNESS ON THE STAND AT THE TIME OF ADJOURNMENT, RESUMES				
10	THE STAND AND TESTIFIES FURTHER AS FOLLOWS:				
11	THE CLERK: MA AM, YOU PREVIOUSLY HAVE BEEN SWORN AND				
12	ARE STILL UNDER OATH. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AGAIN FOR THE				
13	RECORD.				
14	THE WITNESS: MY NAME IS ANNE COURTRIGHT.				
15	THE CLERK: THANK YOU.				
16	THE COURT: PLEASE PROCEED.				
17	MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.				
18	GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.				
19					
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION + (RESUMED)				
21	BY MR. LEVY:				
22	Q DO YOU PREFER COURTRIGHT OR KURTH OR NOTTOLI OR				
23	WHICH ONE?				
24	A MY NAME IS ANNE COURTRIGHT.				
25	Q IT IS COURTRIGHT NOW. OKAY.				
26	THURSDAY WAS WHEN WE WERE CONCLUDING, YOU HAD				
.27	TOLD US ABOUT THE TWO SPACIOUS ROOMS AT CAMP VICTORY THAT				
28	WAS SOMEWHAT LIKE A SUITE OF ROOMS, OUTSIDE OF WHICH YOU GOT				

1	Q AND HOW LONG WOULD YOU G	UESSTIMATE?
2	A HOW LONG WOULD I OR DID	1?
3	Q DO YOU WANT TO TRY TO AN	SWER MY QUESTION,
4	4 MA'AM? I'D LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU RECAL	L HOW LONG IT TOOK YOU
5	5 TO DRIVE FROM CAMP VICTORY TO CAMELOT	•
6	A WELL, I BELIEVE THAT THU	RSDAY I STATED IN THE
7	7 NEIGHBORHOOD OF 15 TO 20 MINUTES IN M	Y CAR.
8	Q OKAY. NOW, DO YOU HAVE	ANY CURRENT
9	9 RECOLLECTION OF HOW FAR IT WAS FROM C	AMP VICTORY TO CAMELOT?
10	10 A NO.	
11	Q YOU WERE THERE FOR SIX N	EEKS?
12	A UH-HUH.	
13	Q YOU TOLD US IN 1974, YOU	ATTENDED YOUR FIRST
14	QUARTER AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY?	
15	A THAT'S CORRECT.	
16	Q AND WHERE WAS IT YOU ATT	ENDED YOUR FIRST
17	17 QUARTER?	
18	A SANTA BARBARA.	
19	Q HOW MANY CHILDREN DID YO	U HAVE AT THAT TIME?
20	A FIVE.	
21	Q AND DID YOU TAKE THE FIV	E CHILDREN TO THE
22	QUARTER WITH YOU?	
23	A YES, I DID.	
24	Q NOW, WHEN YOU WERE AT TH	E QUARTER, YOU ALSO
25	TOLD US YOU OBEYED AND FOLLOWED DICTA	TES AND CODE OF
26	CONDUCT; IS THAT CORRECT?	
27	A THAT'S CORRECT.	
28	Q HOW OLD WAS YOUR DAUGHTE	R AT THAT TIME?



1	Q WAS MR. MULL AT THE CONFERENCE AT SHASTA?
2	A YES.
3	Q WAS IT THERE THAT HE INVITED YOU TO VISIT HIM
4	IN SAN FRANCISCO?
5	A YES.
6	Q DO YOU RECALL APPROXIMATELY WHAT MONTH IT WAS
7	THAT YOU VISITED MR. MULL IN SAN FRANCISCO?
8	A WELL, THE CONFERENCE WAS IN JULY.
9	Q AND DID YOU HAVE ALL FIVE OF YOUR CHILDREN WITH
10	YOU WHEN YOU VISITED HIM?
11	A NO. MY OTHER CHILDREN WENT WITH OTHER FRIENDS
12	BACK TO MICHIGAN FOR TO VISIT THEIR GRANDPARENTS FOR
13	SEVERAL WEEKS.
14	Q NOW, I FORGET WHAT YOU TOLD US THE PURPOSE OF
15	THE VISIT WAS TO WHEN YOU WENT TO VISIT MR. MULL.
16	A WE WERE STOPPING OVER EN ROUTE DOWN TO SANTA
17	BARBARA.
18	Q YOU WERE GOING BACK TO CHURCH HEADQUARTERS THEN
19	IN SANTA BARBARA?
20	A NO. I HAD A HOME.
21	Q YOU HAD A HOME IN SANTA BARBARA. SO CLARIFY
22	FOR ME ONE MORE TIME, HOW LONG DID YOU STAY ON YOUR VISIT
23	WITH MR. MULL?
24	A SEVERAL DAYS.
25	Q AND HOW MANY IS "SEVERAL"?
25	A I DON'T KNOW. THREE OR FOUR.
27	Q THAT WAS A LONG TIME AGO, ALSO?
28	A IT WAS.

FROM MICHIGAN.

1	A MANY PEOPLE WERE, YES.
2	Q NOW, YOUR DAUGHTER AT THAT TIME WAS, WHAT, ONE
3	AND A HALF OR TWO YEARS OLD?
4	A NO. SHE WAS TWO AND A HALF TWO, TWO AND A
5	HALF. NOT QUITE TWO AND A HALF.
- 6	Q SHE WAS ONE AND A HALF IN 1974?
7	A IN SEPTEMBER AND HER BIRTHDAY WAS IN FEBRUARY.
8	Q AND THIS WAS IN JULY SO SHE WAS ABOUT A LITTLE
9	BIT OVER TWO?
10	A UH-HUH.
11	Q WHAT TIME HAD YOU PLANNED TO LEAVE MR. MULL'S
12	HOME THAT DAY?
13	A PROBABLY MIDMORNING.
14	Q AND YOU TOLD US YOU WERE HAVING TEA WITH HIM
15	ABOUT MIDMORNING?
16	A UH-HUH.
17	Q NOW, WHAT DID LINDA DO WITH YOUR DAUGHTER?
18	A SHE ENTERTAINED HER.
19	Q AND WHERE
20	A AND PART OF THE TIME SHE HAD FRIENDS SEVERAL
21	DOORS DOWN WITH KATHLEEN MULL'S KATHLEEN HAMMOND'S
22	CHILDREN AND THEY WENT OUT, SHE TOOK HER DOWN THERE.
23	Q AND WHILE YOU WERE HAVING TEA OR COFFEE OR
24	WHATEVER IT WAS WITH MR. MULL, YOU WANT TO TELL US WHAT THE
25	CONVERSATION INCLUDED?
26	A WELL, WE WERE SHARING THE DICTATIONS AND WHAT
27	HAD TRANSPIRED AT THE CLASS. IT HAD BEEN A LONG CLASS AND
28	IT A LOT HAD HAPPENED. WE HAD LEARNED A LOT. AND WE

WERE TRYING TO INCORPORATE WHAT WE LEARNED INTO OUR LIVES.

WE WERE FINDING SIMILES AND WAYS IN WHICH WE UNDERSTOOD THE

TEACHINGS.

AND AT THAT TIME GREGORY TOLD ME THAT HE HAD GONE THROUGH ANALYSIS, AND HE HAD BEEN A HOMOSEXUAL AND THAT THE TEACHINGS WERE CURING HIM. AND I THOUGHT THAT WAS GREAT.

Q AND THEN WHAT HAPPENED?

A AND THEN WE TALKED SOME MORE ABOUT THE
TEACHINGS. WE WERE VERY EXCITED ABOUT EVERYTHING AND THEN I
WANTED TO GET GOING.

AND THEN I WENT TO COLLECT ALL MY BELONGINGS.

AND I WASN'T AWARE THAT LINDA WAS GOING TO TAKE CHRISTINE

DOWN, BUT THEN I WAS INFORMED SHE HAD TAKEN CHRISTINE TO THE

HAMMONDS' HOUSE. SO IT WAS SEVERAL DOORS AWAY AND I WALKED

DOWN.

Q AND WHAT TRANSPIRED WHEN YOU WALKED DOWN?

A WELL, I WALKED DOWN AND ALL THE CHILDREN WERE HAVING FUN. THERE WERE SEVERAL AGE LEVELS THERE. KATHLEEN HAD TWO GIRLS, AND GREGORY HAD HIS GIRL, AND I HAD MY LITTLE GIRL AND THEY WERE ALL PLAYING WITH HER. AND I JUST SAT AND CHATTED WITH HER LIKE A MOTHER, COMPARING OUR NOTES. IT WAS KATHLEEN'S FIRST CONFERENCE.

WE WERE TALKING ABOUT THE TEACHINGS. AND THEN OUT OF THE BLUE SHE SAID, "YOU KNOW, I'VE BEEN -- I'VE BEEN SEEING HIM FOR A LONG TIME AND IT HASN'T BEEN EASY." I DIDN'T KNOW HER PARTICULARLY. I MET HER AT THE CONFERENCE.

AND SHE SAID THAT -- SHE SAID, "DID HE TELL YOU HE WAS GAY?"

.27

THIS. PERHAPS YOU WERE REFERRING WHEN WE WOULD GO TO CONFERENCES. WE ALL WERE IN MOTELS, 5- OR 6- OR 700 PEOPLE WERE IN A MOTEL. THAT IS THE ONLY THING I CAN THINK YOU ARE REFERRING TO.

Q WHEN YOU BECOME A STAFF MEMBER, IS THERE A
TEACHING WITH REGARD TO THE KARMIC HAMMER: THE MORE
INVOLVED YOU BECOME, THE HARDER YOU FALL IF YOU VIOLATE THE
TENETS OF THE CHURCH?

A I'M NOT SURE OF WHAT YOU ARE SPECIFICALLY REFERRING TO.

- Q WELL, DID YOU LEARN ANYTHING WHEN YOU WENT THROUGH SUMMIT WITH REGARD TO A KARMIC HAMMER?
 - A THE TERM IS NOT A TERM I RECOLLECT.
- Q YOU NEVER HEARD THAT IN ALL YOUR TIME WITH THE CHURCH?

A I CAN'T SAY I HAVE, I CAN'T SAY I HAVEN'T. I
AM SAYING IT IS NOT A TERM THAT IS FAMILIAR WITH ME.

- Q DID YOU EVER HEAR THE TERM THE SECOND DEATH?
- A YES, I HAVE.
- Q WELL, DON'T THEY GENERALLY GO SOMEWHAT

 TOGETHER? IF YOU VIOLATE THE TENETS OF THE CHURCH, THE

 KARMIC HAMMER CAN FALL ON YOU. AND IF YOU DO IT TO SUCH A

 DEGREE THAT IT VIOLATES OR JEOPARDIZES ANYTHING TO DO WITH

 THE CHURCH, YOU MAY EVEN SUFFER THE SECOND DEATH; ISN'T THAT

 PART OF YOUR TEACHINGS?
 - A THAT IS NOT EXACTLY THE WAY IT IS PORTRAYED.
 - Q I IMAGINE IT IS NOT EXACTLY, BUT --
 - A IT IS A LITTLE BIT DISTORTED.

DISCLOSING YOUR PAST OR TALKING ABOUT YOUR SEXUAL

28

Contract of the Name of Street,

1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1986
2	9:57 A.M.
3	DEPARTMENT NO. 50 HON. ALFRED L. MARGOLIS, JUDGE
. 4	(APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.)
5	<i>;</i>
6 ,	MR. KLEIN: DR. SAUL LEVINE, YOUR HONOR.
7	
8	SAUL LEVINE,
9	CALLED AS A WITNESS BY THE PLAINTIFF, WAS SWORN AND
10	TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:
11	THE CLERK: PLEASE BE SEATED AT THE WITNESS STAND.
12	SIR, PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD AND PLEASE SPELL
13	YOUR FIRST AND LAST NAME.
14	THE WITNESS: SAUL LEVINE. S-A-U-L, L-E-V-I-N-E.
15	THE CLERK: THANK YOU.
16	THE COURT: PROCEED.
17	MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
18	
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. KLEIN:
21	Q ARE YOU A MEDICAL DOCTOR?
22	A YES, I AM.
23	Q ARE YOU LICENSED TO PRACTICE PSYCHIATRY AND
24	MEDICINE IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA?
25	A YES, I AM.
26	Q COULD YOU PLEASE GIVE US YOUR EDUCATIONAL
27 .	BACKGROUND?
28	A I RECEIVED MY BACHELOR OF SCIENCE AT MC GILL

	1		
	2		
	3		
-2	4		
	5		
	5		
	7		
	8		
	9		
1	0		
1	1		
1	2		
l	3		
1	4		
1	5		
1	6		
1	7		
1	3		
1	9		
2	0		
2	1		
2	2		
2	3		
2	4		

UNIVERSITY AND I GRADUATED WITH WHAT IS CALLED THERE VERY GREAT DISTINCTION COMPARABLE TO SUMMA CUM LAUDE HERE.

I WENT TO MEDICAL SCHOOL AT MC GILL, GRADUATED THE TOP TEN PERCENT OF THE CLASS, INTERNED AT MC GILL UNIVERSITY AGAIN IN MONTREAL, CANADA AND DID MY PSYCHIATRY TRAINING AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY IN PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA.

I SPENT THE ENTIRE RESIDENCY TRAINING THERE. I WAS CHIEF RESIDENT, PSYCHIATRY AT STANFORD AND WAS AN INSTRUCTOR AT MY LAST YEAR THERE ON THE FACULTY OF MEDICINE IN STANFORD UNIVERSITY MEDICAL SCHOOL.

COULD YOU GIVE US YOUR PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND, PLEASE?

MY FIRST ACADEMIC JOB AND CLINICAL JOB WAS AS A LECTURER ON THE FACULTY AT STANFORD. I THEN RETURNED TO MY NATIVE CANADA AT THAT TIME WHERE MY ENTIRE FAMILY WAS AND JOINED THE FACULTY OF MEDICINE, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

WAS ON THE FACULTY THERE BUT WORKED AT THE HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN WORKING MAINLY IN ADOLESCENT SERVICES AS THE DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OVER THE YEARS. AND WORKED IN THE CLARK INSTITUTE OF PSYCHIATRY, WHICH IS AGAIN AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

IN 1981, I BECAME -- I WAS BY THEN A FULL PROFESSOR IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND BECAME HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AT SUNNYBROOKE MEDICAL CENTER, WHICH IS A THOUSAND BED TEACHING HOSPITAL AND GENERAL HOSPITAL IN TORONTO.

THE INTERIM YEAR, I WAS LADY DAVIS VISITING

27

25

26

28

1	FELLOW AND VISITING PROFESSOR AT THE DEPARTMENT OF
2	PSYCHIATRY AT HADASSA HOSPITAL, HEBREW UNIVERSITY MEDICAL
3	SCHOOL, AND I SPENT THE ENTIRE YEAR THERE IN 1980.
. 4	Q HAVE YOU WON ANY HONORS OR AWARDS IN THE FIELD
5	OF PSYCHIATRY?
6 -	A I HAVE HAD NUMEROUS VISITING PROFESSORSHIPS
7	AROUND THE WORLD AND IN ADDITION, WHICH
8	Q WHAT IS A VISITING PROFESSOR?
9	A I GUESS YOU ACHIEVE A CERTAIN STATURE IN YOUR
10	PROFESSION AND YOU ARE INVITED BY OTHER DEPARTMENTS, BY YOUR
11	PEERS AND COLLEAGUES TO SPEND TIME IN THE HOST DEPARTMENT
12	TEACHING RESIDENTS, COMMUNING WITH COLLEAGUES.
1.3	I DID MUCH MORE THAN THAT AS VISITING
14	LECTURESHIPS AND GUEST SPEAKERS AT NUMEROUS UNIVERSITIES
15	THROUGHOUT NORTH AMERICA AND WESTERN EUROPE AND ELSEWHERE.
16	I AM ON A NUMBER OF EDITORIAL BOARDS AND HAVE
17	BEEN, CONTINUE TO DO. I AM THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE
13	COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF SECTS AND PARALLEL THERAPIES
19	BASED IN PARIS, FRANCE.
20	Q IS THAT SECTS, 5-E-C-T-S?
21	A YES. AND I HAVE SOME OTHERS THAT MAYBE ARE NOT
22	RELATED TO WHAT WE ARE DOING HERE TODAY.
23	Q WHAT IS THAT COMMITTEE ON SECTS AND PARALLEL
24	THERAPIES? WHAT IS THE PURPOSE?
25	A THE PURPOSE IS TO GATHER INFORMATION OF
26	OBJECTIVE STUDIES IN THE FIELD OF INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEMS OF
27 .	VARIOUS KINDS, BE THEY RELIGIOUS OR OTHERWISE, RATHER THAN
28	RHETORIC TO LOOK AT VALID DATA.

1	
_	
_	

Q WHAT IS AN INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEM?

2 3

OF PERCEIVING HIS OR HER WORLD TO SUCH AN EXTENT THAT IT OVERRIDES AND SUPERSEDES ALMOST ANYTHING ELSE THAT THE

5

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Α INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEM IS A SYSTEM OF VALUES, ATTITUDES, PERCEPTIONS THAT SHAPE AN INDIVIDUAL'S ENTIRE WAY INDIVIDUAL MIGHT HAVE THOUGHT BEFORE AND MIGHT BE INVOLVED WITH AT THAT TIME. IT IS ALL -- AN ALL ENCOMPASSING BELIEF. HAVE YOU PUBLISHED ANY ARTICLES OR BOOKS 0

DEALING WITH PSYCHIATRY AND MOST PARTICULARLY WITH INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEMS?

YES, 1 HAVE.

AND COULD YOU TELL US WHAT ARTICLES AND BOOKS YOU'VE PUBLISHED, AND PAY PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO THE CNES THAT DEAL WITH THE ISSUES IN THIS CASE, DEALING WITH RELIGIONS AND INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEMS?

I HAVE OVER 50 PROFESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS, AND I HAVE CONTRIBUTED NUMEROUS CHAPTERS TO NUMEROUS BOOKS IN THE FIELD OF PSYCHIATRY, AND HAVE CO-EDITED TWO BOOKS, AND HAVE AUTHORED ONE ON MY OWN THAT CAME OUT HERE IN CALIFORNIA --HARCOURT, BRACE AND JOVANOVICH -- AND THERE IS ANOTHER BOOK IN PRESS.

OF THE PUBLICATIONS THAT I HAVE PUBLISHED OVER THE YEARS, ABOUT A DOZEN HAVE TO DO WITH THE ISSUE AT HAND HERE. AND THEY RANGE FROM THE PUBLICATIONS THAT HAVE CULMINATED FROM THREE STUDIES THAT I EMBARKED UPON DURING THE SEVENTIES PUBLISHED IN DIFFERENT JOURNALS HERE AND IN CANADA, PSYCHIATRIC JOURNALS.

I WAS LOOKING AT THE HEALTH, PHYSICAL AND

EMOTIONAL HEALTH ASPECTS OF CULTS AND MIND-BENDING GROUPS, I BELIEVE IT WAS CALLED. IT WAS AN OFFICIAL TASK FORCE AND COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO AND THAT, TOO, WAS PUBLISHED IN 1978.

AND I HAVE WRITTEN OTHER ARTICLES HAVING TO DO WITH THIS AREA. I CAN GIVE YOU TITLES IF YOU WANT.

Q WHY DON'T YOU JUST GIVE US THE TITLES OF THE ONES THAT SPECIFICALLY DEAL WITH CULTS, RELIGIONS, INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEMS?

A ACTUALLY, IT IS A COMPLICATED QUESTION BECAUSE THERE ARE SOME PAPERS AND ARTICLES THAT I WROTE THAT HAVE NOT SPECIFICALLY DEALT WITH THE TITLE BUT EVOLVED INTO MY THINKING.

THERE IS A STUDY DONE ON PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN URBAN COMMUNES, AND SOME OF THOSE WERE IDEOLOGICALLY BASED, WERE BROUGHT TOGETHER FOR RELIGIOUS OR OTHER KINDS OF REASONS. AND IT WAS ONE OF THE REASONS THAT KINDLED MY INTEREST IN THE AREA.

SPECIFICALLY ON CULTS, I HAVE PUBLISHED AN ARTICLE ABOUT YOUTH IN CULTS BASED ON STUDY OF 109 YOUNG PEOPLE IN EIGHT RELIGIOUS GROUPS. A SUBSEQUENT STUDY TWO YEARS LATER PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS LOOKING AT A SIMILAR NUMBER.

STUDY OF THE COMMISSION I MENTIONED EARLIER, AN ARTICLE CALLED "CULTS AND MENTAL HEALTH," CLINICAL CONCLUSIONS BRINGING TOGETHER THE LITERATURE, NOT ONLY MINE BUT THAT I COULD GATHER AT THE TIME. THE ROLE OF PSYCHIATRY AND OTHER PROFESSIONS IN THE PHENOMENON OF CULTS.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

24

25

26

27

28

I DID A STUDY WHILE IN ISRAEL ON A HUNDRED

AND -- I FORGOT THE EXACT NUMBER -- YOUNG PEOPLE WHO BELONG

TO JEWISH ORTHODOX SEMINARIES CALLED YESHIVOT AND PUBLISHED

THAT HERE IN THE STATES.

I HAVE PUBLISHED AN ARTICLE LAST YEAR. THE BOOK IS CALLED "RADICAL DEPARTURES." AND A SUBSEQUENT ARTICLE TO THAT WAS CALLED "ADULT FADDISH BEHAVIOR AND BELIEF SYSTEMS." AND THE POINT I MAKE IN THAT ARTICLE IS THAT ALL AGES CAN BE SUSCEPTIBLE TO INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEMS AND, SECONDLY, THAT ALL INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEMS NEED NOT BE RELIGIOUS TO CAPTIVATE AN INDIVIDUAL ENTIRELY.

Q ARE YOU A MEMBER OF ANY ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVING PRACTICE OF PSYCHIATRY?

A YES, I AM.

Q CAN YOU BRIEFLY LIST SOME OF THOSE FOR US?

A I AM A FELLOW OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC

ASSOCIATION, THE AMERICAN ORTHO-PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION. I

AM A COUNSELOR OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL

PSYCHIATRY, THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL

PSYCHIATRY, THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR ADOLESCENT PSYCHIATRY,

CANADIAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION AND A FEW OTHERS. AND

VARIOUS MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS IN ADDITION.

Q ARE YOU CERTIFIED BY ANY BOARD THAT RECOGNIZES PROFICIENCY IN YOUR FIELD?

A YES. I AM BOARD CERTIFIED IN CANADA. I AM A FELLOW OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS, WHICH MEANS I HAVE A SPECIALTY BOARD. I AM ACTUALLY AN EXAMINER FOR THE BOARDS IN PSYCHIATRY IN CANADA.

1	Q HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU SPENT STUDYING CULTS,
2	NEW AGE RELIGIONS WITH REGARD TO INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEMS?
3	A I WOULD SAY ABOUT 13.
. 4	Q WHEN YOU FIRST EMBARKED ON THAT STUDY, WHAT, IF
5	ANY, ASSUMPTIONS WERE YOU OPERATING WITH WITH RESPECT TO NEW
6	AGE RELIGIONS? AND FOR THE SAKE OF NOT USING THE SAME
7	WORDS, I WILL USE THE NEW AGE RELIGION AND CULT AND
8	ALTERNATIVE RELIGION FOR ALL THESE, I WILL JUST USE THE
9	WORD NEW AGE RELIGION.
10	A OKAY.
11	Q WHAT ASSUMPTIONS WERE YOU OPERATING UNDER WHEN
12	YOU BEGAN YOUR STUDIES OF NEW AGE RELIGIONS.
13	MR. LEVY: 1 AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. IT
14	ASSUMES FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE.
15	Q BY MR. KLEIN: WHAT, IF ANY, ASSUMPTIONS WERE
16	YOU OPERATING ON WHEN YOU BEGAN YOUR STUDIES OF NEW AGE
17	RELIGIONS?
13	MR. LEVY: SAME OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.
19	THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.
20	THE WITNESS: CAN
21	THE COURT: YOU CAN ANSWER, SIR.
22	THE WITNESS: OH. THANK YOU.
23	ACTUALLY, A RATHER NEGATIVE ONE, MR. KLEIN. I
24	CERTAINLY PAID ATTENTION TO THE MEDIA REPORTS. AND DURING
25	THE COURSE OF THE EARLY SEVENTIES ESPECIALLY, PARENTS,
26	FRIENDS, FAMILY MEMBERS WOULD COME TO ME AS A CLINICIAN VERY
27	CONCERNED ABOUT FAMILY MEMBERS WHO OR FRIENDS WHO HAD
28	JOINED SOME OF THESE GROUPS. SOMETIMES OFTEN RELIGIOUS,

BUT OTHER KINDS TOO.

CN THE REPORTS FROM A VERY ASKEWED SAMPLE LIKE THAT.

Q BY MR. KLEIN: YOU HAVE TOLD US ABOUT A NUMBER

AND ONE COULD NOT BUT FEEL ANTAGONISTIC BASED

OF ARTICLES AND BOOKS THAT YOU HAVE WRITTEN ABOUT NEW AGE
RELIGIONS. WHAT WAS THE BASIS OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE WHICH YOU
USED TO WRITE THOSE ARTICLES AND BOOKS?

A WELL, FIRST IS, I WOULD SAY FIRST IN IMPORTANCE TOO, IS THE FIELD STUDIES I HAVE DONE, GOING INTO VARIOUS RELIGIOUS GROUPS, MEETING WITH THE LEADERS, INTERVIEWING MEMBERS DURING AND AFTER THEIR MEMBERSHIP. AND WE HAVE DONE THAT NOW ON SEPARATE OCCASIONS NUMEROUS TIMES INVOLVING A FEW HUNDRED PEOPLE, MEMBERS OF GROUPS. AND I STILL FOLLOW OVER A HUNDRED PEOPLE WHO HAD BEEN -- HAD BEEN, NO LONGER ARE -- IN RELIGIOUS GROUPS.

SECONDLY IS MY CLINICAL PRACTICE. WHICH I WAS HAPPY WITH, BUT ONE GETS KNOWN IN CERTAIN AREAS THAT PEOPLE CALL YOU FROM EVERYWHERE. AND I CERTAINLY HAD A LOT OF ACCESS TO FAMILIES AND MEMBERS AND EX-MEMBERS.

THIRDLY WOULD BE I, BECAUSE OF VARIOUS TASK

FORCES, HAVE AN INTEREST, I HAVE READ THE WORLD'S

LITERATURE. THAT SOUNDS GRANDIOSE, BUT I HAVE COVERED A LOT

OF LITERATURE HAVING TO DO WITH THIS AREA. I AM INTERESTED

IN IT.

AND LASTLY IS THE COMMISSION THAT WAS AN EXTENSIVE EIGHT MONTHS STUDY OF THIS AREA, RATHER EXHAUSTIVE. AND WE -- AND DURING THAT COMMISSION, WE LOOKED AT WHAT -- WE TRIED TO GET IN TOUCH WITH AS MANY EXPERTS AS



1
2
3
. 4
`5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

28

POSSIBLE FR	OM EVERYWHERE, AND	IN THE ENGLISH-S	PEAKING WORLD
AND THOSE W	HO WERE AS MUCH ANT	AGONISTIC AND TH	OSE WHO WERE
VERY PRAISI	NG OF THESE GROUPS,	, INCLUDING MEMBE	RS AND
EX-MEMBERS	WITH ANY KINDS OF C	COMPLAINTS, AND W	E INTERVIEWED
THEM EXTENS	IVELY.	<i>;</i>	

- Q WITH RESPECT TO THE FIELD STUDIES, CAN YOU GIVE US AN IDEA OF HOW MANY PEOPLE YOU INTERVIEWED IN THOSE FIELD STUDIES?
 - A I WOULD SAY APPROXIMATELY 400.
- Q NOW, WOULD THOSE FOR THE MOST PART BE PEOPLE WHO WERE ACTUALLY IN THESE RELIGIOUS GROUPS?

A WELL, ALL MY STUDIES HAD TO DO WITH INDIVIDUALS WHO HAD BEEN IN FOR A MINIMUM OF SIX MONTHS. WE DIDN'T WANT PEOPLE WHO WENT IN FOR OVERNIGHT OR COUPLE OF WEEKS AND LEFT, WHICH IS NOT UNCOMMON AT ALL.

AND WHEN I SAY "WE," BECAUSE I OFTEN HAD
RESEARCH ASSISTANTS OR COLLEAGUES. WOULD INTERVIEW OVER A
PERIOD OF LONG MONTHS, SOMETIMES OVER A YEAR, SO THAT THE
MEMBERS SOMETIMES BECAME EX-MEMBERS DURING THE COURSE OF OUR
INTERVIEWS AND I WOULD SAY ABOUT HALF AND HALF. BUT OVER
THE COURSE OF YEARS, MOST OF THE MEMBERS BECAME EX-MEMBERS.

- Q WITH RESPECT TO YOUR OFFICE COUNSELING, ABOUT HOW MANY PEOPLE OVER THE YEARS HAVE YOU INTERVIEWED IN YOUR OFFICE COUNSELING WHO WERE MEMBERS OR EX-MEMBERS OF THESE RELIGIOUS -- NEW AGE RELIGIOUS GROUPS?
- A INCLUDING THEIR FAMILIES, I WOULD ESTIMATE ABOUT THE SAME NUMBER, ABOUT 400.
 - Q WOULD MOST OF THE PEOPLE THAT YOU WOULD SEE IN

. 4

YOUR COUNSELING SESSIONS, WOULD THEY SE MEMBERS, WOULD THEY

BE EX-MEMBERS? WHAT WAS THE PERCENTAGE THAT YOU WERE SEEING

IN COUNSELING?

A MAINLY EX-MEMBERS IN COUNSELING AND FAMILIES

DURING THE MEMBERSHIP. WHEN AN INDIVIDUAL IS VERY COMMITTED

TO THE GROUP AND THE PARENTS OR SONS OR DAUGHTERS ARE VERY

CONCERNED, AND INDIVIDUALS ARE COMMITTED TRUE BELIEVER,

THERE IS NO WAY THAT HE OR SHE PARTICULARLY WANT TO SEE ME

BECAUSE THEY FEEL VERY SATISFIED WITH THEIR LOT.

Q WHAT HAVE YOU READ, IF ANYTHING, IN PREPARATION FOR TESTIFYING IN THIS CASE?

A I READ THE TRANSCRIPTS OF DEPOSITIONS BY MR.

GREGORY MULL, I READ COPIES OF HIS LETTERS OVER A PERIOD OF
A FEW YEARS THAT HE HAD WRITTEN TO ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET,
TO MONROE SHEARER AND TO SOME NEWSPAPERS, I READ TRANSCRIPTS
OF TESTIMONY HERE BY DR. MARGARET SINGER, RABBI ROBBINS,
RANDALL KING, MR. MULL, MRS. LEVY AND MAYBE ONE OTHER. I
DON'T REMEMBER. AND I READ A TRANSCRIPT OF A MEETING THAT
HAD TAKEN PLACE BETWEEN MR. MULL AND ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET
AND MONROE SHEARER AND EDWARD FRANCIS. AND I SPOKE WITH DR.
ROBERT MOORE.

Q NOW, IN YOUR STUDY OF NEW AGE RELIGIONS, YOU'VE DONE COUNSELING AS WELL AS FIELD WORK. DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION AS TO THE VALIDITY OF CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTS THAT THESE GROUPS HAVE ON THEIR MEMBERS WHEN IT IS DERIVED SOLELY FROM INFORMATION GAINED THROUGH COUNSELING SESSIONS.

MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO THE QUESTION, YOUR HONOR. I THINK IT LACKS A FOUNDATION AND I THINK IT IS SUCH

1	A BROAD BASED QUESTION.
2	THE COURT: PLEASE REPHRASE IT.
3	Q BY MR. KLEIN: YOU'VE DONE HOW MANY YEARS OF
4	FIELD WORK INVOLVING NEW AGE RELIGIONS?
5	A THE RESEARCH ITSELF, PROBABLY ABOUT 15.
6	Q HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN COUNSELING THE
7	PARENTS OR
3	A ABOUT THE SAME TIME.
9	Q NOW, AS A RESULT OF YOUR COUNSELING SESSIONS,
10	HAVE YOU REACHED CERTAIN CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF
11	NEW AGE RELIGIONS ON THEIR MEMBERS?
12	A YES.
13	Q AS A RESULT OF YOUR FIELD WORK, HAVE YOU
14	REACHED CERTAIN CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF NEW AGE
15	RELIGIONS ON THEIR MEMBERS?
16	A YES.
17	Q AND DURING THE COURSE OF DOING THIS WORK, HAVE
18	YOU REACHED ANY CONCLUSIONS AS TO THE VALIDITY OF OPINIONS
19	THAT WOULD BE REACHED ONLY FROM SAY COUNSELING AS OPPOSED TO
20	DOING COUNSELING AND FIELD WORK?
21	A YES.
22	MR. LEVY: AGAIN, YOUR HONOR I AM PREMATURE.
23	EXCUSE ME.
24	Q BY MR. KLEIN: WHAT OPINIONS HAVE YOU REACHED?
25	MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR, BECAUSE
26	IT CALLS FOR SPECULATION AS TO WHO THE PEOPLE ARE WHO HAVE
27	FORMED OPINIONS, WHAT THEIR OPINIONS ARE, AND IT IS ON THAT
28	BASIS THAT THIS GENTLEMAN'S OPINION IS ASKED FOR.

THE COURT: SOUNDS TO ME AS IF YOU ARE QUESTIONING THE FOUNDATION --

MR. LEVY: I THINK I AM QUESTIONING BOTH OF THEM.

THE COURT: -- FOR HIS OPINION.

MR. LEVY: I WOULD OBJECT BECAUSE IT DOES LACK
FOUNDATION AND WE HAVE HAD NO EVIDENCE WITH REGARD TO WHAT
THE NATURE OF OPINION --

THE COURT: LET ME ASK A QUESTION. WITHOUT TELLING US WHAT THE SUBSTANCE OF YOUR OPINION IS, CAN YOU TELL US HOW YOU WENT ABOUT REACHING A CONCLUSION --

THE WITNESS: YES.

THE COURT: -- IN ANSWER TO MR. KLEIN'S QUESTION?

THE WITNESS: YES. IT DEPENDS ON THE SPECIFIC STUDY

IN QUESTION. ALL THE STUDIES THAT I DID WITH INTENSE BELIEF

SYSTEMS OVER THE YEARS ALTHOUGH HAD ONE CENTRAL FOCUS, AND

THAT WAS TO, RATHER THAN LISTEN TO RHETORIC, TO GO INTO THE

GROUP AND MEET WITH MEMBERS, INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS, AND DO A -
BOTH A STRUCTURED AND UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW OVER A PERIOD

OF A FEW HOURS WITH THE MEMBERS.

WE WOULD SPEAK TO BOTH THE LEADERS TO GET THEIR PERMISSION AND THE MEMBERSHIP. I DID THIS WITH THE YESHIVOT, THE GROUPS COMMONLY DEPICTED AS CULTS AND OTHER KIND OF GROUPS.

AS OFTEN AS POSSIBLE WE WOULD TRY TO GET CORROBORATORY OR CONFLICTING EVIDENCE FROM PARENTS OR FRIENDS OR OTHERS CONNECTED WITH THAT INDIVIDUAL. AND WE CONTINUED TO DO FOLLOW-UP WITH THAT GROUP OVER THE COURSE OF MONTHS AND YEARS DURING THE COURSE OF THEIR MEMBERSHIP IN

GROUPS.

3 4

HOWEVER, IN THE TASK FORCE IT IS -- WHEN I WAS IN THAT COMMISSION, WE WENT OUT OF OUR WAY NOT ONLY TO INTERVIEW MEMBERS BUT PEOPLE WHO WERE SPECIFICALLY ANTAGONISTIC TO GROUPS AND HAD A LOT OF NEGATIVE THINGS TO SAY.

I TRY TO BASE CONCLUSIONS NOT ONLY ON A GROUP BUT SPECIFIC INDIVIDUAL IN A PARTICULAR SECT OF A PARTICULAR GROUP ONLY AFTER MEETING THAT INDIVIDUAL AND KNOWING A LOT ABOUT HIM OR HER BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER THAT MEMBERSHIP BECAUSE IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO MAKE ANY KIND OF GLOBAL GENERALIZATION ON THE BASIS OF A SINGLE POINT IN TIME.

THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER THE QUESTION.

MR. LEVY: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. I AM GOING TO -THE QUESTION IS HIS OPINION AS TO COUNSELORS' OPINIONS.
NOW, I AM SURE SOME COUNSELORS HAVE SOME OPINIONS ONE WAY
AND SOME ANOTHER. HOW DO WE KNOW HOW HE FORMS HIS OPINION
ON HIS OPINIONS AND WHAT HIS OPINION IS BASED ON?

THE COURT: THAT ISN'T THE QUESTION.

MR. LEVY: THAT IS THE EXACT QUESTION.

THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU REPHRASE THE QUESTION AND HE CAN ANSWER IT.

MR. KLEIN: COULD WE READ BACK THE QUESTION? OR DO YOU WANT ME TO REPHRASE IT AT THIS POINT? IF THE QUESTION IS ACCEPTABLE AT THIS POINT, I WOULD JUST AS SOON READ IT BACK RATHER THAN TAKE A CHANCE ON CHANGING IT AND GOING THROUGH THIS AGAIN.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION AS TO THE VALIDITY

OF CONCLUSIONS REACHED THROUGH COUNSELING BUT ABSENT FIELD CONTACT WITH THE PARTICULAR SECT?

IS THAT SUBSTANTIALLY --

MR. KLEIN: THAT IS EXACTLY IT, YES, YOUR HONOR.
THE WITNESS: YES, I HAVE ONE.
THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

Q BY MR. KLEIN: WHAT IS THAT?

TYPE OF INDIVIDUAL IS TO GET A VERY ONE-SIDED BIASED AND SKEWED SAMPLE. I THINK JUST LIKE COMMITTED MEMBERS TO ANY GROUP, TRUE BELIEVERS HAVE A VESTED INTEREST IN CONVINCING PEOPLE ABOUT HOW WONDERFUL THEIR CAUSE IS. SO DO PEOPLE WHO ARE ANGRY FOR ANY REASON AT A GROUP HAVE A VESTED INTEREST IN CONVINCING AN INDIVIDUAL THAT THAT GROUP IS NEFARIOUS OR EXPLOITATIVE OR DANGEROUS.

ARE GOING TO HAVE A VERY BIASED VIEW OF THAT RELIGIOUS GROUP OR ANY OTHER KIND OF GROUP FOR THAT MATTER.

Q AND IN YOUR OPINION, BASED ON YOUR OWN

OBSERVATIONS AND EXPERIENCE, WHAT KIND OF PEOPLE COME TO

COUNSELING WITH PSYCHIATRISTS ABOUT THESE NEW AGE RELIGIOUS

GROUPS?

A WELL, AS I SAID, CERTAINLY NOT BEING AN APOLOGIST FOR ANY KIND OF INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEM, A LOT OF THE WORK THAT IS DONE BY COUNSELORS, THERAPISTS OF VARIOUS KINDS, MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS IS WHILE AN INDIVIDUAL IS IN A GROUP IS THE PEOPLE WHO ARE IN A SENSE LEFT BEHIND DO NOT UNDERSTAND COULD BE PARENTS, COULD BE FRIENDS, COULD BE

OTHER FAMILY MEMBERS.

. 4

.

IF YOU ARE ASKING SPECIFICALLY ABOUT MEMBERS,

IT IS ONLY AFTER WHEN THEY BECOME -- FOR WHATEVER REASON

THEY LEAVE THE GROUP. IN THE FIRST FEW MONTHS AFTER THEY

LEAVE THE GROUP, IT IS ADMITTEDLY A ROUGH PERIOD FOR THEM,

JUST LIKE LEAVING ANY OTHER CLOSE SOCIAL SITUATION THAT ENDS

LIKE A MARRIAGE OR BUSINESS OR ANYTHING ELSE.

IT IS AT THAT POINT THAT INDIVIDUALS HAVE
CONTACTED ME AND GO THROUGH A PERIOD OF WEEKS OR MONTHS OF
SOME COUNSELING. AND I WOULD SAY THAT MOST PEOPLE WHEN THEY
LEAVE A GROUP HAVE SOME DEGREE OF CONCERNS ABOUT WHY THEY
JOINED IN THE FIRST PLACE AND WHY THEY LEFT AT THIS
PARTICULAR TIME. IT CAN BE UPSETTING TO THEM AND A SMALL
MINORITY DO SEEK COUNSELING AND THERAPY AS A RESULT.

I COULD ALSO ADD THAT THE PERIOD OF
INSTABILITY, IF YOU WANT TO CALL IT THAT, LASTS -- FROM OUR
STUDIES LAST ABOUT SIX MONTHS AT MOST. AND THEN THERE IS
WHAT WE CALL A REVERSION TO FORM WHEN THEY RESUME THEIR
LIVES WHERE THEY LEFT OFF.

THE COURT: CAN YOU GENERALIZE WITH FAIR RELIABILITY WHAT DISTINGUISHES THOSE PEOPLE WHO LEAVE A SECT AND SEEK COUNSELING FROM THOSE WHO LEAVE A SECT AND DO NOT SEEK COUNSELING?

THE WITNESS: YES, I THINK SO.

THE COURT: WOULD YOU DO IT, PLEASE?

THE WITNESS: YES. I THINK THAT I'D SAY TWO KINDS OF SITUATIONS PREDOMINATE. THERE ARE EXCEPTIONS AND I GUESS I WILL GET TO THAT LAST. THERE ARE EXCEPTIONS TO ALMOST

ANYTHING IN HUMAN BEHAVIOR. ONE OF THE PROBLEMS WITH OUR TRADE.

BUT ONE IS AN INDIVIDUAL WHO IN FACT HAD SOME EMOTIONAL VULNERABILITIES OR PROBLEMS BEFORE THEY EVER WENT INTO A GROUP. THIS IS A POPULATION AT RISK FOR ANY INTENSE SITUATION, INCLUDING MEDICAL SCHOOLS.

THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO DO POORLY EMOTIONALLY AS A RESULT OF INTENSE PRESSURES ARE THOSE WHO HAVE SOMETHING THEY HAVE SHOWN IN THE PAST. IF YOU TAKE A HISTORY, THEY HAVE EITHER CONTACTED MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS OR WHO HAVE DEMONSTRATED SOME MANIFESTATIONS OF EMOTIONAL DISORDER BEFOREHAND. I DID SAY THAT THERE ARE INDIVIDUALS WHO ---

I DID SAY THAT MANY INDIVIDUALS, WHEN THEY
LEAVE THE GROUP, HAVE A PERIOD OF INSTABILITY AND CONFUSION,
UNHAPPINESS FOR THAT PERIOD OF TIME. SOME OF THOSE WILL
SEEK COUNSELING BECAUSE IT IS COMMON IN THEIR MILIEU,
FAMILIES OR WHATEVER.

IF, HOWEVER, THE LEAVING OF A GROUP IS

PARTICULARLY DIFFICULT FOR AN INDIVIDUAL, THEN THAT

INDIVIDUAL IN A SENSE HAS THOSE EMOTIONAL TRAITS PERPETUATED

AND THOSE INDIVIDUALS I HAVE FOUND MOST DIFFICULT — THAT

MOST PEOPLE LEAVE GROUPS — MOST PEOPLE LEAVE GROUPS FAIRLY

SMOOTHLY ON THEIR OWN VOLITION NO MATTER WHAT IS DONE BY A

GROUP. BUT THOSE FOR WHOM IT IS DIFFICULT ARE PARTICULARLY

THE ONES WHO WILL SEEK COUNSELING.

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

Q BY MR. KLEIN: YOU HAVE READ THE TESTIMONY OF

i	
1	DR. SINGER AT THIS TRIAL?
2	A YES, I HAVE.
3	Q NOW, SHE GAVE SIX CONDITIONS THAT NEED TO BE
. . 4	PRESENT TO CARRY OUT A THOUGHT REFORM PROGRAM. DID YOU READ
5	THOSE SIX CONDITIONS?
6	A YES.
7	Q JUST BRIEFLY I WILL PARAPHRASE THEM.
8	NEED CONTROL OVER THE PERSON'S SOCIAL AND
9	PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT; NEED TO CREATE A SENSE OF
10	POWERLESSNESS IN THE PERSON; YOU NEED TO MANIPULATE REWARDS,
11	PUNISHMENTS AND EXPERIENCES TO INFLUENCE THE PEOPLE TO
12	SUPPRESS THEIR OLD BEHAVIORS; YOU NEED TO MANIPULATE
13	REWARDS, AND EXPERIENCES AND PUNISHMENTS TO ELICIT NEW
14	BEHAVIOR; PERSON HAS TO BE UNAWARE THAT IT IS BEING DONE TO
15	THEM; AND THE SIXTH FEATURE IS IT HAS TO BE DONE WITHIN A
16	CLOSED SYSTEM OF LOGIC WHERE THERE IS NO COMPLAINT UPWARD TO
17	MANAGEMENT, MANAGEMENT IS ALWAYS RIGHT, THERE IS NO
18	CRITICISM.
19	DURING YOUR STUDIES OF INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEMS,
20	HAVE YOU FOUND THESE SIX CHARACTERISTICS TO EVER BE PRESENT
21	IN ANY OF THE ORGANIZATIONS OR GROUPS THAT YOU STUDIED?
22	A YES.
23	Q IS IT UNUSUAL TO STUDY A GROUP OR AN
24	ORGANIZATION WHERE THESE CHARACTERISTICS ARE PRESENT TO SOME
25	DEGREE?
26	A I WOULD UNDERLINE "TO SOME DEGREE." I THINK
27 .	THAT ANY INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEM THAT IS ASSOCIATED WITH A
28	GROUP, WE ARE THERE HAS TO BE A GROUP INVOLVED, NOT JUST

1	A PARTICULAR. A GROUP INVOLVED HAS THESE FACETS GREATER OR
2	TO SOME DEGREE. SOME MINIMAL, SOME MARKED.
3	Q ARE THERE ONLY RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS THAT
.4	HAVE THESE SIX CHARACTERISTICS PRESENT TO SOME DEGREE IN
5	YOUR STUDIES?
6	A ABSOLUTELY NOT. I HAVE SEEN POLITICAL,
7	MILITARY, THERAPEUTIC, INTENSE MOVEMENTS THAT ARE OFTEN
8	PERCEIVED BY THE OUTSIDE AS THE SAME WAY THIS PARTICULAR
9	GROUP IS PERCEIVED, AS DANGEROUS OR EXPLOITATIVE. BUT IT
10	NEED NOT BE RELIGIOUS. THERE HAS TO BE AN OVERRIDING
L1	IDEOLOGY AND TREMENDOUS GROUP INVOLVEMENT, COMMITMENT.
L 2	Q WHEN THESE SIX CHARACTERISTICS ARE PRESENT,
13	WHAT, IF ANY, EFFECT HAVE YOU FOUND THAT THEY HAVE ON
L 4	INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE GROUPS?
L 5	A IT VARIES, MR. KLEIN, FROM A MINIMAL EFFECT TO
16	A GREAT DEAL OF INFLUENCE.
L7	Q COULD YOU EXPLAIN?
L 8	A WELL, YEAH. THE PROBLEM WITH THESE SIX
9	CHARACTERISTICS, IF THAT IS ALL THAT DEFINES A GROUP AND
20	NOTHING ELSE AND I HAVEN'T SEEN ANY GROUP WHERE THIS IS
21	ALL THAT DEFINES A GROUP THEN WE ARE NOT PAYING ATTENTION
22	TO MANY OTHER CHARACTERISTICS THAT MIGHT BE SUPPORTIVE,
23	ENHANCING, ENABLING TO THAT INDIVIDUAL. THAT IS NUMBER ONE.
24	SECONDLY, AND PROBABLY WHAT I FEEL MOST
25	STRONGLY ABOUT, IS IT DOES TAKE INTO NO ACCOUNT THE
26	INDIVIDUAL PERSONALITY, NEEDS, PROBLEMS, CONFLICTS,
27	WHATSOEVER OF THE INDIVIDUAL, THE PERSONALITY

CHARACTERISTICS AND TYPE OF THE MEMBER.

28

27.

BECAUSE YOU CAN HAVE A MEMBER WHO CAN BECOME AN INTENSE TRUE BELIEVER OVER THE MOST INNOCUOUS GROUP AND YOU CAN GET SOMEBODY TO WITHSTAND THE MOST OPPRESSIVE INFLUENTIAL GROUP. IT PARTLY IS A MARRIAGE BETWEEN THE NEEDS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND WHAT IS OFFERED BY THE PARTICULAR GROUP.

BUT TO FORGET ABOUT THE PARTICULAR

INDIVIDUAL — AND I THINK POINT FIVE OF DR. SINGER'S SIX

CHARACTERISTICS ARE THIS IS DONE WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF

THE MEMBERS — IT IS NOT DONE WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF

MEMBERS. THE MEMBERS HAVE THEIR EYES OPEN. THE MEMBERS

KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IS HAPPENING, THE MEMBERS ARE SHOPPING AND

THEY ARE BUYING WHAT IS IN THE MARKETPLACE.

Q WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY TRUE BELIEVER?

A WELL, A TRUE BELIEVER IS -- I DEFINED EARLIER WHAT AN INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEM IS. A TRUE BELIEVER IS A TERM COINED BY ERIC HOFFER BACK IN THE SIXTIES. IT REFERS TO AN INDIVIDUAL WHO -- THE INDIVIDUAL WHO FOLLOWS THE BELIEF SYSTEM WITH SUCH A PASSION THAT ALL ELSE GETS SUPERSEDED AND SUBJUGATED TO THAT PASSION.

THE TRUE BELIEVER HAS A KIND OF CLOSED MINDEDNESS TO OTHER CONFLICTING POINTS OF VIEW. THE TRUE BELIEVER LEAVES OTHER VALUES, OLD RELATIONSHIPS, OTHER WAYS OF LIFE, SOMETIMES TO THE CONSTERNATION OF OTHER PEOPLE WHO WERE CLOSE TO HIM OR HER IN THE PURSUIT OF THAT BELIEF SYSTEM.

THE TRUE BELIEVER IS OFTEN, WITH ALL DUE
RESPECT, OFFENSIVE TO THOSE AROUND THEM BECAUSE THEY HAVE

THIS CAUSE CELEBRE THAT, IF YOU DON'T BELIEVE, CAN BE VERY,
AT BEST, BORING WHEN THEY PROSELYTIZE AND, AT WORST, JUST
OFFENSIVE AND ABRASIVE.

AND THEN THAT TOO DEPENDS ON THE INDIVIDUAL WHO CARRIES IT FORTH AS A FLAG THAT HAS TO BE CARRIED AT ALL OCCASIONS FROM ANY COCKTAIL PARTY TO ANY INFORMAL SETTING ALL THE WAY TO NOT MENTIONING IT AT ALL BECAUSE THIS HAPPENS TO BE A VERY IMPORTANT BELIEF FOR THEM.

- Q IN YOUR EXPERIENCE, DO TRUE BELIEVERS REMAIN IN THESE GROUPS INDEFINITELY?
 - A NO.
 - Q WHAT HAPPENS TO THEM?

A WELL, I MUST SAY THAT WITH VERY FEW EXCEPTIONS,
THE VAST MAJORITY OF PEOPLE OF ANY INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEM
LEAVE. THEY LEAVE -- ALL GROUPS, ALL INTENSE SYSTEMS. THAT
IS ONE OF THE REASONS WE SEE CHANGES IN PEOPLE'S LIVES, ONE
OF THE REASONS WE SEE THESE GROUPS MAKING THEIR APPEARANCE,
REACHING A CRESCENDO AND THEN DISAPPEARING. I AM NOT SAYING
IT WILL HAPPEN TO THIS GROUP, BUT WE SEE THIS COMMON IN
SOCIETY.

THE INDIVIDUAL IS IMBUED WITH A -- THE MEMBER HAS THIS TRUE BELIEF. AND THE LEADER AT THE TOP AND THE BELIEF SYSTEM IS IDEALIZED TO A CONSIDERABLE EXTENT.

THERE OCCURS AT A POINT OF DISILLUSIONMENT WHEN
THERE IS A REALIZATION THAT THESE PEOPLE ARE JUST THAT,
PEOPLE WITH FOIGLES AND DEFICIENCIES, AND THEY ARE
DISILLUSIONED. THEY SEE INCONSISTENCIES AND HYPOCRISIES AND
THEY SAY, "WAIT A SECOND. I BELIEVED IN ALL MY HEART." AND

. 4

б

Q

IT IS LIKE A CHILD THAT IDEALIZES THEIR PARENTS AND THEN SEES THEM FOR WHAT THEY ARE WORTH, WHICH IS LIKE ALL OF US.

ANOTHER THING THAT HAPPENS AT SOME POINT -- I

JUST HAVE NEVER SEEN OR HAVE SELDOM SEEN EXCEPTIONS -- IS

THAT THEY START MISSING THE VERY THINGS THAT THEY CAST OFF

WITH ABANDON. IT COULD BE THEIR HOMES, IT COULD BE THEIR

FAMILIES, IT COULD BE THEIR WAYS OF LIFE, JOB, SCHOOL,

WHATEVER. BUT THERE IS AN INVARIABLE INEXORABLE MOVE OUT AT

THAT POINT.

I HAVE STAGES OF BELIEF IN VARIOUS MOVEMENTS

AND I CALL THIS SEEDS OF DOUBT. AND THERE IS NO STOPPING

THEM. IT DOESN'T PAY THE GROUP TO SAY, "THOU SHALT NOT,"

OR, "YOU CAN'T GET OUT," BECAUSE THEY ARE GOING TO GET OUT

NO MATTER WHAT. THEY ARE GOING TO LEAVE ON THEIR OWN.

A WELL, I -- HAVING LOOKED AT THIS FOR YEARS, I
REALLY THINK THAT IT HAS TO DO WITH THE NEEDS OF THE
INDIVIDUAL. I SEE PEOPLE -- WE ALL GO THROUGH TOUGH TIMES
IN OUR LIVES FROM TIME TO TIME, PEOPLE GOING THROUGH A

CRITICAL PERIOD WHEN THEY FEEL KIND OF ALIENATED.

WHAT CAUSES PEOPLE TO BE TRUE BELIEVERS?

THEY MIGHT GO -- SOMEONE MARGINAL, THEY MIGHT NOT BE MAKING IT IN A BIG WAY, HOWEVER. THEY ARE NOT SATISFIED WITH THEMSELVES. THERE IS NO OVERRIDING ENTHUSIASM OR DIRECTION IN THEIR LIVES. AND THIS IS THE CRITICAL PERIOD. I CALL IT ALIENATION, DEMORALIZATION AND LOW SELF-ESTEEM.

IF AT THAT CRITICAL PERIOD A GROUP PRESENTS

ITSELF THAT IS NON-THREATENING, THAT IS SEDUCTIVE -- I DON'T

. 4

_

MEAN THIS IN A MANIPULATIVE WAY. I MEAN THEY ARE OFFERING SOMETHING TO ANSWER THOSE PARTICULAR VOIDS, ONE OF THESE THINGS ALL THESE GROUPS GIVE.

WE LIVE IN AN AMBIGUOUS WORLD. THESE GROUPS

SAY, "THIS IS THE WAY IT IS, RIGHT, WRONG, YES, NO, UP,

DOWN." AND IT MAKES IT VERY -- FOR SOMEBODY WHO IS IN SOME

STATE OF DYSEQUILIBRIUM, THIS IS VERY COMFORTING. IT IS A

SENSE OF SECURITY. ALL THOSE VOIDS ARE IN FACT ENHANCED.

THEY GET A TREMENDOUS FEELING OF INNER
IMPORTANCE, NOT SELF-INFLATED. THEY FEEL THEY ARE PART OF
SOMETHING BIGGER THAN THEMSELVES, MORE IMPORTANT THAN
THEMSELVES. IT IS AN OUTER DIRECTED IDEOLOGY. THEY FEEL
THEY ARE A PART OF AN IMPORTANT GROUP OF PEOPLE THAT ACCEPTS
THEM UNEQUIVOCALLY, AND THEY ARE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THAT
GROUP OF PEOPLE AND THEY FEEL GOOD ABOUT THEMSELVES MAYBE
FOR THE FIRST TIME IN THEIR LIVES.

THE COMMITMENT TO THAT GROUP IS A HIGH FOR THOSE INDIVIDUALS. THEY FEEL TERRIFIC ABOUT THEMSELVES.

Q WITH RESPECT TO INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE IN THE SITUATION YOU HAVE JUST DESCRIBED, DOES IT MATTER IF THE GROUP IS A NEW AGE RELIGION, A CULT OR AN ESTABLISHED RELIGION?

A YOU CAN SEE THIS KIND OF INDIVIDUAL IN ALMOST ANY KIND OF BELIEF SYSTEM. I AM ABSOLUTELY CONVINCED OF THAT. I HAVE SEEN THEM. AND THE LIST OF GROUPS THAT ARE CONSIDERED TO BE DANGEROUS OR NEFARIOUS AND WITH THE FOUR LETTER WORD "CULT" IS PARTLY IN THE EYE OF THE BEHOLDER.

THAT IS, I HAVE HAD PEOPLE TELL ME. "THIS IS A

1		
2		
3		
4		

CULT." AND I SAY, "OH, YEAH. THAT PARTICULAR GROUP
EVERYBODY KNOWS." BUT THEY WOULD NAME THINGS THAT COULD BE
COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES, IT COULD BE SOCIAL GROUPS, IT COULD
BE ESTABLISHED RELIGIOUS GROUPS, IT COULD BE POLITICAL
AFFILIATIONS.

AND BECAUSE THE INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPS SUCH A COMMITMENT TO THAT GROUP TO THE EXCLUSION OF EVERYTHING ELSE AND MAYBE TURNS OVER MONEY, MAYBE TURNS OVER ENERGY, EVERYTHING TO THAT GROUP, IT IS SEEN BY OTHERS AS THE GROUP'S FAULT WHEN IN FACT IT IS THE INDIVIDUAL WHO IS ON THIS QUEST AND IS LOOKING FOR SOMETHING AND FINDS IT THERE

Q WHAT DO TRUE BELIEVERS GET OUT OF THESE GROUPS?

A I MENTIONED THAT --

FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD.

MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. IT CALLS FOR A CONCLUSION. UNLESS THIS WITNESS HAS TALKED TO ALL THE TRUE BELIEVERS AND HE WANTS TO LIST WHAT EACH OF THEM GETS.

THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: I HAVE A VERY STRONG OPINION ABOUT WHAT THEY GET OUT OF THE GROUP. I HAVE NOT INTERVIEWED ALL TRUE BELIEVERS IN THE WORLD. I HAVE INTERVIEWED MANY. A FEW HUNDRED. AND THEY ALL — TO ME, THEY ALL GET THE SAME THING.

THEY GET BELIEF AND BELONGING. THEY GET THIS ENORMOUS SENSE OF COMMITMENT, BELIEF IN WHAT THEY ARE DOING, THAT IT IS RIGHT, AND IT IS LOFTY, AND SACROSANCT, AND IT IS IMPORTANT, AND THEY GET THIS TERRIFIC FEELING OF BELONGING

TO A GROUP THAT IS ACCEPTING THEM AND THEY FEEL COMFORTED BY THAT GROUP.

THEY DON'T GO THERE -- THAT IS WHY I STRESSED

THE NEED FOR A GROUP. THEY GO HAND IN HAND. YOU CAN'T

HAVE -- FOR THE TRUE BELIEVER TO BE DESCRIBED THIS WAY, YOU

CAN'T HAVE IT WITHOUT A GROUP AND YOU CAN'T HAVE A GROUP

WITHOUT AN IDEOLOGY TO BE DESCRIBED IN THIS WAY WHEN THEY GO

HAND IN HAND.

THE THIRD THING THEY GET IS THEY FEEL TERRIFIC

ABOUT THEMSELVES. SO WHEN YOU ASK THEM -- IT MAKES IT VERY

DIFFICULT FOR THOSE TO GET SOMEBODY OUT OF THE GROUP. THEY

ASK THEM TO LEAVE. THEY SAY, "WHY SHOULD I LEAVE? I HAVE

NEVER FELT BETTER ABOUT MYSELF OR ABOUT ME IN MY LIFE. WHY

SHOULD I LEAVE NOW?" THAT IS A VERY COMMON QUESTION THAT WE

GET.

Q BY MR. KLEIN: ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE TERM COERCIVE PERSUASION?

- A YES.
- Q WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

A FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, COERCIVE PERSUASION IS
RELATED TO THE COLLOQUIAL TERM BRAINWASHING AND MIND BENDING
WAS USED IN OUR PARTICULAR COMMISSION, AND MIND CONTROL, ALL
THESE ARE RELATIVE SYNONYMS.

ONE WAY OF DEFINING IT IS A PLANNED STRATEGIC SERIES OF SEDUCTIVE AND PRESSURE TACTICS TO CONVINCE AN INDIVIDUAL THAT HIS OR HER BELIEF SYSTEM IS -- OR THE ABSENCE OF ONE -- IS WRONG AND THAT THIS NEW ONE HAS TO BE ADOPTED WITH A GREAT DEAL OF FERVOR. AND THERE IS A PROMISE

	100
1	OF SOME KIND OF PAYOFF AT THE END IF THEY GET IT.
2	BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY FOR THE REAL COERCIVE
3	PERSUASION, GOING ALONG WITH LIFTON DESCRIBED IN CIRCUIT
4	KOREA, WAS THE IMPLICIT OR EXPLICIT THREAT OF VIOLENCE OR
5	DEATH. THAT IS COERCIVE PERSUASION.
6	Q IN YOUR EXPERIENCE, ARE TRUE BELIEVERS VICTIMS
7	OF COERCIVE PERSUASION?
8	A NO.
9	Q COULD YOU EXPLAIN?
10	A WELL, I DON'T THINK THAT I NOT ONLY NOT
11	THINK, I HAVE NOT SEEN IN ANY OF THE STUDIES I HAVE DONE AND
12	ANY OF THE PEOPLE I HAVE WORKED WITH ANY INDICATION THAT
13	THESE PEOPLE ARE UNDER THAT KIND OF STRATEGICALLY MANAGED
14	PSYCHOTECHNOLOGY IN ORDER TO BREAK THEIR SPIRIT AND ENSLAVE
15	THEM UNDER THE THREAT OF SOME KIND OF SEVERE PUNISHMENT. I
16	JUST HAVE NOT SEEN THAT.
17	Q IN YOUR EXPERIENCE, WHAT HAPPENS AND YOU
18	HAVE SPOKEN ABOUT THIS TO SOME EXTENT ALREADY BUT WHAT
19	HAPPENS WHEN A TRUE BELIEVER BECOMES DISILLUSIONED WITH THE
20	GROUP?
21	A TRUE BELIEVER WHO BECOMES DISILLUSIONED LEAVES
22	INVARIABLY. CERTAINLY IN THE YOUNG PEOPLE THAT I HAVE
23	LOCKED AT, 90 PERCENT PLUS LEAVE IN UNDER TWO YEARS. IN
24	OLDER PEOPLE, IT IS SOMEWHAT LONGER AND AGAIN DEPENDING ON
25	THE NEEDS BEING FULFILLED BY THE GROUP AND WHATEVER
26	ADMINISTRATIONS ARE BEING OFFERED BY THAT PARTICULAR GROUP

28

BUT ONCE DISILLUSIONED, THEY ARE GOING TO

AND THE PERSONALITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL MEMBER.

LEAVE, AND THEY ARE GOING TO LEAVE NO MATTER WHAT IS DONE BY THE GROUP. I THINK THE GROUPS HAVE LEARNED OVER THE LAST COUPLE OF DECADES THAT STOPPING THEM DOES NOT DO THEM ANY GOOD. THEY NOT ONLY GET INTO TROUBLE, BUT THEY DON'T PREVENT ANYBODY FROM LEAVING.

SO THE DISILLUSIONMENT -- IT FORCES THEM TO LEAVE AND AGAIN THEY LEAVE WITH A GREAT DEAL OF SELF-QUESTIONING AND SOME PROBLEMS THEREAFTER.

Q YOU HAVE READ MULL'S TRIAL -- MR. MULL'S TRIAL TESTIMONY HERE, YOU HAVE READ HIS SIX-VOLUME DEPOSITION, YOU HAVE READ LETTERS THAT HE WROTE TO ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET AND OTHER CHURCH OFFICIALS. BASED ON THE INFORMATION YOU'VE READ, BASED ON THE KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE, DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION AS TO WHETHER THE BEHAVIOR OF MR. MULL IS CONSISTENT WITH THAT OF A TRUE BELIEVER?

- A WELL, ON THE BASIS OF WHAT I READ, YES.
- Q WHAT IS YOUR OPINION?

A ON THE BASIS OF WHAT I READ, AND I GIVE MYSELF
THE SAME CAVEAT I GAVE TO OTHERS NOT HAVING MET MR. MULL,
THOSE -- THAT TESTIMONY AND THOSE DEPOSITIONS AND THOSE
LETTERS CERTAINLY ARE VERY STRONG INDICATIONS THAT HE WAS,
AS I DEFINED, A TRUE BELIEVER.

Q CAN YOU EXPLAIN JUST WHAT IT IS YOU ARE REFERRING TO?

A WELL, THE -- CERTAINLY DURING THE COURSE OF BEFORE MR. MULL BECAME DISILLUSIONED, THERE WAS A TOTAL ADULATION OF ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET. THERE WAS A TOTAL COMMITMENT TO THE IDEOLOGY. EVEN WHEN THERE WERE CONCERNS

1	ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE IN THE RELIGIOUS GROUP, THE IDEOLOGY
2	ALWAYS MAINTAINED FOR MR. MULL A LOFTY POSITION IN HIS
3	THINKING.
4	AND AGAIN THE LETTERS ARE WRITTEN IN SUCH A WAY
`5	TO ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET THAT THEY IMBUE HER WITH CERTAIN
6	CHARACTERISTICS, WHICH I SEE ALL THE TIME FOR SOMEBODY WHO
7	IS A TRUE BELIEVER THAT THE LEADER IS GIVEN ALMOST MAGICAL
8	CHARACTERISTICS, BEYOND HUMANITY BECAUSE OF THE NEEDS BEING
9	FULFILLED BY THAT PARTICULAR TO THAT PARTICULAR MEMBER.
LO	Q IN YOUR EXPERIENCE, WHEN TRUE BELIEVERS LEAVE
l1	THE GROUP OR ORGANIZATION, DO THEY SUFFER PERMANENT
12	EMOTIONAL PSYCHOLOGICAL DAMAGE?
13	MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO HAVE TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR.
14	CALLS FOR A CONCLUSION. IT ALSO CALLS FOR SPECULATION.
15	CERTAINLY THIS WITNESS HAS NOT EXAMINED ALL PEOPLE WHO HAVE
16	LEFT CULTS.
L7	THE COURT: ARE YOU ABLE TO GENERALIZE WITH STRONG
LS	RELIABILITY?
9	THE WITNESS: WELL, ONE OF THE THINGS WE DO WHEN WE
20	ARE DEALING WITH
21	MR. LEVY: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. RATHER THAN
22	ANSWERING YOUR QUESTION, I THINK THE WITNESS MISTAKENLY
23	STARTED TO ANSWER MR. KLEIN'S QUESTION.
24	THE COURT: I THINK HE IS ABOUT TO ANSWER MY
25	QUESTION.
26	THE WITNESS: I AM. I AM. I WAS GOING TO TALK ABOUT
27.	THE RELIABILITY.
2 12	MO LEVY. HE TOLD HE DE MODETO METH 400 DECOME

THERE ARE THOUSANDS WHO HAVE LEFT.

THE COURT: IT IS NOT NECESSARY THAT HE HAVE EXAMINED OR INTERVIEWED ALL.

. 4

THE WITNESS: I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT IT IS A

PROBLEM IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OF ALL KIND THAT IS AN ISSUE

OF RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY. AND WE ONLY GO ON WHAT IS

CALLED LEVELS OF STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE. AND IT IS ONE OF

THE REASONS WE DO RESEARCH IS TO BE REVIEWED BY OUR PEERS,

TO SAY, "THIS GUY IS SHOOTING OFF HIS MOUTH ON THE BASIS OF

WHAT HE THINKS," OR, "IS THERE ANY RESEARCH TO BACK IT UP,

ANY DATA, WHAT ARE THE LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE?"

FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, BUT 1 AM SURE THERE ARE OTHERS WHO MIGHT SAY THEY ARE NOT.

THE COURT: CAN YOU QUANTIFY THE RELIABILITY?

THE WITNESS: I FEEL VERY CONFIDENT IN MY CONCLUSIONS

AND I HAVE NOT READ ANY STUDIES THAT DO NOT CORROBORATE WHAT

I HAVE SAID. THERE ARE A LOT OF STUDIES THAT I CAN GIVE YOU

THAT HAVE CORROBORATED MY FINDINGS.

THE COURT: WOULD YOU EXPECT NINE OUT OF TEN PEOPLE WHO LEAVE A CULT OR SECT WILL BEHAVE AS YOU HAVE -- AS YOU WOULD TELL US?

THE WITNESS: YES. I WOULD SAY THAT MUCH MORE THAN NINE OUT OF TEN. I WOULD SAY IN TERMS OF PERMANENT EMOTIONAL DAMAGE, IF THAT IS THE QUESTION, AM I ANSWERING THAT QUESTION?

THE COURT: WELL, THAT IS THE QUESTION WE ARE GOING TO GET TO IN A FEW MINUTES.

1 THE WITNESS: OKAY. I WOULD SAY MUCH MORE THAN NINE 2 OUT OF TEN. 3 THE COURT: OKAY. YOU CAN ANSWER. GO AHEAD. 4 THE WITNESS: I HAVE FORGOTTEN THE EXACT QUESTION. 5 I WOULD SAY THAT ON THE BASIS OF OUR COMMISSION AND THE FOLLOW-UP STUDIES WE HAVE DONE AND THE PATIENTS THAT 6 I HAVE SEEN, ALMOST INVARIABLY THERE IS NO PERMANENT 7 8 EMOTIONAL SCARRING. 9 Q BY MR. KLEIN: DURING THE COURSE OF YOUR 10 STUDIES OF INDIVIDUALS, DID YOU EVER DO FOLLOW-UPS TO DETERMINE IF THERE WAS SOME KIND OF PERMANENT, SOCIOLOGICAL 11 OR EMOTIONAL SCARRING OR DAMAGE? 12 13 Α YES. 14 Q COULD YOU TELL US ABOUT THAT? 15 I STILL DO THAT. 16 I STARTED TO SAY THAT IN THE COURSE OF THESE 17 STUDIES, WHEN YOU -- THEY ARE DONE OVER A PERIOD OF YEARS. 18 REALLY. YOU IMMEDIATELY SEE PEOPLE AFTER BECAUSE IF THEY 19 LEAVE SHORTLY AFTER YOUR INTERVIEW, AND I HAVE SEEN THAT IN 20 ALMOST EVERY STUDY, THEY ARE NOT A CAPTIVE POPULATION. 21 THERE IS A TURNOVER IN ALL THESE GROUPS THAT IS 22 DRAMATIC, AS A MATTER OF FACT, THE GROUPS THAT I HAVE LOOKED 23 AT. YOU ARE, BY VIRTUE OF CONTINUING TO SEE THOSE PEOPLE, TO DO FOLLOW-UPS. BUT WE HAVE GONE BEYOND THAT. 24 25 I AM STILL FOLLOWING PEOPLE THAT I INTERVIEWED 26 IN THE MID-SEVENTIES WHO WERE IN VARIOUS KIND OF GROUPS. JUST TELEPHONE FOLLOW-UPS. AND ALSO WITH THE COMMISSION, WE 27

LOOKED AT PEOPLE WHO HAD LEFT THE GROUPS AND WE SOUGHT OUT

1
2
3
. 4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

25

26

27

28

THEIR OPINION, BOTH PRO AND CON.

Q IN YOUR EXPERIENCE, HAVE YOU EVER FOUND A SINGLE INDIVIDUAL WHO SUFFERED PERMANENT EMOTIONAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL DAMAGE AS A RESULT OF MEMBERSHIP IN ANY RELIGIOUS GROUP OR CULT?

A NO, I HAVE NOT.

PSYCHOLOGIST CAN CONCLUDE THAT AN INDIVIDUAL SUFFERED

PERMANENT AND SEVERE PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL DAMAGE DUE TO MEMBERSHIP IN A RELIGIOUS GROUP WITHOUT KNOWING THE INDIVIDUAL'S PSYCHOLOGICAL CONDITION PRIOR TO WHEN HE JOINED THAT GROUP? DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION ON THAT?

A YES.

O WHAT IS YOUR OPINION?

A I THINK IT IS ADVISABLE WHEN ONE IS MAKING A DIAGNOSIS, THAT DEFINES AND DIAGNOSES A REACTION TO AN EVENT IN AN INDIVIDUAL'S LIFE, THAT IT IS MANDATORY TO FIND OUT WHAT THAT INDIVIDUAL WAS LIKE HISTORICALLY, WHAT HE WAS LIKE HISTORICALLY BEFORE THAT EVENT OCCURRED.

Q SO FOR A GROUP, IT WOULD BE MANDATORY TO FIND OUT WHAT THE INDIVIDUAL WAS LIKE BEFORE HE JOINED THE GROUP; IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE SAYING?

A YES.

Q IN HER TESTIMONY, DR. SINGER SAID THAT THE WAY SHE FOUND OUT WHAT MR. MULL WAS LIKE BEFORE HE JOINED THE GROUP WAS THAT SHE READ THE MULL DEPOSITIONS, SHE READ MR. MULL'S DEPOSITIONS TO LEARN WHAT HE WAS LIKE BEFORE HE BECAME AFFILIATED WITH THE CHURCH. HAVE YOU READ THOSE

1	DEPOSITIONS?
2	A YES.
3	MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. THAT IS
<u>.</u> 4	A MISCHARACTERIZATION OF DR. SINGER'S TESTIMONY.
5	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
6	MR. KLEIN: I WILL READ YOU THE TESTIMONY OF DR.
7	SINGER. READING FROM PAGE 632 OF THE TESTIMONY.
8	"QUESTION," I AM READING LINE 20.
9	THE COURT: WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO STOP?
10	MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO STOP AT LINE 12 ON 633,
11	YOUR HONOR.
12	THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
13	MR. KLEIN: (READING.)
14	"QUESTION" BY MYSELF TO DR. SINGER,
15	"WITH RESPECT TO YOUR
16	CONCLUSIONS AS TO THE PERMANENT DAMAGE DONE
17	TO GREGORY MULL, AM I CORRECT LET ME
18	WITHDRAW THAT.
19	"WITH RESPECT TO THE PERMANENT
20	DAMAGES DONE TO GREGORY MULL, DID YOU DO
21	ANY KIND OF INVESTIGATION TO DETERMINE WHAT
22	GREGORY MULL WAS LIKE PRIOR TO 1974 WHEN HE
23	BECAME AFFILIATED WITH THE CHURCH?
24	"A YES, SIR.
25	"Q WHAT DID YOU DO?
26	"A I READ THE DEPOSITIONS THAT
27	WERE MADE AVAILABLE TO ME AND FROM THEM I
28	LEARNED THAT HE HAD BEEN A FUNCTIONING

	100
1	BUILDER AND DESIGNER.
2	"Q ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT MR.
3	MULL'S DEPOSITION?
_4	"A YES, SIR.
5 -	"Q YOU DIDN'T DO ANY INDEPENDENT
6	INVESTIGATION TO FIND OUT HOW SUCCESSFUL HE
7	WAS, SAY, PRIOR TO 1974, DID YOU?
8	MA NO, SIR. I DEPENDED UPON WHAT
9	WAS IN THE DEPOSITIONS.
10	"Q YOU DIDN'T DO ANY INVESTIGATION
11	TO FIND OUT IF HE WAS A DEPRESSED PERSON
12	PRIOR TO 1974, DID YOU?
13	"A NO, SIR."
14	Q NOW, MY QUESTION TO YOU IS
15	MR. LEVY: IF I MAY, YOUR HONOR, I AM STILL GOING TO
16	OBJECT. THERE WAS ALSO IN DR. SINGER'S TESTIMONY THE FACTS
17	THAT SHE HAD TALKED TO MR. MULL'S DAUGHTER AND TO MR. MULL'S
18	FRIENDS PRIOR TO WHO KNEW HIM PRIOR TO HIS INVOLVEMENT AT
19	CAMELOT. I DON'T HAVE A COPY OF THE TESTIMONY OF DR.
20	SINGER, BUT I REMEMBER THE QUESTION SPECIFICALLY BECAUSE I
21	ASKED THEM AND THEN MR. KLEIN WENT OVER THEM AGAIN.
22	THE COURT: THERE WAS TESTIMONY TO THAT EFFECT.
23	MR. KLEIN: I AM NOT DENYING THERE WAS TESTIMONY, BUT
24	I SPECIFICALLY ASKED HER WHAT SHE BASED HER OPINION ON AND
25	THAT IS THE ANSWER SHE GAVE.
26	IF COUNSEL WANTS TO TAKE THIS DEPOSITION, I
27 .	HAVE NO PROBLEM. HE CAN ASK HIS QUESTIONS.
28	THE COURT: HE CAN HANDLE IT AT THE TIME OF

1	CROSS-EX
2	į.
3	,
4	MR. KLEI
5	PIECE OF
6	MISCHARA
7	ו
ទ	OR PA
9 .	
10	YOU ALL
11	WITH EAC
12	
13	۲
14	T
15	м
16	
17	т
13	М
19	Q
20	INDIVIDU
21	JOINED O
22	FOR THE
23	HAD BEEN
24	INVESTIG
25	INFORMAT
26	А
27	
28	AGAIN.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

MR. LEVY: ONLY ONE FURTHER OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.

MR. KLEIN IS DOING WHAT HE USUALLY DOES. HE IS TAKING A

PIECE OF THE TESTIMONY AS OPPOSED TO THE WHOLE. AND IT IS

MISCHARACTERIZATION. AND ON THAT BASIS, I OBJECT TO IT.

THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU DIG OUT THE DEPOSITION OR -- PARDON ME, THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE TESTIMONY.

WE WILL TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS TIME.

YOU ALL DISCUSS IT. I WANT YOU TO SPEND THE RECESS TALKING
WITH EACH OTHER.

DO YOU HEAR ME?

MR. LEVY: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: DO YOU HEAR ME?

MR. KLEIN: YES, YOUR HONOR.

(RECESS.)

THE COURT: PLEASE PROCEED.

MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

Q DOCTOR, IF YOU WANTED TO FIND OUT WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL'S PSYCHOLOGICAL CONDITION WAS PRIOR TO WHEN HE JOINED ONE OF THESE GROUPS, IF YOU WANTED TO FIND THAT OUT FOR THE PURPOSE OF REACHING YOUR CONCLUSION AS TO WHETHER HE HAD BEEN PERMANENTLY PSYCHOLOGICALLY DAMAGED, WHAT KIND OF INVESTIGATION WOULD BE NECESSARY IN ORDER TO FIND THAT PRIOR INFORMATION OUT? WHAT WOULD YOU HAVE TO DO?

A IT HAS TO DO -- I AM SORRY. I TURNED IT OFF.

IT HAS TO DO WITH THE QUESTION OF RELIABILITY

AGAIN. I WOULD WANT TO CORROBORATE OR GET CONFLICTING

OPINION FROM INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVEN'T GOT A VESTED INTEREST IN CONVINCING ME ONE WAY OR THE OTHER AS MUCH AS THAT IS POSSIBLE.

FAMILY MEMBERS, FRIENDS, MEDICAL DOCUMENTS,
SCHOOLING RECORDS, BUSINESS BACKGROUND, THE MORE EVIDENCE
YOU HAVE, THE MORE DATA THAT YOU HAVE ON AN INDIVIDUAL, A
PRIORI, BEFOREHAND, THE BETTER YOU ARE IN A POSITION TO MAKE
A STATEMENT ABOUT A CHANGE IN AN INDIVIDUAL'S PERSONALITY.
TO THE EXTENT THAT YOU HAVE VERY LITTLE, THEN YOU CAN MAKE
VERY LITTLE -- DRAW VERY LITTLE CONCLUSIONS.

Q WE HEARD TESTIMONY FROM DR. ROBERT MOORE WHO
TESTIFIED THAT MR. MULL'S BEHAVIOR WAS CONSISTENT WITH
POSITIVE AND THEN NEGATIVE TRANSFERENCE. WOULD YOUR
CONCLUSION WITH RESPECT TO HIS BEHAVIOR BE CONSISTENT WITH
THAT OF A TRUE BELIEVER? IS THAT IN ANY WAY INCONSISTENT
WITH WHAT DR. MOORE HAS TOLD US?

A NO. I DID NOT USE THE WORD TRANSFERENCE. I
DON'T KNOW THAT I WOULD. ESPECIALLY -- TRANSFERENCE IS A
PSYCHOANALYTIC TERM USED FOR THE THERAPEUTIC SITUATION
MAINLY. IT MEANS IMBUING AN INDIVIDUAL WHO IS
EXTRAORDINARILY IMPORTANT TO YOU IN SHAPING YOUR LIFE AT
THAT TIME WITH ALL KINDS OF CHARACTERISTICS HAVING LITTLE OR
NOTHING TO DO WITH THAT INDIVIDUAL.

IF IT IS POSITIVE, THEN THERE IS A GREAT DEAL OF IDEALIZATION OF THAT INDIVIDUAL. AND THAT PERSON BECOMES SYMOBLIC OF SOMETHING THAT IS IMPORTANT TO YOU FROM YOUR PAST, MIGHT BE A PARENT MIGHT BE SOMETHING ELSE THAT YOU NEED, A VOID IN YOUR LIFE.

A NEGATIVE TRANSFERENCE IS THE STAGE OF
DISILLUSIONMENT OR IT IS A PERIOD OF WHEN YOU IMBUE AGAIN
THE SAME -- IT MIGHT BE AN OBJECTIVE INDIVIDUAL, WHICH IS
WHAT A THERAPIST IS SUPPOSED TO BE, WITH ALL KINDS OF
NEGATIVE QUALITIES. YOU SEE THEM AS MALEVOLENT OR TERRIBLE
OR NO MATTER WHAT DEPENDING ON THAT STATE OF TRANSFERENCE
AND I THINK THAT IS WHAT DR. MOORE IS REFERRING TO. AGAIN I

- Q YOU SAID THAT YOU STUDIED YESHIVOT?
- A YESHIVOT IN HEBREW.
- Q WHAT IS A YESHIVOT THAT YOU STUDIED?
- A 1 STUDIED --
 - MR. LEVY: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. RELEVANCE.
 - THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: THESE ARE ORTHODOX JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

- Q BY MR. KLEIN: WHEN DID YOU MAKE THAT STUDY?

 A THE YEAR THAT I LIVED IN ISRAEL, 19 -- MAINLY

 1980. '79, '80.
 - Q WHY DID YOU MAKE THAT STUDY?

A WELL, FOR A COUPLE OF REASONS. ONE IS THAT

AGAIN I WAS INTERESTED IN BELIEF SYSTEMS AND WHAT MOTIVATES

PEOPLE TO MAKE A RADICAL DEPARTURE, WHICH IS WHAT I DEFINE

THESE THINGS ARE, WHEN SUDDENLY THEY SEEM TO BE MOVING

TOWARDS SCHOOL, TOWARDS PROFESSION AND THEY GIVE IT ALL UP

AND JOIN A MOVEMENT THAT IS EXTRAORDINARILY THREATENING TO

THEIR PARENTS AND THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND.

I STARTED GETTING CALLS FROM THE STATES AND

2	
3	
. 4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
13	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

1

CANADA, JEWISH PARENTS ABOUT THEIR KIDS OR JEWISH BROTHERS

AND SISTERS, SOMETIMES ABOUT PARENTS WHO WOULD JOIN JEWISH

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES. AND THEY HAD THE SAME KIND OF

CONCERN AS WHEN THEY JOIN A GROUP THAT IS COMMONLY DEPICTED

AS CULTS. NOT ONLY BECAUSE OF MY OWN HERITAGE, BUT I WAS

INTERESTED BECAUSE I WANTED TO SEE SIMILARITIES IN DIFFERENT

BELIEF SYSTEMS.

Q BASED ON YOUR STUDY OF YESHIVOTS, WHAT ARE THE SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE NEW AGE RELIGIONS YOU STUDIED AND THE YESHIVOTS?

A I WANT TO BE VERY CAREFUL HERE BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO GET -- DON'T WANT TO SAY THE WRONG THING TO INSULT ANYBODY.

I FIND THAT THERE ARE STRONG SIMILARITIES IN

ANY INTENSE -- ANY INTENSE GROUP BELIEF SYSTEM. THE

YESHIVOT -- I STUDIED FIVE OVER THE PERIOD OF THE YEAR. ALL

HAVE A VERY -- A FAIRLY RIGID HIERARCHY. THERE WAS ONE

INDIVIDUAL AT THE TOP.

THERE ARE STRONG AND INTENSIVE RITUALS THAT GO ON FROM EARLY MORNING THROUGHOUT THE DAY AND TO THE NIGHT.

THERE ARE STRICT RULES REGARDING DRESS, DEMEANOR, DIET,

SEXUALITY, BEHAVIOR CONTROL IN THAT RESPECT.

THERE IS A STRONG GROUP SOLIDARITY AND PRESSURE, THERE IS AN OVERRIDING IDEOLOGY. THERE IS AN IMPLICIT PAYOFF, SO TO SPEAK, IN A REWARD IN ONE GETS CLOSE TO GOD BY, AND ONLY ONE WAY, THROUGH THE TORAH.

THERE IS A SUSPICIOUSNESS OF OUTSIDERS, EVEN
JEWISH OUTSIDERS WHO ARE NOT ORTHODOX, FOR EXAMPLE ME. AND

FOR EXAMPLE RABBI ROBBINS OR OTHER PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT ORTHODOX IN THE WAY THEY ARE PERCEIVED.

SO THERE ARE VERY STRONG SIMILARITIES. AND AGAIN, THOSE SIMILARITIES ARE COMMON TO MOST OF THE GROUPS THAT I HAVE LOOKED AT.

Q DID THE MEMBERS OF THE YESHIVOT GET PAID?

A NO. THEY PAID FEES FOR THE MOST PART. THEY
PAID FEES OR THE FAMILIES DID OR THEY WERE SUBSIDIZED IN
ORDER TO PAY FEES. IT IS A SEMINARY SO IT IS SORT OF
TUITION OR RESIDENT FEES.

Q WHAT EXPERTISE, IF ANY, DO YOU HAVE IN THE AREA OF HYPNOSIS?

A I TRAINED IN HYPNOSIS WHEN I WAS A RESIDENT. I
LEARNED THE THEORY AND THE PRACTICE, CAN INDUCE HYPNOTIC
TRANCES. USED IT IN CLINICAL SITUATIONS IN MY EARLY
CLINICAL CAREER AND AS A RESIDENT. HAVE NOT USED IT IN THE
LAST 15 YEARS.

Q WHAT, IF ANY, DISCUSSIONS HAVE YOU HAD WITH HYPNOTISTS RELATING TO NEW AGE RELIGIONS OR CULTS OR WHATEVER WORD YOU WANT TO USE?

A IN THE COURSE OF OUR --

MR. LEVY: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO THE LINE OF QUESTIONING. IT DOES CALL FOR HEARSAY.

THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: IN THE COURSE OF OUR COMMISSION WORK,
AND THE SECTION THAT I DIRECTED WAS THE HEALTH AND MENTAL
HEALTH ASPECT, WE INTERVIEWED HYPNOTISTS TO FIND OUT WHAT
THEIR OPINION WAS AS TO THE INVOKING OF INDUCING OF TRANCES

б

AND	THE	GENERA	LIZATION	FROM	ONE	SITUAT	LION	TO	ANOTHER,	THAT
15	A CL	INICAL	SITUATION	ТО	AN I	NTENSE	BEL	IEF	SYSTEM.	

I HAVE DERIVED MY OWN CONCLUSIONS IRRESPECTIVE OF WHAT THEY SAID, BUT WHAT THEY SAID CORROBORATED WHAT MY FEELINGS WERE HAVING SEEN THESE GROUPS.

Q BY MR. KLEIN: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION AS TO WHETHER TRUE BELIEVERS ARE HYPNOTIZED?

A YES, I DO HAVE AN OPINION.

Q WHAT IS THAT OPINION?

MR. LEVY: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO HAVE TO OBJECT.

IT DOES CALL FOR A CONCLUSION WITH REGARD TO WHICH TRUE

BELIEVER THIS GENTLEMAN IS TALKING ABOUT.

THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: HYPNOSIS IS A CLINICAL TOOL AND IS USED TO GET AT PRECONSCIOUS AND UNCONSCIOUS MATERIAL OR TO UTILIZE POST-HYPNOTIC SUGGESTION. IT IS A LIMITED TOOL.

I STUDIED WITH TWO OF THE FATHERS OF THAT
TECHNIQUE, ERNEST HILEGARD AND MILTON ERICSON. LEARNED
THEIR THEORIES. IT IS ALSO USED IN SHOW BUSINESS. WHEN AN
INDIVIDUAL IS HYPNOTIZED, HE IS IN AN ALTERED STATE OF
CONSCIOUSNESS, HE IS IN A TRANCE STATE.

I HAVE NOT SEEN INDIVIDUALS IN THESE RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS AS -- AT TIMES AS OFFENSIVE AS THEY MAY BE TO ME AS TRUE BELIEVERS PERSONALLY. IF THEY ARE, I HAVE NOT SEEN THEM AS HYPNOTIZED OR IN A TRANCE STATE.

I THINK WE ARE TALKING ABOUT TWO SEPARATE
ISSUES HERE. IF YOU ASK ME -- TO ME, I HAVE NOT SEEN ANY
EVIDENCE WHATSOEVER THAT THIS IS HYPNOSIS.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

	Q	BY	MR.	KLEIN:	ALL	YOUR	COUNSE	LING	WORK,	YOUR
FIELD	WORK,	YOU	HAVE	REVIEW	ED T	HE LIT	TERATUR	E AND	EDUCA	TIONAL
BACKG	ROUND,	HAVE	YOU	EVER SE	EEN A	ANY EV	/I DENCE	OF A	NY	
INDIV	DUAL C	OR GR	CUP,	NOT JUS	ST TE	RUE BE	LIEVER	S, AN	Y INDI	VIDUAL
OR GR	OUP BE I	ING H	YPNO	TIZED BY	r a r	RELIGI	LÓUS OR	NEW	AGE	
RELIG	IQUS LF	ADER	?			/				

A YOU KNOW WE USE THE WORD HYPNOSIS, HYPNOTIZE

AND MESMERIZE IN COMMON COLLOQUIAL ENGLISH. I HAVE SEEN

PEOPLE GREATLY INFLUENCED, UNDER THE SWAY, AT ROCK CONCERTS

AND OTHER KIND OF TREMENDOUS EMOTIONAL EXPERIENCES. IF YOU

WANT TO CALL THAT HYPNOSIS, THEN WE ARE -- WE ARE NOT

TALKING ABOUT THE ISSUE OF CLASSICAL HYPNOTISM RIGHT NOW.

SO I WOULD HAVE TO ANSWER NO.

Q WHAT DOES IT MEAN PSYCHIATRIC PATHOLOGY? WHAT DOES THAT TERM MEAN?

A IT JUST REFERS TO -- THE MEDICAL MODEL REFERS
TO EMOTIONAL DISORDERS THAT WE STUDY, CLASSIFIED UNDER
SOMETHING CALLED D.S.M. 3, DIAGNOSTIC AND STATISTICAL MANUAL
3, THE PSYCHOSIS OF THE BRAIN THAT WE STUDY IN PSYCHIATRY.
IT IS THE MEAT OF OUR WORK.

Q IT IS THE EXISTENCE OF EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS?

A RIGHT. IT REFERS TO A DIAGNOSTIC

CLASSIFICATION.

Q IT IS AN ABNORMALITY?

A YES.

Q IN ALL OF YOUR STUDIES OF RELIGIOUS GROUP
MEMBERS, HAVE YOU SEEN A GREATER INCIDENCE OF PSYCHIATRIC
PATHOLOGY IN CULT MEMBERS, NEW AGE RELIGION MEMBERS, THAN

26

27 .

1 YOU WOULD EXPECT TO SEE IN A COMPARABLE SEGMENT OF THE 2 POPULATION WHO HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH CULTS OR NEW AGE 3 RELIGIONS? .4 Α NO. 5 CAN YOU TELL US WHICH, IF ANY, RECOGNIZED AUTHORITIES AGREE WITH THE GENERAL CONCLUSIONS THAT YOU'VE 6 7 STATED TO US TODAY? 8 THERE ARE NUMEROUS SCIENTISTS, BEHAVIORAL 9 SCIENTISTS AND OTHERS IN THE FIELD WHO HAVE DONE FIELD WORK 10 AND WHO AGREE WITH WHAT I HAVE SAID. 11 COULD YOU NAME SOME OF THEM? 12 THERE'S E. MANSELL PATTISON, WHO WAS AT 13 U.C.L.A. AND IS NOW CHAIRMAN OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY 14 IN GEORGIA WHO CALLS THESE GROUPS --15 MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO THIS, YOUR HONOR. 16 IT IS HEARSAY. 17 THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER. 18 THE WITNESS: CALLS THESE GROUPS ALTERNATIVE HEALING 19 NETWORKS AS OPPOSED TO THE DANGEROUS GROUPS THEY ARE 20 PORTRAYED TO BE. THAT IS, HE SEES THERAPEUTIC QUALITIES IN 21 THESE GROUPS. 22 THERE IS HARVEY COX WHO IS PROFESSOR OF 23 DIVINITY AND THEOLOGY AT HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL. THERE IS 24 MARK GALATER, PROFESSOR OF PSYCHIATRY AT COLUMBIA WHO IS A 25 REKNOWNED AUTHORITY AND IS WRITING A BOOK ON THIS AREA --26 EDITING A BOOK ON THIS AREA FOR THE AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC 27 ASSOCIATION TO WHICH I AM CONTRIBUTING. THE BOOK IS JUST

STARTING TO BE GENERATED NOW.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

26

27

28

1

THERE IS THOMAS UNGERLEIDER, PROFESSOR OF PSYCHIATRY AT U.C.L.A. THERE IS IRVING ZARETSKY, WHO IS A PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY AT PRINCETON. THERE IS SOME OTHERS. RAYMOND PRINCE, WHO IS NOW A DEAN OF PROFESSOR OF PSYCHIATRY AT MC GILL UNIVERSITY. LEE COLEMAN IS A PSYCHIATRIST AT U.C. BERKELEY. HELEN MENIERE IS THE PRESIDENT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE ON SECTS AND PARALLEL THERAPIES.

AND THERE ARE OTHER AUTHORS AROUND THE WORLD WHO HAVE CORROBORATED THESE FINDINGS. GALATER'S WORK, WHO SPECIFICALLY WORKS AT CULTS. MARK GALATER DID A STUDY OF UNIFICATION CHURCH MEMBERS, MOONIES AND HARE KRISHNA MEMBERS AND FOUND NO GREATER INCIDENCE AND PREFERENCE IN EMOTIONAL DISORDERS IN THE MEMBERSHIP THAN IN THE GENERAL POPULATION.

WE HAVE EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES ABOUT
DISTRIBUTION OF EMOTIONAL DISORDERS AND GENERAL POPULATION
AGE GROUPS, PEER GROUPS.

MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

1 HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR.

MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

BY MR. LEVY:

Q DR. LEVINE, FIRST A FEW BASIC QUESTIONS TO GET
A FEW THINGS OUT OF THE WAY. AS A PROFESSIONAL, WOULD I BE
INCORRECT IN ASSUMING THAT YOU ARE BEING PAID A FEE FOR YOUR
APPEARANCE HERE TODAY?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

A I AM BEING PAID AS AN EXPERT WITNESS. I AM NOT BEING PAID TO TESTIFY. MY TIME IS BEING PAID FOR TO GO OVER

1	THE TESTIMONY.
2	Q EXCUSE ME, SIR. I DIDN'T SUGGEST YOU WERE
3	BEING PAID TO TESTIFY. MY STATEMENT TO YOU WAS YOU WERE
4	BEING PAID FOR YOUR TIME AND YOUR APPEARANCE HERE IN COURT?
5	A YES, YOU ARE CORRECT.
ε	Q MOST PROFESSIONALS GET PAID WHEN THEY APPEAR IN
7	COURT, DON'T THEY, AND TESTIFY AS AN EXPERT WITNESS?
8	A I DON'T KNOW, ACTUALLY. THAT IS NOT AN AREA OF
9	MY EXPERTISE.
10	Q HAVE YOU EVER APPEARED AS AN EXPERT WITNESS
11	ANYWHERE WHERE YOU DIDN'T GET PAID?
12	A YES, ABSOLUTELY.
13	Q HAVE YOU EVER APPEARED FOR CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND
14	TRIUMPHANT ANYWHERE WHERE YOU DIDN'T GET PAID?
15	A NEVER APPEARED FOR CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND
16	TRIUMPHANT ANYWHERE.
17	Q YOU ARE HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AT
18	SUNNYBROOKE MEDICAL CENTER IN TORONTO; 15 THAT CORRECT?
19	A YES.
20	Q HAVE YOU EVER NOTICED THAT MOST MEDICAL
21	FACILITIES DEALING WITH PSYCHIATRIC OR PSYCHOLOGICAL
22	PROBLEMS ARE THEY ALMOST ALWAYS HAVE SOOTHING NAMES LIKE
23	SUNNYBROOKE OR PLEASANT VALLEY OR WHISPERING SPRINGS?
24	A WE HAVE FIVE GENERAL TEACHING HOSPITALS IN THE
25	UNIVERSITY. SUNNYBROOKE HAPPENS TO BE A BEAUTIFUL LOCATION
26	ON A BEAUTIFUL GREEN CAMPUS. IT IS APPROPRIATE IN THIS
27	CASE.
28	() WOULD I BE CORRECT IN ACCUMENC THAT A DIFFACANT

1	NAME CONVEYS A PEACEFUL AND A SERENE FEELING?
2	A I DON'T KNOW. THAT DEPENDS TO YOU OR TO ME. 1
3	AM NOT SURE I DON'T KNOW THAT I WOULD DRAW THAT
4	CONCLUSION. I WOULD HAVE TO DO SOME RESEARCH ON IT.
5	Q WELL, DEATH VALLEY CERTAINLY MIGHT BE JUST A
6	LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT FROM SUNNYBROOKE, WOULDN'T YOU SAY?
7	A NOT NECESSARILY. DEATH VALLEY IS BEAUTIFUL.
8	Q YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH THIS CHURCH, CHURCH
9	UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT, ARE YOU NOT?
10	A NOT REALLY, NO. I AM FAMILIAR ONLY IN TERMS OF
11	WHAT I HAVE READ, WHICH I TESTIFIED TO BEFORE. THAT'S ALL.
12	Q HAVE YOU EVER INTERVIEWED ANYBODY WHO IS A
13	MEMBER OF THIS CHURCH?
14	A NO.
15	Q HAVE YOU EVER INTERVIEWED ANYBODY WHO IS AN
16	EX-MEMBER OF THIS CHURCH?
17	A NO.
18	Q YOU ARE AWARE THAT THEIR CAMPUS AT CALABASAS IS
19	CALLED CAMELOT?
20	A YES.
21	Q WOULD YOU AGREE THAT CAMELOT MIGHT EVOKE SOME
22	PLEASANT THOUGHTS LIKE KING ARTHUR AND THE ROUND TABLE AND
23	LOVELY MAIDENS?
24	A MR. LEVY, I WOULD SAY NOT NECESSARILY TO ME.
25	REALLY. I AM BEING TOTALLY
26	Q YOU NEVER READ ABOUT KING ARTHUR AND THE
27	KNIGHTS OF THE ROUND TABLE?
28	A YES, I DID. BUT CAMELOT IN THIS PARTICULAR

1	CONTEXT DOES NOT CONJURE UP THOSE PARTICULAR IMAGES TO ME.
2	Q WOULD IT BE A FAIR STATEMENT, DOCTOR, TO SAY
3	THAT THE NAME CAMELOT MIGHT BE MORE APPEALING THAN CHURCH
4	UNIVERSAL'S INDOCTRINATION AND RECRUITMENT CENTER?
5	MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO THAT AS NOT BEING
6	BASED ON FACTS IN EVIDENCE, YOUR HONOR, AND ARGUMENTATIVE.
7	THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.
8	THE WITNESS: YES.
9	Q BY MR. LEVY: NOW, YOU HAVE TOLD US ALL ABOUT
10	YOUR EXTENSIVE BACKGROUND WITH HYPNOSIS. ARE YOU FAMILIAR
11	WITH MASS HYPNOSIS TECHNIQUES?
12	A I AM FAMILIAR WITH SHOW BUSINESS MASS HYPNOSIS
13	TECHNIQUES. I TOOK PART IN A COUPLE OF EXPERIMENTS YEARS
14	AGO WHERE A GROUP HYPNOTIST HYPNOTIZED LARGE GROUP OF
15	INDIVIDUALS. I THINK THERE WERE ABOUT 200 OR MORE IN THE
16	AUDIENCE AT THE SAME TIME. EXCEPT THOSE OF US WHO DIDN'T
17	WANT TO BE HYPNOTIZED. AND WE WEREN'T HYPNOTIZED.
18	Q YOUR TESTIMONY IS IN ACCORD WITH SOME OTHER
19	PERSON WHO TESTIFIED HERE WHO KNOWS ABOUT HYPNOSIS, A LOT OF
20	PEOPLE DON'T WANT TO BE HYPMOTIZED, THEY FIGHT AGAINST IT
21	AND THEY ARE NOT HYPNOTIZED.
22	WOULD YOU SAY THAT GROUP INDUCTIONS ARE NOT
23	UNUSUAL IN YOU USED THE TERM SHOW BUSINESS AND YOU ALSO
24	LIKENED HYPNOTISM TO MESMERISM OR THAT KIND OF FEELING THAT
25	YOU GET WHEN YOU GO TO A GROUP WHEN YOU REALLY GET CAUGHT UP
26	IN WHAT'S GOING ON. LIKE A TENT SHOW?
27	A LIKE A TENT SHOW?
28	Q TENT SHOW MAYBE OR A CIRCUS OR AFFAIR?

1	
2	
3	
. 4	
\ 5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
2 . 25	
50 J	

27

28

A YES. I WAS USING THE WORD COLLOQUIALLY AT THAT POINT IN TIME. NOT SPECIFICALLY AS A CLINICAL ENTITY. BUT CERTAINLY I HAVE SEEN PEOPLE SWEPT UP TOTALLY EMOTIONALLY, COGNITIVELY IN WHATEVER THEY HAPPEN TO BELIEVE IN. AND THEY WANT TO. THEY WANT -- THERE IS TOTAL COMPLICITY, SO TO SPEAK. IF THEY DON'T WANT TO, THEY ARE NOT.

Q IS IT POSSIBLE THAT SUGGESTIBILITY MIGHT WORK ON SOMEONE WHETHER THEY WANTED TO OR THEY DIDN'T WANT TO?

A I WOULD SAY I GUESS IT IS POSSIBLE, MR. LEVY.
BUT I WOULD SAY THERE WOULD HAVE TO BE SOME DEGREE OF
MOTIVATION. THAT IS IF THERE IS AN ACTIVE FIGHTING AGAINST
BEING HYPNOTIZED OR CAPTIVATED, IT IS NOT GOING TO WORK.

Q WHAT IF YOU GO TO SOMETHING THAT APPARENTLY YOU ARE ENJOYING WHILE YOU GO THERE. AND THEN WHOEVER IS IN CHARGE ATTEMPTS TO USE SOME GROUP SUGGESTIBILITY TECHNIQUES. AND YOU HAVE NO REASON TO BE FIGHTING AGAINST YOUR PARTICIPATION. WOULD THEN GROUP SUGGESTIBILITY HAVE AN EFFECT ON THAT TYPE OF INDIVIDUAL?

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO JUST OBJECT AS TO THE AMBIGUITY OF GROUP SUGGESTIBILITY TECHNIQUES, WHAT THAT MEANS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: CAN YOU ANSWER?

THE WITNESS: WELL, I THINK -- I AM NOT EXACTLY SURE WHAT MR. LEVY MEANS, BUT I THINK THE ANSWER PEOPLE CAN BE SUGGESTIBLE AND CAN BE INFLUENCED TO SOME EXTENT BY A SEDUCTIVE GROUP THAT IS CAPTIVATING THEM AND SWAYING THEM. IT DOES NOT MEAN THAT THEY ARE HYPNOTIZED. IT MEANS THEY ARE ENTHRALLED, INVOLVED, COMMITTED.

1	Q BY MR. LEVY: MESMERIZED IN THE COLLOQUIAL
2	SENSE?
3	A IN THE COLLOQUIAL SENSE. I WOULD LIKE TO
.4	UNDERLINE THAT.
5	Q HAVE YOU EVER HEARD OF SUBLIMINAL TECHNIQUES?
6	A HEARD OF THEM.
7	Q YOU KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THEM?
8	A MINIMAL. ACTUALLY WHAT I HAVE HEARD IS THAT AS
9	FAR AS HYPNOSIS IS CONCERNED, THAT THERE IS A GREAT QUESTION
10	AS TO THEIR BOTH VALIDITY AND EFFECTIVENESS.
11	Q ARE YOU AWARE THAT IN THE UNITED STATES THEY
12	HAVE BEEN OUTLAWED IN MANY, MANY STATES THE SUBLIMINAL TYPE
13	OF ADVERTISING
14	A NO, I AM NOT AWARE.
15	Q SO THAT WHEN YOU GO IN A DEPARTMENT STORE, YOU
16	GO INTO SOME OTHER STORE, THE STORE CANNOT PLAY THIS
17	SUBLIMINAL TAPES BEHIND THE MUSIC THAT THEY PLAY TO AFFECT
18	WHETHER OR NOT YOU WILL MAKE EXORBITANT PURCHASES?
19	A NO, I WAS NOT AWARE OF THAT.
20	Q THEY ALSO DO THE SAME THING WITH REGARD TO
21	SHOPLIFTING. WHAT THEY DO IS PLAY SUBLIMINAL TAPES. AND
22	THAT ALSO HAS BEEN OUTLAWED. ARE YOU AWARE OF THAT?
23	A NO.
24	Q WOULD IT BE FAIR TO SAY THAT THE DESIRE OF A
25	PERSON WHO BECOMES INVOLVED IN ONE OF THESE NEW WAVE
26	ORGANIZATIONS, THAT THAT DESIRE TO PLEASE THE LEADER OR TO
27	BE COOPERATIVE IS INTENSIFIED IF THEY ARE IN A CLOSED
28	SOCIETY? WHEN I SAY CLOSED SOCIETY, I MEAN A GROUP THAT IS

1 COMPOSED OF PRIMARILY MEMBERS OF THAT NEW WAVE ORGANIZATION. 2 3 ANOTHER DIRECTION. I MISSED THE THRUST OF YOUR QUESTION. . 4 5 б 7 8 RIGHT. 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 SAY YES. 15 Q 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28

COULD YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE, MR. LEVY? I AM AFRAID I LOST YOU, I AM SORRY. I THOUGHT YOU WERE GOING IN

NOW, WE ARE RESTRICTING OURSELVES TO NEW WAVE ORGANIZATION. WHAT I WANT TO KNOW, IF IT WOULD BE IN YOUR OPINION, YOUR EXPERT OPINION AS A PSYCHIATRIST --

-- WOULD IT BE ACCURATE TO SAY THAT THE DESIRE TO PLEASE A LEADER OR TO BE COOPERATIVE IS GENERALLY INTENSIFIED WHEN YOU ARE IN THE CLOSED SOCIETY THAT IS LIMITED JUST TO MEMBERS OF WHATEVER NEW WAVE ORGANIZATION SUCH AS SAY CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT HERE?

WITHIN THE PARAMETERS OF YOUR QUESTION, I WOULD

WHAT IS A DOUBLE BIND IN YOUR JARGON?

DOUBLE BIND IS REALLY SIMULTANEOUS MESSAGE, TWO CONFLICTING MESSAGES FROM WHICH THE INDIVIDUAL, IN A SENSE, CAN'T ESCAPE. OUR JARGON "DOUBLE BIND" WAS ORIGINALLY USED IN THE FIELD OF FAMILY DYNAMICS AND FAMILY THERAPY BUT CAN BE APPLIED IN ALMOST ANY KIND OF SITUATION AS IN CATCH-22 WHERE YOU CAN'T WIN FOR LOSING, WHICH IS ESSENTIALLY WHAT IT MEANS. NO MATTER WHAT YOU DO, YOU ARE ESSENTIALLY -- YOU CAN'T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS AT THE SAME TIME.

AND IF ONE OF THESE NEW WAVE GROUPS WERE TO TEACH THAT, THE ONLY WAY TO GOD AND YOUR ASCENSION IS THROUGH THE FOLLOWINGS OF THAT PARTICULAR NEW WAVE GROUP, AND THEY LEFT IT AT THAT, WOULD NOT THE OTHER CONCLUSION BE

1	IF YOU DON'T FOLLOW AND YOU DON'T PARTICIPATE, YOU DON'T GET
2	THERE?
3	A I HAVE SEEN THIS IN ALMOST EVERY GROUP THAT
.a 4	Q THAT IS NOT MY QUESTION AND I AM NOT CONCERNED
£	WITH WHETHER YOU HAVE SEEN IT IN EVERY GROUP. I AM ASKING A
6	SPECIFIC QUESTION AND I'D LIKE, FOR ONCE, A SPECIFIC ANSWER.
7	A I BELIEVE I'VE ANSWERED YOU SPECIFICALLY
8	BEFORE, MR. LEVY. MORE THAN ONCE.
3	Q LET ME APOLOGIZE, DOCTOR. IT IS NOT A PERSONAL
10	THING BETWEEN YOU AND I. I WOULD JUST LIKE A PARTICULAR
11	ANSWER TO A PARTICULAR QUESTION AT THIS TIME.
12	A 1 AM SORRY. AGAIN, 1 AM GOING TO HAVE TO ASK
13	CAN THAT BE REPEATED? I I LOST IT AGAIN.
1.4	Q OKAY. LET ME TRY TO HELP YOU GET IT BACK.
15	WITH REGARD TO A DOUBLE BIND, IF SOMEONE BECOMES A MEMBER OF
16	A PARTICULAR NEW WAVE GROUP AND THAT NEW WAVE GROUP TELLS
17	THEM THERE IS ONLY ONE WAY TO SALVATION AND ONE WAY TO THEIR
18	ASCENSION, AND THAT IS THROUGH THE TEACHINGS OF THAT
19	PARTICULAR GROUP, AND THEY STOP THERE, IS NOT THE
20	INESCAPABLE CONCLUSION THAT IF YOU DON'T DO IT OUR WAY, YOU
21	DON'T DO 1T?
22	A YES. BUT THIS IS CAN I GO ON?
23	Q TAKE OFF. GO WHEREVER YOU LIKE.
24	A OKAY. THIS IS WE ARE TALKING NOW ABOUT AN
25	INDIVIDUAL WHO IS COMMITTED TO THAT PARTICULAR IDEOLOGY AND
26	TO THAT PARTICULAR GROUP AND LEADERSHIP AND THE ANSWER IS
27	YES UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES. BUT THERE IS ALREADY A
28	COMMITMENT TO THAT ASCENSION, FOR EXAMPLE, OR ANY OTHER

e de la companya de l

1 IMPLICIT OR EXPLICIT PAYOFF. 2 DOCTOR, AMONG ALL THOSE ARTICLES AND EVERYTHING 3 YOU'VE TOLD US ABOUT, YOU CONTRIBUTED TO AN ARTICLE IN A 4 PUBLICATION CALLED "PSYCHOLOGY TODAY," DID YOU NOT? S YES. 6 AND THAT WAS IN -- I THINK IT WAS AUGUST OF 7 1984, WAS IT NOT? 8 Α CORRECT. 9 I HAVE GOT A COPY OF IT HERE WITH ME. IT 10 STARTS OFF -- IT SAYS THAT IT TALKS ABOUT RADICAL DEPARTURES. THAT IS THE NAME OF YOUR BOOK, IS IT NOT? 11 12 RIGHT. 13 "LEAVING HOME TO JOIN AN IDEOLOGICAL COMMUNE IS 14 A DESPERATE MOVE BUT IN THE END IT IS USUALLY A BENIGN AND 15 THERAPEUTIC EXPERIENCE. BY DR. SAUL V. LEVINE." THAT IS 16 YOU, IS IT NOT? 17 YES, MR. LEVY. 18 HAVE YOU EVER HEARD OF ANYONE JOINING A COMMUNE 19 WHERE THE EXPERIENCE WAS NOT THERAPEUTIC OR BENIGN? 20 YES, I HAVE. THAT PARTICULAR ARTICLE, MR. 21 LEVY, THAT PARTICULAR ARTICLE WAS AN EXCERPT FROM MY BOOK. 22 THAT PARTICULAR STATEMENT WAS, IN THE FOLLOWING ISSUE, 23 ELABORATED UPON BY ME IN RESPONSE TO A LETTER WRITTEN BY DR. 24 SINGER, AS A MATTER OF FACT. 25 THERE ARE INDIVIDUALS FOR WHOM GROUPS ARE NOT 26 NECESSARILY BENIGN. I HAVE YET TO SEE AN INDIVIDUAL FOR 27 WHOM A GROUP IS NOT BENIGN WHO HAD SOME EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS 23 DURING THE GROUP OR AFTER THE GROUP WHO DID NOT HAVE

. 4

б

SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS BEFORE THE GROUP.

Q I WOULD SAY THAT IS A FAIR STATEMENT. IS IT A POSSIBILITY THAT SOMEONE WHO HAD PROBLEMS BEFOREHAND, OR DOES THE POSSIBILITY EXIST THAT SOMEONE WHO HAD PROBLEMS BEFOREHAND WOULD BE SUBJECTED TO GREATER STRESS, GREATER EMOTIONS, THAN SOMEONE WHO DID NOT HAVE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS BEFOREHAND?

A IT IS POSSIBLE. IT IS A POSSIBILITY.

I HAVE SEEN INDIVIDUALS HOWEVER WHO HAVE BEEN IN VARIOUS STATES OF DISORDER WHO HAVE IN FACT BEEN HELPED BY THE GROUPS. THAT IS WHY DR. PATTISON CALLED IT AN ALTERNATIVE HEALING NETWORK.

THAT, IN FACT, THE DEGREE OF STABILITY AND THE OVERRIDING BELIEF SYSTEM AND THE BELIEF IN THE POWERS OF THE PARTICULAR GROUP AND THE SUPPORT OF THE GROUP ITSELF ARE ACTUALLY THERAPEUTIC OR BENEFICIAL TO THAT INDIVIDUAL FOR THE TIME THEY ARE IN THE GROUP.

Q LET ME ASK YOU THIS. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS A CULT?

A IT IS A WORD THAT I NO LONGER USE BECAUSE IT
HAS BECOME A TOTALLY PEJORATIVE. IT IS A FOUR-LETTER WORD.
BUT A CULT AS DEFINED BY THE JEWISH BOARD OF GUARDIANS IN
PHILADELPHIA A FEW YEARS AGO IS A GROUP OF PEOPLE WITH A
STRONG OVERRIDING IDEOLOGY WITH COMMITMENT TO A LEADER WHO
IS DEIFIED. THE LEADER IS USUALLY LIVING BUT SOMETIMES
DECEASED, AND IMBUED WITH ALL KINDS OF MAGICAL
CHARACTERISTICS WHO ARE SUSPICIOUS OF THE OUTSIDE WORLD,
SOMETIMES HOSTILITY.

1	AND I ELABORATE ON THAT DEFINITION TO SAY THERE
2	ARE UNIQUE RULES FOR THAT PARTICULAR GROUP. THEY ALL HAVE
3	RULES. AND A UNIQUE USE OF LANGUAGE. BUT AS I SAID AND I
.4	FEEL VERY STRONGLY ABOUT, WHAT IS A CULT IS IN THE EYE OF
5	THE BEHOLDER BECAUSE WHAT MIGHT BE A CULT TO YOU MIGHT NOT
б	BE TO ME AND VICE VERSA.
7	Q YOU ARE THE EXPERT, DOCTOR. THAT IS WHY I AM
8	ASKING YOU. YOU GENERALLY YOU JUST SAID THAT YOU
و	CONSIDER CULT A PEDORATIVE TERM?
10	A YES.
11	Q YOU MEAN BY THAT A DISPARAGING TERM?
12	A YES.
13	Q YOU CHOOSE TO CALL CULTS I NOTE IN YOUR
14	ARTICLE LET ME READ FROM YOUR ARTICLE, PAGE 23, IT SAYS,
15	"BECAUSE THESE GROUPS DON'T EASILY LEND THEMSELVES TO
16	EXISTING TERMINOLOGY, I HAVE CHOSEN THE RATHER INEXACT TERM
17	'RADICAL' TO DESCRIBE BOTH THE GROUPS AND THE JOINING THAT
18	MAKES THEM POSSIBLE."
19	A RIGHT.
20	Q WITH REGARD TO YOUR DETERMINATION THAT THE WORD
21	"CULT" IS PEJORATIVE, YOU SAID, "I HAVE SEEN BAD THINGS.
22	BUT IN THE HUNDREDS OF GROUPS I KNOW OF FIRSTHAND, I HAVE
23	NEVER SEEN EXCESSES WORTHY OF THE PEJORATIVE LABEL OF
24	"CULT.""
25	IS THAT AN ACCURATE STATEMENT?
26	A YES.
27	Q NOW, ON PAGE 23, YOU TALK ABOUT WHAT THE PRESS
28	HAS REPORTED. YOU WRITE THAT:

1	
2	
3	
.4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

23

24

25

25

27

28

THE PRESS REPORTS INCLUDE
THINGS LIKE SOME OF THESE NEW WAVE GROUPS
WERE CONTROLLED BY A CHARISMATIC LEADER WHO
USED HIS POWER TO ENRICH HIMSELF.
UNCONSCIONABLY. IN SOME OF THESE NEW WAVE
GROUPS, PEOPLE BEG FOR FINANCIAL CHARITIES.
PEOPLE SERVE AGAINST THEIR WILL. PEOPLE
ARE PREVENTED FROM COMMUNICATING WITH THEIR
FAMILIES. MAIL, BOTH INCOMING AND OUTGOING,
IS CENSORED. PRIVACY IS PREVENTED THROUGH A
BUDDY SYSTEM. YOUNG GIRLS ARE ENCOURAGED TO
BE HAPPY HOOKERS IN CHRIST, TO SEDUCE NEW
MEMBERS SEXUALLY."

DOCTOR, WHEN MEN AND WOMEN ARE USED IN THESE
WAYS, IS IT YOUR OPINION THAT THAT CONDUCT DESERVES ANYTHING
OTHER THAN A PEJORATIVE LABEL?

A NO. BUT --

Q AND SINCE THE MEDIA AND PRESS AND THE PUBLIC AND MOST OF THE PEOPLE THAT WILL BE COMING IN CONTACT WITH CALL THOSE GROUPS THAT ENGAGE IN THOSE KIND OF PRACTICES CULTS, IS IT YOUR EXPERT OPINION THAT YOU WOULD NOT CATEGORIZE THEM ALSO AS CULTS?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT. IT
ASSUMES WHAT PEOPLE USE THE WORD "CULTS," WHAT THEY ARE
THINKING OF AND THAT IS SPECULATION. THERE IS NO TESTIMONY
OF THAT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: I WOULD BE DELIGHTED TO ANSWER.

1	BECAUSE YOU HAVE MADE A GENERALIZATION, MR.
2	LEVY, FROM ONE OR TWO PARTICULAR GROUPS. THERE ARE HORRIBLE
3	PEOPLE IN THIS WORLD AND I DON'T GENERALIZE. THERE ARE
4	HORRIBLE GROUPS IN THIS WORLD AND I DON!T GENERALIZE TO ALL
5	GROUPS. THE PROBLEM WITH THE WORD "CULT" THAT PARTICULAR
6	GROUP FOR WHICH MOST OF THOSE DESTRUCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS
7	WERE TAKEN FROM WERE CALLED CHILDREN OF GOD AT THE
8	PARTICULAR TIME OF THEIR EXISTENCE.
9	IF YOU ARE GOING TO USE THE WORD "CULT" FOR
10	THAT GROUP, THE FACT IS THE WORD "CULT" HAS BEEN USED FOR
11	ALMOST EVERY OTHER GROUP IN WHICH THERE ARE TRUE BELIEVERS.
12	SOME OF THE GROUPS TO WHICH YOU YOURSELF MIGHT FEEL VERY
13	LOFTY IDEALS AND WORTHY PURPOSES. THAT IS THE PROBLEM WITH
14	THE WORD "CULT."
15	Q BY MR. LEVY: THE ONLY ONE I BELIEVE HAS LOFTY
16	IDEALS IS THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION. OTHER THAN THAT,
17	WHO ELSE CAN YOU LOOK TO.
18	A 1 HAVE HEARD THINGS ABOUT THE AMERICAN BAR
19	ASSOCIATION.
20	Q EXCUSE ME, DOCTOR?
21	A I HAVE HEARD THINGS ABOUT THE AMERICAN BAR
22	ASSOCIATION.
23	Q I DON'T DOUBT THAT YOU HAVE.
24	THE COURT: HOW ABOUT THE AMERICAN MEDICAL
25	ASSOCIATION?
26	Q BY MR. LEVY: PRIOR TO TODAY, DOCTOR, YOU HAVE

Α NO.

27

28

NEVER MET GREGORY MULL, HAVE YOU?

1	Q YOU NEVER INTERVIEWED HIM PERSONALLY?
2	A NO, I DID NOT.
3	Q YOU NEVER SAW HIM BEFORE HE WAS HOSPITALIZED,
_4	DID YOU?
5	A NO.
6	Q YOUR DECISIONS ABOUT HIM ARE BASED SOLELY UPON
7	WHAT YOU READ IN HIS DEPOSITIONS, THE LETTERS THAT WERE
8	WRITTEN BY HIM TO ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET AND THE TESTIMONY
9	HERE AT THIS TRIAL; IS THAT CORRECT?
10	A RIGHT.
11	Q DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES
12	EACH OF THOSE LETTERS THAT MR. MULL WROTE WERE WRITTEN
13	UNDER?
14	A NO, I DO NOT.
15	Q DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA AS TO WHAT HIS STATE OF
16	MIND WAS AT THE TIME OF THE WRITING OF ANY OF THOSE LETTERS?
17	A 1 CAN ONLY MAKE CONJECTURAL ASSUMPTIONS. ALL I
18	HAVE IS THAT TESTIMONY AND THOSE LETTERS.
19	Q SEMANTICALLY SPEAKING, IS THAT AN EDUCATED WAY
20	OF SAYING YOU COULD GUESS?
21	A YES NO. THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
22	GUESSING AND I THINK AN EDUCATED I THINK DR. SINGER
23	CALLED IT EDUCATED INTUITIVE ASSUMPTION.
24	Q DO YOU HAVE ANY EXPERTISE IN THE FIELD OF
25	THOUGHT REFORM?
25	A 1 WOULD NOT CALL IT EXPERTISE. I HAVE
27 _	FAMILIARITY WITH THE LITERATURE AND I KNOW WHAT IS BEING
28	DISCUSSED HERE. BUT I WOULD NOT CONSIDER MYSELF AN EXPERT

	1923
1	ON THOUGHT REFORM.
2	Q WOULD YOU CONSIDER DR. ROBERT LIFTON AN EXPERT?
3	A YES.
4	Q WHAT ABOUT JOLLY WEST AT U.C.L.A?
5	A I DON'T KNOW. I HAVE READ HIS ARTICLE. I
6	DON'T KNOW IF HE IS AN EXPERT. I DON'T KNOW WHAT EXPERIENCE
7	DR. WEST HAS HAD. AS MUCH AS I ADMIRE AND RESPECT HIM, I
8	DON'T KNOW THAT HE HAS HAD ANY EXPERIENCE WITH THOUGHT
9	REFORM.
10	Q HE HAS BEEN CALLED BY AN EXPERT BY THE
11	SUPERIOR COURT SYSTEM IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
12	PARTICULARLY DURING THE PATTY HEARST TRIAL.
13	A I LIVED IN CALIFORNIA DURING THAT TRIAL. THAT
14	DOES NOT MAKE AN INDIVIDUAL AN EXPERT. I DON'T KNOW WHY HE
15	WAS CALLED AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME.
16	Q HAVE YOU READ HIS WRITINGS?
17	A I READ HIS MAJOR ARTICLE WITH DR. SINGER, YES,
18	I HAVE.
19	Q WOULD IT BE A FAIR STATEMENT TO SAY THAT AMONG
20	THOSE PEOPLE WHO ARE HELD TO BE EXPERTS IN THE FIELD OF
21	THOUGHT REFORM, JOLLY WEST FROM U.C.L.A., ROBERT LIFTON AND
22	MARGARET SINGER ARE GENERALLY CONSIDERED TO BE AMONG THE TOP
23	THREE IN THE COUNTRY?
24	A AS FAR AS I KNOW, MR. LEVY, ROBERT J. LIFTON IS
25	CONSIDERED TO BE AN EXPERT IN THOUGHT REFORM. I DO NOT KNOW
26	HONESTLY WHETHER DR. WEST AND DR. SINGER, AS ESTEEMED AS
27 .	THEY ARE, ARE EXPERTS ON THOUGHT REFORM.
28	Q WOULD IT SURPRISE YOU TO KNOW THAT IN DR.

LIFTON'S BOOK, HE ACKNOWLEDGES THE ASSISTANCE AND THE HELP OF DR. MARGARET T. SINGER AND HE ALSO MAKES A DEDICATION WHICH SIMPLY SAYS THAT WITHOUT HER DECADES OF EXPERIENCE AND HER INPUT INTO THE BOOK, THE BOOK COULD NOT HAVE BEEN WRITTEN?

5 6

4

I DID NOT KNOW THAT.

7

I THINK YOU MIGHT FIND IT IN THE DEDICATION PAGE OF THE BOOK.

8 9

Α THANK YOU.

10

11

12

NOW, IF SOMEONE WERE SEQUESTERED AT A CHURCH SETTING OR LET'S CALL IT A SCHOOL SETTING, LIKE A SUMMIT EXTENT THAT THEY COULD PARTICIPATE, SOME ISOLATION FROM THEIR FAMILY AND THE OUTSIDE WORLD, SOME GROUP SUGGESTIBILITY, CERTAIN DEGREE OF PEER GROUP PRESSURE, AND

13 14

16

15

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27 .

28

UNIVERSITY, WHILE THEY WERE THERE THEY WERE SUBJECTED TO THE THE GOOD FELLOWSHIP OR LOVE BOMBING THAT GOES ON IN NEW WAVE RELIGIONS, THE REMOVAL OF THEIR PERSONAL PRIVACY, BEING DORMITORIED OR QUARTERED IN BARRACKS TYPE SETTINGS, WHERE THEIR DAYS ARE FULL FROM EARLY IN THE MORNING TO LATE AT NIGHT LIKE DR. MOORE TOLD US HIS WERE WHEN HE WENT TO A CONFERENCE, HE STARTED AT 5:00 IN THE MORNING AND HE ENDED AT 11:00 OR LATER IN THE EVENING, IF THEY ARE SUBJECTED TO SUBLIMINAL MESSAGES WHERE THERE IS A LIMITATION UPON QUESTIONING BECAUSE THE USUAL RESPONSE IS, "EVENTUALLY WE WILL GET TO THAT QUESTION, DON'T DISTURB THE GROUP AT THE PRESENT TIME," IF THERE IS A CONFUSING DOCTRINE SUCH AS SUGGESTED IN YOUR ARTICLE IN PSYCHOLOGY TODAY, IF THERE IS THE SUGGESTION THAT THEY SHOULD REJECT THEIR OLD VALUES EVEN

27

28

SEND LETTERS TO THEIR OLD MINISTER THAT THEY NOW REJECT THEIR OLD RELIGION, IF THEY ARE SUBJECTED TO MANDATORY CONFESSIONS, IF THERE IS A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF GUILT WITH REGARD TO WHETHER OR NOT THEIR PAST LIVES ARE SUCH AS THEY ARE GOING TO ALLOW THEM TO MAKE THEIR ASCENSION, IF THERE IS A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF FEAR, FEAR OF NOT FOLLOWING A PARTICULAR SPIRITUAL PATH, IF THEY ARE SUBJECTED TO HOURS AND HOURS OF REPETITION DECREEING, IF IN THE COURSE OF WHAT THEY DO THEY GET PLENTY OF GOOD OLD VEGETABLES, BUT WHAT THEY GET IS CONTROLLED BY THE GROUP LEADER, IF THEY GET CONTROLLED APPROVAL, IF THERE ARE DRESS CODES, IF THERE IS A FLAUNTING OF THE HIERARCHY, IF THE PRECULT FAMILY IS DISTURBED OR DESTROYED, IF THERE IS A FINANCIAL COMMITMENT THAT THEY ARE OBLIGATED TO, IF THEY UNDERGO A PERIOD OF FASTING AND ENEMAS AND COLONICS, IF THE AVERAGE PERSON WERE SUBJECTED TO THAT OVER A THREE-MONTH PERIOD IN A SEQUESTERED SETTING, WOULD IT BE YOUR PROFESSIONAL OPINION THAT THAT MIGHT PLAY AN IMPORTANT PART IN A THOUGHT REFORM PROGRAM?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD OBJECT ON A NUMBER -- MR. LEVY: I IMAGINE YOU WOULD.

MR. KLEIN: -- ON A NUMBER OF GROUNDS. MANY OF THOSE TERMS THAT HE USED WHICH IS VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS WOULD BE A DEGREE OF SOMETHING, A NUMBER OF THEM ARE BASED ON FACTS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE. AND FINALLY, TO SAY MIGHT THAT PLAY IS SIMPLY ASKING HIM TO SPECULATE. ON THOSE GROUNDS, I WOULD OBJECT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WOULD YOU EXPECT IT TO PLAY?
WITH THAT, HE CAN ANSWER.

_4

ઇ

THE WITNESS: IF ALL THOSE THAT YOU LISTED, MR. LEVY,
ARE PRESENT FACTUALLY, AND THERE ARE NO OTHER REDEEMING
FEATURES, AND THE INDIVIDUAL HAS NO VOLITION ON HIS OWN, I
WOULD SAY IT WOULD AFFECT AND INFLUENCE THAT INDIVIDUAL.

Q BY MR. LEVY: NOW, IN YOUR ARTICLE AND IN YOUR STATEMENTS, YOU'VE TALKED ABOUT PEOPLE JOIN GROUPS, NEW WAVE GROUPS, AND GENERALLY WITHIN A YEAR OR TWO THEY FADE AWAY AND THEY LEAVE: IS THAT RIGHT?

A THAT'S WHAT I -- YES.

Q WOULD THE EFFECT ON THE INDIVIDUALS BE
DIFFERENT IF THEY DIDN'T LEAVE OF THEIR OWN CHOICE BUT AFTER
THEY GAVE OF THEMSELVES TO THE EXTENT OF THEIR ABILITY AND
MONETARY RESOURCES, AND PROFESSIONAL ABILITIES AND THEN THEY
WERE ASKED TO LEAVE OR KICKED OUT, WOULD THE EFFECT ON THEM
BE DIFFERENT?

OF CASES. ONE IS IF AN INDIVIDUAL IS EXTRUDED FROM A GROUP OR IF AN INDIVIDUAL LEAVES BECAUSE OF SOME CONFLICT WITH THE HIERARCHY AND IS ANGRY FOR WHATEVER REASON, OFTEN ABOUT MONEY OR OTHER KINDS OF CONFLICT, OR AN INDIVIDUAL IS KIDNAPPED AND DEPROGRAMMED, WHAT I OFTEN FIND IS THERE IS A PASSIONATE VENDETTA DEVELOP AND THAT THE INDIVIDUAL OFTEN BECOMES AN ANTI-CULT CULTIST, THAT THE SAME KIND OF VEHEMENCE AND PASSION THAT WAS COMMITTED TO THE GROUP IS THEN COMMITTED TO A CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE GROUP. I HAVE SEEN THIS IN NUMEROUS ORGANIZATIONS AS A MATTER OF FACT THAT HAVE A KIND OF VIGILANTE VIEW AT EVERY GROUP WITH A PRIORI

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
15
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Q THAT IS A NICE LECTURE BUT BACK TO THE QUESTION.

THE QUESTION WAS, DOCTOR, WOULD THE EFFECT ON AN INDIVIDUAL BE DIFFERENT IF HE JUST FADED AWAY THAN IF HE HAD MADE A TOTAL COMMITMENT AND THEN WAS KICKED OUT?

A THE ANSWER WAS YES AND I MEANT BY THAT NICE LECTURE THAT THERE WAS A PERPETUATION OF THE ANGER, ANIMOSITY, RETRIBUTION AND EVEN FLASHBACKS HAVING TO DO WITH THE GROUP BY VIRTUE OF THAT UNPLEASANT LEAVING.

Q NOW, LET'S ZERO THIS IN A LITTLE BIT TO GREGORY MULL. MAY OF 1980, HE WAS ASKED TO LEAVE. HE WAS SUMMONED BACK IN JUNE OF 1980, AND HE PARTED WITH THE LAST OF HIS FUNDS, SOME \$5,500. THEREAFTER, HE SENT A LETTER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY EXPRESSING HIS CONCERN ABOUT SOME IMPROPERLY BUILT BUILDINGS.

DOES THAT SUGGEST TO YOU -- THAT LETTER BY THE WAY WAS SENT TOWARD THE LATTER PART OF THAT YEAR, SO IN ROUGHLY SIX MONTHS OR A YEAR DURING THE YEAR OF 1980 AFTER THIS MAN WAS ASKED TO LEAVE, HE WROTE A LETTER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY -- DOES THAT SUGGEST TO YOU A GREAT DEGREE OF ANIMOSITY AND HATRED AND WHATEVER THE OTHER TERMS WERE YOU USED TO DESCRIBE SOME OF THEM?

- A THAT PARTICULAR LETTER?
- Q YES.
- A NOT NECESSARILY.
- Q AND IF AFTER HE WAS THREATENED NOT TO DO OR SAY ANYTHING ANYMORE, HE CEASED EVEN TALKING TO HIS FRIENDS ON THE PROMISE THAT IF HE DID NOT TALK TO ANYONE OR DID NOT DO

ANYTHING, HE WOULD NOT BE SUED, AND HE COMPLIED WITH THAT ONLY TO BE SUED, WOULD YOU SUGGEST THAT THAT MIGHT HAVE A REASON TO BE UPSETTING TO HIM PSYCHOLOGICALLY, DOCTOR?

A YES, IT'S POSSIBLE.

Q AND IF IN GOOD FAITH AND ETERNAL TRUST IN HIS LEADER, HIS SPIRITUAL LEADER, HE WENT BY INVITATION TO A SQUARE DANCE WHERE WHEN HE WAS ASKED WHAT HIS PURPOSE WAS TO BE THERE, HE EXPRESSED THE DESIRE THAT HE MIGHT BE ABLE TO SEE AND TALK WITH HER, AND HE WAS DENIED ADMITTANCE, DO YOU THINK THAT MIGHT HAVE A PSYCHOLOGICAL INFLUENCE AND EFFECT ON THAT INDIVIDUAL?

A WELL, THERE I WOULD JUST HAVE TO SAY I DON'T KNOW BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW THE TOTAL CONTEXT OF THAT SITUATION.

Q NOW, MR. KLEIN ASKED YOU WHETHER IT WAS PROPER FOR A COUNSELOR TO MAKE AN EVALUATION IF THEY DID NOT HAVE PRIOR KNOWLEDGE AS TO AN INDIVIDUAL'S PRIOR PSYCHOLOGICAL MAKE-UP.

LET ME GIVE YOU A HYPOTHETICAL, IF I MAY.

LET'S SAY YOU WERE COUNSELING WITH SOMEONE WHO WAS SOMEWHAT AMNESIAC. MAYBE PARTIALLY MUTE. MAYBE WHO TOLD YOU HE HAD NO FAMILY OR FRIENDS. WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO MAKE AN OBJECTIVE OPINION BASED ON YOUR PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS AND YOUR DISCUSSIONS WITH THE INDIVIDUAL REGARDLESS OF HOW LIMITED THOSE DISCUSSIONS WERE?

A I WOULD BE ABLE TO MAKE A LIMITED DIAGNOSIS.

IT WOULD TAKE ME LONGER, IT MIGHT NEED CORROBORATORY

EVIDENCE. I MIGHT WANT CONSULTATION FROM OTHER EXPERTS AND

1	I MIGHT WANT OTHER KIND OF
2	CLINICALLY. ALL I AM SAYI
3	ABOUT AN INDIVIDUAL, JUST
4	VALID AND RELIABLE GROUNDS
5	TO THE EXTENT
5	CORROBORATORY EVIDENCE, WE
7	Q 1F THAT PERSO
8	TWO TO TWO-AND-A-HALF YEAR
9	TIME, WITHOUT ANY FURTHER
10	MAKE A DIAGNOSIS AS TO THA
11	PROBLEMS?
12	A YOU ARE TALKI
13	ABOUT WHO?
14	Q YOU, DOCTOR.
15	A THE ANSWER IS
16	POSITION.
17	Q NOW, LET'S SA
13	WHERE YOU ARE OBSERVING, T
19	TREATING WITH THIS INDIVID
20	CHANGE, WOULD YOU STILL NE
21	NOTE AND DIAGNOSE THE RADI
22	A YES. YOU KNO
23	ABOUT NEED. I WOULD WANT.
24	INSTANCES WHERE AN INDIVID
25	PSYCHOTIC BREAK. I AM NOT
26	AT SOME POINT
27	INDIVIDUAL IN HER LATE THI

I MIGHT WANT OTHER KIND OF LAB TESTS TO SEE WHAT I SEE
CLINICALLY. ALL I AM SAYING IS THE MORE EVIDENCE WE HAVE
ABOUT AN INDIVIDUAL, JUST LIKE IN A CASE, THE MORE WE ARE ON
VALID AND RELIABLE GROUNDS.

TO THE EXTENT THAT WE DON'T HAVE THE CORROBORATORY EVIDENCE, WE ARE IN THE REALM OF CONJECTURE.

Q IF THAT PERSON WAS TO BE YOUR CLIENT FOR SOME TWO TO TWO-AND-A-HALF YEARS, DO YOU THINK IN THAT LENGTH OF TIME, WITHOUT ANY FURTHER CORROBORATION, YOU MIGHT BEGIN TO MAKE A DIAGNOSIS AS TO THAT INDIVIDUAL'S PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS?

A YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT ME OR MAKING A STATEMENT ABOUT WHO?

A THE ANSWER IS YES, I WOULD BE IN A MUCH BETTER POSITION.

Q NOW, LET'S SAY AFTER THOSE TWO-AND-A-HALF YEARS WHERE YOU ARE OBSERVING, TALKING TO, COUNSELING WITH AND TREATING WITH THIS INDIVIDUAL, IF YOU OBSERVED A RADICAL CHANGE, WOULD YOU STILL NEED PRIOR INFORMATION TO BE ABLE TO NOTE AND DIAGNOSE THE RADICAL CHANGE?

A YES. YOU KNOW, AGAIN YOU ARE ASKING LOOSELY
ABOUT NEED. I WOULD WANT. FOR EXAMPLE, THERE ARE MANY
INSTANCES WHERE AN INDIVIDUAL DECOMPENSATES, THAT IS HAS A
PSYCHOTIC BREAK. I AM NOT REFERRING TO MR. MULL AT ALL.

AT SOME POINT I AM THINKING OF ONE PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL IN HER LATE THIRTIES, WITHOUT KNOWING THAT THAT INDIVIDUAL HAD A SIMILAR BREAKDOWN ABOUT 15 YEARS EARLIER

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
ខ	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

23

AND NOTHING IN BETWEEN, DETERMINED HOW A DIAGNOSIS WAS MADE.

THAT IS, THE CORROBORATORY EVIDENCE WAS VERY

IMPORTANT IN DETERMINING HOW ONE LOOKED AT THAT PARTICULAR

INDIVIDUAL BOTH IN TERMS OF DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT AND

PROGNOSIS.

SO TO THE EXTENT THAT WE HAVE THE INFORMATION, WE ARE MUCH BETTER OFF AS IS THE PATIENT OR CLIENT. TO THE EXTENT THAT WE DON'T HAVE, WE HAVE TO USE WHAT WE HAVE, WHICH IS LIMITED.

- Q DOCTOR, YOU JUST USED THE TERM -THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO FINISH YOUR QUESTION?
- Q BY MR. LEVY: YOU'VE JUST USED THE TERM PSYCHOTIC BREAK?
 - A YEAH.
- AN INDIVIDUAL AS THEIR SPIRITUAL LEADER AND ACCEPTED TOTALLY AND COMPLETELY THE RELIGIOUS TEACHINGS OF AN ORGANIZATION, SO MUCH SO THAT WHEN THAT SPIRITUAL LEADER LABELED THEM IN THIS CASE BEAST OF BLASPHEMY, AND SHORTLY THEREAFTER THAT PERSON WAS HOSPITALIZED WITH A STROKE-LIKE INCIDENT THAT WAS PRECIPITATED BY THAT LABELING, WOULD IT BE A FAIR STATEMENT TO SAY THEN THAT THE COURSE OF CONDUCT OF THE LABELING BY THE SPIRITUAL LEADER MAY HAVE PLAYED A CONSIDERABLE PART IN PRECIPITATING THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BREAK THAT LED TO THE HOSPITALIZATION?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD OBJECT. THAT

QUESTION CONTRADICTS THE TESTIMONY OF HIS OWN WITNESS, DR.

AFSHAR, WHO SAID YOU COULDN'T TELL WHETHER ANYTHING WAS

1
2
3
_a 4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

24

25

26

27

28

THAT --

MR. LEVY: IS THIS YOUR FINAL ARGUMENT?

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE OBJECTION?

MR. KLEIN: IT IS NOT BASED ON THE EVIDENCE, YOUR HONOR.

MR. LEVY: IT IS A HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION FOR YOUR WITNESS.

MR. KLEIN: HYPOTHETICAL QUESTIONS HAVE TO BE BASED ON EVIDENCE IN THE CASE, YOUR HONOR.

I WOULD OBJECT.

THE COURT: I WOULD URGE THAT YOU THINK ABOUT THE QUESTION. I SUGGEST THAT YOU JUST MISUNDERSTOOD, WHICH CAN HAPPEN TO ANY OF US, MR. KLEIN, AND I SUGGEST THAT IS WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO YOU NOW. THE QUESTION ASKED THIS WITNESS' OPINION AS TO WHETHER HE THINKS THERE MIGHT BE A CAUSATIVE LINK. HE MIGHT HAVE AN OPINION AND HIS OPINION MIGHT AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE OPINION OF SOME CTHER WITNESS.

NOW HE IS GOING TO ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: YOU USED THE WORD EMOTIONAL BREAKDOWN OR PSYCHOLOGICAL BREAKDOWN. I WAS NOT AWARE THAT --

Q BY MR. LEVY: I DIDN'T SAY BREAKDOWN. I USED YOUR TERM, DOCTOR, PSYCHOTIC BREAK.

A 1 WAS NOT AWARE AT ALL THAT MR. MULL HAD A
PSYCHOTIC BREAK. WHAT I WAS INFORMED I THINK FROM THE
TESTIMONY AND FROM THE DEPOSITION IS THAT MR. MULL WAS
HOSPITALIZED BECAUSE OF A CARDIOVASCULAR ACCIDENT, C.V.A.,
ALSO KNOWN AS A STROKE. I AM NOT AN EXPERT ON
CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE BUT -- I AM NOT A NEUROLOGIST, BUT IT

1	WOULD BE THE FIRST TIME THAT I WOULD HAVE HEARD A STROKE
2	PRECIPITATED BY SOMEBODY CALLING SOMEBODY A BAD NAME.
3	Q ARE YOU TELLING THIS COURT IF THERE IS A
4	TRAUMATIC EVENT IN SOMEONE'S LIFE PREDICATED ON A WAY OF
5	LIFE THEY HAVE COME TO ACCEPT AND BELIEVE IN, IF THERE IS A
6	TRAUMATIC EVENT THAT IS SIGNIFICANT ENOUGH TO PUT THAT
7	PERSON IN A STATE OF FEAR AND A STATE OF STRESS, THAT THE
8	STRESS AND THE FEAR AND THE ENTIRETY OF THE SITUATION CANNOT
9	BE A CONTRIBUTING FACTOR TO THAT STROKE-LIKE INCIDENT?
10	A I DO NOT PURPORT TO BE A LAWYER ANY MORE THAN
11	YOU PURPORT TO BE A PSYCHIATRIST.
12	Q I APPRECIATE THAT.
13	YOU WANT TO ANSWER THE QUESTION, PLEASE?
14	A YES. I JUST RESENTED YOUR INSINUATION.
15	Q THEN I APOLOGIZE FOR MY INSTNUATION.
16	A THERE MAY BE ABSOLUTELY NO INFLUENCE
17	WHATSOEVER. WE JUST DON'T KNOW. IN THIS PARTICULAR YOU
18	DON'T KNOW IN ANY PARTICULAR ONE SITUATION.
19	Q GENERALLY SPEAKING, DOCTOR, DOES STRESS PLAY
20	ANY PART
21	A GENERALLY SPEAKING, STRESS CAN PLAY SOME PART
22	IN THE EVOLUTION OF ALMOST ANY KIND OF PHYSICAL DISORDER.
23	THE COURT: INCLUDING A CARDIOVASCULAR INCIDENT?
24	THE WITNESS: IT CAN BE RELATED MORE TO BLOOD
25	PRESSURE AND PULSE RATE RATHER THAN CARDIO
26	THE COURT: INCLUDING A STROKE-LIKE INCIDENT?
27	THE WITNESS: I WOULD SAY ONLY AS A RESULT OF A GREAT
28	INCREASE IN BLOOD PRESSURE, A GREAT INCREASE IN PULSE RATE.

THE COURT: WHICH MIGHT OCCUR AS A PRODUCT OF STRESS?

THE WITNESS: MR. JUSTICE, I JUST DON'T KNOW WHETHER

IT CAN OCCUR TO THE EXTENT THAT IT WOULD PRECIPITATE A

CARDIOVASCULAR ACCIDENT. I DON'T KNOW. I WOULD WANT TO

MAKE A STATEMENT TO THAT EFFECT WITH A GREAT DEAL OF MEDICAL

CONFIDENCE AND I AM NOT GOING TO COMMIT MYSELF WHEN I AM NOT

AN EXPERT IN THAT AREA.

THE COURT: WE WILL RESUME AT 1:30.

(AT 12:05 P.M., A RECESS WAS TAKEN UNTIL

1:30 P.M. OF THE SAME DAY.)

A YES.

Q HAVE YOU EVER COUNSELED WITH SOMEONE WHO, AS A RESULT OF THE STRESS, HAD BEEN DISABLED?

A YES.

REI

Q IF A PERSON HAD A TOTAL COMMITMENT, AN ABIDING BELIEF IN THE SPIRITUAL LEADER, SO MUCH SO THAT THAT INDIVIDUAL HAD FOLLOWED THE PRECEPTS OF THAT SPIRITUAL LEADER TO THE DEGREE THAT THEY DID NOT BALK WHEN A MARITAL RELATIONSHIP WAS TERMINATED, AND THEY DID NOT BALK WHEN IT MEANT THE END OF THEIR EXISTING PROFESSIONAL CAREER, IF SOMEONE HAD THAT KIND OF FAITH AND ALLEGIANCE TO SOMEONE, AND THAT SOMEONE BEING THEIR SPIRITUAL LEADER KICKED THEM OUT OF THE CHURCH, COULD THAT CAUSE A SEVERE TRAUMATIC EPISODE OF THAT INDIVIDUAL WHO WAS SO KICKED OUT OF THE CHURCH?

A 1T COULD CAUSE SEVERE STRESS, YES.

SERPENT BEFORE, I BELIEVE YOUR ANSWER WAS THAT ANY DIRTY
WORD COULD CREATE A STRESSFUL SITUATION. WHEN I REFERRED TO
THOSE TERMS, HYPOTHETICALLY I WOULD LIKE YOU TO ADDRESS
YOURSELF TO AN INDIVIDUAL WHO HAS ACCEPTED THE TOTALITY OF A
RELIGIOUS BELIEF, A NEW WAVE, IF YOU WILL, RELIGIOUS BELIEF.
AND HAS ACCEPTED THE TOTALITY OF THE TEACHINGS OF THAT
BELIEF TO SUCH A DEGREE THAT SOME THREE-AND-A-HALF, FOUR
YEARS LATER, AFTER HE HAS BEEN KICKED OUT OF THE CHURCH,
THAT IT CAUSES SUFFICIENT STRESS SO THAT THAT STRESS MAY BE
ONE OF THE PRECIPITATING FACTORS IN A STROKE, WOULD YOU SAY
HIS DEDICATION TO THE CAUSE WAS COMPLETE?

A YES.

4 5

_

Q IF SOMEONE WERE THE SPIRITUAL LEADER AND KNEW AND UNDERSTOOD THAT DEGREE OF COMMITMENT, HOW WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE THE SPIRITUAL LEADER KNOWING OF THE VULNERABILITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL IF THEY NEVERTHELESS LABEL THEM THE BEAST OF BLASPHEMY AND THE SERPENT?

A WELL, I DON'T KNOW IF I WOULD BE COMPLIMENTARY.

I DON'T KNOW HOW I WOULD LABEL THEM. BUT OBVIOUSLY THE WAY

YOU ARE DESCRIBING, YOU ARE SETTING UP THE SITUATION FOR ME

TO RESPOND TO, AND GIVEN THAT, AS I SAID BEFORE THE

PARAMETERS OF WHAT YOU ARE ASKING, I WOULD HAVE TO SAY I

WOULD BE CRITICAL OF SOMEBODY WHO HAD THAT KIND OF

TREMENDOUS POSITIVE IMAGE AND THEN UTILIZED THAT POSITION

CRITICALLY.

BUT -- THAT'S MY ANSWER TO YOUR HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION.

Q NOW, DOCTOR, IN YOUR PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY,
WHEN YOU ARE COUNSELING WITH SOMEONE, SO THAT I UNDERSTAND
WHAT YOU TOLD US BEFORE, YOU SAID NATURALLY IT IS BEST TO
GET AS MUCH INFORMATION WHEN YOU ARE WORKING WITH A PATIENT
OR A CLIENT AS YOU CAN POSSIBLY GET. AND I UNDERSTAND AND I
AGREE WITH THAT. IN THE COURSE OF YOUR PRACTICE, IS IT
SOMETIME THE CASE THAT YOU DO NOT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY, THE
AVAILABILITY OR THE -- WHATEVER IT TAKES TO GET ALL OF THE
INFORMATION THAT YOU CAN POSSIBLY GET?

A YES.

Q WOULD YOU SAY THAT'S MORE GENERALLY THE CASE THAN OTHERWISE?

,	A I WOULDN'T SAY IT IS MORE GENERALLY THE CASE.
1	THERE IS ALWAYS OR OFTEN ACCESS TO RECORDS AND ACCESS TO ALL
2	KINDS OF CORROBORATORY INFORMATION FROM FAMILY AND OTHER
3	MEMBERS OF A SOCIAL SYSTEM. I WOULDN'T SAY IT IS ALWAYS THE
_4	
5	CASE AT ALL.
6	Q NOT ALWAYS. WOULD YOU SAY THAT QUITE OFTEN, IT
7	IS THE CASE IN THE PRACTICE OF PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHIATRY?
8	A I WOULD SAY OFTEN.
9	Q NOW, LET ME ASK YOU ANOTHER HYPOTHETICAL. IF
10	THE SPIRITUAL LEADER OF A NEW WAVE RELIGION HAD A
11	PSYCHOANALYST ON STAFF WHO ON A REGULAR BASIS SHARED
12	INFORMATION FROM HIS PRIVATE CONFIDENTIAL SESSIONS WITH HIS
13	PATIENTS WITH THE SPIRITUAL LEADER, IN YOUR OPINION WOULD HE
14	BE VIOLATING HIS PROFESSIONAL OATH AND WOULD SHE AS THE
15	SPIRITUAL LEADER BE VIOLATING A PRIVILEGED AREA OF
16	COMMUNICATIONS?
17	MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD OBJECT AS TO
18	RELEVANCE AND AS TO 787 OF THE EVIDENCE CODE.
19	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
20	YOU CAN ANSWER.
21	THE WITNESS: IF THE PSYCHOANALYST PROVIDED
22	INFORMATION OF A CONFIDENTIAL NATURE, HE WOULD BE BREAKING
23	HIS HIS OATH. I ACTUALLY DON'T KNOW HE WOULD BE
24	BREAKING A PROFESSIONAL MORAL CODE. IF HE WERE AN M.D., HE
25	WOULD BE BREAKING OR PSYCHIATRIST IN ADDITION, I DON'T
26	KNOW WHETHER THIS IS LAY ANALYST OR NOT, BUT CERTAINLY AN
27	M.D. WOULD BE BREAKING THE DATH OF HIS OFFICE.
28	THIS LAY ANALYST, I WOULD IT WOULD BE

28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
13	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

UNETHICAL BUT I COULDN'T SAY BEYOND THAT. THE PART ABOUT THE RELIGIOUS LEADER BEING PRIVY TO THAT INFORMATION, I DON'T KNOW WHAT CODE THAT RELIGIOUS LEADER IS BREAKING AGAIN, IN YOUR HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION.

Q BY MR. LEVY: WELL, LET ME PUT IT TO YOU THIS WAY. IF IN THE COURSE OF THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TWO PARTIES, INFORMATION WAS CONTAINED IN A PRIEST-PENITENT COMMUNICATION WAS DISSEMINATED BACK AND FORTH, IN YOUR OPINION WOULD THEN THE SPIRITUAL LEADER ALSO BE BREAKING THAT FIDUCIARY RELATIONSHIP?

A REVEALING THAT INFORMATION TO OTHER PEOPLE YOU MEAN?

Q YES.

A MY PERSONAL OPINION WOULD BE IT WOULD BE BREAKING SOME FORM OF TRUST, DEEP TRUST.

Q NOW, MR. KLEIN STARTED TO ASK YOU A QUESTION AND THEN HE CHANGED THE QUESTION. BUT THE QUESTION HAD TO DO WITH MARGARET SINGER AND THE QUESTION HAD TO DO WITH —— EXCUSE ME. DR. MARGARET T. SINGER. I DON'T WANT TO APPEAR FAMILIAR JUST LIKE I APOLOGIZED TO YOU. I WANT TO GIVE HER HER FULL PROFESSIONAL TITLE. THE QUESTION WENT TO THAT AREA ON WHICH SHE BASED SOME OF HER CONCLUSIONS. AND YOU HEARD THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE COURT AND MR. KLEIN AND MYSELF. I WANT TO READ TO YOU A PORTION —— A FURTHER PORTION OF HER TESTIMONY IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION HERE IN THIS COURT. AND I WANT TO KNOW AFTER I READ THAT TO YOU, IF IN YOUR OPINION —— LET ME HOLD THE QUESTION UNTIL I READ IT TO YOU.

"QUESTION, NOW EVEN THOUGH --"

THE COURT: PLEASE IDENTIFY WHERE YOU ARE READING.

MR. LEVY: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS FROM A

TRANSCRIPT OF THIS TRIAL. I AM READING THE TESTIMONY FROM
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY THE 26, 1986, ON PAGE 557, STARTING AT
LINE FOUR, AND GOING TO 558, LINE 10. STARTS WITH THE
QUESTION,

"NOW, EVEN THOUGH THAT IS

SEVERAL PAGES LONG, I THINK IT IS ALL

PERTINENT. WOULD YOU BE KIND ENOUGH TO

READ TO THE COURT WHAT IT IS YOU DID IN

PREPARATION FOR YOUR TESTIMONY AT THIS

TRIAL?

BEGAN BY LISTING THE READINGS. AND I'VE LISTED THE DEPOSITIONS THAT I READ. I'VE READ SIX VOLUMES OF MR. GREGORY MULL'S DEPOSITION, I READ THE DEPOSITION OF KATHLEEN LEVY, TWO VOLUMES OF ELIZABETH CLARE FRANCIS' DEPOSITION, THE DEPOSITION OF MR. RANDALL KING, THAT OF DR. AFSHAR. I READ THE AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT AND THE DEFENDANT'S TRIAL BRIEF.

THEN I READ A SERIES OF

DOCUMENTS WRITTEN BY GREGORY MULL, MARILYN

MALEK, MR. AND MRS. BEN MAR, SUSAN

PIETRANGELO, A TEN-YEAR MEMBER OF THE

CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT, A DOCUMENT

WRITTEN BY JOHN PIETRANGELO, WHO WAS A

THIRTEEN-YEAR MEMBER, ONE BY SANDRA NILES, WHO WAS IN SEVEN YEARS, ONE BY DONALD TROWBRIDGE, WHO WAS A TWELVE-YEAR MEMBER, ONE BY SUSAN MULDENAUR, ONE BY CYNTHIA SCHWARTZ, ONE BY MAE GADPAILLE AND ONE BY KATHLEEN MUELLER.

INTERVIEWS DONE OVER THE TELEPHONE WITH ANN TROWBRIDGE, DONALD TROWBRIDGE, DAVID AND RACHEL MURPHY, CHARLES AND CHERYL NILES, LUIS LEYVA, JOSEPH SZIMHART, STEVEN PAVUK AND I INTERVIEWED MR. RANDALL KING OVER THE PHONE.

"IN PERSON I INTERVIEWED MR.

GREGORY MULL IN 1982, AGAIN IN 1983 AND IN

1985 FOR APPROXIMATELY TEN HOURS. I

INTERVIEWED ANN TROWBRIDGE IN 1985 FOR FIVE

HOURS. AND IN '85 AND '86 I INTERVIEWED MR.

DONALD TROWBRIDGE FOR A TOTAL OF EIGHT HOURS.

I INTERVIEWED MRS. PAT BROWN IN 1986 FOR

THREE HOURS. AND IN 1985 I INTERVIEWED MR.

WILLIAM PURCELL FOR ELEVEN HOURS.

"AND PRIOR TO THIS, I HAVE OVER
THE YEARS HAD EIGHT CLIENTS, WHOSE NAMES I
CAN'T CITE WHO WERE FORMER MEMBERS OF THE
CHURCH, WHO CAME TO ME AFTER THEY HAD LEFT
THE GROUP FOR COUNSELING.

"THEN I STUDIED OTHER DOCUMENTS

3
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2

3

THAT WERE PROVIDED TO ME. AND DID YOU WANT ME TO READ THOSE?"

THAT IS WHERE THE TESTIMONY STOPS.

NOW, IN YOUR PROFESSIONAL OPINION, DO YOU THINK
THAT WITNESS DID A REASONABLE JOB IN ASCERTAINING ALL THE
INFORMATION THAT THAT PERSON WAS ABLE TO GET IN ORDER TO
FORM THEIR QUALIFIED PROFESSIONAL OPINION?

A MR. LEVY, I HAVE A LOT OF RESPECT FOR DR.

SINGER. I AM SURE THAT SHE DID ALL THESE INTERVIEWS AND I

AM SURE THAT SHE WAS TRYING TO GET AS MUCH INFORMATION ABOUT

WHATEVER WE ARE DISCUSSING TODAY. I FRANKLY DON'T KNOW

WHICH, IF ANY OF THOSE PEOPLE, COULD CORROBORATE OR GIVE ANY

TESTIMONY OR EVIDENCE TO HER ABOUT MR. MULL'S PAST. I JUST

DON'T KNOW.

IF YOU ARE SAYING THAT ALL OF THESE PEOPLE COULD AND DID IN FACT PROVIDE HER WITH THAT KIND OF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, THEN THE ANSWER IS YES. BUT I JUST DON'T KNOW. I DON'T KNOW WHO THESE PEOPLE ARE, FRANKLY.

Q WELL, LET'S START WITH TWO THINGS. FIRST OF ALL, IF THAT KIND OF PREPARATION WAS DONE, IN YOUR PROFESSIONAL OPINION, WOULD IT HAVE BEEN REASONABLE AND PROFESSIONAL TO HAVE DONE INVESTIGATION TO THAT EXTENT?

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT AS TO VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: PLEASE REPHRASE THE QUESTION.

Q BY MR. LEVY: LET ME STATE IT THIS WAY. IF THAT'S WHAT A PROFESSIONAL DID IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND A PERSON AND THE GROUP, THAT THEY WERE TESTIFYING ABOUT, IN

27 .

YOUR PROFESSIONAL OPINION WOULD WORK TO THAT EXTENT HAVE DISPLAYED PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY?

A IF YOU ARE ASKING ME -- SORRY, I AM NOT BEING CUTE, MR. LEVY. IF YOU ARE ASKING ME WHETHER THAT IS SUFFICIENT TO DRAW A CONCLUSION AS TO A SAMPLE OF PEOPLE, I WOULD HAVE TO KNOW WHAT KIND OF PEOPLE THEY WERE.

TO MAKE A REASONABLE ASSESSMENT ABOUT A GROUP,
YOU HAVE TO GET -- EXPERIENCE INTERVIEWS WITH PEOPLE BOTH IN
AND OUTSIDE, BOTH PRO AND BOTH CON THEN YOU CAN MAKE THAT
JUDGMENT. IF YOU ARE ASKING ME SPECIFICALLY ABOUT MR. MULL,
AGAIN, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THESE PEOPLE COULD FILL HER IN.

I AM SURE THAT SHE DID HER HOMEWORK.

THAT IS OFF TO ONE SIDE OF MY QUESTION. YOU
TESTIFIED BEFORE THAT YOU HAVE NOT ATTENDED ANY OF THE
FUNCTIONS OF THIS CHURCH, YOU HAVE NOT GONE TO AND COUNSELED
WITH ANY OF THEIR MEMBERS CURRENT OR EX-MEMBERS, THAT ALL
YOU DID WAS READ GREGORY MULL'S TESTIMONY AND HIS
DEPOSITIONS AND SOME LETTERS. AND YOU, ON THE BASIS OF
THAT, FELT QUALIFIED TO GIVE YOUR OPINION WITH REGARD TO MR.
MULL AND HIS RELATIONSHIP WITH THIS ORGANIZATION?

A I -- THE NATURE OF THE QUESTIONS THAT ARE DIRECTED TO ME ARE IN GENERAL BASED ON MY RESEARCH, NOT ON THIS PARTICULAR -- I DO NOT HAVE FAMILIARITY WITH THE GROUP OR WITH MR. MULL.

Q NOW, THERE WAS A DR. MOORE HERE WHO TESTIFIED YESTERDAY OR LAST WEEK AND HE TOLD US ABOUT ONE OF THE GROUPS THAT HE -- A NEW WAVE RELIGION, THE CHILDREN OF GOD, WHO HE FELT WAS JUST ANOTHER ONE OF THE NEW WAVE RELIGIONS.

YOU HAVE TOLD US TODAY YOU HAVE FOUND SOME OF 1 THEIR CONDUCT TO BE LESS THAN EQUITABLE AND PROPER. WOULD I 2 BE CORRECT IN ASSUMING THEN THAT YOU ARE AT ODDS WITH DR. 3 MOORE? AT LEAST WITH REGARD TO YOUR OPINION OF THE CHILDREN 4 5 OF GOD? 6 NO, NOT NECESSARILY. MY WORK -- MY RESEARCH ABOUT THE CHILDREN OF 7 GOD OCCURRED TEN YEARS AGO. I AM NOT UP TO DATE ON WHAT 8 THEY ARE RIGHT NOW. FURTHERMORE, AS I WAS JUST COMMENTING, 9 THE -- EVEN WHEN YOU HAVE A GROUP THAT MISREPRESENTS ITSELF 10 AND DOES SOME NEFARIOUS THINGS, WHICH THE LEADER OF THE 11 CHILDREN OF GOD DID IN FACT INCUR AT THAT TIME, ESPECIALLY 12 IN THE EARLY SEVENTIES, INDIVIDUAL SECTS OR BRANCHES OR 13 TEMPLES OF THAT PARTICULAR RELIGION MAY BE TOTALLY DIVORCED 14 AND MIGHT IN FACT REPRESENT A WHOLE GROUP OF WHOLESOME 15 COMMITTED SOCIALLY CONSTRUCTIVE INDIVIDUALS. 16 I HAVE SEEN THIS TOO WITHIN THAT PARTICULAR 17 RELIGION. THE CHILDREN OF GOD. 18 WAS THAT CLEAR? 19 20 Q YES, THAT WAS CLEAR. WAS IT THE CHILDREN OF GOD WHO SENT THE YOUNG 21 LADIES OUT TO BE HOOKERS FOR CHRIST? 22 YES. 23 AND THAT IS WHOLESOME? 24 Q NO, I DIDN'T SAY THAT WAS WHOLESOME AT ALL. I 25 26 THINK THAT IS TERRIBLE. ISN'T THAT PART OF THE TOTALITY OF THE 27 28 ORGANIZATION?

NO. WHAT I SAID WAS THAT I HAVE MET PEOPLE WHO

2	ARE MEMBERS OF THE CHILDREN OF GOD, A BRANCH OF THAT
3	RELIGION, WHO HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THAT KIND OF TEACHING.
.4	IF YOU ARE ASKING ME IF THEY ARE TERRIBLE INDIVIDUALS WHO
5	ARE LEADERS OF THE GROUP, ABSOLUTELY YES. FROM MY BOTH
6	RECOLLECTION AND STUDIES, THE REVEREND BERG, UNCLE MO AS HE
7	WAS CALLED, WAS ONE OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS.
8	Q NOW, YOU HAVE MADE SOME ANALOGIES AND YOU MADE
9	ONE BETWEEN A YESHIVOT.
10	WHAT DOES YESHIVOT MEAN BY THE WAY?
11	A YESHIVOT IN HEBREW, IF THAT IS WHAT YOU ARE
12	ASKING ME, IS TO SIT.
13	YESHIVOT IS A JEWISH ORTHODOX SEMINARY WHERE
14	YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN OR PEOPLE OF ALL AGES STUDY THE TORAH.
15	Q IS THAT LIKE A SCHOOL?
16	A YES, SEMINARY, YES. THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL.
17	Q WHEN THE PEOPLE STUDY AND THEY SIT THERE AT THE
18	END OF THE TIME THE COURSE OF THEIR STUDIES, DO THEY NOT GO
19	ON THEN IN THE COURSE OF THEIR LIFE TO MAYBE BECOME RABBIS
20	OR TEACHERS OR GO BACK INTO THEIR COMMUNITY?
21	A MR. LEVY, THE FIVE YESHIVOTS THAT I LOOKED AT
22	IN ISRAEL WERE CERTAINLY A TRAINING GROUND FOR SOME PEOPLE.
23	BUT I MUST TELL YOU THESE WERE INDIVIDUAL THESE WERE SET
24	UP SPECIFICALLY TO ATTRACT JEWISH PEOPLE WHO HAD LOST THEIR
25	FAITH, SO TO SPEAK, WHO WERE NOT THERE TO SEEK OUT RELIGION.
26	THEIR PURPOSE WAS SET UP TO ATTRACT THESE INDIVIDUALS AND
27	TO, I WILL USE THE WORD SEDUCE THEM BACK INTO RELIGION. NOT

THEM BACK BUT THEIR FAMILIES BACK.

1

28

Α

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	

28

1

IF ONE OF THEM BECAME RABBIS, THEN THEY WOULD BE VERY SUCCESSFUL OBVIOUSLY IN THEIR QUEST. BUT THE FACT IS THE PARENTS WERE VERY CONCERNED BECAUSE THESE WERE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO WERE GOING ON TO SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES AND JOBS, WHATEVER, AND SUDDENLY GAVE ALL OF THAT UP TO JOIN A VERY INTENSE DEDICATED FUNDAMENTALIST RELIGIOUS PURSUIT. THEY WERE AS CONCERNED IN MY RESEARCH AS INDIVIDUALS WHOSE SAME KIDS FROM THE SAME ETHNIC BACKGROUND JOINED OTHER GROUPS THAT ARE CONSIDERED TO BE CULTS IN SOCIETY.

I DO NOT CALL YESHIVOTS CULTS. I AM JUST
TELLING YOU THERE ARE STRONG SIMILARITIES BETWEEN A LOT OF
FUNDAMENTALIST SECTS AND RELIGIONS.

Q WOULD YOU EQUATE THE INDOCTRINATION ONE GETS
WHEN YOU GO THROUGH BOOT CAMP AS THE SAME AS THE
INDOCTRINATION ONE GETS WHEN THEY JOIN ONE OF THE NEW WAVE
ORGANIZATIONS?

A EVEN WHEN YOU SAY -- ! HAVE NEVER BEEN TO BOOT CAMP. FROM WHAT I KNOW OF BOOT CAMP, THERE ARE SOME SIMILARITIES.

BUT EVEN WHEN YOU SAY NEW WAVE RELIGIONS, THERE ARE A WHOLE GAMUT OF RELIGIOUS TEACHINGS AND GROUPS, SOME MORE INFLUENTIAL AND DEDICATED AND INTRUSIVE THAN OTHERS.

IF YOU ARE MAKING A GENERALIZATION, I WOULD SAY MOST ARE RATHER INNOCUOUS FROM THAT PERSPECTIVE.

Q IN THE COURSE OF YOUR STUDIES, HAVE YOU CONCLUDED WHICH ONES -- LET ME STRIKE THAT.

HAVE YOU COME ACROSS SOME THAT YOU DID NOT FEEL WERE INNOCUOUS?

	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	દ
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	5
2	7
2	ន

2

3

4

5

6

A YES. I MENTIONED THE CHILDREN OF GOD FOR EXAMPLE. BUT EVEN THEN I AM VERY CAREFUL BEFORE I DRAW CONCLUSIONS TO LOOK AT THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE INDIVIDUAL SECT OF THAT GROUP AND THEN THE GENERAL TEACHINGS BEFORE I KNOW WHETHER AN INDIVIDUAL HIMSELF OR HERSELF HAS BEEN HARMED OR IS IN A DETRIMENTAL UNIT OF PEOPLE.

Q WOULD IT BE A FAIR STATEMENT TO SAY THAT PEOPLE
ON THE OUTER FRINGES OF A GROUP EVEN LIKE THE CHILDREN OF
GOD, SAY THEY WERE AT THEIR VERY OUTSIDE FRINGE, IN YOUR
OPINION ARE THEY OFTTIMES NOT INFORMED ABOUT WHAT GOES ON IN
THE INNER CIRCLES?

A THEY MIGHT NOT BE. IT'S POSSIBLE.

Q IS IT YOUR OPINION AND CONCLUSION OF YOUR STUDY
THAT IN ORGANIZATIONS, THERE ARE SEVERAL LAYERS OF
COMMITMENT?

A YES. DEFINITELY THERE IS A HIERARCHY IN ALMOST ALL OF THESE AND THERE IS USUALLY A PERSON AT THE TOP OF THE PYRAMID, YES.

Q WOULD IT BE FAIR TO SAY THAT THE PEOPLE AT THE LOWER LEVEL OUTER FRINGE ARE DEPRIVED OF THE SAME INFORMATION THAT THOSE AT THE UPPER REACHES OF THE HIERARCHY ARE ENTITLED TO?

A I WOULDN'T USE THE WORD DEPRIVED. I THINK THAT IS SETTING UP A PARTICULAR QUESTION. I THINK THEY ARE NOT PRIVY TO ANY PARTICULAR TYPE OF QUESTION. JUST LIKE YOU HAVE IN ANY OTHER ORGANIZATION, THOSE AT THE TOP ARE MORE PRIVY THAN THOSE AT THE BOTTOM.

DO YOU KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THIS CHURCH, CHURCH

1	UNI VERSAL?
2	A ALL I KNOW IS WHAT I HAVE READ, JUST A
3	SMATTERING. I WOULDN'T CONSIDER MYSELF ANYWHERE NEAR
. .4	KNOWLEDGEABLE.
5	Q IF I UNDERSTAND YOU CORRECTLY, YOU KNOW NOTHING
6	ABOUT THIS CHURCH, NOTHING ABOUT THEIR DEALINGS, NOTHING
7	ABOUT THEIR MEMBERS, NOTHING ABOUT WHAT THEY GO THROUGH, BUT
8	WHAT YOU ARE TESTIFYING TO TODAY IS A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF
9	YOUR INVOLVEMENT OVER THE PAST, WHAT IS IT, 15 YEARS, WITH
10	SOME OF THE NEW WAVE RELIGIONS?
11	A MANY OF THE NEW WAVE RELIGIONS OVER A PERIOD OF
12	MANY YEARS.
13	WHAT I DO KNOW ABOUT THIS GROUP IS WHAT I HAVE
14	READ FROM EXTENSIVE DEPOSITIONS AND TESTIMONY FROM PEOPLE
15	VERY CRITICAL OF THIS PARTICULAR GROUP. AND WHAT I HAVE
16	WELL, FROM ALL THE THINGS THAT I MENTIONED IN PREPARATION
17	FOR THIS CASE. I HAVE DONE NO FURTHER THAN THAT.
18	Q FROM PEOPLE VERY CRITICAL OF THIS CHURCH. SO
19	FAR YOU HAVE TOLD US YOU READ THE DEPOSITIONS OR THE TRIAL
20	TESTIMONY OF THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE TESTIFIED HERE AND MR.
21	MULL?
22	A THAT'S RIGHT.
23	Q IS IT YOUR PROFESSIONAL OPINION THAT RABBI
24	ROBBINS OR DR. SINGER OR MISS KATHLEEN LEVY OR DR. AFSHAR
25	ARE HOSTILE TO THIS PARTICULAR CHURCH?
26	A YES. AFTER READING DR. SINGER AND DR AND
27 .	RABBI ROBBINS AND MRS. LEVY, I WOULD SAY THEY ARE HOSTILE TO

THIS CHURCH, YES. HAVE I GOT THE DEFINITION OF HOSTILE

28

1	WRONG? THEY ARE EXTREMELY CRITICAL.
2	Q AND YOUR TESTIMONY IS BENIGN AND JUST
3	APPROACHES THE AREA OF JUST NEW WAVE RELIGIONS THAT YOU'VE
.4	COME IN CONTACT WITH.
5	LET ME ASK YOU A QUESTION. IF YOU ARE GOING TO
6	INQUIRE WHETHER OR NOT SOMEONE STOLE SOMETHING, AND YOU
7	INQUIRE OF THE THIEF IF YOU ASK THE THIEF WHETHER HE
8	STOLE SOMETHING, ISN'T IT A POSSIBILITY THAT HE IS GOING TO
9	DO WHAT HE CAN TO DEFEND HIMSELF AND NOT BE TOTALLY OPEN
LO	WITH YOU?
11	A IF YOU ASK THE PERSON FROM WHOM HE STOLE, HE
12	ALSO WILL HAVE THE BEST INTEREST IN CONVINCING YOU.
13	Q HAVE YOU READ ANY OF THE DEPOSITIONS OR ANY OF
L 4	THE TRIAL TESTIMONY OF ANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE TESTIFIED
L 5	FOR THE CHURCH?
16	A I HAVE TO RECALL THAT. I DON'T THINK SO.
L7	Q THEN YOU WOULDN'T KNOW WHETHER THERE WAS
18	EQUIVOCATION OR OUTRIGHT LYING IN THE TESTIMONY, WOULD YOU,
9	DOCTOR?
20	A NO, I DIDN'T SAY THERE WAS LYING.
21	Q NO, NO, NO. I ASKED YOU WHETHER OR NOT YOU
22	HAVE READ THE TESTIMONY OF THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE TESTIFIED
23	THUS FAR FOR THE CHURCH, AND YOU TOLD ME YOU DIDN'T THINK
4	YOU HAD. MY QUESTION IS TO YOU IF YOU HAVEN'T READ IT, YOU
25	WOULDN'T KNOW WHETHER THEIR TESTIMONY WAS FULL OF
16	EQUIVOCATION OR LIES, WOULD YOU?
27	A TRUE.
8	Q HAVE YOU EVER IN THE COURSE OF YOUR

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
5	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE COUNSELED WITH ANYONE WHO HAD SPENT AN EXTENSIVE PERIOD OF TIME IN A NEW WAVE RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION THAT SUFFERED ANY EFFECTS THAT YOU WOULD CONSIDER TO BE NEGATIVE EFFECTS?

A YES.

Q WOULD YOU TELL US THE NATURE OF THOSE EFFECTS
THAT THEY MIGHT HAVE SUFFERED?

A I MENTIONED EARLIER THE INDIVIDUALS COMING OUT OF AN INTENSE BELIEF SYSTEM, GROUP MOVEMENT, AFTER AN EXTENDED PERIOD OF TIME IN THAT PERIOD OF TIME IN THAT MOVEMENT WHERE THEY ARE TOTALLY COMMITTED TO A CAUSE AND A GROUP AND HAVE DEVELOPED CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS AND OVERRIDING IDEOLOGY, UPON LEAVING THAT PARTICULAR GROUP FOR WHATEVER REASON HAVE A PERIOD OF A FEW MONTHS WHICH I LIKEN TO CULTURE SHOCK.

AND THERE ARE FEELINGS OF DEPRESSION AT TIMES,
ANXIETY, MANIFESTING LACK OF SLEEP, TREMULOUSNESS,
CONFUSION, WORRY ABOUT THE FUTURE. REVERSION TO THE SAME
KIND OF DEMORALIZATION AND QUESTION ABOUT THE SELF THAT LED
THEM IN TO THE GROUP IN THE FIRST PLACE WILL RETURN.

THEY ARE ASHAMED FOR HAVING ABANDONED THEIR

FAMILY AT THE TIME. THEY ARE ASHAMED, ALSO, BELIEVE IT OR

NOT, FOR HAVING LEFT THE GROUP, HUMILIATION. THERE IS

WONDERMENT ABOUT THEIR FUTURE. IF THEY WERE HAVING A

DIFFICULT TIME BEFORE GETTING INTO THE GROUP, THEY WILL HAVE

A DIFFICULT TIME THEN. ALL OF THIS TENDS TO REINTEGRATE IN

THE INDIVIDUAL IN A PERIOD OF A FEW MONTHS.

IN OUR FOLLOW-UP STUDIES WE HAVE FOUND THESE

27 . 28

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	INDIVIDUALS BEGINNING AGAIN WHATEVER PURSUITS THEY HAD LEFT
2	OFF BEFORE THAT TIME. NOW SOMETIMES THERE IS AN IRREVOCABLE
3	TIME LOSS ESPECIALLY IN SOMEBODY WHO IS INVOLVED IN SPECIFIC
4	KINDS OF STUDIES. SO THOSE, I WOULD SAY, THEY ARE
5	NEGATIVE THAT IS YOUR QUESTION, THOSE ARE NEGATIVE
6 -	EFFECTS. THEY ARE TEMPORARY, THEY ARE TRANSIENT BUT THEY DO
7	OCCUR.
3	Q HAVE YOU EVER SEEN ANY PERMANENT EFFECTS?
9	A I HAVEN'T.
10	Q YOUR STUDIES DEALT MOSTLY WITH THE GROUP THE
11	AGE GROUP BETWEEN 18 AND 26?
12	A IN THE STUDIES, YES. BUT I HAVE SEEN MANY
13	PEOPLE WHO ARE DIFFERENT AGES.
14	Q IF SOMEONE WERE 55 OR 60 AND THEY WENT THROUGH
15	WHAT MAY BEST BE TERMED A TRAUMATIC EXPERIENCE, WOULD IT BE
16	REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT THE RECOVERY PERIOD FOR THEM MIGHT
17	BE LONGER?
18	A IT'S POSSIBLE. BUT I HAVE SEEN PEOPLE IT'S
19	POSSIBLE. I HAVE SEEN PEOPLE OF THAT AGE TOO WHO HAVE COME
20	OUT OF VARIOUS KINDS OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS AND THEY HAVE
21	GOTTEN OVER IT IN A MATTER OF A FEW MONTHS. I HAVE SEEN
22	PEOPLE OF AGES OLDER THAN MR. MULL AND YOUNGER ALL THE WAY
23	DOWN TO THOSE YOU MENTIONED IN MY STUDIES. AGAIN I STAND BY
24	THAT ABOUT SIX MONTHS TO REINTEGRATE.
25	Q NOW, YOUR MOST OF YOUR STUDIES YOU SAID
26	PEOPLE GO INTO THESE NEW WAVE ORGANIZATIONS STAY SOME SIX
27	MONTHS TO TWO YEARS AND THEN THEY GET OUT?
28	A MOST DO. YES.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

28

Q WHAT IF SOMEBODY WERE ASSOCIATED FOR TEN OR TWELVE YEARS?

A IT IS HARDER FOR THEM.

Q WHAT IF SOMEONE HAS A PREEXISTING CONDITION OF A PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM, IF THEY WERE EXPOSED TO THE KIND OF TRAUMA AND STRESS THAT I DESCRIBED TO YOU, IS IT AT ALL POSSIBLE UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES THAT SOMEONE MIGHT BE PERMANENTLY PSYCHOLOGICALLY INJURED?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO THAT AS ASKING FOR SPECULATION. WHETHER IT IS AT ALL POSSIBLE UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

Q BY MR. LEVY: THEN LET ME GIVE YOU A
HYPOTHETICAL. WHAT IF SOMEBODY IS RECRUITED, INDOCTRINATED,
NURTURED OVER A PERIOD OF YEARS, CONNED INTO GIVING UP A WAY
OF LIFE AND A BUSINESS, THEY MOVE FROM THE AREA THAT THEY
HAVE LIVED IN FOR YEARS, MOVE ONTO CHURCH PROPERTY, THEY ARE
SUBJECTED TO PRESSURES ABOUT MONEY, ABOUT PERMANENT STAFF,
ABOUT A CHANGE OF LIFE, ABOUT A MARRIAGE, ABOUT THEIR
PROPERTY, THEY ARE PROMISED CERTAIN THINGS BEFORE THEY GO
THERE AND THE THINGS THEY ARE PROMISED GET CHANGED, PROMISES
ARE NOT KEPT, AND THEN THEY ARE KICKED OUT, DO YOU THINK
THAT MIGHT HAVE THE PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECT ON THEM THAT THEY
MIGHT NOT GET OVER WITH IN A FEW MONTHS OR SIX MONTHS?

A YOU ARE USING WORDS LIKE CONNED AND
INDOCTRINATED. IF THE HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE YOU ARE GIVING
IS FACTUAL, I WOULD SAY THE INDIVIDUAL UNDER THOSE
CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD HAVE A DIFFICULT TIME AND IT MIGHT TAKE

1	LONGER THAN SIX MONTHS. WHETHER THAT WOULD BE PERMANENT, I
2	WOULD HAVE NO WAY OF KNOWING UNTIL I MET THE INDIVIDUAL.
3	Q IS IT POSSIBLE THAT ANY CIRCUMSTANCES IN YOUR
.a 4	MIND CAN POSSIBLY EXIST THAT COULD CREATE PERMANENT
3	PSYCHOLOGICAL DAMAGE?
6	MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT AGAIN BECAUSE IT
7	CALLS FOR SPECULATION, YOUR HONOR.
8	THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.
9	THE WITNESS: I GUESS I CAN ENVISION IN ANY KIND OF
10	FANTASY PERMANENT SEVERE ENOUGH DAMAGE. WE ALL HAVE
11	BREAKING POINTS, MR. LEVY. I JUST HAVEN'T SEEN THEM IN
12	THESE PARTICULAR GROUPS.
13	Q BY MR. LEVY: HAVE YOU EVER LIVED WITH ANY OF
14	THOSE GROUPS?
15	A LIVED WITH THEM? NO, I HAVE NEVER LIVED WITH
16	THEM.
17	Q JUST ONE LAST GROUP I WILL ASK YOU ABOUT. DO
18	YOU THINK THE PEOPLE WHO WENT TO JONESTOWN SUFFERED ANY
19	IRREVOCABLE DAMAGES OR PERMANENT DAMAGES AS A RESULT OF
20	THEIR CULT EXPERIENCE?
21	A YOU WANT ME TO ANSWER THAT?
22	Q IF YOU WANT TO BOTHER.
23	MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT AS ARGUMENTATIVE AND
24	IRRELEVANT, YOUR HONOR.
25	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
25	MR. LEVY: I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER AT THIS TIME, YOUR
27 .	HONOR.
28	///

1
2
3
. 4
5 .
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KLEIN:

Q IN YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH NEW WAVE, NEW AGE
RELIGIOUS GROUPS, HAVE YOU COME ACROSS ANY WHO TEACH THAT
THE ONLY WAY TO SALVATION IS THROUGH THE TEACHINGS OF THAT
GROUP?

A YES.

Q IS THAT SOMETHING THAT IS COMMON OR UNCOMMON?

A 1'D SAY FOR THE FUNDAMENTALIST RELIGIOUS GROUPS
OF VARIOUS KINDS OF DIFFERENT BACKGROUND, THAT IS QUITE
COMMON.

Q YOU TALKED ABOUT THOUGHT REFORM IN RESPONSE TO ONE OF MR. LEVY'S QUESTIONS. HE ASKED YOU IF YOU WERE AN EXPERT ON THOUGHT REFORM. HOW DO YOU DEFINE THOUGHT REFORM WHEN YOU WERE ANSWERING THAT QUESTION?

A I DID DEFINE IT BEFORE. I EQUATE THOUGHT
REFORM WITH A VERY INTENSE, COERCIVE SEQUENCE OF -- CALL
THEM PSYCHOTECHNOLOGICAL STRATEGIES OF BOTH SEDUCTION AND
IMPOSITION OF PRESSURE IN ORDER TO CONVERT A BELIEF INTO
ANOTHER BELIEF OR IN ORDER TO ENSNARE AND ULTIMATELY TO
ENSLAVE USUALLY IF NOT ALWAYS UNDER THE THREAT OF IMPLIED OR
EXPLICIT VIOLENCE OF SOME KIND. IT WAS COINED -- I READ DR.
SINGER'S GENERIC --

MR. LEVY: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. AT THIS POINT I AM GOING TO OBJECT. IT'S GONE WELL BEYOND THE QUESTION AND ANY OTHER SELF-SERVING COMMENTS I WOULD MOVE THAT THEY BE STRICKEN.

THE COURT: IT IS TIME FOR ANOTHER QUESTION.

27_. 28

23

24

25

26

Q BY MR. KLEIN: WHAT ARE EXAMPLES OF THOUGHT REFORM THAT COME TO MIND TO YOU?

MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO HAVE TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR.

THIS WITNESS HAS TESTIFIED HE IS NOT AN EXPERT ON THOUGHT

REFORM.

THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: THE MOST PREVALENT IS IN TERMS OF THE KOREAN WAR THAT ROBERT J. LIFTON WROTE ABOUT.

Q BY MR. KLEIN: AS YOU DEFINED THOUGHT REFORM,
DO YOU KNOW OF ANY NEW AGE RELIGIONS THAT YOU HAVE FOUND TO
USE THOUGHT REFORM?

A NO, I DO NOT.

Q WHEN MR. LEVY GAVE YOU THAT LONG HYPOTHETICAL BEFORE LUNCH, IN RESPONSE TO IT, YOU SAID SOMETHING ABOUT WELL, IF THERE ARE NO REDEEMING FEATURES AND THEN GAVE YOUR ANSWER. WHAT WOULD YOU CONSIDER REDEEMING FEATURES THAT YOU WERE REFERRING TO WHEN YOU ANSWERED HIS QUESTION?

A THE -- THIS IS WHY THIS GETS TO BE A VERY COMPLICATED AREA AND WHY THEY ARE CALLED ALTERNATIVE HEALING NETWORKS FROM DIFFERENT ASPECTS. THESE GROUPS CAN OFFER AT ONE AND THE SAME TIME THESE THINGS THAT MR. LEVY LISTED MIGHT ALSO SUPPLY A SENSE OF PERSONAL ENHANCEMENT, A SENSE OF BEING NURTURED AND SUPPORTED BY THE GROUP, A DEEP SENSE OF BELONGING TO THE GROUP, A SENSE OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPORTANCE TO THEMSELVES AND TO SOCIETY AND SPIRITUAL IMPORTANCE. ALL THESE ARE WHAT I MEANT BY REDEEMING FEATURES.

Q AND TO THE EXTENT THAT THOSE REDEEMING FEATURES

1	ARE PRESENT, WOULD THAT AFFECT THE CONCLUSION AS TO WHETHER
2	THESE GROUPS CAN DO PERMANENT EMOTIONAL DAMAGE TO AN
3	INDIVIDUAL?
4	A WELL, YES, IT WOULD HAVE TO MODIFY IT TO SOME
3	EXTENT. IF A GROUP IS DESCRIBED IN TERMS OF THE SIX
6	CHARACTERISTICS THAT DR. SINGER MENTIONED OR MR. LEVY'S
7	EXAMPLE, IF THAT IS ALL THERE IS TO A GROUP AND NOTHING
8	ELSE, THEN OF COURSE THEIR INFLUENCE WOULD HAVE TO BE MORE
9	NEGATIVE AND MORE INTRUSIVE.
10	Q MR. LEVY, IN HIS QUESTIONS, HE GAVE YOU A
11	HYPOTHETICAL. HE GAVE YOU A COUPLE OF THEM WHERE HE TALKED
12	ABOUT AN ABIDING BELIEF IN THE SPIRITUAL LEADER. IN YOUR
13	STUDIES OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS OVER THE YEARS YOU HAVE BEEN
14	DOING IT, IS IT COMMON OR UNCOMMON TO FIND TRUE BELIEVERS
15	THAT HAVE AN ABIDING BELIEF IN THEIR SPIRITUAL LEADER?
16	A YES.
17	Q 15 IT COMMON OR UNCOMMON TO FIND THAT
18	A OH, I AM SORRY. I WOULD SAY IT IS COMMON.
19	Q YOU TALKED, IN RESPONSE TO SOME OF MR. LEVY'S
20	QUESTIONS, ABOUT THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS UPON LEAVING A
21	RELIGIOUS CULT OR GROUP. ARE THERE NEGATIVE EFFECTS IN THE
22	BREAKUP OF A MARRIAGE?
23	A ALONG THE SAME LINES, YES.
24	Q ARE THEIR NEGATIVE EFFECTS WHEN YOU LEAVE A JOB
25	THAT YOU'VE HAD FOR 20 YEARS?
26	A THERE CAN BE.
27 .	Q AND CAN THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS THAT YOU HAVE FOR
28	LEAVING YOUR MARRIAGE AND MAYBE A LONG STANDING MARRIAGE,
	1

1 LEAVING YOUR JOB, CAN THEY SE OF THE SAME NATURE AS THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS YOU'VE DESCRIBED THAT OCCUR WHEN YOU LEAVE 2 3 ONE OF THESE RELIGIOUS GROUPS? . 4 WELL, EMOTIONALLY AND COGNITIVELY THEY CAN BE 3 OF THE SAME NATURE IN THAT THEY MIGHT CREATE THE SAME DEGREE OF DISCOMFORT, DYSPHORIA, UNHAPPINESS, MISERY, CONFUSION, ET 5 7 CETERA, FOR DIFFERENT REASONS. BUT YES. 8 MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU. 9 I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR. 10 MR. LEVY: JUST ONE LAST QUESTION. YOUR HONOR. 11 12 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. LEVY: 14 Q THERE IS A STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO YOU IN YOUR ARTICLE IN PSYCHOLOGY TODAY AND I JUST WANT TO KNOW WHETHER 15 16 IT IS AN ACCURATE STATEMENT. IT SAYS ALL --17 MR. KLEIN: COULD YOU TELL ME WHAT PAGE YOU ARE 18 READING FROM? 19 MR. LEVY: PAGE 23. IT SAYS: 20 "ALTHOUGH THERE IS AN 21 UNDERLYING STRUCTURE THAT MAKES THESE 22 GROUPS SIMILAR -- THE FANTASIZED 23 OMNISCIENCE OF THE LEADERS, THE RIGID 24 BELIEF SYSTEMS OPPOSED TO THE OUTSIDE 25 WORLD AND A STUDIED STRANGENESS -- THE 25 EARMARK OF A RADICAL DEPARTURE IS LESS 27 THE SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUP 28 THAN THE RAPID, TOTAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE

1
2
3
. 4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

JOINER."

THE WITNESS: YES.

Q BY MR. LEVY: DOES THAT MEAN THAT WHEN SOMEONE IS EXPOSED TO THE TOTALITY OF A QUASI-RELIGIOUS CULT GROUP, THAT THE AFFECT OF THOSE CHARACTERISTICS IS GOING TO IMPACT ENORMOUSLY UPON THE INDIVIDUAL WHO MAY BE SEDUCED INTO BECOMING PART OF THAT ORGANIZATION?

A IT WOULD IMPACT ON THOSE -- REALLY THOSE VERY FEW INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE LOOKING ON A QUEST AT THAT TIME FOR THAT VERY THING, MR. LEVY.

Q AND THEN THE LAST QUESTION, DOCTOR. YOU TALKED ABOUT REDEEMING FEATURES. IS IT POSSIBLE THAT THE REDEEMING FEATURES COULD BE SO IMPROBABLE OF ACHIEVING, THAT THE REDEEMING FEATURES COULD BE PART OF THE SEDUCTION?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD OBJECT AGAIN. IT CALLS FOR SPECULATION WHEN HE ASKS IF IT IS POSSIBLE.

THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: I THINK THE REDEEMING FEATURES CAN BE PART OF THE SEDUCTION, MR. LEVY. IF THAT IS YOUR QUESTION.

MR. LEVY: YES, IT IS. THANK YOU.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR.

MR. KLEIN: NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: OKAY.

THANK YOU.

YOU ARE EXCUSED.

THE WITNESS: THANK YOU.

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, MAY THIS WITNESS REMAIN IN THE COURTROOM FOR THE REST OF THIS AFTERNOON?

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: VERY WELL. 1 2 MR. KLEIN: WE WOULD CALL AS OUR NEXT WITNESS DOROTHY 3 WHITEHEAD, YOUR HONOR. DOROTHY WHITEHEAD A PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, HAVING BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN, б 7 TESTIFIES AS FOLLOWS: 8 THE CLERK: PLEASE BE SEATED AT THE WITNESS STAND. 9 MOVE YOUR SEAT UP. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD 10 AND PLEASE SPELL YOUR FIRST AND LAST NAME. 11 THE WITNESS: I AM DOROTHY WHITEHEAD. D-O-R-O-T-H-Y. 12 THE CLERK: ONE MORE TIME SLOWER. 13 THE WITNESS: D-O-R-O-T-H-Y; WHITEHEAD, 14 W-H-I-T-E-H-E-A-D. 15 THE CLERK: THANK YOU. 16 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION + BY MR. KLEIN: 18 19 MRS. WHITEHEAD, ARE YOU CURRENTLY EMPLOYED? Q 20 YES, I AM. 21 Q I THINK YOU BETTER TALK INTO THE MICROPHONE. 22 Α YES, I AM. 23 Q WHERE ARE YOU EMPLOYED? 24 I AM A REGISTERED NURSE AND I TAKE CALL FOR 25 THREE REGISTRIES IN SAN FRANCISCO. 26 Q HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN A REGISTERED NURSE? 27 A GOOD 30 YEARS. 28 ARE YOU PRESENTLY A MEMBER OF CHURCH UNIVERSAL Q

- 1		
1	AND TRIUMPHAN	T?
2	Α	I AM.
3	Q	ARE YOU A STAFF MEMBER?
4	A	NO.
5	Q	DO YOU KNOW GREGORY MULL?
6	A	YES, I DO.
7	Q	WHEN DID YOU FIRST MEET HIM?
8	A	I BELIEVE IT WAS, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE,
9	LATE 1974.	
10	Q	HOW DID YOU MEET HIM?
11	• Д	I WAS INVITED TO ONE OF HIS MEDITATION GROUPS.
12	Q	DID YOU GO TO THE MEDITATION GROUP?
13	Α	YES, I DID.
14	Q	WHERE WAS IT HELD?
15	А	IT WAS HELD AT I GUESS IT WAS HIS HOUSE IN
16	SAN FRANCISCO	O ON CASELLI STREET. I WAS ESCORTED THERE BY A
17	VERY GOOD FR	I END .
18	Q	AND WAS THERE A SERVICE THERE OR SOME KIND OF
19	READING?	
20	А	WELL, IT WAS KIND OF I KIND OF LOOK BACK ON
21	IT LIKE IT W	AS KIND OF A SOCIAL EVENT AND EVERYTHING REALLY.
22	WE DIDN'T GO	TOO MANY TIMES. HE GREGORY APPEARED WITH A
23	LONG FLOWING	CAFTAN, A LONG FLOWING ROBE AND
24	MR. L	EVY: AT THIS POINT, YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO
25	OBJECT. IT	IS BECOMING A NARRATIVE.
26	THE C	CURT: IT IS TIME FOR ANOTHER QUESTION.
.27	MR. K	LEIN: OKAY.
28	Q	DID YOU GO TO ANY OTHER MEDITATION SERVICES AT
	1	

1	A YES, IT IS.
2	Q AND DID YOU GO TO THE SERVICE WHEN THE PEOPLE
3	FROM THE SUMMIT LIGHTHOUSE WERE THERE?
4	A YES, I DID.
5	Q AND DID YOU GO TO ANY OTHER SERVICES IN GREGORY
6	MULL'S HOUSE AFTER THAT?
7	A WELL, AT THAT PARTICULAR HOUSE WHERE HE HELD
8	THE MEDITATION GROUP, WE WENT ONE MORE TIME.
9	MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. IT IS A
10	YES OR NO QUESTION. WE ARE GETTING ANOTHER NARRATIVE.
11	THE COURT: TRY TO LIMIT YOUR ANSWERS TO THE
12	QUESTIONS ASKED OF YOU AND THEN WAIT FOR THE NEXT QUESTION.
13	THE WITNESS: OKAY, JUDGE.
14	Q BY MR. KLEIN: AT THAT PARTICULAR HOUSE, DID
15	YOU GO TO ANY OTHER MEDITATION SERVICES AFTER THE TWO YOU
16	HAVE DESCRIBED?
17	A ONE MORE.
18	Q AND DID YOU EVER GO TO ANY OTHER CHURCH
19	UNIVERSAL TYPE SERVICES AT A HOUSE OWNED BY GREGORY MULL?
20	A YES, I DID.
21	Q WHEN WAS THAT?
22	A WELL, THAT WAS FOLLOWING WHEN HE CAME HOME FROM
23	SUMMIT UNIVERSITY. I BELIEVE IT THAT WAS I BELIEVE
24	THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, THAT WAS 1975.
25	Q NOW, DID YOU EVER HAVE OCCASION TO HAVE A
26	CONVERSATION WITH GREGORY MULL WHERE HE DISCUSSED WITH YOU
27	THE CLEARANCE LETTER THAT HE WROTE AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY?
28	A YES, I DID.

1	Q WHEN DID THAT CONVERSATION OCCUR?
2	A IN MY LIVING ROOM WHEN I PROVIDED A HOME FOR
3	HIM TO HAVE HIS POTLUCK DINNER TO TALK TO HIS FRIENDS AND A
4	GROUP OF PEOPLE ABOUT THE TEACHINGS.
5	Q WAS THIS AFTER HE HAD RETURNED FROM SUMMIT
6	UNIVERSITY?
7	A YES. HE WAS VERY EXCITED ABOUT HAVING GONE
8	MR. LEVY: YOUR HONOR, AT THIS TIME I AM GOING TO
9	OBJECT. I WONDER IF MR. KLEIN COULD LEAD HIS WITNESS JUST A
10	LITTLE BIT LESS.
11	MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD OBJECT TO THAT
12	CHARACTERIZATION.
13	THE COURT: BOTH OF YOU STOP.
14	IF YOU HAVE AN OBJECTION TO MAKE, MR. LEVY,
15	STATE THE LEGAL GROUNDS WITHOUT RHETORIC.
16	MR. LEVY: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LEADING.
17	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
18	Q BY MR. KLEIN: THIS CONVERSATION, WERE THERE
19	OTHER PEOPLE PRESENT WHEN IT OCCURRED?
20	A YES, THERE WERE.
21	Q ABOUT HOW MANY?
22	A TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, I'D SAY ABOUT 12
23	PEOPLE, INCLUDING MYSELF.
24	Q COULD YOU TELL US WHAT MR. MULL SAID DURING
25	THAT CONVERSATION ABOUT HIS CLEARANCE LETTER?
26	A WELL, HE WAS VERY EXCITED TO TELL WHAT WENT ON
27	AT THE SUMMIT UNIVERSITY. AND AMONG OTHER THINGS, HE SAID
28	THAT YOU HAD TO WRITE A CLEARANCE LETTER AND PUT DOWN

RECORD ALL OF THE THINGS THAT YOU EVER DID WRONG, INCLUDING ANY DRUGS YOU HAD TAKEN OR ANY RELATIONSHIPS, PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS, SEXUAL BEHAVIOR, ANY OF THAT.

AND SOMEONE -- AND HE SAID THAT -- HE WENT ON TO SAY THAT HIS LETTER THEN WAS GIVEN TO MOTHER, SHE READ IT AND IT WAS BURNED. AND THEN HE WOULD KNEEL -- THE PERSON WOULD KNEEL BEFORE MOTHER AND SHE WOULD SAY PRAYERS OVER THE INDIVIDUAL.

AND HE SAID IT WAS THE FIRST TIME -- THEY HAD SAVED HIM UNTIL LAST BECAUSE HIS LETTER WAS SO LONG, HAD SO MUCH IN IT THAT THEY HAD TO PULL UP A CHAIR FOR MOTHER TO SIT DOWN AND READ IT.

Q DID HE SAY ANYTHING ELSE?

A WELL, SOMEBODY IN THE ROOM, I CAN'T REMEMBER
WHO, MADE SOME JOKING REMARK. AND GREGORY SAID THAT, "WELL,
IT DOESN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE WHAT YOU PUT IN IT BECAUSE IT
IS GOING TO BE BURNED ANYWAY."

AND HE SAID, "I'VE DONE EVERYTHING ANYWAY FROM DRUGS TO ALL KINDS OF RELATIONSHIPS." AND THEN HE WENT ON TO SAY THAT HE COULD NOT FEEL LOVE AT ONE TIME IN WHICH HE HAD EIGHT OR NINE GUYS PILE ON TOP OF HIM.

Q WHAT DID YOU DO WHEN HE SAID THAT?

A WELL, I WAS KIND OF EMBARRASSED SO I GOT UP AND LEFT THE ROOM.

Q WERE ALL OF THOSE 12 PEOPLE PRESENT WHEN HE MADE THOSE STATEMENTS?

A AS FAR AS I CAN REMEMBER.

MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU.

I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

CROSS-EXAMINATION +

BY MR. LEVY:

Q MISS WHITEHEAD, WERE THOSE 10 OR 12 OTHER PEOPLE THERE YOUR FRIENDS?

A NO. THEY WERE MOSTLY GREGORY'S FRIENDS.

- Q GREGORY UTILIZED YOUR HOME FOR A POTLUCK DINNER FOR HIS FRIENDS?
 - A THIS IS TRUE.
- Q WAS THERE ANY REASON WHY HE TOLD YOU THAT HE WANTED TO USE YOUR HOME FOR A POTLUCK DINNER FOR HIS FRIENDS AS OPPOSED TO HIS HOME FOR HIS FRIENDS?

A HE JUST SAID THAT HE WANTED TO -- A NICE HOUSE
TO HOLD A POTLUCK DINNER SO THAT HE COULD GATHER ALL THESE
PEOPLE TOGETHER AND TELL THEM ABOUT S.U., AND THAT I SHOULD
DO THIS. AND I WAS JUST COMING INTO THE TEACHINGS, AND SO I
THOUGHT I SHOULD BE CHARITABLE AND OFFER MY HOUSE.

- Q WAS THERE ANYONE AT YOUR HOME BESIDE YOURSELF WHO WAS NOT A FRIEND OF GREGORY MULL?
 - A I THINK MY SON WAS SOMEWHERE AROUND THERE.
- Q SO EVERYONE THAT CAME THERE BESIDE -- CAME TO YOUR HOME WAS A PERSONAL FRIEND OF GREGORY MULL'S?

A NO, I WOULDN'T SAY THEY WERE A PERSONAL FRIEND.

THEY WERE AN ACQUAINTANCE, MANY OF THEM. I KNOW THE

FRIEND -- MY FRIEND WHO WAS MY ESCORT AT A LOT OF THESE

EVENTS, HE WAS NOT A CLOSE FRIEND OF GREGORY NOR WAS I. WE

WERE JUST AN ACQUAINTANCE BECAUSE WE WERE INTERESTED IN THE

1	A WELL, HE HAD A HE VERY OFTEN WOULD COME UP
2	WITH THINGS LIKE THAT. HE WAS BEING JOSHED AT AND SO I
3	GUESS HE WOULD JUST
4	Q MISS WHITEHEAD, WHEN DID YOU START WORKING FOR
5	MARK AND ELIZABETH PROPHET?
6	A I HAVE NEVER STARTED WORKING FOR MARK AND
7	ELIZABETH PROPHET.
8	Q YOU KNEW BOTH OF THEM
9	A I AM NOT EMPLOYED BY THEM.
10	Q NOT AT THE PRESENT TIME.
11	AFTER YOU FIRST BECAME A MEMBER OF SUMMIT
12	LIGHTHOUSE AND THEN CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT, DID YOU
13	FUNCTION IN SOME CAPACITY FOR THE BENEFIT OF MISS ELIZABETH
14	CLARE PROPHET?
15	A I THINK I WAS FUNCTIONING FOR MY OWN GOD
16	GIVING GIVEN RIGHTS OF THE MY BELIEFS, MY BELIEF
17	SYSTEM.
18	Q WHEN DID YOU ACTUALLY GET INVOLVED WITH
19	ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET AND CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT?
20	MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT AS TO VAGUE AND
21	AMBIGUOUS BY THE WORD "INVOLVED," YOUR HONOR.
22	THE COURT: PLEASE REPHRASE IT.
23	Q BY MR. LEVY: WHEN DID YOU BECOME A MEMBER OF
24	THE CHURCH?
25	A I AM NOT SURE EXACTLY, BUT I BELIEVE IT WAS IN
26	1975. I WAS INTERESTED IN 1974, LATE 1974, AND THEN I THINK
27	I BECAME A MEMBER PROBABLY IN 175.
2.0	O DID VOU ATTEND A QUARTED AT CUMMIT UNIVERCITYS

1	Q	YOU BELIEVE YOU CALL HIM LANELLO?
2	A	NO. WE DO CALL HIM LANELLO.
3	Q	YOU EVER HEARD OF ANYBODY CALLING HIM EL MORYA?
4	А	YES.
- 5	Q	EVER HEAR ELIZABETH TALK TO HER FOLLOWERS WITH
6	THE VOICE OF	EL MORYA?
7	A	I THINK YOU NEED TO RESTATE THAT QUESTION. I
8	DIDN'T QUITE	UNDERSTAND IT.
9	Q	LET ME TRY ANOTHER QUESTION.
10		WHILE YOU WERE AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, DID YOU
11	LEARN TO DECI	REE?
12	A	YES.
13	Q	NOW, HERE IS ONE THAT YOU CAN HANDLE EASY.
14	•	IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS A DECREE?
15	А	A DECREE IS INVOKING THE LIGHT OF GOD INTO YOUR
16	OWN WORLD AND	THE WORLD AROUND YOU.
17	Q	DID YOU EVER READ A BOOK BY MARK AND ELIZABETH
18	PROPHET CALLE	ED "THE SCIENCE OF THE SPOKEN WORD"?
19	А	YES, I HAVE.
20	Q	IS THAT ONE OF THE BOOKS THAT IS USED AT SUMMIT
21	UNIVERSITY?	
22	А	I AM NOT SURE. I WOULD PROBABLY TO THE BEST
23	OF MY KNOWLE	DGE, I WOULD SAY YES. MANY BOOKS ARE USED.
24	Q	INCLUDING SOMETHING LIKE "THE PROTOCOLS OF THE
25	ELDERS OF ZI	?**N*?
26	А	I HAVE NOT HEARD OF THAT BOOK BEFORE.
27	Q	DID YOU EVER SEE THE BOOKS THAT HAVE ALUMINUM
28	FOIL WRAPPED	AROUND THEM TO KEEP THE EVIL SPIRITS FROM



SUPPLICATION, THANKSGIVING, ADORATION, OR CONFESSION; A FORMULA OR SEQUENCE OF WORDS USED IN OR APPOINTED FOR PRAYING: THE LORD'S PRAYER; A PETITION; OR AN ENTREATY."

LIKE WHEN YOU ARE IN A JAM AND YOU SAY, "GOD, COME ON AND HELP ME," AND YOU PRAY. YOU PRAY AND YOU ASK FOR SOMETHING, A PRAYER.

NOW LET ME READ TO YOU WHAT A DECREE IS. (READING.)

TA FOREORDAINING WILL, AN EDICT OR FIAT, A FOREORDAINING OF EVENTS. TO DECREE: VERB, TO DECIDE, TO DECLARE, TO COMMAND TO ENJOIN; TO DETERMINE OR ORDER; TO ORDAIN.

POWERFUL OF ALL APPLICATIONS TO THE GODHEAD.

IT IS THE COMMAND OF THE SON OR DAUGHTER OF

GOD MADE IN THE NAME OF THE I AM PRESENCE

AND THE CHRIST FOR THE WILL OF THE ALMIGHTY

TO COME IN TO MANIFESTATION AS ABOVE, SO

BELOW. IT IS THE MEANS WHEREBY THE KINGDOM

OF GOD BECOMES A REALITY HERE AND NOW

THROUGH THE POWER OF THE SPOKEN WORD. IT

MAY BE SHORT OR LONG AND USUALLY IS MARKED

BY A FORMAL PREAMBLE AND A CLOSING, OR

ACCEPTANCE."

WERE YOU NOT TAUGHT AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY THAT WHEN YOU DECREED, YOU WERE LENDING POWER TO THE THINGS THAT

ON, YOU DIDN T TALK TO ELIZABETH OR ED FRANCIS OR ANYONE ELSE IN THE CHURCH?

A I SAID "HELLO" TO MOTHER.

MR. LEVY: THAT WAS NICE OF YOU.

I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU ARE EXCUSED.

WE ARE GOING TO STOP A BIT EARLY TODAY. I HAVE
TO GO TO THE DENTIST AND THIS IS THE ONLY TIME HE COULD SEE
ME. I WISH IT WERE A LESS INCONVENIENT TIME, BUT THIS IS
THE WAY THE SCHEDULE TURNED OUT.

WE WILL RESUME TOMORROW MORNING. WE WILL
RESUME AT 9:15. EVERYBODY BE HERE READY TO PROCEED THEN.
HAVE A PLEASANT EVENING. REMEMBER THE COURT'S ADMONITIONS.

(AT 2:40 P.M., AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN UNTIL TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1986, AT 9:15 A.M.)

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1986 9:25 P.M.

DEPARTMENT 50

HON. ALFRED L. MARGOLIS, JUDGE

(APPEARANCES AS HERETOFORE NOTED.)

1

2

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN CHAMBERS:)

THE COURT: YOU WANT TO BE HEARD?

MR. KLEIN: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

11

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, YESTERDAY IN HIS CROSS-EXAMINATION OF DR. LEVINE, MR. LEVY ASKED THE OUESTION THAT MADE A REFERENCE TO THE PEOPLE'S TEMPLE AND JONESTOWN. I HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT IT CONSIDERABLY SINCE HE MADE THAT REFERENCE. I BELIEVE THAT IT GROSSLY PREJUDICED THIS JURY

TO HEAR THAT COMPARISON OF, IN EFFECT, CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT AND JONESTOWN AND PEOPLE'S TEMPLE.

I HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT ANY WAY OF RELIEVING THAT PREJUDICE. I CANNOT THINK OF ANYTHING I CAN DO OR THE COURT CAN INSTRUCT THE JURY AT THIS POINT THAT WOULD TAKE A VERY, VERY POWERFUL IMAGE OUT OF THE JURY'S MIND, WHICH IS THAT THIS CHURCH IS IN SOME WAY SIMILAR TO JONESTOWN AND WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PEOPLE AT JONESTOWN IN SOME WAY HAS SOME RELEVANCE TO THIS CASE.

25

REQUEST THAT THE COURT DECLARE A MISTRIAL.

ON THAT BASIS OF THE GROSS PREJUDICE I BELIEVE

MR. LEVY: MAY I RESPOND, YOUR HONOR?

HAS NOW BEEN PLACED IN THE MINDS OF THIS JURY, I WOULD

THE COURT: YES, SIR.

MR. LEVY: I WOULD REMIND MR. KLEIN THAT AS EARLY AS THE TIME FOR SELECTION OF A JURY, WE HAD A POTENTIAL JUROR WHO STOOD UP AND SAID HE HAD RELATIVES. AT JONESTOWN AND HE LIKENED NEW WAVE RELIGIONS AND JONESTOWN. SO THE JURY HAS BEEN EXPOSED TO THE SPECTER OF JONESTOWN BEFORE.

SECONDLY, I WOULD REMIND YOU, MR. KLEIN, THAT YOUR WITNESS WHO TESTIFIED, HE HAD NOT MET WITH ANYONE FROM THE CHURCH YOU REPRESENT EITHER WHO WAS A PRESENT MEMBER OR AN EX-MEMBER. HE KNEW NOTHING FIRSTHAND ABOUT THEM, TESTIFYING IN SUCH A GENERAL WAY AND HIS STATEMENT WAS SO CONCLUSIONARY IN THAT HE TESTIFIED THAT IT WAS HIS BELIEF THAT NO ONE ALIVE WITH A NEW WAVE RELIGION COULD POSSIBLY BE PSYCHOLOGICALLY INJURED.

I REMINDED HIM OF THE INCIDENT AT JONESTOWN.

AND I ALSO REMIND YOU AT THIS TIME THAT IT LEFT HIM WITHOUT

AN ANSWER. HE DID NOT RESPOND TO MY INQUIRY, WHICH LEADS ME
TO BELIEVE THAT MAYBE HIS GENERALIZATION WAS OVERSTATED.

I DON'T THINK AT ANY TIME DURING THIS TRIAL OUR SIDE OF THE CASE HAS TRIED TO MAKE A COMPARISON AS TO THIS CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE'S TEMPLE. WHAT WE HAVE DONE IS ASKED HYPOTHETICAL QUESTIONS WITH REGARD TO PEOPLE WHO APPARENTLY WOULD PURPORT TO HAVE A GREATER DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THIS CHURCH THAN THEY IN FACT DO HAVE.

I THINK THE MOTION IS UNTIMELY, IT IS OUT OF ORDER. I WOULD -- OF COURSE I AM NOT THE JUDGE AND I AM NOT GOING TO RULE ON IT, BUT I THINK YOUR REACTION IS AN EXCESSIVE REACTION.

MR. KLEIN: FOR THE RECORD, YOUR HONOR, I OBJECTED TO THE QUESTION AND THE OBJECTION WAS SUSTAINED IS WHY HE DIDN'T ANSWER IT.

THE COURT: I THINK WE HAVE HEARD ENOUGH. I AM GOING TO DENY THE MOTION.

THE REFERENCE TO JONESTOWN WAS A VERY SWIFT,

MOMENTARY REFERENCE, FIRST OF ALL. IT WAS NOT DISCUSSED -
JONESTOWN WAS NOT DISCUSSED EXCEPT THAT IT WAS JUST

MENTIONED YESTERDAY.

SECONDLY, THE WITNESS EXPRESSED HIMSELF IN SUCH BROAD, BROAD TERMS THAT A QUESTION IN WHICH JONESTOWN WAS MENTIONED OR REFERRED TO WAS TO BE EXPECTED AND DID NOT SURPRISE ME. I DON'T THINK THAT THE JURY HAS BEEN PREJUDICED BY THE MENTION OF JONESTOWN YESTERDAY.

I WILL MAKE AN ORDER THAT NOBODY MENTION JIM

JONES OR JONESTOWN IN FRONT OF THE JURY WITHOUT FIRST

OBTAINING PERMISSION TO DO SO. IF SOMETHING DOES OCCUR THAT

CAUSES EITHER SIDE TO WISH TO MAKE REFERENCE TO JONESTOWN,

ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS TO ASK FOR A SHORT MEETING OUTSIDE OF

THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY AND I WILL DEAL WITH THE REQUEST AT

THAT TIME.

BUT WITHOUT SPECIFIC PERMISSION BEING GRANTED,

THERE SHALL BE NO MENTION OF JIM JONES OR JONESTOWN IN FRONT

OF THE JURY EITHER IN THE EVIDENTIARY PHASE OF THIS TRIAL OR

THE ARGUMENT PHASE WITHOUT PERMISSION BEING FIRST OBTAINED.

SO I WILL MAKE THAT ORDER AT THIS TIME.

I DON'T THINK THE JURY HAS BEEN PREJUDICED.

AND GIVEN THE TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESS YESTERDAY, I DON'T

THINK THAT THE QUESTION IN WHICH JONESTOWN WAS MENTIONED WAS

.27

LET'S GET BACK TO WORK.

MR. KLEIN: ONE MORE THING, YOUR HONOR. MY CLIENT,
IN SPEAKING TO THEM ABOUT THIS MOTION -- IN TALKING TO ME, I
TOLD THEM IT MIGHT BE DENIED -- ALSO SUGGESTED IF IT WERE
DENIED, ASKING, AND I MAKE THIS REQUEST, THAT THERE BE AN
ON-SITE INSPECTION OF CAMELOT BY THE JURY AS A POSSIBLE WAY
OF REMOVING COMPARISON THE POWERFUL IMAGE OF COMPARING
CAMELOT TO JONESTOWN.

THE COURT: THAT IS A POSSIBILITY. LET ME MENTION A COUPLE OF THINGS. IF WE ARE TO DO THAT, IT WOULD TAKE TIME AND WE ARE ALL CONCERNED ABOUT THE LENGTH OF TIME IN GETTING THE CASE TO THE JURY BEFORE TOO MANY OF THE JURORS HAVE TO LEAVE US. BUT THAT IS JUST AN ADMINISTRATIVE CONCERN.

GIVE SOME THOUGHT AND TALK AMONG YOURSELVES

CONCERNING THE FOLLOWING: ONE, THE ARRANGING OF A BUS TO

TAKE US OUT AND BRING US BACK. TWO, WE WILL HAVE TO HAVE

SOME ARRANGEMENTS FOR LUNCH I ASSUME BECAUSE —

MR. KLEIN: THEY HAVE FACILITIES FOR THAT.

THE COURT: -- THE TRIP WILL TAKE THAT LONG.

WELL, I DON'T KNOW IF WE SHOULD BE GUESTS

THERE. I HAVE A CONCERN ABOUT THAT. MAYBE WE SHOULD STOP

AT SOME OTHER PLACE FOR LUNCH. I AM OBVIOUSLY HESITANT

ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF OUR BEING GUESTS.

NEXT, YOU ALL SHOULD DISCUSS BEFORE WE TALK
ABOUT THIS ANY FURTHER, BEFORE I TALK ABOUT IT ANY FURTHER
AT LEAST, YOU SHOULD DISCUSS JUST WHAT THE ITINERARY AND

AGENDA SHALL BE SO THAT THERE IS NO CONFUSION OR DISAGREEMENT THERE SAYING WELL WE SHOULD GO HERE, WE SHOULDN'T GO HERE, WE SHOULD TALK WITH THESE PEOPLE, WE SHOULD NOT TALK WITH THESE PEOPLE, WHATEVER.

I THINK THAT THERE SHOULD BE A CLEAR

UNDERSTANDING AMONG YOURSELVES AND THEN WITH ME AS TO JUST

WHAT THE HECK WE ARE GOING TO DO ONCE THE BUS BRINGS US ONTO

THE PREMISES OF CAMELOT SO THAT THERE IS NO BIG HASSLE AT

THAT TIME AND PEOPLE WOULD BE CONFUSED OR ANGRY OR

DISAPPOINTED OR WORSE.

MR. LEVY: MAY I COMMENT, YOUR HONOR?
THE COURT: YES.

MR. LEVY: JUST BRIEFLY. IT IS NOW ALMOST SIX YEARS SINCE MR. MULL WAS THERE. FOR US TO VISIT THERE NOW WHERE VEGETATION HAS HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO GROW, WHERE THEY HAVE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO REFURBISH AND CHANGE AND BUILD AND DO THESE THINGS AND EVENTUALLY GET PERMITS FOR THINGS THAT WERE CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT PERMITS, TO GO AND SEE -- IS LIKE, YOU KNOW, TO GO TO AUSCHWITZ NOW AFTER THE PLACE HAS BEEN REDECORATED. THERE ARE NO MORE BUNKERS --

THE COURT: I HAVEN'T BEEN THERE, BUT I UNDERSTAND IT
IS STILL QUITE GRIM.

MR. LEVY: BY THE SAME TOKEN, WE ARE SIX YEARS DOWN THE ROAD FROM WHEN MR. MULL WAS THERE.

THE COURT: THIS IS SOMETHING WE CAN TALK ABOUT AT A DIFFERENT TIME. YOU ARE NOT HEARING ME.

MR. LEVY: YES, I AM HEARING YOU. I AM JUST LETTING
YOU KNOW I AM OPPOSED TO THE VISIT. BUT I DO HEAR YOU, BUT

I WILL DISCUSS IT WITH THIS GUY.

THE COURT: LET ME RESPOND VERY QUICKLY. I DON'T WANT TO KEEP THE JURY WAITING ANY LONGER. WE ARE GOING TO LOSE THE JURY IF WE ARE NOT CAREFUL.

THE CONCERNS THAT YOU HAVE MIGHT BE DEALT WITH BY ASKING QUESTIONS OF CERTAIN PEOPLE AND GETTING ANSWERS, TAKING SOME TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE PROPERTY. WE CAN DO THAT WHILE THERE. WE WILL HAVE OUR REPORTER WITH US, WHO WILL HAVE HER MACHINE AND SHE WILL BE PREPARED TO TAKE TESTIMONY.

YOU CAN HAVE SOMEBODY TESTIFY AS TO WHEN THIS BUILDING WAS CONSTRUCTED, OR WHAT THE CONDITION WAS SIX YEARS AGO OR WHATEVER. MAYBE THERE ARE PHOTOGRAPHS AROUND THAT CAN BE UTILIZED TO CONTRAST THE APPEARANCE TODAY WITH THAT OF SOME SIX YEARS AGO.

NOW, BY SAYING THIS, I AM NOT PROMISING THAT WE ARE GOING TO GO THERE. AND I WANT TO MAKE THAT CLEAR SO THAT I AM NOT MISUNDERSTOOD. I AM OPEN-MINDED ABOUT GOING THERE. BUT I SHOULD NOT BE UNDERSTOOD TO BE COMMITTED TO OUR TAKING A DAY TO GO THERE.

MR. LEVY: LYNN HAS ALREADY GOT HER LUNCH PACKED.

THE COURT: I ALSO WANT TO DISCUSS WITH YOU FURTHER

AT A MORE CONVENIENT TIME -- THE NEXT COUPLE OF DAYS, THIS

SHOULD BE DISCUSSED THIS WEEK IF WE ARE GOING TO DO IT AT

ALL -- I WANT TO DISCUSS WITH YOU JUST WHAT THE VALUE IS.

WHY IS IT WORTHWHILE TAKING A DAY TO GO THERE BECAUSE IT IS

A WHOLE DAY. I AM NOT COMMITTED TO GOING. I AM OPEN-MINDED

ABOUT IT, HOWEVER, AT THIS POINT.

1 MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU. 2 (THE PROCEEDINGS WERE RESUMED IN OPEN 3 COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING. 4 5 PLEASE PROCEED. 6 MR. KLEIN: I WILL CALL MR. MONROE SHEARER, YOUR 7 HONOR. 8 9 MONROE JULIUS SHEARER, III, + A CROSS-DEFENDANT HEREIN, CALLED AS A WITNESS ON HIS OWN 10 11 BEHALF, HAVING BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN, TESTIFIES AS FOLLOWS: THE CLERK: PLEASE BE SEATED. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME 12 FOR THE RECORD AND PLEASE SPELL YOUR NAME. 13 THE WITNESS: MONROE JULIUS SHEARER THE THIRD. 14 M-O-N-R-O-E, J-U-L-I-U-S, S-H-E-A-R-E-R. 15 THE CLERK: THANK YOU. 16 THE COURT: PROCEED. 17 MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 18 19 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION + BY MR. KLEIN: 21 MR. SHEARER, WOULD YOU PLEASE GIVE US YOUR 22 Q EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND? 23 24 YES. I WENT TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND IN 25 COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND, FOR THREE AND A HALF YEARS. DID YOU RECEIVE A DEGREE? 26 Q .27 NO, I DID NOT. Α WHAT WAS YOUR MAJOR? 28

- 1		
1	А	HISTORY.
2	Q	ARE YOU CURRENTLY A MEMBER OF CHURCH UNIVERSAL
3	AND TRIUMPHAN	NT?
4	A	I AM NOT A MEMBER, NO.
5	Q	ARE YOU AFFILIATED WITH CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND
6	TRIUMPHANT II	N ANY WAY?
7	А	I AM ON THE MAILING LIST.
8	Q	ARE YOU CURRENTLY EMPLOYED?
9	Α	YES, I AM.
10	Q	FOR WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED?
11	Α	LINDSAY AND ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED.
12	Q	WHAT IS THE BUSINESS OF LINDSAY AND ASSOCIATES?
13	A	PRIMARILY THEY ARE IN THE BUSINESS OF SELLING
14	AND INSTALLI	NG AND ADMINISTERING PENSION PLANS TO SMALL
15	BUSINESS OWN	ERS.
16	Q	DO YOU HAVE A TITLE?
17	А	I AM A VICE PRESIDENT.
18	· Q	AND IN GENERAL WHAT ARE YOUR DUTIES THERE?
19	A	I ASSIST IN THE PREPARATION IN THE PROPOSALS
20	FOR NEW CLIE	NTS AND ALSO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PLANS
21	ONCE THEY HA	VE BEEN INSTALLED.
22	Q	HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN EMPLOYED BY LINDSAY AND
23	ASSOCIATES?	
24	Α Α	FOUR YEARS.
25	Q	IS LINDSAY AND ASSOCIATES IN ANY WAY CONNECTED
26	TO CHURCH UN	IVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT?
27	А	NO, IT'S NOT.
28	Q	NOW, PRIOR TO BEING EMPLOYED BY LINDSAY AND

1	ASSOCIATES, WERE YOU A STAFF MEMBER AT CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND
2	TRIUMPHANT?
3	A YES, I WAS.
4	Q HOW MANY YEARS WERE YOU A STAFF MEMBER?
5	A ABOUT 12 YEARS.
6	Q AND WHEN DID YOU CEASE BEING A STAFF MEMBER OF
7	CHURCH UNIVERSAL?
8	A MAY OF 1981.
9	Q WHY DID YOU LEAVE AT THAT TIME?
10	A I FELT THAT THERE WERE OTHER THINGS I NEEDED TO
11	DO WITH MY LIFE, THERE WERE OTHER THINGS I WANTED TO BECOME
12	INVOLVED IN.
13	Q WHEN YOU DECIDED TO LEAVE, DID ANYONE DO OR SAY
14	ANYTHING TO PREVENT YOU FROM LEAVING?
15	A NO.
16	Q ONCE YOU LEFT, DID ANYBODY INTIMIDATE OR HARASS
17	YOU IN ANY WAY?
18	A NO, THEY DIDN'T.
19	Q DID ANYBODY SUGGEST TO YOU THAT THE ONLY WAY
20	YOU COULD MAKE YOUR ASCENSION WAS THROUGH CHURCH UNIVERSAL
21	AND TRIUMPHANT?
22	A NO, THERE WAS NO SUCH SUGGESTION.
23	Q NOW, AT THE TIME YOU LEFT IN MAY OF 1981, WHAT,
24	IF ANY, TITLES OR JOBS DID YOU HAVE AT CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND
25	TRIUMPHANT?
26	A I WAS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
27	CHURCH, I WAS A VICE PRESIDENT OF THE CHURCH, I WAS DEAN OF
28	STUDENTS OF SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, HEADMASTER OF MONTESSORI
ŀ	

.27

WOULD BE VERY INTERESTED IN HAVING HIM COME DOWN AND DO ARCHITECTURAL WORK AT CAMELOT. AND I ASKED HIM IF HE WOULD BE INTERESTED IN DOING THAT.

HE SAID HE WOULD BE. HE WOULD LIKE TO DO THAT.

I SAID, "WELL, YOU KNOW, I AM CALLING TO GATHER
THE FACTS ABOUT THIS SITUATION. I THOUGHT I'D LET YOU KNOW
THAT THE BOARD WOULD BE WILLING TO FURNISH YOU WITH FREE
ROOM AND BOARD FOR THE TIME THAT YOU ARE ON OUR CAMPUS AS
WELL AS PAY FOR YOUR TRANSPORTATION BACK AND FORTH TO SAN
FRANCISCO WHILE YOU WERE THERE — WHILE YOU ARE HELPING US
AT CAMELOT."

HE SAID THAT HE'D VERY MUCH BE INTERESTED IN COMING, BUT HE COULD ONLY COME IF HIS EXPENSES WOULD BE MET.

SO I SAID, "WELL, HOW MUCH ARE YOUR EXPENSES?"

AND HE SAID HE COULDN'T JUST SAY AT THE MOMENT.

HE'D HAVE TO REALLY SIT DOWN AND FIGURE THE WHOLE THING OUT.

AND I SAID, "WELL, WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO?

HOW LONG DO YOU THINK THIS WILL TAKE? DO YOU HAVE ANY

METHODS WHEREBY YOU WOULD BE ABLE TO MEET YOUR EXPENSES?"

AND HE TOLD ME ABOUT A COMBINATION OF THINGS
THAT HE THOUGHT MIGHT TOGETHER MEET HIS EXPENSES. FIRST OF
ALL, HE MENTIONED HE WAS IN THE PROCESS OF TRYING TO GET A
NEW LOAN ON HIS HOUSE THAT WOULD MEET HIS EXPENSES FOR A
PERIOD OF TIME.

HE ALSO SAID THAT HE HAD EXISTING CLIENTS WHO STILL OWED HIM CONSIDERABLE SUM OF MONEY FOR WORK HE HAD ALREADY DONE FOR THEM. IF HE COULD JUST GET THEM TO PAY HIM, THAT WOULD GO A LONG WAY TOWARDS MEETING HIS EXPENSES.

.25

HE ALSO SAID HE HAD ANY NUMBER OF JOBS THAT HE WAS WORKING ON AT THE CURRENT TIME THAT HE WAS OBLIGED TO FINISH EVEN IF HE WAS HELPING US AT CAMELOT AND THAT WOULD ALSO PROVIDE HIM HELP.

I ASKED HIM HOW LONG HE THOUGHT IT WOULD TAKE HIM TO FIGURE ALL OF THIS OUT, WHAT TIME FRAME WERE WE DISCUSSING.

AND HE SAID WELL, OF COURSE WE WERE INTERESTED IN HAVING HIM COME AS SOON AS IT WAS POSSIBLE AND OF COURSE HE WAS INTERESTED IN COMING. SO HE SUGGESTED THAT -- IT WAS EITHER IN THAT CONVERSATION OR CONVERSATION -- THE FOLLOW-UP CALL A FEW DAYS LATER WHERE HE SAID THAT PERHAPS HE COULD COME DOWN SOONER, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

AND HE HAD BEEN THINKING ABOUT SELLING HIS HOUSE. AND IF HE CAME UP SHORT FROM ANY OF THOSE OTHER METHODS, MAYBE THE CHURCH COULD LOAN HIM THE MONEY AND HE'D REPAY THE CHURCH UPON THE SALE OF HIS HOUSE.

Q AT THE CONCLUSION OF THOSE PHONE CONVERSATIONS, EITHER ONE OR TWO AS YOU JUST MENTIONED, AS FAR AS YOU WERE CONCERNED, WHAT, IF ANY, ISSUES HAD YET TO BE RESOLVED WITH RESPECT TO THE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS?

WELL, WE STILL HAD TO FIND OUT HOW MUCH GREGORY
WAS GOING TO OWE ABOVE AND BEYOND WHAT HIS OTHER EXPENSES
WERE GOING TO BE, IF ANYTHING, THAT HE WAS -- FROM THE
SOURCES OF INCOME THAT HE WAS GOING TO GET.

AND I, OF COURSE, HAD TO GET BACK TO THE BOARD

TO SEE IF THEY WERE AMENABLE TO THIS CONCEPT OF ADVANCING

HIM FUNDS WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT HE WAS GOING TO REPAY

EXPENSES WAS, AND THEN WE HAD TO DISCUSS HOW MUCH AND HOW LONG WE WOULD LOAN HIM FUNDS IN EXCHANGE FOR THE REPAYMENT UPON THE SALE OF HIS HOUSE.

Q TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID ANY OTHER CHURCH

OFFICIALS HAVE DISCUSSIONS IN JANUARY OF 1979 WITH MR. MULL

WITH RESPECT TO THESE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS?

A NO.

Q WHY DID YOU ALLOW MR. MULL TO COME TO CAMELOT WITHOUT FINALIZING THOSE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS?

A WELL, WE VERY MUCH WANTED HIM TO COME AND HE WAS ALSO DESIROUS OF COMING. AND I DIDN'T HAVE ANY REASON TO THINK THAT WE WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO WORK THINGS OUT.

Q SUBSEQUENT TO THE DATE IN JANUARY OF 1979 WHEN MR. MULL CAME TO LIVE AT CAMELOT, WAS THERE ANY COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MR. MULL AND CHURCH OFFICIALS WITH RESPECT TO THOSE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS?

A YES, THERE WAS. THE FIRST THING THAT I RECALL WAS ABOUT THE TIME OF THE SECOND PAYMENT TO GREGORY. I HAD RECEIVED A REQUEST FROM HIM, I BELIEVE, FOR WELL OVER \$4,000.

AND SO I SPOKE WITH HIM AND SAID, "GREGORY, I HOPE YOU REALIZE THAT PEOPLE ON STAFF ARE NOT PAID THOSE KINDS OF SUMS, EITHER AS SALARY OR AS ANY KIND OF LOAN OR ANYTHING, AND I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW YOU WOULD EXPECT TO BE PAID THAT AMOUNT OF MONEY."

HE WENT ON TO SAY THAT HE WAS VERY FIRM ABOUT
PLANNING TO SELL HIS HOUSE. AND IF WE WOULD GO AHEAD AND
LOAN HIM THOSE FUNDS, HE WAS SURE THAT HE'D BE IN A POSITION

2€

TO PAY US BACK. AND HE ALSO IMPLIED THAT THAT WOULD BE TAKING PLACE IN THE IMMEDIATE -- VERY FORESEEABLE FUTURE.

- Q DID THERE COME A POINT IN TIME WHEN THE CHURCH DID FINALIZE THE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH MR. MULL?
 - A YES, THERE DID.
 - Q AND AT WHAT POINT IN TIME DID THAT OCCUR?
 - A MID-MARCH OF '79.
- Q WHAT WAS THE FINAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND MR. MULL AS FAR AS YOU UNDERSTOOD IT?

A THE FINAL AGREEMENT WAS THAT THE CHURCH WOULD LOAN HIM FUNDS TO MEET WHATEVER EXPENSES HE COULD NOT MEET ON HIS OWN AND WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT HE WOULD REPAY WHATEVER AMOUNTS WE LOANED HIM UPON THE SALE OF HIS HOUSE.

AND THAT IN THE MEANTIME, WE WOULD GIVE HIM FREE ROOM AND BOARD WHILE HE SERVED ON OUR CAMPUS AND WE WOULD ALSO GIVE HIM THE AIR FARE THAT HE NEEDED TO GO BACK AND FORTH TO SAN FRANCISCO.

AND WE ALSO STIPULATED THAT IF WE WERE GOING TO DO THIS, THAT HE SHOULD PUT HIS HOUSE ON THE MARKET RIGHT AWAY SO THAT WE WOULDN'T HAVE TO KEEP DOING THIS ANY LONGER THAN NECESSARY.

- O DID MR. MULL AGREE TO THAT ARRANGEMENT?
- A YES, HE DID.
- Q THERE ARE SOME LETTERS IN EVIDENCE WHERE MR.

 MULL REFERS TO MONEY GIVEN TO HIM BY THE CHURCH AS LOANS.

 IN HIS TESTIMONY, MR. MULL SAID THAT THE WORD "LOAN" WAS

 USED BY HIM BECAUSE YOU REQUESTED THAT HE USE THAT TERM AND

 HE WAS DOING A FAVOR FOR YOU.

1 DID YOU EVER REQUEST THAT MR. MULL USE THE WORD 2 "LOANS" IN ANY LETTERS THAT HE WROTE TO THE CHURCH? 3 MR. LEVY: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT AT THIS 4 POINT. I THINK THE TESTIMONY HAS BEEN MISCHARACTERIZED. THE COURT: PLEASE REPHRASE YOUR QUESTION. 5 б BY MR. KLEIN: DID YOU EVER REQUEST THAT MR. 7 MULL, IN WRITING LETTERS TO EITHER YOU OR OTHER CHURCH 8 OFFICIALS, REFER TO THE MONEY GIVEN TO HIM BY THE CHURCH AS 9 LOANS? DID YOU EVER MAKE THAT REQUEST OF HIM? 10 I NEVER MADE ANY SUCH REQUEST. 11 NOW, WERE YOU PRESENT AT THE JUNE 6, 1980, 12 MEETING WHERE MR. MULL, ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET AND ED 13 FRANCIS WERE PRESENT? 14 YES, I WAS. IS THAT THE MEETING WHERE A TAPE WAS MADE OF 15 16 THE MEETING? 17 YES. Α 18 DURING THE COURSE OF THAT MEETING, DID MR. MULL 19 EVER STATE THAT HE HAD USED THE WORD "LOAN" AS A FAVOR TO 20 YOU? 21 NO. Α WHEN WAS THE FIRST TIME THAT YOU BECAME AWARE 22 THAT MR. MULL HAD MADE SUCH AN ACCUSATION THAT YOU HAD ASKED 23 24 HIM TO USE THE WORD "LOAN"? THE FIRST TIME I EVER HEARD THAT WAS AT THIS 25 TRIAL. 26 DID YOU EVER ASK MR. MULL TO COME TO CAMELOT ON 27 Q 28 HIS TERMS?

1	
1	A NO, I DIDN'T.
2	Q ARE YOU CERTAIN OF THAT?
3	A YES, I AM VERY SURE.
4	Q PRIOR TO THE FINALIZATION OF THE FINANCIAL
5	ARRANGEMENTS IN MARCH AS YOU TESTIFIED, DID YOU AUTHORIZE
б	GIVING MR. MULL ANY MONEY?
7	A YES, I DID.
8	Q HOW MUCH DID YOU AUTHORIZE GIVING HIM BEFORE
9	THE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS WERE FINALIZED?
10	A I THINK THERE WERE TWO PAYMENTS TOTALING
11	\$3,400, SOMETHING LIKE THAT.
12	Q WHY DID YOU AUTHORIZE GIVING HIM \$3,400 IF THE
13	FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS HAD NOT BEEN FINALIZED?
14	A BECAUSE FROM THE VERY BEGINNING HE SAID THAT
15	WHATEVER PAYMENTS THE CHURCH GAVE HIM, WHATEVER LOANS,
16	MONIES WE GAVE HIM, HE WOULD REPAY THEM ON THE SALE OF HIS
17	HOUSE AND I HAD NO REASON NOT TO TRUST HIS WORD.
18	Q TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID THE CHURCH LEND
19	ADDITIONAL SUMS OF MONEY TO MR. MULL?
20	A YES.
21	Q DO YOU KNOW APPROXIMATELY HOW MUCH WAS LENT IN
22	TOTAL?
23	A 1 THINK AROUND \$37,000.
24	Q DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN YOU AND MR. MULL
25	WERE PRESENT AND THE SUBJECT OF A PROMISSORY NOTE WAS
26	DISCUSSED?
27	A YES, THERE DID.
28	Q DO YOU RECALL APPROXIMATELY WHEN THAT WAS?

1	A IT WAS IN SEPTEMBER OF 1979.
2	Q DO YOU RECALL WHERE THIS DISCUSSION OCCURRED?
3	A IN EDWARD FRANCIS' OFFICE AT CAMELOT.
4	Q DO YOU RECALL WHO WAS PRESENT?
5	A GREGORY MULL, EDWARD FRANCIS AND MYSELF.
6	Q AS BEST YOU CAN, PLEASE TELL US WHAT WAS SAID
7	AT THAT MEETING.
3	A WELL, BASICALLY EDWARD AND I REVIEWED THE FACT
9	THAT WHEN WE HAD MADE THIS ARRANGEMENT IN THE SPRING, WE HAD
10	ALL ASSUMED THAT THE HOUSE WOULD SELL MUCH MORE QUICKLY.
11	AND SINCE IT HADN'T, THE AMOUNT OF THE LOANS
12	HAD GROWN WELL BEYOND OUR ORIGINAL EXPECTATIONS AND THAT IT
13	REALLY WASN'T PROPER FOR A CHURCH OR ANY OTHER ORGANIZATION
14	TO JUST BE EXTENDING PEOPLE FUNDS WITH NO CLEAR RECORD OF
15	WHAT THOSE FUNDS WERE EARMARKED FOR IN A DOCUMENTED MANNER.
15	AND SO WE FELT THAT IF WE WERE TO CONTINUE WITH
17	THE ARRANGEMENT, WE SHOULD DOCUMENT IT BY WAY OF A NOTE.
18	Q DO YOU RECALL WHAT, IF ANYTHING, MR. MULL SAID
19	ABOUT THAT?
20	A WELL, HIS INITIAL REACTION WAS, "DON'T YOU
21	TRUST ME?"
22	AND WE SAID, "YES, GREGORY, WE DO TRUST YOU.
23	THAT IS NOT THE QUESTION. THE POINT IS THAT WE ARE A
24	CHURCH, AN ORGANIZATION, AND WE SHOULD PROPERLY RECORD WHAT
25	WE ARE DOING."
26	I THINK HE MIGHT HAVE SAID, "WHY DO YOU HAVE TO
27	CHARGE INTEREST ON THE NOTE?"
28	AND FOWARD SAID THAT HE FELT LIKE IT WAS YOU

1	Q DID YOU MAKE ANY OTHER PROMISES TO HIM?
2	A NO.
3	Q TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID ANY OTHER CHURCH
4	OFFICIALS MAKE PROMISES TO HIM WITH RESPECT TO THESE
5	FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS?
6	A NO.
7	Q DURING THE LATTER PART OF 1978, WERE YOU ON THE
8	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD?
9	A YES, I WAS.
10	Q WHO ELSE WAS ON IT?
11	A JAMES MC CAFFREY AND EDWARD FRANCIS.
12	Q DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN THERE WAS A
13	DISCUSSION WITH RESPECT TO INVITING GREGORY MULL TO COME AND
14	DO ARCHITECTURAL WORK AT CAMELOT?
15	A YES.
16	Q WHEN WAS THAT DISCUSSION?
17	A THAT WAS ALSO AROUND DECEMBER OF 1978.
18	Q DO YOU RECALL WHAT WAS SAID AT THE BOARD
19	MEETING AT THAT TIME ABOUT MR. MULL AND INVITING HIM TO
20	CAMELOT?
21	A I WENT TO THE BOARD AND I SAID, "I'D LIKE TO
22	INVITE GREGORY TO COME DOWN AND DO ARCHITECTURAL WORK FOR US
23	HERE AT CAMELOT."
24	AND THEY SAID, "GO AHEAD AND EXPLORE IT." SO I
25	DID.
25	Q WHY DID YOU BRING UP THE IDEA OF INVITING MR.
27	MULL TO COME AND DO ARCHITECTURAL WORK AT CAMELOT?
28	A WE HAD VARIOUS PROJECTS THAT WE DID NEED WORK

ON AND WE THOUGHT IT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA FOR GREGORY TO DO

IT. IT WAS COSTING US A GREAT DEAL OF MONEY TO HAVE OUR

OUTSIDE ARCHITECTS DO THAT WORK.

Q DID THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PROJECTS IN MIND FOR GREGORY MULL TO WORK ON?

A YES, WE DID. WE WANTED HIM TO WORK ON THE MONTESSORI SCHOOL BUILDINGS, WILL OF GOD FOCUS AT THE ASHRAM, AND OTHER RENOVATION PROJECTS THAT WE HAD ON THE EXISTING FACILITIES THERE ON THE CAMPUS.

Q WAS THERE ANY DISCUSSION AT THAT BOARD MEETING OR ANY BOARD MEETINGS ABOUT WHETHER GREGORY MULL WOULD WORK ON THE TEN-YEAR CAMELOT PLAN?

A NO. THAT WAS NOT DISCUSSED.

Q TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE MONTESSORI INTERNATIONAL THAT YOU MENTIONED, DID MR. MULL WORK ON ANY PROJECTS IN THE TEN-YEAR PLAN?

A NO.

Q AT THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, WAS THERE ANY DISCUSSION AS TO THE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS THAT COULD BE MADE WITH MR. MULL IF HE CAME TO CAMELOT?

A YES. WE FELT THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO OFFER HIM FREE ROOM AND BOARD WHILE HE WAS ON OUR CAMPUS AND ALSO TO PAY HIS AIR FARE BACK AND FORTH TO SAN FRANCISCO.

Q WAS THERE A TIME WHEN THIS IDEA, THIS DECISION AS FAR AS INVITING MR. MULL TO CAMELOT, WAS DISCUSSED WITH THE FULL BOARD?

A NO, NOT THAT I RECALL.

Q IN LATE '78 AND THE YEAR 1979, WAS RANDALL KING

ĺ	
1	BOARD OR AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING?
2	A YES.
3	Q WHEN WAS IT DISCUSSED?
4	A LATE FEBRUARY AND EARLY MARCH, 1979.
5	Q TO THE BEST OF YOUR RECOLLECTION, WHAT WAS SAID
6	IN THE BOARD MEETING ABOUT WHAT THE FINAL FINANCIAL
7	ARRANGEMENTS WOULD BE WITH MR. MULL?
3	A WELL, WE AGREED THAT WE WOULD TELL GREGORY THAT
9	WE WOULD CONTINUE TO LOAN HIM MONEY AND WITH THE
10	UNDERSTANDING THAT HE WOULD REPAY IT UPON THE SALE OF HIS
11	HOUSE, THAT WE WOULD COMMIT TO DO THIS AT LEAST WHILE THE
12	MONTESSORI PROJECT WAS BEING WORKED ON AND ANY OTHER
13	IMMEDIATE PROJECTS WE HAD IN THE NEAR FUTURE.
14	WE AGREED WE WOULD ALSO TELL HIM, WHICH WE DID,
15	THAT ABOVE AND BEYOND THOSE PROJECTS, HE WOULD HAVE TO BE
16	PREPARED TO SUPPORT HIMSELF FINANCIALLY EITHER IN THE
17	CAMELOT AREA OR IN SAN FRANCISCO. AND THAT IF WE WERE GOING
18	TO GIVE HIM THESE FUNDS, THAT HE SHOULD PUT HIS HOUSE ON THE
19	MARKET RIGHT AWAY.
20	Q PRIOR TO WHEN THE BOARD DISCUSSED THAT IN
21	MARCH, HAD THE BOARD REACHED A FINAL DECISION WITH RESPECT
22	TO THE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND MR.
23	MULL?
24	A NO.
25	Q PRIOR TO WHEN THE BOARD DISCUSSED THAT IN
26	MARCH, HAD YOU EVER STATED OR SUGGESTED TO MR. MULL THAT A
27	FINANCIAL THAT A FINALIZED FINANCIAL AGREEMENT EXISTED
20	RETWEEN THE CHURCH AND HIM?

1	А	NO. I CONVEYED TO HIM THAT THE EXECUTIVE
2	COMMITTEE WO	JLD HAVE TO MAKE THAT DECISION.
3	Q	I'D LIKE TO DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO APRIL OF
4	1981, A DATE	WHEN A SQUARE DANCE WAS HELD AT CAMELOT.
- 5		DID THERE COME A TIME ON THAT DATE THAT YOU
6	ARRIVED AT CA	AMELOT?
7	А	YES.
8	Q	WHEN YOU ARRIVED THERE, WAS MR. MULL ALREADY ON
9	THE PROPERTY	?
10	А	YES, HE WAS.
11	Q	WHEN YOU ARRIVED, WHERE WAS MR. MULL?
12	А	WITH A GROUP OF PEOPLE SOMEWHERE IN THE GENERAL
13	AREA OF THE	GUARDHOUSE.
14	Q	WHEN YOU FIRST SAW HIM, WHERE WERE YOU?
15	Α	DRIVING IN THE DRIVEWAY.
16	Q	WHEN YOU DROVE IN, DID YOU SEE MR. FRANCIS?
17	А	YES, I DID.
18	Q	WHERE WAS HE?
19	А	IN THE SAME GROUP OF PEOPLE.
20	Q	SAME GROUP AS WHERE MR. MULL WAS?
21	А	YES.
22	Q	AFTER DRIVING BY THEM, WHAT DID YOU DO?
23	А	I DROVE PAST THE GROUP AND PARKED IN THE
24	PARKING LOT.	
25	Q	HOW FAR WAS IT FROM WHERE YOU PARKED YOUR CAR
26	IN THE PARKI	MG LOT TO WHERE MR. MULL AND MR. FRANCIS WERE?
27	А	I'D ESTIMATE AROUND 100 FEET OR SOMETHING LIKE
28	THAT.	

1	A WHO ELSE?
2	Q DO YOU KNOW WHO ELSE?
3	A THE ONLY OTHER PERSON I REMEMBER IS TOM MILLER.
4	Q DO YOU KNOW IF ANY OTHER CHURCH-AFFILIATED MEN
5	WERE IN THAT VICINITY OF THE AREA OF THE GUARDHOUSE WHERE
б	MR. FRANCIS AND MR. MILLER WERE EVEN IF YOU DON'T REMEMBER
7	THEIR NAMES?
8	A I THINK THERE WERE A COUPLE OF OTHER PEOPLE
9	THERE.
10	Q DID YOU SEE IN THE VICINITY OF THAT GUARDHOUSE
11	8 TO 20 JUDO EXPERTS BLOCKING THE ROAD IN FRONT OF MR. MULL?
12	A NO.
13	Q DID YOU SEE ANYBODY BLOCKING THE ROAD IN FRONT
14	OF MR. MULL?
15	A NO.
16	Q DID YOU SEE ANY MEN COME OUT FROM BEHIND THE
17	TREES ON THE SIDE OF THE ROAD AND BLOCK THAT ROAD?
18	A NO, I DID NOT.
19	Q DURING THE TIME YOU WERE IN THE PARKING LOT,
20	DID YOU SEE ANYONE MAKE ANY THREATENING PHYSICAL GESTURES
21	TOWARDS MR. MULL?
22	A NO.
23	Q DID YOU SEE ANYONE MAKE ANY PHYSICAL GESTURES
24	TOWARDS MR. MULL?
25	A NO, I DID NOT.
26	Q DID YOU SEE ANYONE TOUCH HIM?
27	A NO.
28	Q FROM WHERE YOU WERE IN THE PARKING LOT, DID YOU

1	A THAT'S CORRECT.
2	Q OTHER THAN THAT ONE INSTANCE THAT YOU'VE JUST
3	MENTIONED, WERE THERE ANY OTHER TIMES THAT THE CONTENTS OF A
4	SUMMIT UNIVERSITY CLEARANCE LETTER WERE DISCUSSED DURING A
5	BOARD MEETING DURING THE YEARS THAT YOU WERE ON THE BOARD?
6	A NO.
7	Q WERE THERE EVER ANY OCCASIONS WHEN YOU WERE ON
3	THE BOARD WHERE A CLEARANCE LETTER WAS BROUGHT TO A BOARD
9	MEETING?
10	A NO.
11	Q DO YOU KNOW WHO DR. RALPH YANEY IS?
12	A YES, I DO.
13	Q DURING THE YEARS THAT YOU WERE ON THE BOARD,
14	DID DR. YANEY EVER REPORT TO THE BOARD INFORMATION HE HAD
15	LEARNED IN COUNSELING SESSIONS WITH CHURCH MEMBERS?
16	A NO.
17	Q YOU CERTAIN OF THAT?
18	A YES.
19	Q WERE YOU IN CHARGE OF CHURCH FUND RAISING AT
20	ANY TIME?
21	A YES, I WAS.
22	Q DID YOU EVER ATTEND A SEMINAR ABOUT FUND
23	RAISING?
24	A YES, I DID.
25	Q HOW LONG WAS THE SEMINAR?
26	A SEMINAR WAS ABOUT A WEEK LONG.
.27	Q DO YOU RECALL WHO GAVE IT OR SPONSORED IT?
28	A IT WAS A PRIVATE GROUP CALLED THE FUND RAISING

1	SCHOOL.	
2	Q DO YOU RECALL WHAT YEAR IT OCCURRED?	
3	A IT WAS AROUND 1975, 176.	
4	Q DO YOU RECALL WHO ELSE WENT TO THAT SEMINAR?	
5	A I WAS THE ONLY ONE FROM THE CHURCH. OTHER	
G	PEOPLE WHO ATTENDED WERE THE FUND RAISING HEADS OF	
7	DEPARTMENTS OF MAJOR CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS SUCH AS	
3	COLLEGES, HOSPITALS. THERE MAY HAVE BEEN SOME OTHER	
9	CHARITIES THERE. I DON'T KNOW.	
10	Q SUBSEQUENT TO YOU GOING TO THAT MEETING, DID	
11	CHURCH UNIVERSAL INCORPORATE ANY OF THE TECHNIQUES THAT YOU	
12	LEARNED AT THOSE SEMINARS INTO THEIR FUND RAISING?	
13	A YES, WE DID.	
14	Q WERE THE TECHNIQUES THAT THE WITHDRAWN.	
15	WERE THERE TECHNIQUES THAT CHURCH UNIVERSAL	
16	EMPLOYED AFTER YOU WENT TO THAT SEMINAR THAT YOU HAD NOT	
17	LEARNED AT THAT SEMINAR FOR FUND RAISING?	
18	A WE DID SOME THINGS THAT THEY DIDN'T RECOMMEND,	
19	YES.	
20	Q WHAT THINGS DID CHURCH UNIVERSAL DO THAT WERE	
21	NOT RECOMMENDED AT THAT SEMINAR?	
22	A WELL, WHEN YOU ARE RAISING LARGE SUMS OF MONEY	
23	IN SHORT PERIODS OF TIME, WHAT THEY CALL CAPITAL FUND	
24	RAISING, THEY RECOMMEND THAT ALWAYS BE DONE FACE-TO-FACE	
25	WITH PERSONAL INTERVIEWS AND SO FORTH. AND WE DIDN'T ALWAYS	
26	DO THAT. WE WOULD OFTEN SEND OUT MAILING APPEALS ALONG WITH	
27	OUR PERSONAL CONTACT WITH MEMBERS.	
28	THEY ALSO RECOMMENDED THAT BEFORE WE EVER DID	

6 7

S 9

10

11 12

13 14

15 15

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

ANY MAJOR FUND RAISING, THAT WE DO A NATIONWIDE SURVEY OF OUR MEMBERSHIP TO DECIDE EXACTLY HOW MUCH MONEY WAS REALISTIC TO RAISE.

> Q DID YOU DO THAT AT CHURCH UNIVERSAL?

NO.

WITH THOSE EXCEPTIONS, WERE THE PROCEDURES USED FOR FUND RAISING BY CHURCH UNIVERSAL ALONG THE LINES THAT WERE RECOMMENDED AT THE SEMINAR YOU WENT TO?

BASICALLY, YES.

AND JUST IN GENERAL, WHAT WERE THE PROCEDURES THAT WERE RECOMMENDED FOR FUND RAISING AT THE SEMINAR WHICH CHURCH UNIVERSAL USED IN ITS FUND RAISING?

WELL, THE OVERRIDING MESSAGE WHICH THEY COMMUNICATED WHICH THEY GAVE TO US IS THAT IF YOU ARE GOING TO DO SUCCESSFUL FUND RAISING, YOU NEED TO COMMUNICATE YOUR. MISSION WELL TO YOUR MEMBERSHIP, TO BE SURE THAT THEY UNDERSTAND WHAT IT IS THAT YOU ARE STRIVING TO DO AND TO FURTHERMORE MAKE THEM AWARE OF YOUR NEED OF WHAT YOU NEED FINANCIALLY IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH THAT MISSION. AND THAT THE MORE THOROUGHLY YOU COULD BE IN YOUR COMMUNICATION, THE MORE SUCCESSFUL YOU WOULD BE.

ONE OF THE OTHER THINGS THEY DID TELL US, THAT IT WAS GOOD WHEN WE HAVE -- THEY ALSO TAUGHT US THAT STATISTICALLY IN EVERY FUND RAISING DRIVE FOR WHAT THEY CALL CAPITAL FUND RAISING, INEVITABLY IT ALWAYS WAS A CASE OF WHERE THE LARGE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM MAYBE 10 OR 15 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL DONOR BASE WOULD ACCOUNT FOR THE VAST MAJORITY OF THE TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS. IN OTHER WORDS, THAT DEALING WITH

1	INDIVIDUALS WAS A VERY REAL PART OF THAT FUND RAISING		
2	EFFORT.		
3	Q AT THE SEMINAR, DID THEY TEACH YOU ANYTHING		
4	ABOUT KEEPING FILES ON CONTRIBUTORS AND POTENTIAL		
5	CONTRIBUTORS?		
6	A YES. THEY RECOMMENDED THAT WE KEEP SUCH		
7	RECORDS ON PEOPLE THAT WE FELT WOULD BE POTENTIAL DONORS.		
8	Q AND DID THE CHURCH DO THAT?		
9	A YES, WE DID.		
10	Q WHAT WAS THE PRIMARY SOURCE OF INFORMATION FOR		
11	YOUR FILES ON CONTRIBUTORS AND POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTORS?		
12	A WE USED THE DONATION RECORDS THAT WE HAD OF		
13	PEOPLE WHO WERE ALREADY IN THE ORGANIZATION AS WELL AS		
14	WHATEVER RECORD WE HAD OF WHAT PUBLICATIONS THEY PURCHASED		
15	WITH THE CHURCH.		
16	MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU.		
17	I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR.		
18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. PLEASE PROCEED.		
19	MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.		
20			
21	CROSS-EXAMINATION +		
22	BY MR. LEVY:		
23	Q MR. SHEARER, DO I UNDERSTAND CORRECTLY YOU ARE		
24	NOT A EXCUSE ME, I DON'T WANT TO INTERRUPT YOU.		
25	DO I UNDERSTAND CORRECTLY NOW AT THIS TIME YOU		
26	ARE NO LONGER A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH?		
27	A THAT'S CORRECT.		
28	Q WHEN DID YOU FIRST BECOME INVOLVED WITH THE		

1	CHUR CH?	
2	А	PROBABLY AROUND 1967, '68.
3	Q	COULD I ASK YOU WHAT YOUR AGE IS NOW?
4	А	THIRTY-EIGHT.
5	Q	MAYBE YOU CAN HELP ME WITH MY MATHEMATICS. HOW
6	OLD WERE YOU	AT THE TIME IN 1967 OR '68?
7	A	ABOUT 20 YEARS OLD.
8	Q	NOW, WHERE WAS THE CHURCH LOCATED WHEN YOU
9	FIRST BECAME	INVOLVED?
10	A	COLORADO SPRINGS.
11	Q	DID THE CHURCH HAVE A PROPERTY IN SANTA BARBARA
12	AT THAT TIME	?
13	A	NO.
14	Q	DID THEY ACQUIRE ONE SHORTLY THEREAFTER?
15	A	YES, THEY DID.
16	Q	AND WHEN DID THEY ACQUIRE THE PROPERTY IN SANTA
17	BARBARA?	
18	A	MID 1969 I BELIEVE.
19	Q	AND IN MID 1969, WHAT WAS YOUR JOB WITH THE
20	CHURCH?	
21	A	I WAS IN CHARGE OF THE PREMISES IN SANTA
22	BARBARA AND	ALSO IN CHARGE OF THE REHABILITATION OF THE
23	PROPERTY, WHA	AT WE CALLED THE MOTHERHOUSE AT THAT TIME.
24	Q	WERE YOU WORKING THERE WHEN YOU GOT YOUR DRAFT
25	NOTICE?	
26	A	NO.
.27	Q	MR. SHEARER, IS IT NOT A FACT THAT WHEN YOU GOT
28	YOUR DRAFT NO	OTICE, YOU HAD NO EXEMPTION AND MR. MARK PROPHET

.27

28

ARRANGED FOR YOU TO BECOME A MINISTER SO YOU WOULDN'T HAVE

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO --

THE WITNESS: NO. I HAD A 2-S EXEMPTION AND THEY WERE PROPOSING THAT IT BE CHANGED FROM A 2-S AS A STUDENT EXEMPTION. AND WHILE I WAS STILL A STUDENT EXEMPTION, I WAS APPLYING FOR IT TO BE CHANGED TO A MINISTERIAL EXEMPTION,

BY MR. LEVY: WAS IT NOT MR. MARK PROPHET WHO AT THAT TIME DECIDED TO ANOINT YOU AS A MINISTER IN THE CHURCH TO ASSIST YOU WITH GETTING YOUR DRAFT EXEMPTION?

I WAS ORDAINED, BUT THAT WAS NOT THE REASON I

- WAS IT MARK PROPHET WHO ORDAINED YOU?
- NOW, YOU'VE TOLD US ABOUT A RATHER ILLUSTRIOUS CAREER WITH THE CHURCH. YOU WERE AN ARCHBISHOP OF THE
 - ARCHBISHOP OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.
 - AND WHEN DID YOU BECOME ARCHBISHOP?
 - I BELIEVE IT WAS AROUND 1975.
- LET'S SEE. YOU WOULD HAVE BEEN ALL OF ABOUT 25 OR 26 WHEN YOU BECAME ARCHBISHOP OF THE CHURCH; IS THAT
 - THAT'S CORRECT.
- AT THAT TIME, WERE YOU ALSO VICE PRESIDENT OF THE CHURCH?

1	A YES.
2	Q AND YOU WERE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF
3	DIRECTORS?
4	A YES.
5	Q WHAT YEAR WAS IT THAT YOU DECIDED TO MOVE ON TO
б	BIGGER AND BETTER THINGS AND LEAVE THE CHURCH?
7	A 1981.
8	Q IF I ADDED CORRECTLY, THAT IS AN ASSOCIATION OF
9	SOME 14 YEARS WITH THE CHURCH?
10	A YES. TWELVE YEARS ON THE STAFF AND A YEAR AND
11	A HALF OR TWO YEARS BEFORE THAT.
12	Q THAT IS ROUGHLY HALF OF YOUR LIFE AT THAT TIME
13	YOU WERE ASSOCIATED WITH THE CHURCH.
14	WERE THERE NO FURTHER GOALS IN THE CHURCH FOR
15	YOU TO PURSUE OR WAS THE TOP SPOT ALREADY TAKEN?
16	A THE TOP SPOT WAS TAKEN.
17	Q THE TEACHINGS THAT GO ON AT YOUR CHURCH, AND I
18	WILL REFER TO IT AS YOUR CHURCH BECAUSE YOU ARE COMING HERE
19	AND TESTIFYING TODAY FOR THE CHURCH.
20	MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO THAT
21	CHARACTER IZATION.
22	THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU START THE QUESTION OVER.
23	Q BY MR. LEVY: THE TEACHINGS AT THE CHURCH, WHO
24	DETERMINES WHAT THE PARAMETERS OF THE TEACHINGS WILL BE
25	OTHER THAN ELIZABETH?
26	A THE PARAMETERS OF THE TEACHINGS? I DON'T KNOW
27	WHAT YOU MEAN BY "THE PARAMETERS."
28	Q OH, COME ON. YOU HAVE GOT A COLLEGE EDUCATION

GROUPS ALL AROUND THE UNITED STATES. WELL, NOT WHEN IT FIRST STARTED, OBVIOUSLY. BUT IT DID HOLD CONFERENCES.

Q ARE YOU AWARE THAT IN ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET'S DEPOSITION WHEN SHE DESCRIBED SUMMIT LIGHTHOUSE AT ITS INCEPTION, SHE SAID THAT THE BULK OF WHAT WAS DONE WAS DONE THROUGH THE MAILS AND ON OCCASION MR. PROPHET WOULD HAVE MEETINGS WITH PEOPLE WHO ASKED FOR AN AUDIENCE WITH HIM?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO THAT CHARACTERIZATION OF THE TESTIMONY FROM THE DEPOSITION. IT IS A MISCHARACTERIZATION.

THE COURT: I HAVEN'T READ THAT PORTION OF THE DEPOSITION SO I AM NOT IN A POSITION RIGHT NOW TO AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EITHER OF YOU.

DO YOU WANT TO PULL OUT THE DEPOSITION AND READ THAT PORTION, MR. LEVY?

MR. LEVY: I WILL DO THAT AT A LATER TIME WHEN MISS PROPHET IS BACK ON THE STAND.

Q LET ME ASK YOU ANOTHER QUESTION, MR. SHEARER.

IF ELIZABETH GAVE YOU INFORMATION THAT

PURPORTED TO COME FROM THE ASCENDED MASTERS, AS SHE DOES AT

SO MANY OF THE CHURCH SERVICES, WOULD YOU PERSONALLY HAVE

ANY WAY OF VERIFYING WHATEVER THE MESSAGE WAS FROM WHICHEVER

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, OBJECT ON FREEDOM OF RELIGION GROUNDS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

ASCENDED MASTER IT CAME?

THE WITNESS: I BELIEVE THE SAME THING THAT WAS TAUGHT IN THE BIBLE WHEN --

.27

A I BELIEVE THAT THE ASCENDED MASTERS HAVE CHOSEN TO EXPRESS THEIR — THEIR INSTRUCTION TO MANKIND THROUGH HER. BUT I DIDN'T SAY THAT ON THE FACE OF THE ENTIRE EARTH THAT SHE WAS THE ONLY ONE.

Q THERE MAY BE A COUPLE OF OTHERS HIDING OUT SOMEWHERE?

A I DON'T KNOW.

Q AFTER 14 YEARS WITH THE CHURCH AND ACHIEVING
THE EXALTED POSITIONS THAT YOU DID, WAS THERE ANYTHING THAT
OCCURRED AT THE CHURCH THAT MADE YOU BELIEVE THERE MIGHT BE
GREENER PASTURES ON THE OUTSIDE?

A NO.

Q WHAT I AM TRYING TO DO, SIR, IS HAVE YOU HELP

ME UNDERSTAND WHY AFTER AN ASSOCIATION OF SOME 14 OR 15

YEARS, WHY YOU WERE -- WHERE YOU BECAME ONE OF THE

CONTROLLING PEOPLE WITHIN THAT ORGANIZATION, WHY YOU CHOSE

TO JUST THROW IT ALL ASIDE TO GO OUT THERE TO GET INTO THE

COMMERCIAL FIELD AND JUST START EARNING A LIVING LIKE

EVERYBODY ELSE?

A 1, LIKE A LOT OF OTHER PEOPLE, MADE A CAREER CHANGE.

Q YOU MEAN KIND OF LIKE IN ROME THE POPE COULD JUST ONE DAY SAY, "I THINK I WILL BE A FOOTBALL PLAYER. I THINK I WILL JUST GIVE IT UP"?

MR. KLEIN: OBJECT AS ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR.
THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

Q BY MR. LEVY: DID ANYTHING OCCUR AT THE CHURCH THAT CAUSED YOU TO LEAVE THE CHURCH WHEN YOU DID?

TRIUMPHANT THAT TOLD US THAT THE PEOPLE IN CHARGE OF THE CHURCH WERE CALLED HIERARCHS?

- A NO, I AM NOT AWARE OF THAT.
- Q ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT NO ONE IN THE CHURCH OR ON THE CHURCH PREMISES WAS EVER REFERRED TO AS A HIERARCH WITH REGARD TO THE PEOPLE WHO FUNCTIONED UNDERNEATH THEM?

A I CAN T MAKE SUCH A CATEGORICAL STATEMENT AS YOU JUST SAID.

Q IF I WERE TO TELL YOU THAT ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET, IN HER TESTIMONY AT HER DEPOSITION, EXPLAINED TO US WHO AND WHAT HIERARCHS WERE AND IT WAS DIFFERENT FROM YOUR DESCRIPTION RIGHT NOW, IN YOUR OPINION WHO WOULD BE RIGHT? YOU OR HER?

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT SINCE HE DOESN'T EVEN KNOW WHAT ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET SAID. IT JUST CALLS FOR SPECULATION.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

- Q BY MR. LEVY: WERE YOU IN CHARGE OF THE DEPARTMENT WHERE GREGORY MULL WORKED?
 - A YES.
 - Q WAS ED FRANCIS THE CODEPARTMENT HEAD?
- A BASICALLY ON PROJECTS EDWARD WAS CODEPARTMENT HEAD.
- Q DID MR. MULL HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO CHOOSE WHATEVER PROJECTS HE WOULD WORK ON?
 - A NO.
- Q THE PROJECTS THAT HE WORKED ON WERE DIRECTED BY EITHER YOU OR ED FRANCIS?

Q BY MR. LEVY: ISN'T IT A FACT THAT RANDALL KING, ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET WERE USING CHURCH MONEY FOR THEIR PRIVATE INVESTMENTS, AND THE I.R.S. GOT INVOLVED, AND CLAYTON BROKERAGE GOT INVOLVED, AND YOUR ATTORNEY TOLD YOU AT THE TIME THAT YOU COULDN'T STRADDLE THE FENCE, THAT YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO GO ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, SETTLE THE CLAYTON BROKERAGE CASE OR THE I.R.S. WILL TAKE AWAY YOUR TAX-EXEMPT STATUS?

MR. KLEIN: ONCE AGAIN, YOUR HONOR, IT IS A COMPOUND QUESTION AND I WOULD ALSO OBJECT PURSUANT TO 787 OF THE EVIDENCE CODE.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

Q BY MR. LEVY: TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, WAS ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET AND RANDALL KING USING CHURCH FUNDS FOR THEIR PRIVATE INVESTMENTS?

A NO, NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE. I WAS NOT A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SUMMIT LIGHTHOUSE AT ANY POINT.

Q NO. BUT YOU WERE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT?

A SUBSEQUENT TO THAT TIME.

Q DID YOU TESTIFY -- DID YOU GIVE A DEPOSITION IN THE CLAYTON BROKERAGE CASE?

A NO.

Q DID YOU TESTIFY OR GIVE A DEPOSITION IN THE CLARE DU BOIS CASE?

A NO.

Q CAN YOU TELL THE COURT BRIEFLY THE CHURCH'S

INVOLVEMENT, WHILE YOU WERE A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH, WITH THE CLARE DU BOIS CASE?

MR. KLEIN: ONCE AGAIN I WOULD OBJECT PURSUANT TO 787
OF THE EVIDENCE CODE AND RELEVANCY TO THIS CASE.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

MR. LEVY: MAY WE APPROACH THE BENCH, YOUR HONOR?
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD AT THE BENCH:)

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE RELEVANCY TO MR. MULL'S CASE?

MR. LEVY: THIS MAN IS A DEFENDANT IN THE CHURCH.

THIS MAN IS A DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE. IT IS INTENDED FOR

IMPEACHMENT. HE HAS TESTIFIED THAT THEY HAVE NEVER DONE

THIS AND THEY HAVE NEVER DONE THAT.

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THIS OTHER CASE
THAT YOU REFERRED TO?

MR. LEVY: THE STATUS OF THE OTHER CASE IS THAT THE CHURCH PAID THIS WOMAN BACK SOME OF HER MONEY TO TERMINATE THOSE PROCEEDINGS. THIS MAN WAS INVOLVED --

THE COURT: PLEASE ANSWER MY QUESTION.

MR. LEVY: MAYBE I DON'T UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION.

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE OTHER CASE TO WHICH YOU JUST REFERRED? IS IT PENDING, HAS IT BEEN SETTLED --

MR. LEVY: IT HAS BEEN SETTLED, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: IT WAS SETTLED WITHOUT --

MR. LEVY: WITHOUT A COMPLETION OF THE TRIAL. PAPERS
WERE FILED --

0 HE WAS ASKED TO COME THERE FOR WHAT PURPOSE? TO WORK ON THE MONTESSORI BUILDINGS, TO WORK ON THE WILL OF GOD FOCUS AND THE OTHER RENOVATIONS THAT WE HAD NOW, LET ME SEE IF I UNDERSTAND THIS CORRECTLY. MR. MULL WAS ASKED TO COME THERE AND DO SOME WORK ON THE EXISTING BUILDINGS. AND IN ORDER TO DO THIS, HE WAS SUPPOSED TO GIVE UP HIS BUSINESS IN SAN FRANCISCO, SELL HIS HOME, FOREGO ANY EARNINGS AND JUST COME TO THE CHURCH TO WORK ON THE RENOVATION OF THE EXISTING BUILDINGS: IS THAT MR. KLEIN: OBJECTION. COMPOUND QUESTION, YOUR THE WITNESS: YOU MENTIONED SO MANY THINGS I CAN'T REMEMBER ALL OF THEM. I MEAN YOU MENTIONED ABOUT FOUR OR FIVE THINGS. I WOULD BE HAPPY TO REFER TO THEM. FIRST THING YOU ASKED ME IS WAS HE ASKED TO SELL HIS HOME OR THAT WAS ONE OF THE THINGS. HE WAS NOT ASKED TO SELL HIS HOME. HE INFORMED ME THAT HE WAS YOU ASKED ME IF HE WAS ASKED TO CLOSE DOWN HIS BUSINESS. HE WAS TOLD AFTER HE ARRIVED THAT HE WOULD HAVE TO BE PREPARED TO KEEP HIS BUSINESS GOING TO SUPPORT HIMSELF FINANCIALLY EITHER IN SAN FRANCISCO OR IN THE AREA OF I CAN'T REMEMBER THE OTHER PARTS OF WHAT YOU

. 27

HE HAD EXISTING CLIENTS THAT OWED HIM CERTAIN SUMS OF MONEY AS WELL AS CURRENT PROJECTS THAT HE WOULD BE OBLIGED TO KEEP GOING. AND THAT THOSE THINGS WOULD GO A LONG WAY TOWARDS MEETING HIS EXPENSES.

WE DISCUSSED THE TIME FRAME AGAIN, AND WE BOTH AGREED THAT WE'D LIKE HIM TO COME SOONER THAN LATER AND HE'D LIKE TO COME. SO HE SUGGESTED THAT SINCE HE WAS PLANNING TO SELL HIS HOUSE, IF HE DID COME AND IF INDEED HIS EXPENSES WERE NOT MET BY THE THINGS I JUST MENTIONED, THAT PERHAPS THE CHURCH COULD LOAN HIM THE FUNDS TO MAKE UP THE DIFFERENCE AND HE WOULD REPAY THE CHURCH UPON THE SALE OF HIS HOUSE.

AND FOR -- WE OFFERED -- I TOLD HIM THAT I

COULDN'T COMMENT ON THAT. I WAS -- THAT CONVERSATION WAS TO

GATHER THE FACTS ABOUT WHAT HIS CIRCUMSTANCES WERE AND TO

REPORT BACK TO THE BOARD. BUT THAT WE WOULD BE WILLING TO

PAY HIS ROOM AND BOARD AS WELL AS HIS TRANSPORTATION, HIS

AIR FARE AND SO FORTH BACK AND FORTH TO SAN FRANCISCO SO HE

COULD KEEP THOSE OTHER JOBS GOING.

Q WHAT ABOUT HIS EXPENSES ON HIS PROPERTY AND HIS HOME AND HIS BUSINESS BACK IN SAN FRANCISCO? WAS THAT GOING TO BE PART OF WHAT YOU WERE GOING TO PAY?

A WELL, HE JUST -- WHATEVER HIS PERSONAL EXPENSES WERE.

Q DID THAT INCLUDE THE NOTE ON HIS HOME IN SAN FRANCISCO AND HIS ONGOING EXPENSES THERE?

A YES.

Q SO IF I UNDERSTAND CORRECTLY, YOU SAID, "THE

CHURCH WILL PAY YOUR EXPENSES FOR ALL OF YOUR ONGOING EXPENSES BACK IN SAN FRANCISCO, WE WILL SUPPLY YOU WITH ROOM AND BOARD, WE WILL PAY FOR YOUR TRANSPORTATION BACK AND FORTH TO SAN FRANCISCO."

NOW, WAS THE CHURCH GOING TO PAY FOR HIS TRANSPORTATION BACK AND FORTH FOREVER?

A FOREVER IS A LONG TIME.

Q WELL, YOU WERE THE ONE WHO MADE THE DEAL WITH HIM. HOW LONG WERE THEY GOING TO PAY HIS EXPENSES TO GO BACK AND FORTH TO SAN FRANCISCO?

A DURING THE PERIOD OF TIME THAT HE WAS WORKING ON STAFF, VOLUNTARY STAFF FOR US.

Q SO HE WAS GOING. TO GIVE UP EVERYTHING HE HAD IN SAN FRANCISCO AND YOU WOULD PAY HIS TRANSPORTATION BACK DURING THE TIME THAT HE JUST VOLUNTEERED TO COME DOWN AND DO THE WORK FOR YOU; IS THAT CORRECT?

MR. KLEIN: OBJECT. THAT MISCHARACTERIZES WHAT HE SAID.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

THE WITNESS: NO, HE WAS NOT GOING TO GIVE UP EVERYTHING HE HAD.

Q BY MR. LEVY: HOW LONG DID YOU ANTICIPATE THAT MR. MULL WAS GOING TO COME DOWN TO THE CHURCH AND WORK ON THE RENOVATION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS?

- A PERIOD OF MONTHS, A PERIOD OF MONTHS.
- Q SO HE WAS ONLY GOING TO BE THERE FOR A PERIOD OF MONTHS. ABOUT HOW LONG WAS THAT PERIOD OF MONTHS GOING TO BE? ONE, TWO, SEVEN, FORTY-FIVE, EIGHTY-SIX? DO YOU

ON A SPIRITUAL PLACE.

WAS HE SUPPOSED TO CONJURE THIS UP IN HIS HEAD OR WAS HE SUPPOSED TO PUT IT DOWN ON PAPER?

A I SAID HE WAS SUPPOSED TO COME DOWN AND WORK ON THE MONTESSORI BUILDINGS, SUPPOSED TO COME DOWN AND WORK ON THE WILL OF GOD FOCUS, SUPPOSED TO COME DOWN AND HELP US WITH THE RENOVATIONS AT CAMELOT. THAT IS WHAT I SAID.

Q FOR HOW MANY --

THE COURT: THE NEW JERUSALEM, IS THERE A PLACE WHERE
A PERSON COULD GO TO THAT WOULD BE THE NEW JERUSALEM? IS
THAT THE IDEA?

THE WITNESS: NO, THAT WAS NOT THE IDEA.

THE COURT: SO THERE WAS NO SPECIFIC LOCATION THAT YOU, FOR EXAMPLE, MR. SHEARER, MIGHT GO TO WHICH WOULD BE THE LOCATION FOR THE NEW JERUSALEM?

THE WITNESS: WELL, AS I EXPLAINED EARLIER, I WAS ARCHBISHOP OF THE NEW JERUSALEM. AND MY UNDERSTANDING OF THAT OFFICE WAS THAT IT WAS BEING RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL OF OUR MEMBERS WHO LIVED IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES AREA.

THE COURT: BUT WAS IT A PHYSICAL PLACE?

THE WITNESS: NO.

THE COURT: OKAY. THAT IS ALL I WANTED TO KNOW. IT WASN'T AN AREA.

THE WITNESS: WASN'T A PLACE THAT HAD AN ADDRESS THAT YOU COULD MAIL A LETTER TO.

THE COURT: OKAY. THAT HELPS.

IS THIS A CONVENIENT TIME TO TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS?

MR. LEVY: YES, IT IS.

(RECESS.)

THE COURT: PLEASE PROCEED.

MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

Q JUST BEFORE THE BREAK, MR. SHEARER, WE WERE TALKING ABOUT THE NEW JERUSALEM. IF I RECALL CORRECTLY, YOU SAID IT WAS A MYSTICAL PLACE, IT WAS NOT AN ACTUAL LOCATION THAT YOU COULD SEND A LETTER TO?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

Q IN YOUR TEACHINGS -- WHEN I SAY "YOU," I AM

REFERRING TO THE CHURCH'S TEACHINGS -- WAS THERE EVER A PLAN

TO DEVELOP A NEW JERUSALEM AT CAMELOT?

A NO.

Q DID YOU RAISE THE MONEY TO DO THE DEVELOPMENTAL PLAN OF THE ARCHITECTURAL FIRM THAT YOU TOLD US ABOUT? DID YOU RAISE MONEY FOR PURPOSES OF BUILDING CAMELOT IN TERMS OF WHAT THAT ARCHITECTURAL FIRM LAID OUT FOR YOU?

A WE RAISED MONEY AND WE USED THEIR DRAWINGS AS A CONCEPT OF HOW THE PREMISES MIGHT LOOK.

Q WAS THE IMMEDIATE GOAL THAT OF RAISING \$7
MILLION FOR CAMELOT SO THAT YOU COULD GET ON WITH THE
BUILDING PROJECT THERE?

A WELL, AS I RECALL, A GOOD PORTION OF THAT MONEY
WAS TO PURCHASE THE PROPERTY. AND WHATEVER EXCESS MONIES
WERE LEFT OVER AFTER WE HAD PURCHASED IT WOULD BE USED
TOWARDS CONSTRUCTION, REMOVATION.

Q TRY TO HELP ME TO UNDERSTAND IF YOU WILL. YOU TOLD THE PEOPLE YOU WERE GOING TO DEVELOP A NEW CAMELOT

BROCHURE?

THERE WAS NO CATEGORICAL DENIAL ON THE PART OF THE COASTAL COMMISSION, NO.

YOUR TESTIMONY NOW IS CONTRARY TO WHAT ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET TOLD US WHEN SHE WAS ON THE STAND?

IT IS --

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. THAT MISCHARACTERIZES THE TESTIMONY.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

THE WITNESS: MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WE DISCOVERED THAT WE MIGHT BE UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE COASTAL COMMISSION. WE DEFINITELY TALKED TO VARIOUS PEOPLE ABOUT THE FACT THAT THERE ARE THINGS YOU CAN DO WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THAT, BEING IN THE COASTAL COMMISSION.

AS A MATTER OF FACT, THERE WERE SEVERAL PEOPLE IN THE AREA WHO WERE GETTING UP GROUPS TO ARGUE THAT IN FACT THE -- WHERE THEY HAD DRAWN THE LINE FOR THE COASTAL COMMISSION WAS IMPROPERLY DRAWN AND THERE WERE DEFINITELY TWO SIDES TO THE WHOLE QUESTION.

IT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE THE FIRST RIDGE TOP FROM THE OCEAN AND INSTEAD THEY WERE EXTENDING IT SIX MILES INLAND. SO THERE WERE DEFINITELY ARGUMENTS TO THE CONTRARY, THAT IT WAS NOT A PART OF THE COASTAL COMMISSION IN THE FIRST PLACE.

BY MR. LEVY: I REMEMBER SPECIFICALLY WHAT YOU Q TESTIFIED TO THIS MORNING ABOUT YOUR CONVERSATIONS WITH GREGORY MULL.

WHY WAS IT THAT YOU DID NOT TELL HIM IN THOSE

27

23

24

25

26

28

SHEARER?

CONVERSATIONS THAT WERE FOR HIM TO MAKE A DETERMINATION AS
TO WHETHER HE WANTED TO GO THERE AND HELP REFURBISH
BUILDINGS, WHY DID YOU NOT TELL HIM THAT THERE WAS A PROBLEM
OR MAY BE A PROBLEM WITH THE COASTAL COMMISSION AND MAYBE
NOTHING NEW COULD BE BUILT THERE?

A BECAUSE I DIDN'T BELIEVE THAT NOTHING NEW COULD BE BUILT THERE.

Q YOU DIDN'T FEEL IT WAS FAIR TO DISCUSS WITH A MAN WHO MIGHT BE GIVING UP HIS BUSINESS OR SELLING HIS HOME OR COMING TO CAMELOT AT AN ENORMOUS EMOTIONAL, FINANCIAL COST, YOU DIDN'T FEEL IT WAS FAIR TO DISCUSS THAT WITH HIM, DID YOU?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD OBJECT. ASSUMES FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

THE WITNESS: I HAVE STATED THAT WE WOULD FINALIZE
THE ARRANGEMENTS WHEN GREGORY GOT TO THE PROPERTY. AND I
DON'T SEE HOW HE COULD HAVE CONSTRUED PREVIOUS TO THAT TIME
TO SELL HIS BUSINESS, ET CETERA, ALL THE OTHER THINGS THAT
YOU SAID.

Q BY MR. LEVY: YOU DON'T SEE HOW HE COULD DO THAT. WHAT ABOUT I WILL SELL YOU MY CAR, BUT I AM GOING TO TAKE THE ENGINE OUT, BUT I AM NOT GOING TO TELL YOU ABOUT IT, AFTER YOU GIVE ME THE MONEY, THEN WE WILL TALK ABOUT THE ENGINE.

ISN'T THAT SOMEWHAT THE SAME THING, MR.

A NO, NOT AT ALL.

WAS TIME NOW TO PUT HIS HOUSE UP FOR SALE AND TO GET IT DONE

28

4 5

RIGHT NOW?

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT. IT MISCHARACTERIZES THE TESTIMONY, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: AS I RECALL, THAT WAS TRANSMITTED

THROUGH ME IN A MEMO THAT I TOLD HIM -- THAT I GAVE TO HIM

IN THE CONTEXT THAT IF WE WERE GOING TO LOAN HIM ANY MONEY

WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT HE REPAID IT ON THE SALE OF HIS

HOUSE, THAT THAT ARRANGEMENT WOULD BE AGREED TO US IF HE

WOULD -- IF HE WANTED TO PUT HIS HOUSE ON THE MARKET

IMMEDIATELY. IF HE DIDN'T WANT TO DO THAT, WE WERE NOT IN A

POSITION TO KEEP LOANING HIM MONEY.

Q BY MR. LEVY: HE WAS GOING TO BE THERE A MATTER OF MONTHS. HE WAS GOING TO WORK ON HIS QUONSET HUTS. AND IN ORDER TO DO THIS FOR THIS SEVERAL MONTH PERIOD, YOU SENT HIM A MEMO TELLING HIM THAT HE HAD OR SHOULD PUT HIS HOUSE UP FOR SALE TO TAKE CARE OF THE LOAN FOR SOME SEVERAL MONTHS; IS THAT CORRECT?

A YES. ONE OF THE LETTERS GREGORY SENT US, HE SAID THAT HE HAD BEEN PLANNING TO SELL HIS HOUSE FOR MONTHS BEFORE HE EVER -- BEFORE I EVER CALLED HIM. SO IT WAS ONLY A QUESTION OF THE TIMING.

Q IS THE MONTESSORI SCHOOL COMPLETE AT THE PRESENT TIME?

A I HAVEN'T BEEN THERE FOR FOUR YEARS. BUT WHEN

I LEFT, WE HAD NOT COMPLETED A NEW STRUCTURE CALLED

MONTESSORI SCHOOL.

Q WHEN DID YOU LEAVE?

1	A IN 1981.
2	Q AFTER GREGORY LEFT?
3	
	A YES.
4	Q WAS NOT YOUR AGREEMENT THEN THAT YOU WERE
5	SUPPOSED TO SUPPORT HIM UNTIL HE COMPLETED AT LEAST THE
6	MONTESSORI SCHOOL?
7	A I SAID UNTIL OUR WORK WAS DONE ON IT WITH THE
8	MONTESSORI.
9	Q OH. AND ARE YOU AN ARCHITECT AND YOU KNOW WHEN
10	THE WORK IS DONE ON THE MONTESSORI? DO YOU HAVE ANY
11	ARCHITECTURAL TRAINING?
12	A NO, I DON'T HAVE ARCHITECTURAL TRAINING.
13	Q AND YOU WERE GOING TO MAKE THE DECISION AS TO
14	WHEN IT WOULD BE TIME FOR GREGORY TO LEAVE WHEN YOU WERE ALL
15	DONE?
16	A WHEN THE CHURCH'S WORK ON THAT PROJECT WAS
17	COMPLETED, WHATEVER THAT WORK MIGHT BE, THAT WAS THE LENGTH
18	OF TIME THAT WE WERE OFFERING TO HIM AS THE DEGREE OF OUR
19	COMMITMENT TO HIM. IF HE DID NOT LIKE THAT ARRANGEMENT, HE
20	WAS FREE TO DO WHATEVER HE WANTED TO DO.
21	Q IN 1970
22	A HE DIDN'T HAVE TO ACCEPT IT.
23	Q GREGORY MULL WENT THROUGH SUMMIT UNIVERSITY?
24	A I AM SORRY, DID YOU SAY 1980?
25	Q I SAID DID GREGORY MULL, TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, GO
26	THROUGH SUMMIT UNIVERSITY?
.27	A YES.
28	Q WAS GREGORY MULL ASKED TO BECOME PERMANENT

1	STAFF?
2	A THE TOPIC CAME UP WITH HIM, YES.
3	Q THE TOPIC CAME UP.
4	DID IT JUST BOB UP BY ITSELF OR WERE YOU THE
5	ONE WHO BROUGHT THE TOPIC UP WITH HIM?
б	A I DON'T I DON'T RECALL BRINGING UP THE
7	TOPIC.
8	Q DID MR. MULL SAY, "CAN I BECOME PERMANENT STAF
9	SO I CAN GIVE ALL OF MY REAL PROPERTY AND PERSONAL PROPERTY
10	TO THE CHURCH?" IS THAT THE WAY IT HAPPENED?
11	A WHAT I RECALL IS A CONVERSATION WITH GREGORY
12	ABOUT WHAT IT MEANT TO BE A PERMANENT STAFF MEMBER.
13	Q WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE A PERMANENT STAFF
14	MEMBER?
15	A IT MEANS TO GIVE YOUR ALL TO THE CHURCH BECAUSE
16	YOU BELIEVE IN IT WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE CHURCH IS
17	LIKEWISE COMMITTING ITSELF TO YOU.
18	Q IN YOUR OPINION, DID
19	A AND
20	Q GREGORY MULL BELIEVE IN THE CHURCH?
21	A YES.
22	Q YOU CALLED, HE CAME, RIGHT?
23	A YES.
24	Q IF HE BELIEVED TO THAT EXTENT, DO YOU, AS ONE
25	OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN THE CHURCH AND ONE OF THE
26	DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE, BELIEVE THAT YOU HAD AN OBLIGATION
.27	TO DISCLOSE TO HIM ALL OF THE PERMANENT FACTORS AND
28	CONSIDERATIONS PRIOR TO HIM CLOSING DOWN HIS RUSINESS AND

GIVING UP HIS CAREER IN SAN FRANCISCO AND COMING TO CAMELOT?

A I AM SORRY, MR. LEVY, I WAS TRYING TO PAY VERY CLOSE ATTENTION TO YOUR QUESTION. BY THE TIME YOU FINISHED, I REALLY DON'T REMEMBER THE FIRST PART OF THE QUESTION.

Q LET ME TRY AGAIN. GREGORY MULL WAS A TRUE BELIEVER IN YOUR CHURCH, WAS HE NOT?

A YES.

Q DO YOU BELIEVE, AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND AS THE ARCHBISHOP OF THE CHURCH, THAT IT WOULD HAVE BEEN EQUITABLE IF THE CHURCH HAD DISCLOSED TO MR. MULL ALL OF THE CONSIDERATIONS PRIOR TO ASKING HIM TO COME TO CAMELOT AND BE THE ARCHITECT THERE?

A YOU HAVE TO OPEN NEGOTIATIONS, YOU HAVE TO OPEN THE DISCUSSIONS SOMEWHERE. I HAVE STATED THAT THE DECISION WAS POSTPONED UNTIL HIS ARRIVAL SO WE COULD DISCUSS THINGS IN PERSON. AND THOSE DISCLOSURES WERE MADE BEFORE THE FINAL DECISION WAS MADE. IT WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN RIGHT TO SETTLE THE WHOLE THING LONG DISTANCE IN ONE OR TWO PHONE CALLS.

Q DID MR. MULL WRITE THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS A

LETTER IN FEBRUARY OF 1979, ABOUT A MONTH AND A WEEK AFTER

HE CAME TO CAMELOT, DID HE WRITE YOU A LETTER --- I AM

SHOWING THE WITNESS EXHIBIT NUMBER 28.

DID HE WRITE YOU A LETTER AND SET OUT ALL OF
THE FACTS AND ALL OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES AND ALL OF THE
CONSIDERATIONS THAT HE UNDERSTOOD TO BE THE STATE OF AFFAIRS
BEFORE HE COULD ENTER INTO ANY PERMANENT AGREEMENT WITH YOU?

YOU'VE SEEN THE LETTER, HAVE YOU NOT?

A I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE UNDERSTOOD. HE DID WRITE

I DIDN'T PREPARE THOSE CHECKS.

28

AND ON THE BOTTOM OF THE DOCUMENT, IT DISCUSSES

28

Q

SOME OF THE THINGS THAT THE CHURCH WILL HAVE TO DO AND WHAT IT DISCUSSES IS IN RESPONSE TO A PRIOR CONVERSATION, ISN'T

GO AHEAD AND READ THE LETTER, MR. SHEARER. IT IS ADDRESSED TO YOU.

IS IT STILL YOUR TESTIMONY AT THIS POINT THAT
THERE WAS NO PRIOR COMMUNICATIONS OR NO DISCUSSION WITH
CHURCH OFFICIALS ABOUT A CATHEDRAL? IT WAS JUST MR. MULL'S
IDEA TO BUILD A CATHEDRAL SOMEWHERE?

A I REMEMBER VERY CLEARLY THE VERY FIRST TIME
THAT THE IDEA OF A CATHEDRAL CAME UP. IT CAME UP AT THE
ASHRAM IN LOS ANGELES WHEN GREGORY PRESENTED US WITH A
PROPOSAL FOR THIS CATHEDRAL AND I REMEMBER AT THE TIME VERY
CLEARLY THAT IT WAS OUT OF THE BLUE.

ABOUT IT. AND WE HAD THE, YOU KNOW, WE WERE NOT IN A POSITION TO COMMENT ON IT WHEN WE FIRST GOT IT.

THE SEQUENCE OF EVENTS AS TO WHEN THIS LETTER CAME IN CONJUNCTION WITH THAT, I DON'T RECALL. BUT I DO REMEMBER THAT THAT PRESENTATION AT THE ASHRAM WAS THE VERY FIRST TIME THAT IT WAS BROUGHT UP.

Q WASN'T IT PART OF YOUR UNDERSTANDING WITH

GREGORY MULL THAT IF HE WOULD COME TO CAMELOT AND WORK

FULL-TIME FOR THE CHURCH, THAT HE WOULD IN FACT DISCONTINUE

HIS PERSONAL BUSINESS IN SAN FRANCISCO?

- A NO, IT WAS NOT.
- Q NO, IT WAS NOT.

JANUARY 23RD, 1979, EXHIBIT NUMBER 24. HERE IS

б

.27

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO MONROE SHEARER.

DID YOU EVER SEE THIS LETTER, MR. SHEARER? J WONDER IF YOU'D BE KIND ENOUGH TO READ THE SECOND PARAGRAPH TO THE COURT.

A (READING.)

MYSELF FREE OF ALL FOLLOW-UP BUSINESS IN SAN FRANCISCO. HAD AN APPLICATION IN FOR A -- I HAD AN APPLICATION IN FOR A SECOND MORTGAGE LOAN WITH MY BANK AND IT WAS TO BE APPROVED AND CONFIRMED EARLY MONDAY MORNING SO I COULD CONSOLIDATE MY BILLS -- IT WOULD HAVE BEEN DEPOSITED IN MY ACCOUNT WITHIN THREE DAYS. IT WAS DENIED BECAUSE THE APPRAISER CAME IN WITH A LOW APPRAISAL. I THEN DROVE 14 MILES TO MY MORTGAGE LOAN COMPANY TO REFINANCE MY HOME WITH THEM -- THEY REQUIRED A PAST INCOME TAX RETURN THAT I HAD TO DRIVE AND GET."

MR. KLEIN: CONSISTENT WITH OUR ENTIRE POLICY, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE ENTIRE LETTER BE READ. WE HAVE DONE THAT ALL ALONG.

THE COURT: WHOSE POLICY, MR. KLEIN?

MR. KLEIN: IT WASN'T MY POLICY, BUT WE HAVE DONE IT, YOUR HONOR. I THINK COUNSEL HAS REQUESTED IT THE WHOLE TIME AND I HAVE READ THE WHOLE LETTER.

MR. LEVY: PLEASE READ THE FIRST PARAGRAPH, TOO.
THE WITNESS: (READING.)

2

3

5

6

7

. B

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

"I WANT YOU TO KNOW HOW

GRATEFUL I AM TO BE HERE. DESIGNS ARE

FLOWING THROUGH ME AND IT IS A CREATIVE JOY.

MY JOB IS TO SURRENDER MY WILL AND GIVE MY

HEART TO SERAPIS BEY, JESUS, PAUL THE

VENETIAN AND ALL CONCERNED WITH CAMELOT.

THEN MY HEAD WILL BE FILLED AND MY HAND WILL

BE BUSY."

MR. KLEIN: THERE IS A LAST PARAGRAPH, ALSO.
THE WITNESS: (READING.)

"IT WILL BE PAID OFF IN THREE WEEKS IF APPROVED. WITH THIS ADDITIONAL BUSINESS I ARRIVED AT CAMELOT AFTER 1:00 A.M. TODAY. IF THIS IS TURNED DOWN I PROBABLY WILL PUT MY HOME ON THE MARKET FOR SALE. I HAVE NOT HAD NEW JOBS SINCE THE BEGINNING OF DECEMBER WHICH WAS THE MASTERS WAY OF FREEING ME FOR CAMELOT. I HAVE A MORTGAGE AND TEMPORARY CAR LOAN PAYMENT AMOUNTING TO \$1,400 WHICH I DON'T HAVE. MY BANK ACCOUNT IS A BALANCE OF \$45. COULD YOU ISSUE ME A CHECK FOR THIS AMOUNT SO I AM COVERED. I MUST MAIL BOTH PAYMENTS FROM CAMELOT TOMORROW. I FEEL IT WAS OPPOSITION THAT I DID NOT GET THE LOAN FROM THE HIBERNIA BANK, BUT THEN I CANNOT FULLY JUDGE WHAT THE ASCENDED MASTERS HAVE IN STORE FOR MY. I AM SORRY TO HAVE TO ASK FOR MONEY AT

1	A FLAT-OUT PAYMENT TO HIM.
2	Q WHAT ABOUT THE ROOM AND BOARD? WAS THAT A
3	FLAT-OUT PAYMENT?
4	A YES. THAT WASN'T MONEY
5	Q WHAT ABOUT HIS EXPENSES IN SAN FRANCISCO? WAS
6	THAT A FLAT-OUT PAYMENT?
7	A NO.
8	Q BUT NO RECORDATION FOR MR. MULL THAT IT WAS A
9	LOAN, NOT IN JANUARY, NOT IN FEBRUARY, NOT IN MARCH, NOT IN
10	APRIL, NOT UNTIL YOU HAD A MEETING IN SEPTEMBER; ISN'T THAT
11	RIGHT?
12	A THE RECORDATION THAT WE FELT WE HAD WAS THE
13	WRITTEN OFFER THAT HE HAD MADE TO US TO REPAY THE MONEY WHEN
14	HIS HOUSE SOLD.
15	Q ON THE LETTER OF FEBRUARY 22ND, LETTER THAT IS
16	RIGHT IN FRONT OF YOU, DOES IT NOT SAY THAT, "THE PROJECT
17	WILL TAKE FOUR YEARS AND IT WILL REQUIRE IN EXCESS OF
18	\$30,000 IF I HAVE THE MONEY ONCE I SELL MY HOUSE"?
19	A YES, IT DOES SAY THAT. AND THAT IS WHY IN OUR
20	MEMO BACK TO HIM WE TOLD HIM THAT WE WERE ONLY MAKING THIS
21	ARRANGEMENT DURING THE DURATION OF THE TIME THAT IT TOOK TO
22	DO THE MONTESSORI BUILDINGS AND ANY OTHER PROJECTS WE HAD IN
23	THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE. THAT IS WHY WE RESPONDED AS WE DID.
24	Q DO YOU RECALL MR. MULL SAYING TO YOU, "I AM 57
25	YEARS OLD AND THIS IS EVERYTHING I'VE GOT IN THE WORLD. IF
26	WE CAN'T MAKE AN ARRANGEMENT, AT 57 YEARS OF AGE, WHAT AM I
27	GOING TO DO WITH THE REST OF MY LIFE?"
28	DO YOU REMEMBER THAT IN HIS LETTER, MR.

SHEARER?

A YES, I DO. AND THAT IS WHY WE TOLD HIM THAT
BEYOND THAT PERIOD OF TIME, HE WOULD HAVE TO BE PREPARED TO
SUPPORT HIMSELF FINANCIALLY EITHER AROUND CAMELOT OR IN THE
SAN FRANCISCO AREA. BECAUSE WE WANTED IT VERY CLEAR TO HIM
THAT HE WOULD HAVE TO — IF HE CHOSE TO VOLUNTEER HIS TIME,
HE WOULD HAVE TO BE PREPARED FOR THAT EVENTUALITY.

Q LET ME READ ONE SENTENCE BECAUSE WE HAVE ALREADY READ THE ENTIRE LETTER, MR. KLEIN. (READING.)

LIVING EXPENSES LIVING ON OR OFF CAMPUS MUST BE AGREED UPON BY YOU BEFORE THE FOREGOING OFFER CAN BE A COMMITMENT."

"THE \$700 PER MONTH SALARY PLUS

\$700 A MONTH PLUS HIS EXPENSES ON OR OFF CAMPUS BEFORE HE COULD MAKE A COMMITMENT TO YOU?

A THAT IS JUST THE POINT. THIS WAS HIS PROPOSAL.

AND WHAT WE RESPONDED BACK TO HIM WAS THAT WE WOULD NOT MAKE

THAT COMMITMENT, THAT WE WOULD ONLY COMMIT TO DOING THIS FOR

THE PERIOD OF TIME THAT HE WAS WORKING ON THE MONTESSORI

PROJECT AND ANY OTHER PROJECTS WE HAD IN THE IMMEDIATE

FUTURE. AND THAT BEYOND THAT PERIOD OF TIME, HE WOULD HAVE

TO BE PREPARED TO SUPPORT HIMSELF FINANCIALLY EITHER AROUND

CAMELOT OR IN THE SAN FRANCISCO AREA.

WE WANTED HIM TO HAVE -- TO GO INTO THAT

UNDERSTANDING WITH A FULL AWARENESS. HE HAD ONLY BEEN DOWN

THERE FOR A MONTH AND A HALF OR TWO MONTHS BY THAT POINT IN

TIME AND WE WANTED TO HAVE IT VERY CLEAR TO HIM.

٠, ا	Q YOU HAD A MEETING WITH HIM IN MAY OF 1980?
1	·
2	A YES.
3	Q WHO AUTHORIZED THE MEETING?
4	A (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.)
5	Q ELIZABETH, THE MASTERS, YOURSELF, WHO?
6	A I THINK WE ALL JUST AGREED IT WOULD BE A GOOD
7	IDEA TO GET TOGETHER AND DISCUSS IT.
8	Q ELIZABETH WAS OUT OF THE COUNTRY AT THAT TIME,
9	WAS SHE NOT?
10	A I WILL BE HONEST WITH YOU, SHE WAS OUT OF THE
11	COUNTRY ON TWO TRIPS. AND THE EXACT DATES THAT SHE WAS OUT
12	AND THE SEQUENCE OF GREGORY'S LETTERS AT THAT PERIOD OF TIME
13	ARE NOT FRESH IN MY MEMORY.
14	THE ONLY THING I DO RECALL IS OBVIOUSLY BY THE
15	TIME OF THE MEETING, SHE HAD RETURNED AND WE MADE
16	ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MEETING ONLY WHEN WE KNEW THAT SHE
17	WOULD BE AVAILABLE.
18	Q IT IS NOT CLEAR IN YOUR MIND?
19	A WHEN SHE WAS OUT OF THE COUNTRY? NO.
20	Q LET ME TAKE A GUESS. I AM GOING TO GUESS THAT
21	YOU HAVE DISCUSSED THIS MATTER WITH YOUR ATTORNEY?
22	A THE NOT THE PERIODS OF TIME WHEN SHE WAS OUT
23	OF THE COUNTRY.
24	Q YOU DIDN'T DISCUSS ABOUT 19 IN MAY OF 1980
25	WHEN MR. MULL WAS ASKED TO LEAVE THE CHURCH?
26	MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT IF HE IS ASKING IF
27	HE DISCUSSED IT WITH HIS ATTORNEY.
28	THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER WHETHER THERE WAS A

4 5

DISCUSSION.

MR. KLEIN: ABOUT A PARTICULAR SUBJECT WITH HIS
ATTORNEY, I WOULD OBJECT. THAT IS A LAWYER/CLIENT PRIVILEGE
WHAT HE DISCUSSES WITH ME, YOUR HONOR.

THE WITNESS: I AM SORRY, WHAT IS THE QUESTION ONE MORE TIME?

Q BY MR. LEVY: WE ARE TALKING ABOUT WHAT YOU MIGHT HAVE DISCUSSED WITH YOUR ATTORNEY WITH REGARD TO WHEN MR. MULL WAS ASKED TO LEAVE THE CHURCH IN 1980. DID YOU TALK GENERALLY ABOUT THAT AREA WITH MR. KLEIN?

A IN GENERAL, BUT NOT ABOUT THE TIME OF THOSE -OF WHEN SHE WAS OUT OF THE COUNTRY, NO. WE DID NOT TALK
ABOUT WHEN SHE WAS OUT OF THE COUNTRY.

Q OKAY. NOW ELIZABETH WAS OUT OF THE COUNTRY THEN.

WHO GAVE YOU THE AUTHORITY TO KICK GREGORY MULL OUT OF THE CHURCH? TELL HIM TO GET OUT OF CAMELOT? WAS THAT YOUR UNILATERAL DECISION?

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT. THAT IS A COMPOUND QUESTION. THERE IS AT LEAST THREE THERE.

THE COURT: YOU HAVE ASKED SEVERAL QUESTIONS. LET'S GO ONE AT A TIME.

Q BY MR. LEVY: LET ME DO IT ONE AT A TIME FOR YOU. DID YOU HAVE UNILATERAL AUTHORITY TO ASK MR. MULL TO LEAVE THE CHURCH IN 1980?

A NO. AND I DIDN'T ASK HIM TO LEAVE THE CHURCH.

Q WOULD YOU TELL ME WHAT IT WAS THAT YOU SAID TO MR. MULL THAT CAUSED HIM TO HAVE TO EXIT THE PREMISES OF

1.5

-27

CAMELOT IN MAY OF 1980?

A I SUGGESTED TO HIM THAT SINCE HIS SERVICES WERE NOT BEING UTILIZED AT THAT POINT, THAT IT WOULD BE BETTER FOR HIM TO LIVE IN THE CONDOMINIUM THAT HE HAD AND TO MOVE OFF CAMPUS. BUT THERE WAS NOTHING ABOUT LEAVING THE CHURCH, JUST MOVE OFF CAMPUS.

Q HE SOLD HIS HOME, HE GAVE UP HIS BUSINESS, HE WAS WORKING FOR YOU FROM OCTOBER OF 1979 TO MAY OF 1980, AND ONE DAY YOU SAID, "I THINK IT WOULD BE NICE IF YOU MOVED OVER TO YOUR CONDOMINIUM."

IS THAT ABOUT HOW THAT CONVERSATION WENT DOWN?

A NO, THAT IS NOT ABOUT HOW IT WENT DOWN.

Q ISN'T IT A FACT, MR. SHEARER, THAT WHEN YOU COULDN'T GET HIS CONDO AND YOU COULDN'T GET HIS MONEY AND YOU COULDN'T GET ANYTHING ELSE OF VALUE FROM HIM, YOU KICKED HIM OUT OF THE CHURCH, DIDN'T YOU?

A NO. ABSOLUTELY NOT.

Q AND YOU JUST ASKED HIM TO GO AWAY BECAUSE HE DISAGREED WITH YOU?

A THE PURPOSE OF HIM LIVING ON CAMPUS WAS BECAUSE
HE WAS GOING TO BE WORKING ON THE PROJECTS. AND AT THAT
POINT IN TIME, HE WAS NO LONGER WORKING ON PROJECTS FOR US.
WE HAVE STAFF MEMBERS WHO NEED THOSE FACILITIES.

Q THOSE HUGE FACILITIES WHERE HE HAD HIS OFFICE AND WHERE HE SLEPT IN THAT TEN-SIX BY ELEVEN FOOT ROOM, YOU NEEDED THAT?

A YES.

Q AND THAT IS THE REASON YOU ASKED HIM TO LEAVE

DEPOSITION OF ELIZABETH CLARE FRANCIS. I AM READING FROM PAGE 211, LINE 14, TO PAGE 212, LINE 3. (READING.)

"Q MRS. FRANCIS, DO YOU HAVE THE UNILATERAL AUTHORITY AS THE HEAD OF YOUR ORGANIZATION TO RESOLVE DISPUTES BETWEEN THE BOARD AND THE MEMBERS?

"A I HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY
TO RESOLVE DISPUTES.

"Q DO YOU HAVE THE
UNILATERAL AUTHORITY TO RESOLVE DISPUTES?
CAN YOU MAKE A DECISION HOW SOMETHING SHOULD
BE RESOLVED?

"A YES.

#Q BETWEEN CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND SAY ANY OF 1TS COMMUNICANTS?

I'M ANSWERING TO WHEN I ANSWER YOUR

QUESTION, BUT I ADJUDICATE DISPUTES BETWEEN

MEMBERS, BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND MEMBERS, AND

OFFER WHAT I BELIEVE IS THE CORRECT

SOLUTION. SOMETIMES IT'S UP TO THE FREE

WILL OF THE PEOPLE TO ACCEPT IT. IN THE

CASE OF EMPLOYEES, IN THE MATTER OF CHURCH

POLICY OR WHAT IS GOING TO BE THE DECISION

SO WE CAN GET ON WITH THE SHOW, SOMEBODY HAS

TO HAVE THE LAST WORD. I HAVE THE LAST

WORD."

Q WAS IT ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET WHO RAN THE

1	А	SEATED AT THE DESK.
2	Q	WHERE AT THE DESK?
3	A	SEATED BEHIND THE DESK.
4	Q	SO WE WILL PUT ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET BEHIND
5	THE DESK (MA	RKING).
6		WHERE WAS GREGORY MULL?
7	A	OPPOSITE HER.
8	Q	WHERE WERE YOU, SIR?
9	A	I WAS TO GREGORY'S RIGHT.
10	Q	GREGORY IS FACING HER, YOU WOULD BE HERE
11	(POINTING)?	
12	A	YES.
13	Q	WHERE WAS ED FRANCIS?
14	А	TO HER LEFT.
15	Q	TO HER LEFT?
16	A	TO HIS LEFT, EXCUSE ME. TO GREGORY'S LEFT.
17	Q	IS THAT AN ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF ABOUT HOW
18	EVERYONE WAS	PLACED DURING THAT TWO AND A HALF HOUR MEETING
19	А	YES.
20	Q	DID YOU KIND OF HAVE HIM BOXED IN, MR. SHEARERS
21	А	WELL, BY BOXED IN, ARE YOU REFERRING TO HOW
22	TIGHTLY COMP	RESSED YOU HAVE GOT EVERYTHING?
23	Q	NO. I MEAN YOU WERE ON ONE SIDE, AND EDWARD
24	WAS ON THE O	THER SIDE AND ELIZABETH WAS RIGHT IN FRONT OF
25	HIM?	
26	Α	THAT'S RIGHT. THE KIND OF A DESK IT WAS, IT
27	WASN'T THE K	IND OF DESK WHERE YOU WOULD HAVE PEOPLE SITTING
28	AEE TA THE C	IDE THERE MEDENIT ANY OVERLEAGE OR ANOTHER

 SAYS.

Q WHAT WAS THE PURPOSE, IF YOU KNOW, OF

CONFRONTING GREGORY MULL DURING THAT LAST TWO AND A HALF

HOURS WITH THE STORY OF ANANIAS AND SAPPHIRA OTHER THAN TO

ADD MORE PRESSURE TO A MAN WHO HAD ALREADY BEEN PRESSURED

FOR MONTHS BY YOU PEOPLE?

A THAT WAS NOT THE PURPOSE AT ALL.

Q IT WAS JUST TO EDUCATE HIM ABOUT THE BIBLE AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME?

A NOT IN GENERAL ABOUT THE BIBLE. ABOUT CERTAIN TEACHINGS, ABOUT MAKING REPRESENTATIONS, OF MAKING FALSE REPRESENTATIONS.

Q DID GREGORY MULL TELL YOU DURING THE LAST TWO AND A HALF HOUR CONFERENCE THAT HE HAD COME TO THE CHURCH WITH PARTICULAR UNDERSTANDING THAT HE HAD RECEIVED FROM YOU; AND THAT HIS CONCERN WAS THAT NOT ELIZABETH, BUT YOU AND ED FRANCIS HAD CHANGED THINGS ON HIM?

A YES, HE SAID THAT.

Q AS A MATTER OF FACT, HE WAS ALWAYS VERY

RESPECTFUL TO ELIZABETH, HE WOULD NEVER DO OR SAY ANYTHING

IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM THAT WAS CONTRARY TO WHAT SHE

WANTED, WOULD HE?

A HE HAD ALREADY DONE THINGS THAT HE KNEW WERE

CONTRARY SUCH AS DECREEING AGAINST HER OR DOING REVERSE OF

TIDES AGAINST HER AT THE TIME. SO HE WAS DOING THINGS THAT

HE KNEW WERE NOT THINGS THAT SHE WOULD ACREE WITH.

Q WELL, THERE WAS A DISCUSSION ABOUT DOING DECREES ABOUT REVERSING THE TIDES. WHAT ARE DECREES?

Q WHEN YOU DECREE AGAINST COMMUNISM, ARE YOU DECREEING IN FAVOR OF IT?

> Α NO.

WELL, NOW YOU ARE BEGINNING TO GET ME TOTALLY AND COMPLETELY CONFUSED. YOU EITHER DO PRAY OR YOU DON'T PRAY, YOU EITHER DECREE OR YOU DON'T DECREE, IT CAN EITHER BE THIS OR THAT.

IS IT A MATTER OF WHATEVER YOU WANT IT TO BE WHENEVER YOU ARE TESTIFYING ABOUT IT, OR IS IT THE SAME THING EACH AND EVERY DAY, AND IS THE RULE THE SAME AS EVERYONE, OR DO YOU AS THE ARCHBISHOP HAVE DIFFERENT RULES?

THERE IS ONE PRINCIPLE OF THE LAW AND IT IS APPLIED UNIVERSALLY. NO ONE BECAUSE OF THEIR PERSONALITY OR WHO THEY ARE IS EVER EXEMPT FROM THE LAW.

DESTRUCTIVITY, THE WAY IT WAS USED IS TALKING ABOUT INHARMONY. AND SHE WAS CHAGRINED TO THINK THAT HE WOULD BELIEVE THAT SHE WAS INHARMONIOUS WHERE HE WAS CONCERNED.

HOW COULD HE POSSIBLY BE INHARMONIOUS? HE HAS GIVEN UP --

I DIDN'T SAY HE WAS. I SAID HE THOUGHT SHE WAS.

SHE'S BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN GETTING HIM TO GIVE UP HIS HOME, TO SELL IT, TO GIVE UP HIS BUSINESS, TO MOVE FROM SAN FRANCISCO TO COME TO CAMELOT TO WORK FOR NINE MONTHS WHEN HE WAS RECEIVING COMPENSATION TO WORK FOR SEVEN MORE FOR NOTHING, AND THEN GETTING KICKED OUT OF THE CHURCH AND THEN BEING SUMMONED BACK WHERE HE GAVE UP HIS LAST

28

\$5,500, HOW COULD HE POSSIBLY THINK THAT ANYTHING THAT SHE WAS INVOLVED IN WOULD BE DISHARMONIOUS? YOUR HONOR, IT IS TWELVE O'CLOCK. I WONDER IF IT MIGHT BE CONVENIENT FOR THE COURT TO TAKE ITS BREAK AT THIS TIME. THE COURT: WE WILL RESUME AT 1:30. I WANT TO SEE COUNSEL FOR A MOMENT. (A CONFERENCE WAS HELD AT THE BENCH WHICH WAS NOT REPORTED.) (AT 12:00 P.M., A RECESS WAS TAKEN UNTIL 1:30 P.M. OF THE SAME DAY.) .27

1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1986 *
2	1:45 P.M.
3	DEPARTMENT 50 HON. ALFRED L. MARGOLIS, JUDGE
4	(APPEARANCES AS HERETOFORE NOTED.)
5	
6	MONROE JULIUS SHEARER, III, +
7	THE WITNESS ON THE STAND AT THE TIME OF THE RECESS, RESUMES
8	THE STAND AND TESTIFIES FURTHER AS FOLLOWS:
9	THE CLERK: SIR, YOU PREVIOUSLY HAVE BEEN SWORN AND
10	ARE STILL UNDER OATH. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AGAIN FOR THE
11	RECORD.
12	THE WITNESS: MONROE SHEARER.
13	THE CLERK: THANK YOU.
14	THE COURT: PLEASE PROCEED.
15	MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
16	
17	CROSS-EXAMINATION + (RESUMED)
18	BY MR. LEVY:
19	Q MR. SHEARER, BEFORE WE WENT TO LUNCH, WE WERE
20	TALKING ABOUT THAT TWO AND A HALF HOUR MEETING THAT YOU HAD
21	ALONG WITH ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET AND EDWARD FRANCIS AND
22	GREGORY MULL.
23	IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THAT MEETING A FRIENDLY
24	OPEN EXCHANGE OF EACH OTHER'S VIEWS?
25	A YES.
26	Q WAS THAT AN ARRANGEMENT WHEREBY THE FOUR OF YOU
27	DISCUSSED OPENLY WHAT YOUR PERSONAL ATTITUDE AND THE WHAT
28	THE CHURCH'S ATTITUDE WAS WITH REGARD TO MR. MULL?

1	A NOT REALLY.
2	Q WOULD YOU EXPLAIN WHAT IT WAS THEN?
3	A IT WAS A DISCUSSION ABOUT THE FACT THAT HE HAD
4	LOANED THIS MONEY BORROWED THIS MONEY FROM THE CHURCH AND
5	WHAT WERE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT.
G	Q AT THAT MEETING, DID YOU COME TO ANY CONCLUSION
7	AS TO WHAT WAS GOING TO BE DONE ABOUT IT?
8	A I DON'T THINK THERE WERE ANY HARD AND FAST
9	CONCLUSIONS DRAWN.
10	Q DO YOU RECALL DURING THAT CONVERSATION
11	ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET TELLING MR. MULL THAT, "I AM NOT
12	GOING TO SUE YOU"?
13	A I RECALL HER SAYING THAT EARLY ON OR MIDWAY
14	THROUGH, YES.
15	Q DO YOU RECALL HER SAYING IT NOT ONCE, NOT
16	TWICE, NOT THREE TIMES, NOT EVEN FIVE TIMES, BUT AT LEAST A
17	HALF A DOZEN TIMES DURING THE TWO AND A HALF HOUR MEETING,
18	SHE PROMISED GREGORY MULL SHE WOULD NOT SUE HIM?
19	A I DON'T RECALL THE EXACT NUMBER, BUT SHE DID
20	SAY IT SEVERAL TIMES, YES.
21	Q WHY DID THE CHURCH SUE HIM IF HE WAS
22	THE COURT: KEEP YOUR VOICE UP.
23	Q BY MR. LEVY: IF HE WAS PROMISED HE WAS NOT
24	GOING TO BE SUED?
25	1 WILL SPEAK LOUDER, YOUR HONOR.
26	A BECAUSE HE DID NOT SETTLE WITH THE CHURCH AND
27	HE CONTINUED TO ATTACK THE CHURCH.
28	Q YOU SUED HIM BECAUSE HE ATTACKED THE CHURCH?

1	A YES.
2	Q AND BECAUSE HE DID NOT SETTLE WITH THE CHURCH;
3	IS THAT CORRECT?
4	A YES.
5	Q IS THAT WHAT YOU SAID?
6	A YES.
7	Q USUALLY WHEN ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET TELLS
8	SOMEONE WHAT SHE IS GOING TO DO OR WHAT SHE IS NOT GOING TO
9	DO, ISN'T IT SO THAT THAT INDIVIDUAL HAS A REASONABLE RIGHT
10	TO RELY UPON WHAT IT IS SHE TELLS HIM?
11	A YES, SHE WOULD HAVE.
12	Q NOW, IN THAT EVENT, ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET
13	TOLD GREGORY MULL AT LEAST SIX TIMES SHE WAS NOT GOING TO
14	SUE HIM.
15	IN YOUR OPINION, DID MR. MULL HAVE A REASONABLE
16	EXPECTATION THAT SHE WAS NOT GOING TO SUE HIM?
17	A NO. BECAUSE SHE BECAUSE SHE MADE IT CLEAR
18	THAT THE REASON SHE SAID THAT IS BECAUSE SHE HAD THE
19	UNDERSTANDING THAT HE WAS GOING TO SETTLE FOR \$10,000 AS HE
20	HAD SAID IN HIS LETTER. AND HE DID NOT SETTLE FOR \$10,000.
21	Q SO THEN YOU SUED FOR \$37,000 INSTEAD OF THE
22	\$10,000 THAT MR. MULL AT ONE TIME HAD OFFERED?
23	A THIRTY-TWO THOUSAND I BELIEVE.
24	Q THREE TIMES THE FIGURE THAT YOU ARE TALKING
25	ABOUT?
26	A YES.
27	Q DOES IT SEEM TO YOU THAT THERE MIGHT BE A
28	LITTLE BIT OF INCONSISTENCY THERE? THE SPIRITUAL LEADER OF

.27

THE CHURCH, WHO SAYS SHE HAS THE ULTIMATE AUTHORITY, TELLS
THE MAN SHE IS NOT GOING TO SUE HIM; AND THEN SHE SUES HIM
NOT FOR WHAT HE OFFERED TO DONATE TO THE CHURCH, BUT FOR IN
EXCESS OF THREE TIMES THAT AMOUNT AFTER SHE'S GIVEN HER WORD
SIX TIMES SHE IS NOT GOING TO DO 1T?

NOW, THERE WAS ANOTHER REASON YOU SAID THAT SHE SUED HIM. AND THAT WAS BECAUSE HE HAD ATTACKED THE CHURCH?

- A CONTINUED TO ATTACK THE CHURCH.
- Q AND IN WHAT MANNER DID HE ATTACK THE CHURCH?

A HE MADE FALSE ALLEGATIONS TO THE BUILDING
DEPARTMENT ABOUT THE LACK OF SAFETY ON OUR PREMISES. HE
WROTE LETTERS TO VARIOUS NEWSPAPERS CRITICAL OF THE CHURCH.
THAT IS AN ATTACK ON THE CHURCH.

- Q YOU OPPOSED TO FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, ALSO?
- A I BELIEVE VERY MUCH IN FREEDOM OF THE PRESS.
- Q AND IF A MAN WRITES A LETTER TO THE NEWSPAPER AND THE NEWSPAPER CHOOSES TO INCLUDE HIS LETTER IN AN ARTICLE THEY MAY BE WRITING, YOU CONSIDER THE FREEDOM OF THAT MAN'S EXPRESSION AS AN ATTACK UPON YOU AND YOUR CHURCH?
 - A WHEN IT IS UNTRUTH.
- Q I ASSUME IN THE COURSE OF THE LETTER WRITING,
 THE CHURCH HAS HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO WRITE LETTERS BACK TO
 THE NEWSPAPERS?
 - A AS I SAID, IT WAS A CONTINUOUS ATTACK.
- Q NOW WITH REGARD TO MY QUESTION, WOULD I BE CORRECT IN ASSUMING THAT THE CHURCH HAS HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO WRITE LETTERS TO THE NEWSPAPER, ALSO?
 - A SOMETIMES YES, I THINK SOMETIMES NO. I THINK

.27

SOMETIMES THE CHURCH WAS FORCED TO BUY SPACE IN SOME CASES.

Q FOR THE FULL-PAGE AD THAT YOU PUT IN THE PAPER?

A NO. BECAUSE CERTAIN LETTERS WOULD NOT BE PRINTED IF I RECALL. IT'S BEEN A LONG TIME, BUT I SEEM TO RECALL THAT THERE WERE A FEW TIMES WHEN WE HAD SPECIFIC LETTERS THAT WE ASKED TO BE PRINTED IN REBUTTAL AND THOSE PARTICULAR LETTERS WERE NOT REPRINTED.

Q WASN'T THERE A 20-PAGE LETTER WRITTEN BY MR.

FRANCIS THAT HE WAS VERY UPSET WITH THAT THE CHURCH WOULD

NOT INCLUDE -- EXCUSE ME, THAT THE NEWSPAPER WOULD NOT

INCLUDE IN ITS ENTIRETY? IS THAT THE ONE YOU HAVE REFERENCE

TO?

A I DO NOT RECALL THE SPECIFIC LETTER.

Q WELL, LET ME HELP YOU REMEMBER THE LETTER. I
HAVE HERE A TYPED WRITTEN LETTER OF EIGHT PAGES. THE LETTER
IS DATED FEBRUARY THE 2ND, 1981. IT IS A LETTER ADDRESSED
TO A LADY AND ALSO TO THE READERS OF THE LAS VIRGENES
ENTERPRISES AND IT IS EIGHT PAGES LONG TYPEWRITTEN PAGES. I
ASSUME IT WOULD TAKE A GOOD PORTION OF AT LEAST ONE SHEET OF
ANY NEWSPAPER.

ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THIS LETTER?

- A NO, I AM NOT.
- Q WHY DON'T YOU TAKE A PEEK AT IT ANYWAY.

IS THAT THE LETTER THAT MR. FRANCIS WANTED THE NEWSPAPER TO PUBLISH IN ITS ENTIRETY?

A I DON'T RECALL WHAT LETTER IT WAS. THERE WERE
PERIODS OF THIS -- DURING THIS TIME PERIOD WHEN I WAS
TRAVELING AROUND THE COUNTRY AND SOME OF THESE THINGS WERE

BEING CARRIED ON AT CAMELOT WHILE I WAS NOT THERE.

Q SO MR. MULL WROTE A LETTER TO THE NEWSPAPER AND EDWARD FRANCIS WROTE A LETTER IN REBUTTAL THAT WAS EIGHT TYPEWRITTEN PAGES LONG. AND BECAUSE THE CHURCH WAS DENIED THE OPPORTUNITY TO INCLUDE THAT LETTER IN ITS ENTIRETY, THAT WAS AN ATTACK BY MR. MULL AGAINST THE CHURCH AND THAT IS WHY YOU SUED HIM?

A THE LETTER WRITING WAS ONE OF THE FACTORS, YES.

Q HIS CONCERN THAT THERE MIGHT BE A VIOLATION OF THE BUILDING CODES IN HIS LETTER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY, THAT IS ANOTHER REASON WHY YOU SUED HIM?

A I WOULDN'T CHARACTERIZE IT AS HIS CONCERN, NO.

I WOULD CHARACTERIZE IT AS AN ATTACK BECAUSE HE COULD HAVE

COME TO US AND TOLD US ABOUT THOSE THINGS DURING THE TIME

THAT HE WAS WITH US. INSTEAD, HE WAITED UNTIL AFTER HE WAS

GONE.

AND EVEN THEN INSTEAD OF TALKING TO US ABOUT IT, HE COMPLAINED TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT. AND THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT NEVER CITED US FOR ANY PROBLEMS THAT WERE VIOLATIONS OF THE CODE AS FAR AS STRUCTURAL VIOLATIONS OR ANYTHING LIFE THREATENING OR THREATENING TO PEOPLE.

SO THE MANNER IN WHICH HE DID IT I CONSIDERED TO BE AN ATTACK.

Q HE NEVER CAME TO YOU TO DISCUSS IT WITH YOU.

DO YOU RECALL HAVING TESTIFIED ABOUT A SQUARE

DANCE A LITTLE BIT EARLIER IN YOUR TESTIMONY?

A YES.

	Q		WAS	N'T	THAT	G	REGOR	Y MI	ULL '	YOU	WER	E TA	ALKING	ABOUT
МНО	CAME	OUT	то	THE	CHUR	сн	PREM	ISE	S ANI) T	OLD	THE	GUARD	HE
MOUL	D LI	KE TO	ME	ET V	итн	EL	IZABE	TH (CLARE	E PF	10PH	ET?	WASN	' T
THAT	THE	SAME	GR	EGOR	RY MU	ILL	THAT	WE	AR E.	TAI	_KIN	G AE	BOUT?	

- A I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE TOLD --
- Q HE WAS DENIED ENTRANCE AT THAT TIME, WAS HE NOT?

A SHALL I ANSWER YOUR FIRST QUESTION?

I DON'T KNOW THAT HE SAID TO ANYONE THAT HE WAS
THERE TO SEE ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET. I DO KNOW HE WAS
DENIED ENTRANCE. I ALSO KNOW THAT HE DID NOT CALL IN
ADVANCE TO FIND OUT IF SHE WAS THERE OR MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO
SET UP AN APPOINTMENT TO SEE HER.

Q THAT WAS A PUBLIC -- IT WAS A SQUARE DANCE BY PUBLIC INVITATION, WAS IT NOT?

A YES.

MR. MULL SHOWED UP WITH MISS MALEK AND HER HUSBAND, AND ALSO WITH HIS DAUGHTER AND A LADY FROM THE PRESS, WHICH WOULD CERTAINLY HAVE GIVEN YOU AN OPPORTUNITY TO GET FAIR TREATMENT BY THE PRESS, AND THEY WERE DENIED ENTRANCE, WERE THEY NOT?

A MR. MULL WAS. I DON'T RECALL WHETHER ALL THE REST OF THE PEOPLE THAT YOU MENTIONED EVER ASKED TO GO IN WITHOUT MR. MULL OR NOT. AS I SAY, I DIDN'T HEAR ANY OF THE CONVERSATION. I WASN'T PRESENT FOR THAT.

Q IS MISS MALEK ALSO AN ENEMY OF THE CHURCH OR SOMEONE WHO HAS ATTACKED THE CHURCH?

A IF I WERE TO GUESS, I WOULD HAVE TO SAY SHE

WOULD PROBABLY HAVE BEEN DENIED ENTRANCE AT THAT TIME.

ISN'T IT A FACT SHE HAS GOT A SON IN THE

THAT SHE HAS BEEN DENIED OPPORTUNITY TO SEE AND

NO. I WENT WITH HER SON TO VISIT IN HER HOME

WHILE I WAS ON STAFF. I WENT WITH HER SON, AND VISITED WITH HER AND HER HUSBAND IN HER HOME. SO I KNOW FOR

KNOWLEDGE OF IN ANY WAY THAT SHE WAS DENIED ACCESS TO HIM.

YOU HAVE MADE THE SUGGESTION THAT MR. MULL DID NOT CONTACT THE CHURCH, DID NOT TRY TO TALK TO YOU.

MR. SHEARER, ISN'T IT A FACT THAT THERE WERE MANY, MANY VIOLATIONS OF THE BUILDING CODE THAT WERE COVERED UP BY SOME OTHER KIND OF CONSTRUCTION OR SOME OTHER KIND OF DUPLICITY WHEN THE BUILDING INSPECTORS DID SHOW UP TO

WELL, LET'S TAKE FOR INSTANCE WHERE ALL THE POWER PANELS WERE AT. ISN'T IT A FACT THAT THE FALSE WALL WAS BUILT AROUND THAT TO COMPORT WITH THE OTHER STRUCTURE SO IT WOULD BE AGED TO LOOK LIKE IT HAD BEEN THERE FOR QUITE

A WHICH POWER PANEL, WHICH WALL? I DO KNOW THAT WE GOT ELECTRICAL PERMITS ON OUR CAMPUS. I KNOW THAT WE WENT THROUGH THE PROCESS AND WE DID GET ELECTRICAL PERMITS.

Q DID YOU EVER TAKE OUT ANY WALLS OR PUT IN ANY WALLS WITHOUT FOUNDATIONS, WITHOUT PERMITS?

A WE NEVER TOOK OUT ANY STRUCTURAL TIMBERS. I

DON'T KNOW IF WE TOOK OUT ANY PARTITIONS, PLASTER OR

SOMETHING LIKE THAT. WE MIGHT HAVE TAKEN OUT SOME PLASTER,

BUT WE DIDN'T REMOVE STRUCTURAL PILLARS.

Q DO I UNDERSTAND CORRECTLY THAT YOU ARE ACTUALLY SAYING BECAUSE MR. MULL WROTE A LETTER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY AND SAID IT WARRANTS AN INSPECTION ON THE PREMISES BECAUSE THERE MIGHT BE SOME THINGS THAT ARE NOT UP TO CODE, THAT YOU ACTUALLY CONSIDERED THAT AN ATTACK UPON THE CHURCH?

A YES, I DID. FOR THE REASONS THAT I HAVE
STATED. THAT HE HAD OPPORTUNITY WHILE HE WAS THE ARCHITECT
ON CAMPUS TO DRAW THIS TO OUR ATTENTION AS WELL AS
OPPORTUNITY AFTERWARDS TO HAVE BROUGHT IT TO OUR ATTENTION
AND HE DID NOT DO SO.

Q HOW WAS HE SUPPOSED TO DO THAT WHEN HE CAME OUT THERE AND YOU WOULDN'T EVEN LET HIM IN?

A I AM TALKING ABOUT THE JUNE 6TH MEETING, I AM TALKING ABOUT ALL THE TIME HE WAS ON STAFF. THAT IS WHERE HE GAINED THIS SUPPOSED KNOWLEDGE. HE SHOULD HAVE ADVISED US AT THAT TIME.

Q THE JUNE 6TH MEETING. IF I RECALL RIGHT ON PAGE 31 OF THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE JUNE 6TH MEETING, YOU TOLD

WERE THE ARCHBISHOP. YOU WERE RIGHT AT THE CORE OF THINGS?

A YES.

Q ARE YOU SUGGESTING TO THE COURT THAT YOUR RECOLLECTION IS MORE ACCURATE THAN ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET'S?

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. IT CALLS FOR SPECULATION TO ASK HIM THAT QUESTION. HE CAN ASK HIM IF HE EVER HEARD --

THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU REPHRASE THE QUESTION.

Q BY MR. LEVY: ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET TESTIFIED
TO THE PEOPLE WHO WERE PRESENT AND TO THE FACT THAT SHE HAD
DISCUSSED THE CONTENTS OF SEVERAL CLEARANCE LETTERS. THE
PEOPLE SHE INCLUDED WHO WERE PRESENT WERE MEMBERS OF THE
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, INCLUDING YOURSELF.

DOES THAT REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION THAT IT

A WELL, WHAT I TESTIFIED TO WAS THAT I RECALL ONE TIME THAT A CLEARANCE LETTER WAS DISCUSSED. AND THAT IS WHAT I RECALL.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, YOU KNOW, WAS A BOARD OF MAJORITY. AND IT WASN'T A SITUATION WHERE WHENEVER SOMEONE SAYS THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, THAT EACH AND EVERY BOARD MEMBER WAS NECESSARILY PRESENT AT EACH AND EVERY MEETING.

AND OVER THE COURSE OF ALL THE YEARS AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, IT IS ENTIRELY POSSIBLE THAT SOMETHING WAS BROUGHT UP ON ANOTHER OCCASION WHEN I WASN'T PRESENT.

TALKING ABOUT BOARD MEETINGS, YOU SAID THAT THE

ONLY TIME SOMEONE WHO WAS NOT ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS WOULD BE AT A BOARD MEETING IS WHEN THEY WERE MAKING A PRESENTATION.

IS THAT YOUR TESTIMONY?

- A YES.
- Q ARE YOU SUGGESTING THAT RANDALL KING, EVEN THOUGH HE WAS NOT A BOARD MEMBER WHEN HE WAS MARRIED TO ELIZABETH, WAS NOT ALLOWED ADMITTANCE TO BOARD MEETINGS?
 - A HE WAS NOT PRESENT, YES.
- Q I AM SURE HE WAS NOT PRESENT AT SOME. MY
 QUESTION IS WHEN HE WAS MARRIED TO ELIZABETH AND HE WAS NOT
 ON THE BOARD, WAS HE DENIED ENTRANCE TO THE BOARD MEETINGS?
- A TO SAY HE WAS DENIED ENTRANCE OR NOT DENIED ENTRANCE IS NOT REALLY APPROPRIATE. IT WAS A PRACTICAL FASHION OF HIM BEING AT SERVICE WHERE HE WAS NEEDED RATHER THAN SITTING IN ON SOMETHING THAT DIDN'T CONCERN HIM.
- Q IF HE SO CHOSE TO BE AT A BOARD MEETING, SINCE
 HE WAS ELIZABETH'S HUSBAND, IF HE DECIDED TO BE THERE, WAS
 THERE ANY RULE OR ANY REGULATION OR DID YOU TELL HIM TO
 LEAVE?
- A NO, I DIDN'T TELL HIM TO LEAVE. NO, THERE WAS NO RULE THAT RANDALL KING COULDN'T BE AT A BOARD MEETING.
- Q WHEN HE WAS MARRIED TO ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET,

 1SN'T IT A FACT THAT WHEN HE CHOSE TO AND IT WAS CONVENIENT

 FOR HIM, HE PARTICIPATED, SAT IN, LISTENED, DISCUSSED,

 OFFERED HIS OPINION AND PARTICIPATED IN BOARD MEETINGS EVEN

 THOUGH HE WASN'T ON THE BOARD?
 - A I AM NOT GOING TO SAY THAT THAT MEVER COULD

HAVE HAPPENED, BUT IT DIDN'T HAPPEN WITH ANY DEGREE OF FREQUENCY WHATSOEVER. RANDALL WAS ON A DIFFERENT FACILITY, PROBABLY 15 MILES REMOVED FROM THE CAMELOT PREMISES, AND HE WORKED THERE, AND HE LIVED CLOSE BY TO WHERE HE WORKED AND HE WAS NOT GETTING OVER TO CAMELOT ALL THAT MUCH.

WHEN HE DID GET OVER THERE SOME OF THAT MUCH AND HE CHOSE TO BE AT A BOARD MEETING, WAS THERE ANYONE OR ANYBODY OR ANYTHING OR ANY RULE THAT PROHIBITED HIM FROM ATTENDING THAT BOARD MEETING?

NO, THERE WAS NO SUCH RULE.

SO HE COULD VERY WELL HAVE BEEN THERE AT THE BOARD MEETINGS?

IT'S POSSIBLE.

DO YOU HAVE AN ACCURATE RECOLLECTION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT HE SAT AROUND AT A BOARD MEETING WITH YOU WHEN A GROUP OF THE BOARD AND ELIZABETH DISCUSSED ABOUT WHAT TO DO WITH GREGORY MULL AND WHETHER OR NOT TO INVITE HIM TO COME TO CAMELOT?

YES. MY RECOLLECTION IS THAT THAT WAS A JOB OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RATHER THAN A JOB OF THE ENTIRE BOARD. AND THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DEALT WITH THAT MATTER AMONG ITSELF AND THAT WE ONLY INVOLVED ELIZABETH WHEN WE WOULD TAKE THE CONSENSUS OF OUR RECOMMENDATION TO HER.

AND I DON'T RECALL RANDALL BEING PRESENT THEN, BUT CERTAINLY HE WASN'T PRESENT FOR WORKING OUT THE NUTS AND BOLTS AND ALL THE WHYS AND WHEREFORES THAT WE WERE GOING TO RECOMMEND TO HER.

NOW BACK TO MY QUESTION. WHEN THE DISCUSSION

27

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

A NO.

Q THIS TIME YOU LET ME FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE.

GAVE UP EVERYTHING HE WAS INVOLVED IN -- HIS
BUSINESS, HIS LIFE IN SAN FRANCISCO -- TO COME TO CAMELOT
FOR NO SALARY, NO GUARANTEE OF PAYMENT, NOTHING OTHER THAN
THE POSSIBILITY OF DISCUSSING WITH YOU THE POTENTIAL FOR HIM
DOING SOME REMODELING WORK AT CAMELOT?

A THERE ARE SO MANY THINGS YOU ARE ASKING ME
THERE, I DON'T KNOW. IF YOU WILL BREAK THAT UP INTO ONE
QUESTION AT A TIME, I WILL BE VERY HAPPY TO ANSWER IT.

BUT THAT IS SUCH A LONG THING WITH SEVERAL

PARTS TO IT AND I AM NOT -- BUT I AM PAYING ATTENTION TO

WHAT YOU ARE SAYING. BUT BY THE TIME YOU HAVE FINISHED, I

HAVE FORGOTTEN THE FIRST PART OF YOUR QUESTION.

Q LET ME ASK YOU ANOTHER QUESTION AND SEE IF YOU RECALL THAT.

DOES THE CHURCH HAVE DOSSIERS ON PEOPLE,
MEMBERS, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, STAFF MEMBERS, PERMANENT STAFF
MEMBERS?

A WE KEEP A FILE ON INDIVIDUAL STAFF MEMBERS. .

Q WHAT IF SOMEBODY COMES TO THE CHURCH AND DECIDE TO GO TO A QUARTER AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY AND AFTER SEVERAL DAYS DECIDES, "HEY, I CAN'T HANDLE THIS," AND THEY LEAVE AND THAT PERSON ATTENDED FIVE OR SIX OR SEVEN OR TEN YEARS AGO.

DO YOU KEEP ALL OF THOSE RECORDS ON THOSE PEOPLE WHO FELL BY THE WAYSIDE?

BUT ONLY STAYED THERE SEVERAL DAYS, SINCE YOU WERE THE DEAN OF STUDENTS AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY -- LET ME ASK YOU IN THAT CAPACITY -- AS DEAN, WAS IT THE POLICY TO KEEP PERMANENT RECORDS ON THE PEOPLE WHO CAME THROUGH THERE AND STAYED THERE FOR AS SHORT A PERIOD OF TIME AS A WEEK?

A I -- YOU KNOW, IT IS ENTIRELY POSSIBLE WE KEPT THOSE RECORDS FOR A PERIOD OF TIME. HOW LONG, I DON'T KNOW.

Q WAS IT YOUR POLICY WHEN SOMEONE LEFT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY PRIOR TO COMPLETING THEIR THREE MONTHS FOR THEM TO HAVE AN EXIT SESSION WITH YOURSELF?

A YES.

Q PRIOR TO HAVING THE EXIT SESSION, WAS IT ALSO THE NORMAL COURSE OF EVENTS FOR THEM TO HAVE SESSIONS WITH DR. RALPH YANEY?

A NO.

Q IN YOUR EXIT SESSION, WERE YOU PRIVY TO THE DOCUMENTS OF RALPH YANEY?

A NO.

Q THERE WAS TESTIMONY IN THIS COURTROOM BY A MAN WHO WAS AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY FOR AS SHORT A PERIOD OF TIME AS SOME SEVEN OR EIGHT DAYS WHO TESTIFIED UNDER OATH IN THIS COURT THAT WITH HIS EXIT SESSION WITH YOU, HE SAW SITTING ON YOUR DESK THE INTERVIEW SHEETS THAT HE HAD WITH DR. RALPH YANEY.

NOW I ASK YOU AGAIN, IS IT THE NORMAL COURSE OF EVENTS FOR STUDENTS AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY OR MEMBERS AT CAMELOT, FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO HAVE INFORMATION FURNISHED TO THEM BY THE PSYCHIATRIST WHO IS ASSOCIATED WITH

KNOWLEDGE, WHERE PEOPLE WHO HAVE LEFT THE CHURCH WHO HAVE SPOKEN OUT ABOUT THE CHURCH WERE REFERRED TO AS SNAKE OIL PEDDLERS BY PEOPLE ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OR PEOPLE WHO WERE ASSOCIATED IN OFFICIAL CAPACITY WITH CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT?

A I HAVE NEVER HEARD THE TERM "SNAKE OIL PEDDLERS" USED BY -- IN THE CONTEXT YOU JUST DESCRIBED.

Q HAVE YOU EVER SEEN MURRAY STEINMAN'S LETTER TO THE NEWSPAPER WHERE HE TAKES TO ISSUE ANYONE WHO MAY HAVE LEFT THE CHURCH AND HAVE AN OPINION NOT IN KEEPING WITH THE CHURCH'S?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT TO THE QUESTION AS TO RELEVANCE AND ALSO SPECULATION SINCE THIS WITNESS SAID HE HAD NEVER SEEN IT.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

THE WITNESS: I LOST TRACK OF YOUR QUESTION.

Q BY MR. LEVY: THE JUDGE SAID IT IS OKAY FOR YOU TO ANSWER THE QUESTION.

A I KNOW. BUT BY THAT EXCHANGE, I LOST TRACK OF THE QUESTION. IF I COULD JUST HEAR THE QUESTION AGAIN.

Q LET ME TRY TO REPEAT IT FOR YOU.

DID YOU EVER BECOME AWARE THAT MURRAY STEINMAN,
AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CHURCH, WROTE AN ARTICLE TO THE
NEWSPAPERS WHERE HE TOOK ISSUE AND LABELED PEOPLE WITH LESS
THAN POLITE NAMES BECAUSE THOSE PEOPLE WERE NO LONGER
ASSOCIATED WITH THE CHURCH?

A I AM NOT DENYING THAT THAT EVER HAPPENED. IT COULD HAVE HAPPENED. AS I SAY, I SPENT A GREAT DEAL OF MY

WHEN THEY HAD A PROBLEM?

A WELL, WE BELIEVED THAT WHEN YOU INVOKE THE HOLY SPIRIT THROUGH DECREEING, THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT CAN TRANSMUTE OR PURIFY ONE'S OWN WORLD TO HELP YOU SEE MORE CLEARLY AS WELL AS TO HELP YOU CORRECT THE CAUSE AND THE SPIRITUAL CAUSE BEHIND THE PROBLEM THAT YOU ARE FACING.

Q WHEN YOU USE THE TERM "INVOKE," DOES THAT MEAN ASK THE HOLY SPIRIT?

A YES.

Q ISN'T IT A FACT THAT A DECREE IS NOT A PLEA,
BUT IT IS IN FACT ALMOST A COMMAND BY THE PERSON EMPLOYING
THE DECREE AS OPPOSED TO A PRAYER?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT ON RELEVANCE AND ON FIRST AMENDMENT GROUNDS.

THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: WELL, ONE OF THE THINGS YOU HAVE TO REMEMBER ABOUT THE CONCEPT OF DECREEING IS THAT THE DECREE IS BEING ISSUED BY THE PART OF THE INDIVIDUAL THAT WE BELIEVE IS ONE WITH GOD. AND IT IS THAT PART OF THE IN-DWELLING PRESENCE OF GOD THAT HAS THE AUTHORITY TO DECREE RATHER THAN THE OUTER PERSONALITY. AND THAT IT IS THAT PART OF THE HOLY SPIRIT WITHIN US THAT GIVES THAT DECREE.

Q BY MR. LEVY: ISN'T IT A FACT THAT THERE IS A DIFFERENCE IN A PRAYER AND A DECREE?

A YES.

Q AND ISN'T IT A FACT THAT WHEN YOU PRAY, YOU ASK; AND WHEN YOU DECREE, YOU COMMAND?

A THAT IS AN OVERSIMPLIFICATION, BUT IT'S ALL

.27 Q NOW, WITH THAT FERVENT PRAYER, I WOULD ASK YOU TO LOOK AT THE BACK OF IT.

ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT YOU WOULD PUT YOUR
CHILDREN'S NAME IN THAT DECREE WHERE THE PLACE OF THE BLANK
LINE IS?

A I WOULDN'T HESITATE TO PUT MY CHILDREN'S NAME
IN THERE. I WOULDN'T HESITATE TO PUT MY CHILDREN'S NAME
ANYWHERE BECAUSE I DON'T BELIEVE THAT DECREES WOULD HARM
THEM OR ANYONE ELSE.

Q I AM GOING TO READ TO YOU JUST THAT LAST PARAGRAPH. (READING.)

"BELOVED MIGHTY ASTREA AND
PURITY AND LEGIONS OF LIGHT, LOCK YOUR
COSMIC CIRCLES AND SWORDS OF BLUE FLAME IN,
THROUGH, AND AROUND ALL MALIGNING OF THE
MESSENGERS AND STAFF BY DEPROGRAMMERS, THE
CLOCK OF BETRAYERS, FUNDAMENTALISTS,
LAGGARDS AND FALLEN ONES," BLANK SPACE FOR
YOUR CHILDREN'S NAME, "AND ALL INDIVIDUALS
INFLUENCED THEM. SEIZE, PIN, AND BIND!
SERPENT AND HIS SEED, THEIR MECHANIZATION
CONCEPT AND EVERY ANTI HOLY SPIRIT,
MANIFESTATION IN CAMELOT, AMERICA, AND THE
WORLD!"

YOU'D INCLUDE YOUR CHILDREN'S NAME IN THERE WITH THE FALLEN ONES AND THE BETRAYERS?

A WELL, LOGICALLY THEIR NAMES WOULD NOT BELONG IN

·27

1	Q THE QUESTION IS DO YOU RECALL AS YOU SIT HERE
2	
3	A I CAN'T RECALL A SPECIFIC INSTANCE.
4	Q I AM GOING TO READ YOU FROM PAGE 212, LINE 4,
5	THROUGH PAGE 212, LINE 20, FROM THE TRANSCRIPT OF ELIZABETH
6	
7	
3	THIS ACCURATELY DESCRIBES THE ROLE OF ELIZABETH CLARE
9	PROPHET. QUESTION BY MR. LEVY: (READING.)
10	*DO YOU HAVE ANY
11	RECOLLECTION AT ANY TIME OF YOU HAVING THE
12	LAST WORD AND THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OVERRULING
13	YOU?
14	"A YES.
15	"Q ON WHAT OCCASIONS WHILE
15	MR. MULL WAS ASSOCIATED WITH CHURCH
17	UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT DID THEY DO THAT?
18	"A I DON'T KNOW THE SPECIFIC
19	OCCASIONS.
20	"Q IS IT SOMETHING THAT
21	HAPPENS ALL THE TIME?
22	"A WHEN I FUNCTION AS A
23	BOARD MEMBER, AND OTHER BOARD MEMBER'S VOTE
24	MAY VETO SOMETHING I WISH TO DO. I THOUGHT
25	YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT SPIRITUAL MATTERS AND
26	DISPUTES AND RESOLUTIONS, WHICH IS WHAT I
27	ANSWERED ON THE LAST QUESTION. PROBLEMS AND
28	ARGUMENTS BETWEEN PEOPLE AND SO FORTH.

 CHURCH -- REPAY AT LEAST \$10,000 ON THE MONEY THAT HE OWED THE CHURCH.

MR. LEVY: AT THIS POINT, YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT AND I AM GOING TO MOVE THAT THIS RESPONSE BE STRICKEN AS A MISCHARACTERIZATION OF THE TESTIMONY. THE TAPES ARE IN EVIDENCE. THE TRANSCRIPT IS IN EVIDENCE. AND THIS IS THIS WITNESS' OPINION. I'D ALSO OBJECT —

THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND YOUR OBJECTION. THE BEST EVIDENCE IS ACTUALLY THE TRANSCRIPT ITSELF IS THE BEST EVIDENCE OF WHAT WAS SAID. IT IS IN EVIDENCE. LET'S MOVE ON.

MR. KLEIN: THERE HAS BEEN NUMEROUS QUESTIONS ASKED ABOUT THE MEETING, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: BUT WE ARE IN THE UNUSUAL SITUATION,
REALLY UNUSUAL, OF HAVING IN EVIDENCE A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT
SO WE DON'T HAVE TO GUESS AS TO WHAT WORDS WERE UTTERED.
NOW, I WILL EXPECT UPON SOME REFLECTION, YOU WILL AGREE WITH
THAT.

MR. KLEIN: I WOULD AGREE. WE JUST HAD A LOT OF TESTIMONY ON IT.

THE COURT: THIS IS NOT LIKE THE SITUATION THAT SO

OFTEN OCCURS WHERE THERE IS NO RECORD OF WHAT WAS SPOKEN AND

PEOPLE TESTIFY FROM THEIR BEST MEMORIES.

MR. KLEIN: I AGREE, YOUR HONOR. I UNDERSTAND.

THANK YOU. I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

MR. LEVY: A FEW, YOUR HONOR.

///

///

RECROSS-EXAMINATION +

1

AND MR. MULL TO DISCUSS AN IMPASSE, AS YOU PHRASED IT, WITH REGARD TO MONETARY PROBLEMS AND MR. GREGORY MULL PRIOR TO THE TIME HE WAS ASKED TO LEAVE CAMELOT?

- A EDWARD AND I MET WITH GREGORY.
- Q HOW MANY TIMES?
- A AT LEAST ONCE. I DON'T RECALL HOW MANY TIMES.
- Q DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN IT WAS?
- A I'M SURE IT WAS VERY -- JUST A DAY -- A FEW
 DAYS BEFORE HE LEFT CAMPUS, WHENEVER THAT WAS. WHENEVER HE
 LEFT THE PREMISES OR MOVED OFF CAMPUS.
- Q WAS THAT THE MEETING WHERE YOU SAID, "GREGORY,

 IF YOU DON'T PUT YOUR CONDOMINIUM IN TRUST FOR ELIZABETH,

 THEN YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO LEAVE"?
- A NO, I DIDN'T SAY THAT. AS I HAVE ALREADY STATED, WE -- WE OPENED UP ALL KINDS OF POSSIBILITIES, INCLUDING THE POSSIBILITY OF DEFERRING PAYMENT UNTIL HE RECEIVED HIS \$65,000 NOTE.
- Q WAS THERE EVER ANY MEETING WITH THE FULL BOARD, WITH OR WITHOUT ELIZABETH, WHERE MR. MULL WAS GIVEN A FAIR CHANCE AT ALL OF THE PROBLEMS WITH REGARD TO FINANCIAL IMPASSES THAT HAD ARISEN?
 - A AT LEAST TWO OF THEM THAT I KNOW OF.
- Q ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT THE BOARD HAD MEETINGS WITH MR. GREGORY MULL, THE FULL BOARD HAD A MEETING WITH MR. GREGORY MULL, WHERE THERE WAS A TOTAL AIRING OF ALL OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING HIS COMING TO CAMELOT AND THE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS PRIOR TO HIS BEING ASKED TO LEAVE THE CAMPUS?

1 HONOR. 2 3 STEVEN SCHWARTZ, + A PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, HAVING BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN, 4 5 TESTIFIES AS FOLLOWS: б THE CLERK: PLEASE BE SEATED AT THE WITNESS STAND. 7 SIR, PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD AND PLEASE SPELL 8 YOUR NAME. 9 THE COURT: MOVE UP A LITTLE CLOSER TO THE 10 MICROPHONE. 11 THE WITNESS: STEVEN SCHWARTZ. S-T-E-V-E-N, 12 S-C-H-W-A-R-T-7. 13 THE CLERK: THANK YOU. 14 THE COURT: GO AHEAD. 15 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION + 17 BY MR. KLEIN: MR. SCHWARTZ, ARE YOU CURRENTLY EMPLOYED? 13 Q 19 I AM A CONSULTANT TO THE TELEVISION AND FILM 20 INDUSTRY. 21 Q ARE YOU EMPLOYED OR SELF-EMPLOYED AT THIS 22 POINT? 23 YES, I AM. Α Q 24 PRIOR TO BEING SELF-EMPLOYED, DID YOU HAVE AN 25 EMPLOYER? 26 A YES. I WAS CHIEF VIDEO ENGINEER FOR LUCAS FILM LIMITED IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA. 27 28 Q ARE YOU CURRENTLY AFFILIATED IN ANY WAY WITH

1	CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT?
2	A NO, I AM NOT.
3	Q WAS THERE A TIME WHEN YOU WERE A CHURCH STAFF
4	MEMBER?
5	A YES.
6	Q WHAT YEARS?
7	A I WAS A CHURCH STAFF MEMBER FROM 1975 THROUGH
8	1979 AND ENDING, I BELIEVE, JANUARY OF 1979.
9	Q WHILE YOU WERE A CHURCH STAFF MEMBER, DID YOU
10	EVER LIVE AT CAMELOT?
11	A YES, I DID.
12	Q YOU SAID YOU WERE A STAFF MEMBER UNTIL 1979.
13	WHY DID YOU CEASE BEING A STAFF MEMBER IN 1979?
14	A AT THAT POINT I DESIRED TO PURSUE A CAREER AS A
15	TELEVISION ENGINEER IN A CAPACITY THAT I COULD NOT BY
16	STAYING ON THE STAFF. MAINLY DUE TO LACK OF FACILITY.
17	Q DID THERE COME A TIME THEN WHEN YOU CEASED
18	BEING A CHURCH MEMBER ALTOGETHER?
19	A YES. I CEASED TO BE A CHURCH MEMBER IN
20	FEBRUARY OF 1983, AT WHICH TIME I APPLIED MYSELF 100 PERCENT
21	TO MY CAREER AS A TELEVISION ENGINEER AND I MOVED AWAY FROM
22	THE LOS ANGELES AREA.
23	Q DID ANYBODY EVER DO OR SAY ANYTHING TO TRY TO
24	PREVENT YOU FROM LEAVING THE CHURCH STAFF?
25	A NO.
26	Q AFTER YOU LEFT THE STAFF OR AFTER YOU CEASED
27	BEING A CHURCH MEMBER, DID ANYBODY EVER THREATEN OR
28	INTIMIDATE YOU OR HARASS YOU IN ANY WAY?

1	A NO, NOT IN ANY WAY.
2	Q DID ANYBODY EVER SUGGEST TO YOU THAT YOU COULD
3	NOT MAKE YOUR ASCENSION IF YOU WOULD IF YOU LEFT THE
4	CHURCH?
5	A NO.
6	Q DID YOU ATTEND SUMMIT UNIVERSITY?
7	A YES, I DID.
8	d MHENS
9	A IT WAS JANUARY THROUGH MARCH, 1975.
10	Q WHEN YOU ATTENDED SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, DID YOU
11	KNOW GREGORY MULL?
12	A YES, I DID.
13	Q DID HE ATTEND THAT SAME QUARTER?
14	A YES.
15	Q HAD YOU KNOWN MR. MULL PRIOR TO ATTENDING
16	SUMMIT UNIVERSITY WITH HIM IN JANUARY TO MARCH OF 1975?
17	A YES. WE WERE BOTH A MEMBER OF THE SAN
18	FRANCISCO GROUP OF THE CHURCH, WHICH I BELIEVE I STARTED
19	ATTENDING THE GROUP SERVICES ON SUNDAY IN THE SUMMER OF '74.
20	Q WHEN YOU ATTENDED SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, WAS IT
21	POSSIBLE TO GET YOUR HOMEWORK DONE AND GET SUFFICIENT SLEEP?
22	A YES. ABSOLUTELY.
23	Q DID YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEM DOING THAT?
24	A NO.
25	Q WHEN YOU ATTENDED SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, WERE YOU
26	ABLE TO HAVE CONTACTS WITH PEOPLE WHO WERE NONMEMBERS OF THE
27	CHURCH?
28	A YES. I CONTACTED MY FAMILY ABOUT ONCE A WEEK

1	UNI VERSITY?
2	A NO, HE NEVER DID.
3	Q DID HE EVER INDICATE TO YOU THAT HE WASN'T
4	GETTING SUFFICIENT FOOD OR SUFFICIENT SLEEP?
5	A NO.
6	Q HOW OFTEN DID YOU SEE HIM WHEN YOU BOTH WERE
7	ATTENDING SUMMIT UNIVERSITY?
8	A I WOULD SAY DAILY.
9	Q DID HIS PHYSICAL APPEARANCE IN ANY WAY
10	DETERIORATE FROM THE START OF THE SUMMIT UNIVERSITY SEMESTER
11	TO THE END OF THE SEMESTER?
12	A NO.
13	Q WERE YOU EVER TAUGHT AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY THAT
14	YOU SHOULD FEAR NONCHURCH MEMBERS?
15	A NO.
16	Q DO YOU REGRET GOING TO SUMMIT UNIVERSITY?
17	A NO, I DO NOT REGRET IT IN ANY WAY.
18	Q DURING THE YEARS THAT YOU WERE ON THE CHURCH
19	STAFF, DID YOU EVER HEAR ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET OR ANY
20	CHURCH OFFICIAL TELL ANYONE TO THREATEN OR HARASS OR
21	INTIMIDATE ANY EX-CHURCH MEMBERS?
22	A NO, NEVER.
23	Q WHAT EFFECT, IF ANY, HAS BEING ON THE CHURCH
24	STAFF HAD ON YOUR LIFE?
25	A VERY, VERY POSITIVE ONE. WITHOUT THE
26	EXPERIENCE I HAD ON THE CHURCH STAFF, I WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO
.27	PURSUE THE CAREER I HAVE PURSUED AS A TELEVISION ENGINEER,
20	WILLEL T HAD DECIME THAT CONTROL OF THE CONTROL OF

A STAFF MEMBER.

3

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 13

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

.27

28

AND I WAS ABLE TO WORK UNSUPERVISED ON A NUMBER OF PROJECTS, BOTH MECHANICAL, MAINTENANCE TYPE PROJECTS AND SOME EXPERIMENTS IN TELEVISION AND SOUND. AND WITHOUT THAT, I DON'T THINK I COULD BE AT THE TOP OF MY FIELD AS I AM TODAY.

WHEN YOU WERE A STAFF MEMBER, WERE THERE ANY RESTRICTIONS ON YOUR COMMUNICATION WITH FAMILY OR FRIENDS WHO WERE NOT STAFF MEMBERS OR NOT CHURCH MEMBERS?

CAN YOU ASK IT AGAIN?

YES. WHEN YOU WERE A STAFF MEMBER, THIS IS AFTER SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, WERE YOU IN ANY WAY RESTRICTED IN YOUR CONTACT WITH FAMILY OR FRIENDS WHO WERE NOT STAFF MEMBERS?

> Α NO, NEVER WAS.

DID YOU HAVE CONTACT WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS WHO WERE NONCHURCH MEMBERS WHILE YOU WERE A STAFF MEMBER?

ABSOLUTELY. NOT ONLY PHONE CONTACT, BUT I WOULD VISIT MY PARENTS ABOUT TWICE A YEAR, I SAW GRANDPARENTS, BROTHER, SISTER, VISITED FRIENDS WHEN THEY WERE IN TOWN, HIGH SCHOOL FRIENDS OR FRIENDS FROM COLLEGE. NEVER ANY RESTRICTIONS.

WHEN YOU LEFT THE CHURCH STAFF, EVENTUALLY Q CEASED BEING A MEMBER, DID OTHER CHURCH MEMBERS SHUN OR SUOA DIOA

> NEVER. Α

AFTER YOU LEFT THE CHURCH TOTALLY, DID YOU HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH CHURCH MEMBERS?

1	Q YOU CERTAIN ABOUT THAT?
2	A CERTAIN.
3	Q YOU EVER FEEL WHEN YOU WERE A CHURCH STAFF
4	MEMBER THAT YOU COULDN'T LEAVE WHENEVER YOU WANTED TO LEAVE
5	THE STAFF IF THAT IS WHAT YOU WANTED TO DO?
ઉ	A NO, NEVER FELT THAT WAY.
7	Q WHILE YOU WERE A STAFF MEMBER, DID YOU EVER
8	FAST?
9	A YES.
10	Q WHEN THEY HAD FASTS AT CAMELOT, DID YOU ALWAYS
11	TAKE PART IN THOSE FASTS?
12	A NO, NOT ALWAYS.
13	Q CURRENTLY LIVE IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA?
14	A YES, I DO.
15	Q WHY ARE YOU TESTIFYING TODAY?
16	A I HAD A VERY GOOD EXPERIENCE WITH THE CHURCH.
17	AND TO THE EXTENT THAT MY TESTIMONY CAN HELP, I AM HERE.
18	MR. KLEĮN: THANK YOU.
19	NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR.
20	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
21	MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
22	
23	CROSS-EXAMINATION +
24	BY MR. LEVY:
25	Q MR. SCHWARTZ, JUST EXACTLY WHAT DO YOU DO IN
26	THE TELEVISION INDUSTRY?
27	A I AM A TECHNICAL CONSULTANT. SPECIFICALLY WHAT
28	I DO IS SPECIALIZE IN ELECTRONIC POSTPRODUCTION, WHICH IS
	1

1	A YEAH.
2	Q NOW, WHEN YOU KNEW MR. MULL AT SUMMIT
3	UNIVERSITY, WAS HE ANY OLDER THAN YOU THEN?
4	A OH, YES, HE WAS OLDER THAN ME. I BELIEVE. I
5	DIDN'T KNOW HIS EXACT AGE, BUT I PRESUME HE LOOKED OLDER
6	THAN I LOOKED.
7	Q YOU COULD ACTUALLY TELL WHEN YOU WENT THERE
8	THAT HE WAS OLDER THAN YOU?
9	A YES.
10	Q ARE YOU CONCERNED WITH YOUR ASCENSION?
11	A YES, I AM.
12	Q WHERE IS IT YOU PLAN TO ASCEND TO, SIR?
13	A TO HEAVEN.
14	Q HAVE YOU SPENT A GOOD DEAL OF YOUR LIFE IN THE
15	PURSUIT OF YOUR ASCENSION?
16	A YES, I HAVE.
17	Q AND DO YOU FIGURE YOU GOT IT LOCKED; IS THAT
18	WHY YOU LEFT THE CHURCH, BECAUSE YOU DON'T HAVE TO WORRY
19	ABOUT YOUR ASCENSION ANYMORE?
20	A NO, NOT AT ALL.
21	Q I HAVE HEARD TESTIMONY FROM ANY NUMBER OF
22	PEOPLE FROM THE CHURCH WHO SAY PRETTY MUCH THAT, "IT CAME
23	TIME TO GET ON WITH MY LIFE."
24	IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT THE CHURCH THAT YOU
25	COULDN'T CONTINUE DOING WHILE YOU WERE GETTING ON WITH YOUR
26	LIFE?
. 27	A NO.
28	Q SO WHY DID YOU CEASE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE

1	
1	CHURCH?
2	A IT WAS A MATTER OF TIME I CHOSE TO DEVOTE TO MY
3	FIELD AND THE TIME THAT I NEEDED TO SPEND IN A RELAXATION.
4	I DECIDED I WOULD RATHER SIT BACK WITH A CUP OF COFFEE, LOOK
5	OUT MY WINDOW, TAKE A DRIVE IN THE CAR AS MY WAY OF
6	UNWINDING BECAUSE I HAVE A VERY BUSY AND TIRING SCHEDULE AS
7	A TELEVISION ENGINEER. AND AS I WAS PURSUING THAT CAREER
8	FURTHER, I REALIZED IT WAS MORE AND MORE DEMANDING.
9	Q IS IT YOUR OPINION THAT IN ORDER TO DEVOTE
10	YOURSELF TO A PURSUIT OF A CAREER, YOU CANNOT HAVE A
11	RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION?
12	A NOT AT ALL.
13	Q YOU GAVE ANY NUMBER OF YEARS OF YOUR LIFE TO
14	THE CHURCH. AND THEN JUST ONE DAY YOU DECIDED YOU'D GIVEN
15	ENOUGH AND YOU REALLY DIDN'T NEED A CHURCH CONNECTION
16	ANYMORE?
17	MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT. IT IS COMPOUND
18	QUESTION. IT IS ALREADY AT LEAST TWO QUESTIONS.
19	THE WITNESS: YES. COULD YOU ASK ME ONE AT A TIME,
20	PLEASE.
21	Q BY MR. LEVY: YES. I DON'T WANT TO MIX YOU UP,
22	SIR.
23	MR. KLEIN ASKED YOU ABOUT FASTING AT CAMELOT.
24	NOW, IS THE FASTING AT CAMELOT ANY DIFFERENT THAN THE
25	FASTING AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY?
26	A NOT FOR ME, IT WASN'T.

27

28

Q ISN'T IT A FACT THAT AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, YOU

WERE REQUIRED TO FOLLOW THE CODE OF CONDUCT; AND WHETHER YOU

LIKE IT OR NOT, YOU FAST ON FAST DAYS? 1 2 NO. 3 ISN'T IT A FACT THAT IN 1975, WHEN YOU WENT TO 4 SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, CAFETERIA WAS CLOSED ON FAST DAYS? 5 THAT WAS TRUE. 6 BUT IF YOU WANTED TO SNEAK OUT AND VIOLATE THE 7 CODE OF CONDUCT, YOU COULD MAKE IT RIGHT OVER THERE TO 8 DENNY'S AND GET YOURSELF A CUP OF COFFEE? 9 NOT SNEAK OUT, NO. 10 Q WELL, ACCORDING TO THE CODE OF CONDUCT, YOU 11 WERE AT A RETREAT, WERE YOU NOT, YOU WERE SUPPOSED TO STAY 12 THERE AND ABIDE BY THE CODE OF CONDUCT? 13 IS IT YOUR TESTIMONY THAT WHEN YOU WERE AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, YOU FAILED TO ABIDE BY THE CODE OF 14 15 CONDUCT AND DIDN'T SNEAK OUT, JUST BROKE THE CODE OF 16 CONDUCT? 17 Α ACCORDING --MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT. THERE IS AT LEAST 18 TWO OR THREE QUESTIONS IN THERE, YOUR HONOR. COMPOUND IS MY 19 OBJECTION. 20 21 THE COURT: IF YOU ASK ONE QUESTION AT A TIME, MR. 22 LEVY, IT WOULD BE HELPFUL. 23 MR. LEVY: I WILL SURE TRY, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU. 24 BY MR. LEVY: HAVE YOU EVER HEARD OF EXCALIBUR 25 PRODUCTIONS? 26 EXCALIBUR PRODUCTIONS? NO. 27 IS THERE ANY KIND OF ORGANIZATION CONNECTED 28 Q

1	WITH THE CHURCH THAT WAS KNOWN AS EXCALIBUR ANYTHING?
2	A CONNECTED WITH THE CHURCH, NO.
3	Q WAS THERE A BUSINESS ORGANIZATION THAT YOU
4	ATTEMPTED TO INITIATE CALLED EXCALIBUR ANYTHING?
5	A YES, ABSOLUTELY. EXCALIBUR VIDEO SYSTEMS WAS
6	THE NAME.
7	Q EXCALIBUR VIDEO SYSTEMS?
8	A RIGHT. INC.
9	Q HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CHURCH?
10	A NOTHING WHATSOEVER.
11	Q MR. BENTON WILCOX, IS HE ALSO A CHURCH MEMBER?
12	A BENTON WAS A CHURCH MEMBER, YES.
13	Q THE TWO OF YOU TRIED TO GET A PRODUCTION
14	COMPANY STARTED?
15	A YES. WE ACTUALLY TRIED TO START A TELEVISION
16	POSTPRODUCTION FACILITIES.
17	Q TWO OF YOU GOT INTO A LITTLE SNIT, HAD A TEMPER
18	TANTRUM AND THE ENTERPRISE FELL APART?
19	A ABSOLUTELY NOT.
20	Q IT WAS A SUCCESSFUL ENTERPRISE?
21	A IT WAS A SUCCESSFUL ENTERPRISE WHEN BENTON
22	RESIGNED IN THE SUMMER OF '82 AND IT WAS STILL A SUCCESSFUL
23	OPERATION. WE WERE IN THE BLACK WHEN I LEFT IN FEBRUARY OF
24	1983 TO MOVE UP TO NORTHERN CALIFORNIA. EXCALIBUR VIDEO
25	SYSTEMS WAS VOLUNTARILY CLOSED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN
26	APRIL, 1983.
.27	Q NOW, TECHNICALLY IT MAY NOT HAVE ANYTHING TO
28	HAVE HAD ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE CHURCH, WAS THAT A PLACE

WHERE A NUMBER OF CHURCH MEMBERS WERE EMPLOYED BY YOURSELF 1 2 AND YOUR PARTNER? 3 YES. 4 AS A MATTER OF FACT, MR. MULL'S DAUGHTER WORKED 5 FOR YOU, DIDN'T SHE? 6 YES. SHE WAS A RECEPTIONIST AND SECRETARY. 7 Q DO YOU RECALL HOW MUCH YOU WERE PAYING HER AT 8 THE TIME? 9 NO, I DON'T. I WAS -- IF I MAY SAY, I WAS NOT 10 INVOLVED IN THE BUSINESS ASPECTS DIRECTLY. I WAS THE VICE 11 PRESIDENT OF ENGINEERING. MY RESPONSIBILITIES WERE THE 12 OPERATIONAL AND TECHNICAL ASPECTS. BENTON WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR, AS PRESIDENT, FOR THE BUSINESS, AND HE WAS MORE PRIVY 13 14 AND AWARE OF SALARIES THAN I AM. 15 Q THE TWO OF YOU, YOURSELF AND BENTON WILCOX. OWNED AND RAN AND CONTROLLED EXCALIBUR? 16 17 Α THAT IS NOT CORRECT. 18 WELL, WOULD YOU CORRECT IT FOR ME? Q 19 YES. EXCALIBUR VIDEO SYSTEMS HAD A VERY 20 COMPLICATED FINANCIAL STRUCTURE DUE TO THE FACT THAT THERE 21 WERE ESSENTIALLY INVESTORS WHO CHANGED THEIR MIND IN THEIR 22 INVESTMENT. AND AS A RESULT, NO ONE WAS REALLY EVER IN 23 CONTROL OF EXCALIBUR VIDEO. 24 JUST KIND OF RAN ITSELF, DID IT? 25 WELL, THE DAY TO DAY OPERATIONS WERE RUN BY BENTON. 26 27 YOU HAD NO IDEA WHAT ANYBODY WAS GETTING PAID 28 OR WHAT THEY WERE DOING?

1	GETTING A SALARY?
2	A I BELIEVE LINDA GOT A SALARY, BUT I DON'T KNOW.
3	Q DIDN'T MR. MULL IN FACT GIVE THE MONEY TO YOU
4	SO YOU COULD PAY HER A SALARY SO THAT SHE COULD STAY
5	AFFILIATED WITH THE CHURCH?
6	A I WOULD SAY I DON'T HAVE ANY KNOWLEDGE OF THAT.
7	Q LET'S SEE. WHEN YOU DESCRIBED YOURSELF TO MR.
8	KLEIN, I THINK YOU SAID YOU WERE WARM AND WITTY?
9	A UH-HUH.
10	Q AND WHAT WERE SOME OF THE OTHER QUALIFICATIONS
11	YOU HAD?
12	A ENERGETIC, STRONG-WILLED.
13	Q AND VIRILE AND STRONG-WILLED. BUT YOU CAN'T
14	REMEMBER THAT MR. MULL SPOKE TO YOU PERSONALLY AND HANDED
15	YOU THE MONEY SO THAT YOU COULD PAY LINDA SO THAT HE COULD
16	TRY TO MAINTAIN HIS RELATIONSHIP AND BRING HIS DAUGHTER INTO
17	THE CHURCH?
18	A PHRASED THAT WAY, I WOULD SAY THAT IS NOT TRUE.
19	MR. MULL NEVER HANDED ME MONEY DIRECTLY NOR DID I HAVE
20	CONVERSATIONS WITH HIM CONCERNING HIS DAUGHTER.
21	Q WHO DID HE HAND THE MONEY TO THEN?
22	A IF MONEY WAS HANDED, IF THAT TOOK PLACE, WHICH
23	I HAVE NO KNOWLEDGE OF, IT WOULD PROBABLY BE MR. WILCOX.
24	Q AND OF COURSE YOU NEVER DISCUSSED THAT WITH MR.
25	WILCOX?
26	A NEVER.
27	Q AND OF COURSE YOU NEVER HAD A FALLING OUT WITH
28	MR. WILCOX?

1	
1	A OH, NO. NOT AT ALL.
2	MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU.
3	I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
4	MR. LEVY: NOTHING FURTHER.
. 5	THE COURT: YOU ARE EXCUSED.
6	THE WITNESS: THANK YOU.
7	THE COURT: CALL YOUR NEXT WITNESS.
8	MR. KLEIN: GRACE MC GUIRE, YOUR HONOR.
9	
10	GRACE MC GUIRE, +
11	A PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, HAVING BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN,
12	TESTIFIES AS FOLLOWS:
13	THE CLERK: PLEASE BE SEATED AT THE WITNESS STAND.
14	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD AND PLEASE SPELL YOUR
15	NAME.
16	THE WITNESS: MY NAME IS GRACE MC GUIRE. FIRST NAME
17	IS GRACE, G-R-A-C-E. LAST NAME MC GUIRE, M-C CAPITAL
18	G-U-I-R-E.
19	THE CLERK: THANK YOU.
20	
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION +
22	BY MR. KLEIN:
23	Q PLEASE BE SURE TO SPEAK INTO THAT MICROPHONE SO
24	EVERYBODY CAN HEAR YOU.
25	ARE YOU CURRENTLY A CHURCH MEMBER?
26	A YES, I AM.
27	Q WHERE DO YOU LIVE?
28	A I LIVE IN REDWOOD CITY, CALIFORNIA.

1	Q	ARE YOU CURRENTLY EMPLOYED?
2	A	YES, I AM.
3	Q	WHAT DO YOU DO?
4	А	I AM AN INTERIOR DECORATOR.
5	Q	ARE YOU CURRENTLY A CHURCH STAFF MEMBER?
6	Α	NO, I AM NOT.
7	Q	WAS THERE A TIME WHEN YOU WERE A CHURCH STAFF
8	MEMBER?	
9	Α	YES, I WAS.
10	Q	WHEN WAS THAT?
11	Α	IN SEPTEMBER OF 1976 THROUGH DECEMBER OF 1984.
12	Q	AND WHY DID YOU
13	Α .	EXCUSE ME. 1983, I BELIEVE. IT WAS SEVEN
14	YEARS.	
15	Q	YEARS THAT YOU WERE A STAFF MEMBER WERE WHAT
16	YEARS?	
17	А	THAT'S CORRECT. 1976 THROUGH 1983.
18	Q	JUST CALM DOWN. I KNOW IT IS AN UNUSUAL
19	EXPERIENCE.	HAVE YOU EVER TESTIFIED BEFORE?
20	Α	NO, I HAVE NOT.
21	Q	WHY DID YOU CEASE BEING A CHURCH STAFF MEMBER
22	IN 1983?	
23	А	BECAUSE I DECIDED TO RETURN TO SAN FRANCISCO TO
24	BE WITH MY C	HILDREN.
25	Q	HAD YOUR CHILDREN LIVED AT CAMELOT?
26	A	YES, THEY HAD.
.27	Q	COULD THEY HAVE LIVED AT CAMELOT WHEN YOU WERE
28	LIVING THERE	?

1	А	YES.
2	Q	WAS THERE A REASON WHY THEY DIDN'T LIVE AT
3	CAMELOT?	
4	А	YES. THEY DECIDED TO RETURN TO SAN FRANCISCO
5	TO LIVE WITH	THEIR FATHER. THEY MISSED HIM.
6	Q	DID ANYONE FROM THE CHURCH DO OR SAY ANYTHING
7	TO PREVENT YO	OU FROM LEAVING THE STAFF AND GOING BACK TO SAN
8	FRANCISCO?	
9	А	NO ONE DID.
10	Q	DID ANYBODY HARASS OR THREATEN OR INTIMIDATE
11	YOU WHEN YOU	DECIDED YOU WANTED TO GO BACK TO SAN FRANCISCO?
12	А	NOT AT ALL.
13	Q	DID THE CHURCH MEMBERS SHUN OR AVOID YOU WHEN
14	YOU DECIDED	TO GO BACK TO SAN FRANCISCO?
15	Α	NO, THEY DIDN'T.
16	Q	DO YOU KNOW GREGORY MULL?
17	А	YES, 1 DO.
18	Q	DO YOU KNOW KATHLEEN HAMMOND OR KATHLEEN MULL?
19	Α	YES, I DO.
20	Q	WHEN DID YOU FIRST MEET HER?
21	Α	IN 1975 AFTER A CONFERENCE.
22	Q	DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN YOU AND KATHLEEN
23	MULL BECAME	FRIENDLY?
24	Α	YES.
25	Q	WHEN WAS THAT?
26	Α	IN 1976 WHEN I JOINED THE STAFF.
.27	Q	AND DURING THE TIME THAT YOU WERE FRIENDLY WITH
28	HER, HOW MAN	Y TIMES A WEEK WOULD YOU TYPICALLY SEE HER?

1	A SOMETIMES TWO TIMES A WEEK, SOMETIMES THREE,
2	FOUR, FIVE, DEPENDING ON WHERE SHE WORKED OR WHERE I WORKED
3	OR WHEN OUR YEAH.
4	Q WERE YOU BOTH STAFF MEMBERS AT THE SAME TIME?
5	A YES, WE WERE.
6	Q DID YOU HAVE ANYTHING ELSE IN COMMON IN
7	ADDITION TO BEING STAFF MEMBERS?
8	A YES, WE DID. OUR CHILDREN.
9	Q WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THAT?
10	A WE HAVE CHILDREN APPROXIMATELY THE SAME AGES,
11	DAUGHTERS.
12	Q WERE THEY FRIENDS?
13	A YES, THEY WERE.
14	Q DID THERE COME A TIME IN 1978 WHEN YOU AND
15	KATHLEEN MULL HAD A CONVERSATION ABOUT GREGORY MULL'S SEXUAL
16	PREFERENCES?
17	A YES.
18	MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR.
19	ANYTHING THAT THIS WITNESS SAYS IS HEARSAY.
20	THE COURT: WELL, THAT WILL BE SUSTAINED.
21	MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD MAY I BE HEARD?
22	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
23	(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD
24	AT THE BENCH:)
25	MR. KLEIN: THERE IS TWO POINTS, YOUR HONOR. FIRST
26	IS THE STATEMENT IS NOT BEING PUT IN FOR THE TRUTH OF THE
. 27	STATEMENT. WE HAVE ALREADY ESTABLISHED THAT MR. MULL HAD
28	BEEN HOMOSEXUAL. IT IS PUT IN FOR THE FACT THAT SHE SAID

.27

SECONDLY, IT IS PUT IN AS A PRIOR INCONSISTENT STATEMENT BECAUSE I ASKED KATHLEEN MULL IF SHE HAD EVER SAID IT TO ANYBODY, AND SHE GAVE ONE NAME AND SAID NO ONE ELSE. AND THAT IS WHY PURSUANT TO THE EVIDENCE CODE, I ASKED THAT SHE NOT BE EXCUSED SO I CAN ASK OF THIS WITNESS IF SHE HAD SUCH A CONVERSATION WITH KATHLEEN MULL WHERE SHE TOLD HER THAT GREGORY MULL HAD BEEN A HOMOSEXUAL.

IT HAS BEEN A KEY ISSUE IN THIS TRIAL. MR. MULL TESTIFIED THAT --

THE COURT: KEEP YOUR VOICE DOWN.

MR. KLEIN: MR. MULL TESTIFIED THAT ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET WAS THE ONLY ONE WHO KNEW THIS. AND THAT WHEN IT GOT AROUND, IT MUST HAVE BEEN HER. AND TO THE EXTENT THAT KATHLEEN MULL TOLD OTHER PEOPLE ABOUT IT IS CERTAINLY VERY, VERY RELEVANT TO WHAT WE ARE DOING HERE.

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO BE HEARD?

MR. LEVY: YES, YOUR HONOR. NUMBER ONE, KATHLEEN
MULL, MUELLER OR HAMMOND IS NOT ON TRIAL HERE. SHE
TESTIFIED THAT SHE TALKED TO ONE PERSON AND THAT ONE PERSON
WAS A MINISTER AT THE CHURCH.

MR. MULL -- THERE HAS BEEN NO PROOF AT THIS
POINT THAT MR. MULL IS A HOMOSEXUAL. THERE HAS BEEN
TESTIMONY THAT DURING HIS EARLY YEARS, HE EXPERIMENTED WITH
HOMOSEXUALITY. WE HAVE HAD NO MEDICAL TESTIMONY OR
PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTIMONY OR ANY OTHER KIND OF TESTIMONY THAT
CONCLUSIVELY WOULD MAKE AN ADJUDICATION AS TO WHAT HIS
SEXUAL PREFERENCE IS.

NOW, ANY TESTIMONY BY THIS WITNESS WITH REGARD TO CONVERSATIONS THAT PURPORTEDLY TOOK PLACE WOULD STILL BE HEARSAY. AND I BELIEVE THAT THEY WOULD --

THE COURT: WELL --

MR. KLEIN: JUST TO MAKE CLEAR, YOUR HONOR, I AM NOT PUTTING IT IN TO PROVE THAT HE IS A HOMOSEXUAL. MERELY THAT SHE SAID IT.

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE RELEVANCE? THAT IS MY REAL QUESTION RIGHT NOW.

MR. KLEIN: THE RELEVANCE IS THAT THEY HAVE SAID THAT MR. MULL TOLD THIS TO ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET. IT WAS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. AND MY POINT IS HE TOLD A NUMBER OF PEOPLE AND KATHLEEN MULL TOLD A NUMBER OF PEOPLE THAT HE WAS HOMOSEXUAL. AND IT WAS KNOWN TO THE WHOLE COMMUNITY THROUGH THEIR OWN STATEMENTS, NOT THROUGH ANYTHING --

THE COURT: APPARENTLY SHE IS ABOUT TO SAY IT WAS KATHLEEN WHO SPOKE TO HER AND NOT GREGORY.

EXCUSE MY REFERENCE TO FIRST NAMES, BUT IT IS THE ONLY WAY TO DISTINGUISH IT.

MR. KLEIN: THAT KATHLEEN HAMMOND MULL TOLD HER THAT GREGORY HAD BEEN A HOMOSEXUAL.

THE COURT: SHE CAN ANSWER.

(THE PROCEEDINGS WERE RESUMED IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)

Q BY MR. KLEIN: DID THERE COME A TIME IN 1978
WHEN YOU AND KATHLEEN MULL HAD A CONVERSATION ABOUT GREGORY
MULL'S SEXUAL PREFERENCES?

A YES, WE DID.

.27

Q

1	A I WAS.
2	Q WERE YOU IN THE VICINITY OF THE GUARDHOUSE
3	ON AT SOME POINT DURING THAT DATE?
4	A YES, I WAS.
5	Q WHY WERE YOU THERE?
6	A I WAS THERE AS A GREETER TO WELCOME PEOPLE WHO
7	CAME ONTO THE CAMPUS THAT DAY TO ATTEND THE SQUARE DANCE.
8	Q DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN GREGORY MULL CAME
9	ONTO THE CAMELOT PROPERTY?
10	A YES, HE DID.
11	Q DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN HE WAS IN THE
12	VICINITY OF THE GUARDHOUSE?
13	A YES.
14	Q WAS HE ALONE?
15	A NO, HE WAS NOT.
16	Q DO YOU KNOW WHO WAS WITH HIM?
17	A YES. HIS DAUGHTER LINDA, HER BOYFRIEND,
18	NEWSPAPER REPORTER FROM THE LAS VIRGENES TIMES I BELIEVE AND
19	A PHOTOGRAPHER.
20	Q WHEN GREGORY MULL CAME INTO THE VICINITY OF THE
21	GUARDHOUSE, WERE YOU THERE AT THAT TIME?
22	A YES, I WAS.
23	Q DO YOU RECALL WHO WAS THERE IN THE VICINITY OF
24	THE GUARDHOUSE WHEN MR. MULL ARRIVED AT THAT POINT? WHO WAS
25	THERE WHO WAS AFFILIATED WITH THE CHURCH?
26	A PAULA ZARZYCKI, SUSAN MC ADAMS, DOUGLAS KENYON,
.27	EUGENE GARCIA AND MYSELF.
28	O DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN EDWARD FRANCIS

ARRIVED? 1 2 YES. HE ARRIVED SHORTLY THEREAFTER. 3 ONCE MR. MULL AND MR. FRANCIS WERE BOTH IN THE VICINITY OF THE GUARDHOUSE, DID THEY HAVE A CONVERSATION? 5 Α YES, THEY DID. DID YOU HEAR WHAT THEY SAID? 6 Q 7 YES, I DID, PART OF IT. 8 Q AS BEST AS YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT WAS SAID? 9 GREG WAS INSISTENT UPON COMING ONTO THE CAMPUS. 10 HE RAISED HIS VOICE, HE TALKED VERY FAST AND HE WAS VERY LOUD. HE WAS -- HE DEMANDED TO BE ALLOWED ONTO THE CAMPUS. 11 12 HE BROUGHT HIS GUESTS WITH HIM. 13 HE ALSO -- I AM SORRY, I DID NOT TELL YOU THAT 14 MR. AND MRS. MALEK WERE ALSO PRESENT AT THAT TIME HE BROUGHT 15 HIS GUESTS, HIS DAUGHTER, HER BOYFRIEND AND SO ON. AND HE WANTED THEM ALL TO COME UP AND ENJOY THE SQUARE DANCE. 16 17 Q WHAT, IF ANYTHING, DID MR. FRANCIS SAY? 18 HE TOLD HIM THAT HE WAS NOT WELCOME. 19 DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN GREGORY MULL SAID 20 SOMETHING TO YOU? 21 Α YES. 22 WHAT DID HE SAY? Q 23 HE DIDN'T SEE ME AT FIRST. AND WHEN HE 24 OBSERVED MY PRESENCE, HE WALKED OVER AND HE SAID, "OH, 25 HELLO," TO ME IN SOME WAY. HE TOLD ME THAT HE FELT VERY SORRY FOR ME, THAT I MADE SUCH A LARGE MISTAKE IN MY LIFE. 26 .27 FELT VERY SORRY FOR MY CHILDREN, THAT I HAD 28 MADE A LARGE MISTAKE IN SELLING MY HOME AND GIVING MY -- MY

1	MONEY TO THE CHURCH, FOR GIVING MY CHILDREN UP FOR THE
2	CHURCH, FOR REMAINING ON STAFF WHILE MY CHILDREN WENT BACK,
3	THAT I WAS A FOOL AND I WAS THAT I WAS A TERRIBLE PARENT
4	Q DID HE SAY THIS WITH OTHER PEOPLE PRESENT?
5	A YES.
6	Q TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID THE OTHER PEOPLE HEAR
7	17?
8	A I AM SURE THAT THEY DID. HE WAS VERY LOUD.
9	Q NOW, AT THAT TIME WHEN THIS OCCURRED, WERE YOU
10	DIVORCED AT THAT TIME?
11	A YES, I WAS.
12	Q WHEN WERE YOU DI VORCED?
13	A I WAS DIVORCED IN 1973.
14	Q WHEN DID YOU FIRST BECOME AFFILIATED WITH THE
15	CHUR CH?
16	A 1975.
17	Q HAD YOU EVER HEARD OF THE CHURCH AT THE TIME O
18	YOUR DIVORCE?
19	A NO.
20	Q DID THE CHURCH HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE
21	BREAKUP OF YOUR MARRIAGE?
22	A NO, NOT AS HE SAID. NOT AT ALL.
23	Q AND DID YOU AT SOME POINT SELL YOUR HOUSE?
24	A YES, I DID.
25	Q AND DID YOU DONATE THE MONEY TO THE CHURCH?
26	A I DID.
.27	Q DID ANYBODY ASK YOU TO DO THAT?
28	A NOT AT ALL.

1	Q DO YOU REGRET DOING THAT?
2	A NO.
3	Q AS FAR AS YOUR CHILDREN WITHDRAWN.
4	AS FAR AS YOUR CHILDREN, WERE YOU RESTRICTED IN
5	ANY WAY WITH HAVING CONTACT WITH THEM?
6	A NO, I WAS NOT.
7	Q DID YOU IN FACT HAVE CONTACT WITH THEM WHEN YOU
8	WANTED TO?
9	A YES, I DID.
10	Q DO YOU RECALL WHY YOU GAVE THE MONEY FROM THE
11	SALE OF YOUR HOUSE TO THE CHURCH?
12	MR. LEVY: I WOULD OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. RELEVANCE.
13	NO, I WITHDRAW THE OBJECTION. I AM CURIOUS.
14	THE COURT: SHE CAN ANSWER.
15	THE WITNESS: I WANTED TO SUPPORT THE CHURCH. WE
16	WERE AT THE TIME IN PASADENA AND ATTEMPTING TO PURCHASE WHAT
17	IS NOW CAMELOT. I BELIEVED IN THE COMMUNITY AND THE
18	ASCENDED MASTERS AND I WANTED TO BE WITH THE COMMUNITY. I
19	THOUGHT IT WOULD BE A WONDERFUL PLACE FOR MYSELF AND THE
20	CHILDREN. I BELIEVED IN THE FUTURE OF THE CHURCH.
21	Q BY MR. KLEIN: SINCE THEN YOU HAVE LEFT THE
22	STAFF AND MOVED BACK TO SAN FRANCISCO; AM I CORRECT?
23	A THAT'S CORRECT.
24	Q AND DOES THE FACT THAT YOU HAVE DONE THAT IN
25	ANY WAY CHANGE THE WAY YOU FELT ABOUT GIVING THE MONEY?
26	A NO.
.27	Q AFTER MR. MULL SPOKE TO YOU, DID HE SPEAK WITH
28	MR. FRANCIS?

1	A YES, HE DID. FOR SOMETIME.
2	
3	A IT WAS PRETTY MUCH IN THE SAME VEIN.
4	Q DURING THE TIME THAT MR. FRANCIS AND MR. MULL
5	WERE TALKING, WERE YOU THERE THE ENTIRE TIME?
6	A YES, I WAS.
7	Q DID A GROUP OF MEN AT ANY POINT EMERGE FROM
8	WHERE THE TREES WERE AND WALK ONTO THE ROAD AND BLOCK THE
9	ROAD?
10	A NO. WHAT IS FUNNY IS THERE ARE EUCALYPTUS
11	TREES, AND THEY ARE SKINNY TREES AND IT WOULD BE RATHER
12	DIFFICULT TO HIDE BEHIND ONE OF THESE EUCALYPTUS TREES.
13	ANOTHER THING, TOO, THERE WERE MANY PEOPLE
14	COMING ONTO THE CAMPUS WHO WERE INVITED TO THE SQUARE DANCE
15	WHO WERE DRIVING UP AND DOWN THE ROAD. IT WOULD HAVE BEEN
16	VERY PECULIAR TO SEE A GROUP OF MEN STANDING THERE AND IN
17	JUDO ROBES OR WHATEVER, KARATE ROBES. NO, THERE WAS NO ONE.
18	Q DURING THE CONVERSATION MR. FRANCIS HAD WITH
19	MR. MULL, AT ANY TIME WHILE MR. MULL WAS ON THE PROPERTY DID
20	ANYBODY MAKE ANY KIND OF THREATENING GESTURE TOWARDS HIM?
21	A NO.
22	Q AT ANY TIME DID ANYBODY MAKE ANY KIND OF
23	GESTURE TOWARDS MR. MULL?
24	A NOT AT ALL.
25	Q HOW MANY YEARS DID YOU LIVE AT CAMELOT?
26	A APPROXIMATELY FROM 1980 THROUGH 1983 OR 1979
.27	I AM SORRY. 1978 THROUGH 1983.
28	Q WHAT EFFECT, IF ANY, DID LIVING AT CAMELOT HAVE
	The same of the sa

1 ON YOUR WIFE? 2 I HAD A WONDERFUL SENSE OF COMMUNITY, OF FAMILY 3 GREATER THAN MY OWN, WHICH OF COURSE ENCOMPASSED MY OWN 4 FAMILY. I LOVED MY SERVICE ON THE STAFF. IT WAS A VERY RICH EXPERIENCE. THE COMMUNICATION WITH THE ASCENDED 5 6 MASTERS, THE DISCIPLES OF CHELA WAS WONDERFUL. IT WAS A 7 WONDERFUL EXPERIENCE. 8 DID YOU DECREE? Q 9 YES, I DID. 10 0 WHAT EFFECT DID DECREEING HAVE ON YOU? 11 IT WAS WONDERFUL. IT WAS A GREAT COMMUNICATION 12 WITH GOD. DID AND DOES. 13 Q I AM SORRY? 14 Α DID AND DOES. I STILL DECREE. 15 Q WHAT DID THE CHURCH TEACH YOU ABOUT HONESTY? 16 IT TEACHES HONESTY. DURING ALL THE TIME THAT YOU WERE AFFILIATED 17 18 WITH THE CHURCH, DID YOU EVER HEAR ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET 19 OR ANY CHURCH OFFICIAL TELL ANYONE TO DO ANYTHING THAT YOU CONSIDERED TO BE DISHONEST? 20 21 NO. Α 22 0 DID YOU GO TO SUMMIT UNIVERSITY? 23 Α YES, I DID. 24 Q DO YOU RECALL WHAT YEAR? 25 Α 1976. 26 Q HOW WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE THAT EXPERIENCE? .27 IT WAS A WONDERFUL EXPERIENCE. I LEARNED A 28 LOT. I LEARNED ABOUT THE ASCENDED MASTERS. IT WAS MY

1	Q HAVE A WONDERFUL TIME AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY?
2	A RIGHT.
3	Q HAVE A WONDERFUL TIME AT THE CONFERENCES?
4	A I DID.
5	Q HAVE A WONDERFUL TIME WHEN YOUR DAUGHTER
6	KEIRSTEN DECIDED SHE DIDN'T WANT TO LIVE IN THE CHURCH AND
7	SHE WANTED TO GO BACK AND LIVE WITH HER FATHER?
8	A IT WAS HER CHOICE.
૭	Q WAS IT WONDERFUL FOR YOU WHEN SHE DECIDED
10	A I RESPECTED HER CHOICE, HER FREE WILL.
11	Q THAT IS VERY NICE OF YOU.
12	WAS IT ALSO WONDERFUL FOR YOU WHEN SHE CHOSE
13	NOT TO LIVE WITH YOU AND BE INVOLVED IN THE CHURCH AND GO
14	BACK AND LIVE WITH HER FATHER?
15	A I DON'T KNOW IF I CAN ANSWER THAT QUESTION. I
16	DON'T QUITE UNDERSTAND IT. WHAT DO YOU MEAN "WONDERFUL"?
17	Q YOU TOLD US HOW WONDERFUL SUMMIT UNIVERSITY WAS
18	AND HOW WONDERFUL THE CHURCH WAS. I JUST WONDERED IF THAT
19	WAS WONDERFUL, TOO.
20	MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT. IT IS
21	ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR.
22	THE COURT: IT IS TIME FOR ANOTHER QUESTION.
23	Q BY MR. LEVY: YOU SAID YOU WERE A CHELA. WOULD
24	YOU TELL US WHAT A CHELA IS?
25	A CHELA IS A PERSON WHO HAS A COMMUNION WITH GOD
26	WHO LIVES IN ATTUNEMENT WITH THE WILL OF GOD WHO ATTEMPTS TO
. 27	BE IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE WILL OF GOD.
28	Q HAVE YOU EVER LOOKED UP THE WORD "CHELA" IN THE

1	WEBSTER DICTIONARY?
2	A CHELA MEANS SLAVE.
3	Q IT ALSO MEANS THE PAW OF A SCORPION. ARE YOU
4	AWARE OF THAT?
5	A NO, I AM SORRY.
6	Q YOU OUGHT TO TRY WEBSTER'S ONE TIME.
7	YOU WERE DESCRIBING FOR US THE SQUARE DANCE?
8	A CORRECT.
9	Q NOW, MR. MULL CAME TO THE SQUARE DANCE; IS THAT
10	RIGHT?
11	A YES, HE DID.
12	Q AND YOU LISTED A NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO WERE
13	PRESENT WHEN MR. MULL AND MR. FRANCIS HAD A CONVERSATION.
14	WHERE WERE THEY STANDING WHEN THEY HAD THE CONVERSATION?
15	A IN THE CENTER OF THE ROAD IN FRONT OF THE
16	GUARDHOUSE INITIALLY. AND THEN AFTER A SHORT TIME, WE ASKED
17	THEM TO MOVE OVER TO THE SIDE OF THE ROAD BECAUSE THEY WERE
18	OBSTRUCTING THE TRAFFIC, FLOW OF TRAFFIC GOING IN AND OUT OF
19	THE DRIVEWAY.
20	Q WAS THERE A PRETTY HEAVY FLOW OF TRAFFIC?
21	A SIZEABLE AMOUNT.
22	Q DID YOU HAVE TO CONCERN YOURSELF WITH THE
23	TRAFFIC, OR WERE YOU ABLE TO DODGE THE CARS OR HOW DID YOU
24	HANDLE THE SITUATION?
25	A I ASKED THEM TO MOVE OVER SO WE COULD HAVE THE
26	CARS PASS BY.
.27	Q HOW LONG DID THE CONVERSATION BETWEEN MR. MULL
28	AND MR. FRANCIS LAST?

1	A I WOULD SAY ABOUT 45 MINUTES.
2	Q DO YOU HAVE A GUESSTIMATE AS TO HOW MANY CARS
3	AND HOW MANY PEOPLE PASSED BY DURING THOSE 45 MINUTES?
4	A IT WAS KIND OF A LONG TIME AGO. NO, I DON'T.
5	Q YOU REMEMBER ALL THE PEOPLE THAT WERE THERE AND
6	EXACTLY WHAT THEY DID AND WHAT THEY SAID, BUT YOU HAVE NO
7	IDEA
8	A I DON'T REMEMBER EVERYTHING WHAT THEY SAID OR
9	WHAT THEY DID. I AM SORRY, I DON'T.
10	Q WERE THERE MORE THAN HALF A DOZEN CARS THAT
11	CAME THROUGH IN THAT 45 MINUTES?
12	A I AM SURE. IT WAS A SPECIAL EVENT. WE HAD
13	POSTERS UP AROUND THE AREA. WE INVITED FRIENDS, PEOPLE IN
14	THE COMMUNITY TO COME TO THE SQUARE DANCE. SO WE HAD MANY
15	PEOPLE DRIVE IN.
16	Q ALL I AM TRYING TO FIND OUT IS APPROXIMATELY
17	HOW MANY?
18	A I DON'T REMEMBER.
19	Q WELL, I KNOW YOU DIDN'T COUNT THE CARS, BUT I
20	AM JUST WONDERING WAS IT A LARGE NUMBER?
21	MR. KLEIN: OBJECT AS TO VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS.
22	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
23	Q BY MR. LEVY: WAS THE TRAFFIC FAIRLY HEAVY
24	COMING IN THROUGH THE FRONT GATE?
25	A WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY "HEAVY"?
26	Q WERE THERE A LOT OF PEOPLE? WAS THERE A LOT OF
27	CARS?
28	A HUNDREDS?

GROUP OF CARS, NO MATTER HOW MANY THERE WERE, THAT YOU COULDN'T FOCUS ALL OF YOUR ATTENTION ON A CONVERSATION YES, IT'S POSSIBLE THAT I COULDN'T FOCUS ALL OF

SO WOULD I BE CORRECT IN ASSUMING THAT THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN SOME EXCHANGE THAT YOU DID NOT ACTUALLY

NOW, WHILE YOU WERE FOCUSING YOUR ATTENTION ON ALL THESE CARS THAT WERE COMING IN, WHILE YOU WERE GREETING ALL THOSE CARS, IS IT POSSIBLE THAT ANY GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO WERE CONNECTED WITH THE CHURCH COULD HAVE APPROACHED THE GROUP OF PEOPLE THAT YOU DESCRIBED AS SURROUNDING MR. MULL

NO. BECAUSE I WAS STANDING RIGHT THERE WHERE

AND YOU WERE ON DUTY WATCHING OUT FOR THEM?

I WAS STANDING RIGHT WHERE MR. FRANCIS, MR.

AND YOU DIDN'T SEE ANYONE ELSE APPROACH THAT

YES. I SAW TOM MILLER CAME DOWN A LITTLE LATER ON. I DON'T REMEMBER THE EXACT -- HOW MUCH LATER HE CAME DOWN AFTER EDWARD. AND MONROE WAS THERE STANDING OFF TO THE SIDE AT ONE POINT. HE CAME DOWN TOWARDS THE VERY END OF THE

THERE WERE STAFF MEMBERS WHO CAME OUT OF THE

28

234

1 GRAPHICS BUILDINGS, LADIES WHO WERE WORKING GRAPHICS, MAYBE 2 A COUPLE OF GENTLEMEN WHO WALKED BY ON THEIR WAY UP TO THE 3 SQUARE DANCE. SO THERE WERE OTHER PEOPLE THAT CAME INTO THE Q AREA? 5 6 A FEW STAFF MEMBERS WHO WALKED BY, YES. 7 YOU SAID SOMETHING THAT PUZZLED ME A LITTLE 8 BIT. YOU SAID IF EVERYBODY WAS DRESSED IN KARATE ROBES, YOU 9 CERTAINLY WOULD HAVE NOTICED THEM. 10 ARE THE PEOPLE IN THE SECURITY DEPARTMENT AT 11 CAMELOT TRAINED IN KARATE? 12 I DON'T KNOW. I DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT QUESTION. 13 14 THAT IS NOT A HARD QUESTION. IS THERE A Q 15 SECURITY DEPARTMENT AT CAMELOT? 16 THERE MAY BE. Α 17 YOU WERE ONLY THERE FIVE, SIX YEARS AND YOU 18 DON'T KNOW, DO YOU? 19 I DON'T KNOW WHAT THEIR PRACTICES ARE NOW. I Α 20 AM SURE --21 WHEN YOU WERE THERE -- MA'AM, IT IS NOT A 22 DEBATE. I GET TO ASK QUESTIONS, YOU GET TO ANSWER THEM. 23 Α I KNOW. I AM SORRY. 24 WHEN YOU WERE THERE AT CAMELOT, WAS THERE A 25 SECURITY DEPARTMENT? 26 Α I BELIEVE THERE WAS. .27 DO YOU HAVE ANY KNOWLEDGE AS TO WHETHER OR NOT 28 THEY WERE TRAINED IN KARATE SINCE YOU BROUGHT UP KARATE

1 ROBES? 2 NO, I DON'T. Α 3 I AM CURIOUS AS TO WHY YOU --4 I DO NOT KNOW --5 MA'AM, I WILL ASK THE QUESTIONS AND I THINK IT WOULD BE NICE IF YOU JUST ANSWERED THEM. 6 7 MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I THINK THE WITNESS WAS 8 EXPLAINING HER ANSWER AND THAT IS CERTAINLY PROPER. 9 THE COURT: IT WOULD HELP IF SHE WOULD ANSWER. MAYBE 10 I CAN ASK A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS AND WE CAN MOVE THIS ALONG. 11 WERE THERE PEOPLE AT CAMELOT WHEN YOU WERE 12 THERE WHO HAD AMONG THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES SECURITY? 13 THE WITNESS: YES. 14 THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND THEY MAY HAVE HAD ADDITIONAL 15 RESPONSIBILITIES, BUT AT LEAST THERE WERE SOME PEOPLE WHO 16 HAD RESPONSIBILITY FOR SECURITY? 17 THE WITNESS: THAT'S CORRECT. 18 THE COURT: 15 THAT CORRECT? 19 THE WITNESS: YES, IT IS. 20 THE COURT: SO FAR SO GOOD? THE WITNESS: RIGHT. 21 THE COURT: NEXT, APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY PEOPLE HAD 22 23 RESPONSIBILITY FOR SECURITY? 24 THE WITNESS: THAT I DO NOT KNOW. 25 THE COURT: CAN YOU APPROXIMATE? 26 THE WITNESS: I CANNOT. I WAS NOT IN THE SECURITY DEPARTMENT. IF THERE -- I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY PEOPLE --.27 28 THE COURT: GIVE US A RANGE. ONE HUNDRED TO ONE

1 HUNDRED FIFTY, OR FIVE TO TEN, OR THIRTY TO FORTY OR 2 WHATEVER THE NUMBER. 3 THE WITNESS: VERY TRUTHFULLY I DON'T KNOW. 4 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 5 THE WITNESS: I WAS NEVER INVOLVED IN SECURITY. 6 THE COURT: DO YOU -- YOU UNDERSTAND THE EXPRESSION 7 "MARTIAL ARTS"? 8 THE WITNESS: YES. 9 THE COURT: HUM? 10 THE WITNESS: YES, I DO. 11 THE COURT: OKAY. DO YOU HAVE ANY INFORMATION THAT ANY OF THE PERSONS THAT WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT WHO HAD 12 13 SOME RESPONSIBILITY FOR SECURITY WERE TRAINED IN THE MARTIAL 14 ARTS? 15 THE WITNESS: YOU MEAN DO I HAVE ANY INFORMATION ANY 15 OF THE PEOPLE WE WERE TALKING ABOUT, MEANING THE PEOPLE WHO 17 WERE DOWN AT THE FRONT GATE ON THAT DAY? 18 THE COURT: YES. LET ME START OVER. THINK FOR A 19 MOMENT ABOUT ALL OF THE PEOPLE WHO HAD SOME RESPONSIBILITY 20 FOR SECURITY. THE WITNESS: UH-HUH. 21 22 THE COURT: WHEREVER THEY WERE THAT DAY. 23 DO YOU HAVE ANY INFORMATION THAT ANY OF THEM 24 HAD SOME TRAINING IN ANY OF THE MARTIAL ARTS? 25 THE WITNESS: IT IS A DIFFICULT QUESTION. I DON'T 26 KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT THE SECURITY DEPARTMENT. I DON'T KNOW .27 HOW MANY PEOPLE WERE INVOLVED IN SECURITY. 28 I KNOW THAT THERE WAS A DEPARTMENT. I DON'T

2

KNOW HOW MANY PEOPLE, SO I DON'T KNOW -- AND I DON'T KNOW IF THOSE PEOPLE WERE INVOLVED IN MARTIAL ARTS TRAINING. I DO NOT KNOW.

THE COURT: DO YOU KNOW IF ANYBODY AT CAMELOT HAD ANY TRAINING IN ANY OF THE MARTIAL ARTS?

THE WITNESS: I DON'T KNOW.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

Q BY MR. LEVY: WOULD IT BE A FAIR STATEMENT,
BASED ON THE QUESTIONS YOU'VE JUST ANSWERED, THAT YOU DON'T
KNOW WHO AT CAMELOT WHEN YOU WERE THERE WAS PART OF THE
SECURITY FORCE AND WAS TRAINED IN THE MARTIAL ARTS?

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. THERE
IS TWO QUESTIONS THERE AND IT IS A COMPOUND QUESTION. IT
ASSUMES -- THE FIRST ASSUMES THE SECOND.

THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU BREAK UP THE QUESTION.

- Q BY MR. LEVY: WOULD IT BE A FAIR STATEMENT,
 BASED ON YOUR TESTIMONY TO THE JUDGE, THAT YOU DON'T KNOW
 WHO WAS INVOLVED IN SECURITY?
 - A THAT'S CORRECT.
- Q WOULD IT ALSO BE A FAIR STATEMENT WHILE YOU WERE AT CAMELOT, THAT YOU HAVE NO IDEA WHO IT WAS THAT TRAINED IN THE MARTIAL ARTS?
 - A THAT IS ALSO CORRECT.
- Q WOULD IT ALSO BE A FAIR STATEMENT YOU WOULDN'T KNOW WHICH OF THE PEOPLE WHO APPROACHED THE LITTLE GATHERING YOU DESCRIBED TO US MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE BEEN SECURITY, WOULD YOU?
 - A THAT IS A DIFFICULT QUESTION TO ANSWER.

```
WHY DON'T YOU TRY.
 1
              Q
 2
                    WELL, AS I RECALL, SOME OF THE PEOPLE WHO
       WALKED BY WERE LADIES, OLDER LADIES WHO WORK AT GRAPHICS. I
 3
 4
       WOULD HARDLY IMAGINE THAT THEY WERE INVOLVED IN MARTIAL
 5
       ARTS.
 б
              Q
                    BUT YOU WOULDN'T KNOW, WOULD YOU?
 7
              Α
                    TRUTHFULLY NOT.
 8
                    SO IN ANSWER TO MY QUESTION, YOU DON'T KNOW WHO
 9
       OF THE PEOPLE THAT CAME BY WERE ON THE SECURITY DEPARTMENT
10
       OR WHICH OF THE PEOPLE MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE BEEN TRAINED IN
11
       THE MARTIAL ARTS, WOULD YOU?
12
                    NO, I DON'T.
              Α
13
              Q
                    DOES IT MAKE YOU UPSET TO SAY NO, YOU DON'T?
14
              Α
                    NO.
15
                    HOW MUCH DID YOU SELL YOUR HOUSE FOR?
              Q
16
              Α
                    $80,000.
                    DID YOU GIVE IT ALL TO THE CHURCH?
17
              Q
18
              Α
                    NO.
19
                    MOST OF IT TO THE CHURCH?
              Q
20
                    A BIG PORTION OF IT.
21
                    DID YOU HAVE ENOUGH LEFT OVER TO MOVE ALL YOUR
       BELONGINGS DOWN TO PASADENA WHERE THEY WERE LOCATED AT THE
22
23
       TIME?
24
              Α
                    YES, I DID.
25
                    DO YOU RECALL WHO MOVED YOUR PERSONAL
26
      POSSESSIONS AFTER THE SALE OF YOUR HOME TO QUARTERS IN
.27
       PASADENA?
28
                    YES, I DO.
              Α
```

1	Q WHY DON'T YOU TELL US WHO IT WAS.
2	A DONALD TROWBRIDGE AND I DON'T REMEMBER THE
3	OTHER PERSON.
4	Q PUT YOUR STUFF ON THE CHURCH BUS AND MOVED IT
5	RIGHT ON DOWN TO PASADENA?
6	A THAT'S CORRECT.
7	Q WERE YOU PERMANENT STAFF WITH THE CHURCH?
8	A NO, I WASN'T.
9	Q YOU WERE JUST WERE YOU EVER PROBATIONARY
10	STAFF WITH THE CHURCH?
11	A YES, I WAS.
12	Q DO YOU KNOW WHETHER OR NOT THERE IS A
13	REQUIREMENT AT THE CHURCH WHEN YOU BECOME PERMANENT STAFF,
14	YOU DIVEST YOURSELF OF ALL YOUR REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY
15	AND TURN IT OVER TO THE CHURCH?
16	A NO, I DON'T KNOW.
17	Q YOU WERE ONLY THERE FIVE OR SIX YEARS, BUT YOU
18	DON'T KNOW THAT?
19	A I WAS NEVER ASKED TO DIVEST OF MY PERSONAL
20	Q THAT IS NOT MY QUESTION TO YOU, MA'AM. WHAT I
21	SIMPLY ASKED YOU WAS DO YOU KNOW WHETHER OR NOT WHEN YOU
22	BECOME PERMANENT STAFF, THE RULE AT CAMELOT IS THAT YOU
23	THE RULE AT THE CHURCH IS THAT YOU TURN OVER YOUR REAL
24	PROPERTY AND
25	A I WAS NEVER APPRISED OF THAT RULE.
26	Q YOU JUST TURNED IT ALL OVER ANYWAY?
27	A I DIDN'T TURN IT OVER. I KEPT IT.
28	Q DID YOU MAKE A DONATION TO THE CHURCH?

75 TG 1

1	A I DID MAKE A DONATION TO THE CHURCH. BUT I
2	KEPT MY PERSONAL EFFECTS AND BELONGINGS, FURNITURE.
3	Q WHEN YOU MOVED TO PASADENA, WHERE DID YOU
4	RESIDE?
5	A I RESIDED ON THE PROPERTY IN PASADENA.
5	Q AND WOULD YOU TELL US WHAT THAT PROPERTY WAS
7	CALLED?
8	A IT WAS A CAMPUS IN PASADENA ON HOWARD STREET.
9	Q DID YOU HAVE A NICE ACCOMMODATION AT THE CAMPUS
10	ON HOWARD STREET IN PASADENA?
11	A YES, I DID.
12	Q WHEN YOU MOVED THERE, DID ANY OF YOUR CHILDREN
13	MOVE WITH YOU?
14	A YES, THEY DID.
15	Q HOW MANY OF THEM?
16	A BOTH OF THEM.
17	Q WOULD YOU TELL US WHAT YOUR ACCOMMODATIONS WERE
18	LIKE WHEN YOU MOVED ONTO HOWARD STREET IN PASADENA?
19	MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT AS TO THE RELEVANCY
20	AT THIS POINT, YOUR HONOR.
21	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
22	WE WILL RESUME AT 9:15 TOMORROW MORNING.
23	REMEMBER THE COURT'S ADMONITIONS.
24	(AT 4:05 P.M., AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN
25	UNTIL WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1986, AT
26	9:15 A.M.)
.27	·
28	