

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,

Wednesday, 13th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON

and a Jury

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT (a corporate body)

CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP,

Plaintiffs

CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER and

1972 P. No.2039

WENDY ANN PEACH

-AND-

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED and First Defendants

ED SANDERS

Second Defendant

and between:

SAME -AND- SAME

1972 P. No.1603

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October 1972)

-----

**FIRST DAY**

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,  
Wednesday, 13th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON  
and a Jury

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT (A corporate body)  
CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP, Plaintiffs  
CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER and 1972 P. No.2039  
WENDY ANN PEACH

-AND-

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED and First Defendants  
ED SANDERS Second Defendant

and between:

SAME -AND- SAME 1972 P. No.1603

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October 1972)

(Transcript from the Shorthand Notes of The Association of  
Official Shorthandwriters Ltd., Room 392, Royal Courts of  
Justice, and 2, New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.2)

MR MICHAEL KEMPSTER, Q.C. and MR PETER BOWSER (instructed by  
Messrs. Joynson-Hicks & Co.) appeared for the Plaintiffs.

MR BRIAN NEILL, Q.C. and MR LEON BRITTAN (instructed by  
Messrs. Goodman, Derrick & Co.) appeared for the First Defendants.

THE SECOND DEFENDANT did not appear and was not represented.

E V I D E N C E

F I R S T D A Y

Mr CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP, Sworn

Examined by Mr KEMPSTER

- Q Are you Christopher Alfred Fripp? A. Yes.
- Q Mr Fripp, what is your present address? A. 242 East 49th Street, New York City.
- Q Mr Fripp, are you a member of the Process-Church of the Final Judgement? A. Yes, I am.
- Q Are you a full-time Minister of that Church? A. Yes.
- Q What is your present function in that church? What do you do and what are you seeking to do? A. My function is that of a Senior Minister in the church, primarily working in the United States, but also in Canada, and also with responsibility for certain of our members in this country. I am a member of what is called the Council of Masters, which is the senior body within the church, comprising some dozen people, who are the Senior Ministers and responsible for the well-being of the church.
- Q I think it is common ground that you are also a trustee of the property of the Process-Church in the United Kingdom? A. That is so.
- Q When did you join the Process-Church? A. In the earlier part of 1965.
- Q That is at a time before it was incorporated in the United States? A. Yes.
- Q I don't think that matters from this point of view, but would you explain to the Jury in your own words why you joined the Process? A. I joined initially on the basis not of a full-time dedication or a lifework. My first contact with the Process was that I met an old friend of mine whom I had known at school and also at University, and he was attending certain courses which were then being held by the group in London. I was interested by what he told me of the activities of the group, and decided to go and investigate it for myself, which I did. I met many members of the group and it immediately struck me that the group was a helpful - potentially very helpful - element in society, helpful both for myself personally and for other people who might have the same kind of need for help as I felt myself at that time.
- Q Perhaps you could indicate to the Jury - it may be a little personal, but this cannot be avoided - what sort of help you felt you needed at that time? A. Yes. At that time I was aged, I think, 27, and I had been practising as a chartered accountant for about five years. That was a career which I had selected and which had every indication of being financially rewarding for me, and also I think of providing me with an established, and possibly successful, career. However, there was another aspect of my life which I felt was not as satisfactory as the matter of earning a living in a responsible and reputable kind of way. That area of my life was concerned with



what I felt my job, my duty if you like - I think sometimes in terms of duty - might be in terms of helping other people. What I mean by that is that my experience of chartered accountancy as a profession gave me very little outlet for certain aspects of myself, aspects which I wished to use in fact to help people. I found it a somewhat arid profession.

Q Having felt this need - and I won't try to put it in my words - in what way did the Process appear to you to meet this personal need? A. I think in several ways. Initially the one that struck me most forcibly was the degree of honesty and openness that existed between the members of the group. It also seemed to me to be an intelligent group of people, who were, in a serious way, endeavouring to improve themselves. So, initially on a somewhat experimental basis, I decided to maintain my contact with the group.

Q Has your commitment deepened or otherwise since those years? A. It has undoubtedly deepened, and I now regard myself as having a lifetime vocation in my church, and I regard that as a settled fact of my remaining years.

Q Before you started to study accountancy, I think you were at university and you served, did you, as a Lieutenant in the Royal Horse Artillery during your period of National Service? A. Yes, that is correct, two years National Service.

Q Turning away for a moment from your personal position, can you, in your own words, perhaps express what you see as the meaning of the word "process" which is enshrined in the title of the first Plaintiffs? A. Yes, certainly. The word "process" for us reflects an aspect of our thinking about life in general. By that I mean that we all, I think - all Ministers of the church - regard life as a continuing process, a process of growth, or potential growth at any rate, and self-improvement, an on-going thing rather than a static thing; hence the word "process".

Q I wonder whether, again as briefly as may be, you could, in your own words, explain to the Members of the Jury what members of the Process-Church believe? A. Yes. Obviously, since the organisation is called a church, we are religious, and therefore obviously we believe in God. The foundation of our beliefs lies in the words of Christ, particularly in two of His teachings. The first is that he said "As ye sow, so shall ye reap". He said it in fact in many ways. Another was "As you give, so shall you receive". He also said, "Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you".

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: So far we have not got any striking novelty about any of these. A. I would say not, my Lord.

MR KEMPSTER: I hope your Lordship is not unduly disappointed. I shall explore all the difficulties of the Process belief.

Q I wonder, Mr Fripp, whether you can find something novel for my Lord? A. Yes, I am sure I can. If I may, I would like to just mention the second of the two precepts of Christ I mentioned earlier. The second is "Love your enemies".

A MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I thought the second was "As you give, so shall you receive". That is the one you quoted just now. A. I quoted three things, my Lord, all of which amount to the same thing. "As you give, so shall you receive", "As you sow, so shall you reap" and "Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you". So that the second is "Love your enemies". This I would like to expand a bit, possibly reaching the new territory that you were asking for, Mr Kempster. What I am talking about here is the whole problem of evil. The problem of evil, as we all know, is something that B has concerned theologians and churchmen and religious people for a very long time. For instance, in the Old Testament, in the Book of Job, the problem of evil, where it comes from, and what it is all about and how we should deal with it, is treated at great length. We believe that loving your enemy is the only way to deal with evil effectively; and this we extend to the doctrine of what we call the Unity of Christ and Satan. C We do that because -----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Mr Kempster, I do not want to interfere with your examination-in-chief, but it does occur to me it is just possible that these precepts may be set out in print somewhere, a sort of practice direction, or something like that.

MR KEMPSTER: Your Lordship will remember that yesterday afternoon I referred your Lordship to the constitution registered with the Charity Commissioners.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is quite right. I have got that here.

E MR KEMPSTER: I rather thought that the Members of the Jury, having regard to the allegations made against the Process-Church and these individual members, might be quite interested to see the sincerity of belief that they held, if your Lordship will permit that.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is a different matter. I thought possibly, if these principles or practice directions are set out in writing, it might save some time.

F MR KEMPSTER: I am sure your Lordship can rely on me not to run the evidence further than I think proper in the Plaintiffs' interests.

Q Mr Fripp, you were dealing with the doctrine of the Unity of Christ and Satan. Have you any more to say about the implications of that doctrine? A. Yes, two things. One is when Christ said "Love your enemies", He must also have been talking about Himself and what He regarded as His job; and in our belief Christ regarded part of his own mission as to redeem Satan, who is the traditional figure of evil. Lastly, I think that this has very direct, everyday, practical application for us in our everyday lives in dealing with evil, the problems of life, drug addicts, alcoholics, people who have mental problems, people who are alienated from society, criminals, which is a large part of what our work is concerned with. H

Q You have been in Court, I think, while I was mentioning that

the Process over the years have put out a number of publications, some fairly sensational in their get-up. Is that right?  
A. Yes.

Q Doubtless Mr Neill, on my left, will have a lot to ask you about that, but in general do you feel in a position to explain to the Members of the Jury what was and has been the aim of the Process in putting out publications with an apparently sensational appeal? A. Yes, I do.

B Q If you would explain to the Jury. A. In our early days as an organisation, our prime area of concern, so far as our publications went, was to expose the roots of all the negative aspects of human life. By "negative" I mean harmful, evil, destructive, creating death, aspects of life in which human beings fail, all that kind of thing; war, violence, sexual problems, mental problems, drug problems - as I say, all the negative aspects of human life. What we were seeking to do was to throw light on why those problems exist. We knew that we were facing a difficult task. Obviously what I have just said implies no small job. We also knew that people in general would often rather not look at a problem, and rather pretend that it does not exist. When I say "people in general", I include myself. For instance, war. War is obviously an appalling thing. It is also obviously part of mankind's history, and a very large part at that. But often one finds war glorified or excused, or it is dressed up as something other than destructive and death-giving. So, as an example, when we came to write about war, we intentionally wrote about it in a sensational manner, endeavouring to evoke a response. We wanted a reaction. We wanted to create a stir. We did not want to write another little tract which nobody would take any notice of. We wanted to publish something which would alert as many people as we could reach to the appalling atrocities of war. The reason we wanted to do that was to get the problem examined at its roots.

Q Do the same comments apply to your Process studies of death, fear and sex? A. In varying degree, yes.

F Q I am shortly going to ask you to deal with each of these further and better particulars of Defence, which are all still relied on by the Defendants. Before doing so, however, I myself evaded a question which the learned Judge put to me this morning as to the meaning, in one of your publications, of the word "transcendence". Can you help the Members of the Jury with that? A. Yes. "Transcendence" means rising above, getting above a particular level of problem, transcending a difficulty, rising above a difficulty, so that it ceases to be a difficulty.

MR KEMPSTER: Members of the Jury, to follow my questions now, would you pick up again this bundle of what we call pleadings? It starts with the Amended Statement of Claim, and then goes on to the Defence and the particulars of justification. It is page 38.

A MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Again I don't want in the least to interfere with the conduct of your case, but are these matters that could more usefully be pursued in cross-examination? Do you want to go through them all in chief?

A MR KEMPSTER: With respect, my Lord, I certainly propose to turn the pages with this witness in chief. Many of the matters will not in any event be within his knowledge; so I don't think it will take very long.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: After all, these are the facts relied on by the Defendants in support of their justification, are they not?

B MR KEMPSTER: They are indeed, my Lord.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: So is not that burden best left on the shoulders of the Defendants?

MR KEMPSTER: It is certainly on their shoulders, my Lord. There are just two positive matters, though, that it would seem appropriate to ask this witness, because they are admitted.

C Q Would you turn on, Mr Fripp, until you come to page 43? Paragraph 23 says: "In the Death Issue of Process Magazine an article by Charles Manson appeared on page 36". Is that correct? A. I could not swear as to the page, but it certainly appears in the issue, yes.

Q Would you explain to the Members of the Jury how you came to publish an article by this particular individual, the motive behind doing so, and what you hoped to achieve by doing so? A. Yes. The reason that we printed an article by Charles Manson in our Process magazine about Death was that we wished to present as many contrasting views about death as possible. (Copies of Process magazine on "Death" produced and marked Exhibit P.11).

E MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: From Manson to Muggeridge.

MR KEMPSTER: Yes. This organisation is very catholic in one sense of the word, my Lord.

F Q You were explaining, I think, Mr Fripp, what you had in mind in putting in Mr Manson's contribution. A. Yes. It was in order to present as many contrasting views about death as possible. As you will see, the article by Mr Manson is on the left-hand side of the page, and the article by Malcolm Muggeridge (who is a well-known, prominent Christian) is on the right-hand side of the page.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did they both get paid for it? A. Neither of them got paid, my Lord.

MR KEMPSTER: If my learned friend wants more, he can ask you about that. Then going down to paragraph 25 on the same page in the pleadings (43), did you in fact visit Charles Manson after his conviction? A. Yes, I did, in jail.

I Q Again would you explain to the Members of the Jury why you did this? A. I visited him in prison because I wished to see if I could help him. He was clearly a person very lost and probably mad, and probably without anybody to help him. So I visited him in order to endeavour to do that, to help him.

Q Paragraph 26: "These Defendants" - that is Rupert Hart-Davis - "will contend that there were marked similarities between the First Plaintiffs and the Charles Manson Group in the combination of an absolute leader ..." Does the Process-Church have an absolute leader? A. No, very definitely not.

Q Secondly, "the use of exotic garb". What have you got to say about clothing? A. In my judgment, we have never worn exotic garb.

B Q Then: "the subtle but persistent break down of personality in the group sessions". I think the proper question for me to put is: does the church conduct any sort of psychological or other practices having either the aim or the effect of breaking down personality? A. No, certainly not.

C Q Then, "the use of drugs". Does the Process-Church of the Final Judgement in fact use drugs or advocate the use of drugs? A. No; quite the reverse. It has been a rule of our organisation since the beginning that people should not use drugs. I use "drugs" in the sense of narcotic drugs; I am not talking about aspirins. We have always encouraged people around us not to use drugs either.

MR KEMPSTER: I think, my Lord, I can leave the rest of those to Mr Neill now.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: So do I.

MR KEMPSTER: Mr Fripp, when did you first read this book "The Family"? Did you read it in America or here? A. I first read it in America.

E Q Then did you later read this edition published by Rupert Hart-Davis? A. Yes, I did.

Q In which I think you are named? A. Yes, I am.

Q What were your personal reactions on reading this book and the references to the Process and to you? A. I was appalled. This was obviously a potentially very damaging book about me, about my work, and about what I am endeavouring to do in the world. It said an enormous number of extremely hostile, damaging, unpleasant - there are all sorts of adjectives I could use - things about myself, about my friends, about the people I work with and about the church to which I dedicated my life, and I regard it as an extremely serious matter for me personally, for my friends, for my family, for people who put their trust in me, and for everything that I stood.

Q Did you at some stage read the particulars of justification to which I have just been drawing your notice? A. Yes.

H Q What were your reactions when you saw what the Defendants were still saying about you and the church? A. I was frankly amazed that they should have such tiny, and in most cases totally untrue, things to say in support of allegations of such enormous graveness. I personally feel I am accused of murder in that book, and I don't like it.

Q Then did you read the further particulars of justification,

bringing in the work of the Church of Final Judgement in Toronto, that were served as late as August 3rd of last year? (Page 54 in bundle). A. Yes, I did.

Q What was your reaction to that matter? A. It seemed to me to indicate, yet again, a very irresponsible attitude on the part of the publishers. It also struck me as being totally untrue, because I have some quite close acquaintance with the work of our church in Toronto.

Cross-examined by Mr NEILL

Q Mr Fripp, you and I will have to cover quite a lot of ground, and I just wonder if we can start with what you know about Charles Manson. You told my Lord and the Jury that you went to visit him in prison. A. Yes.

Q Did you have some discussion with him? A. No, I would not say I had any discussion with him. The circumstances were that there was a thick metal grille between me and him. There were two warders standing immediately behind him, and two lawyers standing immediately behind me. The conversation lasted about half an hour, and it consisted very largely of some rather insane rantings by Charles Manson.

Q Before you went to see Mr Manson in prison, had you taken time to study what Manson had done and what he believed in? A. I had read the newspapers, which contained certain accounts of what he was supposed to have done, and of his conviction at the trial. As to what he believed in, I had very little idea.

Q Let us see how far you can help us on that. Manson believed, did he not, that the world was coming to an end? A. I don't know whether he believed that or not.

Q Manson was fascinated, was he not, by that part of the scripture in the Book of Revelations which deals with final judgment? A. Again, I don't know. I am not an expert on Manson.

Q Do you know this much, that he was fascinated by death and destruction? A. I know that he was convicted of murders, and some of the things that he is reported to have said would indicate that he had a lot of attention on death and destruction.

Q You saw fit, Mr Fripp, to commission a special article by him for the Death issue of your magazine, did you not? A. Yes.

Q I think it is plain from the document itself that that was specially written for you. Let us look at it. Have you got the Death issue of the magazine? A. Yes, I have.

Q On page 36, left-hand column, ten or fifteen lines down: "Later in the jail cell Charles Manson, in an article specially written for the Process, developed these thoughts and gives his reality on death". A. Quite right.

Q I don't want to ask you about something that you yourself don't know, but was it you or somebody else who decided that an article by Charles Manson, the convicted murderer, was to appear in the Process magazine? A. It was not primarily me who decided that. I was aware of the decision, but it was not actually my decision.

- Q Whose decision was it? A. I believe it was the decision of the editor of this magazine.
- Q You can help me more about individuals in the organisation. Who would that be? Would that be Hugh Mountain? A. No. If you look on the inside of the back cover, you will see the editorial staff is set out, and at the top you will see "Malachi - Editor".
- Q These are not their real names, are they? A. That is Father Malachi's religious name and title, and the name by which he is generally known.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: His religious name? A. Yes, my Lord.
- MR NEILL: This is his religious, or sacred name as it is sometimes called. What is his real name, or legal name, if you prefer that? A. Peter McCormick.
- Q Was it his decision, are you saying, to have an article by Manson in the magazine? A. I believe it was, yes. As I said also, I was aware of the decision.
- Q To be quite fair about it, does that mean it was discussed with you and you approved of it? A. I certainly approved of it. I cannot recall whether it was discussed in any great depth.
- Q In which part of the church is Father Malachi, his Chapter? A. He is currently living in New York.
- Q I don't think we have heard much about the organisation of the church, but there are a number of what are called Chapters, are there not? A. Yes, there are.
- Q Which, if I may use a lay term, would be different branches of the church in different cities: one in London, one in New York, one in Toronto, one in Chicago, and so on; is that right? A. Yes.
- Q So he was in the New York Chapter? A. He is currently in the New York Chapter.
- Q At that time was he in London? A. At what time?
- Q At the time it was decided that this article by Manson should be published. A. No. I believe he was in Toronto, Canada.
- Q Again on Manson, do you know anything about his interest in witchcraft? A. Very little. I know very little indeed about his beliefs. He is in America traditionally part of the general atmosphere. I suppose you could say it is in common language that Manson was concerned with magic and witchcraft, yes.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Common knowledge, was it? A. I would say so, my Lord, yes. It was certainly his repute.
- MR NEILL: Was it common knowledge that he was linked with motor

cycle gangs in the California area? A. As to that, I don't know. I personally have not heard such, other than what Mr Sanders has written.

A Q Again, we have not heard about this, but it is right, is it not, that you went to California yourself at one time? A. I have been to California many times.

Q We will perhaps have to go into that in due course. Were you aware that the followers of Manson dressed in black?

B A. No, I was not. I have actually seen I think four of Manson's followers outside his jail cell, and they were not wearing black. That is my only contact with them.

Q But at the time when he was at liberty, are you aware that there were occasions when they dressed in black? A. No. I never saw him while he was at liberty, nor have I read any accounts of whether he was wearing black or anything else.

C Q We will perhaps come back to that later. I think you told us that you first became interested in Process in 1965; is that right? A. Correct.

Q Who was it that first introduced you to Process? A. He was a man called Alister Clayre.

I Q Through him did you get to know Mr and Mrs De Grimston? A. He introduced me to the group, and as part of the group I met Mr and Mrs De Grimston.

Q Mr and Mrs De Grimston were the leading members of the group, were they not? A. Yes, I would say that is true.

E Q Because when we come to look at some of the literature that you published, a very large amount of it was, I won't say written, but appeared with the name of Mr De Grimston associated with it. That is right, is it not? A. Yes, that is correct.

Q I want to pass straightaway to some of the publications which you were putting out for the public. Before we actually look at any of them, let us see if we can agree on some points. The organisation called the Process, or the church, as it became, called the Process, had headquarters in London at 2 Balfour Place at one time. That is right, is it not? A. Yes.

Q In the middle of 1966, as Mr Kempster told us yesterday when he opened the case, is it right that the group went to the Bahamas and then on to Mexico to a place called Xtul? A. Several members of the group went to the Bahamas and then on to Xtul; not all the members.

Q Did you go? A. Yes, I did.

Q Mr and Mrs De Grimston went? A. Yes.

Q Did the other two Plaintiffs go? A. Yes, they did.

H Q Again, we may have to come back and look at that in more detail later. When you came back from Mexico, was it then that you



moved to Balfour Place, or had you been there before?  
A. No. We moved into Balfour Place in the Spring of 1966.

Q Then in 1967 - I think this was the first time - did the Process begin to publish various sorts of publications? A. No. There were certain publications which we put out before that date.

Q There had been some before the beginning of 1967? A. Yes.

Q At any rate, I think at the moment I am only concerned with the 1967 ones. I don't think I have seen earlier ones than that. In 1967 you carried on with publishing a number of pamphlets, and then in April 1967 a magazine called "Process"; is that right? A. I would say broadly correct. Whether it was in April that we published an issue, I cannot recall.

Q Perhaps you will take it from me for the moment. If I am wrong about it, your learned counsel will correct me. Let us just see what the purpose of these publications was. The purpose of these publications was to set out, was it not, the teaching of the Process Church? A. No one publication was designed to set out all the teachings, obviously, but broadly what you are saying is true - the teachings as they were then.

Q If one were persuaded to buy all the publications, one would then, by reading all the publications, get a picture of the teaching of the Process Church; is that right? A. Yes, I think that is probably pretty correct.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Has the discovery in this case included a profit and loss account or a balance sheet?

MR NEILL: My Lord, there have been accounts, yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Perhaps we shall see them at some time.

MR NEILL: Again, I am coming very soon to looking at some of these, but so that I can follow it, am I right in thinking, having read not everything but some of these publications, that what you were telling the public about the teaching of the church was that, in addition to the Christian God, there were other Gods whom you worshipped? A. Two points, Mr Neill. One is that we were not officially a church at that time.

Q This is 1967. I think, strictly speaking, it was the beginning of 1968 that you called yourself a church, was it not? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Let us deal with the time when you called yourself a church.

MR NEILL: I am taking this from what Mr Kempster told us, I think. You then became interested in religion, anyhow? A. Yes, certainly.

Q Let us leave aside the word "church" and call yourself a religious organisation. Would that be right? A. Yes, that would be fine.

Q You were seeking to tell the public that you, as an organisation, believed not only in the Christian God, but also in three other Gods? A. Yes.

Q Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan? A. And Christ - or is that the Christian God you are referring to?

Q You must help me. Therefore, you would say there were four: there is the Christian God, and, in addition to that you treated Christ separately, and then the three Gods: Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan; is that right? A. Not precisely. It is more that we say that there is God, who is the overall deity, if you like, and we speak of four aspects of God, who have in our terms the names which you have just listed; four aspects of one God.

C MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan are three. Who is No.4? A. Christ, my Lord.

MR NEILL: When you came to publish your publications, you were seeking to set out, as far as the three Gods - that is, Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan - the teachings which they had passed to you by means of revelation. That is right, is it not? A. "Teachings" I think is not a wholly accurate word. "Views", if you like, "attitudes", but I would not have said "teachings" at that point.

Q Let us start by one of the copies of your magazine, because in the early summer of 1967 you began to put out a magazine called "Process", did you not? A. Yes.

Q That was on sale at Balfour Place, was it? A. I am not actually certain which issue of the magazine you are referring to, Mr Neill.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: In early 1967 did you start a magazine called "Process"? A. My Lord, the magazines had several editions, several issues.

F MR NEILL: We will start with the first one I want to bother the Jury with, which is No.2. That is May 1967. It is called "Freedom of Expression". That one you recognise? A. Yes.

Q That was one which was on sale at Balfour Place; is that right? A. True.

Q Was that a magazine which, in addition to being on sale at Balfour Place, members of the Process were going round London selling to anyone who wished to buy it? A. Yes.

Q Perhaps we could see if there are copies available.

H MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, we have not got copies available. If your Lordship would look on page 39 of the pleadings, which sets out the documents relied on by the Defendants, this particular issue does not appear.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I dare say it does not.

MR KEMPSTER: That is why we have not got it.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: He told us it was one of their publications early in 1967. If Mr Neill wants to refer to it, he can, but it is unfortunate if the Jury and I cannot have it.

MR NEILL: My Lord, there are copies here. I think my learned friend rather, if I may respectfully say so, jumped the gun. (Copies of Process magazine on "Freedom of Expression" produced and marked Exhibit P.12)

MR KEMPSTER: I am sorry; it is one I have not seen.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: There are only two for the Jury.

MR NEILL: There is not much, my Lord. It is only a little bit.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If you can indicate to me the little bit, they are very welcome to mine.

THE WITNESS: Excuse me; I don't have one.

MR KEMPSTER: I think the witness better have my copy, my Lord. Whether I have jumped the gun or not, we have not got many copies of this one.

MR NEILL: Let us look at the editorial. This is the issue which came out in May 1967, called "Freedom of Expression", and this is the one that was on sale at that time. The editorial, first of all, on page 3. It starts off by: "Suppression is the keynote of our country", and so on. I am not going to read it all. Then in the last paragraph but one it has this to say: "It is time to rid ourselves, once and for all, of the grey people who presume to judge over what a man may read or listen to. Law and law-giving would be infinitely more acceptable if it were conceived in a spirit of inspiration and leadership. It is not. We call upon all extreme people to forget the conflicts between left and right and to unite against the grey forces of suppression". That is what you were teaching at that time, was it not, Mr Fripp, that the extremes were to unite and the enemy (if I may use that expression) were the ordinary grey people who followed conventional lines? A. I would take exception to two of your expressions there. One was the use of the word "enemy". I personally never regarded the teachings as being one of enmity.

Q When it says "unite against", you don't regard that as indicating enmity? A. No.

Q It indicates opposition, does it? A. Yes.

Q Perhaps, having started with that, now let us turn to page 25. Again, I am not going to read all this, because we have a lot to go through. This is an article which begins on page 24, if I can understand the lay-out, and starts with this phrase: "How can you recognise the Grey Forces at work in political society?" Then on the right-hand page, half-way down, just by the long line of your Process sign: "Is there anything that can be done about the grey forces? Yes, indeed. Jehovah and Lucifer have returned to the scene of the failure; but now

they are not working in opposition, but in conjunction and cooperation. And their purpose? To root out the grey forces utterly from every sphere of society and destroy them. To bring the world and every individual in it to a full recognition of their total failure before God. To annihilate the irrelevance and rubbish that clog men's brains. To bring every grey government to its knees and to replace it either with utter chaos and anarchy or with a militant dictatorship working in accordance with the will of Jehovah. Jehovah and Lucifer are sick of a world which has suppressed all knowledge of their existence. They are back to bring humanity to its logical end; and to oppose them is to invite spiritual death". Do those sentences which I have read represent the views of Process at that time, May 1967?

A. I don't think they can be taken in isolation. One important point I feel here is that the word "grey forces" in this context does not refer to individuals; it refers to what you might call a spiritual atmosphere of suppression, which is what this magazine is all about. It is saying, if people are not allowed to express themselves, then what happens is that they get rather like an ingrowing toe nail, and what you end up with is a period of apparent calm, followed by an explosion of violence. What we are saying here is that the grey forces which - and I repeat it - are not necessarily individuals, and in this context are not individuals but are spiritual forces, inducing people to be tepid, uncourageous, and to not say what they really feel; and our thesis, if you like, in this is that it is much better if people say what they feel rather than not saying what they feel and going around in a state of suppressed hostility.

Q Not only say what they feel, but do what they want. That is what you are teaching, is it not, or were teaching then?  
A. No, certainly not.

Q Let us just look at it again together quite quietly, Mr Fripp. Are you saying the words "Jehovah and Lucifer have returned to the scene of the failure .... And their purpose", and so on, "To bring every grey government to its knees and to replace it either with utter chaos and anarchy or with a militant dictatorship" is talking about spiritual forces?  
A. I am afraid I don't understand your question.

Q I thought you told us a few minutes ago that when you were referring to "grey forces" in that context you were talking of spiritual forces? A. Yes.

Q Are you saying that the word "grey government" is to be construed in the same way as "spiritual government"? A. No, not necessarily. I was explaining the use of the word "grey forces". You are now talking about "grey government".

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You tell us what you mean by "grey government". A. The same thing, my Lord, a government which does not have the courage of its convictions, which follows a policy of vacillating moderation rather than doing what it feels needs to be done.

MR NEILL: That would be any government which did not subscribe to a militant dictatorship; is that right? A. I think what we are saying here, Mr Neill, is that as we interpreted it at that time, two of the four aspects of God, Jehovah and Lucifer, were

intending to change the situation in that they personally did not like irrelevance and rubbish, and failure before God, and that they were intending to work towards changing it. That was not something that we were advocating as being a good thing. It is, I think, at this point in the nature of a prophesy. We were not saying that everybody has got to jump up and do this, or, indeed, that we were going to jump up and do it, but more in the nature of a prophesy.

Q I hear what you say about that. Let us turn on to page 27. Here we will see some advertisements for some of the literature that was on sale. If people were not getting enough from the Process magazine itself, they could buy some of these other booklets. We see advertisements on page 27 for four booklets, one "Man's Relationship to Man", secondly "Jehovah on War", thirdly "And There Was Darkness", and fourthly "Drug Addiction". I am not going to trouble you with all these, but let us just see how "Jehovah on War" is being advertised in May 1967. We see it is "Jehovah on War -- 4/-". "Therefore do I now prophesy. I no longer command. Instead I prophesy, and My prophecy upon this wasted earth and upon the corrupt creation that squats upon its ruined surface is: "Thou shalt kill". What was the point of putting that as an advertisement for this booklet?  
A. What it was getting across, if you like, is Jehovah's view on the world, or a part of his view on the world.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: And the inverted commas are intended to be a quotation from Jehovah, are they? A. I would need to refresh my memory from the full text, my Lord.

Q You have a look and tell me. What else do they mean?  
A. He is prophesying, my Lord.

Q Jehovah is? A. Yes, "Thou shalt kill". He specifically makes the point that he is not commanding; he is prophesying that there will be killing.

MR NEILL: We will look at it in due course. That is the message that is being recorded by Mr De Grimston, set out in this booklet "Jehovah on War", and advertised in this Process magazine; is that right? A. That is what the advertisement says, yes. The book says more than that, obviously.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is the advertisement in any way misleading? A. No, I don't think it is, my Lord.

MR NEILL: Now let us go on to the June issue, because on the back page of this one they say in the next month, the June issue of Process, there is going to be one on mindbending. Let us all have a look together at the mindbending issue of Process.

My Lord, we have had photograph copies prepared of this. If there are originals in colour, I would be grateful if they could be produced. (Copies of Process magazine for June 1967 produced and marked Exhibit P.13).

C I think you were in court yesterday when Mr Kempster was telling us the sort of people among whom Mr and Mrs De Grimston had been working and, indeed, those among whom the church now works, and you gave some evidence about this yourself a little earlier this afternoon. Is it right to say that those to whom the Process Church were coming, and to whom their teaching was going, many of them, were people mentally disturbed, mentally distressed, suffering from drug addiction, and persons who in one way or another were inadequate personalities? A. No. I would not say that is true at that time. We are talking about 1967. At that time we were still in the stage of organising ourselves, of experimenting, of working out what we wanted to do and how we proposed to do it. We were not seeking to reach a large number of people by direct personal contact. You referred earlier to something I said about the kind of people we work with now in terms of criminals and drug addicts and people alienated from society and so on. That was not true in 1967.

D Q Mr Kempster told us in his opening - I do not hold it against you - that Mr and Mrs De Grimston had been working among such people right back in 1965 or so. Is that wrong? A. Yes. The point I am making is not that there were no such people, but rather that the majority of people were people rather like myself, and I would certainly not say that I was mentally disturbed at any time.

Q But this was something - again so that we can get it clear - for sale not only in Balfour Place but was being taken round London, on sale by members of Process? A. Yes.

E Q And anyone who was prepared to pay 2s.6d., as it was in those days, could buy one? A. Yes.

Q On the front page we can see there are pictures. "Just who is brain washing who?". "Is Savundra one of us?". Then a picture "Sedative for death". That is meant to be a picture of a watch tower on a concentration camp, is it not? A. Yes, it would appear to be.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: At page 14 is a headline: "Liveralism, The Sedative for Death".

J MR NEILL: I am not going to take up too much time over this, but let us look at some of the passages there. Inside the front page, on the righthand page, we have written sideways: "Jehovah Christ Lucifer". In June 1967 Satan had not come on the scene as a name, had it - he arrives in July. Is that right? A. I don't really understand your question. What do you mean, "he comes on the scene"?

Q Satan: we do not see his name on this title page, do we? A. No, that is true.

H MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You told us about belief in God and the others; the others included Jehovah, Lucifer, Satan and Christ? A. Yes.

MR NEILL: But he is not actually featured on this page? A. No, not on this page he is not.

Q We see we have "Revelations every Sunday"? A. Yes.

Q And the times are set out: "Jehovah"-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "Revelations" is another word for "meetings", is it? A. Yes, including a talk by somebody, my Lord.

MR NEILL: Then on page 4 we see the pictures there. You see the bit which in my copy is in purple, but in the copy the Jury has will be just inset in black towards the top of the page, the picture with the swastika? A. Yes.

Will you tell us in your own words, what conceivable purpose was there for including that picture on that page? A. This page is in fact an advertisement page for films, and you can see there are a number of film titles at the bottom of the page: "Orpheus, The Seventh Seal", etc. As I explained earlier, one of the things we were seeking to do at that time was to bring home to people the truth about the horrible things that go on in the world, and the photographs on this particular page fit into this context. They were intended to shock, to draw attention to the fact that mankind is capable of some very terrible things.

Q Then on page 5 there is only one thing I want to draw your attention to, because we will see a reference to this later. It gives the Contents (righthand page), then near the bottom, on the right:

"PROCESS magazine is published by THE PROCESS of 2, Balfour Place... PROCESS magazine gives advertising space only to organisations with which the Editorial Board is in sympathy".

That is right, is it? A. I see that, yes.

Q Were you on the Editorial Board at that time? A. No.

Q Then on pages 16 and 17 we have the first of what are called "Games". It looks rather like a form of Ludo, but a Process Game. Who devised this game? A. So far as I can recall, it is a combination of people who did it.

Q Did you take part? A. I think I did in some minor degree, yes.

Q On the lefthand side we see:

"Rules of the Game. Play Job with other people. Place counters on GET BORN!, and then throw dice in turn"

and so on. A. It is Job, in fact, not Job.

Q Job. The purpose of the game is to get into the inner game, is it not? A. So far as I can recall it is; it is some time since I played it.

Q Let us look and see what sort of Rules there were. I am not going to look at it all, but you see on the lefthand page "School"? A. Yes.

Q "1, 2, 3: You accept Education verbatim... Move to JOB.  
4, 5: Run away from School. Move on to ILLUSION.  
6: See that there is a basic flaw in whole Educational System. Recognise that it is worthless. Join Inner Game".

That was the correct Process answer, was not it? A. What was the correct Process answer?

Q The last one, because by that means you get into the Inner Game? A. That is how you progress, apparently, towards this Inner Game. I think I should add that this whole thing is a joke.

Q Is a joke? A. Yes.

D MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is there any possibility of your explaining to the jury or to me why it is funny? A. What we were endeavouring to do here, my Lord - this is a serious publication but it is very easy to become very pompous about matters such as freedom of expression, mind bending, psychiatry, religion, anything you like. It is very easy to become rather serious and pompous. This endeavoured to be a lighthearted game - not something which is to be taken seriously; or because item 6 says "Recognise that it is worthless", to assume thereby we were at that time saying that all education was worthless. We were not.

E MR NEILL: Could we look at some of the later games later on. Once again I am going to be short on this. Let us look at some of the things that happen in the Inner Game: that is, the inner circle. You see the word "Illusion" at the bottom of the righthand page? A. Yes.

F Q "Illusion...Pop Star...Own Business". Let us look at just above that. One of the things you have got to do if you get into the Inner Game is "Deride and ridicule the Grey Force job of each other player in turn". What was the point of that? Was that a joke? A. If you like it's a joke. It's a way of encouraging people to express themselves, in this case rather negatively; but if it is understood by all the players that this is a game and not necessarily something to be taken with any great seriousness it can actually help you to be able to express yourself freely.

Q Above that, the other side of the Process sign or symbol, do you see a man holding his hand above someone's head? A. Yes.

Q "Describe visions of the 'End of the World'. MUST terrify other players"? A. Yes.

H Q That was another joke, was it? A. Yes. I myself never actually succeeded in describing a vision of the end of the world which terrified people. It may be other people can.



- A I am simply suggesting that I do not think anybody really takes that word "terrify" very seriously who actually played the game. I would add again that whenever I saw this game being played, and participated in playing it, it was extremely lighthearted; it was not a serious endeavour to terrify people.
- B Q This was played at 2 Balfour Place, was it? A. Yes, I think it was. It was probably played in the Coffee House there.
- B Q People came to the Coffee House, including many young people, I suppose, was it? A. Certainly a large proportion of them would have been young people, not exclusively: yes.
- C Q Would they include people who had turned to what they thought was a religious organisation for help? (The witness laughed). A. Yes, they might. But we don't regard religion as something you shouldn't laugh about either.
- C Q And they came and played this game at 2, Balfour Place? A. Yes, I think on occasion they did.
- D MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: In the top lefthand corner, item 5, "Brain cut out by lobotomy". What is the element of humour in that? A. That, I would say, is not humorous, my Lord.
- D Q I thought the whole page was a joke? A. No. I think the context of the whole thing is largely humorous, but having one's brain cut out by lobotomy, as will be apparent from another article in this particular magazine, we regarded as an appalling thing.
- E MR NEILL: How did that get on to that page? A. I don't understand the question, Mr Neill.
- E Q In our game which is meant to be a joke and to be played in a lighthearted vein, how did this bit about the mental home get on to the page? A. That whole bit up there is in fact, you will notice, in grey, the background to it is in grey.
- F Q What does that mean? A. "Brain burnt out by ECT. Brain turned to cabbage by drugs. Brain cut out by lobotomy". What we are saying is that all those things are appalling, and it is perfectly apparent from another article in this magazine. That certainly is not something we would regard as in any way amusing or funny.
- G Q Does that mean that everything in grey on this is in fact meant to be serious, and everything in white is meant to be funny? A. I really don't know. I would have to read it through with some care to be able to say that.
- H MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You "Die of Old Age" in white, No.6 in "School".
- H MR NEILL: I want you to be careful about this. You said because this is in grey, and this was meant to be serious?

5

A

A. I did not say "because it was in grey"; I simply drew attention to the fact it was grey.

Q Is there any significance in the fact it is grey? A. I think one of the things we were endeavouring to set out in this magazine was that there are certain psychiatric practices which we regarded as extremely harmful; and those in the top lefthand corner are certainly ones that I would regard as extremely harmful and not a good thing.

B

Q That simply is not true, to suggest this is all intended as a lighthearted game, is it? A. I think one must distinguish between the atmosphere and context within which this game was played, and seeking to find from it any overall assessment of what the Process was saying at that time.

C

Q I will put my question again. It simply is not true that this was intended to be played just as a lighthearted game? A. It had a purpose, certainly, which was to draw attention to things. If somebody played this game and had never heard about lobotomy it may be it would help him to know what it was. So Yes, to that extent, it had a serious -

D

Q It simply is not true, is it, that this was intended to be played as a lighthearted game? A. I would say broadly it is true that it was. It has some serious points within it, but that it is, in essence, a lighthearted game.

Q Will you turn back to page 14. You have an article there by a Mr Tyndall. Is that Mr Tyndall of the National Front? A. Yes, it is.

E

Q Again I am not going to read it all, but it finishes up at the bottom of the page:

"A fate of such decay awaits all those nations who choose the 'middle of the road'".

A. That is what it says, yes.

F

Q Let us be quite clear about this: you, at that time, were advocating that people should follow one of the three gods, and what they should not do is to be conventional or be one of what are called the grey forces? That was your teaching, was not it? A. I would say that is somewhat oversimplifying it.

G

Q I will take it in two bits: you were teaching people, or suggesting to people, that they should follow one of the three gods? By that I mean Jehovah, Lucifer or Satan? A. Or Christ.

Q Or Christ. Very well, we will leave him in for the moment. One of the four gods then. You were suggesting that people should follow one of the four gods? A. We were suggesting, in essence, in fact, something completely different: that people do follow one of the four gods. Not that they should, but that in fact everybody does.

H

- A Q But you were telling them to reject the middle way, were you not? A. We were telling them that they would be able to help themselves more by realising their true nature, and that if they could recognise their inner feelings that would give them a greater clarity about themselves.
- B Q By recognising their true nature: precisely what I suggest I have been putting to you, that they should follow their true nature and either be followers of Jehovah or followers of Lucifer or followers of Satan? A. In one sense, but with some reservations.
- C Q But that, broadly, is what you were teaching, was not it? A. We were saying that it is - particularly in this issue - a good thing to know what is going on inside yourself: a very conventional kind of message, that to know yourself is a good thing, and that frequently people are afraid of their own feelings, they are afraid to express a view outside the norm, and that that can lead to a very painful kind of existence.
- D Q Then we have pages 22 onwards, help from Dr Emil Savundra. Then at page 25 we have an appeal - this may be relevant when we come, as we must later, to look at the accounts. This is an appeal by Process:
- E "Got a fortune you don't know what to do with? Got more money than you know how to spend? Want to invest in the 'End of the World'? THE PROCESS, so they say, is adept at helping people to dissipate their fortunes. Give everything you have to THE PROCESS and you'll never regret it, not in the next world, nor in what is left of this one".
- It is quite plain from that, by itself, that you were teaching that the end of the world was at hand, were not you?  
A. That is was coming, yes.
- F Q And very soon? A. I think we have never in fact specified a particular date.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is a great disappointment. But you were inviting subscriptions from people who wanted to invest in the end of the world? A. Well, again, I think -
- G Q What does it mean, "Want to invest in the 'End of the World'"? A. Again it was a humorous one.
- Q Oh, it was another joke, was it? A. Yes. I myself have no idea how one could conceivably, in any sanity, invest in the end of the world. Presumably there would be no money left.
- Q Never mind about that; but I want to get it quite clear that that is intended as a joke? A. Yes.
- H MR NEILL: Did you explain to people who paid their half-crowns and bought it in the street, "There are some jokes in

A this. You'd better watch out!". Anything like that? A. Yes. I don't think anybody actually sent us any bullion carriage paid, either.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did you issue share certificates in the End of the World? A. No.

MR NEILL: Then on page 26 we have some advertisements for the circles you were holding:

B "Telepathy Developing Circle. It is only personal blocks and barriers that prevent you from receiving spiritual and mental emanations.

C "The Process Developing Circle increases your awareness of yourself and others. By opening yourself to other people as they are, rather than as you think they ought to be, you become able to receive and interpret the workings of their unconscious projections".

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do you know what that means? A. I think so, yes.

D MR NEILL: Were you one of the people that those who paid their money would come to to take part in this telepathy developing circle? A. Yes, I could have been.

Q You would conduct it, would you? A. I might have been one who did, yes. I have conducted such circles.

MR NEILL: We will look at that tomorrow.

E MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Half-a-crown was referred to as the entrance fee just now. What was it in fact? How much did they have to pay? A. I'm afraid I can't recall.

MR NEILL: It would be more like 3 guineas, would it not? A. For a telepathy developing circle, no, certainly not.

F Q That was a private session, was it? A. No, it was a public occasion to which anybody who wished could come. I might add that for some years we have ceased to charge for such activities completely.

G Q Let me make it clear that I am not for a moment concerned with what may be happening today: I am concerned with what you were teaching in 1967 and 1968, what you were putting about and selling to the public then. Now let us turn over, and here is the sign in the middle of the page again we have seen before. This is page 28. We have seen a picture of Mr Robert de Grinston - again we notice it as we go along. It says:

H "Like every physical element and human quality, Science and Intellect have two alternative functions. They can be used to understand and see God more clearly and fulfil His purpose more completely. Or they can be used to destroy the concept of God and forget His purpose altogether",

MR C.A. FRIPP:  
Cross-examined.

so on. Then it talks about the past. Then halfway down page you see this reference again:

"What are the grey forces? They are an alien element with a vested interest in the mental and spiritual stagnation of humanity. If the MAJORITY of people were unsuppressed and honest with themselves and in contact with God and the truth, where would you be then?

"Then I should be of no use whatever to the grey forces. Nor would I function as the scourge of Time. Because Normality would then be on the side of Truth and Time. But such is the state of the world that I am the prime weapon in the hands of the enemy, who are now so far advanced in their domination of humanity that we're involved in little more than a 'mopping up' operation. As a race, humanity is lost to the forces of grey".

Now:

"And what of the Gods? They are combined together, the black and the white, the evil and the good, the Gods of love and the Gods of hatred, the creators and the destroyers, the purveyors of joy and the perpetrators of agony. All are one: extremes against the middle".

Before we go on, let us see where you were standing. You were on the side of the "extremes against the middle", were you not? A. In some sense, yes.

That was the Process-Church against the forces of the grey. Forget the word "Church": the Process, I will call it, then we won't get involved in chronology. A. Yes.

Q Then:

"All are one: extremes against the middle. Not to SAVE humanity. That is neither possible nor worthwhile, but to DESTROY humanity, in all its dingy greyness, in all its hypocritical mediocrity, and thereby take away the foothold that the alien beings have established in the universe. The conflicts of the Gods are laid aside for unity against the common enemy. Jehovah and Lucifer, God and anti-God combine to oust the murky un-God".

Then it says:

"Where do you yourself stand?",

and right at the bottom of the page we see:

"So, NORMALITY MUST BE WRONG".

That is all in capitals. Now that is the teaching of Process in June 1967?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is that right? A. This is one of the things we were saying.

MR C.A. FRIPP:  
Cross-examined.

said with sincerity? A. May I say how I see what we  
aying, my Lord?

ld rather you answered the question. You see those  
al letters: "Normality must be wrong"? A. Yes.

of all, was that published with sincerity? A. Certainly  
sincerity, my Lord; yes.

L: Would you look at the middle of the page. The question  
ut - this is carried out in the form of a question and  
er -

"What is your attitude to humanity? I despise humanity".

it is the Process teaching in June 1967? A. No. That answer  
es from the concept of normality. It is not the Process  
aking.

en we have, on the next page, another lot of advertisements.  
e have this advertisement again: "Jehovah on War", again  
elling us about the prophesy: "Thou shalt kill". Then  
"..and there was darkness", we have Mr Mountain's contribu-  
tion, where he says in the middle of the page:

"And just as Jehovah had spoken to the people  
through his great prophets, and as he had warned them  
of the doom of humanity should men continue in their  
rejection of the God Jehovah, so now did Jehovah will  
it that the Earth should be set ablaze and that humanity  
should be destroyed".

That obviously has been selected as the basic message of  
Mr Mountain's book "..and there was darkness"? A. Yes.

Preaching death and destruction? A. Preaching that if man-  
kind pursued the course on which it was currently set then  
inevitably its destruction would come.

But you were saying it was too late now, was not it - that  
is the whole point, that it was too late?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You are not following the words,  
"so now did Jehovah will it that the Earth should be set  
ablaze and that humanity should be destroyed". A. Yes.

Q That only means one thing, does it not? A. Yes.

MR NEILL: Then below that we are told where to get the public-  
ations, at Balfour Place, and telling us about Process No.4.  
Over the page, on the back cover, we see:

"PROCESS" - this is "NEXT ISSUE" - "The voice of the  
extremes. Stands against mediocrity and suppression.  
Exposes the Grey Forces..Unseen, they rule the world.  
Who are the Gods? Next month we write about them, and  
about the Master of the Universe, JEHOVAH".

MR C.A. FRIPP:  
Cross-examined.

, beside it, we see the Editors - not your name:  
ophers de Peyer was the Executive Editor, who is  
Plaintiff in this action; and Miss Wendy Peach,  
Q. Is that right? A. Yes.

ext we have to turn and look at the July issue.  
this, I am afraid, will take some time.

MELFORD STEVENSON: So am I.

Here again there is, I think, a shortage of issues;  
hope the jury can have one each. There are plenty  
ies of the photographs.

CE MELFORD STEVENSON: We had better come back at 10.30  
row morning and face the next issue.

(The witness withdrew)

(Adjourned to tomorrow morning at 10.30)

---

# **SECOND DAY**



EVIDENCE

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

QUEEN'S Bench DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,

Thursday, 14th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE LEIFORD STEVENSON

and a Jury

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT (A corporate body)

CHRISTOPHER ALFRED WRIFF,

CHRISTOPHER DE FEYER and

WILLY ANN PEACH

Plaintiffs

-and-

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED and

ED SANDERS

First Defendants

Second Defendant

And between:

SAME -and- SAME

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October, 1972)

I N D E X

Page

FRIPP, Mr C.A., Recalled;

Cross-examination                      contd.                      2

Re-examined                      ..                      ..                      61

DE PEYER, Mr C., Sworn:

Examined                      ..                      ..                      65

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,

Thursday, 14th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON

and a Jury

-----

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT (A corporate body)

CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP,

CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER and

WENDY ANN PEACH

Plaintiffs

-and-

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED and

ED SANDERS

First Defendants

Second Defendant

And between:

SAME -and- SAME

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October, 1972)

-----

(Transcript from the Shorthand Notes of The Association of Official  
Shorthandwriters, Ltd., Room 392, Royal Courts of Justice, and  
2, New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.2.)

-----

Mr MICHAEL KEMPSTER, Q.C. and Mr PETER BOWSHER (instructed by  
Messrs Joynson-Hicks & Co.) appeared for the Plaintiffs.

Mr BRIAN NEILL, Q.C. and Mr LEON BRITTAN (instructed by  
Messrs Goodman, Derrick & Co.) appeared for the First Defendants.

The SECOND DEFENDANT did not appear and was not represented.

-----

E V I D E N C E

S E C O N D     D A Y

Mr CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP, recalled

Cross-examination by Mr NEILL, contd

- Q Mr Fripp, we finished last night with the June issue of the Process magazine. That is the one entitled "Mindbending". Do you remember that? A. Yes.
- Q I was now going to turn to the next month's issue, the issue on Sex. Just before we look at it together, there are one or two things I could perhaps ask you about. Am I right in thinking that whereas those two issues we have looked at before, and the one we are going to look at now, were published in succeeding months, May, June and July 1967, some long period - by that I mean over two years - elapsed before the next issue came out? A. I think that is correct. I cannot remember the precise months in which they were actually issued, but there certainly was a varying time gap between the various dates of issue.
- Q This issue which we are going to look at together very soon, the Sex issue, was on sale, was it not, for about two years, or at least two years? A. Again, I cannot remember precise periods of time, how long it was on sale, but it was certainly on sale for some considerable time, yes.
- Q That was on sale not only in London, but also in other chapters where (as it became later) the church - and perhaps I can use the word "church" as a form of shorthand - was operating in 1967, 1968 and 1969? A. I am not sure that it was on sale outside England in 1967. I think probably not until 1968.
- Q At any rate, in 1968 it was on sale in particular in the United States, was it not? A. Yes, a few copies. It was not a very large circulation in the United States, but some of them were on sale in the United States, yes.
- Q We will come back and look at that soon. May we take the Sex issue? (Copies of Process Magazine on Sex produced and marked Exhibit P.14). I don't know how many copies of the original are available. In due course we had better make sure that the Jury have, at any rate, a copy among them. For the time being, we have got the photograph copy. This is Process 4, UK 3/6, USA 75c; is that right, on the outside cover? A. Yes.
- Q This is entitled "Sex". Here we have a reference on the outside cover: "Lucifer, Jehovah, Satan & The Grey Forces. Three Paths and a Quagmire". Then we see there are pictures on the cover, and at the bottom segment (if that is the right word) we see a picture of, on the right-hand edge, an upturned cross, and then below that a naked woman on - what is that, an altar? A. I think it probably is. I don't know, actually. This particular copy is not very clear about that.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Take mine. A. Thank you, my Lord. It would appear to be, yes.
- Q It is quite obviously an altar, is it not? Didn't you realise that? A. That it was an altar, my Lord?
- Q Yes. A. I think it is depicting simply an aspect.

Q An aspect? A. This is the kind of picture one sometimes sees in rather sensational .....

Q Sensational what? A. Productions about sex. As I was explaining yesterday, my Lord, part of our approach was to endeavour to draw attention to the extreme aspects of the subjects that we were discussing.

MR NEILL: We will come to this in much more detail in a moment, but you were encouraging the extremes, weren't you, Mr Fripp?  
A. I don't feel so, no. We were simply pointing out that they exist.

Q This represents a celebration of a black mass, does it not?  
A. I don't actually know what this is supposed to represent. I was not concerned with the ----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You were not asked if you were concerned. The question was: does it not represent a black mass? A. I am not an expert in black masses, my Lord. I am afraid I don't know the answer to the question.

Q Again, that is not what you were asked. Don't you know?  
A. No, I don't know, my Lord.

MR NEILL: In view of that answer, we will have to look at some other things, Mr Fripp. The Process organisation was very interested in witchcraft and black magic, was it not?  
A. I would say that we were interested in a lot of things. To say we were very interested in black magic and witchcraft would not be true.

Q We will look at that later. Did you see that magazine before it was issued to the public? A. No, I did not.

Q You contributed to it, did you not? A. There is an article here that I wrote, yes.

Q Perhaps it is a matter really for Mr De Peyer because on the back, and we will turn immediately to the back cover to see if you can help us with what that depicts, but before we look at that, let us just see who the editors are: Hugh Mountain, Managing Editor; Chris De Peyer (that is the next Plaintiff) Executive Editor; Peter Eckhoff, Adviser; Wendy Peach (that is the last-named Plaintiff) Assistant Editor, and then two or three other people we need not for the moment trouble with. Perhaps, if it is a question you cannot deal with, we will ask Mr De Peyer. While we are looking at that picture, so as to save time, that represents a skeleton with wings, and underneath what - is it souls in torment, or bodies in torment, or what?  
A. I think quite possibly both, Mr Neill. It was an advertisement for our next issue - Fear.

Q That was being put out by a religious organisation, was it?  
A. Yes.

Q Now let us turn to the inside cover and see what is being said by the three groups into which the church had now turned itself; that is, the Jehovians, the Luciferians and the Satanists. That was the three groups, was it not, the followers of each of your three gods, or three of your four gods? A. I feel

that is a fairly major distortion of what we were saying. It was not that there were three groups within the church which were in any way separate from any of the other groups. It is not a matter of there being groups within the church at all. What we were saying was that there are various ways of regarding particular issues in human life. It was not a matter that there was any separation between the Luciferians or the Jehovahians or the Satanists, or the followers of the church generally.

B Q Let me just try to understand that. It is right, is it, that some people in the church describe themselves as Jehovahians?

A. When we use those kind of terms ----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Oh, couldn't you answer the question? Put it again, Mr Neill.

C MR NEILL: Is it right that some people in the church, or in Process, if you prefer that, at that stage, describe themselves as Jehovahians? A. In one sense, yes.

Q And other people in Process describe themselves as Luciferians?

A. In the same sense, yes.

Q And some people in the church describe themselves as Satanists?

A. Yes, in the same sense.

D Q Those three groups were followers - that is what I am suggesting to you -- in particular, one, of the god Jehovah, the other of the god Lucifer, and the third group of the god Satan?

A. No, I do not agree, not followers of those particular gods. All of us always felt what we were doing was serving God and not solely one particular aspect of God.

E Q It is a thing we will probably have to look at again. Now let us turn to the inside cover, because there we have a little biography or little description of one of each of these three groups. First of all, in the top right-hand corner - this is page 2, I am looking at - we see Hugh Mountain. That is, as we now know, the Managing Editor. He describes himself on the right in the circle, "Jehovian", and he had got an Alsatian puppy called "Lucifer"; is that right? A. Yes.

Q "Hugh Mountain", it is said, "is 21 years old, Jewish, genius, megalomaniac, ex-Oxford University (left in disgust), strong willed, dynamic, brooks no contradiction. Likes: Radio Caroline, cornflakes, other megalomaniacs, work & intensity. Dislikes: Limpness, cowards, liars & moronic intellectuals." Then we go on in black - this perhaps does not show up in the photograph copy, but in darker print - "Dedicated to the elimination of the Grey Forces". Then we have on the left-hand side of the page, do we not, the third-named Plaintiff (the second personal Plaintiff) Mr De Peyer: "Christopher De Peyer", who is a Luciferian, and "Isaac", his Alsatian dog, is shown below. He is 29 years old, or was at that time, "English of Swiss origin, ex-architect (abandoned it out of sheer boredom), cool, calm, detached, charming, diplomatic, subtle, ingenious & lethal".

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: He is going to be the next witness, is he?

MR NEILL: Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Good.

MR NEILL: "Likes: Turks, yachts, money, the sun, blueberry pie, luxury and anarchy. Dislikes: Authority, discipline, parents who perform like baboons, churchmen & other hypocrites", and he, too, in black, is "Dedicated to the elimination of the Grey Forces". Then at the bottom of the page, in the other inset, we have "Caleb Ashburton Dunning". Is "Caleb" his real name? A. I think he was baptised Rupert.

Q Then if I refer at any stage in my questions to Rupert Ashburton Dunning, that would be the same person who here describes himself as Caleb; is that right? A. Yes.

Q Let us just see how he describes himself. He has an Alsatian dog called "Satan", and we see a picture above of the dog Satan. He describes himself as a Satanist, in the lettering round the edge of the circle. He "is 23, English, ex-gambler (he's playing for higher stakes now), clever, cunning, projects sweetness & light, xtummie" -- is that a word that you had got since you went to Mexico? A. I believe it is a word of South African origin, and I believe that it means rather dumb; not very talkative.

Q -- "silent, periodically explodes into dynamic action". Let us see what he likes. He likes "Chaos, catastrophes, graveyards, lemons, depravity & Boris Karloff. Dislikes: Sweet music, self-righteousness, religious idiocy, and Barbara Cartland", and he, too, is "Dedicated to the elimination of the Grey Forces". Then on the opposite page we have a photograph of a number of people. Is that the editorial board, or is it those who are in charge of Process, or both? A. Those I think are some at least of the people who were living in our house in London at that time, and it includes several, if not all, of the people mentioned on the back cover.

Q Does it include you? A. No, it does not.

Q Does it include Mr De Peyer? A. Yes, it does.

Q And it includes Miss Peach? A. Yes.

Q Then underneath that we see again this expression or admonition: "Invest in the end of the world. How to dissipate fortunes". Then it says: "Thank you for your magnificent response to the appeal which appeared in our last issue, Process Three, for fortunes to dissipate. However we have successfully dissipated all of them in absolute record time and are eagerly awaiting more. If you have not quite left yourselves destitute, you should have done, you're holding out on us. And those of you who still have millstones of money hanging around your necks, relax, The Process will be only too happy to relieve you of them". So that we can get this out of the way, the source of finance of Process at this stage, Mr Fripp, was partly from donations, was it not? A. Yes.

Q And partly from people who paid for sessions; that is, either therapy sessions or group sessions. Is that right?

A. No, that is not correct. We had ceased to give sessions to the public before the issue of this magazine.

Q So it was only sessions inside the group, was it? A. Yes.

Q When you say "sessions", so there is no mistake about this, are you saying no courses were being given to the public at all?  
A. No, I am not saying that. In our terminology there was a distinction between sessions and courses.

Q Bear with me, because I am not acquainted with all these words. Were there courses being given to the public?  
A. Yes, there were.

Q Were you getting money from the public, from money they paid for courses? A. Yes.

Q That was the second main heading of your finance; is that right?  
A. I would say probably the main heading of our finances in that period was money which had been put into the church by people like myself, ministers of the church.

Q Your third source of money was from publications?  
A. The sale of publications, that is correct.

Q That was an important source of money, was it not?  
A. It was a significant source of money, certainly, yes.

Q Then we come to the editorial. We have got the contents page, which we will see on page 4. As we are going to come to, at any rate, some of the items, I am not going to go through the left-hand side of page 4, but we see the editorial, which says: "Sex. Humanity split four ways. The first path is that of the purist, who knows instinctively that sex is a degradation and a humiliation both of himself and of his partner, who finds in it nothing but the most transient of physical pleasures that in no way compensate for the shame and guilt that follow the experience. He knows that the sexual act is a defilement of his purity and a contradiction of his duty.

"Then there is the path of the idealists, of those who feel that their fulfilment is to be found in partnership with another human being, and who strive to attain a state of grace and happiness in union with another; whose ideals are spiritual, and who try to use sex as a physical vehicle and expression of their deepest love and highest aspirations of communion".

The first group, so I can just understand it, or the first path, is that followed by the Jehovians, is it not? A. Yes.

Q The second path is the path followed by the Luciferians?  
A. Yes.

Q Now we are going to come, in the third paragraph, to the third path, and this is the way of the Satanists, is it not? A. Yes.

Q "The third path is for those who feel that in the physical act of sex and in the practice of every carnal pleasure, there lies the only true expression of their personality. These are they who strive to find in sex the opportunity to experience every facet of their being, who test themselves against it in every



conceivable circumstance and with a multitude of partners, and who seek their true fulfilment in the physical sensations and excitements that for them only sex can provide".

I will read more about that later, but then we have the fourth attitude: "There is a fourth attitude to sex, which leads nowhere and is not a path to a goal but an endless circuit of repression and frustration. It is the attitude of a person who has sex, but always in moderation: for whom it is more important to be respectable than to test himself in the fires of intensity: who might like to experiment a little more, and secretly envies the experiences of those more courageous than himself, but remains always within the bounds of the reasonable and the rational, clinging always to safety, and avoiding any possibility of the social condemnation that is the experience of all who follow to extremity the urges that they feel within them. In this attitude there is no courage, no idealism, no purity and no true experience of self: only a tepid and insipid limbo where the watchwords are moderation and compromise, and the end-product is spiritual sterility and hidden self-contempt. Three paths and a quagmire - and everyone can choose".

Let us look at those last words together, Mr Fripp. That is suggesting, is it not, to the reader of this magazine that he can choose one of three paths or, if he exercises moderation and restraint, he is going to find himself in the quagmire of the grey forces? A. What we -----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is that right? A. We are saying that this is part of what happens.

Q Could you answer the question? Is that correct, what has just been put to you, and very clearly put?

A. I am sorry, my Lord; could I have the question again?

MR NEILL: Aren't those last nine or ten words at the bottom of that column saying this to readers of the Sex magazine: "You can choose one of three paths, or you can choose a way of moderation and restraint which will lead you into a quagmire"?

A. We are saying that is what human beings do, that all of us behave in one of these various ways in some degree, yes.

Q That is what you are advocating, isn't it? A. No. We are saying this is how it is; not that it is desirable, but this is how it is.

Q To save time, let us leave the next two pages and go on to page 8. I want to ask you about page 8 because here you are advertising, as I read it, for personal sessions.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is obvious, is it not? A. Yes.

MR NEILL: Do you still want to say that at that time you were not offering sessions to the public? A. So far as I know, not, Mr Neill. I was not actually in England at the time this was put out. I do know that we did not offer personal sessions in America, which was where I was at the time that this issue was on sale to the public. My memory was that personal sessions were not available in England either, but I may be wrong on that.

Q I will have to come back to this. Do I understand you to say that you were at that time in America? A. Yes.

Q Whereabouts? A. I was in at least three cities in America; so it depends what precise period you are asking me about.

Q I thought we were dealing with this on the basis that July 1967 was when this was first put on sale. A. In July 1967 I think I was on a boat in fact from Europe - not England - from Italy, to America, where I arrived in very early August 1967.

Q Perhaps we will come back to that. I don't want to waste time on it. Let us go back to page 8. Let us see what is being offered by the Process at that time. "The Process offers personal sessions to those who are dissatisfied. If you see yourself in what you read below, then contact the Session Supervisor at Balfour Place. In the dark chasms of the mind, chaos. Buried deep within, beneath a blanket of grey intellect, perpetual conflict. Out of the night, as though from nowhere, pain. Out of the gloom, frustration. Indecision waits at the next crossroads. Fear at every corner. Disappointment lurks in the shadows, springs out and walks with us for a while in hurtful silence. Uncertainty on every doorstep as we hurry past. Despair seems not far off. Guilt, a constant companion, pricks us from behind. A mist of boredom hangs about us. There is doubt again", and so on. I don't think I need read it all. Then at the bottom you say: "Is there no way out, no escape from the vicious circle, no way to exorcise the lurking demons of our troubled souls? Are we shackled for ever to these strangers of the dark? Or is there, somewhere, if we can find the switch, a light that floods the murky corners of the mind, reveals the shadowed faces from the pit, and casts them out?". That is addressing itself, is it not, to the unhappy, the lonely and the disturbed? A. Yes, to anybody who feels a response to what is written there.

Q And many of those would be young people, alone and disturbed, in cities in various parts of the world? A. Certainly they could be, yes.

Q That is the invitation. Now let us see what the opposite page tells us. "Sex, The Gods & The Grey Forces. Three paths and a quagmire. Who is strong enough to follow one of the paths? Who is fool enough to fall into the quagmire? The Grey Forces hold sway, but The Gods are returned" - I want to read the next four words carefully - "to recruit their armies for the End. The pendulum swings. Three paths and a quagmire. On the following pages an 'Advocate' puts the case for each". Is it not as plain as plain can be, Mr Fripp, that that is inviting the reader of the magazine to follow one of the three paths? A. I feel it is saying: "Recognise yourself, and this is how it is".

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You know, you would do more justice to yourself if you listened to the question and addressed your mind to it. I think you had better put that question again, Mr Neill.

H MR NEILL: Is not that plainly suggesting to the reader, Mr Fripp, that he or she should follow one of the three paths?  
A. With the greatest respect to my Lord -----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You are not treating this Court with any respect at all. Cannot you answer that "Yes" or "No"? It is a very simple question. A. No, my Lord; I feel that is not what it is saying.

Q The Jury will judge.

B MR NEILL: What do you say it is saying? A. I feel it is saying that human beings have within themselves the capacity to move in a variety of directions. I feel this is what this whole magazine is designed to say; and that we can help ourselves by recognising the truth about ourselves, so that we can be in greater control of ourselves and lead better lives.

Q I am not going to take too much time, but doesn't it say one thing you must avoid doing is falling into the quagmire of moderation? A. It is saying that if we allow ourselves to be inhibited and uncourageous, then we cannot know ourselves.

C Q Let us take that and see how far we get on that little path. Must not be inhibited: we agree that is what it is saying; is that right? A. It is saying that the consequences of inhibition are often harmful.

I Q So you must follow one of the three paths? A. No, I do not feel it is saying you must do anything; simply that this is how human beings sometimes can behave.

E Q Let us try to be sensible, Mr Fripp. This young, unhappy, disturbed person who picks this up and says "The Process is the thing for me". What is being said to them? It is being said to them: "Who is strong enough to follow one of the paths? Who is fool enough to fall into the quagmire?" Is not that a plain invitation to the reader to follow one of the paths? A. I have spoken with many people who have read this magazine, and they have not interpreted it in the way you are suggesting.

F MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: How do you interpret it? A. My Lord, I interpret it as saying that human beings are capable of very extreme things, and that it is helpful to know within yourself everything that is inside yourself.

MR NEILL: Then let us look at the bottom half of the page together: "The Game of the Gods", and round the edge we have "Lucifer" in white, "Jehovah" white on black, and "Satan" black on red, and down at the bottom, rather blurred, "The Grey Forces". That is right, is it not? A. Yes.

C Q That is surely once again, Mr Fripp, suggesting that to follow one of the gods is better than being one of the grey forces? A. I feel it is saying that to know what you are is better than to not know what you are.

Q Then if we turn over the next page, we see a young man, I think carrying - what is that, a sword or what? A. No; I think it is a stick.

I. Q Walking towards either the sun or the moon. Perhaps it does not matter. Then we see a photograph of you; is that right? A. Yes, it is.

Q That is page 11. Here you are speaking as the advocate for Jehovah? A. Yes.

Q Here you are speaking of the distasteful side of sex, in fact. A. I am putting forward a view, yes.

Q One of the paths that a person could follow, because this is the Jehovah's advocate speaking? A. A path a person can follow, yes.

Q And you are suggesting they should follow? A. No, not "should" but "could".

Q "Could"; very well. Again, I am not going to read all this, but if we can just look through it quite quickly. "Sex is rampant", it says, and so on. The second paragraph: "Sex was given to man that he might worship God with all his being and with all his attributes. But that is not how man has used sex". Then the next paragraph: "Sex is death. It is the incumbent of the Devil. It is the focal point of man's rejection, the effort to propagate his species in the denial of God. It is the attempt to couple with another human in the exclusion of God. It is the defilement of purity". Then at the bottom it finishes up: "And now, as the world goes to its final doom, Jehovah decrees 'Expiate or Die'". That is a plain suggestion that those who follow the way of Jehovah should in fact repudiate sex altogether, is it not? A. It is saying that many people in the world who feel this kind of thing take that kind of attitude, consciously or unconsciously.

Q Then we have got on the next two pages an article by a lady called Isabel Rennie, who is the advocate for Lucifer. Now I want to turn, on pages 14 and 15, to what is said by the advocate of Satan, because this is one of the paths - whether you like "follow" or not - which are being advocated in this magazine as a path which can or could be followed, is it not? A. Advocated in the sense of this is the kind of thing that some people feel.

Q More than that; some people could do? A. Yes, and some people do do.

Q I said I would not look at Lucifer. I am only going to look at one line of Lucifer on the page before, in view of that answer. Can we just go back to page 13 and read the last line of what Lucifer's advocate says? That says: "But choose. The time is short. Attend Lord Lucifer". Now, that is suggesting to those who want to follow Lucifer that they should make a choice and follow Lucifer? A. Yes. From the Luciferian point of view, that is what he is saying.

Q Or what she is saying. A. What she is saying. Thank you.

Q So Lucifer is advocating a choice and saying "Follow Lucifer"? A. Yes, in one sense. He is saying: "Be aware. Know what you are doing".

Q Now let us turn to pages 14 and 15. Mr Fripp, I am not going to read out in open Court the left-hand page. I am going to ask you and I am going to ask the Jury if they would be kind enough to read that left-hand column to themselves, and when they have

read the left-hand column, if you will then do the same with the centre column. I am going to ask you just some general questions about it. I don't want to read it out. I would like you, if you would, to spend a moment or two reading it now. (After a pause): I am going to pick it up at the top of the third column. You see: "A blinding flash of lightning. A peal of thunder seems to burst within the very walls. No one moves; for no one dares to move. Satan, your God is among you, black and lowering, reeking of evil and the pit. You stand transfixed before Him, knowing you've only just begun to taste the divine degradation that He offers for your pleasure". Then it goes on: "So there, my friend, is a fleeting glimpse of Satan's promise to those that follow Him. Take your choice, indulge, explore the very limits. Leave nothing out and use every means of sharpening the senses. Alcohol to set the blood coursing in your veins, narcotics to heighten your feelings to a peak of sensitivity, so that the very lowest depths of physical sensation can be plumbed and wallowed in. The farthest reaches of the body's strange delights must not be passed over. Sink down in the decadence of excessive self-indulgence. Let no so-called sin, perversion or depravity escape your searching senses; partake of all of them to overflowing. What else is there? What other satisfaction? For always death must come and end the sensual game, and take away the dark forbidden pleasures of the flesh that are the mark of life and the only true means of living. But let him not come before you have lived your life to the full, seen everything, done everything, and felt everything the body is capable of feeling. There is nothing else now, with the end of man so near. 'There is no dialectic but Death, and the Spider weaves over tomorrow'". Isn't that, Mr Fripp, a plain suggestion to those who wish to follow Satan that they can indulge in the kind of conduct described on that page?

A. This is saying that Satan, as the tempter, offers this to man.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is one of the three gods, isn't it? A. We feel, my Lord, that Satan is an aspect of God. Since God created all things, He must also have created Satan.

MR NEILL: And it is one of the ways that you are telling the young and disturbed to follow, isn't it? A. No; and I say again I have met many people who have read this magazine, and none of them have ever interpreted this in that sense.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: How do you know? A. I said of the people I have spoken to, my Lord.

Q It is designed for the young and impressionable who are worried, isn't it? A. Not specifically for the young, my Lord, no.

MR NEILL: But many of your followers - and we won't worry about numbers - were the young and impressionable, were they not? A. We had many young followers, yes.

Q And those who were young and impressionable and read this would think that the Process organisation were pointing this out as a way which was advocated by one of their gods? A. I don't feel so, and those who ever met us, for instance, knew that we ourselves were celibate, that we did not partake in sexual relations of any kind at that time.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Who is the gentleman in the circle at the bottom right-hand corner, called "Mendez"? Who is he?  
A. He is a minister of the church, my Lord.

MR NEILL: He became Father Mendez, did he not? A. Yes, he did.

Q Mendez, is that the name of a Christian saint? A. No.

Q It means the Devil, does it not? A. I believe it means somebody who is traditionally associated with Satan.

Q Because the symbol of the Devil is what is called the Mendez Goat? A. Yes, the symbol of Satan.

Q In your organisation, the sacred (if I may use that expression) name given to Mr Castle - Mr Andrew Castle I think his real name was - was Father Mendez? A. Yes.

Q Not far away from Father Satan, is it? A. I feel it is quite a long way from Father Satan.

Q Would it be unfair to describe the first two columns of that page as filth? A. I personally feel that it is filth, yes. It is the kind of thing that one can read very easily in pornographic bookshops, and it is expressing a particularly unpleasant aspect of the human personality, that some people indulge in, that some people feel within themselves.

Q Now let us turn over. We see here, printed in grey, the advocate for the grey forces, a psychiatrist. He gives his account of again something which in due course the Jury may want to look at, but I don't think I am going to take time on at the moment. All I am concerned with is to look at what is said on the bottom of page 17. Here is the young, impressionable reader being asked to make his choice, isn't it? Let us read it quietly together. "Three paths and a quagmire. Where do you belong? Are you Jehovah's man, taking the stringent road of purity and rejoicing in the harsh strength of self-denial? Do you follow Lucifer, pursuing the ideal of perfect human love in a blissful atmosphere of sweet self-indulgence? Is Satan your master, leading you into dark paths of lust and licentiousness and all the intricate pleasures of the flesh? Or do you take the road to nowhere, half in half out, half up half down, your instincts and ideals buried in a deep morasse of hypocritical compromise and respectable mediocrity? Three paths and a quagmire. And time is running out". At the risk of boring my Lord and the Jury, I must, in view of that, ask you again: Is not the magazine there saying to the reader: "It is for you to make a choice, reader, between one of these three paths and a quagmire"? A. Yes, it is saying that human beings can make that choice.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is your answer to that question "Yes"? A. That we are advocating that people should make a choice?

Q Should make a choice between one of three paths, or fall into a quagmire. Isn't that a fair interpretation of this?  
A. I personally don't feel so, my Lord.

Q What is wrong with it? A. I feel what we are saying is, again, what is helpful is to know yourself, and if you can understand yourself. For instance, if you feel the kind of things which I feel you very accurately described as "filth" on the red page, the Satan page, if you feel those things within you but you don't allow yourself to become aware of them and to get into control of them, then you are liable to get out of control and maybe end up actually doing them, which I personally would not regard as in any way a desirable activity.

(Continued on next page)

Q Is there a word in this publication which says that ? A. I feel that the very fact that -----

Q Would you answer the question: is there a word or a sentence of that in this publication ? A. I do not say this is spelt out sufficiently accurately.

Q It is not there at all, is it ? Can you point to a single sentence that makes that suggestion ? A. No, I do not think I can, my Lord.

MR NEILL: On the next two pages we come to the next of the three games. We looked at the game of Job yesterday afternoon. We are now coming to another game and what is the name of this game set out here ? A. The game of rape.

Q I am not going to read all this, but let us try to understand this. Here again the object of it to get into the inner game, is it not; you are told that in the right-hand bottom corner. A. Yes.

Q "If you have played Job (Process 3) play rape the same way. If not, place counters on birth and throw the dice in turn. Follow the instructions on the board, according to the number thrown. If you join one of the inner games you progress by fulfilling the requirements of the game rather than by throwing the dice" and then if you fail you move back to the outer game. The point of it is to get into the inner games, is it not ? A. Yes.

Q Let us just look at a few of them to see how you get into the inner games. If we look at the top of the page, "Marriage Phase Two". Do you see that ? A. Yes, I do.

Q How does one get into the inner game of marriage Phase 2 ? The only way of doing it is to score six and "Accept own depraved nature. Leave spouse and indulge in every conceivable promiscuous perversion. Join SATAN'S game". A. I feel it is important to understand here that this is obviously a game, it is not saying that people should actually go and do that. It is like playing Monopoly; if you get fined £200 you do not actually physically go and pay the tax man £200. There are children's games, I believe - and I remember some myself - where you apparently play around with guns and shoot people, but it does not mean to say you are actually expected to do that while you are playing the game, or afterwards.

Q But you have an advertisement, have you not, inviting people to come to play these games, including the game of rape ? A. Yes -----

Q To play Job and Rape and another game from another magazine. A. Again, I would like to say that I have seen many people play this and they have not interpreted it in any harmful sense, on the contrary it has been a very light-hearted and humorous occasion.



MR C.A FRIPP  
Cross-examined:

- A Q Let us see the kind of stuff you have to do to get into the inner game. At the bottom of the page: "Threshold of Life", if you get a 6 you "Decide to experience every possible kind of carnal pleasure. Join SATAN'S game". Once you get into the inner game you then have to do what you are instructed to do. A. That is the game, yes.
- B Q Let us see what is suggested in Jehovah's game: "1. Explain the reasons for your chosen alignment with Jehovah. 2. Deliver a one minute harangue, slaughtering six. Must make other players cringe. 3. Describe your superiority, strength and power over other players. Must make them feel inferior". That is one of the things the Jehovahians did, was it not, to make other people feel inferior? A. In a negative characteristic, yes.
- Q "4. Give seven reasons why sex is an abomination in the eyes of Jehovah". Now people who were playing this game and had got into the inner game and got 4 would have to do that, get up and give seven reasons why sex is an abomination in the eyes of Jehovah". A. If they wanted to, yes.
- L Q And 5 suggests they "Flagellate yourself with any suitable instrument" and then 6, Satan's game - I do not need to read them all, but "4. Reel off fifteen obscene words one after the other. No repetition allowed". Are you seriously suggesting, Mr Fripp, that in the summer of 1967 this was a religious organisation devoted to help the young and impressionable and those who need help? A. Yes, obviously I feel that way or I would not be doing what I am doing.
- E MR JUSTICE MELFORD-SEVENSON: And you are inviting the Jury to believe that, are you? A. Yes, my Lord, and I feel that on our record this is true.
- MR BEILL: When people were playing the game did they, if they threw a 5 in Jehovah's game, flagellate themselves? A. I never actually saw anybody do that, no.
- J Q Did you hear them reel off fifteen obscene words one after the other without repetition? A. No, I have not heard that either.
- Q Then on the next page we have got a photograph of Geraldine Brown of Xtul about "Fall" and Frederick Brown of Xtul on "Condemnation". Then we have got something called "The Natural life of Jimmy Saville" by Jonathan de Peyer. Then we come to an article on homosexuality. Then we have got an encounter between Peter Eckhoff, Jehovahian, and the God Lucifer and some more stuff by Chris de Peyer, and on page 26 we have got some pictures of childbirth. I do not know how they have come out on the photographed copy, but would you describe those as horrifying pictures? A. They are certainly unpleasant pictures.
- H Q I will take your word "unpleasant" for it. What was the object of putting those pictures on page 26 of this magazine? A. We felt that people can sometimes be harmed by being encouraged to attend a child birth which is not necessarily

for them a very pleasant occasion, and that sometimes people are persuaded to do that against their own better instincts. It is a point of view.

B Q On page 28 we have got the announcement that the "Coffee lounge has been ceremoniously handed over by Lord Lucifer to His Satanic Majesty and is now SATAN'S CAVERN", and then on the opposite page we have - and I do not want to read it all, but I will try to summarise it - a page designed to ridicule the Church of England, do we not? A. The Grey Forces, in fact - a state of mind rather than any individual. When we talk about "grey forces" we are not talking about a particular individual but a state of mind, which we feel is a very unhappy one and a very harmful one.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: Who is the individual depicted in the top right-hand corner? A. It is the Archbishop of Canterbury, my Lord.

Q Would you like to reconsider the question put to you? Is this not designed to ridicule the Church of England? A. In certain respects I think it is, my Lord.

MR NEILL: As being a grey force? A. As having grey force elements within it.

E Q Again let us look at what it says: "Avoid the difficult choice between God and the Devil. Settle for neither and join the Church of England which is sponsored exclusively by the Grey Forces". This is a wholesale condemnation and ridiculing of the Church of England, is it not? A. To me personally it is an exaggerated view. I concede what you are saying. I do not think any of us actually really feel this is all that can be said about the Church of England, it has many excellent aspects to it. It is simply saying it can, and sometimes is, manifesting this grey force kind of attitude.

F Q The readers of this would interpret that, would they not, as a wholesale condemnation and ridiculing of the Church of England? A. Well, I think one would have to ask somebody who had read it. As I say, that is not what in my experience they would say.

G H Q Then on the next page we have got a number of letters. I do not think we need read all these, but taking the top left-hand corner: "I know you won't print this letter, but I want you to know I think you're evil, straight from the Devil. And whenever I see your magazine on sale anywhere I make the sign of the Cross" and the answer: "The Cross too is ours. Christ is the Son of Jehovah the great God of this Universe. Take heed before defiling his symbol with your puny fear. He was not afraid". Then to the right of that the writer says: "Are you seriously suggesting an alliance between God and the Devil to bring about the end of creation? If so, by what benighted kind of logic do you arrive at this conclusion?" and the Editor says: "No logic. God given knowledge". Is that suggesting that this is a matter of revelation to members of The Process? A. It is suggesting that that is one way the conclusion is reached. There is plenty of logic also, in fact.

Q Then on the right-hand page we have an advertisement. Am I right in thinking that so far everything that has been advertised in this magazine has been an advertisement of other Process either activities or publications? A. I think so, yes.

Q And here we have an advertisement of a German magazine which is described as "Germany's most macabre magazine". Is that for horror and destruction? A. I do not know, I have never, to my knowledge, seen a copy of this Total magazine.

Q Is that, again, something to ask Mr De Peyer about; he was more closely connected with the magazine than you were, if I follow you. A. Yes.

Q He was the Executive Editor. A. Yes.

Q Very well, I will ask him. Then we see on the next page an advertisement for what is taking place at Process House, Balfour Place. "Processscenes" is the phrase used, which I presume means what is going on at Process House? A. It was a particular dramatic presentation.

Q We see "The Gods Jehovah, Lucifer & Satan; Religion, Politics, Science" and then further down the page on the right "Trials of the Pope, the Royal Family, sex, Hitler, The Hippies, drugs, blackmagic".

MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: I have not found that.

MR NEILL: It is half-way down page 32, my Lord, under the heading "Processscenes". Let me put it to you again: black-magic was one of the things in which Process, or Process members, were interested? A. One of the things, yes.

Q Now let us look at the opposite page and let us see how the films are described. "Films Every Saturday" three times on Saturday and twice on Sunday: "Films of war, degradation, violence, despair, power, lust, fear, hate, sin & horror". That is a fair description, is it not, of what the Process was interested in? A. You mean this list of words?

Q Yes. A. No, I do not think it is.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: They are indicating the subject-matter of the films that you were inviting people to come and see at Balfour Place. A. Yes, my Lord, for a particular reason, too, if I may go on.

MR NEILL: Your having said that, what was the particular reason? A. The reason that I said yesterday, which is that we feel it is very important that people realise the negative things that go on in the world, that they see them with clarity.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: What did they pay for this? A. For seeing these films, my Lord?

Q Yes. A. I don't know. I was not actually present in London, I think, at any time when these films were shown.

MR NEILL: I do not want to waste time if you are going to say you do not know about it, but can we just get some dates. Were you there at all in England or Balfour Place in the second half of 1967 ? A. No.

Q Were you in England or Balfour Place in particular at any time in 1968 ? A. No.

B Q Were you in England or Balfour Place at any time in 1969 ? A. Yes, I think I returned to England from Rome in about mid-summer, June or July, 1969.

Q Just to get the chronology right, it seems to follow that some time in the first half of 1967 or earlier you had left England and gone abroad; is that right ? A. Yes, it is.

Q When did you go ? A. I think it was in about April.

C MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: Of which year ? A. 1967, my Lord.

MR NEILL: So would I be right in putting it to you that you were abroad between April, 1967, and I think July, 1969 ? A. June or July, 1969.

I Q We will come to the publications separately, but what was happening in London between April, 1967, and June or July, 1969, is something it would be better to put to another witness, would it ? A. If you want somebody who was actually there, yes.

E Q Just finishing with the Sex magazine, on page 34 there is something about joining Process: "Are you tired of being a pawn of the Grey Forces? Have you the courage to fight against mass mediocrity? Would you like to spend half your life in heaven and half in hell, instead of all of it in limbo? Are you sick of conforming? Does your job give you a pain in the neck?", and so on. Now "Would you like to spend half your life in heaven and half in hell, instead of all of it in limbo" is clearly an invitation, is it not, to the reader who wants to join Process to take part in activities at the extremes ? A. To feel intensely; and to live a life of intensity.

C Q Then it goes on about Grey Forces and I do not think we need trouble with that. Then we see the fees that are charged for the various courses and the Developing Circle; some of them are on Monday, some are on Tuesday and some on Wednesday. Then we have on the right-hand page - and this is the next thing we are going to look at - an advertisement for, or extract from to be more accurate, the three publications on war by the three Gods who were the particular Gods of The Process: Jehovah on War, Lucifer on War, Satan on War, 1 guinea each. Had they just come out, these three books ? A. I am afraid I cannot recall precisely when they came out.

H MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: Did you read them ? A. Certainly I read them, my Lord, yes.

Q And approve of them ? A. Not in the sense that they were

advocating any particular course of action; I approved of them in the sense that they were expressing something about human-beings.

MR NEILL: We are going to look at them because I want to follow that up. At any rate, I will not read out the bits on that page because we are going to look at them later. Then there is a reference to the books you can get and we see how you describe it; you say, at the bottom, you will "go away certain that we cater especially for Fanatical, Extreme, Religious, Communist, Capitalist, Black and White Powered Nuts. You will find, however, that if you want a cool clear look at what is really happening you would be much better advised to buy one of our own publications". I think it is only fair to put this to you: I suggest that that Sex magazine we have been looking at together and the sort of things it is advocating is, in the hands of a young impressionable person, a very dangerous publication indeed. Do you disagree with that? A. I do disagree with that, yes, for the same reason that I said before, that I have met many people who have read it and they have not interpreted it in the way you are suggesting, nor in my experience have they been damaged by it or influenced in a harmful way.

Q I am going to look now, if I may, at these books on war. I have got them altogether in a book called "The Gods on War". They were published separately, were they not, at 1 guinea each, and then they were all combined together in a single booklet. I do not know which is the most readily acceptable. This runs to some 112 pages and I am certainly not going to read it all, but if we turn to page 112 we see the date "August 1967"; is that right? A. Yes.

Q Certainly the three volumes separately had been advertised in July, so it looks as though this combined edition came out in August; that is right, is it not? A. That would appear to be so, yes.

Q We start inside the front page: "Christ said: love thine enemy. Christ's Enemy was Satan and Satan's Enemy was Christ. Through Love enmity is destroyed. Through Love saint and sinner destroy the enmity between them. Through Love Christ and Satan have destroyed their enmity and come together for the End. Christ to Judge, Satan to execute the Judgment". Again, let us just remind ourselves where we are: you at The Process were saying at this time, were you not - and you may in fact be saying it now - that the Latter Days, as you call it, are upon us. A. Yes.

Q The three Gods were walking the earth again read for the end of the world? A. I don't know where the "alking the earth" comes from.

Q Well, perhaps that is the wrong wording: had come back for the end of the world. That is right, is it not? A. That they were present, yes.

Q On the opposite page to the page I have read there is a photograph and is that a photograph of Robert De Grimston? A. It is.

- Q And on the next page we see: "The Gods on War" and then underneath that "recorded by Robert de Grimston". That meant, did it not, that these were messages which Mr De Grimston had received and which he set down by way of recording. A. Yes, I think that is fairly accurate.
- Q Do you know when and where he had received those messages ?  
A. No, I don't think I do in detail.
- Q Were they during 1967 or were they earlier ? A. I would guess that they were probably 1966 or 1967. I do know he wrote these three pieces on three separate times.
- Q These were messages, were they not, which Mr De Grimston had recorded from each of the three Gods in which The Process believed ? A. Yes, they are an expression of three different points of view as named.
- Q Let me put that question again: these were messages, were they not, which Mr De Grimston had received from each of the three Gods in which The Process believed ? A. Yes, I think that is true.
- Q We would get on faster if you would answer the questions. I am trying to make them fairly simple. Again, let us imagine together the person who is going to buy this, the reader. They are going to read this as a message from the three Gods of The Process ? A. Yes.
- Q And if they are Jehovahians they are going to pay particular attention to the direct message from Jehovah ? A. Presumably.
- Q If they are Luciferians they are going to pay particular attention to the message from Lucifer ? A. Yes.
- Q And if they are Satanists they are going to pay particular attention to the message from Satan. A. Quite likely.
- Q I think we can pick it up at page 11, I am not going to read it all -----

MR KEMPSTER: Would you just read the first paragraph ?

MR NEILL: Certainly. "The three great Gods of the univers Jehovah Lucifer Satan. Consciously or unconsciously, apathetically, half-heartedly, enthusiastically or fanatically, under countless other names than those by which we know Them, and under innumerable disguises and descriptions, men have followed the three Great Gods of the Universe ever since the creation. Each one according to his nature.

"For the three Gods represent three basic human patterns of reality. Within the framework of each pattern there are countless variations and permutations, widely varying grades of suppression and intensity. Yet each one represents a fundamental problem, a deep-rooted driving force, a pressure of instincts and desires, terrors and revulsions.

"All three of them exist to some extent in every one of us. But each of us leans more heavily towards one of them; whilst the pressures of the other two provide the presence of conflict and uncertainty". But each one according to his nature, and I think you agreed with me a few moments ago, just to take one of them, that Stanists, followers of Satan, would look particularly at what so-called message there was for him from Satan? A. He could well, yes.

B Q But we will look at what the Lord Jehovah said on page 11: "In the beginning there was WAR. And after, there was WAR. Then WAR again and more WAR!" and so on.. I am very anxious not to be unfair, so if there is any particular passage you think I am going past too quickly tell me and I will stop. I am going to just pick out passages because this is, at the moment, merely historical, is it not? A. Yes, it is.

C At the bottom of page 13 we see "Finally, when all was spent, and all My words and threats and terrors had been passed aside, ignored, rejected; finally, when I knew no more how to force My laws upon you, I came in love. Through CHRIST, 'Love thine enemy', I cried", and so on. That only describes that stage in history when he came in love. Then we have on page 14 a rather horrifying picture and the next two pictures are the same.

D Then at page 19 we pick up the history again: "But WAR continued. Hatred waxed strong upon the earth", and so on. Then on the next two pages there are photographs, one of them of a submarine and the other of a demonstration or a parade ---- A. If I may interrupt, as you invited me to do, I think it is important to bring out that the point of view that is being put forward here is that mankind has brought war upon himself by his own actions.

E Q Now if we can turn to, so to speak, the present time, at page 23 he begins to pick it up in the present time: "I, JEHOVAH have now come to help you, to give you the WAR that you love so, to turn upon you the hatred you have delighted so in meting out. I, JEHOVAH, am again beside you upon the battlefield;" and I do not think we need the rest of that page.

F Then we have some more horrifying pictures on the next pages and then on page 26, about five lines down: "You have made your choice. JOHOVAH your God shall implement it for you. For JEHOVAH gives man what man demands of Him; and man for centuries, has cried out for blood and more blood, and JEHOVAH has satisfied not the demand.

G "But now in the Last Days shall man's cry be heard, and I, JEHOVAH, shall besow upon My creation that which it craves. And in the ending of the world shall all the dams be broken and the floods shall rise upon the land, and the deluge of man's hatred shall be unleashed and sweep across the face of the earth.

H "And in the Last Days, according to the prophecies of ancient times, My Army shall come upon the field", and so it goes on.

Then page 35 -----

MR KEMPSTER: Would you mind reading a passage on page 31, the first two paragraphs ?

MR NEILL: "War is the central pivot of man's rejection of Me. For War in the ultimate presumption. War is the great destroyer, and only GOD has the right to destroy. WAR is the sentence of death passed upon the guilty, and only GOD may pass the sentence of death".

B Then he goes on to say, on page 35, what he is doing:  
"I bring you WAR; WAR as you have never known it, filling as you have never seen it, destruction as you have never felt it, devastation as you have never imagined it. It is your promised destiny", and so it goes on.

On page 36: "The hearts of those who feel nothing shall melt, and the hearts of those who loved shall be turned to stone. The weak shall be strong, and the strong shall wither away. The rational man shall babble lunacy, and the virtuous man shall steep himself in vice!"

Taking this point shortly, that is suggesting to those who read it that there is a message from Jehovah of what is to come and that he, Jehovah, is going to bring war on earth of a kind which has never been seen before ? A. Yes, I think this is true, that is another Book of Revelations which prophesies similar things.

Q Now let us turn to what the Lord Satan's message was for those who were particularly interested in what he had to say. That begins at page 77, and it starts with a picture on the opposite page which says "Know the true desires of your soul". Now we have got Satan saying, as recorded by Mr De Grimston:  
E "Man, you are come to the bitter end of your degradation. Drain the dregs and leave not a stain in the glass. For WAR is upon you, around you and within you. You are submerged in WAR so totally now there is no escape. Like a cancer it has taken hold on you, crept stealthily among you and become entrenched. No force on earth can remove it. And no force in heaven will.

F "For We, the Gods, give man what man demands, not what he pretends to want. And man, who puts on airs and cries for peace and light and love, and claims that his one desire is to live in harmony with those around him; man, who clothes himself soberly with proper decency and goes about his business saying: 'I am civilised, I am respectable. I am a rational being in control of all my emotions'; he is no more than an ignorant fool, a hypocrite, a self-deluded imbecile".  
C

Now the next page: "For all he really wants is death, slaughter, bloodshed, rape, pillage, and the violent hysterical screeching lunacy of WAR. That is his true desire, and nothing less will truly satisfy him.

H "Man", says one quoting God, "see yourself! Know the true desires of your soul. Feel the love of horror, the lust for blood, the exstasy of watching death stride out upon the earth and take his toll.



"When is your mind at peace ? Only when your body is at WAR.

"When are you truly satisfied ? Only when blood is on your hands, hatred in your heart and the light of battle gleaming in your eye.

"Do not deceive yourself! Death is sheer delight to you. Torture is supreme fascination.

"Can you drag your eyes from the vision of a body stretched upon the rack, broken on the wheel, or squeezed to lifelessness by the slow agony of the hangman's rope ? No, you can only gaze transfixed, every grain of your attention focused on the sight.

"And can you look away from the writhing monster of a battlefield, close your ears to the shrieks and groans of wounded men, close your eyes to the blood and the mangled flesh ? No, you are entranced, enchanted, gleeful at the lurid picture of violent death and slaughter", and so it goes on.

Then at page 84 this is what Satan is telling his followers: "Pretend no more to seek after sterile peace, that holds no pleasure for your active soul. Revel in the multiple delights of WAR. Feel the blood lust rising in your veins, the mounting, tense anticipation of the moment before battle is joined.

"Feel the firm grip on the swordhilt, the cold hardness of the steady gun butt. Smell the blood and the cordite".

Then the next paragraph: "And know where man's fulfilment lies. Know that life is worthless unless it is lived in the very teeth of death, that peace is nothing except as a fleeting moment in the midst of WAR, that love is empty save as a transitory oasis in the world of violent hatred, that to create is only meaningful in order to destroy".

Page 86: "I, SATAN, stand for WAR. I glory in WAR. I glory in the magnificence of man in battle, man struggling with life and death, man giving vent to his wrath.

"I scorn the weak-willed victims of WAR, the hordes of helpless citizens, who cry for mercy as they are driven from their homes and from their lands. They are the fodder for the monstrous WAR machines, the fuel that the great engines of death devour in their relentless march over the face of the earth.

"They deserve no better than their lot, for they have no strength, or courage of their own; no will to rise and fight, no fire within their souls to drive them into battle. They were born to a futile death, a miserable death, a worthless feeble destiny of nothing. They were born to be trampled upon, to be cut down by the mighty sword of the conqueror.

"And such is their fate, significant only as it is part of the game of WAR.

"So waste no more time with crawling on your belly in the dust. Stand up and cast aside the trappings of a civilised facade. Throw off the cloak of meaningless respectability. Strip yourself bare to the roots of your bestial nature. Let the animal loose in you. Become as you are; the Beast, naked and proud, teeth bared and eyes aflame, your feet firm planted on the ground, your face towards your enemy.

"Release the Fiend that lies dormant within you, for he is strong and ruthless, and his power is far beyond the bounds of human frailty.

"Come forth in your savage might, rampant with the lust of battle, tense and quivering with the urge to strike, to smash, to split assunder all that seek to detain you. And cast your eye upon the land before you. Choose what road of slaughter and violation you will follow. Then stride out upon the land and amongst the people.

"Rape with the crushing force of your virility; kill with the devastating precision of your sword arm; maim with the ruthless ingenuity of your pitiless cruelty; destroy with the overwhelming fury of your bestial strength", and it goes on and on.

Then on page 89 - opposite which is "Release the Fiend within you" - "SATAN'S army is ready in the field, and slaughter is the order of the day. For I, SATAN, am Master of the world, and My law is death".

Then page 90, the second paragraph: "Gorge yourself on the horrors of irretrievable loss; the miserable fate of the victims that still remain, the helpless bewilderment of their despair, the pitiful cries of their useless supplication, and the wailing anguish of their bereavement. And grind your heel into the face of their stupidity.

"Burn the chaff of humanity! For such is its desire and its desert. And dance the dance of a dervish around the leaping flames.

"Again I say: Release the Fiend within you!

"Release the Fiend! Release the Fiend! And the Fiend shall conquer, and the chaff be burned".

Page 92: "The Fiend shall devastate the earth ... I, SATAN, shall stalk with the Fiend" and then at the bottom of the page: "And the mother that pleads weakly for her child shall see it slain before her. And the woman that pleads piteously for her miserable virtue shall be struck down and raped. And he that fearfully pleads for his life shall be cut to pieces".

Then going to page 96, the last few pages are the final message, so to speak, to the followers of Satan: "And the strong and the mighty and the ruthless; creatures of the Fiend that follow him; they shall stand at the core of the raging chaos, spreading death around them and embracing it

themselves like a long lost brother.

"And those that die in the glory of battle, those that kill before they die, those that meet death as an equal and not as a pale grey suppliant, those that stay proud and strong, and die as they have lived, those that revel in the sheer delights of death, instead of fleeing helpless before its inexorable avalanche, they are My people; the men of SATAN, born of the underworld and reared in the dark chasms of the Pit.

"And these shall be My Army at the End; rank upon rank of black-hearted angels from the depths of Hell".

Then at the top of page 99: "Go Forth! Prepare for the Day of Reckoning!

"And he that shall meet the day steeped in the blood of his enemies shall be raised up and magnified in strength and power. He that shall be found in the very midst of battle, reeking of death, lip curled in ultimate defiance, shall be reborn to rule immortal in the world of SATAN. But he that is seen to run and hide, he that is heard to cry out for mercy, he that collapses in helpless despair, all shall be doomed to endless torment for their weakness".

At page 102, after some more photographs, the second paragraph: "And I shall rule the world, and My people with Me, so shall I rule the Universe and My might and My power shall know no bounds".

Then, omitting the next paragraph: "Then shall I be free and all My people ..."

Then on page 104, the second paragraph: "I am the epitome of both death and life. I am the body in the depths of dark depravity, and I am the soul in the heights of sublime spiritual ecstasy. The legions of the damned are of Me, as is the great company of archangels. And when the bonds of matter hold Me no more, then shall I and My people, My Army, My legions, all My followers, rise from the depths of the blackness of the Pit and transcend the stars.

"I am the body and the soul of man. Whilst the Fiend of the body is enslaved by the fearful mind, the soul is imprisoned. Only when the Fiend is released can the soul be free.

"So I, SATAN, am come to release the Fiend, to let him loose upon the earth for the latter days, so that the world shall end with nothing less than the ultimate destruction of total WAR.

MR C.A. FRIPP:  
Cross-examined.

"And those who accept the End" -  
that will be the members of Process, will it not -

- "and play their part, together with the Fiend, in bringing about the End; those who stand proud and fearless in the midst of the End, and wield with Me the Sword of Ultimate Destruction; they shall rule with Me when humanity is dead; and after, seek freedom with Me in the conquest of the Universe".

Then, further down:

"So rise and prepare for the final battle...Invoke the cataclysm!" and so on. "Release the Fiend! And stride with SATAN's Army to the End".

Now, Mr Fripp, is not that a horrifying piece of writing?  
A. Yes, completely. It is an expression of total destructiveness, which is what Satan, in that aspect, is concerned with - complete evil.

Q And that is advice, if followed, which would lead to all that Mr Manson did, and worse? A. I do not feel it is advice. I feel that that is made clear in several respects in this book. One is in the opening section, which Mr Kempster requested you to read out, where it is clear we are talking here again about aspects of the human personality. It is also clear that we are not suggesting that anybody should behave in this way. There is a large section of this book which you have not read which expresses another point of view, which is that war is not only appalling but something which nobody should indulge in. It is the Satan section. And there is a fourth section of the book, called Transcendence, which again you have not read.

MR NEILL: Let us look at Transcendence.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Must we go on?

MR NEILL: I will leave this for Mr Kempster if he wants to.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I should have thought so.

MR KEMPSTER: It would probably save time if my friend and the jury, before putting this book aside -

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Mr Kempster, I do not want to consume a moment more time than is essential in this case, and above all I want to avoid any repetition. You can come back to it and reintroduce it if you wish to.

MR KEMPSTER: Then I shall.

MR NEILL: Before we pass from that, let me put this to you. Let us imagine the young, disturbed man who has read page 8

MR C.A. FRIPP:  
Cross-examined.

of this Sex issue of Process, seen himself and his troubles recorded there, has bought his issue of Sex and now turns to the teachings of the Process. Let us assume that he is persuaded by the advocacy of the advocate for the Devil in the Sex issue and sees himself as a Satanist: what is the message that he is going to get from his God, his special God, Satan, from this book? A. From this book he will get the message - again the passages you have not read are very important - that war is an appalling thing, that it is totally destructive, that it is against the will of God, and that with Christ's help (again the section you have not read) he can rise above that level of himself, so that he does not need to respond to those urges, if he has them in him. I think that is the message he will get.

Q You have given that answer. Can you point to a passage in the book which says that, quite shortly? A. I feel the book says it in various ways.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Just give us the best. A. I feel Transcendence at the end, and also the Introduction; and also in the flyleaf:

"CHRIST said: love thine enemy".

MR NEILL: You have told us about the passage I read on page 7. You have told us about the flyleaf opposite to the photograph of Mr De Grimston. Is there any other passage or page you want to refer us to where the young, or a reader, is told: "Although it is one of our gods, don't believe a word of what Satan tells you"? A. Yes. Again in Transcendence, particularly the last two paragraphs of page 109.

Q Where are you saying, the middle part of page 109:

"And finally the knowledge of irrevocable commitment to the way of bloodshed; the plough to which man has put his hand and cannot turn back until he has completed the cycle of his own self-destruction through war"?

A. Yes. That is a description of the last passage which you were reading, Satan on War. What we have here is a summary of the entire book, in a sense:

'Three distinct and separate patterns of reality'.  
Para.2: "First", the Jehovahian reality.

The next paragraph, second, the Luciferian reality, the knowledge of the evil of war, the degradation, etc. The next paragraph, Satanic reality, the one you have just read. Then:

"No one of the three is more real than the other two, except in the mind of the individual. The acceptance of the reality of all of them is the ultimate truth; the complete understanding of the triangular conflict which exists in every one of us.

"In adherence to one and rejection of the other two there is courage, but it is a blind courage; a part-acceptance, but equally a part-rejection of reality. To cling to one pattern only and resist the others brings no resolution and no fulfilment, because the knowledge is incomplete. Only by a full understanding and acceptance of all three patterns as parts of ourselves", etc.

B Then later on it talks about Christ's part in it, which is as the bringer of awareness in the whole situation.

Q It is right. is it not, when we were looking at the Sex issue together we saw that each of these three books, Jehovah on War, Lucifer on War and Satan on War, were advertised separately at the price of one guinea each? A. Yes.

C Q And there would have been those who, because they were interested in Satan, would have bought Satan on War, would they not? A. It is possible, yes.

Q If they had bought their Satan on War, they would have read Satan's message alone, would they not? A. Yes, that is possible. There was a small edition in that separate issue, and because we felt that the whole picture should be presented we then combined them into the one volume we have here.

D MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: And what were the public charged for them all together? A. I am afraid I can't remember, my Lord, what this was on sale for.

E Q It was profitable, was it? A. Certainly, yes, I think it was profitable, in the sense that we made a profit - our expenses of producing the book.

MR NEILL: Did you consider the effect that this was going to have on young, impressionable minds? A. Yes, we did; and that was, in fact, why we combined them into the one volume.

F Q Some who regarded themselves as Satanists, if they understood what is said at the end there, would regard this as a plain message from their god as to how they were to behave, would not they? A. If they interpreted it that way, yes, they could. People can interpret many things in many different ways. People have interpreted the words of Christ as a justification for crusades.

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is there any caution anywhere in any one of these books against interpreting it as a guide to your own conduct? A. I feel there is again in Transcendence at the end of this volume.

H MR NEILL: Is that the only place, and apart from the bit opposite the photograph and page 7, where anybody reading it would get the warning: "This is not intended as a guide to your own conduct"? A. Yes. I feel so; because the pictures are intentionally horrifying - you commented upon it yourself -

MR C.A. FRIPP:  
Cross-examined.

A/ they are intentionally horrifying to show how awful war is. Also there is the fact that each of these three sections is completely mutually contradictory. So how anybody could interpret them as saying: "This is what the Process stands for" I cannot follow. They are obviously in complete contradiction of one another.

F Q Would not you regard that part of the book, Satan on War, as a very dangerous publication? A. No, I do not so regard it.

Q Not even read by itself, as it was on sale for a guinea? A. I think to describe it as "very dangerous" is a great exaggeration.

C MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: How would you put it? A. I would say it is an expression of what mankind is capable of, it is an obvious expression of evil.

MR NEILL: I am trying to put it at your level. You are putting this church forward as a church of religious teaching and religious belief, are you not? A. Yes.

D Q Therefore you must expect, must you not, that there will be people who will take to your teaching as a religion? A. Yes.

Q And follow it as an act of faith and belief? A. Yes.

Q So they - some of them - will be those who see themselves as followers of Satan and who will regard these words in this book, the Satan part, as divine teaching? A. Well, as I said before, people can interpret things in funny ways. Anybody who thinks God is saying, "Go out and kill people", God overall, given Christ says: "Love your enemy", which is very clearly set out, given Transcendence, given the complete contradiction from what we call the Luciferian point of view, which is talking exclusively about the appalling nature of war and abstain from it and in no way partake of it---

Q I want an answer to this question: A person who bought at one guinea the book Satan on War would regard that book as divine teaching? A. I think he would probably regard it as the ravings of a lunatic.

Q Regard it as what? A. The ravings of a lunatic.

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Who would the lunatic be? A. That anybody who really felt that this was---

Q You mean, the author? A. No, my Lord. If he simply read as Mr Neill suggested that one passage, he would feel that this must be a very unbalanced view.

MR NEILL: I am going to put my question again. I am not talking about one passage.

H MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do try to listen to the question. A. Right, my Lord.

MR NEILL: I am asking you about a person who, having bought their Sex issue, then tenders a guinea, as they are invited to do, and buys the book Satan on War. That person, who I am suggesting may be young and impressionable, might regard what was set out in that book as divine teaching? A. It is obviously possible. I do not myself know of any such event.

Q But why should not he? This is one of the three gods - or four, if you like - of the Process church. Here he is setting out his teaching in a recorded message, a specially revealed message to Mr De Grimston, which Mr De Grimston then has printed and has on sale for one guinea. Why should not I, or anyone else, going and buying and reading that book, regard that as the divine teaching of the god Satan?

A. In a sense it obviously is the teaching of the god Satan. Satan does stand for evil. The Process does not stand for evil, and we were not saying, "You should do this". We are saying: "This is what Satan, in his evil role, has been telling mankind to do for a very long time, and unfortunately many people have responded to it."

Q It is not a very long time. This is what he is telling them to do now in the latter days. That is why we looked at the latter day bit. This is what has got to be done now.

A. I said "for a very long time" because I feel personally that Satan has been saying this kind of thing to human beings for a very long time.

Q That may be, but what he is saying now is what I am concerned with. By "now", I am talking about the summer of 1967. He is saying, or the book is saying: "Here the Latter Days and this is what my message is to believers in the Process".

A. Again, you asked me if there was any other place in which we set out things. There are, as you are aware, many other publications, and I feel that, if you are taking the church as a whole, it is necessary to consider them also.

MR NEILL: I think we have spent long enough on that.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You had better be careful. We do not know how many more publications there are. It is a terrifying prospect.

MR NEILL: I am going to confine myself to only two or three more, I think.

Q Here we are, in the summer of 1967, and what was happening in London then I am going to leave to someone else, because you cannot help us about that. Let us now turn to what you were doing in the latter part of 1967. A. Yes.

Q Did you go, in the latter part of 1967, to California? A. Yes, I went to San Francisco in November 1967.

Q Did you there set up a chapter - if I may use the word "branch", we will know what we are talking about, but what you call a chapter - of the Process-church in California? A. Yes.



Q Was that set up about December 1967? A. Yes.

A Q Did a number of people, including a man called Wild, become initiates of the church? A. Yes.

Q In December 1967. And was the Process active in San Francisco for some months in the winter of 1967-1968? A. I think for about 3½, 4 months, and there were two ministers there, myself and one other.

B Q Who was the other one? A. Hugh Mountain.

Q That is the Hugh Mountain - so that we know exactly where we are - who was, at the time of the Sex issue, the managing editor of the Process. Is that right? A. Yes.

C Q At that time had you, by then, already got what we have called in this case "sacred names"? A. I was trying to remember when we got them. I think it was right around that time. I think it was in fact in November 1967.

Q And you became Father Alban Abraham? A. Yes.

Q That is two sacred names at that stage? A. Yes.

L Q That was later dropped? A. Yes.

Q But at one stage you had a double sacred name.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "Alban" with a hyphen? A. No.

MR NEILL: No, I think two separate words.

E Q And Mr Mountain's name - again if I am wrong about this you will correct me - was Father Aaron-Tubal-Cain. Is that right? A. Yes.

Q Would it be that about that time Mr Castle, who described himself as Mendez Castle in the Sex issue, became Father Mendez Augustas - with a final "as" instead of "us"? A. Yes.

Q He was Satan's Advocate. "Andrew Castle" I called him. Father Mendez Augustas? A. Yes.

Q There were you - forgive me if I call you by your ordinary surname - you, Mr Tripp, and Mr Hugh Mountain, the managing editor, setting up this chapter together in San Francisco? A. Yes.

Q Were you at an address which I think was 407 Cole Street? A. No.

Q Where were you? A. The chapter house was located on a street called Geary Boulevard.

Q Did a number of people join the church there? A. Yes.

H Q Including, as I think you agreed, this man Wild and his wife? A. Yes.

MR C.A. FRIPP:  
Cross-examined.

Q How were you living there? Were you getting donations again from those who were willing to subscribe? A. Yes. We had actually started the chapter with some small funds we brought with us when we arrived there, and also, as you suggest, from donations.

Q And were you giving whatever is the appropriate American equivalent, either sessions or courses, or as you will, of instruction? A. "Sessions" not. Courses, yes.

Q You were giving courses, for which you were making the appropriate charge? A. Yes.

Q Were people attending those courses at Geary Boulevard? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did you buy the property there? A. No, we rented a house.

Q Where did the money come from? What was its original source before you started collecting donations in San Francisco? A. From the founding members of the group, who put in their own funds, myself included.

MR NEILL: In addition to those two sources again was there money coming in from the sale of the publications of Process? A. Not initially, because we didn't actually have any of those publications with us.

Q We are not concerned, at the moment, with exact dates, but while you were in San Francisco had you got your publications for sale and were people going out on the streets and selling them? A. As to going out on the streets and selling them, on one occasion only. We had a very limited supply of our publications available.

Q They would include, presumably, these books on Gods on War: Satan on War, Jehovah on War, Lucifer on War? A. Not in fact for sale, because we had, I think, one copy, which we retained in the chapter house, and it was not for sale because we had no copies sufficient for sale.

Q That was used, then, as a basis for people to read? A. If they wished to read it in the chapter house they could do so, yes.

Q Was it used in teaching? A. I do not think so specifically, no.

Q Was this magazine on Sex on sale? A. Yes, that was available for sale, I think about halfway through our time in San Francisco.

Q That was the current edition, so to speak, of the Process magazine, was it not? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: And for many months remained the only up-to-date edition of the magazine. Is that right? A. Indeed, my Lord, yes.

MR NEILL: Indeed until some time in 1969 - we may have to come to that later - certainly at that stage it was the only one, or had you earlier ones there? Had you the Mind Bending issue with you? A. Certainly not for sale. We may have had one copy for file purposes.

Q But the Sex issue was the one that was on sale, and that was the current number? A. Yes.

R Q What were you doing? You were going round, were you, preaching the Process in San Francisco? A. Yes, to some degree. We visited various places. We spoke with people. Most of our activity was spent in our house with people coming to us.

Q These would be the initiates coming for teaching? A. I am not clear whether you are using "initiate" in the technical sense or in the sense of people who are interested.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Potential converts. A. Yes; potential converts were certainly coming to the chapter house.

MR NEILL: We have not been into this - I am trying to keep it short - but there were (and are, indeed, I think) a number of grades in the church, are there not. You start off at the bottom as an initiate? A. As an acolyte.

Q Then you become an initiate? A. Yes.

Q Then you move up and become a messenger? A. Yes; or you can become what is called a disciple, which is a lay follower of the church.

E Q A messenger is, so to speak, stage 3 from the bottom: acolyte, initiate, messenger? A. Yes; with a parallel rank of disciple.

Q Which would be a layman? A. Yes, which is a lay member. A messenger is a trainee minister: not a minister but a trainee minister.

Q Mr Victor Wild became a messenger, did he not? A. Yes, he did.

Q In the San Francisco chapel. So that we can clear it up: above the messenger, inside the church, there are then four ranks of ministers. Is that right? A. Three, I think.

G Q What are they? A. Prophet, priest and master.

Q Who is right at the top of the church? A. The Council of Masters.

H Q What part in the hierarchy does Mr De Grimston play? A. His work is primarily concerned with research and with writing. He also plays an important part in the administration of the church, not on the level of detail but on the level of help for the council of masters, consultation, discussion.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is he the treasurer? .. No, my Lord.

MR NEILL: Who is the treasurer? .. The treasurer is now Father Phineas.

Q And his other name would be what? .. Andrew Moor. He was a recent appointment.

Q Is he some relation of Mr De Grimston? .. Yes, he is. He is his brother.

Q And he is one of the people who have been in the Process all the time, Mr Andrew Moor? .. Yes, from very early days.

Q Victor Wile, besides becoming a messenger, also got a sacred name: he became Brother Ely? .. Yes.

Q Then, at the beginning of 1968 -- which is just about the time you are setting up in San Francisco -- the American company, that Mr Kempster told us about in opening, and gave us a little booklet about, was incorporated? That is the Louisiana company, who are the First Plaintiffs in this action? .. That is correct.

MR NEILL: I wonder if the witness could have that little bundle which was handed up of the incorporation documents? The jury have that.

Q We have looked before, or were invited to look by Mr Kempster, at the constitution at the time of the registration I think as a charity; but I have in this little bundle, beginning on the third page, the articles of incorporation of the First Plaintiffs. Are you familiar with those, or is this a question better put to another witness? .. No, I think I am probably familiar with them. I don't actually have the document at the moment. (Same handed).

MR NEILL: I am only going to look at one or two bits of this. Let us look at Article III.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: My eye has just been caught by Article I, setting out the name, and they "shall enjoy an incorporate existence and succession for a period of 99 years". That might be very awkward, might it not, in certain events which they were confidently expecting? (The witness laughed).

MR NEILL: Again this may be something another witness can deal with, but was there a date in 1967 that you suggested that the world was coming to an end? .. Do you mean, were we suggesting there would be a particular --

Q There would be a date in 1967 when the world came to an end? .. No.

Q You do not remember? .. There was no such date. We have always said we don't know when it's going to be, but it looks like somewhere around the end of the century..

- Q At any rate, that gives the 99 year existence. Let us see what is said in Article III. This is about the time, the beginning of 1968:

"This incorporation is to establish The Process, Church of the Final Judgement which has been called into existence by God to be made known to all men that the latter days are upon us for ever now the Lord Christ is in the world and gods walk"-

you quarrelled with me when I used the word "walk"; that is where I got it from, you see? A. Yes, I do.

- Q I had forgotten it when you challenged me about it, but I knew the word came from somewhere -

"-gods walk amongst men and there are signs and wonders foretold in prophecy in preparation for the final judgement of men".

That is essential to your teaching, is it not, that first paragraph? A. Yes.

- Q That you "had been called into existence...to be made known to all men that the latter days are upon us" and the gods are walking? A. The fact that the gods are walking, this is news to me. I obviously should have known this, but it is not part of our teaching that gods are walking amongst men. This was drafted by a particular attorney in New Orleans, Louisiana, not by myself, and I personally do not feel that that particular phrase reflects us accurately.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It is a solicitor's mistake? A. I fear it is.

MR NEILL: If you will kindly turn on to Article IX, You will see that you are described as chancellor and secretary. A. Yes.

- Q And on the next page you have signed it. Article IX says:

"The name and post office address of the subscribers to these Restated Articles of Incorporation are:

Father John, Chancellor and Secretary (C.A.Fripp)".

By the time this was signed I think you had changed your name from Alban to John? A. Yes, I had.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Who bestowed these sacred names, who decided who should be what? A. It was usually - invariably it was the individuals own choice, maybe with help.

- Q You chose the name? A. Yes.

- Q What made you go for Alban Abraham? A. As a matter of fact I didn't know, I didn't have any very clear idea, my Lord, and it was suggested to me. I never particularly liked it,

in fact, and I took it. That is why I changed it later to John, which I find a nicer name.

MR NEILL: Then we see, going back to Article III, and turning over the page from where it talks about the gods walking, what the primary function of it shall be, six lines down:

"(1) To maintain, own and operate institutions of spiritual learning on all levels, and in these institutions of attainment to teach all branches of the academic arts and sciences as well as the occult arts; to instruct the young of The Americas in all branches of science and the occult mysteries"-

Does that mean black magic, or what? A. Certainly not. We never engaged in black magic.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What does it mean? A. "Occult" simply means "hidden".

Q I know that; but what is meant by the phrase, in this context, "the occult arts" and "the occult mysteries"?  
A. I think it means those things which are not immediately apparent, that one can learn. These are a proper area of endeavouring to learn. It does not mean black magic, or anything of that kind.

MR NEILL: Is it meant to include purely spiritual things? Surely "occult" is connected with witchcraft, is it not?  
A. Spiritual things, yes; not witchcraft.

Q Further down at (3):

"The aforesaid Church shall have as one of its purposes the power to receive grants from other foundations and persons to expedite spiritual and occult research"-

You see there that the word "occult" is being used in contradistinction to "spiritual", is it not? It does not mean the same thing. A. I don't know that it means the opposite. "Spiritual" and "occult" are there, and occult in the sense of hidden, not in the sense of evil or black or white magic or anything of that kind.

Q White magic, would it be? A. Not necessarily magic even. I think the word "occult" simply means hidden.

Q "The spiritual and hidden, or research into hidden things"?  
A. Yes, things not known at that point, which presumably is what one does research into.

Q "in all areas of discovery as well as power to issue stipends, grants and fellowships for research... And it shall be possessed with the power to publish and make known to the world at large and the academic scientific and spiritual community the discoveries that are made through its facilities in the areas of science and of the arts"-

Now let us read the next words together:

"-and in the occult and magical arts"-

Does "magical" mean something different there? A. "Magical" - I don't understand, different from -?

Q What does "magical" mean there? Does it mean magical, or does it mean something else, or just hidden? A. Magical I think means magical. I personally do not really know what the word means.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You do not know what this refers to? Are you really saying that? A. "Magical" is a word I rather associate with conjuring tricks.

MR NEILL: It goes on -

"-and to dispose by sale, lease or other contractual arrangements of the fruits of its labor, in order to finance its further research in the area of humanities and occult exploration".

There we are. Then on the next page, Article IV, after one or two references to "occult" there - I will not take up time on them - sets out how this thing is to be set up:

"The offices of this incorporation shall consist of a Teacher and a Pontiff and a Master Treasurer and a Chancellor"-

Am I right in thinking you are the Chancellor? A. Yes.

Q Who is or are the holder(s) of the other office? A. Teacher is Robert De Grimston. Pontiff is Peter Eckhoff. Master Treasurer was, until very recently, Mr Christopher De Peyer.

Q He is now Mr Andrew Moor? A. Yes.

Q Mr De Grimston's brother. The Teacher, therefore, is Mr De Grimston; the Pontiff is Mr Eckhoff, whose name I think is Father Joel Maximillian? A. Correct.

Q I will not take up time on the rest of it, but that provides for the various grades of the church, does it not? A. It does talk about the various grades, yes.

Q It is part of your teaching, is it not, that in fact when this terrible Day of Judgment comes those who are members of the Process shall be all right, if I may use that expression? A. No.

Q It is not? A. No.

Q Are they going also to be treated in exactly the same way as the other people? A. I don't know. It's up to a power far greater than me to decide that one.

Q But the Process-Church at any rate offers an opportunity for those who follow its teaching not to partake in the destruction and judgment on the others? A. No. I feel that the judgment is something which comes for all men. What the Process is endeavouring to do is to play a constructive part in the period between now and that judgment, whenever it may come.

(Adjourned for a short time)

MR NEILL: Mr Fripp, we had just been looking at the constitution. That was the constitution of the first Plaintiff company that came into existence in January, 1968. Is that right?  
A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: June 1968, was it not?

MR NEILL: My Lord, I think it was filed. If we look at page 1 ----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You are quite right.

MR NEILL: At any rate, that is the beginning of 1968. For that time and for the next, I think you told us, three and a half months roughly you were in San Francisco with the San Francisco Chapter? A. I think I was there till about the beginning of March, middle of March, something like that.

Q You were there with Mr Hugh Mountain? A. Yes.

Q I will come back to ask you a bit more about what happened then, but about the same time, in April 1968, the next publication came out, which I want to ask you a little bit about, not as much as about the last one, and this is one called "If a Man Asks". Do you remember that one? A. Yes, I do.

Q Was that a publication which reached you out in California? A. I think I first saw it in a non-published form; i.e., as a series of documents circulated within the internal membership of the church.  
(Copies of Process publication "If a Man Asks" distributed and marked as Exhibit P.16).

Q So you would have seen it before it in fact was on sale to the public; is that right? A. I think so, yes.

Q That I think again was a publication which was based upon what Mr De Grimston (who is called the Teacher, we saw in the constitution) had recorded as a message which he had received. Is that right? A. Yes.

Q I think you have got it in the actual original form as published. It is divided, I think, into a number of sections, giving the reply to various questions which might be asked by someone outside the Process. That is right, is it not? A. Yes.

Q "One" - that is the first bit - "If a Man Asks - What is The Process? - Say to him It is the End, the Final Ending of the world of men. It is the agent of the End, the instrument of the End and the inexorable Power of the End". Putting that in perhaps simpler language, language I might understand, does that mean that in fact those in the Process had been chosen by the Gods to take part in bringing about the end of the world? A. Amongst other things. We feel that everybody has their part to play.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is not an answer to the question. Is it your view that those in the Process had been selected by God to take part in the bringing about or celebration of the end of the world? A. Yes, my Lord.



MR NEILL: They are described as the agents, the instruments and the inexorable power of the end. That is right, is it not?  
A. This says the Process is, yes.

Q The Process. Am I right in thinking that means the Process Church?  
A No, it specifically does not, if you read on.

Q Then perhaps you could explain it.

MR KEMPSTER: If you read the next sentence.

MR NEILL: "For The Process is not of man but of God. The Process is the Divine Will of Destiny which has planned and plotted the course of all that is and has been and shall be, in accordance with the laws of the Universe". Is the Process Church, then, the agent of the Process?  
A. An agent. The third paragraph of page 6 reads: "The Process is not a group of beings clothed in human forms. It is not a Church upon earth".

Q So that is merely an idea, "The Process"; is that right?  
A. Yes.

Q Those who are members of the Process Church are those who are to put in operation on earth the ideas of the Process?  
A. Not exclusively. We believe that every human being is chosen by God to play a particular part.

Q But those in the Process Church - and I will try to remember to emphasise the word "church" - have been certainly picked out as some of those who are to bring about the Process?  
A. Yes.

Q And by bringing about the process, that involves the destruction of the world?  
A. If that is how God so decides, yes.

Q He has decided. That is the whole point of your teaching, isn't it, that He has decided we have reached the latter days and judgment is at hand and the Gods are going to bring the end of the world about?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is right, is it not?  
A. Yes, my Lord.

MR NEILL: Then on page 8 - again, if I am going too fast and you think I have missed some important bit out, tell me, or Mr Kempster very kindly will - we see this: "And there are three ways for all humanity and all the beings of the Universe, three alternative levels of participation. For all must participate; none can shake off The Process. And the first is total commitment to the Game; total recognition of the power and the presence of God; total submission to the Divine Will of Destiny", and so on. Then at the bottom: "total acceptance of what is, and total willingness to serve God and the Gods and the Great Beings of the Universe, in whatever way might be required". Again trying to put that in Shorter English, if I may, that means, does it not, that members of the Process Church are to serve the Gods (including your three Gods) in whatever way those Gods might require them to do?  
A. In whatever way God might require.

Q That is said to be "This way is to be Of The Process". This

would involve, would it not, if they were required to do something by one of the Great Gods, then they ought to do it?  
A. What we are saying is to serve God and the Gods.

Q Let me put the question again. A. And the will of God.

Q And the will of the Great Gods as revealed through Mr De Grimston's recordings? A. I don't follow the last part.

Q What is wrong about that? You say the members of the Process Church must be ready to serve God and the Gods and the Great Beings. Included in that group will be the Gods of Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan? A. Yes, and Christ.

Q Does not that involve that if one of those Great Gods, namely, Jehovah or Satan, for the sake of argument, gives certain instructions to the Process Church, the members of the Process Church are to carry those instructions out? A. Yes, it could. It is a very interesting and important -----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You say it could. Does it have any other meaning? A. What I am thinking, my Lord, is that ----

Q Couldn't you answer the question? Could it have any other meaning than that the directions of the Gods (in the plural) are to be carried out? A. Yes, that is true.

MR NEILL: If you do that, you then become what is technically known as "Of The Process"? A. Yes.

Q And that is, so to speak, the thing you want to aim at, if you are a member of the church, to be of the Process? A. Yes.

Q Because, as we see on the next page, you can be "With the Process but not Of The Process". That is a sort of half-way house, if I may use the expression. Then the worst thing to be is "to be Against The Process". That is right, is it not? A. The most uncomfortable thing.

Q That involves rejecting the Process. Then if we go on a bit - again, if I am going too fast, stop me - at page 14, having been told about the three ways - that is, you can either be of the Process, with the Process or against the Process - we are told that "there are three ways and soon there shall be only two. Soon he who is not Of The Process shall be Against The Process, for no man shall be With The Process yet not Of The Process". Again interpreting, if I may, that means the with the Process people drop out, and that means you have to decide you are either of it or against it? A. Not with a group of people, as was stated earlier on. With the will of God; that is the basic definition at the start of this piece; specifically not a group of people.

Q Not a group of people, but in fact it means, does it not, that individual attitude is either you are of the Process or you are with the Process or you are against the Process? A. Yes.

Q So what this is saying on page 14, as I understand it, and you will tell me I am wrong if I am, is that there is going to come a time when an individual - forget about the word "group" - has

got to decide either he is going to be of the Process or he is going to be against the Process? A. Yes.

B Q Then it goes on: "And you who have chosen to be Of The Process shall be strong and powerful, for you shall live within the aura of the Divine Will, and great joy shall be yours and great understanding and great love. And your mighty voice shall be heard throughout the Universe, for it shall be the Voice of God. And all shall be revealed to you, and all shall be given to you. And you shall stand amidst the Devastation of the End, undismayed and undiminished". Is not that suggesting that those who are of the Process, and I would include in that the members of the Process Church, when the end comes, are going to stand undismayed and undiminished? A. Those who are of the Process, yes, in the sense of the will of God.

C Q Won't that include the members of the Process Church? A. I feel that is God's decision and not mine.

Q At any rate, at page 15 we are told that those "who have chosen to be Against The Process, whether by active opposition or by passive oblivion, you shall know the agony of the Final End". So that is describing what the Process is. That is, so to speak, question No.1. Then we have question No.2.

MR KEMPSTER: Would you read the middle paragraph on page 16, which again defines what is meant by "The Process"?

MR NEILL: Very well. "And The Process is the Word of existence. For though heaven and earth shall pass away yet shall the Word be eternal and indestructible".

E MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: In other words, it is going to be a very uncomfortable position for those who are not of the Process. Is that not right?

MR KEMPSTER: The form of the discomfort, my Lord, is in the second paragraph on page 15.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes. I have read it.

F G H MR NEILL: Having got the basic point about the Process, and I am grateful to you for explaining that, we now come to the second group of questions, which is Part 2, which starts at page 21. "If a Man Asks - What is your religion? How is it different from other religions?" and then what one is being told to say. "Say to him - Ours is the fulfilment of all religions. Ours is the Religion of the End, the Final End. Ours is the Religion of the Final Judgement, when all has been said and all has been done and man stands before his Maker, naked, stripped of his images and his facades, devoid of all justifications and excuses, with no time left to put right what is wrong, and nothing to conceal the basic fundamental truth about himself. Ours is the Religion of the Cataclysms, for we are the messengers and the forerunners of the great destruction that God shall bring upon the earth. Ours is the Religion of Death, for Death shall come behind us with his scythe as never before, taking a toll unmatched in all the time that man has crawled upon the earth. No war, no plague, no natural disaster ever known shall compare with the devastation that shall come in our wake. And ours is

A the Religion of the Spirit of the Great Messiah, who is come at last to snatch the crumbling world from the petty fearful hands of those that rule it to its pitiful detriment, not now as a Saviour but to Judge. For He comes to separate, to take His people unto Him and to cast all those who are not of Him into a Hell far worse than Hell itself." Those who are not of Him, means those who are not of the Process; that is right, is it not? A. Of the Process, in the meaning of the will of God, yes.

B Q Although you could not guarantee it, you would hope that those who were of the Process would include many, if not all, of the members of the Process Church? A. As you say, I could not guarantee it, but I would hope it.

C Q "And men shall cry at the moment of their condemnation: 'But what have I done?' And it shall be answered to them: 'It is not what a man does that damns him at the Final Count. It is what a man fails to do'. Saints shall be among His people and sinners shall be among His People. But they who have hidden fearful in the shadows, they who have done nothing but follow the rigid pattern of human conformity, they who have played the game of keeping safe, they who have maintained a rational facade to conceal their true feelings, they who have obeyed the letter of the human law and felt it was enough, they who have done no more than the minimum, they who have sought to remain acceptable to all around them, they who have taken shelter behind the vast unwieldy structure of a Church designed to serve man instead of God, they who have slid through life in a rut of barren respectability expending all energy on remaining in the rut, they who have passed by on the other side and justified their non-participation", and so on; they "shall be condemned for all eternity". Here again, putting it as shortly as one can, what you are saying and teaching is this, is it not, that those who choose the middle road - whether you call it "grey", or whatever you like to call it, or barren respectability - are in for trouble? A. Yes.

E Q And the way out which you are suggesting, though I accept and appreciate that you cannot guarantee it, is to follow the Process Gods? A. To obey the will of God as manifesting through those Gods.

F MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is there anything wrong with that? "The way out of the trouble" - is this right - "is to follow the Process Gods"? Right? A. Yes, my Lord.

G MR NEILL: Still talking about the religion, a little further on, it is said at the top of page 30: "We are not here to fulfil the demands of humanity. We are not here to fit into the values and the standards of humanity. We are not here to justify humanity. We are the gate into the new world," and so on. Then on the next page it is said: "And the Separation shall be complete. And the Army of God shall close its ranks upon the world and the Final Devastation shall begin. Ours is the Religion of the End. And we shall bring about the End. For the End must be". Now, is not that a plain statement in that booklet that the Process Church is going to help the Gods bring the end about? A. Yes, I think that is true.

Q So when we read in our "Gods on War" about how Jehovah and how Satan were forecasting and explaining about the end, we now see quite clearly that among those who are going to help Jehovah and Satan are the members of the Process Church? A. Help them, but not in the way that you are insinuating.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: No, there is no insinuation about it. It is a perfectly plain question. Put it again.

B MR NEILL: We read in "The Gods on War" the teaching of the Gods, and in particular Jehovah and Satan, on how the end was to be brought about. Here I suggest is a plain statement that among those who are going to help to bring about the end in the way these three Gods suggest are the members of the Process Church? A. To help to bring about the end, yes.

C Q And to take part in. "And we shall bring about the End", it says. A. Everybody has to take part in it who is there, obviously.

Q Do try, Mr Fripp. A. Yes.

Q Just read that last paragraph again. It is only about 12 or 14 words. "Ours is the Religion of the End". That must mean the Process Church, must it not? A. Yes.

I Q "And we" -- "we" there means the Process Church or members of the Process Church, does it not? A. Amongst others.

E Q "we shall bring about the End. For the End must be". Let us forget about the others for the moment, but that is plainly stating that those in the Process Church are going to take part in bringing about the end? A. Yes, certainly. What I am asking for is an opportunity to say what I feel that means.

F Q Please do. If you think at any time I am putting a question too quickly or unfairly, say so, and you answer it as you want to explain it. What do you want to say? A. Thank you. One of the most important things, in my view, about this whole aspect of religion that we are talking about is to set out the facts as one sees them. Part of the facts as we see them is that there is an awful lot of very evil things going on in the world, that God has promised in many writings - and I am not talking about ours; the Bible, for instance - that there is going to come an end, an end of the world, and that it is preceded by a lot of very agonising times. I regard my part in that, to the best of my ability, to help people to see what is going on and to help each other and to serve God during that time. I do not regard it as my part, nor do I regard it as the part of any member of my church, to go out and hurt anybody; quite the reverse.

ii Q Can you just tell me, Mr Fripp, how somebody who had bought their copy of "Satan on War" for a guinea in the summer of 1967 and now in the spring of 1968 buys their copy of "If a Man Asks" and reads the bit I have just been reading, is to understand that they are not to hurt anybody? A. I do not feel that there is any instruction anywhere to hurt anybody. I also feel that there is a lot in our literature which says precisely the opposite. For instance, again, the frontispiece of this book,

"Christ said: love thine enemy". It is not my interpretation of the word "love" to hurt anybody.

Q You remember when we were looking at the Book of Jehovah he was saying: "There came a time when I sent Christ down among you. You rejected Christ and now you have reached the Latter Days. It is too late. Judgment is now coming upon you, and Satan is coming to execute it". That is the gist of it, isn't it? A. Satan is coming as the manifestation, if you like, of the retribution.

B

Q The frontispiece you referred me to says "Christ to Judge, Satan to execute the Judgement". A. Yes. I was drawing a distinction, Mr Neill, between "execute" and "execute the judgement". They seem to me to have rather different meanings.

Q "Christ to Judge, Satan to execute the Judgement"; that means that Satan, according to this teaching, is coming to execute those who are judged as being persons who have got to be destroyed or devastated or in some other way have something unpleasant done to them. That is right, is it not? A. No, I don't feel it is. May I say something else?

E

Q Yes. A. Thank you. When I was asked yesterday by Mr Kempster to explain what I regard as our beliefs, I started talking about "As you sow, so shall you reap", "As you give, so shall you receive". My view is that any agony that mankind suffers at the end is a repayment of a debt. I believe in the concept of sin, and that mankind, including myself, has sinned before God, and that that debt has to be paid off, that the account has to be balanced. So I regard these unpleasant things as the paying off of that debt, which precedes a release into a new age, into a new beginning, which is another large aspect of our teaching. We do not say that the final curtain is the end and that is the end of everything, and everybody goes off into hellfire or heaven, or something; on the contrary, that there is a new beginning, and that new beginning will be ruled by Christ in love, and will be different from the world as we know it at the moment, which is in some senses at least ruled by conflict and fear and all sorts of negative and very unpleasant things. So the new beginning is a very important part of our teaching.

Q A new beginning for some people and others will have been devastated, won't they, to use your words? A. That seems to be so.

Q To bring about that devastation, the Process Church is to play its part in accordance with the teaching of the Gods? A. Yes.

Q Let us just reflect what that last answer means, Mr Fripp. That means, does it not, that someone who was prone to violence would be able to find a justification in a religion for giving vent to his violence? A. Not in my religion.

H

Q Wouldn't he, because apart from those who are chosen, the others are going to be devastated? A. I say again, no justification in my religion.

Q I may have misheard you, but didn't you say a moment ago that apart from those who were chosen, the others will be devastated?

A. I said that would seem to be so, by which I meant it appears to me that that is the will of God.

Q You also I think said that those who were going to take part in the devastation would include members of the Process Church.

A. No, I don't think I said that.

Q That would be right, wouldn't it? A. That we would take part in the devastation?

Q Yes. A. No, not as far as I am concerned.

Q Surely that is one of the things we have had in this bit on what the religion is there for? A. Are you suggesting I personally feel it is my job to go out and devastate people or that that is a teaching of my church, because, if that is your suggestion, I am not in agreement with you.

Q But isn't that part of your function? The passage we have just been reading says "We shall bring about the end".

A. The end contains many things, and as you will see from the very piece that we are examining, it includes a realisation of knowledge, that people begin to understand God more clearly, which is very different from going and shooting people or devastating them.

Q Let us go on. Let us turn to the next one, and the question here is: "If a Man Asks - Why is the world coming to an end? Say to him: Man has eyes and ears. Man can see and hear. Man can know. And man has been shown and man has been told. Man has been given the truth in countless forms and countless languages", and so on. Then on the next page it tells us that man has chosen not to see and Christ has given a warning. On the next page it says the time of reckoning is at hand, and so on. At the bottom of page 38 -----

MR KEMPSTER: Would you mind reading that paragraph at the foot of page 37, the third paragraph?

MR NEILL: "Can he show an interest in what he has been given? Can he show a greater awareness of himself? Can he show a greater ability to live in harmony with his fellow man? Can he show a greater knowledge of his God? Can he show a greater sense of true fulfilment? Can he show a greater loyalty to the source of his existence? Can he show a greater soul? Can he show a greater spirit? Can he show a greater understanding of what is? He can protest all these things. He can verbalise with great dexterity of phrase. He can profess with great learning and scholarship. He can philosophise at great length". Then it goes on: "And he can produce a thousand logical arguments why humanity is heading for a magnificent destiny - in spite of the evidence". In other words, all this bit Mr Kempster has asked me to read out, he can do that, but it goes on: "And herein lies the inevitability of man's destruction. He has convinced himself of his own validity and the validity of the direction in which he is going". Then it goes on on page 41. Now we turn to something to do with violence again. We remember the question that had been asked at the beginning was "If a man asks - Why is the world coming to an end?" and one of the answers at page 35 was: "Man can know". Let us see what is said in the middle of page 41:

The man who hears of violence and says: 'That is a part of me expressing itself. That is My hatred, that is My need to kill, that is My lust for blood, that is My cruelty, that is My intention to destroy'; that man knows. That man sees. That man is not blind. And as long as that man holds to what he knows, he has the power of knowledge". Now, what is that meant to be, Mr Fripp? A. That is just talking about personal responsibility. It is saying it is not a constructive thing to do to say "I am all good and the people I don't like are all bad". It is saying that all of us are a mixture of good and bad, and the way that we can be most constructive is to look at ourselves and recognise that all of us have good in us and all of us have bad in us, as opposed to blaming other people and being totally irresponsible oneself.

Q Let us go on to question No.4. It says: "If a man asks - Who shall be doomed for all eternity and who shall be raised up in the Final Judgement of the world of men". This is a point we have been on before, that there is a separation going to take place between those who are going to be doomed and those who are going to be raised up. A. Yes.

Q "Christ said: 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth'". That is giving as a text the suggestion that those who are going to be saved are the meek. A. Yes.

D Q Let us see how you describe the meek. "Who are the meek?" you say at the bottom of page 50; and at the top of page 51 you say it does not mean the victims; it does not mean the hard done by. The next paragraph: "Not the pious; not the self-righteous hypocrites", and so on. "Not those who bewail the violence and the malice and the hatred in the world". Then on page 52 you say: "And not the shy and the reticent, the bootlicking and the self-effacing". Then you say: "So who are the meek that are blessed and shall inherit the earth at the End of the world of men? The few who accept what is". So you go on.

MR KEMPSTER: Perhaps you could read that.

MR NEILL: "The few who do not protest their rightness and superiority. The few who do not blame and justify themselves. The few who do not build their images by reducing others. The few who are not afraid to know themselves and see themselves and accept what they know and see. The few who do not demand sympathy and attention. The few who give without counting the cost", and so on.

MR KEMPSTER: "The few who love without jealousy".

G H MR NEILL: Then on the next page it says: "The meek are not the weak and weeping". Then on page 56 we see: "But when judgement, condemnation, chastisement and destruction are required from them, the meek do not hesitate to strike, with devastating power and precision, at the very root of that which is to be brought down and destroyed". That is, again, what is being suggested, that the meek should do. That would be the people you are suggesting are those selected as being the people who the Process Church would recommend? A. Yes.



Q They don't hesitate to strike, with devastating power and precision, at the very root of what is to be brought down and destroyed. A. And that is that which is opposed to the will of God.

Q The last question, and we can pass on this more quickly, I think: "If a man asks - Why does The Process wear black?" At that time, in 1967, 1968 and 1969, am I right in thinking that members of the Process Church wore black? A. Not throughout that time. Do you want me to try and recall when we started to wear it.

B MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Were there some years when you wore black? A. Yes, there were, my Lord, the latter part of those three years Mr Neill mentioned.

MR NEILL: What were you wearing in addition to the black? Was it a black jacket and black trousers, or what? A. It was a black pair of trousers, black shoes, black socks, and a black polo-neck jersey.

Q Were you carrying any symbols of religion? A. Yes. We wore two symbols of religion. One was the cross and the other was a satanic symbol of a goat.

Q That is the Mendez Goat, the symbol of Satan? A. Yes. May I say something more?

Q Yes. A. There was a particular reason we wore those two in combination, which was we feel that Christ's mission in the world is to redeem, and that the ultimate task He has is to redeem the ultimate evil; i.e, Satan.

E MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Why did you want the goat? A. As a symbol of Satan, my Lord, in that context.

MR NEILL: Here we get at page 63 this question, "Why does The Process wear black?" Here is the Process something in the mind or something on earth, namely, the church? A. No; I think this is the church.

F Q It is used in a different way, is it, than it was in question No.1? A. Yes.

Q It rather looks like it, does it not, because it does talk about wearing something? A. Indeed.

G Q "Say to him: Black is the colour of the Bottomless Void to which the human race is doomed by its insistence upon a Godless compromise of living death. So Black we shall wear in mourning for the doom mankind has brought upon itself. Black we shall wear as a symbol of the death of a world. Black we shall wear in memory of a failed creation. Black we shall wear in anticipation of the charred ruins of the mutilated earth. Black we shall wear as recognition of the black vengeance of the Lord Jehovah. Black we shall wear in sympathy with the black sorrow of the Lord Lucifer. And Black we shall wear in honour of the black destruction of the Lord Satan. But above all, Black we shall wear for countless millions of innocent creatures whom man has tortured without mercy for the furtherance of his own

H

self-centred interests". There you write "Black we shall wear in honour of the black destruction of the Lord Satan". That is envisaging a destruction in which you are going to take part, isn't it? A. No. As I said before, I do not regard my job, or any member of my church's job as destruction in the sense of hurting people. I would like to say one other thing, which is that clearly to destroy something which is evil, for instance, if I am jealous and somebody helps me to rid myself of that, that is a beneficial thing for me.

R Q Let us put that aside and come back to California. There were you in San Francisco up until, I think you told us, about the middle of March 1968, teaching at this house in San Francisco, this religion of the latter days; is that right? A. Yes.

Q And teaching this religion of destruction, death and doom? A. No.

Q Isn't that a fair description of it? A. No.

Q What is wrong about it? A. It is extremely partial, and it leaves out a lot of things. We were preaching other things as well, and not even all of the things that you were suggesting.

J Q You were preaching that destruction was at hand? A. We were preaching that the end of the world was not very far away, and that part of that would necessarily be destruction.

Q And that death was at hand? A. Yes. Death is a fact of life, obviously.

E Q Did it strike you then or does it strike you now, Mr Fripp, that this insistence on death and destruction would have a certain effect on the young and the impressionable? A. Obviously it would have an effect.

F (Continued on next page)

G

H

Q We have gone over this before, but the teaching that you were putting forward involved The Process Church as the instrument, or one of the instruments, of the Gods ? A. Yes.

Q And as one of the instruments of the Gods, it was your job to help in this process which the Gods had set in train ?  
A. Yes. I would like to say something else, if I may ?  
You asked what we were preaching at that time. One of the prime things we were preaching this - in fact we had been doing it before then and we have been doing it ever since - is personal responsibility, the value of self-control and self-discipline, and also of self-awareness, and also "As you sow so shall you reap; if you want to be comfortable the best way is to help other people to be comfortable".

Q That is your evidence, but was it not a strange thing - putting it no higher - to be putting out on sale in San Francisco and possibly elsewhere roundabout this magazine called "SEX"?  
A. I do not feel so.

Q Which you agreed with me could possibly fairly be described as filth. A. I did so describe one page, yes.

Q When was it that you closed down your Chapter in San Francisco?  
A. I think it was in March, 1968.

Q And did you then go to Losangeles ? A. Yes, I did.

Q And did you start a Chapter there ? A. Yes, of a rather different kind.

Q Tell us about the rather different kind of Chapter in Losangeles. A. The prime difference was that the one in San Francisco was open to the public and we had a house which any member of the public could visit us, if he so wished. In Losangeles we had a house which was not open to the public.

Q What was going on there ? Was it just for those who wished to become or had become initiates or some type of accolyte or some other training minister ? A. It was a period during which we sought to train people and we were, therefore, concerned with a lot of education and training internally rather than an external mission.

Q Had you got available for reading by those who were coming for that training these various books we have been looking at ? A. Yes, certainly.

Q The Sex magazine, Gods on War and this other one - no, that might not quite have reached America by then. A. I am afraid I cannot recall. I don't think it had, but I would have to look this up. I am not absolutely certain.

Q How long were you in Losangeles then ? A. A short time, until, I think, towards the end of May, 1968.

Q And you then closed down Losangeles ? A. Yes.

Q And you then went East; is that right ? A. Yes, to New York.

MR C.A FRIPP  
Cross-examined:

MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: What happened to the San Francisco Chapter, did it close down altogether? A. Yes, it did, my Lord.

Q Had you collected subscriptions, or what? A. On the financial point, people who gave the subscriptions in the San Francisco Chapter were almost exclusively those who subsequently became ministers in the church, most of whom are still with the church.

B MR NEILL: What about Mr Wild. He was a messenger when we last heard of him. A. Yes, that was in San Francisco, he became a messenger.

Q Is he still a messenger? A. No, he is not. He ceased to be a messenger very shortly after we left San Francisco.

C Q Is he still a member of The Process Church? A. Yes, he is a member. He is not a minister, he is a lay member.

Q We will come back and talk about him. You went to New York and you set up a Chapter there; is that right? A. Yes.

D Q San Francisco open for 3½ months and Los Angeles for a short time, perhaps a month or two; is that right? A. Yes.

Q Then that is closed down and New York opened up, let us say, at the end of May or some time in June, 1968. A. The end of May I think.

E Q At that time, so that we can all get the picture, we have got Mr Mountain and yourself in New York, previously being in San Francisco. Are you the only member of the church at that level in America at that time? A. No.

Q Who else was there? A. Mr Eckhoff and Fr. Joel.

I Q Where is Eckhoff; is he in New York or in some other Chapter? A. He was in America, initially in New Orleans, where we also had a Chapter; he was then in Los Angeles and he was also in New York.

Q At some time did you open a Chapter in Boston? A. Yes, that was in 1970.

Q Did you also open a Chapter in Chicago. A. Yes, also in 1970.

C Q After you had closed the San Francisco and Los Angeles Chapters am I right in thinking that you only then had two Chapters in the United States, at New Orleans and New York? A. No, we had only one because we had also closed the New Orleans Chapter. Perhaps it would help if I explained a little bit?

H Q Please do. A. At that time/we were not seeking a large personal following for our church, it was still a very exploratory time, exploratory in the sense that we had a lot yet to learn and to experience before we felt we were ready to found a large public church. It was, if you like, a missionary period, and during that time in those locations in America in 1968 a number of people joined the church who are now ministers of it -- Americans I am referring to.

- Q At that point you were operating only in New York and training the new recruits, if I may use that phrase ? A. Yes.
- Q Did you at that stage, in 1968, go back at any time to California ? A. No.
- Q When did you next yourself go back to California ? A. In 1971.
- Q Had you yourself anything to do with the obtaining for the sixth issue of your magazine Process an article by Charles Manson ?  
A. Not directly. What I said was that I knew that an article by him was going to appear in the magazine but I myself was not concerned with the acquisition of it.
- Q You told us, I think, that from 1967 to the summer of 1969 you were in America and then in the summer of 1969, June or July, did you come back to this country ? A. No, it was the summer of 1968 I left America.
- Q I think you told us this morning you left in April, 1967, and came back in June or July, 1969. A. I came back to this country. I left America in 1968 and I was in Europe, not in this country until the summer of 1969.
- Q I see; you were travelling in various parts of Western Europe, were you ? A. Yes.
- Q And then in 1969 you came back to this country. A. Yes.
- Q When you came back to this country did you take any part in the preparation of the next and last thing I want to ask you about, "The Gods and Their People" ? A. No.
- Q Where during this time was Mr De Grimston ? A. Can you be more specific as to which time ?
- Q Between, say, 1968 and 1969. Was he in this country, or in the United States, or was he travelling about ? A. In 1968, until the Autumn, he was in America and he then went to Europe, and he also, I think, came to this country about a month before I did in 1969, somewhere around April or May, as far as I recall.
- Q In the winter of 1969/70, a short time after the man Manson was arrested ---- A. I am sorry, which date are we at now ?
- Q The end of 1969 do you remember the announcement of the arrest of Charles Manson ? A. Yes, I do.
- Q At that time you yourself were back in England, were you ? A. Correct.
- Q Having been about a year travelling round Europe you are now back in England; is that right ? A. Yes.
- Q And you did not go to America again until when ? A. Until, I think it was, on January 31st or February 1st of 1970.
- Q And the next time you visited California was in 1971 ? A. I did say that, but in fact I had forgotten, I had a visit of

about two days to California immediately after I arrived in America in February, 1970.

B Q What were you doing there ? A. I went over to the United States with one other minister with a mission on behalf of the church to look around and see where it would be good to open a Chapter in America, and the two of us travelled from New York across the country looking at various places and then back to Boston, where we settled and established a Chapter. I think I was in California for about two days in Los Angeles.

Q Did you set up a Chapter there again, or not ? A. No.

C Q In 1970, January, 1970 - and this is the last of the main publications I want to trouble you about - there was published by the Process Church a book called "The Gods and Their People". Do you remember that ? A. Yes, I do.

Q Was that something which you saw before it was issued ? A. In one sense I saw it, in that I was very familiar with the contents generally speaking.

D Q The teaching, as I follow it, in that book is wholly in accordance with The Process Church doctrine, is it not ? A. Yes, it is a Process Church publication.

Q There was nothing surprising about it to you ? A. Perhaps I had better have a copy.

Q Certainly, I think we can now look at it. (Copies handed to his Lordship and the Jury)

E MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: Who wrote this ? A. Mr De Grimston, my Lord.

MR NEILL: His, like "The Gods on War", takes the form of a recording by Mr De Grimston of messages which he has received; is that right ? A. Yes.

F Q This is "The Gods and Their People" and am I right in thinking that the messages received by Mr De Grimston are received from the various Gods ? A. I think you would have to ask him about that.

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: That is what is meant by the word "recorded" is it not ? A. But not necessarily recorded from the Gods. I do not wish to be difficult, my Lord, but I cannot in this case answer that question because I do not really know the answer. I know the circumstances in which this book was written, if that would help.

H MR NEILL: Yes, perhaps you could tell us that. A. This is the result of a lot of discussion and of observation and it endeavours to set out a description of people as they are. You applied the word "teaching", I think, to it. From my point of view the only teaching, I think, in this book is in the sense of a description rather than a commandment or an instruction.

- Q This, whether it is recording something Satan has said or something one of the other Gods has said on his behalf, does in fact contain messages relating to Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan. A. Yes.
- Q As the "Three great Gods of the Universe" - we can see that on the first page. Do you see that? A. I do, and also Christ.
- Q At the end, yes; I was coming to that. It also adds at the end Christ who you describe as the Unifier. This again, am I right in thinking, was on sale in the various Chapters of The Process Church and on sale in the streets by Process people carrying it round? A. Primarily within Process Chapters. I think only occasionally the second method you have described.
- Q If I came to the Process Chapter, attracted by some of your advertising, this would be one of the books of teaching which I would be able to buy? A. It is.
- Q And this would describe the three classes of person the Jehovian, the Luciferian and the Satanist which we saw described earlier in the Sex issue of the Process magazine? A. Yes.
- Q These are descriptions of three groups of people, are they not, who are fit to be members of The Process Church? A. No.
- Q I do not follow that, because we have got the God Jehova who has got his Jehovians, we have got the God Lucifer who has got the Luciferians, we have got the God Satan who has got his Satanists. Are these not descriptions of the followers of each of those three Gods? A. Yes. I think you are saying something rather different in the way you put it before. Also on page 7 you will see "For the three Gods represent three basic human patterns of reality"; and then what follows is descriptive. Also on the last paragraph of that same page "All three of them exist to some extent in every one of us", which is rather different, I think, from something you were implying that every single person only feels one of these descriptions that are set forth in this book.
- Q The next sentence: "But each of us leans more heavily towards one of them, whilst the pressures of the other two provide the presence of conflict and uncertainty". A. Yes.
- Q You are not suggesting, are you, that there would not be some people who would be primarily Jehovians with a little bit of the others included, there would be some who would be primarily Luciferians and there would be some who would be primarily Satanists? A. Yes.
- Q Those who were primarily Satanists and were members of The Process Church would very closely approximate to the description set out of Satanists in this book? A. Yes.
- Q Let us see how you describe Satanists in this book ----  
A. Approximate in the sense of they might feel these things, not in the sense that they might do the things that are described here.

Q You can explain that when we come to it. I am going to suggest to you that this is a description of what I may call the true Satanist, and I think it is common ground between us that there would be some people who would be very near to being the true Satanist among the members of your church. A. Well, I shall have to find out what you think a true Satanist means.

Q It is set out here how a Satanist is to be described. You have drawn my attention to page 7 where you say everybody has some feature of each of the three Gods in them, and I think you were saying a few minutes ago there would be a number of people who were primarily Satanist although they might have some Luciferian or Jehovian characteristics about them; that is right, is it not? A. Yes.

Q That being so, there would be some people who would be very close to the description of the Satanist set out in this book? A. Yes; obviously this attempts to portray certain aspects of the human psyche.

Q Let us see how it starts, page 55: "SATAN is the Great God of Ultimate Destruction. He stands beyond the gates of the human game, and awaits the blast of the trumpet that heralds the End.

"For He is the End. He is the Bringer of Doom. And His reach extends from the highest pinnacles of Heaven right down into the very depths of Hell.

"For He spans the Universe. He is the soul and the body of the Universe, and between the soul and the body lies the mind.

"His creations are the throngs of Archangels that stand at the summit of allexistence, and the crawling hideous monsters of the Pit that writhe in the swirling darkness of the Bottomless Void. And between the two is the world of men.

"And within the world of men the Lord SATAN spans from pole to pole; the ruler of extremes; leaving in between, the offe of human conflict which the 'normal' man endures; the equal battle of the two-poled mind, by which he maintains a tortured equilibrium.

"And SATAN rules that which is outside the conflict of the mind, either below it or above. He has no part of that which lies within it.

"He rules the regions of the mind unhinged. He rules insanity. His people are those who have blindly escaped from human reality and its preset values, have either delved into the strange world of physical sensation, without the restraining hand of mental barriers, have plumbed the depths of sensuality, carried indulgence of the body to its limits and left the logic of the brain behind, or have plunged altogether into madness, have unhooked themselves completely from the dictates of a 'normal' mind, and followed an extra-mental path that has neither judgment nor control for those who travel it.

"And SATAN is master of those who take these roads. He is



master of all who cast off from the even battle of mentality, and set out to explore the unvalued, undefined miasma of experience, that lies beyond the mind's control".

That is plainly referring, is it not, not only to what these people may think, but what they do? A. Yes, it can do. There are people in the world who behave like this, clearly.

Q Those who delve into the strange world of physical sensation.  
B "He rules the body and its sensual needs, and He rules the mindless cloud of lunacy; both respite from the tortures of the mind's uncertainty.

C "And at the other extremity, He rules the superhuman mindlessness of mysticism. He is master to the being in pursuit of the purity of spirit; the being who seeks to transcend the conflicts of the mind, to rise beyond the barriers of thought, to reach outside the limitations of human values; who does not sink in witless blindness, without judgment or control, into the world of insanity or sensuality, but rises, aware, controlled, unshackled, into the realms of mindless spirituality; the realms of supernatural vision and experience.

D "And SATAN is the God with whom the mystic finds his other world", and then he deals with the mystic.

Then on page 60 he describes in a little more detail what the Satanist does, like his God: "And the Satanist, like his God, stands outside the bounds of the human game.

"He stands at one of the two extremes.

E "He is an outcast, because he does not fit the pattern.

"He rebels against the world of human values, and attempts to separate himself from the conflicts of the human mind.

F "At the lower end of the scale, he is the pervert and the orgiast; the sensual wallower and the sadist. He delights in cruelty and violence. He revels in the twisting of all social norms. He finds pleasure in pain, and exaltation in paths of degradation.

G "He dabbles in drugs, and finds there satisfaction in the negation of the human mind, which he carries so unwillingly within his brain. For narcotics twist the mind out of shape; they dull it, or invert it, or turn it inside out, or send it spinning into space. And thus the Satanist escapes from it. Drugged, he can float away into a world that has no part with reality in human terms. He can find realities more pleasing to him. He can create realities, fantasise them, summon up every kind of other-worldly vision, while the ties that bind him to the earth fade into nothing and leave him free of the shackles of the human game".

H "There you are describing, are you not, (or Mr De Grimston is recording) a description which he has received, which you saw fit to put into print for your organisation, of what the Satanist is. A. Yes.

Q That Satanist is the true follower of one of your Gods.  
A. No.

Q That I do not follow. You talk about a Satanist and say "And the Satanist, like his God, stands outside the bounds of the human game". A. Yes, but I feel words are very important here, if I may say so for a moment, Mr Neill. When you said a true Satanist and I said "No" I said it deliberately, because if I said "Yes, that is a true Satanist" then it sounds like I approve of that behaviour, or that my church approves of that behaviour, and we do not. What we are saying here is there are people in the world who behave like this, and if you like for shorthand, in one sense, we are saying, "Let us apply the word Satanist to them", but I would like to direct attention to page 10 of this book. The introduction of the whole thing says we are now going to describe these three different ways of looking at things, and then on page 10 the first paragraph is very important.

Q Very well. "Problems and pressures from within. And we have a choice. Either we can face them, recognise them, accept them as part of ourselves, tackle them with awareness and understanding, and finally rise above them. Or we can suppress them, reject them, disown them, pretend they are not there, justify them, blame them on something beyond our control, hide from them and thereby ultimately become completely trapped and stupefied by our fear of them. They do not go away, however deeply we may bury our heads in the sand". What you are saying there is if you are a Satanist then you have got to accept the fact that you have these feelings as part of yourself. A. And that if you don't, they do not go away, on the contrary one becomes completely trapped in them.

Q It is no good bottling it up, you have got to accept it as part of yourself? A. Accept it and thus no longer be bound by it and rise above it.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: Where is that? A. On page 10, my Lord.

MR NEILL: At page 61: "And speed the Satanist worships also, for that too disorientates the mind. The motorcyclist who rides for the sensation, feels himself cut off from the world that stands still around him. His senses become blurred, the roaring in his ears and the wind on his face send his mind spinning. He forgets the inert world of men and replaces it with a world of constant movement, where nothing stays the same, nothing is solid and definite, nothing can pin him down to a precise continuous reality. And that is SATAN's world". That is a reference, is it not, to motorcyclists. Was the Process Church interested in motorcyclists? A. No, not particularly.

Q I am not going to bother you with the next publication I will leave that to another witness to save time, but in one of your issues of The Process you devote a page to motorcyclists in California, do you not? A. Motorcyclists. I am not sure specifically in California.

Q The Hell's Angels. Is that not a group of motorcyclists in California? A. Yes, it is, and it is obviously an example of

the very thing you have just read.

Q They are Satanists, are they? A. If they fit this description, then yes.

Q Motorcyclists who drive for sensation; that is Satan's world? A. Well, we are not saying everybody who rides a motorcycle and enjoys it is necessarily a Satanist, that would be patently absurd. This is part of a general description.

B Q "Speed the Satanist worships also". Is that not seeking to glorify the role of the Satanist? A. Absolutely not, no. It is saying there are people; it is descriptive, that there are people who like riding motor bikes very fast. It is not saying that is a good thing to do, it is showing that there are people who enjoy that. I personally don't.

Q Let us just try and get down to earth. Are not the young men who are going to read this stuff going to see in this a suggestion that the Satanist is a person who finds pleasure in all these things that we have been reading about, including speed and motorcyclists? A. Yes, I think he probably would.

Q And are you not to him, to that ordinary young man, glorifying all these things that Satan stands for? A. No, I do not feel so.

E Q A few more pages and then I am done. On the next page "And alcohol provides another means of shutting out the agonies of mental conflict; another road whereby the Satanist escapes; another blurred miasma ..." Then: "And danger is yet another way out of it; a life of constant risk, the life of the criminal, the life of the man on the run, and the life of the man who lives by violence, always close to the presence of death. Again the down-to-earth facts of man's circumstances, man's problems and man's anguish are forgotten and replaced with the immediate sense of threat, the immediate danger that fills the whole being taking all of its attention."

F "The Satanist lives by the maxim: 'Nothing suffocates hope more than the ordinary passage of ordinary events'."

Again, to take up a theme we have seen before, is that not saying: the Satanist rejects the drab, he is not one of the grey forces, he rejects that and lives by one of the extremes? A. Yes, it is.

G Q And that is precisely what, to the young people who bought the Process publications, and others, you and The Process Church were teaching? A. No, and I think if you look at page 85 you will find why.

Q Which particular part do you want me to look at? A. I think all three of the paragraphs on that page.

H Q We will read them together, then; "Further, as the awareness grows, each discovers that despite apparently irreconcilable differences, they are both subject to the same fundamental laws; the laws of existence, the laws of being, the laws of the mind,

the soul and the essence.

"A Jehovian manifests a tendency to blame. A Luciferian manifests a tendency to justify. A Satanist manifests non-comprehension.

"Once each has recognised his individual tendency and 'owned' it as part of himself, then all of them can realise that each of these different outward manifestations is basically the same thing; an avoidance of a sense of responsibility, a refusal to accept the power of choice which each one feels is his". A. That, surely, is very important. We are saying there that each of these different manifestations is an avoidance of responsibility.

Q Let us go on on the next page: "The Gods give us reality, which is different for all of us. CHRIST gives us knowledge of reality, which is truth, and which is common to all of us". Is not "the Gods give us reality" suggesting that there would be those to whom reality is Satanism? A. It is saying precisely that; that there are people for whom getting drunk or indulging in physical excess of some kind is what is real for them. It is descriptive again; it is not an advocacy that people should behave in this way, it is saying there are people who do this. And obviously there are people who do this and attempt to clarify why they do it and how they can stop doing it.

Q In your Sex issue you had a man who described himself as a Satanist on the inside of the front cover. A. Yes.

Q Is he a person to whom this description fits, or in what sense is he a Satanist? A. You yourself read out that there were two aspects of Satanists.

Q He is a mystic, is he? A. I do not know him very well, in fact.

Q Is he a member of the organisation now? A. He is currently in America, I believe in New York, and in contact with the church there.

Q It could mean one of two things. It could either mean a Satanist who was a mystic and at the top of the tree, or one who was at the bottom of the tree. Let us see what he likes, according to this. He likes "chaos, catastrophes, graveyards, lemmons, depravity and Breis Karloff". Would he be at the top of the tree or what? A. He would appear, from that description, to be more what you are calling the bottom of the tree.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD-STEVENSON: Why the lemmons? A. I am not in a position to say, my Lord. If I may add one thing, liking those things, or feeling there is an inclination within one to behave in a particular way is very different from actually doing it.

MR NEILL: The last thing I want to look is page 64: "Satanists are the destroyers of humanity. They are bent upon the destruction of 'the ordinary passage of ordinary events'. They set out to destroy the pressures and realities of humanity within themselves, their minds, their conscious thought processes. But also, and

more significant, they seek the destruction of what reactivates those thought processes; humanity outside themselves", and so on. "They are drawn to violence, not only as another form of escape, but also as a means to destroy.

"Violence appeals to the Satanist, whether or not he is actively involved in it, because it means destruction. Crime, particularly violent crime such as rape, murder, armed robbery and insurrection, fascinates him, again because it means destruction. He may or may not practise it, but regardless, he feels a strong involvement with it".

We need not read all this at the moment I can go through it with another witness, but is not all this, by setting out in detail the description of the Satanist and what he is, to the ordinary young person who is going to buy this literature, an encouragement to them to do what is set out? A. I should have thought it was the reverse.

Q Is this publication still being put out by the church?  
A. Yes, it is.

Q And you would not agree with my suggestion, then, that this is a dangerous teaching for those who are young and impressionable?  
A. No, again the reverse. I have met many people who have read it and none who have reacted in the way you are suggesting.

Q If somebody took it, as I suggest the ordinary young person not versed in theology would take it, the young person would say "If I am a Satanist I can do what is the description of a Satanist in this literature and what the God Satan would advocate". That is how he would look at it, is it not? A. No.

Q Is that not precisely what you were advocating in your Sex issue? A. No. It is the same point. We were saying "This exists, recognise it, understand it and thus you can transcend it in control as opposed to driven compulsorily and blindly and destructively".

(Continued on next page)

MR C.A. FRIPP:  
Cross-examined.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Let us go back for a moment to that detailed description of irregular sexual intercourse which you have yourself described as "filth", which occupied many paragraphs of that Sex issue. You know I am talking about? A. I do, my Lord, yes.

Q What, effect would you expect the publication of that matter in that place to have on the mind of an immature person who reads it? A. I think they would probably be shocked.

Q Might they be attracted? A. I think it is possible they would be attracted, not because---

Q What was the purpose of publishing it? A. The same as with all these publications, which was to say "This exists in the human world, recognise it".

Q Do you think that the knowledge of its existence was not quite widespread independently of your advertising it? A. I think it receives plenty, perhaps too much, dissemination.

Q Why did the Process-Church add to the publicity? A. In order to set it within the context of the other attitudes we were describing about sex, to make a coherent picture.

MR NEILL: Can we finally look again at that page in the Sex issue now we have read some of your other publications and go back. We have read the Satan message on War. We have read the description, or part of it, as recorded by Mr De Grinston, of the Satanist, of how he behaves. Now let us again assume the young person who has turned to the Process-Church for help and teaching, and let us see what Father Mendez, as he has now become in 1968-69, is telling him to do. I am not going to read those early columns, but Father Mendez, one of the Council of Masters of your church, I believe - is that right? A. Yes.

Q -says:

"So there, my friend, is a fleeting glimpse of Satan's promise to those that follow Him. Take your choice, indulge, explore the very limits. Leave nothing out and use every means of sharpening the senses", and so on. I am not going to read it all over again.

"Sink down in the decadence of excessive self-indulgence".

To a young, impressionable and possibly person of limited intelligence and intellect is not the whole of this teaching of the very greatest possible danger? A. Well, I feel not, for the reasons I have said before, including the experience of talking to many people who have read it and none of whom have interpreted it as a licence for indulgence, which I think is what you are suggesting.

MR C.A. FRIPP:  
Cross-examined.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do you agree it is capable of being so interpreted? A. I think it might be. I can only say I have not experienced it as such.

Q Seeing it is capable of being so interpreted, was not it easy to foresee that it might fall into the hands of people who might so interpret it? A. I think it possibly would have been helpful if we had thought more closely along those lines.

Q Is the answer Yes? A. I think it is.

Q And as it is easy to foresee that that might be a consequence of its publication, it would have been better not to publish it, would it not? A. That I think, with respect, my Lord, is going too far.

Q Going too far? A. I still feel that this magazine, overall, has created a helpful effect.

Q Can we take it then that Father Mendez has your wholehearted agreement in the conduct which involves the publication of matter of this kind? A. Within the context, and with the proviso that I made, yes.

Q And he is still a respected member of your organisation, is he? A. Yes, he is.

Q Are we going to see him, do you know? A. I believe it is possible, yes.

MR NEILL: He is one of the people right at the top, is he not? A. He is a member of the council of masters, yes.

Q -who are a group of something like 8 people? A. I believe it is more; more like 12.

Q So be it, quite a small group who in fact control the Process-church? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do they earn their living from the Process-church? A. None of us have any personal money at all. We all give to the church any personal money we may have had.

Q Are they in fact supported for the necessities of life by the Process-church? A. They are, my Lord, yes.

MR NEILL: Supposing you were to hear that some young man had read this magazine and had taken it literally as an invitation to follow the path of Satan and had gone out and done one of the acts he is invited to do as a Satanist and as a follower of one of your gods, would you feel any moral responsibility if you heard he had done it? A. Certainly.

Q And that is, surely, the danger of this sort of publication, is it not? A. In theory, yes; but, as I said before, I feel that, within the context of the overall publication, that is not in fact a real danger.

MR C.H. FRIPP:  
Re-examined.

Re-examined by MR KEMPSTER

Mr Fripp, you have been asked a lot of questions- A. Yes.

on the basis of three aspects of God which are called gods, and you have been asked whether or not a member of the Process-church should or should not obey the apparent behest of one god or the other. Do you follow my question? A. Yes, I do.

Q Are the expressed characteristics of the several gods ever the same? Do they ever appear in any publication to give the same description of one of their adherents? A. No. I think in no publication, that is true.

Q Can a member or adherent of the Process conform with the standard set out, for example, by Jehovah without at the same time disobeying the precepts of Satan or Lucifer? A. Absolutely.

Q He can or cannot? A. He cannot conceivably obey Jehovah without disobeying the other two.

Q And does this sort of dichotomy run through the publications or not? A. Yes, in different forms. It is very clear that the three descriptions which occur in varying publications are mutually contradictory. They are at war with one another, if you like.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It is a trichotomy, not a dichotomy, is it not?

MR KEMPSTER: Trichotomy. I am very grateful. I was searching in my own mind for the mot juste and your Lordship, as usual, has it.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You have no idea how many I have suppressed.

MR KEMPSTER (to the witness): Would you advert again to one of the last publications you were asked to look at, The Gods and their people. Would you look at page 10. We read there:

"Problems and pressures from within. And we have a choice. Either we can face them, recognise them, accept them as part of ourselves, tackle them with awareness and understanding, and finally rise above them. Or we can suppress them, reject them, disown them, pretend they are not there",

and so on.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We have read that one twice.

MR KEMPSTER: We have had that. I hope your Lordship will forgive me.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Not much. Certainly not again.



MR C.A. PRICE:  
Re-examined.

MR KEMPSTER: Is your Lordship inviting me to stop my re-examination?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We do not want to repeat twice matter we have already had, do we? Mr Neill went back, at the witnesses request, to this very passage.

MR KEMPSTER: He did, and it is leading on to the second paragraph, which was not read, and to which I am proceeding:

"And CHRIST is the Emissary of the Gods. He is Their link with human beings. Their incarnation, Their representative within the world. He stands outside and beyond the separate and individual patterns. He draws them together, seeing the pressures, knowing the problems. He is there to guide all of us who will follow Him, through the first choice, uniting us into a common aim. He is there to give us the courage and faith to face the problems, recognise them, accept them as part of ourselves, tackle them with awareness and understanding, and finally to rise above them".

And the next page:

"The choice is ours. CHRIST and a path of vision and reality, sometimes painful, always intense; or anti-Christ and a path of blindness and lies, and the dull agony of fear that one day the truth will emerge. And it must".

Do you know, why did the Process-church include these paragraphs at the outset of this book? A. Because they are very important. They encapsulate the real choice that we feel there is before each one of us, either to understand what we are doing or to not understand it and live in a dull agony of fear, i.e., that by following Christ we can escape from the very unpleasant things which are described in part of this book.

Q Thank you. Will you then turn with me to the last part of this book, "The Gods and their people", under the heading "Christ", page 79. We read:

"Christ is the Unifier. He brings together all the patterns of the Gods, and resolves them into One. He is the Emissary of the Gods upon earth; Their link with men, by which men have the opportunity to know and understand Them. He is the Word, spoken in the world; interpreted, set down so that men can absorb it and live by it.

"The Gods speak to men and through men. Their voices are heard within. Their pressures and influences are the hurdles, the obstacles; the realities which men must face within themselves. The Gods bring the concepts of good and evil into our lives, into our minds, into our hearts, into our souls, into our bodies, where they vie against one another to test our strength and our courage".

Then over the page, the middle paragraph:

"CHRIST is our guide in playing the Game to the greatest advantage; which is the advantage of all creation; which is the advantage of GOD. As the Emissary, CHRIST speaks for all the gods".

Why were these passages put in? A. To show what the church is actually advocating, as opposed to describing.

Q I noticed on page 79 the expression "good and evil". Does the Process-church regard some things as good and others as evil? A. Yes.

Q And does the Process-church regard the sort of behaviour described in the words attributed respectively in these publications certainly to Satan and sometimes to other dieties, as good or evil? A. Quite often as evil - particularly that read passage in the Sex magazine. That behaviour I personally, and I think all members of my church, would regard as evil.

Q Then the publication: "If a man asks". That was the brown publication, Members of the Jury. Just a reference on page 39. There we find this expression about "doom". What is the Process belief as to what constitutes doom? A. I would say it is alienation from God, to be totally out of contact with God, with the Creator.

Q One other document, which you said was drawn up by an American lawyer, the incorporation documents. Would you turn to Article III, "Objects and Purposes". Then would you turn on to Article IV, the fifth page:

"And in laity there shall be and it is provided for three orders of holiness".

Then would you go nearly halfway down:

"And there shall be<sup>provided</sup> and it is provided and is decreed that there shall be made Disciples of the faith who shall assist in the promulgation of the faith in all ways which are prescribed by their Ordinary and that they seek a life of perfection which is more than called for by the rules of a good life and sanctity. And the Holy Spirit shall shine from their bosom and their glories shall be made manifest by their deeds of piety and diligent endeavours on behalf of the Church and its work".

Pausing there, how did or does the church construe such flowery expressions as appear here? For example, do they include assisting the end of the world by acts of violence or other forms of degradation?

A. Well, it would include encouragement from the church to participate in helping say old folks or mentally retarded or sick, people in nursing homes, and generally to lead a

life in which they help people as much as they can, with the assistance of the church behind them.

Q Coming to a more general point, it has been suggested to you, both by my learned friend and by the learned Judge, that one or more of the Process publications could, in the wrong hands, do harm. You follow that suggestion? A. I do.

Q And I think you assented in one particular that they might? A. Yes.

Q You, I think, have been a member of the Process-church since its inception? A. Yes.

Q To what extent have you been concerned so that you can tell the jury about the work that the church has done in the various chapters, perhaps in the United States, perhaps elsewhere? What is your position? Are you in a position to speak of that? A. Yes, I am.

Q In your experience, what has been the effect of the Process teaching on the people who come to the Process-church for help? A. I think it has been extremely beneficial. As I was mentioning earlier, we have a large number of what one might call social programmes. One of the things we endeavour to do there is to provide a situation in which people can give to other people, in which they can help other people, so that, for instance, by organising a regular visit to an old folks' home, which is a very common kind of place in America, the people who participate in that visiting programme have the opportunity to help others, and in helping others they are helped themselves. It is a mutual exchange of giving. There are innumerable examples of that. It is the prime activity that the church is concerned with in over 100 cities in the United States.

Q What knowledge have you personally of baneful or unfortunate effects on perhaps some impressionable young man or woman of the Sex issue or any other Process publication? A. I know of no harmful or baneful effects.

Q A certain anxiety has been expressed about the wellbeing or continence or otherwise of Mr Castle. A. Yes.

Q Do you know him personally? A. Yes, I do.

Q How long have you known him? A. I have known him for some 8 years, I believe.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I do not hear any anxiety expressed about it.

MR KEMPSTER: I am sorry, I thought your Lordship was concerned about his -

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You said "continence".

MR KEMPSTER: Your Lordship is not concerned about his continence.

MR C.A. FRIPP:

Re-examined.

I thought your Lordship was concerned as to what sort of man could have written this sort of stuff.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is a different matter.

MR KEMPSTER: Thank you.

Q What sort of man is he? A. I would say he is a very gentle person. He is an intelligent man. He is well educated. He has a particularly soft kind of touch which has helped many people in my direct experience and knowledge. He is not in the slightest the kind of person who behaves as it has been suggested that article encourages people to behave. On the contrary, I know for a fact that for several years within our church we took a vow of celibacy - I think I mentioned this earlier - and he also placed himself under that vow and maintained it. So that he is not the kind of person who actually does the kind of things described in that article. Completely the contrary.

(The witness withdrew)

MR CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER, Sworn,

Examined by MR KEMPSTER

Q Are you Christopher De Peyer? A. I am.

Q What is your present address? A. 242, East Fortyninth Street, New York City.

Q And I think you are a trustee of the property of the Process in the United Kingdom? A. I am, yes.

Q Are you a full-time minister of the Process-church? A. I am.

Q What is your present task within that organisation? A. I have recently come from New Orleans where I was the director of a chapter, and I have been posted to New York as part of an administrative function which I shall be undertaking for the church in New York.

Q How long have you been a member of the Process-church? A. Just under 11 years.

Q Before you joined the Process-church, what were you doing? A. I was studying to be an architect.

Q Did you have any personal problems of your own? A. Not in the sense that they troubled me in that sense. I was very concerned with the kind of life that I led and could see stretching before me, and also with the kind of lives that other people led. I very much wanted to do something to change both mine and theirs.

A Q What lack did you feel in your life and that of other people around you? A. I think several. One was a lack of a sense of purpose and fulfilment, a sort of religious lack. Another was a lack of real and meaningful contact between myself and other people; and also observing this manifesting between other people.

B Q At this time, or before you joined the Process, had you had any experience of drugs? A. Yes.

Q What had been your experience? A. Before I joined the Process for about two years I had experience of marijuana and, on one occasion, Mescaline.

C MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: When you say you experienced, do you mean you consumed it? A. I had smoked it and eaten it - not at the same time.

MR KEMPSTER: After you joined the Process, did you continue to afford yourself these indulgences? A. No.

D Q Why not? A. The indulgences in the first place were an escape from the feeling of futility and lack of purpose that I felt in my life and described earlier; and having joined the Process there arose and grew in me a feeling of purpose and fulfilment. There was no need, from that point on, for any form of escape.

Q What attracted you from architecture and Mescaline, or whatever it was, to the Process?

E MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: He had other hobbies too.

MR KEMPSTER: I am glad to hear it. I have not asked him in evidence.

F Q What attracted you in the Process? A. The thing that attracted me particularly was that here was a group of people who were attempting to help one another and the people around them in a very positive and constructive way, who were looking into areas of the mind, of the human psyche, which people in the normal run of events do not get the opportunity to look at, and which therefore often cause people a great deal of pain and suffering. This group which I observed working were concerned with helping people to overcome that pain and suffering that their own compulsive activity was creating for them.

G Q And since you have joined the Process have you devoted all your time and all your resources to its work? A. I have.

H Q You told my Lord and members of the jury that you had just come from New Orleans. Were you working in America for long? A. I have been working in America since August 1970.

MR C. DE PEYER:  
Examined.

A Q Only in New Orleans, or also in other chapters? A. No,  
I was the director of the chapter in Chicago from  
August 1970 until July 1971. And then from July 1971  
until February of this year I was in New Orleans.

B Q Quite generally, what do you think, or as a result of your  
observations what do you tell the jury you or the church  
has been able to achieve for people who have come within  
its influence? A. I think there is a great deal, and it  
would be difficult to try to précis it, but I will. All  
over we have something over half a million members. This is  
mainly since the year 1970, when we became established in  
America on a sort of permanent basis. You heard Mr Fripp  
describe earlier how, during 1968, we had a more or less  
missionary task in America, and since the establishment  
of the Boston chapter in 1970, and other chapters since  
that time, we have been very, very concerned with social  
C action programmes which involve helping the handicapped, the  
sick, the mentally ill - anybody, in fact, who is suffering  
in any kind of way, mentally, physically or spiritually,  
and a great many people come to us - for instance, in the  
chapter in New Orleans about 2,000 people a week would come  
to the chapter for help of one kind or another.

D MR KEMPSTER: Thank you. My Lord, I am now turning to this  
interesting topic of Process publications.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Shall we save that for tomorrow  
morning?

(The witness withdrew)

E (Adjourned to tomorrow morning at 10.30)

-----

**THIRD DAY**

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

RECEIVED

Royal Courts of Justice,

Friday, 15th March, 1974

Before:

MR JUSTICE HELFORD STEVENSON

and a Jury

-----

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT (A corporate body)

CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP,

CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER and

WENDY ANN PEACH

Plaintiffs

and

ROBERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED

and

ED SANDERS

First Defendants

Second Defendant

And between:

SAME - and - SAME

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October, 1972)

-----



# I N D E X

---

A

Page

DE PEYER, Mr Christopher, Recalled:

B

Examination-in-chief continued	2	
Cross-examined ..	4	
Re-examined ..	53	

GIBSON, Rev. Arthur, Sworn:

C

Examined ..	55	
Cross-examined ..	63	
Re-examined ..	66	

D

COALE, Mrs Wendy Ann  
(PEACH, Miss Wendy Ann), Sworn:

Examined ..	66	
Cross-examined ..	69	

E

---

F

G

(i)

H

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,

Friday, 15th March, 1974

Before:

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON

and a Jury

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT (A corporate body)

CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP,

CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER and

Plaintiffs

WENDY ANN PEACH

and

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED

First Defendants

and

ED SANDERS

Second Defendant

And between:

SAME - and - SAME

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October, 1972)

(Transcript of the Shorthand Notes of The Association of Official  
Shorthandwriters, Ltd., Room 392, Royal Courts of Justice, and  
2, New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.2.)

Mr MICHAEL KEMPSTER, J.C. and Mr PETER BOWSER (instructed by  
Messrs Joynson-Hicks & Co.) appeared for the Plaintiffs.

Mr BRIAN NEILL, J.C. and Mr LEON BRITTAN (instructed by  
Messrs Goodman, Derrick & Co.) appeared for the First Defendants.

The SECOND DEFENDANT did not appear and was not represented.

E V I D E N C E

T H I R D   D A Y

MR CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER, Re-called  
Examination continued by MR KEMPSTER

- A Q Mr De Peyer, you remember that yesterday afternoon we were just coming once more to some of the Process publications when it was thought it was appropriate to adjourn, but just before we do there is a question that interested, perhaps, my Lord particularly and that is the question of the financial position of the ministers of The Process, of which you are one. Did you have any private means before you joined The Process ? A. I did, yes.
- B Q What happened to such money as you had ? A. I gave it to the Group. What happened in the early founding days was that all those who became founder members of the Group gave whatever worldly goods they had, which was money and whatever else they had.
- C Q What is the current position about your maintenance and money for work and travel and eating and living, and so on ? A. That is provided by the church. I have no personal money at all.
- Q My questions, of course, will be general, no doubt Mr Neill's will be particular. You were the Executive Editor of The Process magazine, were you not ? A. For the first four issues, yes.
- D Q That included the two issues in which particular interest has been taken, "Sex" and "Mind bending" ? A. That is correct. Looking at the Sex issue again, just looking at the cover:
- Q "Lucifer, Satan, Jehovah & The Grey Forces", will you tell the Members of the Jury: is the Process church a church of one body of believers with the same belief, or is it, as it were, a federation of believers in Lucifer, Satan and Jehovah respectively ? A. No, it is a body with believers of one belief; in other words, all the members of the church believe basically in God, of which Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan and Christ are four aspects. I think there has been some confusion in the sense that people have obviously got the impression of a kind of encampment of Jehovahians and Luciferians and Satanists and Christians. This is not so; the basic purpose of the whole thing is to find the underlying unity to what we call the God patterns, which are described in the magazines.
- E
- F
- G Q It is common ground, I think, that in the Sex issue the advocate of Satan sets out a lot of material which one might be minded to call pornographic - I am not asking you to judge it by the standards in America or here relatively speaking, but it was described by your colleague as filth. Can you explain to the Jury why you thought it appropriate to publish that particular contribution ? A. Yes, certainly. The purpose of this contribution, and indeed all the other contributions referring to the God patterns, was to very clearly set out for people the underlying pattern of, in this case the Satanist and the Satanic behaviour. The way we see these God patterns - and I think it is very important to realise this - is that within the human psyche there are in fact these three patterns working against each other generally, and unless we can recognise them as they exist in ourselves they have control of us rather than us having control of them. So the whole purpose of these early magazines
- H

A was in fact to describe certain forms of human behaviour which exists and which you can see every day in the newspapers, and by describing them, release people from them so there is no longer a need to enact them compulsively and blindly and cause the harm and destruction that they do cause if they are so enacted.

B MR KEMPSTER: Did your Lordship wish to make an observation ? I saw your Lordship's apparent reaction to the evidence.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I was not making any apparent reaction.

MR KEMPSTER: Looking more enerally at the work of The Process, did you come at some stage to read, perhaps in America or was it here, Mr Ed Sanders' book "The Family" ? A. Yes; I think I would be correct in saying that I was the first person in America to read it. I found, or rather was given by a journalist friend of mine, a review copy of the book in America.

Q And did you in due course read the copy published in the United Kingdom and elsewhere by these defendants, Rupert Hart-Davies Limited ? A. I did.

D Q On reading what is there said about The Process church and its members, what was your reaction, what did you feel ? A. Well, I felt a number of reactions. On a most personal level I was extremely upset. I have rather an unusual surname, as everybody is aware, and the De Peyer's you find in the telephone book belong simply to yhe one family, it is not like having a surname of Smith or Jones which there is a certain amount of anonimity about; nobody has any doubt as to the fact that, for instance, my brother was mentioned in this book. So I was extremely upset at the anguish and agony and horror that my family went through as a result of this book. They knew about it and read it and were extremely upset, and I realised that this would be the case and I was appalled that this kind of thing should be put out.

F MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We had better be reminded of the reference you are talking about.

MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, my question was phrased quite generally.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I know, but he has spoken of a reference "to my brother". Where is it ?

G MR KEMPSTER: If your Lordship will give me a moment.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Let us not take up more time now. Perhaps somebody could find it and let us know.

H MR KEMPSTER: I am sure that will be done, my Lord. (To the witness): We will come back to that Mr De Peyer. Then in due course, of course, you and the other personal plaintiffs in The Process church sought to prevent publication of the book in England. A. Yes.

A Q That was following the settlement of an action brought in the United States, a matter already covered. A. Right.

Q And that was unsuccessful ? A. The injunction proceedings, yes.

Q Then did you see in due course what the defendants set out in their pleading called the particulars of defence, what they alleged to be true about The Process and its adherents ?  
A. I did see that, yes.

B Q Did you then see further particulars of allegations made against the plaintiffs, bringing in allegations about the Chapter in Toronto ? A. I did see that.

Q Much later. A. Yes.

C Q What were your feelings when you read those ? A. Well, my feelings were I was amazed, I was completely stunned. You know, it was so far out of reality and it was so different and such a distortion of what was actually the case that, apart from the horror that somebody would put this out, it is almost a kind of terrorism to persecute a religious group in this way, and apart from that my own personal feelings were one of complete amazement.

D Q You appreciate, do you, that the defendants today are still saying that those details set out in the particulars of their defence are true ? A. I understand that, in the sense that they are attempting to justify it. I cannot understand it in any other sense.

What

E Q /is your brother's sacred name? A. Father Christian. He is mentioned, I think, a couple of times at least.

MR KEMPSTER: I have found one on page 94, my Lord. If there are others perhaps your Lordship would give me leave to mention them.

F MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I do not see Fr. Christian's name on page 94.

MR KEMPSTER: It is the fourth paragraph, my Lord.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes, I see it.

Cross-examined by MR NEILL:

G Q Mr De Peyer, I wonder if you can help on a matter which I put to Mr Fripp but he could not help us very much, and that is the things which fascinated Charles Manson. Is that something about which you can help us ? He told us the one thing he knew was that he was interested in blackmagic and witchcraft.  
A. Mr Neill, the only thing that I know about Charles Manson is what I read in the newspapers at the time of Sharon Tate's murder and what I subsequently read in "The Family".  
H Apart from that I know nothing.

Q Let us see how far we can get. You know that he was fascinated, do you, by death and destruction ? A. Only from what I have

read in the newspapers.

- A Q He was fascinated by the Book, or some parts of the Book of Revelations ? A. I am afraid I don't know, Mr Neill. I have not got any first-hand knowledge of Mr Manson or his interests at all.
- B Q Mr Fripp went to see him but you did not ? A. That is correct.
- B Q I want to ask you this because we will have to come to it later: are you, or is some other witness, going to be in a position to deal with the circumstances in which the contribution from Mr Manson was included in the magazine ? A. I think there will be. I am not your best witness on that because I did not go to America at all until August, 1970, and the particular magazine to which you are referring was prepared in Toronto. I can tell you what Mr Fripp told you, but I cannot tell you more, I am afraid.
- C Q You were the Executive Editor up to No.4. Did you have anything to do with No.5, the issue on Fear ? A. No, that was prepared while I was with the Paris Chapter and I did not have anything to do with the preparation of that.
- D MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Who succeeded you ? Who was the Executive Editor then ? A. I am afraid I do not have a copy of the magazine here -----
- E MR NEILL: You can be provided with one, because we do not want any mistake about this as there are a number of questions I want to ask you and I do not want to put them to the wrong person. A. I think I can probably answer your questions, but I am not sure I can answer my Lord's question.
- E MR NEILL: I could not find any reference to the people who were in charge of it and that is why I am seeking your help.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I do not think we have got the "Fear" issue.
- F MR NEILL: No, you have not, my Lord. I did not ask Mr Fripp about it because he said he did not know much about it. A. I believe the Editor from this point on is Fr. Maracai, secularly known as Peter McCormick. I believe that is the case. I would not swear totally to that. As I say, I was not in England when this issue was actually prepared or put out.
- G Q It may be it is not really a matter for you and if you decline to answer I will quite understand, but do you know whether we are going to have the assistance of Fr. Maracai in this court ? A. I believe that is certainly the intention, yes.
- H Q I have one or two further questions about this Fear issue but I think it is mainly a matter for him. Do I understand it, Mr De Peyer, that you are living at the same address as Mr Fripp in New York City ? A. That is now the case, yes, as of about the middle of February.
- Q Before that you told us, I think, you were in charge of a Chapter, or working in a Chapter, in New Orleans ? A. Yes, I

was the director of the New Orleans Chapter.

A

Q When we come to the third witness, Miss Peach, is she also living in America ? A. She is at this time, yes.

Q The position, just so that we understand it, is that the church is incorporated in Louisiana and the three individual plaintiffs are working and living in America and are seeking damages in this court; is that right ? A. That is correct.

B

Q You have been in The Process since the very early days, have you not ? A. That is correct.

Q You, I think, are one of four brothers; is that right ? A. Yes.

Q And you and your brother - I think it is a younger brother - Jonathan have been, both of you, in The Process since the early days ? A. Yes.

Q So that if we find references we will know who we are talking about, is your sacred name - again if I may use that phrase - Fr. Lucius ? A. That is correct.

J

Q At one time Fr. Lucius Leptor in the days when you had the double names ? A. Yes.

Q And is your brother, as we just heard a few minutes ago, Fr. Christian ? A. That is right.

Q You, therefore, were with The Process when they first moved into Balfour Place ? A. Correct.

E

Q That is a big tall building which at one time anyhow was called Process House; is that right ? A. I think it never had a name plaque on it to that effect. We did so describe it in the magazine, yes.

Q Did there come a time when Process, having moved into Process House, moved out of Process House ? A. Yes.

F

Q And they moved out of Process House because an order was obtained by the landlords, was it not, to get possession ? A. Yes. You are referring, presumably, to the second time that we moved out, not the time we went to Mexico ?

Q You moved out for a time and when to Mexico, I am going to come back to that. But the second time, the final time you moved out, was in 1970, was it not ? A. No. I believe I went to America in August, 1970 and I believe that the Processions who were still in Balfour Place at that time finally moved out in, I believe, February 1971.

G

Q Very well; at any rate, about the end of 1970 would not be far wrong - February 1971, I accept that. Is it right that the order for possession was obtained on the ground of noise ? A. I don't believe that is correct, no. I believe it was a technical infringement of the lease was the reason for the repossession.

H

MR C. DE PEYER  
Cross-examined:

A Q Going back to the early days, in the early days in London was the organisation started as a company? A. As a company?

Q Yes, of a financial type. A. Yes, there was -----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do you mean the organisation at Balfour House, or the whole thing?

P MR NEILL: The whole thing. It was originally called, was it not, RMS and MA De Grimston, Limited? A. Yes, that is so. In fact, there is a variety of stages. Although I was not concerned with the business side of the Group at this stage, I believe Mr and Mrs De Grimston had a partnership to begin with and then subsequently a company was formed.

Q That was formed in 1966, was it not? A. To the best of my knowledge. I do not know that I have the documents here to confirm that, but I believe that is the case.

Q The reason I am asking you this and thought you were the right person to ask was that you were one of the directors of the company and, indeed, the secretary? A. Yes.

D Q Did there come a time in 1968 when it changed its name to Doubles Limited? A. It did change its name to that. As to the date, I am afraid I would have to see the special resolution to confirm that for you.

Q Very well, I do not think the date matters at all. There came a time when it changed its name? A. That is correct.

F Q In 1971, after you had gone - and tell us if you cannot help us about this - did that company cease its activities? A. The company became dormant at a certain time. The exact date I am afraid I cannot, again, tell you, but as I understand the situation now, the company is now dormant.

Q Does it mean, therefore, that The Process is not active in this country now? A. No, it does not mean that. It means simply that the charity is active here. There are members of the church, many members of the church, in this country.

Q Who is in charge of the London Chapter? A. Well, I think there is possibly a misunderstanding there. There is no technical London Chapter as such, we do not have a particular property, but we have quite a large number of members here with whom we are in constant touch.

G Q Let us put it another way: are there any members of The Process church who are ministers in this country at all at the moment? A. Not on a permanent basis, no.

Q So putting it in simple terms, does that mean that the London Chapter which existed in the late 1960's and 1970-71 has now closed down? A. That is correct.

H Q So you have got a number of members and they are all laymen; is that right? A. Right.



Q The people who started The Process were the De Grimston's, were they not ? A. Yes, they were the founders.

Q I think at one time it had another name even before it was called the Process, did it not ? A. That is true.

Q What was that name ? A. The original psychotherapy, which I have referred to already, was called Compulsions Analysis.

B C Compulsions Analysis started calling itself The Process first of all and then later when it was first incorporated in the beginning of 1968 it was then called The Process church.  
A. That is true. I think some explanation is due. The organisation, particularly when Mr and Mrs De Grimston started it, was strictly secular in nature and there was a change; until the time when the Process became a church there was a change from the more secular orientated activities to the holy writ religiously orientated activities.

I Q With that introduction, let us look together, if we may, at the Sex issue of this magazine, because that will provide a convenient guideline for some of the questions I want to ask you. Let us start with the front cover. This was published - and the exact month does not matter, but I put it to Mr Fripp and it is only fair to put it to you that this was published about July, 1967. A. I think the correct date, Mr Neill, is September, 1967.

E Q I see. You were the Executive Editor and were you the person, Mr Mountain being the Managing Director so perhaps you and Mr Mountain between you the persons mainly responsible for that magazine ? A. Yes.

Q You decided the layout, you decided the contents; is that right ? A. Quite largely, yes.

F Q Can we look together at the front cover and can I ask you what is depicted at the bottom segment of the front cover ? A. That is some kind of Satanic ritual, but exactly what kind of Satanic ritual it is I am afraid I could not tell you because it is a montage of photographs rather than one photograph of a particular event.

Q On the left-hand side we have the picture of a naked girl and on the right-hand side we have a young man carrying some sort of sack. A. Yes, it is a pack.

Q Walking towards either the sun or the moon. A. The sun, yes.

Q Can you explain to us how it came about that on the front cover of a religious magazine you had those pictures ? A. Yes, I can. I was explaining to Mr Kempster before that the object of this magazine was to describe three patterns of human behaviour and these three pictures of illustrative in some degree of those patterns. This was the purpose. The one on the left-hand side is meant to be illustrative of the Luciferian pattern, the one on the right-hand side the Jehovahian pattern and the one at the bottom, as no doubt you have guessed, is meant to be illustrative of the Satanic pattern.

Q Then on the inside cover we have got the three individuals. I am not going to read all of this again, but they are described one of them as being a Jehovian, one as being a Luciferian and one being a Satanist. A. Correct.

Q First of all, was that not intended to convey to those who read it that the person so described belong one to each of those three groups? A. No. This was, I think, a misunderstanding that arose quite to some extent in Mr Fripp's testimony. The purpose of the label Jehovian, Luciferian or Satanist is to describe a pattern of behaviour not a form of behaviour that should be followed, but a form of behaviour which if it is not known about may well be followed. So it is not a question of belonging to a group as such as you put it. I mean, all those three people belong to The Process church and if they behaved in the way that is described in the magazine there would be no possibility of their belonging to the same group, they would be mutually antagonistic.

MR JUSTICE MEIFORD STEVENSON: What is the point of identifying them in that way? A. To give some point of identification, because these individuals, if they simply behave compulsively and without awareness, my Lord, would follow these particular patterns.

MR NEILL: Are you saying - and you are the editor of this magazine - that anybody reading that front cover could possibly understand that? A. Well, I think I could draw your attention, Mr Neill, to letters in The Process on Fear which we published and which were reactions to this magazine, and I think it is very clear from those letters that people did understand the purpose of the magazine on Sex.

Q We will no doubt here from Fr. Maracai why he selected certain particular letters and published them in a later magazine. All I am asking you, as the editor of this magazine - because it was over two years before the Fear magazine was published - is why are you saying that anybody who read that inside cover, any person who was attracted to The Process, could possibly understand that those people were not being described as members of three separate groups of The Process? A. Well, I think there are a variety of reasons, Mr Neill. First of all it never happened; nobody ever, in my experience - and I have talked in the course of my eleven years of working, counselling and helping people to literally hundreds of thousands of people and nobody has ever put that construction on the terms Jehovians, Luciferians and Satanists.

Q I am not going to take much time on this, but let us read together what Caleb Ashburton-Dunning describes himself as being: "Likes: Chaos, catastrophes, graveyards, lemons, depravity & Boris Karloff". Now, is that absolute nonsense, or not? A. This page, Mr Neill, was meant in a satirical -----

MR JUSTICE MEIFORD STEVENSON: Deal with the question that is put to you. Is that nonsense or not?

MR NEILL: Does it represent what he does like, or is it absolute moonshine? A. I am afraid I cannot give a simplistic answer.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You are not asked for a simplistic answer. Here it is stated that Mr Caleb Ashburton-Dunning likes chaos, catastrophes, graveyards, lemons, depravity & Boris Karloff". That is a statement of fact, is it not?  
A. My Lord, if I could -----

Q Would you answer: that is a statement of fact, is it not?  
A. It is satirical, my Lord, and, therefore, it may have elements of fact in it but it is not entirely truthful in the absolute sense.

MR NEILL: Let us take it quietly and by stages. Is any of it true? A. Certain aspects of it I am sure are. I can speak much better for myself than I can for Caleb Ashburton-Dunning, who I do not know particularly well.

Q Let me try and start a little earlier on. Did you write that?  
A. I did not write this particular piece, no.

Q Who did? A. I think either one of the other editors or probably Mr Ashburton-Dunning himself. I am afraid I do not know the answer to your question.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did you write the bit about yourself?  
A. Yes.

MR NEILL: Then let us read that, shall we. "Chris De Peyer is 29..." Is that right, you were 29 years of age? A. Yes, I think that was right.

Q "English of Swiss origin ..." Is that right? A. Yes, the Swiss origin is some time back. My name is Swiss.

Q "ex-architect". Is that right? A. Yes.

Q "abandoned it out of sheer boredom". Is that right? A. It is.

Q "cool, calm, detached, charming, diplomatic, subtle, ingenious & lethal". A. Well!

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You wrote that, did you? A. I wrote that, my Lord, yes.

MR NEILL: What does "lethal" mean? A. That is an interesting question. You know, this is not intended entirely seriously; we were sending ourselves up when we wrote these pieces.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You were what? A. We were sending ourselves up - making mock of ourselves, my Lord.

MR NEILL: I want you to try and do yourself justice. You are a, at this time, new religious group, not yet a church but a new religious group? A. Correct.

Q And you are - and we will come to look at it on page 8 in a few minutes - handing out the possibility of help and religious guidance to those who are upset, lonely, disturbed, and so on. A. Correct.

Q Are you suggesting that any of those persons who were going to buy this magazine are going to understand this as a sort of satirical joke ? A. Well, all I can say is that nobdoy understood it any other way in my experience, and I think one point is worth making -----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You know, really, I wonder whether you could introduce into your vocabulary the words "yes" and "no" ? A. If I feel I can so answer the question, my Lord, yes.

MR NEILL: Are you saying that the people to whom I suggested this magazine would be offered - that is the disturbed and the young - would understand this inside page simply as a satirical joke ? A. Yes, and if I may be allowed I think I could explain why. This magazine was sold on a person to person contadt basis; in other words, Process ministers and trainee ministers sold this on the streets and in the bookstall at 2, Balfour Place and anybody who bought one of our magazines would be taken through it, in some senses as part of the inducement to buy it and also to show them what it was about. So it was not like going into a bookstall and buying something completely cold; there was quite some degree of personal contact in each case.

D Q Is that a truthful answer, Mr De Peyer ? A. That is entirely truthful, Mr Neill.

Q Are you really saying that every person who bought this in the street would have explained to them exactly what this magazine was setting out to do ? A. I am not saying that, no -----

Q They would be taken through it to some extent. A. To some extent they would be taken through it; they would be shown it and they would be made contact with onthe subject of the magazine.

Q Does rhat mean "A joke on page 2, filth on page 15", or whatever it is ? Is that how they go through it, or what ? A. I very much doubt it; I hardly think such a method of going through it would sell it.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What is the explanation about the Alsation dogs ? A. What is the explanation of it ?

Q Yes. What were they told about the Alsation dogs ? You are the writer of this. A. Right, my Lord. We were - and still are - very fond of animals and we published a book called "The ultimate Friend" which was a book about vivisection and the harm and hurt that vivisection does to animals.

MR NEILL: And that is why you showed these pictures; is that right ? A. Because of our fondness to animals, yes.

H Q Before we leave that page let me ask you this: the name "Caleb" Ashburton-Dunning. That is not his real name, is it, it is Rupert is it not ? A. His secular name is Rupert, his sacred name is Caleb.

Q Is that because he is thought to be a reincarnation of Caleb ?  
A. Not to my knowledge.

Q Let us go, if we may, to page 8. This was a very important page, was it not ? A. Yes, it was.

Q Did you write this yourself ? A. I did not personally write this. I think possibly Mr Mountain wrote it.

R Q But you would have seen it before it went into the magazine ?  
A. Oh yes.

Q This is a page, as it says, holding out an offer of help to those who were in some way in trouble. A. That is correct.

C Q And what it was offering was personal sessions to those who are dissatisfied or had these other troubles which are explained on that page. A. Right.

Q Did you yourself take part in these sessions ? A. Yes, I did.

L Q Am I right in thinking that there were really two kinds of session. There were individual sessions where there was a teacher and a pupil, if I may use that term, and there were group sessions where a number of people, possibly up to 20 would take part and they would then be paired off into pairs. A. That is roughly correct. May I enlarge on that a little for you ?

E Q Certainly. A. The sessions referred specifically to the one to one situation which was a counselling type of situation. The group situations were not described as sessions but in fact are described in the back of the magazine and are the communicating course, the free expression course, the telephthy developing course. So it would be more accurate, in fact, to describe those group situations as courses rather than sessions.

F Q I will use your wording then: personal sessions mentioned on page 8 are the individual ones, the ones at the back of the magazine are courses which I have called wrongly group sessions; is that right ? A. That is correct.

Q Let us see what happened at these individual sessions. At these sessions is it right that the teacher - and that might well be yourself, might it not ? A. That is correct.

G Q I am talking now of the period when you were in London and throughout that stage, because you were here for a number of years. In the early days, at any rate, you would have a machine called an E-meter, would you not ? A. In the early days we did, yes.

H Q That was something which was taken from the Scientologists, was it not ? A. It was not something that was "taken" from Scientologists, it was something that was also used by Scientologists. It is something that has been used in psychological research since the 1920's.

MR C. DE PEYER  
Cross-examined:

Q But there came a time when you abandoned that; is that right?  
A. That is correct.

Q Had, in fact, Mr De Grimston had links with the Scientplogists at some time? A. No. What happened was that Mr and Mrs De Grimston, before they began what was then Compulsions Analysis, researched a large number of groups, both religious and psychological and they looked into Scientology in the course of their research. But they were not linked with or members of Scientology.

Q At these individual sessions is it right that the questioner would keep on putting the same question over and over again, like "What are you afraid of"? A. I am sorry!

Q At these individual sessions is it right that the questioner, the teacher --- A. Could I say, Mr Neill, we have got several terms and if I can, perhaps, give the correct term it may make it a little easier.

Q Yes. A. The person who was taking the session at this stage was described as the therapist and the person whose problems were being sorted out was described as the subject. When you said the "teacher" I was a little confused for the moment because I thought you were referring to Mr De Grimston.

Q Later on he was called The Teacher. A. That is correct.

Q So we will call this the therapist and the subject. The therapist might be you? A. That is correct.

Q And the subject might be one of these young people who are invited on page 8 to join and come for personal sessions? A. Young or old.

Q Mainly they were young, were they not? A. I took an enormous number of sessions and the preponderance was probably in the 20s and 30's, but there were certainly older people who came as well.

Q Had you any training whatever as a therapist? A. I had a very intensive training in the therapy that had been devised by Mr and Mrs De Grimston, yes.

Q Of course, the people behind all this were the De Grimston's, were they not? A. They originally formulated the initial therapies, yes.

Q And taught you, as it were, what to do? A. That is correct.

Q Let us go back to the sessions where you are the therapist and somebody is the subject. Did that take the form of repeated questions being put to the subject? A. Yes.

Q Over and over again. Questions like "What are you afraid of?", such things as that? A. I would not describe it as "over and over again". It was done in a very light and relaxed, warm and friendly way. There was no question of the sort of

hypnotic effect that I think "over and over again" implies.

Q Do you remember a young girl called Tessa Ventriss ? A. Yes, I do.

Q Perhaps that is a good moment to turn to the part of your activities which she took part in. A. I am sorry, would you repeat the beginning of that.

Q That is a good moment to turn to a part of your activities that she took part in. She went with you, did she not, on the advance party when you left London in 1966 on your way to the Bahamas ? A. Well, no, that is not correct. I was the first person to go to the Bahamas at the end of May, 1966, and I went alone.

Q Perhaps it does not really matter if it was the advance party, but you certainly were in the Bahamas with Tessa Ventriss, you say she came out later. A. That is correct.

Q And were there a number of other people including your brother ? A. Yes, there were.

Q That is Jonathan, and a girl called Sabrina Verney ? A. Sabrina Verney came out very much later. She came out with her art teacher, one Geoffrey Baker. Sabrina Verney was not known to us at all before she came to the Bahamas.

Q And you moved on from the Bahamas and then went to this place in Mexico called Xtul. A.. Right.

Q Is it right that in November, 1966, a solicitor came out and brought back three of the young people who had gone out there ? A. That is correct.

Q That is Tessa Ventriss, Sabrina Verney and your brother Jonathan. A. That is correct.

Q In Xtul is it right that the form of living was primitive ? A. Yes, that is correct.

Q And the person in control of this group - I am not sure how many, but a number of people and six of these Alsation dogs - were the De Grimstons ? A. Are you asking me if the De Grimstons were in control of the group ?

Q Yes. A. No, that is not strictly true. Quite a number of us had responsibilities for the group.

Q Were you one of those with responsibilities ? A. I had responsibilities, yes.

Q Then you would be a very good person to tell us about it. The regime there was one, was it, that involved strict discipline ? A. It did not involve strict discipline in the sense of imposed discipline; it involved strict self-discipline, yes.

MR C. DE PEYER  
Cross-examined:

You see, one of the things in this religious game of rape which the Jehovahian has to do, if they get as far as the inner game, is to flagellate themselves, is it not? A. I believe so. I would have to refresh my memory.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I should have thought you would remember flagellation if that took place.

MR NEILL: If you play the inner game and you get 5. A. Yes, I have got it.

Q If you get a 5 you are on the inner game. A. Correct.

Q You are doing rather well! Is that not something which took place in Mexico? A. Flagellating ourselves?

Q Yes. A. Yes, it is.

Q And everybody did that apart from Mrs De Grimston, did they not? A. No, that is not correct.

Q Well, a substantial number did it and Mrs De Grimston did not; is that correct? A. I do not believe that that is correct. I cannot remember precisely who did and who did not, but I certainly do not remember specifically that Mrs De Grimston did not.

Q Let us leave Mrs De Grimston out of it. At any rate a substantial number of you were doing that as part of your self-discipline? A. That is correct. May I explain?

Q Yes. A. The purpose of this - and I might say this lasted for not more than two or three weeks at the most - is we were experimenting at this stage, we were perhaps discovering religious purpose and meditation and understanding ourselves at Xtul and we were experimenting with various forms of religious discipline, which included this. I mean, this is a classical form of religious discipline from the monasteries and we not only experimented with this but also with fasting and prayer and meditation. So I do not want to give the impression that this was exclusively what we did.

Q You certainly, I suggest, spoke to Tessa Ventriss about it and explained it to her, did you not? A. Me personally?

Q Yes. A. It is possible. I do not remember whether I personally spoke to Tessa Ventriss about it.

(Continued on next page)



And there was at this site in Xtul either a temple or the ruins of a temple; is that right? A. It was what we called a temple. It was not a temple before we came there. We so called it.

Q You called it a temple. It was some form of building, was it?  
A. That is right.

Q What had it been before you arrived? A. I think it had probably been a cottage or small house of some kind.

B Q You called it a temple. It was in the temple that people went if they wanted to beat themselves. That is right, is it not?  
A. That is correct, or fast or have a vigil.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: At any rate, the flagellation was self-flagellation, was it? A. Yes, my Lord.

Q What with? A. With a knotted rope, my Lord.

C MR NEILL: Is that a knotted rope which we see the Jehovian carrying on the front cover or not? A. You see the rather tattered ends of it. I think you get a better idea probably by looking at the rope around his waist.

D Q That is what it is meant to represent, is it not, that picture of the Jehovian, someone who flagellates himself? A. No.

Q It is part of what a Jehovian does, is it not? A. It is part of the Jehovian pattern of behaviour, Mr Neill.

E Q At that stage out in Xtul you believed in Jehovah. Had Satan become one of the Gods at that stage? A. I believe he had specifically towards the end. We were in Xtul really discovering God and the aspects of God. Precisely at what stage each was discovered, I am not sure that I could give you accurately, but I think it would be fair to say that we did know of Satan at Xtul.

F Q Certainly by the summer of 1967, by the time you had come back again, Satan had become one of the trilogy of Gods, three Gods, whom you worshipped? A. He had become part of the trilogy, as you so describe it. I would point out that Christ was one of the main elements in Xtul. So I think if we can talk about the four rather than the trilogy.

G Q Yes, I accept that, the four Gods. At any rate, Satan had become one of the four? A. Yes, and I should point out that we don't worship Satan or any of these Gods individually. We worship God, and these aspects of God collectively as making up God.

Q You really discovered Satan in Xtul in the winter of 1966?  
A. I think that would be correct, yes.

H Q When you were out there, was there talk of reincarnation?  
A. There could well have been. We believe in reincarnation.  
I don't remember a specific incident, but that may well be so.

I don't think I need put it all to you, but I did suggest to you that why he got this name Caleb which we have seen in this magazine here was because he was meant to be the reincarnation of Caleb. A. No; that is not the case. Our names were taken because of their characteristics. If a person chose himself to feel that he was a reincarnation of somebody .... I am called Lucius. That does not mean to say I feel I wrote the Golden Ass. If somebody chooses to feel or feels an identification with an historical character and feels he may be a reincarnation, that is entirely his own business.

Q It is not fair perhaps to ask you how Mr Rupert Ashburton Dunning took the name of Caleb because you could not help us on it. A. I believe he chose it. I know no more than that.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You all chose your own name, did you not? A. Yes, my Lord.

Q Was there a sort of central register kept? A. We have a book of names, which people choose from.

MR NEILL: Miss Ventriss was brought back from Xtul and she left the Process, didn't she? A. Correct.

Q Was there another lady who was a member in those early days, I think she was Mrs Mostyn-Owen? You may remember her by another name, as Gaia Servadio. A. That does ring a bell. If I remember correctly, I think she came for one session with me. She was not a member of the Process. She was a journalist investigating and getting material for an article.

Q I think you later found that out, but you did not know that at the beginning, did you? A. That is correct, we did not know that at the beginning, except for the fact that during the session which I gave her, there were certain areas which she was unwilling to talk about in respect of a particular problem that she had, and it later transpired that this was the situation, the fact that she was a journalist acting undercover.

Q She was a person, was she not, who not only attended individual sessions - and you told us of one you took her for - but also what I called a group session and you corrected me and told me was a course? A. Yes. She simply attended one personal session with me; no more.

Q But she did attend courses, or a course? A. She attended a few courses, that is correct.

Q Isn't it right that at those courses the persons concerned were paired off, and then one of the things they had to do in the course of the exercises was to insult each other? A. That is one of a large number of things that they had to do, yes.

Q Was not that something which a number of people found very distressing? A. No.

Q You say no-one found that very distressing? A. I say no-one found it very distressing, right.

Was not the purpose of it to find out a weak spot in your opposite number? A. Yes. I think, if I could explain the purpose of it, you will understand why no-one found it very distressing.

Yes. A. The point of it was to help a person overcome an area of vulnerability that they felt in themselves. For instance, if they felt in some way dishonest and someone said this to them, and it upset them, then that would be examined. This was done very gradually, and although there were possibly cases of people who were slightly upset, the thing was taken on a gradient scale. There was no sudden, catastrophic personal disaster in the situation. It was very carefully monitored and very carefully done.

Q You know the word "brainwashing", do you? A. Yes.

Q Could that be described as that kind of process that you were carrying on here? A. Absolutely not. It is the precise and total opposite of what we were carrying on. Brainwashing means to put something into the brain in order to follow a certain set of beliefs. What we were attempting to do was to bring something out of the person, something that they could then understand about themselves.

Q I want to put to you something now that, I will call her Mrs Mostyn-Owen, will say, that when she was with the Process - and I suggest she was there a few months - she was continually pressed to leave her family. She was a married lady with children. Is that, in your recollection, true or untrue? A. That is untrue.

Q I cannot say whether it was you or someone else, but I am suggesting that someone in the Process organisation constantly pressed her to leave her husband and family. A. Mr Neill, nobody in the Process would press anybody to leave their husband and family.

Q But it has led, has it not, Mr De Peyer, to a number of break-ups of families? A. On occasion it has led to disagreements, but no permanent break-ups, no.

Q I don't want to embarrass you with personal questions, but it has led to difficulties in your family, has it not? A. It led to difficulties temporarily. Those difficulties for some considerable time have no longer existed.

Q When you were younger that did lead to difficulties both as regards yourself and your brother? A. Yes.

Q At this time - that is, when Mrs Mostyn-Owen was going to these sessions of Process - your dress was this black trousers and sweater, was it not? A. I believe it was. I am afraid I don't remember the precise date. She came round possibly for a few weeks at the most. She had one personal session with me and attended a few courses.

Q At any rate, again perhaps the dates don't matter very much, but there was a substantial period, was there not, when members

of the Process, certainly ministers, were going round in this black garb? A. That is correct.

Wearing both signs of Satan and the Christian cross as well? A. Right.

Q I want to come back in a moment to this magazine, but let me just ask you this: Are you saying that this magazine was to be taken all as a joke, part as a joke, or all seriously?

A. I am saying that certain pages in the magazine were meant and intended either satirically or humorously.

B Q We will look at that in a moment, but I must, as I mentioned Mrs Mostyn-Owen, suggest this to you, that she talked to you about this magazine - that is to you, I think, personally - because she knew that you were responsible for it, and that the impression she got was that you took these magazines very seriously. A. The pages which we took seriously we did take seriously, yes. I don't ever remember talking to Mrs Mostyn-Owen about this magazine.

C Q Again, it is a long time ago and it may be it is a different person, but you were certainly one of the two people mainly in charge of this magazine in 1967? A. That is correct, yes.

D Q I will have to come back to a later period when there were some other sessions, but let me just ask you this before we part from those early years: One of the people who was out in Xtul was a man called Wickham, was he not? A. That is correct.

Q He was among those who flagellated themselves? A. Yes, I believe he was.

E Q May we take the magazine again, because I am anxious to follow your fairly recent answer, about some of it satirical, some of it serious, because we may want to have a little help about that. Let us look at it together. The frontispiece: serious or satirical? A. Serious.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: By "the frontispiece" you mean the cover?

F MR NEILL: The cover, my Lord, yes.

Q The cover, serious? A. Correct.

Q Page 2, satirical? A. Pages 2 and 3.

Q Page 4? A. Serious.

G Q Therefore the words at the bottom of page 4, the serious page, "Three paths and a quagmire - and everyone can choose", are serious? A. That is serious.

Q Then page 5. I have not frankly asked about this. Perhaps I ought to ask you. Is that serious or satirical?

H A. I don't think it quite falls into either of those categories. I interviewed Stefanie Powers. I think you will see the writing, particularly on that page, is fairly humorous. This interview is not meant to be, nor indeed are any of the interviews in any of the magazines with persons who are not members of the Process.

meant to be, expressions of Process points of view, but simply interesting people to interview.

Q Then pages 6 and 7 I suppose are meant to be satirical, are they? A. That is correct.

Q We have not, again, looked at this. Let us look at it very quickly together. I am looking at the top of page 6: "Do you have nightmares about giant bats sitting on top of Process House? Do you think members of The Process are brainwashing charlatans? Do you think The Process is out to get you?" and so on. "Do you spread rumours that The Process practises voodoo and black magic?" Was that something you wrote? A. I did not personally write this, no.

Q Who wrote this? A. I could not say for certain. It might have been Hugh Mountain. It might have been a combination of people.

Q But, again, you read it before it went in, I suppose? A. Yes, I approved it.

Q Was what was written here because this was the name which the Process had in London at the time? A. No.

Q What was it put there for? A. It was put there because certain journalists - and I am sure you are aware of early publicity that we had - had made certain sensational accusations against us. If I can draw your attention to a later part of this magazine, it will partly answer your question. If we could turn to page 31, you will see there a letter which begins in the lower half of the page, under the grey piece. It says: "Dear Sir, Thank you for your generous four-page spread on us in your last issue". This was meant to be a satirical response to an article that appeared in the magazine Oz, which I believe is now defunct. From a magazine like this and from one or two that I could say came out of the same stable (if that is not too polite a term) we were getting a little flak.

Q A little what? A. Flak; a few unpleasantnesses.

Q So you took up two pages of this to answer it in this satirical manner; is that right? A. Yes.

Q Where it says: "Do you spread rumours that The Process practises voodoo and black magic", those were things that were in this article that you wanted to counter; was that it? A. That kind of thing, yes. Whether that specific thing was in the article, I cannot now remember.

Q It was pretty stupid, was it not, Mr De Peyer, to put what appears to be a picture of a black mass ceremony on the front cover? A. Not at all stupid, Mr Neill.

Q You are saying, I understand, that this article (which we have not looked at and are not going to look at) had made some allegation about black magic. A. I don't follow your logic.

Q I think you are here trying to deal with a suggestion in an Oz magazine that the Process practised voodoo and black magic.

A. Please don't misunderstand me. I am not saying that the Oz magazine said that specifically. I am saying that is the kind of thing being said by Oz magazine and similar publications.

Q At any rate, it was being said of the Process in 1967 that they practised voodoo and black magic; is that right?

A. I don't recall somebody specifically saying that. I don't believe that somebody actually said that.

Q Then what on earth was the point in saying: "Do you spread rumours that The Process practises voodoo and black magic" if no-one had said it? A. Mr Neill, this page is meant to be fun.

Q This is fun, is it? A. The page is meant to be satirical and humorous.

Q Perhaps we had better pass to something serious. Page 8: is that serious? A. Page 8 is serious, yes.

Q And page 9 is serious? A. That is serious.

Q Because these are the two important pages for the newcomer to Process, the person to whom this magazine may be their first introduction to the organisation. A. Why you pick these two pages, I am not sure. They are certainly important.

Q They are important, because we have had so far the editorial and the contents page, but so far we have not had anything serious inside the magazine at all, have we? It has all been satirical. A. I see what you mean. They are some of the first serious pages they will come to.

Q That is correct. We have had satire on 2 and 3, the editorial which is serious, then the thing with Miss Power which is not in any category at all, and some more fun and satire on 6 and 7. So here we are coming to the first two serious pages. That is right, is it? A. That is correct.

Q I will ask you a little bit about page 9, because I do find this difficult. "Three paths and a quagmire". That picks up the words used at the bottom of the editorial. "Who is strong enough to follow one of the paths? Who is fool enough to fall into the quagmire? The Grey Forces hold sway, but The Gods are returned to recruit their armies for the End. The pendulum swings. Three paths and a quagmire. On the following pages an 'Advocate' puts the case for each". Then I am not going to look at that for the moment, but at the end of this section, page 17, when you are meant to have read the four cases - that is, the case for Jehovah, the case for Lucifer, the case for Satan and the case for the grey forces - at the bottom of page 17 you are inviting the reader to come to a decision. A. To come to a decision, yes, in terms of choosing which of these patterns of behaviour he feels most nearly fits him.

Q Let us go back to page 9. I want to look at that again, in view of that answer. They are coming "to recruit their armies". That means, doesn't it, to the new reader, that this religious organisation is suggesting that the Gods - Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan - are each coming to collect their followers? A. Correct.

Q Followers of Jehovah, followers of Lucifer, followers of Satan.  
A. This is a statement of what we consider to be the case, yes.

Q So the reader is being told in the following pages which army they ought to join? A. No.

Q Why not? A. What is being set out here is the situation as it is. They are not being told or instructed to do anything. In this preamble it says that "The Gods are returned to recruit their armies for the End". Following on from that it illustrates three patterns of human behaviour; in fact four, if you include the grey force page. So that people can see and become aware of their own compulsive behaviour, the pattern that they most strongly identify with. This is the purpose of this.

Q What is the point of talking about recruiting their armies? This is telling people "You ought to join up with one of these armies because the Gods are coming to collect you". I suggest to you that the three recruiting officers, if I may so describe them, set out on the next few pages the various attractions of joining the three armies. That is right, isn't it? A. It is not right, Mr Neill. Perhaps I could explain to you why it is not right.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Wait. Does not the word "recruit" imply an invitation to join something? A. It does, my Lord.

MR NEILL: And they are coming to recruit their armies.  
A. Correct.

Q Why is it wrong to describe the advocates as recruiting officers? A. Because what is being set out here is a statement of fact, that the Gods are returning to recruit their armies. Then in the following pages the patterns of behaviour are being described. It is not being said that somebody should follow these patterns of behaviour or belong to any of these armies, as you put it, but that this is what is happening, and unless we are aware of this fact and unless we are aware of the individual patterns, this is what will happen.

Q That is just not right, is it? I won't come to Satan for the moment. Let us see what Lucifer's advocate or recruiting officer, as I would describe here ---- A. It is right, Mr Neill.

Q Look at what Isabel Rennie says at the bottom of page 13. Just read it. A. I can.

Q "But choose. The time is short. Attend Lord Lucifer". Is not that the plainest possible invitation to the reader by the recruiting officer for Lucifer to say, "Join Lucifer's ranks"? A. Mr Neill, the answer is "No".

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: And a little higher up, again the imperative, "Attend Lord Lucifer. Serve Him with unfailing loyalty and your path to Eden is assured". What is that intended to convey to the reader? A. My Lord, the intention of this and all four of these articles is to give people an awareness of what exists or could exist in their individual psyche. The requirement to choose is a requirement to choose which of these

patterns they identify with. It is a pattern of human behaviour. I know and I can understand that we are having a great deal of difficulty getting this point across, but if I can perhaps say it again: The point of this is to describe something that is. It is not intended to tell people to do something.

MR NEILL: What are the two words at the bottom of the page "But choose" meant to mean? A. It is meant to mean you are meant to choose whether this is your God pattern or not.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is there a word in this document to suggest that? A. You asked Mr Fripp that yesterday.

Q Can you answer the question? A. I am not sure that I could point to a word. What I could say is that nobody has understood it that I know of in the terms other than those we set out, and that is very amply illustrated in the next issue of the magazine by the letters.

Q Has it ever been suggested to you that if in one publication you associate invitations to join the kind of practices that are set out here with perfectly high-minded moral exhortations, you can always excuse what you have written by pointing to the high-minded part? Do you follow that? A. I am afraid I did not follow that, my Lord, no.

D Q Never mind.

MR NEILL: Let us turn over the page to page 15. I am not going to read it again. You see in the third column there are three black dots? A. Yes.

E Q Can we just read the next few words together? It says: "So there, my friend, is a fleeting glimpse of Satan's promise to those that follow Him. Take your choice, indulge, explore the very limits", and so on. Isn't that, again, a plain calling upon the reader to make a choice and follow that pattern of behaviour? A. No.

Q It is purely descriptive? A. It is purely descriptive. I think, if I can draw your attention to the other publications that you went through with Mr Fripp yesterday, you will find that very clearly set out.

Q This magazine Sex was on sale in Soho, was it not, Mr De Peyer? A. It is possible, Mr Neill. I don't know of it being on sale in Soho.

Q We will look later at some letters about that. Are you saying that the person who buys this magazine under this title Sex in a London street - let us forget the area of it - is going to understand that this is merely describing existing patterns of behaviour? A. I know of nobody who understood it otherwise, Mr Neill.

H Q Now we have taken time over this and looked at it, and you heard Mr Fripp when we were looking at it yesterday, are you prepared to accept this, that a young person who was not necessarily of high intellectual calibre could well be led to think that this



was an invitation to him to follow one of the three Gods?  
A. No, I don't accept that.

You are really saying that in your view, nobody reading these advocates' pleas, would not think it was an invitation to follow that kind of behaviour? A. I have to go on the evidence, Mr Neill. I have no evidence of that. In fact, I have evidence of quite the contrary.

Q You would say that this is still a suitable publication to put out as a religious magazine, would you? A. I might point out that when this magazine was put out, we were not a religion; we were not a church.

Q But you were a religious organisation. I think Mr Fripp agreed with that yesterday. A. Our intentions were certainly and our thoughts were religious. You have to realise that the whole development of the Process is an evolutionary development all along the line. At the stage when we designed and published this particular magazine, we were not at that time a church in our minds, although we certainly had strong religious convictions, yes.

Q I thought we had been over this. Surely you would describe yourself at that stage, though not formally a church, as a religious organisation? A. Yes, I would.

D Q And this was a religious magazine? A. Yes, in the broadest sense, certainly.

Q Was the magazine which is advertised on page 31 a religious magazine? A. Do you mean the one advertised on the right-hand side?

E Q Yes, Total. A. I cannot remember whether that was religious or not. As far as I do recall on this, this was an exchange advertisement for our own magazine. In other words, in exchange for putting an advertisement for Total in this magazine, they put an advertisement for our magazine Process in theirs. This magazine, I can remember being shown it, because obviously we were careful as to who or what carried our advertisements, but I cannot remember a great deal of detail.

I Q Was that the only other magazine that carried your advertisements on that basis, of exchange? A. It was the only one that did, yes.

Q That was the only one you could find for your religious magazine who were prepared to do this on a reciprocal basis of exchanging advertisements; is that right? A. No, that is not the case. We did not look for advertisements. These people came to us.

G Q "Germany's most macabre magazine". A. As far as I remember, it was an erudite and somewhat scholastic-type of magazine, dealing with young poets, young artists, this kind of thing. I cannot remember an enormous amount of detail about it, I am afraid, but that is the general thing behind it.

H Q If that is true, why on earth not say so in the advertisement? "Important new literary magazine" or "Important literary magazine from Germany" or "Leading literary magazine"?

A. I think you will have to ask them that, Mr Neill. We did not set up this advertisement. They set it up for themselves. They presumably thought that was the best way to sell it. I cannot answer for why they presented their magazine in the way they did.

Q We have nearly done with this, but let us look at the advertisements that you got on pages 32 and 33. This is where we got the name Process House, which was not actually stuck up, but that is how it was known, in the middle, "Process House, Balfour Place"? A. Yes.

Q And the Process scenes, and so on. On the right-hand side of the page: "Trials of the Pope, the Royal Family, Sex, Hitler, The Hippies, Drugs, Black Magic". Were those all things which the Process were interested in? A. Not specifically. A Process scene was a form of entertainment. Where it says "Trials of", it is simply a list of subjects. We put on a form of entertainment in the form of a trial. We would have counsel for both sides arguing a particular case that would be relevant to the subjects. What was intended to be shown was the two sides of a conflict, and that in the end that conflict could be resolved. This was the purpose of this.

Q Then on the opposite side we have got these advertisements for these films. Were these religious films? A. If you will pass me a copy of Process Three on Mindbending, I can tell you what kind of films they are.

Q Perhaps your counsel will be very kind to do that, and perhaps my Lord and the Jury, who have got copies, will turn to them? A. It is actually on page 4, Mr Neill.

Q This was another one, I think. You were connected with this publication, too; is that right? A. That is correct.

Q You were the executive editor. A. This also is an advertisement for films, and these are the kind of films which we showed. As you will see from that list, every single one is a classic. "Guernica", as I am sure you know, deals through Picasso's painting with the Spanish Civil War. "Orpheus" by Jean Cocteau deals with the story of Orpheus. "The Seventh Seal" by Ingmar Bergman, as I am sure you know, is a religious film. "Ivan the Terrible" is a classic film by Eisenstein, a very famous Russian film-maker, about the story of Ivan. These were the kind of films that we were showing as advertised in this magazine.

Q In view of that answer, let me ask you two questions. First of all, why, on the middle of page 4 of the magazine "Mindbending" did you select that revolting picture of the face with the Swastika beside it? A. Mr Neill, because a lot of these films dealt with revolting subjects in a very tasteful way and in a way that would make people aware of violence, of the effects of violence, of the destructiveness of human beings one for another. This was the purpose of the films. That picture was probably a still from one of the films that we showed.

Q That was the one you thought the most suitable to highlight in purple on that page? A. Indeed. The object of this was to

make it quite clear the destructiveness that human beings go in for, in war, in violence, in rape, in murder, the total horror of certain aspects of human existence. It was our intention to draw people's attention to this, so that they could be shaken out of the apathy that they were in in order that this might stop. This was the purpose of this kind of thing.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did it occur to you at all that there might be a section of the public willing to pay for horror films? A. My Lord, these were classics. I would hardly describe them as "horror" films.

Q Again, can you really help us about the purpose of putting that decomposing skull and the Swastika in the middle there?

A. This was intended, my Lord, to bring people to an awareness of the kind of horrors of war and violence. I think you will find, my Lord, in the Bible passages which people have misused.

MR NEILL: On the back of that edition, again I suppose language which you either selected or approved, we have got this: "Process. The voice of the extremes. Stands against mediocrity and suppression. Exposes the Grey Forces". A. Correct.

Q Is that right, you were the voice of the extremes?  
A. Yes, indeed.

Q Let us look together now. You have told us the kind of film you were advertising, great classics, and the religious film "The Seventh Seal". Can you try to explain to my Lord and the Jury why on page 33 you did not say, "A season of great classics and the religious film 'The Seventh Seal'" or something like that? A. By the time this magazine came out, we had what you might call a fairly large following. Most people who came to the coffee house at Balfour Place were regulars. We were not into, let us say, proselytizing or into the sort of large-scale public mission that we now have. Consequently, in a sense, most of the people who bought this magazine would almost certainly have previously bought some other Process magazine.

Q Mr Fripp I think used the phrase that the sale of magazines and other literature was a significant source of finance - I think his word was "significant" - for the organisation. This was important, selling all this stuff, was it not?

A. Yes, it was. The importance of it was not very great at the time under discussion. It became greater as time went on, because we developed a whole street ministry. But in early 1967, and even later on, we did not start selling magazines on the street until the spring of 1967.

Q Don't let us worry too much about the exact dates. I think it is common ground that this Sex magazine was the current issue of Process available for sale for over two years.

A. Mr Neill, 15,000 copies of this were printed. I am almost completely certain that those were sold out before two years were up. We relied, as my memory serves me, for some considerable time on the books that we published rather than selling this magazine, because I believe it had sold out.

2 Did you think of putting on that advertisement on page 33, "Films which show the horror of war" or "horror of violence", something like that, instead of advertising it in this way?  
A. Since that was our entire policy, and most of the people who came to us knew this, we did not feel that was necessary.

Q Is it not fair to say that this kind of advertisement for films would attract a young man or a young woman who had some depraved tastes or morbid interest in violence, because they would look at it and say, "This is the kind of thing I want to go and see"?  
A. No, and I will tell you that I very often would sit on the reception desk in Balfour Place and take their tickets or 2s. 6d. or whatever it was that they paid, and nobody, but nobody, of that description came in.

(Continued on next page)

Q They were all high-minded people, were they? A. I don't know what your definition of "high-minded person" is, but they were all interested people, they were not depraved.

Q They were all people interested simply in exposing the horror of violence and not in violence itself. Is that right? A. I cannot speak for the many hundreds who came in, each individually, under one classification. I know that there were certainly people who came with that intention, there were people who came because we were showing very excellent movies, and they came because they were interested in films. They certainly did not come because they were depraved or for any other negative reason.

Q Somebody might say: "I see they are advertising a film on Lust at Balfour Place, I will go round and see it", and they would expect to see not something, a sort of treatise on the wickedness of lust but something which would pander to their tastes. That is right, is it not? A. You can theorise on that, I suppose, but it did not happen.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You are inviting the jury, are you, to accept the view that, in exhibiting the kind of film which has been referred to, you were, as you saw it, performing a very high-minded duty. Is that right? A. That is correct, my Lord, yes.

Q At half-a-crown a time. A. I can't remember the exact - there was some technical reason, which I could go into, we had to become, I think, a club in the technical sense in order to be allowed to show films.

Q Because you were showing films that had not passed the censor. Is that right? A. That is not correct, my Lord - they were all classic films.

MR NEILL: Have you no regrets about this magazine at all, Mr De Peyer? A. None whatsoever.

Q We have got the advertisement on the next page about the courses and so on. A. Yes.

Q Mr Fripp told us that Process had no particular interest in Witchcraft, and he said that the occult really meant something that was hidden. Would you subscribe to that view? A. I would.

Q I think we will have to look at that, in view of what you say about this. During the winter of 1967-68, after Mr Fripp had gone away, you had a number of speakers who came to talk? A. That is correct.

Q We had better look and see what some of the subjects were that they came to talk about, because we have a file of speakers. (File handed up; copies circulated).

MR NEILL: Members of the jury, I think you will find that, unfortunately, these pages are not numbered. The bundle starts

**MISSING  
PAGE(S)**

MR C. DE PEYER:  
Cross-examined.

Then on the next page we see what the objects of this course are going to be:

"Eight week course on the Development of Sub-Conscious Art Forms from Visualisation of the Human Form".

A. Possibly, before you go on with this, this was never carried out.

MR NEILL: Never carried out, I see.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Never mind. We just want to see what was contemplated. A. It was contemplated, I might say, by Mr Oakley.

MR KEMPSTER: It was contemplated, not by The Process but by Mr Oakley. If this is going to be put against the Process it would be interesting to see how it was done.

MR NEILL: In view of what you say, it was not carried out. Was it a decision by you, or by some other members, that it was not to be carried out? A. I imagine it was a decision of Mr Eckhoff's. Certainly if it had come to my notice I would have-

Q You did not know about this? A. I did not know about this specifically. I know this did not happen.

Q We will see what the object of it was. A. I am afraid I cannot answer for the letters that people write to us.

Q Very well, if it was never carried out perhaps it is fair to leave it there. Mr Oakley did come and talk to the Process later on, did he not? A. That is possible. You will have to tell me what you are referring to.

Q Was Mr Ken McNaughton a leading member of the Process? A. Yes, fairly.

Q Had he a special name, or sacred name? A. Father Dominic.

MR KEMPSTER: Are you going to deal with the Mountaineering Association?

MR NEILL: Yes, one from the Mountaineering Association, 22 June. Then we come to 30 August 1967. You see a long letter signed "Ken McNaughton": "Dear Mr Ward" - this is a letter from Mr McNaughton to somebody called Mr Ward; I do not know who he is -

"Further to our telephone conversation this afternoon... I enclose some details of our meeting to be held next Wednesday, September 6th at 7 p.m. ... Mr Gilbert Oakley" -

he is the gentleman we have just seen a letter from -

MR C. DE PEYER:  
Cross-examined.

- "will be speaking, and the subject is 'The Kiss of the Whip'. Mr Oakley believes that all whipping is a sexual perversion and has expressed this view in a number of his books, some of which are listed at the end of this letter".

Then we see the kind of books that Mr Oakley writes under varying names at the bottom of the page. Is that a letter you have seen before? A. Yes, it is.

Q Did you attend that lecture? A. No.

Q Did you regard that as a suitable lecture to be given by a religious organisation? A. Mr Neill, you have gone through quite a large section of this book, in which there have been Mr. Simpson, Mountaineering Clubs and so on, and you happen to have picked on this particular one. We gave the opportunity to a vast number of outside speakers to speak on their subject; and, as I said earlier, Mr Oakley's interest in this other matter we disallowed. But we did allow him to give this particular lecture, yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: This particular lecture? A. Yes.

Q At the time you decided to do that, you had seen the earlier letter, had you? A. I don't recall seeing the earlier letter at all.

Q Somebody in authority? A. Yes, somebody in authority would have seen it.

Q And in spite of that he was invited to come again. Is that right? A. Yes, he was, indeed.

Q And to speak on the subject which is described as "The Kiss of the Whip"? A. That is correct.

Q To what did that refer? A. I think I cannot answer it any better than this letter can answer it. As I say, I did not attend the lecture. I imagine that if Mr Oakley believes that whipping is some kind of sexual perversion, presumably that is what the lecture was about.

Q Was there a charge for admission? A. I believe there was some kind of charge. I think it is illustrated - it looks like 5s. I am looking at an advertisement in one of the magazines and it seems to be 5s.

MR NEILL: Was that advertised? A. This particular lecture?

Q Yes. A. Yes. We had a regular handout sheet, list of lectures, and generally speaking we had them on Tuesdays and Wednesdays; and, as I say, a vast number of people from all walks of life came. The object of these lectures was to illustrate different mentalities, if you like, to all sorts of different subjects. On the front of this magazine you will see some lectures advertised.



MR C. DE PEYER:  
Cross-examined.

- Q If you turn back, you will see that on 21 August there is a letter actually from yourself? A. Yes.
- Q "Secretary". You were secretary of the Process then, were you? A. Yes, I was secretary of the company.
- Q Yes. You were writing to Dr Szanto. Is this your writing at the bottom? A. No, that is Mr McNaughten's writing.

Q He writes:

"Interview 29th August in coffee lounge. Agreed to speak October 4th and to come to 'Brainwashing' September 27th. Would like to see advance publicity for his meeting before it goes out".

So that it looks as though there was a course on Brainwashing? A. I believe there was; and so far as I remember Dr Szanto is a fairly eminent psychologist on this subject, which I think is why we contacted him.

- Q Dr Szanto's lectures, we are told on the next page, 8 September 1967, was "The Case against the Medicine Man". A. "The Case against the Medicine Man", how right you are.

Q That is right, is it not? A. That is correct.

Q Then there is one on "Sleep and Dreams" [8 September], and "Espionage - Why Spy?", 8 September letter, and so on. A. That is by the Chief Commissioner of Police.

Q A letter acknowledging receipt of your letter. That is right, is it not? A. Yes, that is correct.

Q Did anything come of that? A. I cannot remember. We would have to go through the letters. It is a long time ago.

Q Then on 14 September we have a letter from a man called Mr Noel, who says:

"You will remember that we met last night and we agreed to exchange publications".

This is to Mr McNaughten again. A. Correct.

Q "Enclosed is a copy of the last issue of 'Pentagram'" - that is a magazine dealing with witchcraft, is it not? A. As far as I know, yes.

Q Are you saying you have never read it? A. I never personally read it. I remember seeing it. Witchcraft, I am afraid, bores me stiff.

Q But of some members of the Process that is true, is it not? A. I would not say that any members of the Process are particularly interested in witchcraft. We obviously read up on the material that people sent us if they were going to give a lecture. Witchcraft is part of the subculture, and it

MR C. DE PEYER:  
Cross-examined.

is generally from the subculture that most of the violence and negativity in human life springs, and therefore a very important area to examine. And this is what we were doing in all these lectures: examining different areas of human life so that people could learn. It was a process of education. That was the purpose of it.

Q Then he says:

"My next issue will run to approximately 60 pages and will be entirely devoted to a long monograph on the psychedelic drugs and will, I am sure, be of tremendous interest to members of The Process".

A. That doesn't seem to be about witchcraft, psychedelic drugs; and since we were, at that time, operating a drug rescue operation, which you would know about if you read the book Drug Addiction, this is probably why he thinks it would interest us.

Q Then on the next page we see Dr Szanto again you mention, "The Case against the Medicine Man". Is that right? A. Yes.

"The state of present day medicine and the attitude of doctors will be presented and defended by a practising consultant physician who will have to remain anonymous. Members of the audience are invited to attack any branch of contemporary medicine".

Is that right? A. That is correct.

Q There is then a letter in handwriting. We do not want to pause over it, unless you particularly want it. It is talking about the zodiac, I think. Then there is something about the Glastonbury Giants, of great antiquity in Somerset? A. Yes.

Q Then we see [15 January] the same gentleman, Mr McNaughton? A. Yes.

Q -under his other name of Brother Dominic Luther? A. Yes.

Q He says to Mr Burland:

"We at The Process have a great interest in witchcraft and magic".

Was that a mistake by him? A. No. He personally may have that interest. I think that was in order to encourage the speaker to come; rather than any kind of statement of policy, because it certainly is not true that "we, at the Process, have a great interest in witchcraft and magic".

Q So that he was just pretending you had an interest. Is that right? A. I am suggesting an interpretation. I don't know precisely why---

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You are saying that the writer of this letter does not mean what he writes? A. I am saying either that or he is speaking solely for himself.

"We at The Process have a great interest in witchcraft and magic". It is quite unambiguous, is it not? A. It is certainly totally unambiguous, yes; but it isn't true.

MR BILL: He is writing to Mr Burland on 15 January; and the same day he writes to a Mr White:

"We at The Process have recently formed The Church of the Final Judgement, the central tenet of our belief being the Union of Christ and Satan. Our interests are wide and every Tuesday evening we run a processcene which is open to the public and at which we present unusual aspects of religion, witchcraft, magic etc."

A. Right.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Was that true? A. Is this me writing the letter, my Lord?

Q I did not ask whether it was you writing, I know it is not. I am asking whether the statement is true. A. Yes, the statement is true, and it is true in the sense that we put on, as I explained to you earlier, a large number of subjects that you might describe as subculture or areas at the fringes of the accepted culture, because these are the areas which are the most dangerous and therefore the most important areas to know about. This was our interest. If we were interested, or if Ken McNaughton was interested in witchcraft, this would be his reason for being interested. I personally am not interested in witchcraft, never have been interested in witchcraft, and find the subject extremely boring.

R NEILL: That was not - and I think you know it - the question which you were asked. The question you were asked by my Lord was: "Was the statement true?". A. I answered that question

Q "Was that statement, "At the Processcene at which we present unusual aspects of religion, witchcraft, magic etc.", true?". A. And I said Yes.

Q And is that a proper description, then, of what was presented at these Processscenes? A. It is an aspect of what was presented.

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Was there anything wrong in it, anything inaccurate about it? A. Yes, in that it presents a small aspect of the total picture. Mr McNaughton was presumably writing to somebody who was interested in this subject himself, and he would not, therefore, cover a vast area. We were interested in all aspects of human behaviour and human experience, but he would obviously stick, for reasons of brevity, to the areas which would interest the person he was writing to.

H Q And he makes an appointment in Satans Cavern? A. Correct.

MR NEILL: He, at any rate, read a bit of this journal Pentagram, because he says :

"I heard of The Regency through the journal Pentagram and would be very interested to learn more about it".

A. Quite.

Q What does Regency mean; can you help? A. I am afraid I have not the faintest idea.

Q There is some sort of note at the bottom and it is very difficult to read. I appreciate that these are not in your writing, this is Brother Dominic's, I think. A. Yes.

Q He says. He says he "Founded The Regency in 1965 from Witch Background". I do not want to pass over anything you think we ought to look at. A. I would like to say I think---

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think you had better wait for the question and try not to embark on monologues in between. A. Thank you, my Lord.

MR NEILL: Then on 4 February - it is fair you should see them all, and have a chance of commenting on them all; I am not going to miss out any you want to talk about - we have:

"We look forward to hearing you speak..." on "the subject of Tibetan Meditation and Mantras".

A. That is correct.

Q We see that:

"Terry Delamar came with Sangharakshita. He is connected with the anti-University",

and so on. Then on the next page we have Brother Dominic writing again saying:

"We at The Process have a series of weekly meetings on Tuesday evenings during which we examine closely various religions and philosophies. We have had several evenings devoted to Buddhism and we found that they created enormous interest".

Then on the next page he writes to a Mr Larkman and says:

"We at The Process have a series of weekly scenes on Tuesday evenings during which we examine unusual subjects, often associated with religion and the black arts".

What does that mean? A. The black arts - this is what you are asking me about, the black arts?

Q Yes. A. I presume areas such as witchcraft.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What date is this?

MR NEILL: It is the second letter of 14 February. A. I should point out that you are simply selecting these letters as we go through. We have practically gone through half the book now and are simply stuck with the three or four that are connected with witchcraft.

B Q No doubt you will have a chance to deal with any others. I want to take quite slowly the ones we should not miss. But is that right, that you "examine unusual subjects, often associated with religion and the black arts"? A. Indeed, it is; but not limited to religion and the black arts.

Q Then Mr Larkman replies on the next page, 17 February: "Dear" Father "Dominic Luther", he would be pleased to come. The third paragraph:

C "Gerard Noel is known to me well and will probably have told you about the extent - and nature - of my interest in The Mysteries of Mithras. I have given many illustrated talks on this - some conventional, others a bit more way out. There are, by the way, some considerable elements of the 'black arts' in this cult - called, by the"-

D "Christians", I suppose? A. I believe so.

Q -"parodies of the Devil! Possibly, my researches into the Soma and Haoma plant and its ritual uses may also be of interest to certain of your circle, if my intuition is correct. The Haoma-juice cult was, of course, central to the"-

E I suppose that is the "Mithraic Mysteries"? A. I would imagine so, yes.

Q Let us see how Mr McNaughton replies to that on the next page:

F "Dear Mr Larkman, Thank you for your letter of 17 February. We are a religious group, and are interested to hear from anyone who has something 'different' to say, particularly if it is 'way out'! The topics you mentioned - The Mysteries of Mithras, the parodies of the Devil and the Haoma-juice-cult - all sound like great material".

G Is that right? Did you accept that view of it? A. Yes. I have explained before, I think, that we were particularly interested in the fringe elements, because these demonstrated things that people needed to know about.

Q You did not see any danger at all in all this, the sort of lectures you were advertising? A. I really do not think you can find very much danger, Mr Neill, in Mithras. It was a religion of the Romans.

H Q Why this may be of interest is this, that on one interpretation, which I have suggested to you, of your advertisements there was an admonition or advice to people to join the

way of Satan. I know you do not agree with that, but that was one interpretation. That is what you were doing in your Sex magazine, were you not? A. Mr Neill, you are the only person I have ever met who has so interpreted it.

Q Let us go on quite quickly with this. On 21 March there is one devoted to Islam and the Prophet Mohammed. Is that right? A. You are ahead of me.

Q If you want to point out any other ones, you can do so. A. There is one on 11 March, where he is writing to Magnus Weschler about "religion, philosophy or discipline".

Q At any rate, we have got the other lectures. I will try to take it shortly. A. Also on 11 March, Mr Francis Huxley, whose name I am sure you are familiar with.

MR KEMPSTER: Society for Anglo-Chinese Understanding do you want?

MR NEILL: Yes. 28 April, Chairman of the Individual Anarchists of Great Britain and so on. At any rate, a large number of subjects. Then we come on to 6 May. If we have left anything particular out, you will tell me.

MR KEMPSTER: The programme for April, just after 16 April, gives a good summary.

MR NEILL: After 16 April we have the programme for April:

"Mohammad - an extension of Christ?", "Judas - Traitor or Saint? An overdue portrait by the first missionary of the Church of Judas". "The Thoughts of Mao Tse-Tung" and "The Third World Revolution in the Metropolitan Inferno". Then we can pick it up on 6 May, because this gives us a useful date about when you left Los Angeles. This letter is addressed to Mr Dick Van Dyke:

"I thought I should let you know that The Process has left the Los Angeles Chapter in Cochran Avenue, the address of which I gave you when you were in our Coffee Lounge a few weeks ago. Our work in Los Angeles finished and that group has moved onto New York".

A. I am not with you.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: This is Brother Dominic Luther writing to Mr Dick Van Dyke?

MR NEILL: Yes. It is a convenient date because we were not sure of the date he left Los Angeles. A. Yes. Mr Van Dyke had been to our services in London.

Q On the next page we have six lectures for June:

"Eclipse of God", "The Pathway to Superconsciousness", "The Magic of the Mayas", "The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse", "Interplanetary Witchcraft" by Mr Sanders, who is described as a practising Witch; and the last lecture, "The Need to Kill your Parents".

A. Of those six lectures mentioned there, only one has anything to do with witchcraft at all.

Q What is "The Magic of the Mayas" then? A. That is about the Mayan religion. As you may be aware, the Mayas had a very great, technically advanced civilisation.

Q Then Wednesday, 26 June we have another advertisement. It looks as if the lectures there may have been put off, "The need to kill your parents" lecture; and "On matters of life and death" by Air-Marshall Sir Victor Goddard; and "A history of Prophecy" by the author of "Witchcraft" again. A. Yes. She is a woman whom I actually know. She is not a witch, she is somebody who writes about extra-sensory things, and she is talking about a history of prophecy here, not about witchcraft.

Q On 18 July: "Enclosed is a list of our current Processscenes", addressed to Mr Noel, the gentleman of Pentagram. A. I am afraid my copy is not in date order. It goes from 27 June to 13 May to 14 June. Perhaps you can tell me where this is.

Q 13 May must be out of order. We go on 14 June. Then it jumps to 18 July? A. Yes. Is that the letter to Mr Yorke you are referring to?

Q No, the second letter of 18 July, to Mr Noel on the next page:

"Enclosed is a list of our current Processscenes. The first 'Scenes on our next list will be: 'Atlantis - Fact or Fiction?. Joyce Mitchell of The Atlanteans'. Then: 'Ceremonial Kabbalistic Magic',

by a gentleman called "Frater Methratten of The Hermetic Order of the Sacred Word", then he has another name in brackets. A. Yes. That presumably was about the Kabbal.

Q At any rate, there are a number of letters about that. On 9 August we have another letter to Mr Yorke, the gentleman to whom we had a short letter before, saying:

"Brother Dorian and I enjoyed talking with you very much".

A. I am sorry, I am not with you.

Q There is one to Mr Knight first, of The Helios Book Service; one to Mr Butler. A. There is one to Dr Cooper, the psychiatrist.

Q Yes, "Madness-Treatment and Mistreatment". Then we have one to Mr Butler, Mr Knight and Mr Yorke:

"Brother Dorian and I enjoyed talking with you very much. I have written to Mr Butler and Mr Knight and I will endeavour to obtain a copy of 'New Dimensions' as you suggest. We at The Process have a precise plan

for our own work but we are very interested to learn as much as possible about the world of magic in Britain".

Is that right? A. That is correct. I think that quite clearly sets out that we have our own plan; but apart from that we would be interested to learn about magic in Britain.

Q Unless there are any other particular ones you want to refer to let us finally look at a little note we had. You remember I mentioned the sale of the magazine in Soho. Would you turn to 8 October. You see there are a couple of letters of that date, very near the front of the bundle. A letter to Mr Sanders: "Thank you for agreeing to talk on Interplanetary Witchcraft". That seems to be the second of Mr Sanders' lectures, he had one in June or May. A. Wasn't it on the same subject? Possibly this was put off. I don't know.

Q The next page is to Mr Smythe: "Thank you for agreeing to speak...on witchcraft cult in England". That is Mr Smythe, 29 October. Then we have a little note: "Tuesday Processcene (Mother Lillith). You see that? A. Yes.

Q Who is Mother Lillith? A. That is Mother Hathor now.

Q Do you know whose note this is? A. I have no idea what this is at all. It looks like some kind of report.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I have not got this.

MR NEILL: I am sorry. And the members of the jury have not got this.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The last one I have is Sister Mercedes Leah, to Mr Sanders on 8 October saying "I am glad we are going to hear you talk about this intriguing subject" of Interplanetary Witchcraft. "Looking forward to meeting you".

MR NEILL (to the witness) It is the last thing in the bundle. (Same handed up). Could we look together at this. I suggested to you these were on sale in Soho, and this is where I got the suggestion from. A. They were on sale in many London streets, and I am sure Soho may have been one of them. But there is nothing special about Soho.

Q We will look together at what was written. This is what is said. Have you a copy of this now? A. Yes.

Q "Tuesday Processcene":

"Jim Haynes, of the Arts Lab. was due to speak but phoned in the day to say he may be late because of trouble with his Amsterdam trip - those who inhabited Theo's place after The Process had blessed its walls. We 'helped him out' by cancelling the Scene after discovering that only two or three people were coming, knowing that our Brethren could make more money".



MR C. DE PEYER:  
Cross-examined.

"Make more money"- what, selling - A. I am sorry, I am totally unaware of what this is, Mr Neill.

Q Then "Father Mendez" in the Cavern. Then "Selling and Donating" - this is Father Mendez again. You see that? A. Yes.

Q "Books sold: For Christ is Come 24 £15". A. If I may interrupt you there, that would be interesting. It appears to be saying there what books were sold, 24 For Christ is Come, which is a book about Christ which was written very early on by Father John, Mr Fripp you were talking to yesterday.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Was that a very good seller?  
A. Yes, it was a good seller.

MR NEILL: Let us see what he says: "Donating £485.10s.11d."  
A. Yes.

Q "Another exciting week on the streets with the bullion flowing from the unGOD pockets into ours".

"unGOD": does that mean the ungodly? A. No. I don't know precisely what that means.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It probably means everybody who has not yet joined Process, does not it? A. That could be so.

MR NEILL: "Early in the week donating Brethren set off into outlying areas of London for the day to sound them out".

The "donating Brethren" means not the people actually donating but presumably collecting donations? A. That is correct.

Q "The results were promising - look out high streets of suburbia! In the evenings, Soho with its electrifying Satanic atmosphere, is a favourite area".

It sounds as though the sellers were going round Soho in the evenings because that was a suitable place to sell your magazines. A. Selling, Mr Neill, For Christ is Come.

Q Is that the only thing they were selling? A. That is what is indicated here.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Was there a big demand for that in Soho? A. Apparently they managed to sell 24, my Lord. What better place to take a book about Christ than a place with an electrifying Satanic atmosphere?

Q You had better not embark on addresses to the jury; your Counsel will do that in due course. A. Right.

MR NEILL: My Lord, I am going to pass to something else.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Very well, we will adjourn.

(Adjourned for a short time)

B MR NEILL: Just before my Lord adjourned we were dealing with the summer of 1968. Is it right that from 1967, the time of the Sex magazine, up until you left England, these sessions, and so on, were going on - the personal sessions and the courses for groups or numbers of people; is that right? A. That is not quite correct, no. The courses were going on and continued to go on and still go on, but the individual sessions stopped either at the time, or shortly before the time, we became a church on January 1st, 1968.

Q After that you really only had the courses where there would be a number of people together? A. Yes.

C Q Is it right that in the summer of 1969 a man called Maxwell, Mr Ronald Maxwell, (who turned out also to be a journalist) came and attended a number of what we call courses at The Process? A. I believe that to be correct. I could not swear as to the date.

D Q You said I was the only person you had ever heard of who took this view about the Sex issue, but was he another person who took a poor view of the Sex issue? A. I am afraid you would have to remind me by showing me his article. I do not recall it very well.

E Q I will leave that for the moment. I just want to put to you, really, one or two things in his description of what took place to see if it is common ground between us as to what happened on these courses, because it may be we can deal with that quite quickly. He will say that at the course the person attending would have to chant words to this effect "John Grey's code is hypocrisy, mediocrity, blasphemy". A. That is quite possible. I cannot remember the exact words. Could you, perhaps, remind me which newspaper Mr Maxwell was writing for?

F Q He was writing for the "Sunday Mirror". I am not interested in the newspaper, I am interested in what happened at Balfour Place. A. It would help me to remember who he was.

Q I am not going to trouble you or the Jury with the actual article, all I am asking is if that is what was taking place at Balfour Place. A. The courses or that particular activity?

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That particular chant. A. I believe that did take place in one of the courses on certain occasions, yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "John Grey's code is" what?

H MR NEILL: "is hypocrisy, mediocrity and blasphemy". A. That was a small part of a much longer statement, that I remember, although I could not reproduce for you, I am afraid, the whole thing.

Q You mean the chant was much longer than that? A. Yes.

Q But was it all against this figure called John Grey? A. It was depicting John Grey, yes.

Q And did you sing a song, or did those who attended the course sing a song, called John Grey's body lies a mouldering in the rut? A. It is possible. As I say, I cannot remember the exact words. That is certainly possible.

Q Did these meetings, or these course, take place in Balfour Place and were they in a room lit with candles and red light? A. We had a number of meetings and courses -----

B MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Please try to avoid embarking on a lecture. You will do very much better to say "yes" or "no". A. My Lord, there were both. There were meetings at which that did occur and at which that did not occur.

C Q When they were lit with candles and red lights; is that right? A. Yes. There were certain activities, namely the midnight meditation, at which there were candles and red lights. They were actually candles in red containers.

MR NEILL: I quite understand it would not be fair to ask you to remember the exact courses at which this happened, but there were courses at which there were candles and red lights; is that right? A. Yes; as I described to you, candles in red glass containers.

D Q And on courses which Process organised were the persons who attended on occasions provided with a tin can and a spoon? A. Yes.

E Q And were those on the courses required from time to time to beat the tin can with the spoon? A. They were. The tin can and the spoon were examples merely of maracas and other similar noisy instruments.

Q And would that be accompanied by a chant "Doom, death, destruction"? A. Again, that is three words out of a much longer chant.

F Q I see. I am afraid I cannot help you further on that. You say there were other words. Can you tell us what they were? A. Well, I can tell you what the chant depicted, I cannot verbatim tell you what the words were.

C Q Well, tell us what the chant depicted. A. The chant depicted the state of this archetypal figure John Grey, who stood for the things we have outlined, mediocrity, hypocrisy and blasphemy, and it was this archetypal figure John Grey was the representative figure of the grey forces.

Q Were there questions asked about the individual's thoughts about hell? A. On occasion, yes.

H Q I mentioned earlier a girl called Miss Ventriss. She attended courses, I think, at an earlier stage. When the courses began do you remember did the courses start by those attending them having to say that they felt no enmity or hatred towards The Process or Mrs De Grimston? A. No.

You do not remember anything like that ? A. No.

What do you say was the purpose of these courses where you had to sit around and bang things and chant these songs about John Grey ? A. Well, each course had a different purpose. The ones which you are describing and asking me about were about free expression, about people getting off their inhibitions and being able to express themselves with a variety of musical instruments, of which the tin can and the spoon were about the most crude.

Q This you treated as part of religious teaching, did you ?  
A. This was practise rather than teaching. This was a kind of therapy situation.

Q With that introduction, may we now turn to another magazine. Now I appreciate that this is not one which you were responsible for because it was after you ceased to be editor but I think we ought to look at it because there is an article by you in it and you may be able to help us about one or two things in it. This is the Fear magazine we were looking at this morning. This is No.5. The last one was No.4, Swx, was it not ? A. That is right.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: How long had elapsed in between ?  
A. About two years, my Lord.

MR NEILL: Can you give a date to this ? If you cannot I will pass on. A. It would have been, I believe, early 1970 late 1969.

Q Was this produced in London or produced in Toronto ?  
A. This one was produced in London. I am sorry, I am failing to find an article by me. I cannot actually recall it, perhaps you could draw my attention to it.

Q I think on page 12. Or is that your brother ? It may be it is my mistake. A. Yes, that is my brother.

F Q On the outside cover what is represented there ? Or would you prefer I put that to Fr. Malachi ? A. I think it would probably be easier for Fr. Malachi to answer. I can say that, as far as I knew, it was primarily meant to be an interesting colour from a selling point of view. I do not think it was meant to represent, as such, anything specific.

G Q It is not intended to represent anything Christian, is it ?  
A. Not apart from The Process symbol in the centre there.

Q What is a Christian symbol, is it ? A. We believe in Christ and, therefore, it has Christian connotations, yes.

H Q But as to the rest of it, apart from that symbol, is any of it meant to be religious ? A. I do not know that you could call it exactly religious, possibly not, no. It is meant to be interesting, I think.

Q You said it was for the purpose of sale; is that right ?  
A. It is supposed to be eye-catching and interesting, yes.

- Q Inside we have got all these pictures and Fr. Malachi may be able to tell us all about that. A. I can tell you about those if you wish.
- Q These are various members of the church, are they? A. That is correct, yes. You see a picture of me, in fact, in the middle of the right-hand page with a slight red overlay giving a blessing during one of our religious services with a cross behind me. Perhaps you can see that. In the top right is a picture of my wife and my dog.
- Q And in the bottom we see all these Alsatian dogs. A. Correct.
- Q Are they all members of the church? A. They belong to members of the church.
- Q Do they all have sacred names? A. I do not know that you would describe them as sacred names. They have names which we give them. We do not make any special issue about whether they are sacred or not.
- Q Some of them have sacred names because one of them is called Satan. A. A sacred name is something that is especially bestowed in a baptism ceremony.
- Q At any rate, the three main people on the inside cover/have Alsatian dogs, one called Lucifer and one called Satan, and they were both sacred in the sense they were names of your Gods, were they not? A. Yes.
- Q All these other dogs belong to members of the ministry, do they? A. Yes, I think most of them do. In fact, there is quite a duplication there, several of the dogs appear a good deal more than once. It is a kind of montage photograph. We never at any time had that number of dogs.
- Q There is some duplication? A. Yes. I can see, for instance, my own dog is in that line up twice.
- F Q You told us this morning how the Process church was interested in animals. Is there any particular reason why you always seem to have the same kind of dog, Alsatian dogs? A. No, there is no reason, in fact we do not all have the same kind of dog. If you look on the left-hand side of the page there you will see a picture of a cat and just below that a Yorkshire Terrier, and my wife in fact has a Pekingese puppy. There are quite a number, a great many in fact, different kinds of animals: small dogs, large dogs, cats, fish.
- G Q But this great group of animals here together they are all Alsations. Am I right in that? A. That is correct. As I said, that is a montage. We never at any time had that many Alsatian dogs.
- H Q Again perhaps Fr. Malachi can tell us why he did that. Was it anything to do with fear? A. Nothing at all, no.
- Q What was the object of this issue? Or is that, again, a matter for Fr. Malachi? A. You could ask Fr. Malachi and he

could certainly explain it to you, but the object of this issue was to help people to understand what they were afraid of and to enable them to overcome that fear. Our teaching believes that fear is, in fact, one of the most dominant aspects seen in the world, that war, violence and all forms of negativity stem from fear, and, therefore, we felt it was very important to bring this out to help free people of it.

Q Look at page 7, Mr De Peyer, that Cartoon figure there. That is not intended to appeal to a man of intellect, is it ?  
A. I don't know, Mr Neill. It is intended to appeal to probably the younger generation. These are characters out of a series of comics called Marvel Comics which a very great number of young people obtain.

Q It is, in fact, an appeal to the young and the unsophisticated, is it not ?  
A. Not particularly the unsophisticated. In fact, the people who put out these comics and the people who buy them are often very sophisticated. It is a kind of almost an art form in itself in America.

Q Then we have on pages 10 and 11 -----  
A. I think on page 6, Mr Neill, you will find a very clear exposition of what we are saying.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think you can leave Mr Neill to find what he wants to find.

MR NEILL: Let us look at this. If there is anything I miss Mr Kempster will be able to ask you about it when I have finished my questions. If there is anything that needs to be looked at in the light of something else let us know. Here we have got the three great Gods of the universe again on page 10; is that right ?  
A. That is correct, yes.

Q One of the great Gods is Jehova, one is Lucifer, and this time we have Satan twice, once in his super humanity role and the other in his sub humanity role.  
A. That is correct.

Q And it lists underneath the Gods what their characteristics are ?  
A. It is the characteristics of the pattern and not so much of the Gods. I think we went through this in the writing above "For the three Gods represent three basic human patterns of reality" and this is what this is about.

Q Then on the other side we have this picture. Would it be fair to describe that as a horrifying picture ?  
A. It is meant to be a fearful picture certainly, yes.

Q Do you not see, Mr De Peyer, the possible danger of this as something which would appeal to the immature and depraved ?  
A. No; in fact, I would say there is far greater danger in not helping people to come out with this kind of thing. It is precisely because of suppression and inhibition that acts of violence occur.

Q If you release suppressions and inhibitions they may lead to acts of violence, may they not ?  
A. Not if they are released in the right circumstances, no. It is in fact fears that are so continually pushed down and suppressed that do erupt

into acts of violence. The whole purpose of this magazine and all our teaching is to bring these things out, to help people see them so they do not erupt in acts of violence.

Q We see the editor, Fr. Malachi, on page 14 as the advocate for Satan. A. That is correct, yes.

Q We will have to ask him about that because that is presumably written by him. A. I would imagine, yes.

Q After a purple bit for Jehova, a blue bit for Lucifer, a red bit for Malachi and a grey bit for John Grey hypocrite, we have the little box on page 15: "Where do you belong? Do you follow JEHOVAH; accepting your fear, but pressing onwards with faith and courage to rise above the sense of failure and dissatisfaction that surrounds you? Or do you answer to LUCIFER; separating yourself from the ways of the world, using your love of life and beauty, together with an underlying optimism", and so on. "Or is SATAN your master, calling upon you to defy your fear, to plunge in where you are most afraid and discover that after all you are invulnerable? Or do you feel trapped in the Way of the Grey; compelled by force of circumstances to hide your fear? Do you feel so inhibited by the world around you that you dare not even acknowledge your fear? Think again. Each one of us has a choice. Which is more worthwhile; being yourself as you really are, or the preservation of a joyless image? Christ the Emissary is there to guide you". Does that not suggest, Mr de Peyer, that you have a choice between either being yourself - that is belonging to one of the three groups - or remaining trapped in the Way of the Grey? A. No. Would you like me to explain?

Q Yes. A. The point of this, as I explained in reference to the Sex magazine, is that these are patterns and the introduction to this section on page 10 quite clearly states that. The object is not to behave in the manner described, but to see these patterns as they relate to you or to anybody else who is reading this magazine. The point at the bottom on both sides of page 15 "Christ the Emissary is there to guide you", etc., is because we believe that Christ can take people out of conflicts, and the conflict is described in the previous pages. It is not an instruction or any other kind of implementation to say that somebody should belong to one of these patterns; quite the contrary, we are saying these patterns exist and that Christ is the way to get out of them.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Christ is really introduced into this issue, broadly speaking, or at least emphasised, for the first time. Is that not right? A. My Lord, Mr Fripp wrote a book called "Christ has come" which was published very early on.

Q I am sure he did, I am not asking about that. Christ is emphasised in this periodical for the first time, is he not? A. That is what I was trying to answer, my Lord. We had this book out which laid out quite specifically our thoughts on Christ at a very much earlier date.

Q I daresay you did, but as far as your periodical literature is concerned, Christ emphasised and appears for the first time?

A. As far as the periodical is concerned, that is true, my Lord.

Was that because the emphasis was on Sex and Fear, and so on ?  
A. In no way, my Lord. We had, as I described to you, this book "Christ has Come "setting out how we felt about Christ.

MR NEILL: But as far as the colourful magazine is concerned - that is the one with the appeal to a number of young people ---  
A. And older people.

Q Young people because of the sales impact of the cover. To those people this is the first of the magazines where this emphasis is placed on Christ ? A. I think that is true. You would have to show me for sure in 1, 2 and 3. We have examined 4 so I am not questioning that, but whether in 1, 2 or 3 there is no mention of Christ, I am not sure that is true.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I did not say no mention.  
A. I am sorry, my Lord, I was answering Mr Neill. For instance, Process 3 has Jehovah, Christ and Lucifer, a big advertisement for them.

MR NEILL: I am not saying they are not mentioned, but this emphasis comes for the first time at the beginning of 1970, does it not ? A. You mean simply referring to the magazines?

Q Yes. A. Yes.

Q They are not your words, but I suggest the words "Each one of us has a choice. Which is more worthwhile; being yourself as you really are, or the preservation of a joyless image?" are really suggesting a choice between being what you are - that is, either a follower of Jehovah, or a follower of Lucifer or a follower of Satan - that is the one choice, or the other side is to be a follow of the Way of the Grey. A. I am sorry, Mr Neill, this is just not what we were putting out and it is not what it says here, and the introduction on page 10 makes that perfectly clear. We are talking about patterns of behaviour, patterns of reality.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Mr Neill, the Jury will be able, if they want to, to read all this matter for themselves and I do not think rehearsing these various passages and saying what they mean is likely to help very much. The meaning of them is to be extracted - if extracted at all - by the Jury from the words used and the gloss that may be wished to place upon them I would not have thought carried the matter much further.

MR NEILL: I put this to you because I thought it would be right to give you a chance of expressing a view because I shall be making suggestions to the Jury later on. There are two other things I just want to look at, quite shortly, in this magazine - which, again, I appreciate is not yours. Can you help at all about the article which appears on page 23 ? That is the red one which is opposite the article by Fr. John. A. I have the one, yes.



That shows what I suppose is a vulture or some bird of prey over the words "Satan rides again with the Hells Angels".  
A. Yes.

Can you held as to how that article came to be in a religious magazine ? A. We were endeavouring to show the spread of Satanism through the instrument of the Hells Angels. This is not actually an article, if you look at it closely, it is a series of quotes, mainly from books. There are quite a number of quotes by a gentleman called Hunter St. Thompson, who is a very well-known author in America.

Q You have read that book, have you ? A. Some time ago, yes.

Q It is on the Hells Angels, and that was a motorcycle gang in California ? A. The Hells Angels, Mr Neill, are a generic term for all sorts of groups. They are not restricted to one group, there are Hells Angels in this country also.

Q But was there not a gang of motorcyclists in California called the Hells Angels ? A. Not that I know of. I think there were probably quite a number of gangs and they probably each had quite a separate name.

Q Here you are saying that the purpose of this, as I followed your answer a moment ago, was to show the spread of Satanism across the world ? A. Yes.

Q Does that mean Satanist members of The Process church ? A. No.

Q What does it mean ? A. It means people who can possibly follow the sub humanity level of the Satanic pattern as described earlier in this magazine.

Q Are you telling my Lord and the Jury that the word "Satanist" on that page has a different meaning from wherever else we find it in your magazine ? A. No.

Q It has the same meaning ? A. Yes.

Q So when we saw Caleb Ashburton-Dunning was a Satanist, that was the same meaning as we have here ? A. I would point out to you again page 10, where you will see Satan sub humanity and Satan super humanity, and what is illustrated by this page on bikers is an example of Satan's sub humanity.

Q You are not seriously suggesting, are you, that the description of Mr Ashburton-Dunning in the Sex issue was a description of a super humanity person ? A. No.

Q Then what was the purpose of that answer ? A. Of which answer?

Q Are you saying that there is a difference in meaning between the word Satanist where it appears on this page and the word Satanist as it appears on the inside cover of the Sex magazine ? A. No, I am not saying there is any difference. I am pointing out to you that on page 10 we quite clearly delineate two aspects of Satan. Now without going back to the

six issue - which I can do - as I remember it, the description of Mr Ashburton-Dunning contained elements of both. And I would point out again that this is a compulsive pattern of behaviour, it is not something that we advocate.

But surely anyone reading this would think that it was glorifying the Satanist depicted here as one of your groups, would they not ? A. Nobody ever has, Mr Neill.

Q Have you yourself been to California ? A. No.

Q You have never been there ? A. Never been there.

Q It is no good asking you about Mr Wild ? A. No good at all; I have only heard about him through my colleagues.

C Q Fr. Malachi, of course, has been there and he can tell us more about this article and how it came to be written ?

A. I think he would be able to. He will certainly be able to tell you from his experience. I do not believe at this date that Fr. Malachi had been to California, I believe Fr. Malachi was in California for a short time only, a period of perhaps a couple of weeks, and that that was I think in 1971 or 1972.

D Q I am rather anxious to know who it was who got all these quotations. Do you think Fr. Malachi would know more about this ? A. They are mainly from books, Mr Neill, that are published.

Q Is the Gypsy Jokers a gang you have ever heard of ? A. Not apart from in Mr Sanders' book.

E Q So that is not something I can ask you about. I have got in my hand now the book by Hunter S. Thompson which is referred to in this magazine, I think, called "Hells Angels, California". That is the book, is it, that you have read ? A. It may be. It is not in that edition that I read it and it is probably seven or eight years ago that I read it, so I cannot recall it and I am not sure I ever read it cover to cover. I was aware of it and dipped into it.

F Q You do not recollect references in there to particular gangs ? A. No. I recollect that there were references, but not what the names of the gangs were.

G Q Then finally on this issue let us just look at another game. Is this a game you played ? It is a game called Fobia and it is on pages 30 and 31. A. This is not a game that I personally have played. I have seen all the games in the magazines being played at one time or another.

Q Being played, presumably, at Process House ? A. Yes.

H Q Is this a game intended to have a religious significance ? A. It was meant, besides having in some respects a certain humorous aspect to it, it was also intended to enlighten.

Then we have an advertisement on page 35 for this book "The Ultimate Sin". That, I think, is the one about vivisection, is it not? A. That is correct.

Q Had you anything to do with the writing of that book?

A. Nothing to do with the writing of it. I was, I believe, in London when it was produced.

Q And did you read it before it was sent out? A. Yes.

Q This is one of the last of these books I am going to have to look at, but I just want to ask you about it: did you think that was a suitable thing to put out on public sale?

A. Definitely.

Q Perhaps we had better just look at that. That is this book, "The Ultimate Sin". A. Mr Neill, would it be possible, before we leave the last magazine, to say something about that?

Q I am going to come back to it.

D MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You really must allow Counsel to conduct his own cross-examination. You have got a member of the Bar there who can re-examine you. You are not here to make speeches. A. I am sorry, my Lord.

E MR NEILL: I have got one or two more questions about it and we will come back to that. Let us have a look at "The Ultimate Sin" because this is something that has been advertised, again with a horrifying picture, in your Fear magazine. A. That is correct, yes. Perhaps I can have another copy as this one seems to have an upside down page?

Q This was something produced in May, 1968, in London; is that right? A. That is correct.

Q I do not think you will disagree with this: this was designed to shock, was it not? A. That is correct.

F Q It contains, again, pictures which I expect again you would agree are horrifying pictures? A. Yes, I do agree.

Q You set out descriptions of various kinds of treatment of animals, but what I want to ask you about and ask you if you can help as to how it got into this magazine is something which is on page 20.

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The page which starts "That which continues to live in a world ruled by hatred"?

H MR NEILL: Yes, my Lord. "Animals are GOD", it goes on. Let us see how this came to be there, the bottom paragraph but one: "Have you heard a man describe what he would do to the person he hated most in the world?" Again I do not propose to read this out if you would very kindly read the next paragraph and then read the following page". (The witness did so) It starts off "Have you heard a man describe what he would do to the person he hated most in the world?" Is that something

that you had heard someone describe ? A. No, that is imagination.

It is a diseased imagination, is it not ? A. No. What this book is about is the torture of animals and in order to bring this home, when the torture of animals is possibly not very real to people, the torture of a human being is depicted in the hope of making torture per se more real to people. You do not have to read very many books in the library to find something like this.

Q You see, you have had your pictures, you have had descriptions all about what happens to animals, according to your account, and then you add this --- A. Not our account, Mr Neill, this is quotes from a large number of medical personnel.

Q If you please, the quotations which you give are of various things which happened to animals, and then the writer of it adds this bit on pages 21 and 20. Is that not the product of a diseased imagination ? A. You asked me that before and the answer is most definitely not. The purpose of it is to hope that this senseless torture of animals would be stopped, and you call that a diseased imagination. I am sorry.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: One consequence of printing all that was that some literature which some people would regard as sadistic was sold, was it not ? A. No, my Lord, certainly not.

Q It was sold, was it not ? A. This book ?

Q Yes. A. This is not sadistic literature, by no means.

Q How would you describe it ? A. I would describe it as a very strong case against vivisection, which is what it was intended to be and that is indeed what it is.

MR NEILL: Now we will come back to the Fear issue. You wanted to say something and I do not want to stop you. What did you want to say about the Fear issue before I ask my last question about it ? A. Well, there are a variety of pages in the magazine, first of all on page 15, which quotes from Revelations and which is a very good description of what we call the Grey Forces: "I know they work, that thou art neither cold nor hot. I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth", and so on. That is from Revelations. There is another quote from Revelations on the following page - I will not read it all - and it is about Christ coming again. It is Revelations Chapter VI verses 15-17 at the bottom. On pages 18 and 19 there is a very carefully researched - and Mr Fripp in fact did most of this research - article on the state of the world; the increase in population, soil erosion, air pollution, water pollution, food poisoning, disease, etc, all statistics taken from scientific institutions showing the increase of these things in the world. Then on pages 26 and 27 there is an article - and this was written at the end of 1968 beginning of 1969 and circulated amongst the internal members of The Process and then put into print in this magazine, and

MR C. DE PEYER

Cross-examined:

this very, very clearly describes Satan, his function, what we mean by humanity, and what will happen to humanbeings at the end. If you want a clear exposition of what we are talking about you won't find a clearer one than that.

What is that in the middle there ? A. That is meant to be a serpent, which as you probably know is Satanic. When Satan came in the garden he came in the form of a serpent. Finally, on page 36 there is a letter in response to the Sex magazine - in fact there are a number of letters in this issue in response to the Sex magazine - and I simply draw your attention to them because they in no way bear out the interpretations that have been put upon them.

(continued on next page)

Some of these people were disagreeing with what Mr Maxwell thought about it, were they not? A. Yes, that is that particular letter, but that person has understood the purpose of the magazine very well indeed.

Q On page 34 we have someone at the top saying that he found Process Four one of the best mags he had ever read. A. Yes.

Q I won't make any comment on that. Let me finally look at the back cover and ask your help about that. Was that to increase sales or was that to teach a religious message? A. Neither.

Q What was the purpose of that? A. The purpose of that was to advertise the next issue of the magazine.

Q Would it be unfair to describe that picture as revolting? A. I think it would be unfair, yes.

Q How would you describe it? A. I would describe it as a very good illustration of death. As it so happens, that particular skull I believe is from a museum. It is a very famous skull. I cannot place it exactly for you, but it is made out of a stone; it is not an actual skull. It is a work of art.

Q Finally, the issue on Death I understand is something you had nothing to do with, and again perhaps I will reserve that for Father Malachi. A. I had nothing directly to do with it, Mr Neill, no.

Q That I think was not produced in London, and perhaps it is right not to ask you about that. A. It was produced in Toronto. My wife had an article in it. That is about the closest I came to it.

Re-examined by Mr KEMPSTER

Q Mr De Peyer, have you a copy of the book which in fact this action is all about in front of you, called "The Family"? A. No, I don't.

Q Perhaps you could be provided with it. (Book handed to witness). Would you turn to page 90? Do you there see another reference to your brother? A. Yes, at the top.

Q "Meanwhile the DeGrimstons were in Los Angeles where they located a real estate operator named Aarons with offices on Robertson Boulevard who showed sympathy for the group. Father Christian also known as Jonathan dePeyer claims that it was John Phillips ...." That is your brother, is it not? A. That is my brother, yes.

Q Turning back just for a moment to the earlier issues of Process magazine and the references to the Gods recruiting for their several armies with a view to the end, could a member of the Process join - I presume this would be some sort of mental exercise - all four armies, or all three armies? A. No, somebody who basically wished to join the Process because they wanted to overcome or transcend the patterns of behaviour described as God patterns.

Can a member of the Process describe himself or herself as an adherent or follower or recruit of Satan or Lucifer or Jehovah exclusively? A. Absolutely not.

Now just a question on the Sex issue. You told my learned friend when you were being asked about its possible unhappy influence - I think you used the expression you had evidence to the contrary? A. Yes.

Q Could you tell the Members of the Jury what you meant by that answer? A. Yes. I have come across quite a number of people, because I do a lot of counselling work, who found that this was helpful to them; that they were able to transcend their own feelings, which were often negative, and, of course, the descriptions of the God patterns in that magazine were negative and were intentionally so in order to draw people's attention to that area of the human psyche, so that they could in fact transcend it. I found personally many people who found it particularly helpful, and the letters that I drew attention to are some examples of that.

Q Now the Fear issue. You referred a number of times to page 10, but I don't think the passages on page 10 have ever been read out, though the Jury may have read them on their own. Would you turn to page 10 in the Fear issue? A. Yes.

Q Would you yourself read out to us the second and third paragraphs on the left of what looks like one of the Horsemen of the Apocalypse, or something? A. Yes. That is from a Dali painting.

Q Would you read those two paragraphs? A. "For the three Gods represent three basic human patterns of reality. Within the framework of each pattern there are countless variations and permutations, widely varying grades of suppression and intensity. Yet each one represents a fundamental problem, a deeprooted driving force, a pressure of instincts and desires, terrors and revulsions. All three of them exist to some extent in everyone of us. But each of us leans more heavily towards one of them, whilst the pressures of the other two provide the presence of conflict and uncertainty".

Q Turning on to page 15, my learned friend very kindly read the left-hand column in the red pyramid, "Where do you belong?" May I read the right-hand column and then ask you whether this represents your teaching? "There is no way out, but there is a way through. There is no escape, but there is fulfillment. Knowing is the way. And knowing is not analysing or speculating or rationalising. Knowing is feeling, experiencing, seeing clearly, understanding, absorbing, expressing and going through. Knowing is living what you know; being what you are; thinking and feeling what you are afraid of allowing yourself to think and feel; saying and doing what you are afraid to say and do, but what you know must be said and done. Then you can begin to know yourself; who and what you are, your inclinations and your revulsions, your capabilities and your limitations, your strength and your weakness, your responsibilities, and your effects on others. And you can begin to know the consequences of being what you are, so that you can cease to be afraid of

them. And Christ, the Emissary, is there to guide you. He is the way through. He is freedom from conflict and release from Fear". Does that fairly express your teaching? A. It does.

MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, I have no further questions of this witness.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Good.

(The witness withdrew)

MR KEMPSTER: Normally your Lordship would expect me now to call the third Plaintiff. Normally I would wish to do so, but I have a witness who has come over to this country from Canada. Your Lordship will recall that the pleadings are not unconnected with Canada. It is possible we could get through his evidence this afternoon.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I don't mind in what order you call any of them.

MR KEMPSTER: I am obliged.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The Jury and I have got to sit here, and if we are not listening to him, we shall be listening to another.

MR KEMPSTER: That is very true, my Lord, certainly.

Reverend ARTHUR GIBSON, Sworn

Examined by Mr KEMPSTER

Q Are you the Reverend Arthur Gibson? A. Yes.

Q Mr Gibson, is your address - I don't know whether you live there - St. Michael's College in the University of Toronto?  
A. That is my address and I live there.

Q Are you a Priest of the Roman Catholic Church? A. I am.

Q Do you currently hold the post of Chairman of Religious Studies at the University I have just mentioned? A. That is correct.

Q With how many young men and women are you concerned and would you tend to come in contact, either by lecture or by other means?  
A. By lecture and in my capacity as Chairman of this Department, I should say with about 1,200 to 1,300 each year.

Q Have you held or do you hold some appointment related to the Vatican? A. Yes. I did until a year ago. I was a Consulter of the New Vatican Secretariat for the Non-Believers, a secretariat founded after Vatican II for pursuing dialogue with non-believers; but my term of office there concluded a year ago.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I have to confess I have not got that all in a note; but never mind.

MR KEMPSTER: I think if your Lordship were to say he has held special responsibility in connection with non-believers, that would suffice.



- Q When were you ordained, Mr Gibson? A. On August 24th, 1963.
- Q At the time of your training for the priesthood, was it with a view to ministry in any particular country? A. My seminary training in Rome for seven years was at the Pontifical Russian Seminary, which at that time was training priests for work in the Soviet Union.
- Q For how long have you held the post you described in Toronto? A. I have been Chairman of the Religious Studies Department at St. Michael's College for 4 $\frac{3}{4}$  years.
- B Q Have you ever come across a religious organisation called the Process-Church of the Final Judgement? A. Yes.
- Q In what circumstances did your paths cross? A. In February 1972 I was telephoned by a Canadian Broadcasting Corporation interviewer, who asked me if I would appear that same afternoon on an interview programme together with a Satanist.
- C MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did you? A. I did.
- Q "In February 1972 I gave a television interview with a Satanist"; right? A. With one who was described to me as a Satanist, my Lord.
- D MR KEMPSTER: Was the person whom you met in fact what you describe as a Satanist? A. No.
- Q Who was the person whom you met in the course of this interview? A. Father Malachi.
- Q Was that Mr Peter McCormick? A. I cannot say for certain any other name of his except Father Malachi. That is how I have always known him.
- F Q I think you can assume it is. Having met Father Malachi - we will call him that for the moment - did that lead to any further contact between you and the Process Church? A. Yes.
- Q Looking at the matter from today's date, for how many years have you been in touch with the Process Church Chapter in Toronto and with its work? A. Just over two years, and very frequently.
- Q Have you met Mr Christopher Alfred Fripp? A. Yes.
- Q You might know him as Father John. A. I do.
- G Q Father Lucius, the last witness, Mr De Peyer? A. Yes.
- Q Mother Cassandra, the fourth Plaintiff, Miss Wendy Ann Peach? A. Yes.
- H Q We may have to embark on the vexed problem of belief and publications. Can you briefly tell the Jury what the Process Chapter in Toronto does? A. Yes. There is a headquarters at 99 Gloucester Street, which holds assemblies - that is, worship services - every Saturday evening, has attached to it a drop-in centre, that is to say -----

Q JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is that a place where the destitute go? A. Not necessarily the destitute, my Lord, but young people who want to drop in for a little while. It is a sort of cafe.

Q A cafe? A. Yes. They can get coffee.

Q A social affair? A. Yes. Also, there is a very considerable sidewalk apostolate.

MR KEMPSTER: Could that be interpreted as street ministry?  
A. Street ministry, yes.

MR KEMPSTER: Does that convey anything to your Lordship?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Absolutely nothing.

MR KEMPSTER: I don't want to lead the witness. Some of us might understand what he means.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: At the moment it conveys a sort of concept of "Stop me and buy one". Is that right?

MR KEMPSTER: That may well be right, my Lord. That may be one of the aspects of evangelism we shall hear about.

A. I will try very briefly to describe it. Members of the Process Church in Toronto are present on the two main thoroughfares -- Young Street and Bloor Street -- speaking to passersby and offering them various literature such as these Process magazines. That is what I meant by sidewalk apostolate.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I see. Street vending, in other words? A. Plus street speaking, I suppose. In many cases they make no sale. Moreover, I am aware of a considerable amount of work being done by that chapter with the aged, particularly the aged shut-ins, who have few relatives or few who care about them; and also in mental hospitals.

MR KEMPSTER: For your Lordship's note, I would apprehend "Care for the aged and the mentally sick".

Q Is there any problem of drug addiction in Toronto, or is Canada spared that? A. At the moment it is, I believe, very rare, but four or five years ago, even three years ago, it was a major problem, particularly in Toronto.

Q Do you know whether the Process expressed in action any concern for this matter? A. I have heard it expressed.

Q Do you know anything personally about that? A. It was expressed in my presence.

Q By whom? Do you know what they did of your own knowledge? I don't want too much hearsay. A. To my own knowledge, no.

Q Would I be right in thinking that as a priest, you have an understanding of the word "vocation"? A. I hope so.

Q Again without a lengthy discourse, can you explain to the Jury

what you understand by that word? A. I understand by that word a call from God to some specific activity, and a call that comes through certain signs, not necessarily, indeed very rarely, miraculous signs, but signs that an intelligent person can interpret.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: And now and again does an intelligent person make a mistake about the signs? A. Yes.

MR KEMPSTER: From the contact you have had, not only with the individual Plaintiffs in this action but other ministers of the Process in Toronto, have you anything to say about them in the context of your definition of vocation?

A. I believe, from my reading of their literature and from my personal acquaintance with several of them, that the Process Church as a group received such a vocation, received certain signs of it, and spent several years wrestling with an interpretation of those signs. I believe they have now and had arrived at the moment I met those in Toronto a very clear understanding of the vocation, and I believe that it is for that reason that their words and publications have become much more measured than perhaps some of them were at the outset in the initial years.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Would I be unfair in summarising that by saying that during your knowledge of them, they have toned down a bit? A. Not toned down, my Lord. I would prefer to say matured.

MR KEMPSTER: I think I can take this generally. Have you been in Court for a little while? A. Yes.

Q Were you in Court yesterday? A. Yes.

Q And this morning? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We are not going through Fear and Sex again, are we?

MR KEMPSTER: I doubt it, my Lord, but I am going to ask a question about those publications. Does your Lordship wish to stop me?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I cannot, can I?

MR KEMPSTER: No.

Q Father, have you yourself read the various Process publications that have been referred to? A. Yes.

Q With then the background of work with young people that you have described, do you think that those publications, or even one of them perhaps if you took one in isolation, would tend to influence a reader, any sort of reader you can imagine, to behave in the way described? A. I am sorry; I don't quite understand what you mean by "the way described". In the books?

Q In the books. A. I do not believe that any of the publications would cause any person of any age to embark on that sort

of behaviour. If there was a predisposition and a previous record, I believe such reading might stimulate to further such activity.

C It is not for me to choose, but one of the most unpleasant passages we have had read to us and we have read appears in the Sex issue on page 15. Is that sort of explicitness unusually pornographic in the context of the material available in Toronto or elsewhere in America, to your knowledge? Is it the most pornographic thing you have ever read?  
A. By no means.

Q Do you know North America as a whole? A. Yes, indeed.

Is pornography freely available throughout North America?  
A. Throughout North America, yes, very definitely.

C Again, having regard to the Process literature which you have read and the Process members you have met, does the teaching of the Process, as you see it, tend to produce harmful results in human behaviour? A. Absolutely not. Quite the contrary.

Q You have been working for some time in North America. I wondered if I could ask you if you understand one or two expressions which have been used by an author called Ed Sanders in a book called "The Family". Have you read this book, by the way? A. Only very brief portions of it.

Q Did you read any portions referring to the Process? A. Yes.

Q If I asked you what was meant by the word "input", you would probably be able to say, wouldn't you? A. Yes.

E Q Do you know an English word "sleazy"? A. Yes.

Q What does that mean? A. Tawdry or shoddy, I would say.

Q How do you understand the expression "sleazo input"?  
A. I am not sure that I understand it, but I would interpret it as meaning influences from outside which were themselves shoddy and tawdry, and would produce bad output.

I MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I thought everybody was agreed with your definition from days and days ago, that it was a malign influence.

MR KEMPSTER: I am very happy to learn that, my Lord. I thought your Lordship at least still had some difficulty in accepting this jargon.

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: No. I accepted your definition of that, and I thought everybody else did.

MR KEMPSTER: I am obliged. We will move on. I hope I am not wasting time. I am referring, my Lord, to page 31 of the Amended Statement of Claim. If all these are accepted -----

H MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That I don't know. You had better go through them.

- A MR KEMPSTER: If I may remind the Members of the Jury, this is the bundle called "Pleadings". It was, I think, one of the first documents I referred to, alas some days ago now, including the Amended Statement of Claim, where we set out the words complained of and the Defence.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What is the next word you want to deal with?
- B MR KEMPSTER "Sado-sodo sex magic". That is page 31.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: This is the glossary at the end.
- MR KEMPSTER: That is it; or, in pleader's jargon, these are the special understanding that a reader ----
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The interpretation clause.
- C MR KEMPSTER: Yes.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It "means magic which involves sadistic and sodomite sexual rituals".
- MR KEMPSTER: Would you agree with that? A. Yes.
- D Q What do you understand by the word "bikers"? A. I would understand a motor cycle gang.
- Q Do you know anything about motor cycle gangs in North America? A. Not from personal acquaintance.
- Q Do you understand the word "rip-off"? A. Oh, yes. It is a very frequent occurrence in our Canadian House of Commons these days.
- F Q A rip-off? A. Yes.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It says here "stealing or theft". Do you mean that? You are not confusing one House with another, are you? A. I am sorry, my Lord; I meant it as a term very frequently used in our House of Commons. Yes. In Canada it certainly has connotations, too, of a large-scale theft, and particularly by financial or commercial interests rather than by an individual; by a group, that is.
- MR KEMPSTER: Are you familiar with a verb in what here would be a sort of sub-culture, "zap"? A. Oh, yes.
- G Q What does that mean? A. Straight down, hit violently, so that they pass out.
- Q "Goons"? A. Goons I believe are first-cousins to zombies. They are creatures entirely or almost entirely under the control of another, but I believe that goons are usually held to inflict violence under the influence of the person who has them in his control.
- H Q Another expression "gang-bang". A. I believe that is a sort of relay rape.

That is enough of that. "Bunch-punching"? A. I am not familiar with it, but I guess it is the same thing.

MR KEMPSTER: I don't think we need worry too much, my Lord, about Mr Crowley's magic number.

Q With that knowledge, is it right that you read certain references to the Process in "The Family", in this book?  
A. Yes.

Q What did you think that Mr Ed Sanders - and if you can summarise your answer, I am sure we would be grateful - was saying about the Process Church and its members? A. That they were one of the three major influences that -----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Wait a moment.

MR NEILL: My Lord, he has pleaded here an innuendo. I suppose, in so far as the innuendoes are supported by particulars, he would be entitled to call evidence about it. I don't know which particular meaning he is going to deal with at the moment. He is obviously not entitled to deal with it generally.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is what I had in mind.

MR NEILL: I am grateful to your Lordship. In so far as these particular words are concerned -----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The words are in a quite different compartment. He is certainly entitled to define words which have a specialised meaning to a special section of society, which might not be generally understood. In the case of an innuendo - isn't this right - if the innuendo is to be understood in a particular way by some identifiable section of society, a member of that identifiable section would be entitled to come and say it was so understood.

MR NEILL: Indeed, my Lord, yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Isn't that the limit of the admissibility of evidence of this sort?

MR NEILL: It is, my Lord. If this is simply limited to - and I rather anticipated it was - what is the meaning of "sleazo input", and that may be what my learned friend is seeking to get, then I -----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We have had "sleazo input".

MR NEILL: What it meant in that context. I was waiting to see if my learned friend went further than that. If he is only going to say that, I don't think I can object to that. If he goes further than that, I think I would certainly object.

MR KEMPSTER: Would you turn to page 69 of "The Family"? I want to read from the third paragraph. "But what was it that caused Manson's death-trip? The factors that seem to have fed the violent freak-out shall be termed here sleazo inputs.

"Gazing about Los Angeles, it is possible to discern at least three death-trip groups that must have provided powerful sleazo inputs into Manson and the family. It is significant that there exists in Los Angeles occult groups that specialize in creating zombi-like followers. These are groups that have degrees of trust and discipleship, that use pain and fear and certain drugs to promote instant obedience.

"These three groups are:

B "1. The Process Church of the Final Judgment, an English organization dedicated to gore, weirdness and End of the World slaughter. The Process, as they are known, was active in Los Angeles in 1968, when Manson abandoned flowers, and in the summer of 1969 - when murder reigned".

C Pausing there, what did you understand there that Mr Ed Sanders was saying about the Process and its members?

A. I understood him to be saying that this group was one of the influences that had prompted Manson to his activities.

D  
  
E  
  
F  
  
G  
  
H  
  
(Continued on next page)

Cross-examined by MR NEILL

- Q Mr Gibson, let me understand what you are saying. Before you came to this court had you seen any of the Process magazines? A. Yes.
- Q Had you seen them all? A. No.
- Q Had you seen the issues with which we have been particularly concerned: that is, the issues on Mindbending, Sex and Fear? A. I had seen the issue on Fear, I had not seen the other two.
- Q When you saw the issue on Sex, was it for the first time when you came to this court? A. Yes.
- Q Would you allow that issue on Sex to be on sale in the porch of your church? A. Would I personally? Yes.
- Q Do you really mean that? A. Yes.
- Q I suppose it follows from that that you would have no hesitation about allowing the other issues of the magazine I have referred to, that is, Mindbending and Fear, to be on sale in the porch of your church? A. I would have most reservations about the issue on Mindbending; but may I explain the reason? And may I also explain why I personally would have no objection or no reservation about it being on sale in the porch of my church. I would have reservation about the issue on Mindbending because I believe that there it is most important that the contents of that particular issue of the magazine be interpreted instantly, be seen in context, be read in context. And even then it seems to me that these are not of as immediate interest to the general public as are the contents of the issues on Sex and Fear. The reasons why I would have no objection personally to their being on sale is that I would supervise the sale.
- Q Does that mean you would only sell them to persons to whom you gave the benefit of your advice? A. That is correct.
- Q Does it follow from that that you would not allow them to be on general sale in your church? A. Absolutely.
- Q Does that apply to the Sex issue or to all three issues we have looked at? A. If I understand the question exactly and correctly, then it applies to all Process publications.
- Q All. What you are telling us, if I understand it, is that none of the Process publications are suitable to be on sale to the public unless they are accompanied by advice and guidance. Is that right? A. Mr Neill, I would prefer to say I personally would not be a party to putting them on sale. I did not intend to say I absolutely believe them not suitable to be on sale, but I think it infinitely preferable that all literature of this sort be disseminated on a personal encounter basis.



Q And that would be, if I follow what you are saying, because if it was not accompanied by explanations and advice it could lead to dangerous or unpleasant results. Is that right?  
A. In a tiny, very, very tiny percentage of all possible cases, yes; but as a priest and pastor of souls I would have to be concerned even about one-tenth of 1%.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: But you are not relying just on the smallness of the fraction, are you? A. Yes.

Q Are you saying that the dissemination of pornography is really innocuous because it is not likely, generally, to be translated into conduct? A. My Lord, to my knowledge I have at no time in my testimony qualified this publication as "pornography".

Q No, other people have. A. I do not agree with them.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You do not.

MR KEMPSTER: Forgive me, your Lordship's question, "Other people have", what other people is your Lordship basing that question on?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am not here to answer questions. It has been referred to as pornography certainly by Mr Neill, and I thought by you. Am I wrong?

MR NEILL: "Filth" was the word.

MR KEMPSTER: Certainly I accept that.

MR NEILL: Mr Fripp accepted it.

MR KEMPSTER: Mr Fripp accepted it.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Mr Fripp accepted it as filth.

MR NEILL: Yes. A shorter word.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Since then there has been a reference to it as "pornography" by someone.

MR NEILL: It may have been me.

Q May I put the question again: Is the reason why you would not yourself be party to the sale of any of this literature without guidance and advice because it might have either dangerous or unfortunate effects on some readers?  
A. On a very few. That is part of the reason. Another part of the reason is that it would fail of its purpose. I believe in many cases it would fail of its purpose entirely. It would make no impression at all, except one of bewilderment.

Q I can quite follow that, the point about bewilderment, but I would like to explore a little more the first category: it may be a small fraction, but there would be a number of people on whom this would have a dangerous effect. Do you agree with that? A. Yes.

Q And that would apply to much, if not all, of this literature which was on public sale by Process? A. Excuse me, Sir. I said there were two reasons: first, because of the possible dangerous effect on a microscopic percentage of possible buyers, and secondly it would fail of its purpose. That I think would apply to all, that second reason. The first would not by any means apply to all.

Q It would certainly apply to the three magazines we have been looking at? A. In my judgment?

Q Yes. A. Yes.

Q Yes? A. Yes.

Q And (I think you were in court yesterday, I am anxious not to go back to them) it would apply, would it not, to the booklets which I was going through with the witnesses yesterday, Gods on War, Gods and their People and Today the Ultimate Sin? A. No, Sir, not in my judgment.

Q It would not? A. No. The second reason would apply to those.

Q You do not think those, wallowing (as I would put it) in the description of war, would have a bad effect on a mind which was already susceptible to that kind of thing? A. I have read these repeatedly and with care, and I can only say that in my personal judgment the three separate volumes, Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan respectively, on War would leave the average, and particularly the average young reader completely bewildered, would not be interpreted as a stimulus to action but would be interpreted as simply weird writing.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Were you able to extract any meaning from them yourself? A. Certainly.

Q You were? A. Yes, of course, because I was already familiar with the teaching of the Process; even though I had not read some of their basic publications I had heard the same thing by word of mouth and I had a context in which to put it.

MR NEILL: You are talking now about the average young reader. You were talking about the form. What I want you to concentrate on, Mr Gibson, is not the average young reader but those who are disturbed or depraved or for some reason or another have some inclination towards violence. Let us concentrate on those; do not let us worry about the size of the group, but on those do you accept that these publications, Gods on War, Gods and their People and this Ultimate Sin publication could have a dangerous effect? A. Those publications, no, I do not agree that they could have a dangerous effect. I think they would simply bewilder.

Q But so far as the Process magazines we have referred to, you agree that could be so? A. Could be. That is a credential judgment - could be.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: A what judgment? A. Credential judgment.

Re-examined by MR KEMPSTER

- Q Taking now, if you will, in mind what you have described as this microscopic tenth of a percent that might adversely be affected by some of the Process magazines, do readers of the Bible always react to its passages correctly or helpfully, particularly if their minds are disturbed? A. I am sorry, could you rephrase that?
- Q Is the Bible always a helpful influence, even on people within this category of the microscopic tenth of 1% who, I understand, are predisposed to some sort of unfortunate behaviour? A. I have considerable evidence that it is a very harmful and dangerous influence.
- Q The Bible? A. Yes. May I add, particularly if read or published or purveyed selectively, excising simply certain sections and tearing them out of context.
- Q In the Sex issue you will have noticed that particular attention has been paid to one particular page, one particular contribution? A. Yes.
- Q Is the possible harmful effect of that, if any, on this small constituency in any way enhanced or diminished by the context in which it appears? A. By which you mean the context of the whole magazine, that whole issue?
- Q Yes. A. I would say considerably diminished.

MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, I have no further questions of this witness. May this witness be released to go back to Canada?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Certainly, yes. Thank you.

(The witness withdrew) (Released)

MR KEMPSTER: I will call Miss Peach.

MRS WENDY ANN COALE (MISS WENDY ANN PEACH), Sworn,  
Examined by MR BOWSER

- Q Although I called you Miss Peach, is your full name now Wendy Ann Coale? A. That is correct.
- Q Do you live at 99 Gloster Street, Toronto, Canada? A. In fact I have moved from there to New York.
- Q What is your address there? A. 242, East Fortyninth Street.
- Q Were you formerly Wendy Ann Peach? A. Yes.
- Q And are you married now to a member of the Process Church? A. Yes, I am.
- Q You are the Fourth Plaintiff in this action? A. I am.

- Q Are you a trustee of the property of the Process Church in this country? A. I am.
- Q And you are a minister of the church? A. I am, yes.
- Q And you are known within the church as Mother Cassandra? A. Yes.
- Q You were educated in this country and, after leaving high school, you went to the Regent Street Polytechnic. Is that correct? A. That is correct.
- Q While at the Regent Street Polytechnic did you meet some people new members of the Process-church? A. Yes, I did.
- Q Would that be in about 1963? A. Yes, it would - possibly even earlier than that, because I had been working after the polytechnic.
- Q Can you tell us who those people were? A. Yes. I met Father Joel, who is Peter Eckhoff; Father Lucius, who is Christopher de Feyer.
- Q And through him I think you met Mr and Mrs de Grinston? A. Yes, I did. There were other people at the Polytechnic also I met who were in the group.
- Q Did Mr and Mrs de Grinston give you any advice or assistance of any sort? A. Yes. They gave me initially some very helpful advice.
- Q To what end was that advice directed? A. At that time I was a very shy, very timid person, I was very afraid of company, I didn't have many friends, I didn't find it easy making friends. I was a very miserable person. I met them in a social situation and they were asking me some simple questions about what I did and this sort of thing, and during the course of the conversation they I think got across to me that I had a problem in making contact. It sounds stupid but no one had ever talked to me like that before.
- Q Can you tell us briefly: What was the result of their advice upon you? A. The result was, the first initial thing was to feel that someone was actually interested in my problem, which is a very reassuring thing to have happened. It gave me a feeling of confidence that someone was actually interested and could possibly help me, which I had not met before.
- Q And did it help you? A. It did indeed.
- Q What was your relationship with your mother like before you met the de Grinstons? A. It was a state of complete no contact, no communication, I didn't like her and she didn't like me.
- Q And was that relationship affected by your meeting the de Grinstons? A. Yes, it was.

Q In what way? A. For a short period I didn't tell her I had met her. Then I was still not feeling friendly towards her, not feeling warm towards her. Then I began to realise that I had caused her much pain and I felt bad about this, I felt guilty about it, as one does, and I wanted to make it up to her, because this had been going on for many years since my father died. I told her in fact about Mr and Mrs de Grimston, and the other members of the group, and the sort of help they had been giving me. She in fact met Mr and Mrs de Grimston, and our relationship from that time forward has been most positive and most warm and most loving. At that time it was in fact an immense relief for me to make up to her for things I felt I had done to her.

Q Thank you. You became a member of the church, and I think travelled to many countries with members of the church? A. Yes.

Q Did you, in 1966, go to Nassau? A. I did.

Q Would that be in June? A. It was around June, yes.

Q From there, in about September, did you go to Xtul? A. Yes, went to Xtul, in Mexico.

Q Then in December of that year you came back to London? A. In December, yes. It was about a month after the main party came back to London. I stayed on to, as I remember, help the others set up, stay there for a longer period.

Q Did you stay in London until about November 1967? A. Yes. Then I went in November 1967 to New Orleans in the United States.

Q How long did you stay there? A. I was in New Orleans from November until I think the end of March of the following year, which must be 1968.

Q Where did you go to then? A. In March I went to Los Angeles, where I stayed until August of that year, when I went to New York -- no, I am getting confused.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do the lady's precise movements matter?

MR BOWSHER: What does matter is: At what times were you in California? A. I was in California from May until August 1968, I believe. Then I went to New York. Wait a moment, I am getting confused.

Q That was the only time, was not it? A. That is the only time I have been in California, yes. I have got my dates confused. I am sorry.

Q We have seen that you had some part in the production of some of these magazines. Is that right? A. Yes.

Q Were you an editorial assistant; is that the right way of describing it? A. Yes.

Q So far as actual writing is concerned, did you write any articles? A. I wrote one article in the Sex issue, which is called "And so to Eve". That is the only writing I have done. I am not a great writer I am afraid.

Q That article on page 27 of the Sex issue is headed by your photograph. I do not want to read all of it, but how would you describe that article? A. I would describe that article as a description of the Fall as in the Book of Genesis in the Bible as I interpreted it.

Q Mr Neill may wish to ask you something about that article. I will leave it now. Have you read the book The Family? A. Yes, I have.

Q What was your reaction when you read that book? A. I read it in the States. I was extremely upset. I couldn't believe that anyone could distort, lie, express such horrible things about the church and the people in it.

Q Have you read the pleadings in this action? A. Yes, I have.

Q What was your reaction on reading them? A. Complete disbelief that anyone could write such things - the pleadings are the pleadings of justification?

Q Yes. A. They seemed completely outrageous.

Q I am asked to make this clear: Have you worked in Toronto? A. Yes, I have.

Q In what period? A. Toronto: I was there for quite a long period of time. I left in January 1973. I went there in May 1971. I believe that is correct.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The church pays for all these travels, does it? A. Yes.

Q What is the biggest chapter now running? A. My Lord, there are several chapters. I do not know which the biggest is. They are all headquarters of a region in the United States.

Q How many people does the New York one employ? A. Employ? We do not employ people.

Q How many people work in it? A. At this current moment I do not know. Probably about 20.

Cross-examined by MR NEILL

Q You say you are a trustee of the London church. I do not think we have had this from one of the other witnesses. What property do they own? A. Do you mean in terms of buildings?

MISS W.A. PEACH:  
Cross-examined.

- A Q You say you are a trustee of the property of the Process-church in London. That was your evidence? A. Yes.
- Q What property is that? A. As I understand it, it is any possessions which the church has here in London.
- B Q I wondered if you could be a little more helpful than that. What is it that the Process-church owns in London? A. At this current moment they do not own any actual property. We have people here we correspond with and look after, which may be seen as property, I do not know. In my position as trustee I feel responsible for those people.
- C Q You have been introduced, with the other personal Plaintiffs, as being trustees of the property of an unincorporated body in England called The Process-Church of the Final Judgement? A. Right.
- Q Are you really telling us, Mrs Coale - perhaps I may call you that - A. Yes.
- Q -that it does not own any property at all of which you are trustee? A. I am afraid I cannot answer that question. I do not know.
- I Q I do not want to be unkind, but it, I understood, was introduced to us as being a registered charity. A. That is correct.
- Q And you, as one of the three trustees, say you have no knowledge of any property owned by the charity. Is that right? A. Not in terms of buildings.
- E Q Anything else? Have you got any books? A. We have books here.
- Q Any premises? A. We have a rented place, but we don't own it as such.
- Q You rent it. Where is that? A. It is in the centre of London.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is quite a big area. A. In Wignore Street.
- MR NEILL: What is the address in Wignore Street? A. 14 Wignore Street.
- G Q Is that the same premises as the Process were at before they moved to Balfour Place? A. Yes, it is.
- Q 14 Wignore Street. Is that a flat or what? A. It is an apartment, a flat.
- Q To whom does that belong? A. It belongs to The Hastings and Thanet Building Society, I believe their name is.
- H Q You have been connected with the church from the very early days, is that right? A. Yes, I have.

- A Q Were you in England until the end or towards the end of 1967?  
A. No.
- Q You told us about going to Xtul, but apart from that were you in England until then? A. Until the end of 1967? I went to Paris for a period of time. I get so confused on dates. I am s rry. I went to Nassau in 1966. I went to Paris I believe in November 1967.
- B Q When you were in London were you a minister of the church at that stage? A. I became a minister in New Orleans. That is when the church, as such, was formed.
- Q And you chose, did you, the name of Cassandra? A. That is correct.
- C Q If I am right, Cassandra was a prophetess of doom, was she not? A. She has been so described, yes.
- Q Is not that how she is known, as someone who was always prophesying misery and woe and trouble? A. I have heard those descriptions of Cassandra, yes.
- I Q You must have thought about it, Madam, when you chose the name. There were any number of names to choose from, and you pick on one which is not a Christian name but is the name of a Greek woman, is it not? A. Yes, it is.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: A Greek deity, is it not? A. No, I do not believe so, my Lord.
- E MR NEILL: She was the daughter of the King of Troy, was she not? A. Yes.
- Q And she was the person who was always prophesying misery? A. I d n't know whether she was always prophesying misery. She certainly prophesied the downfall of Troy. I have forgotten what she did prophesy: she prophesied the downfall of somewhere.
- Q Is that why you picked the name? A. No. I liked the sound of it. I find it a very attractive name.
- Q Better than Wendy? A. Much better than Wendy. I had a nickname as a child which went into my years at college and at work, which was "Little Wendy", and I was referred to as Little Wendy. So that it did tend to have a slightly uncomfortable feeling for me.
- G Q You thought Cassandra was a much better name? A. Yes, I did.
- Q When you became a minister of the church were you one of the Ministers in New Orleans? A. Yes, I was.
- H Q And did you go as a Minister to Los Angeles? A. I did, yes.



When you went as a minister to Los Angeles, was that after the San Francisco chapter had been closed? A. The San Francisco chapter had not been closed by the time I arrived in Los Angeles. It was closed very shortly after. I don't know how long after, but very shortly.

Q That would have been the spring of 1968? A. Yes, I believe so.

Q Let us see if we can understand what was happening in Los Angeles in the spring of 1968. Were you the only minister of the church there? A. No, by no means.

Q How many others were there? A. I don't recall, but I think there were about 4 or 5.

Q Do you remember their names? A. Father Joel, Peter Eckheff, was there.

Q We have heard of him. A. Yes. Father Aaron, Hugh Mountain, was there as I recall. Father Micah, who is Timothy Wyllie I believe was also there. Father Greer I believe was there. She is Janet Thornton-White.

Q Was Mr Jonathan De Peyer there? A. Yes, I believe he arrived in Los Angeles with me.

Q That is Father Christian, is it not? A. That is correct.

Q So that you had quite a group, 6 or 7 names I think we have had so far. What were you doing in Los Angeles? A. There were more people in Los Angeles other than the people I have named. There were people who had joined us in New Orleans who made their way to Los Angeles because they wished to be with us, and we were organizing a house for these people to stay in, where also we could train them and introduce them to the concepts of responsibility and self-discipline within a community which they wished to join.

Q So that I can get the picture of it: About how many are we talking about? Say about 8 ministers and then another 20 trainees, or what? A. Possibly 20. I could not be accurate.

Q You were all living in a house in Los Angeles, were you? A. That is correct.

Q Were you making your living from donations you received, from the courses you were giving and from the publications you were selling? A. No. At that time we did not charge for courses. People could give a donation if they wished to for courses, but there was no charge. We were living on, yes, donations, in money from the sales of publications, but also from the money that people joining the group gave; because, as has already been said, to join the group one gave up all one's personal possessions.

Q So that there was some money mainly from that which had been given by those who had joined as ministers. Is that right? A. I am sorry -

Q There was some money, mainly from those who had joined as Ministers like yourself? A. I believe so. I am not sure. Other people were joining at that time.

Q You were also getting money, as the days went by, from selling your publications? A. A minimum amount.

Q That would mean, would it, that in Los Angeles you were selling these various publications to the public? A. As I remember, we were only selling the Sex magazine, and only a small number of those. I do not recall any of the other publications either being there or being sold.

Q Was that being sold in the street or in cafes or where? A. On the street. Not in cafes.

Q Did you do that, or did others do it? A. I personally did not.

Q So that it would be some of the others? A. Yes.

Q -who were going out selling this magazine in the streets of Los Angeles? A. Yes.

Q I think you told us you were there until August 1968? A. No, I don't believe that was accurate.

Q At one time you did, but if you got the date wrong I am not trying to trap you about it. What time do you remember you left Los Angeles? A. I wish I could remember these dates clearly. We were only in Los Angeles a short while.

Q A couple of months? The exact date does not matter. A. Yes, no more.

Q Two or three months? A. No more, a very short time.

Q How did it come about that you closed the chapter in Los Angeles? How did it happen? A. We didn't feel we had a function to perform at that time in Los Angeles. We felt we should go to New York. We felt there was maybe something there for us to do; we didn't feel there was anything for us to do in Los Angeles.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Does that mean that after a certain time in a place you felt the market had come to an end and you moved on to another one? A. By "market", do you mean sales of literature?

Q No, the general demand for your activities. A. In Los Angeles we were not performing if you like, a public function. We were strictly a training chapter for people who had joined us both in San Francisco and in New Orleans.

Q It must have cost a great deal to set up an establishment with something around 8 people in Los Angeles, must not it? A. I do not recall how much it cost. I do not believe it cost a great deal, no.

MISS W.A. PEACH:  
Cross-examined.

think it did? A. Not that I recall.

any idea where the money came from? A. From the  
have already said.

donations? A. Our own money also.

As I understood it, a number of people had followed  
New Orleans to this new chapter in Los Angeles?

been established in New Orleans for some time, had  
I was personally there, I believe, from November  
January, which was 3 months.

Why you go to Los Angeles? A. The chapter had started  
before I arrived.

in New Orleans? A. The one in New Orleans.

rate, a number of people follow you to Los Angeles  
you are there, as I think we have left it, about 2 or 3  
.. Then you all move on again, do you? A. Yes.

whole party? A. Yes.

you again: How was it you suddenly decided to leave  
Los Angeles? A. This is a hard thing to describe. We  
very much by what we call "signs". I wish to express  
so that one can understand it. Signs can come in many  
s. They can come as feelings, very strong feelings.

MICHAEL MELFORD STEVENSON: I have a distinct sign we ought  
adjourn until Monday. A. That is a sign.

(The witness withdrew)

(Adjourned to Monday morning next at 10.30)

**FOURTH DAY**

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,  
Monday, 18th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON  
and a Jury

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT

(a corporate body),  
CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP,

CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER, and

Plaintiffs

WENDY ANN PEACH

1972 P. No.2039

-AND-

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED, and

First Defendants

ED SANDERS

Second Defendant

and between:

SAME -AND- SAME

1972 P. No.1603

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October, 1972)

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
COALE, Mrs Wendy Ann (Miss Wendy Ann Peach) recalled Cross-examination contd.	2
Re-examined	25
SOLLEY, Mr Bernard,	
Examined	25
Cross-examined	27
FRIPP, Mr Christopher Alfred, recalled	
Further Cross-examined	30
Re-examined	36

-----

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,  
Monday, 18th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON

and a Jury

-----

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT

(a corporate body),  
CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP,

CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER, and

Plaintiffs

WENDY ANN PEACH

-AND-

1972 P. No.2039

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED, and

First Defendants

ED SANDERS

Second Defendant

and between:

SAME -AND- SAME

1972 P. No.1603

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October, 1972)

-----

(Transcript from the Shorthand Notes of The Association of  
Official Shorthandwriters Ltd., Room 392, Royal Courts of  
Justice, and 2, New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.2)

-----

MR MICHAEL KEMPSTER, Q.C. and MR PETER BOWSHER (instructed by  
Messrs. Joynson-Hicks & Co.) appeared for the Plaintiffs.

MR BRIAN NEILL, Q.C. and MR LEON BRITTAIN (instructed by Messrs.  
Goodman, Derrick & Co.) appeared for the First Defendants.

THE SECOND DEFENDANT did not appear and was not represented.

-----

EVIDENCE

FOURTH DAY

MRS WENDY ANN COALE (MISS WENDY ANN PEACH), Recalled

A MR NEILL: Before I resume my cross-examination of this witness, I have considered the pleadings over the weekend. I wonder if I could indicate to your Lordship those parts the Defendants are not going to pursue.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That might be a most useful operation.

I MR NEILL: First of all pages 58 and 59, to get that out of the way. That is the allegation relating to Toronto in 1971 and 1972, mainly page 59. I am not going to pursue that aspect of the case.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Which paragraph is that?

C MR NEILL: Five lines from the bottom of page 58: "The First Plaintiff maintains", to the end of page 59.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is something out of the way.

D MR NEILL: Now in the Particulars of Defence, beginning at page 41, subparas. 14, 18, 20, 21 and 22. I am not going to pursue those subparagraphs now. Therefore it is right for me to say at this stage that the allegations in those subparagraphs are withdrawn.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Very well. That slightly lightens our task.

Cross-examination by MR NEILL Continued

E Q You remember on Friday evening we had reached this stage, I think. I was asking you how it came about that the Process-Church left Los Angeles in early summer - the exact date I do not think we need worry about - of 1968? A. Right.

Q And you said that the Process received a sign. Can you help us a little more about that? A. I don't think I was specifically saying we had received one sign.

F Q I am sorry. Perhaps you will explain it in your own words. I may have misunderstood. A. Certainly. I think on Friday I was attempting to describe what a sign was and having some difficulty, and my Lord showed us a sign.

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I did not show you a sign. A. You pointed out it was time to end, I believe. There were a series of things. We had completed a certain aspect of our training in Los Angeles and there was a very strong feeling among the group that we wanted to go back to Europe. Los Angeles is not an attractive city, so from various things - there might have been others, I don't recall - we decided to go to New York in our way back to Europe.

H MR NEILL: So you had been in San Francisco for about 3-4 months, and you had been in Los Angeles a matter of a couple of months? A. I personally had not been in San Francisco.



Q You had not been in San Francisco at all? A. No.

Q At any rate, when you were in Los Angeles is it right to say that at your headquarters there, or the house you were staying at there, there were members who had come, some from New Orleans - A. Yes.

Q -some from Los Angeles? A. No.

Q They joined you there? A. They joined there, but not from Los Angeles.

Q And some who came from San Francisco? A. Yes.

Q And in addition to that there were people like yourself who had come originally from England? A. Yes.

C Q And a number of other people like Mr Fripp as well? A. Yes.

Q When you moved out of Los Angeles, what happened to all those different groups? A. We all moved to New York.

Q The whole lot? A. Yes.

I Q When you were in Los Angeles did you know a man who became Brother Ely, Victor Wild? A. He was there for about two weeks when I was there, yes.

Q Did he come with you to New York? A. No.

Q Did he stay behind, was he in charge in Los Angeles, or what? A. No, he had left the group before we left Los Angeles.

E Q But he had reached the stage, at that point, of being a messenger in the church? A. That is correct. But then he left the group and therefore no longer was a messenger.

Q Did you know what business Mr Wild had? Do you remember whether he had any business? A. I don't know.

F Q You did not know whether he had any kind of shop? A. I have heard subsequently that he has now, but I do not know what he had then.

Q Let us see if I can understand what was happening in Los Angeles. You were getting donations to keep you going, or what? A. That was a small part of our income, yes.

G Q A small part? A. Yes.

Q You were getting a certain amount of money from selling magazines? A. Yes.

Q What else were you getting your income from? A. Our income was also from our own selves, people who had joined the group. We were living on that money.

H Q Were you, at that time, conducting courses for people outside the group? A. No, we were not.

- Q Were you holding services? A. We were holding internal services, yes.
- Q Did the cross form part of the service, and also the symbol of the Devil? A. I don't remember specifically what symbol we had, but I am sure we had a symbol of Christ and Satan, because that was normal practice, and still is.
- Q At that time you were still wearing the black garb of the early Process-church, were you not? A. We were wearing black clothes, yes.
- Q That would be a black cape, would it? A. No, we were not wearing black capes in Los Angeles. It was very hot just to begin with.
- C Q But you had got black capes; whether you were wearing them on any specific day, you had got black capes? A. No, not at that point.
- Q You got them later? A. I believe so.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You mean you personally had not got them? A. The group did not<sup>have</sup> them at that time.
- Q They did not? A. No.
- MR NEILL: You got the black capes later on? A. Yes, I believe so.
- Q You keep saying "I believe so". You were in fact a leading member of the church, were you not? A. Yes.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: A minister? A. Yes, a minister.
- MR NEILL: A minister. One of the members of the council of masters? A. Correct.
- Q You were a mother; some of the junior people were only sisters. You were Mother Cassandra? A. Yes.
- F Q You know quite well whether black capes were obtained or not? A. I don't remember the specific date at which we got them.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Never mind about specific dates, but later on were black capes issued? A. Later on black capes were issues, yes.
- C MR NEILL: But when you were still in Los Angeles were you then wearing black clothes, black sweater and black trousers? A. That is correct.
- I Q Did you have, on those clothes, both crosses and symbols of the Devil? A. we had symbols of Satan and crosses - silver crosses, yes. I am sorry, may I say something? I have just thought that in fact I think the symbols of Satan were in fact made in New York. We had them embroidered in New York. I don't believe we were wearing them at that time.

MISS W.A. PEACH:  
Cross-examined.

I believe we were simply wearing the silver crosses, and the red Goat of Mendez, which is the other symbol to which you are referring, I think, we had embroidered in New York.

Q Both you and the other two Plaintiffs who appeared in court in this case have appeared in a blue uniform and wearing - certainly so far as you are concerned - a cross?  
A. Right.

B Q Is that your normal uniform, or a uniform you put on for the purpose of this case? A. This is our normal uniform, and has been for some months.

Q For some months? A. Yes. We had a silver-gray uniform before we adopted a blue uniform.

C Q When was it, then, that you abandoned wearing your black uniform with the symbols of Satan? A. I think it was about 2½ years ago.

Q So that I can get this quite clear, am I right in thinking that in 1968, when you got to New York, and from then until 2½ years ago, at all times members of the church were wearing black with symbols of Satan on their uniform?  
A. And with the cross of Christ, yes.

D Q And with the cross of Christ. How did it come about that the symbols of Satan were taken off again? A. They have not been. They are on the cross still.

Q They are on the cross? A. Yes.

E Q But you used to wear a sort of epaulette? A. We had a small embroidered badge, the thing I was talking about before.

Q But much more prominent than what you are wearing now, was not it? A. I would say it was no less and no more prominent. People are very attracted to our cross and ask why it has the serpent on it.

F MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The symbol of Satan is a serpent, is it? A. It can also be, yes.

Q I thought it was a three-horned goat? A. That is one symbol. The serpent also is a symbol of Satan, from the Garden story.

G MR NEILL: But it was the goat you were wearing - the little badge with the goat on - in 1968 and 1969? A. Yes.

Q What is called the Mendez Goat? A. Correct.

Q And that was to demonstrate, was it not, that Satan was a prominent deity or god in your cult? A. Correct.

H Q In Los Angeles was your address in a road or district called South Cochran? A. That was a road.

Q C-o-c-h-r-a-n. Is that right? A. I believe so. It might have an "e" on it.

MISS W.A. PEACH:  
Cross-examined.

- Q We need not fall out over that. Was that 1882 South Cochran?  
A. Yes, I think that is correct.
- Q Living in that house altogether were a group of, it must have been 20 to 30 people? A. Yes.
- Q And a number of Alsatian dogs? A. Yes.
- B Q Who was it joined you in - not "from" - Los Angeles as a new member of Process? A. There was Father Lars - who is now Father Lars - Harry Hirano, who was staying at the same house, he had a room there.
- Q He is still in the church? A. Yes.
- C Q He is a father in the church, and we will see a picture of him in one of the magazines, I think. Did he pass through the various grades in the church, moving up and becoming a minister? A. That is correct.
- Q You were telling us that in Los Angeles you were having these services for members of the church itself? A. Yes.
- D Q You told us at the services there would be the symbols of Christ and symbols of Satan. What were you preparing yourselves for at that stage? A. In what terms?
- Q In Los Angeles. That is where you were before you went to New York. A. We were training the new people in self-discipline, in responsibilities, in responsibilities about living with a group, in the teachings and that sort of thing.
- E Q So far as people outside the group were concerned, your contact with them was through the magazines you were selling? A. Through the magazines, through the contact they had with the people on the streets - talking to the people on the streets.
- F Q Were you going round explaining that here was a church or sect, whatever you like to call it, which had Satan among one of its gods? A. I personally wasn't selling magazines in the streets. Does that answer your question?
- Q So that this would be something done by some of the men, was it? A. No, it wasn't only men - men and women.
- G Q If you did not do it yourself perhaps it is not fair to ask you, but do you know what they were doing? Did you ever go out with any of those selling in the streets? A. No, I did not.
- Q Did Father Christian go out selling in the streets? A. I believe he did, yes.
- H Q Again do not answer if you would rather not. Do you know whether we will have help from him? A. I don't know.

MISS W.A. PEACH:  
Cross-examined.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Who was Father Christian?

MR NEILL: He is the other De Peyer brother, Jonathan De Peyer. A. Yes, Jonathan.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: He was in Los Angeles, was he?  
A. Yes, he was.

B MR NEILL: Perhaps you can help this far. Were those going out teaching the beliefs of the church teaching that the end of the world was at hand? A. Some of them may have said that to people. There were no requirements that that is what they say. They were not told what to say. If a particular person felt that they wanted to tell people that the end of the world was at hand then maybe they did. I don't know.

C Q Come: this is absolutely central to your teaching, is it not - or it certainly was in those days - that the end of the world was at hand, chaos was round the corner, and all this destruction we have read about was just about to happen?  
A. We still believe that the end of the world is close, we don't know when, yes.

D Q You were then all in black, and that is what you were teaching, was it not? A. It was simply one of the things. It was not a main, overall, all-encompassing concept. We wanted people to be positive, to be warm, to be loving. We didn't want to inflict on people great things of doom, death and destruction, which a certain aura of this trial seems to have gotten across. It simply wasn't like that. We wanted to give joy and pleasure.

E Q Joy and pleasure? A. Yes. The world at present is in a bad state, people are unhappy and miserable.

F Q Are you really tell us that in 1968, when you were in Los Angeles, you were teaching joy and pleasure? A. Mr Neill, the people we were training in Los Angeles were learning things about themselves and about their communication and contact with each other they had never learnt before, and it gave them joy and pleasure.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The information that the end of the world was, as you put it, close did not give people much joy and pleasure, did it? A. No, it doesn't. It doesn't give me joy and pleasure. But if we believe that this is so, it doesn't mean we can then live a life of misery from then on, it means we can prepare ourselves for such a time and give as much joy and pleasure as we can.

G R NEILL: We will come and look at some of the literature and see where we get our joy and pleasure in that in a few moment, but anyhow that is what you are telling my Lord and the jury, is it, that you were teaching joy and pleasure?  
I A. This we hoped to get across to people, that they could have joys in their lives, rather than misery, yes. This was a large aspect of our teaching.

MISS W.A. PEACH:  
Cross-examined.

- Q Did that spirit of joy and pleasure come out in the magazines you had on the street? A. I hope so, to some degree. We also wished to get some other things across with our magazine.
- Q Let me go back for a little to what you can help us about in England. When did you first join the Process? A. In 1964, March.
- B Q You were a very early member? A. I was, yes.
- Q You became an assistant editor - or the assistant editor- of the magazine Process? A. Correct.
- Q Were you a person who took part both in sessions and in group courses? A. Yes, I was.
- C Q So that you would be one of the people who, I think Mr Fripp told us, were called therapists? A. Yes.
- Q See if you can help us a little more about these group courses. Did part of those courses require the persons attending them to try and insult each other? A. There was one small exercise on the course where people both had to give the other people an insult and then follow that with a compliment.
- D Q I am bound to suggest to you that one of the purposes of the insulting was to wound the other person. A. No, that is not correct.
- E Q What was the point of insulting people? A. The point of insulting people in the thing I have just described, where a person gave another person an insult and then a compliment, was to give the people some freedom to say what they wanted to say: it was not intended to harm or wound, as Mr Neill put it, the other people. Then, as soon as they gave an insult (which was encouraged to be very simple, not rude or degrading, but just very simple, something like, "I don't like your face"), to follow it up with a very warm-meant compliment, because people also have trouble complimenting other people, they find that they get very embarrassed saying nice warm things to people, and we encourage that a great deal.
- F Q You must have attended many of these courses over the years, must you not? A. Yes, I did.
- G Q Were not some people distressed by them? A. (After a pause) Distressed in what form? I never found anyone very distressed by them, no. Some people sometimes maybe saw something about themselves which upset them, in that they had trouble with contact and they did not find it easy to get over their problems in being able to communicate with other people, and this sometimes upset people; and we endeavoured, to the best of our ability, to help them over their communication problems and blocks.
- I

MISS W.A. PEACH:  
Cross-examined.

- Q Are you telling my Lord that no one was upset by these insults followed by compliments, as you put it? A. I don't remember anyone being upset by that, no. It was not a very serious, lengthy procedure, and not the sort of procedure that would upset people.
- B Q Were these courses devoted to joy and pleasure? A. They were devoted to getting people to communicate, to make contact with each other, which we hoped would give people joy and pleasure.
- Q Did those who took part in the courses have to sign some document? A. No.
- Q Are you quite sure about that? A. Quite sure.
- C Q I suggest it was something to this effect - I cannot give you the exact wording of it - saying that their mental health was their own responsibility? A. No.
- Q Do you remember a Miss Gaia Servadio (or Mrs Mostyn-Owen)? A. No.
- D Q Did you go to Xtul? A. Yes, I did.
- Q Was it in Xtul that Process, if I may use the phrase, discovered the importance of Satan? A. I find that question hard to answer. In Xtul I would say we discovered the importance of religion, of leading our lives in a very religious way, in a very pure way, hoping that we would lead our lives for God.
- E Q We are now in 1966 in Xtul. At that stage was Satan one of your gods? A. Our theology was not formed in any tangible written way at that point. We had not seen with full clarity the position of the deities that make up God. I do not recall a great deal of conversation in Xtul about Satan. In fact I do not recall any, but I am sure there might have been some.
- F Q Because it is fair to say, is it not, that your theology, as you call it, does change from time to time? A. The basics are always the same. We clarify things, we see more, we hope to be more and more positive.
- G Q When did Satan assume the importance he had in 1967 and 1968? A. When did he assume, in 1968?
- H Q The importance he had in 1967, when we look at some of the magazines, and 1968, when you were in Los Angeles and New York? A. As I said, it was a developing theology. I cannot tell you exactly when Satan was seen by us as an aspect of God in his full clear role. Obviously it was before the magazines came out. I believe there were times in Xtul when Satan was discussed, and after Xtul also, when we went back to London. We were continually talking in religious terms.

One of the matters also of belief of some members at any rate of the Process was a belief in reincarnation, was not it?  
A. Some members believe in reincarnation, that is correct.

Q Do you? A. Yes, I do.

Q Are you the reincarnation of somebody? A. Of somebody? I'm sorry-?

Q Are you the reincarnation of an earlier figure in the past?  
A. I haven't a clue whether I was an earlier figure in the past. May I tell you what my beliefs in reincarnation are?

Q All I am asking you is: Are you, or have you said you were, a reincarnation of some figure in the past? A. I have never said such a thing. My beliefs in reincarnation are based upon the fact that I believe each being, each human being, and each being within the human being, lives through a series of lifetimes.

Q Before we leave Balfour Place and look at some of the magazines, let me ask you about Mr and Mrs de Grimston. You were there when the group, before it became a church, first moved into Balfour Place? A. Yes, I was.

D Q Is it right that Mr and Mrs de Grimston were the original occupiers of the house? A. Of which house?

Q At Balfour Place? A. No, we all moved in together.

Q But they lived at the top, did they not? A. Mr and Mrs de Grimston had a flat at the top of the house, yes.

E Q Mr de Grimston, we have been told, is the Teacher (with a capital T) in the church? A. That is his title in the charter, yes.

Q Is he also called the Omega? A. No, he is not called the Omega.

Q Who is the Omega? A. The Omega is Mr and Mrs de Grimston, together.

F Q Together. And they send out messages, do they, calling themselves jointly the Omega? A. Send out messages?

Q Do they send out messages to the church describing themselves, or signing themselves, as the Omega? A. No. Where they are they call the Omega.

G Q Wherever they are at any time is called the Omega? A. Yes. We have the Alpha in each of our chapters.

Q The Alpha in each of the chapters, and the Omega is wherever the de Grimstons are? A. That is correct.

I MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON. And where are they at the moment?  
A. They are in the United States.

Q Do you know, are we going to see them here? A. I don't know.



- A MR NEILL: The Alpha and the Omega comes from the Revelations, does it? A. Yes, I believe Alpha and Omega is mentioned in the Revelations.
- Q Come, come! A. The beginning and the end.
- B Q You say "I believe it is mentioned in the Revelations". This idea of the Alpha and Omega comes directly from the Book of Revelations, does it not? A. (After a pause) I am sorry, "the idea of"? The Alpha and Omega are in the Book of Revelations.
- Q And that is where they come from in your cult, your church? A. I don't know whether that is where we took them from.
- C Q You do not know? A. I don't know.
- Q Let us look together for a very short time at your role in the magazine. It is only fair to ask your help on one or two bits of it, because you were one of the editors. I don't think we need look at these, but you were an assistant editor of the edition on Mindbending. Is that right? A. Yes.
- D Q You had been an editorial assistant in the first one we looked at, The Freedom of Expression. Is that right? A. Yes, I believe so. I haven't got a copy of that here.
- Q Perhaps you will take it from me. It can be checked if need be, your name is set out on page 3 of that. A. I am sure it is, yes.
- E Q Let us come straight away to the Sex issue, which is the one which was on sale for a time in 1968 in Los Angeles, the one you were tell us about? A. Yes.
- F Q What exactly, as assistant editor, did you do on the magazine? A. My main function was to organise the people who were actually working on the magazine - to organise their schedules, to make sure that they kept to the timetable of the house, and to make sure that their contact between each other was good, that they weren't arguing, having difficulties, and to keep the atmosphere around the work warm and inclusive.
- Q Inclusive? A. Yes.
- G Q What does that mean? A. I use the word to mean that everyone working on the magazine felt included in the work, that no one person was going off and isolating themselves and feeling separate from the other members of the work team.
- Q Working as a team. Does that mean, therefore, that the magazine was produced as a team effort? A. I would say so, yes.
- H Q So everybody knew what was going into it? A. I am talking mainly about the actual art work and the organising of the production of the magazine; I am talking about the work team.

Q Perhaps you can help a little about the article, because that is something you would be organising. Is that right?  
A. I was not actually organising the art work, I was organising the people who were doing the art work in terms of schedules.

Q Making sure that the atmosphere they were working in was warm and inclusive? A. I hoped to do that, yes.

Q In that function of seeing they were warm and inclusive, did you in fact have something to do with the front cover and back cover of the magazine? A. Not in terms of design, no

Q Did you see it before it was published? A. Yes, I did.

Q Have you got it before you? A. Yes, I have.

Q Was that something of which you approved? A. It was something which I felt got across the message we were trying to get across, yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If I may say so, I know that the members of your body have great difficulty in answering questions. We have noticed that for several days. It is a very simple question, susceptible of Yes or No. Did you approve of the front cover? A. I approved of it in terms of it getting across our message, yes.

Q Do you mean that there is some qualification about your answer? A. Only what I have said.

MR NEILL: May I put it again. What I am asking is: Did you approve of the front cover of that magazine? A. I approved in terms that it got across our message, yes.

Q That suggests - I will ask you to help - that in some other way you disapproved of it? A. No.

Q You did not disapprove of it. Is that right? A. I approved of it because it got across our message, yes.

Q Did you disapprove of it in any way at all? A. I don't particularly like the colour, but I don't think that is what you are talking about.

Q Apart from the actual orange colour - let us forget about the actual orange colour - is there anything else you disapprove of about that front cover? A. No.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "I do not like the colour. I do not disapprove of anything else". Is that right? A. Yes.

MR NEILL: You said you approved it specifically in terms that it got across your message? A. Yes.

Q What message does that front cover get across of which you approve? A. That there are different ways, there are different realities, on the subject of sex.

MISS W.A. PEACH:  
Cross-examined.

Q Different realities on the subject of sex. Perhaps you will explain that a little more to us. On the left we have a picture of a girl. What reality about sex is that illustrating? A. The Luciferian reality.

Q Perhaps you will take it a little further than that. How would you put it in words which perhaps I can understand?  
A. The Luciferian reality.

Q The Luciferian reality of sex as demonstrated by the picture of that girl? A. As I see this picture, it depicts, if you like, the ideal girl figure, the dream, the typical advertisement; that sort of figure would be used in a lot of advertising, the sort of dream quality of the ideal girl.

Q On the right we have this picture of a young man walking towards the sun, I think? A. Yes.

Q With a knotted rope round his waist and what looks like a sack or something on his back? A. Yes.

Q What reality is that demonstrating? A. The Jehovahian.

Q Again, in ordinary terms, what does that mean? A. It means the Jehovahian reality on sex is one of disapproval, very strong self-discipline, denial, and strictness with self I think you describe it.

Q At the bottom of the page we have the Satanic one? A. That is correct.

Q That really speaks for itself, does it not? A. Yes.

Q Is that a celebration of some kind of black mass? A. I assume that is what it is.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Have you any doubt? A. No.

Q MR NEILL: It plainly is: an inverted cross? It plainly is, is it not? A. Yes, I assume it is.

Q You know it is.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You were one of the editors.  
A. I was not concerned with the formation of -

Q Maybe not, but you told me you saw this cover and the only part of it you disapproved of was the colour. A. I believe Mr de Peyer said it was a montage. I am not sure.

Q Whether it was a montage or anything else. A. It was to depict the Satanic.

MR NEILL: I am not going to go through more than a very little bit of the rest of the magazine with you, but I think it is only fair to put to you the question I put to other witnesses, about pages 9 and 17. Is not the statement at the

MISS W.A. PEACH:  
Cross-examined.

top of page 9 a plain suggestion that the reader can follow one of three paths or find himself in the quagmire of the Grey Forces? A. No.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You will have to help me about that and, I suspect, the jury. "Three paths and a quagmire", the three paths being Lucifer, Jehovah and Satan? A. Correct.

B Q And the quagmire is the Grey Forces? A. Yes.

Q "Who is strong enough to follow one of" these three paths? Is not that intended as an indication that anybody can follow one of the three paths? A. No, it was not meant to describe -- these were descriptions of the paths which people do follow. They were not invitations that people should follow.

Q The last part is followed immediately by the question: "Who is fool enough to fall into the quagmire?". A. That is the question.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Go on, Mr Neill; I am sorry.

MR NEILL: It then goes on:

"The Grey Forces hold sway, but THE GODS  
are returned to recruit their armies for the END".

E Does not that suggest that the three gods, Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan, have come back to collect their forces for the end? A. I believe the gods are back.

Q Do try to help. I am trying to put the question. If you do not understand the question, I put it badly, then ask me to put it again. Will you try to answer the questions I put. What I was putting to you was, does not that sentence,

"The Grey Forces hold sway, but THE GODS  
are returned to recruit their armies for the END",

mean that the three gods Jehovah, Lucifer, Satan,

have come back to collect their forces for the end?

H A. It says they "are returned to recruit their armies", yes.

Q Does that not mean to collect their forces together, armies together, for the end ? A. Yes.

Q And are not the following pages setting out what the characteristics are going to be of those who are to join the three armies ? A. No.

Q Then what does it mean, what is the point of putting that, "the Gods are returned to recruit their armies for the end" ?  
B A. I do not know why it was put there.

Q You do not know why ? A. You asked what was the point. I do not know what point was decided upon, why it was put there.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Who made this decision ? A. I imagine Mr De Peyer did, I don't know.

C MR NEILL: Let us go to page 19, because I am not going to waste time on this. Page 17; this is at the end of where the four advocates put their respective cases, Jehova, Lucifer, Satan and the psychiatrist on behalf of the Grey Forces. A. Yes.

Q Then in the little white box at the bottom of page 17 we have: "Three paths and a quagmire. Where do you belong?" and then it asks the reader which are you, "Are you JEHOVAH'S man ... Do you follow LUCIFER ... is SATAN your master ... Or do you take the road to nowhere, half in half out, half up half down, your instincts and ideals buried in a deep morasse of hypocritical compromise and respectable mediocrity?"  
D "Three paths and a quagmire, And time is running out".  
That is plainly suggesting that the reader has got to make a choice because time is running out ?  
E A. I think it simply says time is running out. I do not see a choice.

Q I can read that, in fact I read it to you, but what I am suggesting is this: having set out the three possibilities, "Are you Jehovah's man", "Do you follow Lucifer" "is Satan your master" "Or do you take the road to nowhere", it says "Three paths and a quagmire, And time is running out". Is that not suggesting to the reader that because time is running  
F out he had better get a move on and make a choice ? A. He had better get a move on and look at himself, Mr Neill.

Q What is the point of looking at himself ? A. The point of looking at yourself, Mr Neill, is to discover your compulsions, your feelings of anxiety, your fear; to see yourself with clarify so that you can release yourself from these feelings of fear, inhibition, burden which everyone has.  
G

Q I am not going to go through the game of rape, but is that a game you have played - the one we see set out on the next page?  
A. Yes, I have played it.

Q Is that a religious game ? A. Not really, no.

H Q How would you describe it as a game ? A. I would describe it as a game which in a light way gets across some of the more extreme ideals about Jehovah - not "ideals", realities of Lucifer, Jehovah and Satan. I do not think I expressed that very clearly.

MISS W.A PEACH  
Cross-examined:

Q Get across in a light way the realities about whom ?  
A. Lucifer, Jehovah and Satan.

Q "Reel off fifteen obscene words one after the other". Is that part of a light game ? That is the inner game if you play a four. A. I would not know fifteen obscene words and I have never heard anyone take that in any serious manner.

Q Does that mean people did not follow these instructions ?  
A. No, they did not.

Q Who on earth put this in, then, in the magazine ? Was it intended to be followed ? A. It was not intended to be taken in the way that you are suggesting, no.

Q Well, how was it meant to be taken ? A. As a game, which is what it says it is.

Q Let me see if I can understand that. Are you saying that when you play a game according to certain rules those rules are to be followed or not to be followed ? ... Mr Neill, when people in Monopoly get to the square "Go to jail" they do not rush off to the local jail. Equally here we did not expect people to take it absolutely precisely to the letter of what it says, and people did not, they took it in the spirit of a game.

Q What did they do if they got a four ? I suppose it was played with dice, was it ? A. Yes.

Q You play with dice and you got a four and you are in the inner game on Satan. What do you do ? A. The only time I have seen anyone do that they burst into giggles and did not manage to do it.

MR JUSTICE MEEFORD STEVENSON: Or had not time ? A. They did not do it.

MR NEILL: What did they do if they got a two ? A. In Satan's game ?

Q In Satan's game: "Deliver a one minute hard sell of depraved sex. Must make other players drool". A. I think they had a similar reaction, giggling, or embarrassment, or something, I don't know. I have never heard anyone do that.

Q Was not this a disgraceful thing to put into a magazine like this ? A. I did not think so, no.

Q It had a religious purpose, did it ? A. I would not have called it necessarily "religious", it was rather a particular flavouring -----

Q A particular what ? A. Flavouring. It was rather gently getting across some realities in a game fashion.

Q Was this all part of the joy and pleasure ? A. People had fun playing it, yes, Mr Neill. I saw them. It did no harm at all as I saw.

MISS W.A. PEACH  
Cross-examined:

Q This appeared in the very centre page of this magazine. A. Yes.

Q You open it up and that is the first thing you come across, a game called rape. A. If that is how you open a magazine that would be the first thing you come across.

Q If you open it up in the middle you come across the game called rape? A. If you open it at the back you come across another advert.

Q Headings like "Lust" "Perversion", "Rape", and so on. Only one or two other things I want to ask you about. On page 33 I would just like your help about these advertisements for these films. Was this part of the magazine which you approved of, apart from the orange colour, before it went out, or not? A. Yes.

Q Does that mean that you approved of those advertisements? A. Yes.

Q Can you explain why the films which were being shown every Saturday as part of The Process teaching, I suppose, were advertised in that way? A. Mr Neill, I believe that Mr De Peyer and Mr Fripp explained this and I do not think I can explain it any better than they have.

Q I would like your help because you are a plaintiff in this case and it helps to have your view. How would you explain that advertising? A. I am sorry, what do you mean?

Q Well, you see, here is an organisation which, though not at that moment a church, was, I think you agreed with me, a religious organisation? A. Yes.

Q This is the summer of 1967 and this magazine was on sale, as we know, for some very considerable period after that. Now you are advertising for Saturday and Sunday entertainment at Balfour Place films of war, degradation, violence, despair, power, lust, fear, hate, sin and horror. A. Yes.

Q Can you explain to my Lord and the Jury why those films, or that advertising of films, were being shown to the public? A. Because we felt it was very important to get across man's inhumanity to man.

Q Is there a word on that page which suggested that that was the message of these films? A. I would say war is man's inhumanity to man.

Q This was to titillate, was it not? A. No.

Q Let me show you another advertisement which you put out. (Same handed to the witness) Have you got the original or a photostat? A. I believe I have a photostat.

MR NEILL: There is one original and I believe your Lordship has that. I wonder if the witness might have it for one moment? (Same handed to the witness) That is an advertise-

ment of a particular film showing on this Saturday, a film called Seigfried. A. Yes.

Q Is that a form of advertising which was used week by week and you stuck in the top place the actual film for this Saturday? Is that right? A. I do not remember seeing this particular hand out before. I do not know whether it was used each week, I was not anything to do with the films.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Who was? A. Fr. Mendez, Andrew Castle, organised the films.

MR NEILL: Mr Castle. He is called Fr. Mendez after mendez of the mendez goat; is that right? A. He is Fr. Mendez, yes.

Q As one of the Council of Masters I expect this is something which you would be in a position to express a view about. Let us just look at how these films are being advertised to the public?

MR KEMPSTER: Before my friend does this, can I, perhaps, ask him to bear with the witness because this is in fact a Process document but we have not seen this on discovery; it is the first time we have seen it and I would like its status to be established.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It has got the address of Process, 2, Balfour Place, at the bottom. I do not know what more you want.

MR KEMPSTER: I was going to invite my friend, perhaps, to put a date on it and whether it is in the context of any particular publication.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You may want a date on it, but it has got the address of 2, Balfour Place on it.

MR KEMPSTER: Certainly, yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is Process House, is it not? A. Probably.

Q Where was the cinema or the theatre, whatever it was? Where were the films displayed? A. They were shown in one of the large rooms on the ground floor.

MR NEILL: I am told it was disclosed, my Lord, but I will have that checked. I cannot exactly help about the source of this, but I understand it is a document from The Process. (To the witness): You see, this seems to be advertising a film at 2, Balfour Place. It is very like the one we have got in the Sex magazine. Is there anything about this advertising which you disapprove of? A. I don't really remember having seen this before. I am not saying it was not given out, I really don't know.

Q Having looked at it, is there anything in it of which you disapprove? Now you have had a chance of reading it - and take a little more time if you like - is there anything



in that advertisement of which you disapprove as a Process advertisement? A. It is not nice, but I don't disapprove of it.

Q It does not seem to be getting across a message of joy and pleasure, does it? A. That is obviously not what it is intended for, no.

B Q It is intended plainly, is it not, to attract those who have an interest in these unpleasant matters? A. I would say it was intended to attract people to Seigfreid. I have not seen this film so I do not know what it is about.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What you are really being asked about, as I understand it, are the words - flagellation, despair, slaughter, sadism, and so on. It does not sound something designed to give pleasure, does it? A. No.

C MR NEILL: Or to spread a feeling of love or a feeling of inclusion, or anything of that sort? A. No.

Q Or warmth? A. No.

I Q You are asking people to 'phone for further details, and then you can have your evening meal in the coffee bar. A. Yes, where there is some love and warmth.

Q You have got the original, I think, and I do not think it has come out very well on the photostats, but there are two pictures shown there. There is a picture of a man and is that the man who is the subject of the flagellation, or what? A. I assume so, yes.

E Q And what is the picture which comes between the "B" and the "I" there? A. It looks like a guillotine, I am not sure that is what it is. I assume it is.

Q Let me ask you this: what sort of person do you think is going to be attracted by that kind of advertising? A. I have no idea.

F MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Can you not help us at all? A. We have all sorts of people coming to our films.

G Q I am sure you do, but, you see, here are these words set out and what is being suggested to you, I think - and it is only right you should deal with it - is this not obviously addressed to people who take a sadistic pleasure --- A. That is certainly not who we were trying to attract, no, my Lord.

Q Well, what were you doing? A. We were trying to attract people to come to our place who had problems, who had worries, who had fears. I am not talking specifically about this advertisement, I am just talking generally, that is the policy.

H Q What was the charge for admission? A. I don't know. It was low, but I don't know exactly the price.

MISS W.A. PEACH  
Cross-examined:

A  
MR NEILL: It was about 5s.0d in those days, was it not ? A. I have no idea.

B  
Q Let us try another way. Supposing you were considering a young person whom you knew, a youngish girl of 15, 16, 17, something like that, and you saw her reading in the street an advertisement of films of that sort. Are you telling my Lord and the Jury that you would be happy for her to go to 2, Balfour Place, or wherever the films were advertised, to see a collection of films of that sort ? A. I believe Seigfreid is a very well-known film and that is what this is advertising.

C  
MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Madam, do you think that begins to be an answer to the question that was put to you ? A. I hope so, yes.

Q You see, you all run away from any question the answer to which appears to be embarrassing. It may not be your fault, but that seems to be your pattern. Do try and listen to each question and apply your mind to it. A. Yes.

D  
MR NEILL: Let us forget for the moment about the actual film here and let us assume this young girl does not know the story of Seigfried or what the film in fact shows, but she looks at the words - a number of films, more than Seigreid - which are described in the way they are described on that advertisement. What I am asking you is this: would you be happy for a young girl whom you knew that she should go to the place where those films were advertised as being shown and attend a performance ? A. I would have thought so. It would depend on what the film was that was advertised.

E  
Q Let us forget about the actual name of the film ---- A. But surely this is what this is for. I do not see how we can forget that, because that is what this is advertising, it is Seigfried.

F  
MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Would you be happy that a young girl, seeing an advertisement of this kind for films of this kind, should go the place where these films are on show and see the films ? A. If it was for The Process, yes, which is what this is advertising. Obviously there are some places where young people are best not to go.

G  
MR NEILL: Some of these places which advertise films in that way ? A. Possibly, I don't know. I have not seen advertisements like this.

Q You have not seen advertisements like that ? A. I have seen adverts in papers using words, yes.

H  
Q Only one or two more things I want to ask you about. You were on the staff of the magazine Death, were you not ? A. Can I have a date ?

Q You were Cassandra and you were described as a Muse; is that right ? A. Yes.

Q There was not another Cassandra ? A. No, that is me.

A Q Before we come to Death ---- A. Could I have a copy, please ?

Q Certainly. (same handed to the witness) Before we come to the Death magazine, can you help us about Fear because I do not think we have got in the copy of Fear a description of those responsible for it. Were you on the staff of Fear ? A. No, I was not; I went to Paris.

Q You were nothing to do with that ? A. No.

Q As far as Death is concerned, on the inside of the back cover at page 51 you are there described as Muse. A. That is correct.

Q That is the bottom page on the left-hand side. A. Yes.

Q What part did you play in the production of that magazine ? A. The same as I described for the other magazines.

Q That was keeping the staff together, was it ? A. Yes.

Q Perhaps, as we are going to see Fr. Malachi, I will leave it there.

MR KEMESTER: I do not want my learned friend to assume that I am undertaking to call any particular witness at this stage. I reserve the right to call whatever witnesses I choose.

MR NEILL: Perhaps I had better ask you, then, if you can help a bit about the article which appears on page 36. This magazine, in contrast to the other ones we have been looking at, was produced in Canada; is that right ? A. I believe so, yes.

Q Other magazines we have looked at where all produced in London ? A. Yes.

Q Let us just see how this article came to be written. Are you in a position to tell my Lord and the Jury about how that article was obtained ? A. No, I am not.

Q Who can help us about that ? A. Possibly Fr. Malachi and I believe Mr Fripp also described some things there.

Q And who ? A. I believe Mr Fripp talked about it also.

Q He talked about it in general terms, but he said Fr. Malachi was the person who could help more. A. I believe that is true.

Q He just knew that this was going into the magazine but he did not have anything to do with getting hold of it. A. Yes.

Q Do you know who, in fact, was in charge of getting hold of that article ? A. No; I think that is best left to him.

Q To Fr. Malachi ? A. Yes.

Q At any rate, you cannot help us about that. A. No, I cannot.

A Q It is said to be an article specially written for The Process.  
A. Yes.

Q Let me ask you this general question: did it ever cross your mind that what you were putting on sale on the Sex issue might, if it got into the hands of a young immature or disturbed person, have very harmful results indeed? A. No.

B Q Does it occur to you now after we have all been looking at this for the last few days? Does it occur to you now that that might happen? A. I have never seen an instance of that, Mr Neill. People I have spoken to about the magazine had very positive thoughts about it, feelings about it, and I have never seen any harm done by it.

C MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "It never crossed my mind that the Sex issue might have a harmful effect on a young child". Is that right? A. Yes, my Lord; and I have also never seen the evidence to show that it has had a harmful effect.

B MR NEILL: Are you still of the view that that magazine is a proper thing to put on public sale? A. I think we did as we did and we sold it. We felt we should, yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is the answer "Yes"? A. We do not wish to repeat the magazine.

Q "I think Sex was a proper magazine to put on public sale". Is that right? A. Yes, otherwise we would not have put it on sale, my Lord.

E MR NEILL: Is it a magazine which you would put on sale now? A. No, we have developed our artwork, our writing and everything from that point. We are a continually developing organisation, Mr Neill, we learn more and more about ourselves, about the way in which to communicate to people, the way in which to convey our message to people, and hopefully we have learned much over the years and we are able to communicate better now than we were then. We would not repeat that magazine now.

Q Why? A. For the reasons I have just said.

C Q Is it not because you realise that you are open to very, very strong criticism for putting that sort of filth on the market? A. No, Mr Neill, it is not; it is for the reasons I have said.

Q You would not dissent from Mr Fripp's description of page 15 of the Sex magazine as filth, would you? A. What was your question - "dissent"?

Q You would not disagree with it? A. No, I would not.

H Q What do you say was the justification, if any, for putting that sort of stuff in your magazine? A. It was getting

across the reality of the subhumanity aspect of Satan, the lower aspect - the reality that this exists and the description of that existing in the world.

Q Just finally, I am afraid I had forgotten to ask you about the Processscenes. Did you attend any Processscenes ?  
A. Very few.

Q Is it right to say that some of those were devoted to things like black magic, and so on ? A. They were devoted to all manner of topics, Mr Neill.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I have forgotten, where are these Processscenes ?

MR NEILL: It is page 32 of the Sex issue, my Lord, and we have had some references to it in a bundle of correspondence. (To the witness) Can we just look together at one more document and then I will be done. (Same handed to the witness) Does your Lordship have the original ?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: No, I do not think so. It appears to me to be a photostat.

MR NEILL: Perhaps my learned friend would like to look at it.

MR KEMPSTER: In any event I would concede that if it has been disclosed in the defendants list as a copy and I have offered no notice of objection, it would be admissible under Order 27 Rule 4, but I just wondered which it was.

MR NEILL: I am told it is an original but I cannot say more than that. (To the witness): At any rate, this we can tell from the date and the days of the week was in 1967. Perhaps you will take that from me and it can be checked if need be, but October 25th was a Wednesday in 1967. Did you attend any of these Processscenes ? A. No.

Q I am not going to read them all, but can we just look through them and see where among those we find any joy and pleasure.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am quite sure October 24th does not!

MR NEILL: The 25th October, "Invaders from Space"; October 27th "Drugs, road to Heaven chemical death?"; Friday, Saturday and Sunday "Corridors of Blood & The Hole". Did you go to that ? A. No, I did not.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Have you any idea what it means ? A. No; it is just the name of the film, I believe. It may be one film or two films, I don't know.

MR NEILL: 31st October "Aleister Crowley meets The Pope. Beast meets God's rep". Aleister Crowley is this gentleman who has been described as The Beast, is he not ? A. I believe, yes.

Q Well, you know, do you not ? A. That is the title he gave himself, I believe.

Q You know all about him, do you not ? A. I don't know much about Aleister Crowley, no.

Q It is a name you know ? A. Oh, sure, yes.

Q November 3rd "The Voice of Satan. The God of majesty, magic and ultimate destruction"; that week-end "The Haunting & Playthings"; the following Tuesday we have got "The Jews Chosen race or persecuted of God?"; and a nice jolly Friday evening with "Tales of terror & mass slaughter. A delicate rendering from The Black Pope and The Prince of Darkness"; the week-end "Innocents & Beware". Then the following Tuesday "Party political broadcast on behalf of The Anti Christ" and then we have got "Humanity's game". Is there a word in all that to which you could give the description joy and pleasure ? A. I did not attend the scenes so I do not know whether there was joy or pleasure in any of them.

Q Leave aside what was in them, is there anything in that advertisement which would suggest to the person who read it that if they went along to 2, Balfour Place they would get any joy or pleasure ? A. They would certainly think they might get some stimulation because there is every subject under the sun there, but I am not sure about joy or pleasure.

Q Or any love or warmth ? A. I do not think that is what this advertisement is there to convey necessarily for love and warmth. It is to get across that there is a stimulating time to be had, I should say, at Process in Balfour Place. The love and warmth existed in Balfour Place and they could find that when they came.

Q They would be very surprised, would they not, if they got there and found love and warmth after that advertisement ? A. I don't know.

Q You see, there is all this concentration. Let us face it, concentration on destruction, depravity and misery. A. Yes; we also gave courses which are advertised here but which we do not have advertisements for, which we also put out as hand-outs, and they got across that you could come along and you could learn to communicate and get fulfilment in your life. This is simply one advert for one type of activity. Our whole total activities are not contained on that sheet. It would be unfair to say that this summed up what happened in Balfour Place.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: When did Balfour Place come to an end ? A. I don't remember. It came up earlier, my Lord.

MR NEILL: I did put it, my Lord. A. I think Mr De Peyer answered that question, yes.

MR NEILL: I think it was at the end of 1970.

MR KEMPSTER: I think it was in August, 1970, my Lord, they were told to get out and they got out later, either Christmas or the New Year.

MISS W.A. PEACH

Re-examined:

MR NEILL: An order for possession was obtained against them. I put it, I think, November, 1970 and my recollection is that the witness said it was February, 1971, they actually left. I think that is right.

Re-examined by MR KEMPSTER:

- Q Just two points. Do you know whether The Process magazine in Los Angeles - that is the Sex issue, which is the only one it is said was sold there - was sold otherwise than by members of The Process ? A. Never.
- Q If I may adopt a phrase used by Lord on Friday, are you in a position to say whether it was sold on a "Stop me and buy one" basis, or how ? A. It was sold by people coming up and they talked to them and if they wished to buy a magazine they did.
- Q Do you know anything about, or did you yourself give any instructions to those who were on the streets as to, the nature of any conversation ? A. That was not my job, no.
- Q Just one other question. You have been asked a lot about black capes. First of all, do you remember in what country this particular item of attire was assumed ? A. I believe it was in England.
- Q Can you put a date on it ? A. Now you are getting into dates again.
- Q If you cannot, say so. A. I cannot remember.

(The witness withdraw)

MR. BERNARD SOLLEY, Sworn

Examined by MR. KEMPSTER

- Q Is your full name Bernard Solley ? A. Yes.
- Q Are you a Solicitor of the Supreme Court ? A. I am.
- Q Do you practise under the style of Bernard Solley & Company, at 9, Cavendish Square in London ? A. Yes.
- Q In April, 1972, were you instructed by The Process Church of the Final Judgment of Louisiana Corporation ? A. I do not know where the corporation is. I was instructed by Mr Fripp on behalf of Process yes, by telephone call.
- Q I wonder if you could look at a bundle of correspondence. I only want to ask you about one letter. Did you write a letter on the 11th April to Messrs Rupert Hart-Davies Limited ? A. Yes, this looks like it.
- Q Is that your letter ? A. It is, yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: In which bundle do I find that ?

MR KEMPSTER: It appears on the first page of the party and party correspondence, my Lord. (To the witness): If you

look at the first two lines you will see the words "We refer to our telephone yesterday when we informed you that we act on behalf of The Process Church of the Final Judgment and our clients have been informed that the book called "The Family" written by Ed Sanders is proposed to be published by you on the 1st May next". Pausing there, do you recall that telephone conversation? A. In general outline, yes.

B Q Do you remember to whom you spoke on behalf of Rupert Hart-Davies Limited? A. I ended up with what I thought was a Mr Allen Cook. I have learned subsequently that his name is not Cook but was I think Brook but I spoke to who I thought was Allen Cook.

Q This letter itself refers to a conversation and was anything said between you and this gentleman - whether it be Cook or Brook, or whatever - about an agreement that had been made in America for the deletion of references to The Process from the book "The Family"? A. Yes. He said that the agreed deletions would not be in the English edition.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: He said that the deletions the American publishers had agreed would be deleted? A. Would be deleted so that, in fact, everything that had been agreed in America would be carried out over here.

Q The deletions agreed in America would be implemented here; is that right? A. Yes, my Lord.

E MR KEMPSTER: So much for that point. In 1969 were you in any way concerned with framing the Constitution of The Process church which was lodged in the register of charities? A. Yes, I drafted them out for The Process church.

Q It is right, is it not, that the signatories to that document called the Constitute are Miss Peach, Mr De Peyer and Mr Fripp? A. Yes.

F Q What role were they to play, or did they play? A. They were the trustees. When they made an application to the Charity Commissioners they would be the trustees, under the terms of the charity, of the charity.

Q Have you read the book "The Family"? A. I have skimmed through it, yes.

G Q When skimming through it to what person or persons or body did you think it referred when referring to The Process? A. Well, to the members of the Process and certainly Mr Fripp - I think his name is mentioned although there is a different Christian name - and certainly, although I did not see the names of other parties, I certainly knew of the various parties concerned - certainly Miss Peach and Christopher De Peyer.

H



MR B. STOLLEY  
Cross-examined:

Cross-examined by MR NEILL:

- Q When you had this conversation with the gentleman we now know as Mr Allen Brook and you wrote your letter, at that stage you did not tell him, did you, the exact terms of the agreement ?  
A. No, I was not aware of them at that time.
- Q You did not know them yourself ? A. No.
- Q So if reference was made to deletions you did not know what deletions he was talking about ? A. None at all.
- Q You have seen the book, you just told my Lord and the Jury. Have you seen the publications of The Process ? A. I think I have seen one or two of them, yes.
- Q When you were drafting the charity document had you got in front of you what they were putting out ? A. No, in fact it was the other way. I did not see those circulars until, or these distributed copies, until after I had drafted the Constitution.
- Q So it had all gone to the Charity Commissioners, had it, before you saw any of the literature they were putting out ?  
A. Yes. I don't think it would have affected me, I must say that.
- Q It would not have affected you ? A. No.

(Continued on next page)

Q I am not going to go through it all again, but are you really saying that you consider all these documents we have been looking at as suitable literature to be put out by a church?  
A. You are asking me to define the question of a church. I would not like to define the word "church" in this context. I certainly think they are a religious body. So far as that literature is concerned, I certainly never set myself up as a censor of any document which anybody wishes to publish.

Q Can you think it possible that on young minds some of this stuff would have a very bad effect? A. I really could not answer that.

Q You could not? A. No.

Q We know now that all the trustees of this charity are in fact abroad. Could you have got it registered if they had all been abroad at the time you made your application? A. I doubt it.

Q Are you still acting for the trust? A. No. Pretty well this is, I think, the only professional service I rendered for the Process, actually, the drafting of this constitution.

Q You drafted the constitution, had a telephone call and wrote a letter; is that fair? A. I think that is pretty well the sum total, yes.

(The witness withdrew)

MR KEMPSTER: Your Lordship will recall that, I think it was, last Tuesday or Wednesday I called for documents relating to the publication and distribution of the paperback open market edition of this book.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes.

MR KEMPSTER: None have been forthcoming, and I therefore wish to put in the book, this paperback, as it is, together with two agreements - these are agreed documents - one between Mr Ed Sanders and Rupert Hart-Davis Ltd - that is the agreement exhibited to Mr Reynolds' affidavit - and the other an agreement between Hart-Davis Ltd. and Granada Publishing Ltd, dated 15th October, 1970. That relates specifically to the paperback. (Paperback book marked as Exhibit P.23).

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It is a mass of photostatic print which has been put in front of me. What I have now got is an agreement of the 19th January, 1970 between Ed Sanders and E.P. Dutton.

MR KEMPSTER: I am sorry that has appeared before your Lordship. That is unnecessary. Your Lordship does not have to be troubled with that. I hope that your Lordship will have, first, an agreement between Mr Ed Sanders and Hart-Davis Ltd, and, secondly, one between Hart-Davis and Granada, and I hope also the Jury have those.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: This one is quite illegible. I think you had better look at it. It is nothing whatever to do with this. We can go on for ever looking at bad photostats. Cannot we get some facts which are agreed?

MR NEILL: I agree.

MR KEMPSTER: It is the agreement exhibited to Mr Reynolds' affidavit.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Never mind that. Cannot we get an agreed statement of fact as to what happened about the paperback?

MR KEMPSTER: I don't know, my Lord. It does not appear that we can.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Have you tried?

MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, we have tried, yes. We have asked for some documents to show what happened to it, and none have been forthcoming.

MR NEILL: My Lord, might I try over the mid-day adjournment to have a word with my friend about this? If we cannot agree, I shall have no objection to his putting it in.

MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, in any event, on the footing that they are legible, I wish to put them in, the two agreements which are agreed.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I would have thought everybody's task would be simplified by an agreed statement of fact. There is no doubt that this paperback is published.

MR NEILL: No doubt about it at all, my Lord. The only question is where it went. That is the matter about which I shall talk to my learned friend at mid-day.

E MR KEMPSTER: Your Lordship will appreciate that we could have talked much more easily had I seen some document going to its distribution.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I don't appreciate anything about it.

MR KEMPSTER: Very well, my Lord. That is the case for the Plaintiffs.

MR NEILL: My Lord, when I was cross-examining Mr Fripp, I put to him one or two questions about the Manson article. It may have been my fault, but I understood him to say that was really a matter for Father Malachi to deal with.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes.

MR NEILL: If need be, I can turn up the reference where I put that. In the circumstances, I would ask leave for Mr Fripp to come back, so that I can pursue that matter with him.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think that is perfectly reasonable.

H MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, I don't oppose that.

Mr Fripp, I wonder if you could have in front of you a copy of the Process issue dealing with Death? A. I have one.

Q You remember we looked very quickly the other day at page 36 and the article written by Mr Manson on page 36. A. Yes.

Q I think you told us then that Father Malachi would be a better person to deal with those questions about that than you? A. I think about certain questions around it, yes, that is true.

Q Is Father Malachi in this country? A. Yes, he is.

Q Is he in Court? A. Yes, he is.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: And quite well? A. So far as I know, my Lord, quite well.

MR NEILL: Let us just see together how far you can help us. You, of course, were not one of those shown on page 51. That is where we get the photographs of the editorial board, if that is the right word. A. That is correct.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: And the bearded character at the top is Father Malachi? A. Yes, my Lord.

MR NEILL: That is Father Malachi. At the bottom we have got Mother Cassandra, the last witness. Just to the right of that we have got Father Mendes, the gentleman who is described as the advocate for Satan. A. Not in this magazine.

Q No; in the earlier magazine, the Sex issue. A. Yes.

Q Then Father Lars we see some way up on the right, who is the gentleman who joined in Los Angeles; is that right? A. That is correct, yes.

Q With that introduction, let us come back to page 36. Who was it - do you know - who went to the jail where Manson was to make arrangements for this article? A. I believe it was a girl called Susan Dubins, who talked to the attorneys for Charles Manson. This was, I think, after he had been tried, or possibly during his trial. I don't know precisely that point.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "Susan Dubins I believe arranged for the article" - right? A. Yes, my Lord.

MR NEILL: Susan Dubins was a Sister Belinda; is that right? A. I don't know precisely how long, because I was not directly concerned very much with her, but I think for some two or three months she had been accepted as a trainee minister. At the end of that two or three months she left the church in any capacity as wishing to train for the ministry, and became simply a lay member of it.

Q That is very interesting. What I asked you was quite a simple question: was her name in the church Sister Belinda? A. I think so. Again, I am not absolutely certain, but I believe that is correct.

You think that it is Susan Dubins (otherwise known as Sister Belinda) who went to make arrangements for the Manson article?  
A. I think what happened was she volunteered to do so. She asked whether we would be interested to have an article from Manson, I believe. Again, I am not talking out of my own direct knowledge, but simply out of things that have been told to me.

Q Were you interested in an article by Manson?  
A. Was I personally?

B Q Yes. A. Yes.

Q Why was that? A. Charles Manson is clearly a person of extreme depravity. So far as I know, he has been convicted of various murders. He was obviously a very sensational kind of person in that he attracted a great deal of publicity. We thought, therefore, that it would be interesting to present to our readers the views on death of such a person, particularly in contrast with such a pronounced Christian like Mr Muggeridge.

Q Are you saying it was entirely Miss Dubins' idea that you should get an article from Manson? A. I believe the idea originated with her. I believe that is what I said.

Q He would be a good example, would he not, of what you call a Satanist? A. Of a sub-humanity Satanist, yes.

Q A Satanist of the kind suggested on page 15 of the Sex issue?  
A. May I look at page 15?

Q I was using that as I thought convenient shorthand, but let us go back to it. A. Yes, that is fine. I understand what you mean by "page 15".

Q You have the Sex issue, have you? A. Yes, and I have page 15.

Q And you have got Father Mendes' (Mendes-Castle, as he is then known) advocacy. I was just suggesting to you that Mr Manson was a Satanist in the terms on page 15 of the Sex issue.  
A. If his activities were indeed as described by Mr Sanders in the book which is the subject of this action, then he would appear, so far as I can tell, to fit part of this description.

Q Come, Mr Fripp! You were telling my Lord and the Jury a moment or two ago that from what you knew of Mr Manson, he was a very depraved person. A. Yes, which was based on newspaper accounts and the general publicity that Mr Manson received. I am not an expert on Manson. I think I have gone through this before when I was on the stand earlier on.

Q But you picked him out, as I understood it, or, rather, acceded to the suggestion that this lady Susan Dubins was making, because he was a very depraved person? A. No; because he was an interesting person, who illustrated a particular aspect of what human beings are capable of doing. He was interesting from that point of view; not desirable or to be followed or encouraged, but merely interesting, something which it is worth looking at.

so you advertised this as an article specially written for the Process and say he developed these thoughts and gives his reality on death. A. That is what is written, yes.

Q Do you anywhere in that issue point out a word of disapproval of Mr Manson? A. I think it is very clear what we are trying to do in this magazine.

B MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Couldn't you answer the question? Is there anywhere in this issue a word of disapproval of Manson? A. I feel the whole magazine, my Lord, is a disapproval of Mr Manson.

C MR NEILL: But is there any specific statement on page 36 or anywhere else, saying: "We set out what Mr Manson has to say, but readers must beware because he is a very depraved man"? A. No, I don't believe we have said anything like that. I would have thought it was perfectly obvious to anybody that Mr Manson, given the reputation he has with the public, is not the kind of person we would be advocating as somebody to follow.

Q Do you know how that article was got out of Manson's prison? A. I have been told that it was arranged perfectly officially with Manson's attorneys.

D Q I think you told us that neither he nor Mr Muggeridge was paid anything. That is right, is it not? A. I don't believe it was me who told you that, but so far as I know that is absolutely true. It has never been our practice to offer sums of money for articles of that kind.

E Q Do you know what Mr Manson was told about your organisation when he was asked to write the article? A. So far as I know, he was not told anything.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You went to see him, did you tell us, at one point? A. Yes. That was later, my Lord.

MR NEILL: Did you talk to him then about the article you had had from him? A. No.

F Q Nothing about it? A. No.

Q Why not? A. I had not gone there to talk to him about this article. As I said in my previous testimony, I went there to see if I could help him. He seemed to me to be a person who needed help.

Q How long after the article did you go to see if he needed help? A. I went to see him, I believe, in April 1971. I cannot put a precise date on when he wrote this article, but I believe it was before I visited him.

Q You don't know when this issue of Death came out? There is no date on it. A. No, but I can probably work something out by recalling things. (After a pause): I think it was in the autumn of 1971, but, quite honestly, I was not concerned with the production of this, and I am not absolutely certain. It was the autumn or winter of 1971, at a guess.

Mr C.A. FRIPP:  
Further Cross-exd.

KEMPSTER: My Lord, just inside, under "Contents", I see the legend "January 1972".

NEILL: I am very grateful. I missed that. That is on page 4. That does help.

Q So how long would that have been before you visited Mr Manson?  
A. January 1972 is after I visited Mr Manson.

Q April 1971 you went? A. Yes. The magazine was obviously in preparation for a period of some months.

Q I had not appreciated those dates. Does that mean it was still some months before the magazine came out when you went to see Mr Manson? A. If my memory is correct and I went to see him in April 1971, and the magazine is dated there January 1972, that is a period of some seven months; but, as I say, the magazine was in preparation over quite some period of time, and as you will have seen it was advertised in our previous magazine. The theme of it, that we were going to do a magazine on death, had been decided quite some time before. Therefore, we had been collecting articles for quite some time.

Q Had you seen the text of Mr Manson's article when you went to see him in April 1971? A. No.

Q You were still waiting for it, were you? A. I was not waiting for anything. I am not even sure that I was aware he had written an article. I was not on the magazine staff, as we have already established.

Q When did you first know that an article by Manson was going to be put in a Process magazine? A. That it was going in for certain, probably just before the magazine was actually printed, which would have been in the late winter of 1971.

Q It was not until just before it came out that you would have known about this article? A. I could have known about it. To the best of my recollection, it was probably in the autumn of 1971 that I knew about it.

Q When you went to see him in April then, you knew nothing about it; is that what you are saying? A. I think so, yes. I did not visit him because he had written an article for us.

Q Or because you were thinking <sup>he</sup> might write an article for you? A. No, not at all.

Q I think you told us the other day that he was in a very confused state when you saw him? A. Certainly, yes, that is how he seemed to me, a very confused state. I could say other things about his state, but that was certainly one of them.

Q Are you really saying that an article by the man whom you had seen in April 1971 in that confused state was something suitable to have in your religious magazine? A. Yes. I think there is a whole point here, Mr Neill, as to what we consider suitable. We consider suitable things which would be instructive; hence the point that we have several times made that we wish to make descriptions of things, often very unpleasant things, and we do

it for a particular reason, which is to clarify, so far as we can, what is happening in the world. Because we see so much violence and unpleasant things happening in the world, we feel it is important that people, so far as we can help them to do so, see all of that with clarity; not to run away from it and pretend it does not happen.

B MR NEILL: My Lord, the other matter I was going to deal with with Father Malachi in the witness box, and I did not pursue with any other witness, because I left it, was the passage in the Fear issue on the Hells Angels. Again, subject to any objection my learned friend would wish to raise, and subject, of course, to your Lordship's approval, I would wish to put a few questions, not very many, about the article which appears on page 23 of the Fear issue.

MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, I have no objection.

C MR NEILL: Again, I think I made it clear I was leaving that because I thought someone else could deal with it better.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If you think you are going to extract anything from this gentleman, by all means try, so far as I am concerned.

D MR NEILL: I will only be a moment.

Q Perhaps it is right that I should put it to one of the witnesses for the Plaintiffs. What was the point, do you know, of including this series of quotations in the magazine?

A. Again, to draw attention to an aspect of human behaviour. It is a descriptive passage by taking quotations from other writers.

E Q Had you anything to deal with it?

A. With this page?

Q Yes. A. No.

Q Had you read the book on Hells Angels? A. No.

F Q You know, do you - or do you not - that they are a group of motor cyclists in California? A. As Mr De Peyer said, I believe they are more widespread than simply in California; in fact, I know they are, because I have heard about them in the Eastern United States as well as in California.

G Q You have come across them in the east, have you? A. I have not personally met them. I have seen publicity about them.

Q Would it be unfair to describe them as vicious? A. So far as what I have heard of them, they are totally vicious, yes.

H Q Let us see how whoever wrote it ended up this article: "Our Father who wert in Heaven - Satanist prayer". You see those words at the bottom right-hand side? A. I do.

Q Is that a Satanist prayer of the Process Church? A. Of course not, no. It is in quotation marks, my Lord, as everything else.



MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I agree, but what is the source of the quotation? A. That I do not know, my Lord.

Q Can you tell us why it was reproduced? A. As an illustration of the way these kind of people think, my Lord.

MR NEILL: You see they are described as Satanists. A. Yes.

Q They would be members or suitable members of the Process Church, wouldn't they? A. No, of course not.

Q I don't follow that, because we have had our friend Mr Caleb Ashburton Dunning described as a Satanist in the earlier issue, the Sex issue, haven't we? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: He is a member, isn't he? A. He was a member, my Lord, yes.

C Q He has gone? A. He left the church in, I think, 1966 or 1967; 1967 probably.

D MR NEILL: We have got Father Mendes, who is the advocate for Satan. Isn't he a Satanist? A. Not in the sense that I think you are asking me to answer, no, he is not. He is a Processean, which means he worships God but recognises within himself certain patterns of behaviour, a point again that this Court has heard frequently. This does not mean that he is advocating the kind of thing that we are looking at on this Hells Angels page; quite the reverse. We are not advocating this, again; we are simply describing something which everybody knows goes on in the world, and we are trying to show why it happens and how it can be prevented from happening.

E Q Do you see in the middle of the page: "Satan rides again with the Hells Angels"? A. Yes.

Q Is not that suggesting to the reader that one of your Gods is riding with the Hells Angels? A. I think what it is saying is that there are people in the world who feel that they are following Satan, the kind of Satanic activity which is commonly talked about, and they feel they are doing something for their God. I personally do not. Again, it is a descriptive passage.

F Q I wonder if I can just put it again. Does not that suggest to the reader that one of your Gods, Satan, is riding with the Hells Angels? A. I feel not, not one of our Gods, no.

G Q It may be I have completely misunderstood what the three Gods' names were. I thought one of the names - you will correct me if I am wrong about this - was Satan. Is that right? A. That is perfectly correct.

Q Is not the Satan on the top line, underneath the bird of prey, the God Satan? A. Yes, it is.

H Q And that is one of your three Gods? A. Yes. I feel there is a very important point that comes across in this whole magazine, which is that what our church is trying to do is to redeem people from the kind of activity which is described on this page, that nobody is beyond redemption. This is the

central precept of our entire church, that nobody should be beyond the endeavour of redemption; and if, with Christ's love, we can help such people to change their course of action, then we have done something good and something for God.

Does that message appear on page 23? A. No, it does not, of course not. It certainly appears in this magazine, though.

MR KEMPSTER: May I ask two questions in re-examination, my Lord, on this particular part?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes.

Re-examined by Mr KEMPSTER

Q The Death issue, on the back page, there is an advertisement for the next issue of the Process - Love; is that right?

A. That is perfectly correct, and that magazine has been issued and is the one which we are currently selling.

Q Who is the central figure in that illustration? A. Christ.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Which illustration?

MR KEMPSTER: Has your Lordship got the back page of Process on Death?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes.

MR KEMPSTER: I don't think your Lordship is looking at the back page.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Not yet. I am going to.

MR KEMPSTER: Perhaps I should say the outside cover at the back.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The editorial staff. The back page, yes; Christ is introduced.

MR KEMPSTER: That was not the answer, my Lord. His answer was the central figure in the illustration was Christ.

(The witness withdrew)

MR NEILL: My Lord, may I say at once, as far as the time is concerned, that, through my own miscalculation, I have miscalculated the amount of time the Plaintiffs' case would take. I wondered if your Lordship would grant me the indulgence of adjourning now and resuming the case at whatever time your Lordship thought right after the mid-day adjournment?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You mean your witnesses are not here?

MR NEILL: Yes, my Lord.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: When will they be?

MR NEILL: I hope to have a witness here at 2 o'clock, my Lord.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I quite agree. Everybody on your side plainly expected, and had good reason to anticipate, that Malachi, whose other name I forget, would be called, and he is not going to be called.

MR NEILL: My Lord, I had a large number of questions for him.

B MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Of course you did. Now what you are left with will be a comment on the abstention from putting him in the witness box. I think it is perfectly reasonable to adjourn to enable you to get your witnesses here.

MR NEILL: I am very grateful to your Lordship; and over the adjournment I will talk to my friend about the paperback, if I may.

C MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes, certainly. When would be suitable?

MR NEILL: If your Lordship would allow me to say 2 o'clock, I would be grateful.

D MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Certainly. I don't suppose the Jury will be very annoyed. I am not.

(Adjourned for a short time)

E

F

G

H

MR L.J. LARSEN:  
Examined.

MR NEILL: My Lord, I am afraid I am bound to have to make a further application to your Lordship. I do not propose, in this case, to open the matter to the jury. I think I have indicated the nature of the Defendants' case quite clearly. I have got one short witness here, but I am not in a position, I am afraid, to call any other evidence this afternoon. Over the adjournment enquiries have been made and the other witnesses are not available. I am extremely sorry about that. I say at once that the Defendants were not expecting the Plaintiffs' case to close so quickly, and the witnesses to be called are not, I am afraid, available. I can call this one short witness now; or alternatively I can have it dealt with tomorrow.

My evidence, I think I can say, will not take very long. My witnesses, whom I will call tomorrow, are four or five in number. And, in addition to that, there are two witnesses who will be arriving from the United States first thing on Wednesday morning. I anticipate, therefore, that my evidence will be over in the middle of the week, so that the time that your Lordship feared when you first heard about the case last Tuesday I hope will be substantially less.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Was it only last Tuesday? It seems months ago.

MR NEILL: I think it was last Tuesday afternoon we began. It is not perhaps so long ago as it seems since we began. I am very sorry about this, but that is the position.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think it is fair to say that you were unintentionally misled, largely by the answers given by witnesses in the witness box.

MR NEILL: Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: No one is to be blamed for that, and obviously the jury and I will have to do our best to do justice in the end. I am not talking about "the End" in inverted commas. We had better dispose of what we can this afternoon and then get on.

MR NEILL: Yes. I will call Mr Larsen. He is mentioned in para.24, page 43.

MR LARRY JOHN LARSEN, Sworn,

Examined by MR NEILL

Q Are you Mr Larry J. Larsen? A. Yes.

Q And the "J" stands for what? A. John.

Q Your address is what, in California? A. Is it all right if I give the business address?

MR .L.J. LARSEN:  
Examined.

the business address will do very well. A. 815 East Meats  
avenue, Orange (that is the city, city of Orange), California.  
two or  
about/three years ago did you see a member of the Process,  
a young woman, called Susan Dubins? A. Yes, I did.

Can you tell my Lord when that was? A. That was roughly  
January 1971.

She is a young woman - you may have been in court this  
morning - who had also the name of Sister Belinda. Did you  
know of that name? A. Yes, I did.

Q Where was it that you saw Miss Dubins? A. At her apartment  
in Hollywood.

Q When you saw her, you may have discussed a number of other  
matters, but did she make some request to you about a docu-  
ment? A. Yes, she did.

Q Perhaps you will tell my Lord and the jury what that was?  
A. She said that Charles Manson had written an article about  
Death and that the Process wanted that article for their  
forthcoming issue called Death. She wanted to know if I  
or Mr Paul Fitzgerald could assist in getting or smuggling it  
out.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "Mr Paul Fitzgerald": who is he?  
A. He was a defence attorney in the Manson case, defending  
Patricia Krenwinkel.

Q Smuggling what? A. The article that Charles Manson had  
written on Death.

Q Out of where? A. Out of the jail that he was in.

MR NEILL: What did you say to that? A. I said I didn't think  
it would be possible, but that I would ask a question about it.

Q You mean, you would ask somebody about it? A. Yes.

Q But you did not think it would be possible? A. That is correct.

Q Did Miss Dubins say what she knew about the article, whether  
she had had any contact herself with Mr Manson, or not?  
A. She said she had either tried to visit or had visited  
Charles Manson about one month prior to my visit. I think  
she said she was successful in seeing him briefly.

Q I do not think we have heard this yet, but in January 1971  
what stage had the Manson proceedings reached? Was it at  
the trial, or after the trial, or how? A. This was, I  
believe, just at the conclusion of the guilt or innocence  
phase, and I don't believe that the penalty phase had yet  
started, although it may have. It was just about that time.

Q The procedure in California is that you have the criminal  
proceedings split into two pieces: first of all you have the

MR L.J. LARSEN:  
Examined.  
Cross-examined.

decision as to guilt or innocence; then subsequent to that the hearing before the jury with regard to what the penalty is to be? A. Yes, in almost all cases.

- B Q And in this case you think it was in the interval between those two procedures? A. Either at the very end of the guilt-innocence phase or at the very start of the penalty phase.
- Q Apart from visiting Charles Manson you think about a month before this event, did she say anything else about any contact she had had with the trial or anyone attending the trial? A. She said she was in trial almost every day.
- C MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Meaning in the court? A. Yes, attending the trial.
- MR NEILL: Did she indicate, when she was attending the trial, whereabouts she was sitting? A. It would be in the public section of the courtroom.
- D Q Sitting in the public section, but did she give any indication as to anyone she was sitting with, or near to, or anything like that? A. She seemed to know a number of the Manson Family girls.

Cross-examined by MR KEMPSTER

- Q I may have missed it, but are you an attorney? A. No, I am not.
- E Q What had you to do with the trial of Charles Manson? A. At that point I was assisting Paul Fitzgerald in some of the investigation on the case.
- Q Are you a private investigator then? A. Yes, I am.
- F Q So you were a private investigator acting on behalf of the defence of Charles Manson. Is that right? A. Not Charles Manson.
- Q Of whom? A. Patricia Krenwinkel.
- Q She was a member of the Family (with a big "F"), was she? A. Yes.
- G Q So did Miss Dubins arrange to come and see you? A. No.
- Q Did you make an appointment to see her then? A. Yes.
- Q Having made an appointment to see her, she asked you if you could help to get an article by Charles Manson out of jail for the Process-church? A. Yes.
- H Q Following her request, did you make any attempts to get this article out? A. No, I didn't.

MR L.J. LARSEN:  
Cross-examined.

Q So you did not do anything? A. No, I didn't take it serious.

Q A quite different topic I do not know whether you know the answer to this as a private investigator, but was pornographic material freely available for sale in California in these times? A. It would have to depend on your definition of "pornographic material".

Q Shall I say dirty books and magazines. That will suffice for my purpose, if that conveys anything to you? A. The laws have changed so rapidly in California, it depends on which year you are talking about.

Q I see. Are there any years you can remember when dirty books and magazines were not available in California? I am not asking you about the law, I am asking you about their availability. A. Publicly or privately?

Q Readily acceptable? A. The real change in the law took place---

Q I am not asking you about that. I am not asking you about the law at all, I am just asking you if there was any time you can remember when dirty books and magazines were not freely available in California? A. Yes.

Q How long ago? A. That was about the turning point, 1970, 1971.

Q When you say a turning point, from what to what? A. There were many changes in the case law of the United States Constitution, United States Supreme Court.

Q May I put my question again. I am asking you whether you could remember any year when dirty books and magazines were not available in California? A. You first said "readily available".

MR KEMPSTER: All right, readily available.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I imagine that if somebody wants to buy a dirty book in California they have always been able to do it, have they not? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Of course.

MR KEMPSTER: I am obliged to your Lordship.

MR NEILL: Thank you, Mr Larsen.

(The witness withdrew)

MR NEILL: That is my only witness available today.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It is unfortunate.

MR NEILL: I have a number of witnesses tomorrow, and two arriving

on Wednesday. There may come a time tomorrow - and I thought I should indicate this now - when I will run out again.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The same position?

NEILL: The same position.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It is terribly serious from the jury's point of view. Everybody is in difficulty about this. If the judge is sitting alone, somebody will be wasting his time anyway; but there are 12 members of the jury here, whom I am reluctant to inconvenience more than I must.

What do you say about this, Mr Kempster? It is your fault, partly.

C MR KEMPSTER: Thank you, my Lord! Of course. Accepting the very heavy burden of blame your Lordship has placed on my shoulders, may I indicate just this, that this action was adjourned once on 25 February, at the Defendants' application, to 12 March. Your Lordship will appreciate the gravity of the charges and the particulars of justification that are still on the record against the Plaintiffs. I can only mention that - and, of course, that Father Malachi is available if my friend really wants him - and sit down.

D MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That does not sound like any opposition, does it? So all I can do is to adjourn. I am terribly sorry, members of the jury. It is not necessary to add that it is through no fault of mine. But I hope we will be able to get on with it tomorrow. And I suppose most of the evidence will finish on Wednesday?

E MR NEILL: Indeed, I think so. But if the witnesses do go a bit quickly, I may be in the same position tomorrow afternoon. It is better to say that now than to surprise your Lordship tomorrow.

F MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Very well. It follows there is nothing more we can do today. I am sorry, members of the jury.

(Adjourned to tomorrow morning at 10.30)

---

G

H



**FIFTH DAY**

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,

Tuesday, 19th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON

and a Jury

-----

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT (A corporate body)

CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP,

CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER and

Plaintiffs

WENDY ANN PEACH

-and-

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED and

First Defendants

ED SANDERS

Second Defendant

And between:

SAME -and- SAME

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October, 1972)

-----

I N D E X

Page

B

LARSEN, Mr. L.J.  
Further cross-exd. .... 2.

VENTRIS, Miss T.  
Examined ..... 2.  
Cross-examined ..... 16.  
Re-examined ..... 20.

C

GIBBENS, Prof. T.C.N.  
Examined ..... 21.  
Cross-examined ..... 25.  
Re-examined ..... 27.

---

E

F

A

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,

Tuesday, 19th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON

and a Jury

-----

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT (A corporate body)

CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP,

CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER and Plaintiffs

WENDY ANN PEACH

-and-

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED and First Defendants

ED SANDERS Second Defendant

And between:

SAME -and- SAME

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October, 1972)

-----

(Transcript from the Shorthand Notes of The Association of Official  
Shorthandwriters, Ltd., Room 392, Royal Courts of Justice, and  
2, New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.2.)

-----

Mr MICHAEL KEMPSTER, Q.C. and Mr PETER BOWSHER (instructed by  
Messrs Joynson-Hicks & Co.) appeared for the Plaintiffs.

Mr BRIAN NEILL, Q.C. and Mr LEON BRITTAN (instructed by  
Messrs Goodman, Derrick & Co.) appeared for the First Defendants.

The SECOND DEFENDANT did not appear and was not represented.

-----

E V I D E N C E

F I F T H            D A Y

MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, before my learned friend calls his further evidence, there are I think three or four questions that I should have put to Mr Larry Larsen. I am sorry to have to crave your Lordship's indulgence, but I think it would be in the interests of the Plaintiffs that he should be recalled.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: All right.

Mr LARRY JOHN LARSEN, recalled

Further Cross-examined by Mr KEMPSTER

B

Q Mr Larsen, have you read the book "The Family"? A. Yes, I have.

Q Do you know Mr Ed Sanders? A. Yes, I do. (Book "The Family" handed to the witness).

C

Q Would you turn to page 9? In the third paragraph we read: "During the last six months of my investigation, I was aided considerably by a private investigator, Mr Larry Larsen, an intrepid sleuth whose persistent, resourceful collecting of data was amazing", and so on. Is that you? A. Yes.

D

Q The second question is this: do you know what sort of (shall I say) writings had been published by Mr Ed Sanders prior to "The Family"? A. Yes.

Q Can you name any of them? A. "Shards of God" is really the only title I can recall.

Q I am going now to ask you to identify the book. (Book "Shards of God" handed to witness). A. Yes.

E

Q Anything else? A. I know he wrote poetry.

Q I am going to put two copies of poems before you. Will you tell my Lord and the Jury whether those are the poems you had in mind. (Documents handed to witness). A. No; I have never read any of Ed Sanders' poetry.

F

Q You have not read those? A. No.

Q You would describe him as a poet, would you? A. Yes.

Q From reputation, then, would it be romantic poetry or classical poetry, or how would you describe it? A. I really don't know.

G

(The witness withdrew)

Miss TESSA VENTRIS, Affirmed

Examined by Mr BRITTAN

Q Is your name Tessa Ventris? A. Yes.

H

Q Are you living at Shudy Camps, Cambridge? A. Yes.

Q It is common ground that there was a period when you were in contact with the first Plaintiffs in these proceedings, the

A Process-Church of Final Judgement. Could you say when you first came into contact with the Process Church? A. I cannot remember the year exactly. I think it was 1965 and 1966, in November.

Q How did you first come into contact with the church?  
A. I heard somebody talking about it at a party.

Q Who was that person? A. James Wickham.

B Q As a result of hearing about it, did you get in touch with the church? A. Yes.

Q And did you attend the church's premises? A. Yes.

Q Where were they at the time? A. In Wigmore Street.

C Q Were you seen by any official of the church when you began going there? A. The first person I saw was Robert De Grimston.

Q What did he ask you to do? A. He gave me an interview. I cannot really remember what happened in the interview.

D Q Were you presented with any document of any kind?  
A. I remember that there was some document that I had to sign about the responsibility of joining, but I cannot remember when it was presented.

Q What did it say about the responsibility of joining?  
A. I think it said if I joined and I got ill, it was my responsibility.

E Q You say that the document said that if you joined and got ill, it was your responsibility. Did the document specify any kind of illness that you might have which would be your responsibility, or just ill? A. I cannot remember things very clearly - it happened so long ago - but I think it did specify mental illness.

F Q Having signed that document, what sort of activities were you involved with at Wigmore Street? I just want you to refer to them in general terms, and then we will describe them in detail.  
A. I signed on to do a course of sessions.

Q Were those individual or group sessions? A. Individual.

Q Was there anything else that you signed on for or got involved with before we describe the sessions? A. After a few weeks I joined the communications course that they ran in the evenings.

G Q Dealing with the individual sessions, who conducted the sessions with you? A. Mary Anne De Grimston.

Q Could you describe what happened at those sessions?  
A. The idea was to eliminate personal problems by a series of questions.

H Q What sort of questions were asked? Were they personal or painful or pleasant, what sort of questions? A. Questions like, "What is your problem?", "What are you achieving?".

Miss T. VENTRIS:  
Examined.

Q Was there any kind of mechanical or electrical apparatus?  
A. Yes, there was an E-meter.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What sort of an instrument was that?  
A. I believe it is a form of lie detector, but it is very simple.

MR BRITTAN: Was it attached to you in any way? A. There was a cylinder which I held.

Q You held it? A. Yes.

Q What was it made of? A. I don't know.

Q You just held it in both hands or one? A. No; just like that, with one hand, and there was a flex which attached it to a dial.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Could you see the dial registering anything? A. I could not, no.

MR BRITTAN: Could anyone else see the dial registering?  
A. The therapist.

Q That is Mrs De Grimston? A. In this case, yes.

Q As far as you knew, were other people undergoing similar treatment? A. I did in fact have sessions with other people which were exactly the same.

Q Continuing with Mrs De Grimston, what was her attitude towards you during the sessions? A. It was a mixture.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What does that mean? A. In a way she was very friendly; in a way she was very ferocious.

MR BRITTAN: Ferocious? A. Well, she is a determined woman.

Q Could you help his Lordship and the Jury just a little by explaining in which way she was ferocious and determined?  
A. She was determined that she would get you through the questions that you were answering, as much for your own good as hers.

Q And ferocious? A. That was the ferocious bit.

Q What sort of effect did the sessions have on you? Did you feel cheerful or depressed or what after? A. The pattern was that the first sessions made you more and more depressed until you reached a certain point. That happened with me.

Q When you got particularly depressed, was there anything that you were asked to do? A. If I was desperate, I could ring Mary Anne.

Q Were there any other sort of exercises of a physical kind?  
A. Not that you could do by yourself.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "Mary Anne" was Mrs De Grimston?  
A. That is right.

Miss T. VENTRIS:  
Examined.

MR BRITTAN: I think you were implying that there were physical exercises which you could do with other people.

A. You could do them with the therapist. You could not do them with just anybody.

Q What were they? A. Simple things, being led around a room, touching objects.

B Q Would she tell you what to touch, or did you choose what to touch yourself? A. No; it was under direction.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What kind of objects? A. Walls, tables, books. It was called physical reorientation.

MR BRITTAN: When you engaged in this touching exercise, did you feel any better for it or the same? A. Marginally better.

C MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Better from what? A. More in contact with reality, if you like.

MR BRITTAN: Were you touched yourself or physically touched at all? A. Yes.

D Q Would you explain about that? A. It was a special procedure in which the therapist's fingers moved around your body from place to place, and you gave an acknowledgment each time you were touched.

Q You said "moved about the body". On which parts of the body were you touched in this way? A. Just the ordinary parts of the body; not sexual parts, or anything like that.

E Q Can you say roughly how many of these sessions you had? A. I suppose I must have had a hundred or so.

Q Over how long a period of time was that? A. Over a year and a half on and off.

F MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: How old were you at this time, roughly? A. I think when I joined the Process I was 19, 18 coming up 19.

MR BRITTAN: I think you said you signed on for something else as well as the individual sessions. A. Yes.

G Q Would you like to describe what happened? A. The communications courses were exercises in communication, which we did in pairs under supervision.

Q What did the exercises consist of? There were the two of you and the supervisor. What did you have to do? A. In the first one we just had to look into each other's eyes.

Q Were there other ones? A. Yes.

H Q What did they consist of? A. Then you had to acknowledge communication. You had to say, "All right, thanks; fine", something like that.



Q Were there any other exercises in the communications course?  
A. They progressed to more difficult ones like handling strong emotions which people were presenting to you.

Q I wonder if you could say how the strong emotions were presented to you? A. For instance, somebody would pretend to be very angry and shout at you.

Q Was that the partner that you were doing the course with would be told to be angry and shout? A. Yes.

B Q What sort of thing would the partner shout at you when they were told to be angry? A. They would pretend to be a patient in a session, behaving badly.

Q Did they shout insults or what? A. Anything.

Q Were there insults? A. Oh, yes.

C Q What sort of insults were shouted at you? A. It is hard to say. I cannot really remember.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Cannot you remember one of them?  
A. (After a pause): Well, I cannot specifically, no.

D Q Do your best. A. Just the usual sort of things that you abuse people with, like "You're stupid", "You're frightened of me".

MR BRITTAN: What sort of impression did that make on you at the age of 19? A. I was sometimes upset, but it was only a game, really.

E Q What were you supposed to be doing, according to those conducting the course, when you were subjected to this particular treatment? A. You had to learn to handle people who were doing things like that.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do you mean you shouted another insult back, or what happened? A. No. You had to be not upset and you had to go on asking them the question that you were trying to get them to answer.

F MR BRITTAN: Who conducted this course? A. Bob and Mary Anne De Grimston.

Q That is Mr and Mrs De Grimston jointly? A. Yes.

C Q How many sessions of this course (if I may so describe them) did you have? A. It is hard to tell. I went twice a week for about a year.

Q Was that at the same time as you were having the individual sessions? A. Yes.

H Q So it is fair to say that you were having pretty intensive treatment of one kind or another from the Process at that time? A. Yes.

Q In the communications course that you have just been describing, you had a partner. Was it always the same partner or a different partner? A. A different partner.

- Q While you were doing all this, were you encouraged or discouraged by the Process to have contact with the outside world?  
A. Discouraged.
- Q Were you given any reason why you should cut yourself off from the outside world? A. We were the elect.
- Q In what sense the elect? Elected to do what?  
A. To survive the holocaust, I suppose.
- B Q When was that expected? A. No date given.
- Q Shortly or a long time to come? A. Within 50 years, I should think.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did you have to pay any entrance fee? A. No.
- C MR BRITTAN: Where were you living during the period that you were undergoing this intensive treatment? A. Lots of different places.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did all this entertainment take place in Wigmore Street? A. No; some of it was in Balfour Place.
- I MR BRITTAN: It is right that the Process moved from Wigmore Street to Balfour Place. A. Yes.
- Q I want you to tell me a little about the financial side of things. When you started with the Process, what were you living on? A. An allowance from my mother, and I had a small inheritance as well.
- E Q What happened to the allowance? How much was the allowance?  
A. £10 a week.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: From your mother, did you say?  
A. Yes.
- F MR BRITTAN: What happened to the allowance after you got involved with the Process? A. After we moved to Balfour Place, when we were all living there together, I had to give it to them.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "I had to give it to" whom?  
A. To the Process.
- MR BRITTAN: And the inheritance? A. That got whittled away.
- C MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What does that mean - that you were spending it yourself, or that they took it over? A. No. I was spending it on sessions, and things like that.
- Q So the sessions cost something? A. Oh, yes.
- h MR BRITTAN: Let us get this quite clear. The £10 allowance, when you moved to Balfour Place, you handed over to the Process. In addition to that, you had to pay for the sessions? A. No.
- Q Perhaps you could explain. A. Before we moved into Balfour Place, you paid for each session individually, as you would a psychiatrist.

Q How much per session? A. 3 guineas an hour. A session was two hours.

Q If I have got the arithmetic right, a session of two hours was 6 guineas, and if you did about 100 of those, you would have paid in total something over £600. A. But remember some of them I did not pay for, because we were living as a community.

Q That is the latter ones, is it? A. Balfour Place started about a year and a bit after I was with the Process.

Q And after you moved to Balfour Place you did not pay for the sessions? A. No.

Q Did you pay for the communications course? A. Yes. I cannot remember how much. It was a lump sum.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Have you any idea roughly how much? A. I suppose it was £100 or so.

MR BRITTAN: You may not be able to answer this question, in which case please say so. Have you any idea how many people were undergoing sessions at the time that you were? A. We seemed to stay in a group of about 20.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Were they mostly young people, in your sort of age group? A. There were five or six my age. Most were older.

MR BRITTAN: How much older? A. The oldest of us was about 35 and the youngest about 18 or 19.

Q What effect did this have on your relations with your mother and family? You I think have said you were discouraged from contact with the outside world. A. Contact with my mother was all right because I was still a minor.

Q You moved to Balfour Place, where you actually lived in. Did that have any effect on contact with your mother? A. Not really, no.

Q On the financial side, when you moved in, you were paying your £10 a week to the Process. Did you have any other source of income? A. They suggested to me that I should get a job as well.

Q Did you get a job? A. Yes.

Q I believe it was at a flower shop and then at Marshall & Snelgrove? A. That is right.

Q What did you do with the money that you earned? A. I gave it to them.

Q Were they grateful? A. No.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: When you say "them", do you mean the De Grimstons, husband and wife, or do you mean some official of the organisation? A. The secretary of the organisation, as far as I remember.

MR BRITTAN: Who was the secretary? A. Christopher Fripp.

Q At Balfour Place it has, I think, been agreed that the De Grimstons lived at the top of the house. That is right, is it not? A. Yes.

Q Who was in charge of the whole operation there, would you say? Who was running it? A. Bob and Mary Anne.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The De Grimstons? A. Yes.

MR BRITTAN: Was it run under a light rein or was it very strict? A. Very strict.

Q What was Mary Anne's (Mrs De Grimston's) attitude towards new entrants? A. At first she was very kind, and then very severe.

Q What form did her severity take? A. Accusations of personal weakness.

Q Were you accused of personal weakness by her? A. Yes.

Q How did you feel when you were subject to accusations of this kind? A. Mostly I felt they were quite true.

Q Did your feeling of weakness have anything to do with your interest and involvement in the Process or not? A. No.

Q I want to ask you some questions about the views of the Process. Did they have any views for or against the concept of reincarnation? A. They seemed to be in favour.

Q Did Mrs De Grimston have any views as to who she was a reincarnation of? A. No particular person. She might have been a German.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Might have been a German? A. Yes.

Q Did she say so? A. Well, I remarked once that she spelt one word in a German way, and she said "Oh, yeh, I might have been a German in the past".

Q Any particular German? A. No.

MR BRITTAN: What you have described is a sort of psychiatric-type operation. Was there at Wigmore Street a mention of a switch to religion at any stage? A. Yes. That was soon after I joined.

Q Who was it that said what about the switch to religion? A. Mary Anne said, "How do you feel about becoming a religion?"

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "How do you feel?" A. To the group.

Q That was at Wigmore Street? A. Yes.

MR BRITTAN: What did the group feel? A. The group was very surprised.

Miss T. VENTRIS:  
Examined.

Q When it overcame its surprise, did it react to this suggestion in any way or accept it, or what? A. We burst out laughing, but we had to go along with it.

Q It may seem obvious to you, but why did you have to go along? A. You could not deviate if you belonged to the group.

Q Did anyone try to deviate? A. People left, yes.

B Q I think it is, again, common ground that in the summer of 1966 you went to the Bahamas. A. Yes.

Q When you first went, did you go with anyone or by yourself? A. I went with a group of people on an aeroplane.

Q But from the Process could you name anyone who you went with first, before I think you were subsequently joined by others? A. There were a couple of people who went ahead.

Q Who went ahead? A. Christopher De Peyer and somebody else I don't remember.

Q Before you? A. Before me, yes. Then most of us went in a bunch.

I Q Did you arrive before the De Grimstons and Mr Fripp or after them? A. Yes, about three weeks before.

Q In the period before the arrival of the De Grimstons and Mr Fripp, what sort of time did you have in the Bahamas? A. We had a nice time.

E Q Doing what? A. Getting jobs, enjoying ourselves.

Q Did you continue to have a nice time when the De Grimstons and Mr Fripp arrived? A. No.

Q What was the difference? A. We had not done any sessions or courses while we were by ourselves, and there was a tightening up of discipline all round.

Q I understand you to be saying there was a tightening up of discipline and you began courses and sessions? A. Yes.

Q I think a time came when you moved from the Bahamas to Mexico; is that right? A. Yes.

Q Did you go first to Mexico City? A. Yes.

Q And then to Sisal? A. Yes.

Q And then to Xtul? A. I spent a short time in a village near Xtul and in another house as well. They were two sort of stopping-off places on the way there.

H Q That was Chubera, was it? A. Yes.

Q Then you all moved to Xtul in the end? A. Yes.

Miss T. VENTRIS:  
Examined.

- Q What did you do at Xtul? How did you spend the day?  
A. The first part of the day was spent in manual labour.
- Q And the rest? A. The afternoons we had to ourselves most of the time, in which we had discussions and sort of spiritualist meetings.
- Q Do you remember a place in Xtul called the temple? A. Yes.
- Q What went on in the temple? A. Vigils and self-flagellation.

(Continued on next page)

MISS T. VENTRIS:  
Examined.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did you flagellate yourself? A.Yes.

MR BRITTAN: With what? A. With a knotted rope.

Q Did you do that when you felt like it, or on instruction?  
A. When you had sinned, you expiated like that.

Q Did you decide whether you had sinned, or someone else?  
A. It was pretty well defined what sin was.

Q What was the definition? A.To disagree with dogma, or to fall asleep during the meetings.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Whose dogma? A. The dogma of the Process.

Q What was the other kind of sin you mentioned? A. To fall asleep during the meetings.

MR BRITTAN: So if you disagreed, or fell asleep; was there any other sin? A. You can have sinful thoughts, I suppose.

Q You went off to the temple and flagellated yourself? A.Yes.

Q Did anybody suggest you should do it, or was it always left entirely to you? A. It was obvious when it was necessary.

Q When you beat yourself, how many times did you do it?  
A. About six.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Six strokes? A. Yes.

MR BRITTAN: Were there some people who gave themselves more strokes than that? A. Yes, most of them did.

Q Most of them gave themselves more. Up to how many? A. I cannot remember. About sixty, I should think. I am only guessing really. You could hear them.

Q In what sort of condition did they emerge from the temple?  
A. One or two of them got hysterical.

Q And physically, could you see any signs of flagellation?  
A. Most of the men had bruises on their backs.

Q This you could see because they were naked on the back? A.Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Because they were what? A. They were stripped for working.

MR BRITTAN: How long would people spend in the temple? A.Beat-  
ing themselves?

Q Or for any other purpose? A. If they were on all-night vigil, they would spend many hours there.

Q People would spend all-night vigils? A. Yes.

MISS T. VENTRIS:  
Examined.

Q Did Mr De Peyer ever say anything to you about whipping?  
A. He introduced the idea to me.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Introduced the idea of what?  
A. Self-flagellation.

MR BRITTAN: When all this started, how many ropes were there available for the community? A. At first there was only one.

Q Did this cause any problems? A. Yes, we had to queue.

Q Did anybody suggest that anything should be done about that?  
A. Mary Ann suggested we should all wear ropes all the time.

Q And did you? A. Yes.

Q Do you know if Mrs De Grimston flagellated herself? A. I am pretty sure she didn't.

Q What about Mr De Grimston? A. I don't think he did either.

Q Mr Fripp? A. Yes, he did.

Q Badly, or just a little? A. Badly.

Q What effect did that have on him? Did you ever see it?  
A. It is hard to say. I thought at the time he must be a masochist.

Q Do you remember any occasion when anybody came out of the temple in a condition that required your assistance? A. Yes.

Q What happened? A. It was a girl who had beaten herself and got into hysterics.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "She required my help".

MR BRITTAN: Yes. What did you do? A. I slapped her face.

Q I wonder if you could tell his Lordship and the members of the jury, how old would you say that girl was? A. She was about 19 or 20.

Q At this stage I think it is right to say that the religious philosophy of the Plaintiffs had developed a certain amount. I am not going to ask you the details of the theology, but, so far as reincarnation was concerned, were you supposed to be anyone in particular? A. Most of us were supposed to be representative of characters in the Old Testament, and I was Jezebel.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did you choose to be Jezebel, or did somebody suggest that? A. I think Mary Ann suggested it.

Q Did she say why? A. Because she thought I was a destructive person.

MR BRITTAN: Were you called Jezebel? A. No.

MR BRITTAN: But you were believed to be the reincarnation of Jezebel.



MISS T. VENTRIS:  
Examined.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You did not get the name? A. No, but they used to sing "Jezebel" to me sometimes - you know there is a song.

MR BRITTAN: I do.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I do not.

MR BRITTAN: It is a well known song. A. I cannot sing it to you, I am afraid.

MR BRITTAN: You were believed to be the reincarnation of Jezebel. Do you remember a Mr Tim Wvllie? A. Yes.

Q Of what or of whom was he believed to be the reincarnation? A. The serpent in the Garden of Eder.

Q Was Mary Ann De Grimston herself believed to be the reincarnation of anyone? A. Not so far as I remember.

Q Or Robert De Grimston? A. No.

Q Do you remember a person called Peter Eckhoff? A. Yes.

Q Was he believed to be the reincarnation of anyone? A. At one point he was believed to be the reincarnation of Jesus Christ.

Q Do you remember somebody called Wendy Peach? A. Yes.

Q What was her relationship with Mr Eckhoff? Was she friendly with him? A. She was his girl friend for a time.

Q And was she believed to be the reincarnation of anyone? A. The Virgin Mary.

MR KEMPSTER: I venture to suggest that this was not put to the several witnesses, insofar as it is important. I do not want to attach too great importance to it.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: They can all come back and deal with it, if you want to.

MR KEMPSTER: If your Lordship pleases.

MR BRITTAN: Do you remember a Mr Hugh Mountain? A. Yes.

Q He was there as well, was he? A. In Mexico?

Q Yes. A. Yes.

Q Was he believed to be the reincarnation of anyone? A. I think he was Moses.

Q Mr Fripp, who was he? A. I think he was Aaron.

Q Mr Christopher De Peyer? A. He was Ahab.

Q And Mr Ashburton-Dunning? A. He was Caleb.

Q Did Mrs De Grimston do any work? A. No.

Q Was she particular about her meals? A. Yes.

Q In what way? A. She had different meals to us, and they had to be served at exactly the right time.

Q Was she sympathetic if someone was a little late with a meal? A. No.

Q What was her attitude? A. She was angry.

Q About water for washing: how did she get that? A. We had to bring it from a well a mile away.

C Q Often? A. Every day.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Was this for her to wash, or for all of you to wash? A. For her to wash - not for us.

MR BRITTAN: What was the weather like in Mexico at that time? A. Fine.

Q Hot or cold? A. Just right.

Q You did not have fritters for breakfast, good meals and water. That was all for Mrs De Grimston? A. Yes.

Q Do you remember somebody called Claudia? A. Yes.

Q Do you remember an incident relating to her use of a mug? A. That was my use of a mug, I think, not hers.

Q Tell his Lordship and the jury about your use of a mug and what happened. A. The seniors lived in a separate room to us and had large mugs for their tea. The girl who used to make the tea used to get very annoyed because she couldn't get any of the large mugs.

F Q So what happened? A. I took a big mug.

Q You took a big mug, and you should have had a little one? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: And was that the trouble, you took a big one? A. Yes, I should not have done. The girl came in looking for it, really mad, so I put my sombrero over it.

Q "She came in looking for it, really mad. I put my sombrero" over what? A. Over the mug, so that she could not see it.

MR BRITTAN: So that she could not see the size of it? A. She could not see it at all.

Q Without going into the minute details, did anybody suggest any sort of penalty for the use of the large mugs? A. No, they were just told off.

MISS T. VENTRIS:  
Examined.

- Q We have heard about Mrs De Grimston's food. So far as people generally were concerned was fasting something that ever happened? A. Yes.
- Q Was that frequent or infrequent? A. Every day there were one or two people fasting for the day.
- Q Were they people who decided they felt like fasting, or were asked to fast? A. It was obligatory. It was not a matter of when, but you knew you had to do it.
- Q Did there come a time when Mr Greenby arrived on the scene? A. Yes.
- Q When he arrived, what was your reaction? A. Delight.
- Q You were delighted to be leaving? A. Yes.
- Q Why were you keen to go? A. I felt the pressure was too great.
- Q The pressure on you? A. Yes.
- Q From whom? A. From the group - especially the people at the top.
- Q You said you were delighted to see Mr Greenby. Who is Mr Greenby? A. He is a solicitor.
- Q What had he come for, on whose behalf? A. He had come to take us back to England.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do you mean that somebody had instructed him on behalf of those of you who were minors, was he acting professionally? A. He was acting on behalf of parents of three of us who were minors.

MR BRITTAN: One being your own father? A. Yes.

- Q And you went back to England with him? A. Yes.
- Q When you got back, did you find it easy to adjust to normal life or not? A. Very difficult.
- Q Perhaps you could explain in your own words what it felt like readjusting, why it was so difficult? A. The Process had been my way of life and my only friends.
- Q Is there anything further you want to say on the readjustment process? A. No.
- Q Do you now have any contact with Process at all? A. No.

Cross-examined by MR KEMPSTER

- Q When you gave your name and address a little while ago I do not think you told my Lord and the Jury your occupation? A. I am a religious student.

MISS T. VENTRIS:  
Cross-examined.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: A religious student? A. Yes.

Q Where are you studying? A. At the Zen Centre.

MR KEMPSTER: You are studying Zen Buddhism? A. Yes.

Q Is Shudy Camp the name of a community? A. That is the name of the village.

Q And are you in a community? A. Yes.

Q Are you studying the Seven-fold Path, or what? A. The Eight-fold Path.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You will have to explain these things to me. A. Basically Buddhism is self-restraint. We practise self-restraint as much as Christians do.

MR KEMPSTER: Have you - forgive me asking you this - any job or means of livelihood? A. I have a small private income.

Q When you came into touch with the Process earlier on, did you come into touch with them and enter for these courses and pay for them quite voluntarily? A. Yes.

Q And at that stage was this organisation called the Process? A. When I joined it it was called Compulsion Analysis.

Q Would it be right to say that, at that stage, Mr and Mrs De Grimston, and possibly others, were offering their form of mental therapy for fees, for money? A. Yes.

Q Then I think first in Wigmore Street, and then in Balfour Place, the emphasis changed to an emphasis on religion. Is that right? A. It was a different name, that is all.

Q But did not religion begin to bulk much larger in everyone's outlook? A. A little, yes; but we had always talked about God.

Q So far as you could gauge, when you embarked on these courses Mrs De Grimston and others who came in touch with were seeking to help you? A. Yes.

Q One or two points on the financial front: Is it not right that the communications course cost you £30? A. I said I couldn't remember.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You were not ever shown a tariff or price list, were you? A. No.

Q Can you remember how the price was fixed? A. I have already said as much as I remember.

Q Did anybody say: "How much have you got?", or anything of that sort? A. Later on there was a sliding scale to accommodate people with low incomes.

MISS T. VENTRIS:  
Cross-examined.

MR KEMPSTER: When you all went to Balfour Place, is it right that virtually the whole community had outside jobs? A. Yes.

Q And would everybody pool their earnings in the common fund? A. They gave very much and got very little.

Q Would it be right to say - what I am suggesting at the moment is - that what was suggested to you was common to members of the community; that is, to go out, earn money, bring it back, put it in the pool? A. It was common. I resisted the suggestion but I was overridden - I resisted the suggestion to go out to work, but I was overridden.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: By whom? A. By the group.

MR KEMPSTER: When you say you were overridden, was the understanding that if you were not prepared to go out into the world and earn money you would have to leave the community? A. I suppose so.

Q Of course, this going out to the flower shop and Marshall & Snelgrove and so on involved a certain amount of contact with the outside world? A. Very little.

Q You said you got very little. I suppose you got board and lodging, did you? A. Yes.

Q And services you needed. I suppose you needed fares to get to and from your work, and some clothing, and so on. What happened about that? A. We had a pound a week. I believe fares were paid for. I didn't need any.

Q I think you used the expression about your inheritance got whittled away? A. Yes.

Q Were you at the time, or prior to the time you were taking courses from the Process, being treated by a professional psychiatrist? A. I went to him about once every three months.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do you mean someone who was a part of the Process, or an ordinary practitioner? A. An ordinary practitioner.

MR KEMPSTER: Did he know that you were also taking courses at Process? A. No, the one stopped before the other began.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I see, you went to the psychiatrist before you got involved with these people? A. Yes.

MR KEMPSTER: And I suppose you paid him fees? A. My mother did.

Q Will you tell my Lord and the Jury how you came to decide to go to America, to cross the Atlantic? A. I didn't go to America.

Q To the Bahamas and then New Mexico? A. I just went because the group was going.

MISS T. VENTRIS:  
Cross-examined.

Q And you were quite attached to the group, I take it? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Were you attached to Mrs De Grimston? A. Yes, I was.

MR KEMPSTER: Was the idea of going eventually to Mexico so that the group could go away from London and think out its ideas about religion? A. No.

B Q It was not. What was the idea? A. To get away.

Q Just to get away? A. To get away from bad publicity and the public in generally.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: To get away from bad publicity? A. Yes.

MR KEMPSTER: At all events, would not you agree that the disciplines you have described at Xtul, such as vigils, fasting, self-flagellation, were traditional religious disciplines? A. They weren't inside the tradition, they weren't taught as part of a tradition. They may have been traditional.

I Q You know that they had been practised as part of religious training over the centuries? A. Yes, of course.

Q Were not the members of the group at this stage experimenting in their efficacy, that is to see whether they did them any good? A. I suppose you could say that; but it was suggested to us we should do it, we didn't have the choice.

E Q You did not have a choice? A. No.

Q Was that because the climate of opinion was so strong that this ought to be done and that ought to be done amongst the group? A. I suppose you could say that.

I Q I do not want you to accept my words if you do not agree with them. How would you express it? A. Pressure was put on you, in all kinds of ways, to conform, and if you did not conform you were given a big denunciation, and maybe thrown out.

Q When you say "thrown out", you would be asked to go home? A. Well, it might become necessary for you to go home if they were unpleasant enough.

C Q So that would mean you would lose your contact with this community which at that time you valued? A. In a sense. I had nothing else.

H Q We have heard a lot of evidence about possible reincarnations. Were these names taken very seriously, or were they somewhat lighthearted? A. They were taken quite seriously.

Q Mr Wyllie, for example, was quite happy to call himself Serpent? A. No, he did not call himself that.

MISS T. VENTRIS:  
Cross-examined.

Q Or to be called Serpent? A. We were all expected to work out our roles. I don't know quite how.

Q You cannot recall how he worked out that particular one?  
A. I remember somebody arrived on the scene who was given the role of Adam.

Q Did he go round with the minimal clothing, or what?  
A. No. I don't hardly remember him. He was a hippy, I think.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Were there other hippies in this community? A. Not really, no. It was before the hippies were invented, pretty much.

MR KEMPSTER: You have described what you call the pressures on you, which were such that you were glad to leave Xtul? A. Yes.

Q Were these pressures to live what was conceived by the group to be a religious life? A. It was more just to do what Mary Ann said, that was her interpretation, with which I didn't agree.

Q Was her interpretation that people should lead a religious life? A. She never actually said so.

Q She did not say so, but is that how you understood it?  
A. To begin with, yes. At the end, in Mexico, I thought she was just out to dominate.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: How did she manage to maintain this discipline? A. I don't know really. She is just a very strong personality.

MR KEMPSTER: How long have you been associated with the Zen Buddhist community? A. I have been a Buddhist for about two years. I have been in the centre for about eight months.

Re-examined by MR BRITTAN

Q You said, in answer to Mr Kempster, that the group moved from England to get away from bad publicity? A. Yes. ✓

Q What sort of publicity was it that was causing trouble?  
A. There were several unpleasant articles in the papers, and a threat that the BMA - the British Medical Association - might get unpleasant with us.

Q Do you know on what grounds the British Medical Association were planning to cause difficulties? A. I heard that they thought---

MR KEMPSTER: Can we have the source of this? We are getting a very long way from the action.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think that is reasonable: Did you know why the BMA were concerned?

MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, with respect--- A. I did only hear it.

MR KEMPSTER: Could we have the source?

MISS T. VENTRIS:  
Re-examined.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am sorry, that is a question I am going to allow.

MR BRITTAN: What were the BMA getting upset about? A. That we were run by people unqualified to treat people who might be mentally ill.

Q I am sorry if this sounds obvious: unqualified to do what?  
A. To be like a psychiatrist.

MR BRITTAN: Unless your Lordship has any questions, that is all I propose to ask.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You have told us you had professional medical treatment before you got involved with these people. So far as you know what other members of the group were former patients? A. I think one or two were, yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Thank you.

MR NEILL: Thank you.

(The witness withdrew)

PROFESSOR TREVOR CHARLES NOEL GIBBENS, Sworn,  
Examined by MR NEILL

Q Professor, what is your address? A. Institute of Psychiatry, Denmark Hill, London.

Q Are you a Professor of Forensic Psychiatry of London University? A. Yes.

Q Are you Consultant Psychiatrist at the Maudsley Hospital? A. Yes.

Q Are your professional qualifications Doctor of Medicine, Member of the Royal College of Physicians and Fellow of the Royal College of Psychiatrists? A. Yes.

Q I think you have had an opportunity of looking at some of the Process literature? A. Yes.

Q And in particular, so that we can just see what you have got, have you got the book called The Gods on War? A. Yes.

Q The Ultimate Sin, the one with the animal on the front? A. Yes.

Q And the Process magazine, called Process, the issues entitled Freedom of Expression, Mindbending, Sex, Fear and Death? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: In other words, all the books we have been looking at?

MR NEILL: Yes.



Q I really want your help about these magazines and other literature, and could we start by looking at the Sex issue of Process. Would you turn to page 8. There is an invitation by this organisation called the Process offering personal sessions to the persons who are described on that page. Do you see that? A. Yes.

Q I think it was accepted by the witnesses for the Process that the persons to whom that page would apply would be persons who were either disturbed or, as it is described, dissatisfied, or in some way in trouble in mind. A. Yes.

Q That would seem to be the position. A. Yes.

Q First a general question: Do you think, in your judgment, that these publications would have some effect on people in that category? A. Yes. It would have a variable effect.

Q You have had an opportunity of looking at the emphasis which is placed in these documents on what they describe as the three gods: that is Jehovah, Lucifer and Satan, A. Yes.

Q Will you turn your particular attention to what is suggested in regard to Satan. (We will want to look at the others as well). So far as the writings about Satan are concerned, can you express a view, as a psychiatrist, as to the effect that they might have on a young, immature or disturbed person?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You are looking at pages 14 and 15?

MR NEILL: I was going to come on to that specifically. I was going to deal with it generally, then put the particular pages later. A. Overtly - as, indeed, when they say, "Allow the fiend out" - they invite the expression of unacceptable feelings by the person who reads them, they invite the person to express them, to bring them out.

Q Let us look particularly at page 15, which is described as being the Advocate of Satan - that is Mendes Castle. A. Yes.

Q It is suggesting that God has come on a journey and so on. Then we have the three dots in the third column:

"So there, my friends, is a fleeting glimpse of Satan's promise to those that follow him".

Could you help my Lord and the jury about this. What effect might that have on a person who fell into the category I am suggesting who read that? A. I think what I find is the difficulty is that it arouses a whole range of possible emotions or desires; and it says nothing, at the end, of the Process-church's intention to reconcile these with Christ, or whatever they have, in other things, said. It leaves the question in the air that this could be grossly misunderstood as an invitation to, you know, release these tendencies. In my view it recklessly disregards the possibility that

some people would misunderstand what the general teaching of this church is.

A  
MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If you took this by itself, it appears to be inviting people to embark on the kind of behaviour that is described here, does it not - by itself?  
-- A. By itself.

B  
Q. But, when you get later on the more verbose bits - "Gods are people" and "Gods are mourners" - there are qualifying passages which enable you to take your choice? -- A. That is right, my Lord.

C  
Q. I do not say that you pay your money, but at any rate you take your choice? -- A. Yes. It leaves it very open in a great many of these publications. It does not conclude with the sort of suggestions made elsewhere in the documents that Christ in love will control these impulses, and so on. They are expressed in many documents as a form which is almost an invitation - or could be regarded as an invitation by the perhaps not very intelligent people to have this responsibility, I think.

D  
MR. NEILL: I have drawn your attention to page 15 in the Sex issue; and, again, at page 17 we see at the bottom of the page a white box with "Three Paths and a Quagmire". How would that, in your opinion, appeal to a person who had inclinations towards Satan? -- A. Again, this invites the person to believe that Satan is right in these views, and it says nothing about reconciliation with Christ or control by Christ of these emotions later on. Great sections leave out their final doctrines.

E  
MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: While we are looking at this page, can you identify the Psychiatrist whose portrait appears there?  
-- A. No. I have struggled to do so, but I have not.

F  
MR. NEILL: Some questions were asked by counsel for the plaintiffs about pornography generally of one witness, but is it relevant, in your judgment, that these documents claim to have the force of religious teaching; is that relevant in considering what effect they are going to have on those who read them? -- A. Yes; I think this is a very important factor.

G  
Q. Would you explain that to us? -- A. I think it is a very important factor that it can be understood as inviting people to behave in a sexually immoral or violent or extremely hostile way; it not only invites them as an idea, but it tries to give them the force of religious persuasion. I feel that to have an impulse to do something may be greatly backed up by a feeling that this has religious sanction - or, indeed, political or patriotic sanction - and that these public emotions would make the person feel that he had justification for what he might not think in himself was very justifiable.

H  
MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "Religious sanction for anti-social behaviour". Would that be a fair way to put it?  
-- A. Yes; a religious sanction.

MR. NEILL: I think you are by now quite familiar with these documents. There is the Sex issue that we have looked at, and

I think my Lord and the jury have been through that a number of times. I now want to take this as quickly as we can, but can you turn to the document "The Gods on War" and tell us if there are passages in that which you would wish to comment upon? -- A. I think the capacity of a person to take this out of context, for example in the passages of Satan on page 89, where it says "Release the fiend within you". Much that goes on in this -----

B Q. At the top of page 87 there is the phrase that I think you have just referred to? -- A. Yes; "Release the fiend that lies dormant within you, for he is strong and ruthless, and his power is far beyond the bounds of a human frailty". It then takes that phrase out and makes a caption of it - "Release the fiend - release the fiend"; and on the next page "The fiend shall conquer".

C Q. Is that on page 90? -- A. Yes. Pages of this go on, and it is only much later at the end of the document that a rather inconsequential sort of disclaimer is made - or an explanation is made - that these are the thoughts or expressions of Satan and not necessarily of the organisation.

D Q. In addition to the passages in the text - we have read them before and I think you have indicated the sort of passage that you have in mind sufficiently - we have got in this little booklet a number of photographs. Have you any comment to make about those? -- A. These, I feel, are horrific, in the sense that they must be designed to arouse, and clearly are intended to arouse, strong emotions. I have not any special opinion on what sort of emotions they would arouse in most people. I think that is perhaps something that is not an expert opinion in any way.

E Q. Then we have finally in this group "The Ultimate Sin" document? -- A. Yes.

F Q. That is something which was widely advertised in the Process magazine itself. That sets out to be a story about, or a plea against, vivisection. Are there passages in that which you would wish to comment on? -- A. This is a particularly repulsive document, it seems to me, from three points of view. First, it is factually quite wrong, of course, that vivisection is carried out without anaesthetics in this way, implying that it is all carried out in this way. Next, it describes in horrific detail the actual tortures that can be, or have been, inflicted on animals. It then goes on to say what sort of tortures should be inflicted on a man who can be so wicked as this; and it gives lengthy descriptions of how this man should be tortured and kept alive, and tortured and kept alive.

G  
H Q. So that we are following it completely, I think you have in mind pages 20 and 21. Is that right? -- A. Yes. What is particularly offensive, it seems to me, is that it does not anywhere suggest that this hostility and intense hatred is not exactly what they are attempting to arouse. There is not any reconciliation passage in this document at all; there is

nothing which says, as they sometimes say, "Christ says 'Love your enemies'". There is no reference to reconciliation as a religious principle in this document that I could find.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: When you refer to it as "a repulsive document", having regard to the pictures, in your view are those illustrations likely to titillate sadistic instincts? -- A. I think in many people they would, my Lord; yes - sadistic feelings and also gross hostility, of course.

Cross-examined by MR. KEMPSTER

Q. I do not want to express a personal view, but the Sex issue, page 15, does not set out a very attractive view of sex, does it? That is the one to which your attention was specifically drawn, with the words "Come on a journey", rather nasty, furtive stuff? -- A. It depends what you mean.

Q. Do you think that any reader would find this description of sexual activity attractive? -- A. No. It is accompanied by contemptuous phraseology.

Q. I followed your evidence with great care; but is this not really calculated to make, and would it not have the effect of making, a reader think: "Well, what a filthy path of conduct Satan advocates"? -- A. It is a very common technique in pornography to appear to be self-righteously condemnatory, when the intention is deliberately to titivate.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Pornography can always be dressed up as morality, can it not? -- A. Yes, my Lord.

MR. KEMPSTER: Presumably you would not feel qualified to comment on the motive of the person or the persons who produced this? -- A. No; I would not.

Q. I was suggesting to you that the ordinary reader reading this would not in fact be titivated, but would regard this process -- perhaps that is an unhappy word -- would regard the procedures or behaviours described here with some degree of revulsion? -- A. I do not think that the reader can deduce that, because there is nothing on this page that says that the object of the church, as they say, is to reconcile feelings so that you can control these abnormal emotions.

Q. I understood that point, but I was reminding you to consider just a reader reading this page, possibly in isolation, and I was suggesting to you that at the end of it the reader would say: "If this is Satan's way, I do not fancy it"? -- A. I do not think that follows; no.

Q. You would not fancy it, would you, reading this? -- A. It does not invite you to take this opinion - nothing on the page invites you.

Q. Nothing at all. I am only asking you to consider what a reader's reaction would be to reading it? -- A. Obviously very varied.

- A Q. Would I be right in thinking as to what is described here that you would regard what Satan advocates with some distaste? --  
A. Some will be offended and feel it very distasteful; others presumably not.
- B Q. Why do you think that anyone would regard this passage otherwise than as distasteful? -- A. Some people might regard it as informative -- that there are a number of other forms of sexual behaviour that they have not thought of. There is a range of opinion on these matters.
- C Q. Supposing that someone thought that it was informative, could it be taken any further than that by anyone reading it? --  
A. No; I do not think so.
- Q. Coming to "The Gods on War", of course inside the front page we have the Second Commandment of Christ -- "Christ said 'Love thine enemy'". -- A. Quite.
- Q. Then, if you turn on to page 109, under "Transcendence", you have "Explanation", do you not, and it says in the top paragraph: "Three distinct and separate patterns of reality, and yet each to some extent is present in each one of us"? -- A. Yes.
- D Q. Then over the page at the page 110, we have: "Only by a full understanding and acceptance of all three patterns as parts of ourselves, can we begin to rise above the driving need to pursue only one of them in the face of the powerful and agonising pressure of the other two combined. Clear vision of all three brings detachment and peace of mind, because it brings the full knowledge of reality, which is truth". Having read you that, may I ask you this. Does it help a person to adjust to life -- I can put it as briefly as that -- to know what sort of desires and impulses may be present in his make-up? -- A. Yes, indeed.
- E Q. It does? -- A. Yes.
- F Q. And is it right that one can control one's behaviour and relate to society and other people better if one is aware of the sometimes unpleasant forces working in the subconscious? -- A. Certainly.
- Q. Turning to "The Ultimate Sin", have you ever read any other anti-vivisectionist literature? -- A. Yes.
- G Q. It is nearly always written in a rather hysterical vein, is it not? I know this one is, or I would think it was. -- A. Yes.
- Q. Is that not a common pattern of anti-vivisectionist literature? -- A. Yes, but this is produced by the Church of the Final Judgement.
- H Q. It is; but I was asking you on that (and I accept your comment) that it is a common pattern when people start thinking about vivisection and getting worked up? -- A. Yes.

- Q. While it obviously could be distressing and disturbing, this publication could not reasonably be expected to affect human behaviour, could it - human behaviour? -- A. I do not know. It glorifies hatred, does it not? It invites you to hate as much as possible. There are several phrases - "Save your anger for the torturers"; "Save your mourning" and so on; "Save your fury for the vengeance that comes".
- B Q. Do you feel that that would prompt anyone to go along, for example, to a laboratory and attack people carrying out experiments? -- A. I do not know. This has often happened, of course.
- Q. Has it? I did not know that. -- A. They describe it themselves. They have instances of medical students who have objected to people carrying out experiments and so on.
- C Q. But not, I think, of acts of violence against them in fact? -- A. Not that I know of; no.
- Q. You must see quite a lot in the course of your work of, shall I say, distasteful literature? -- A. Yes.
- D Q. This does not rate very high - or shall I say "very low" - does it, in that group of works? -- A. It is an astonishing document to be produced by a religious church which says that God is love and that you must not hate but you must forgive.

Re-examined by MR. NEILL

- E Q. To clear this up, you have been asked a number of questions about what the effect of this might be on, I think it was suggested, the average reader. What I would like your help about to get this clear is this. Suppose the kind of disturbed person who is being invited to come to Process for the help first mentioned on page 8 of the Sex issue, what effect might this have on that kind of person? -- A. I think it is in the written word; it is in the gross, reckless capacity to
- F misunderstand what is meant in the literature, which I find could be likely to have a bad effect on certain patients.
- Q. On certain people? -- A. People - not necessarily what is intended to be said, but what is actually said.
- Q. What is actually said and the effect it might have? -- A. It is recklessly liable to cause gross misunderstanding.
- G MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The device of dressing up pornography as a moral thesis is a very old trick indeed, is it not? -- A. Yes.
- Q. Which is found in a variety of publications? -- A. Yes.

H

(The witness withdrew)

MR. NEILL: My Lord, those are the only two witnesses I am in a position to call this morning. I told your Lordship yesterday that we had witnesses coming from America tomorrow morning. I admit at once, as I did yesterday, that I am afraid we did miscalculate at the time -----

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I know, and I also indicated that I had a small measure of sympathy for you.

MR. NEILL: One does try to make reasonable calculations, my Lord, particularly when people are coming from such a distance as from California.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You had assumed, with some excuse, that certain people were going to be called, and they have not.

MR. NEILL: As to the one witness that I had hoped to call at 2 o'clock, I have just received a note that a colleague of his has suffered a heart attack, and therefore it is unlikely that he will be able to attend himself. That being the position, I have only, in fact got today one other rather short witness coming after the adjournment. That being the position, I wonder - I realise that I am asking a great indulgence of your Lordship - whether the sensible thing, rather than coming back for a short time at 2 o'clock, would not be to adjourn until tomorrow morning, because, if I did ask your Lordship now to adjourn till 2 o'clock and we then went on, I would have early in the afternoon to make a similar application. I wonder whether it would not be more sensible to deal with the matter by adjourning until tomorrow.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think that may well be so, but it is really most unfortunate when we have a jury sitting here, whose time is being consumed by all these matters. I am very worried about that. What do you say, Mr. Kempster?

MR. KEMPSTER: On this side, my Lord, we are concerned not only with time, but of course with the costs of this action. May I say that, for our part, if there is a witness who is available at 2 o'clock -----

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: As to costs, we need not trouble ourselves with them at the moment; we shall have to wait until the end of the case. If it then emerges that you have some complaint so far as costs are concerned - if it does - I will probably consider it; but what I am much more concerned about is the jury's time.

MR. KEMPSTER: My Lord, they are here and it would appear that they would be able to hear some evidence at 2 o'clock, and I would invite your Lordship to allow them to do so.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I do not think it would be very convenient to anybody if we then had to adjourn until tomorrow morning. You invited the jury in the early stages of this case to read this book.

MR. KEMPSTER: Yes, my Lord; that is what the action is about.

A  
MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If I may say so, it is unnecessary to tell me that. Are you still inviting all of us to read that book? May I say at once that I have read most of it. Do you want to impose the reading of the whole book on the jury?

MR. KEMPSTER: My Lord, I have invited them, and I apprehend that many of them may have done so. If not, I would be very glad if they would.

B  
MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Have you done so, members of the jury?

THE FOREMAN OF THE JURY: We have been pecking through it, my Lord.

C  
MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: There it is; they say that they have been pecking through it, and I think that you are very fortunate. I was wondering whether it would be a good thing to devote the afternoon to reading it, but I think that probably we have extracted all that we need.

MR. NEILL: There is this point, my Lord. When this case started, your Lordship did say that it was likely to last 15 days, according to the information given to the court by the parties.

I  
MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: For once, their estimate seems to be fairly near accurate.

E  
MR. NEILL: I hope that it will be comfortably less than that, my Lord, because we are now in the sixth day, and we are getting quite well on into the case; indeed, we are quite near the end. That being the position, on one view one could say that the jury have been saved a number of days already. I quite appreciate that, from their point of view, it is very inconvenient to come here for half a day, and I can only apologise through your Lordship to them.

F  
MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It seems to me that, now we are in this position, it will be more convenient to everybody to adjourn until tomorrow morning, rather than to come back at 2 o'clock for the jury to hear a short witness, so that, members of the jury, you be back at half past ten tomorrow morning.

(The jury left the court)

G  
H  
MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Mr. Neill, at some time hence I shall have the repulsive task of summing-up this case, if things go on as they are, and a quite considerable part of your particular justification has gone. It would be a great convenience to me if together we could formulate what exactly are the surviving issues in the case. I do not know whether you intend to range over the whole territory of the matters which do survive, but I should be very grateful personally if the area that I have got to cover in summing up could be indicated by some agreed statement, because much of it has obviously gone and much of what appears to remain is probably of no practical significance now. So that, if you could both apply your minds to that, I would be grateful.

MR. NEILL: Certainly, my Lord. I will try and produce a document



making it clear what passages there are. I will show it to my learned friend and pass it through the usual channels to your Lordship.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Thank you.

(Adjourned till tomorrow morning at 10.30)

**SIXTH DAY**

EVIDENCE

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,

Wednesday, 20th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON

and a Jury

-----

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT

(a corporate body),

CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP,

Plaintiffs

CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER and

WENDY ANN PEACH

-AND-

1972 P. No.2032

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED and First Defendants  
ED SANDERS Second Defendant

and Between:

SAME -AND- SAME

1972 P. No.1603

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman  
dated the 19th day of October 1972)

-----

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,  
Wednesday, 20th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON  
and a Jury

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT

(a corporate body),

CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP,

Plaintiffs

CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER and

WENDY ANN PEACH

-AND-

1972 P. No.2039

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED

and First Defendants

ED SANDERS

Second Defendant

and Between:

SAME -AND- SAME

1972 P. No.1603

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman  
dated the 19th day of October 1972)

(Transcript from the Shorthand Notes of The Association of  
Official Shorthandwriters Ltd., Room 392, Royal Courts of  
Justice, and 2, New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.2)

MR MICHAEL KEMPSTER, Q.C. and MR PETER BOWSER (instructed by  
Messrs. Joynson-Hicks & Co.) appeared for the Plaintiffs.

MR BRIAN NEILL, Q.C. and MR LEON BRITTAN (instructed by Messrs.  
Goodman, Derrick & Co.) appeared for the First Defendants.

THE SECOND DEFENDANT did not appear and was not represented.

E V I D E N C E

S I X T H D A Y

I N D E X.

Page.

GERAGHTY, Mr. T.,	
Examined . . . . .	2.
Cross-examined . . . . .	5.
Re-examined. . . . .	7.
PEARLSTEIN, Mr. H.J.,	
Examined . . . . .	8.
Cross-examined . . . . .	25.
SULLIVAN, Rev. M.G.,	
Examined . . . . .	35.
Cross-examined . . . . .	41.
Re-examined. . . . .	46.
FITZGERALD, Mr. P.,	
Examined . . . . .	46.

---

MR T. GERAGHTY:  
Examined.

MR TONY GERAGHTY, Sworn,  
Examined by MR BRITTAN

- A Q Is your full name Tony Geraghty? A. That is so.
- Q Do you live at 45 Knoll Wood Road, Bexley, Kent? A. Yes.
- P Q Is it right you have been a journalist for some 20 years?  
A. That is also correct.
- Q Did you start on local weekly papers, and afterwards spend  
7 years with the Guardian? A. Six.
- Q Have you now been 7 years with the Sunday Times? A. I am  
in my seventh year with the Sunday Times.
- C Q Were you Chief Reporter (News) at the Sunday Times? A. Until  
quite recently, yes.
- Q Do you now work writing features for the Sunday Times? A. Yes.
- Q Was there<sup>a</sup>/period during which you worked with the Boston  
Globe newspaper as part of an exchange arrangement? A. That  
is so.
- D Q In the United States? A. Yes.
- Q When was that? A. That was in 1971, I think.
- Q While you were in Boston were you impressed by any particular  
religious organisation and the work that they were doing in  
the streets of that city? A. Yes. I was living in Harvard  
and noticed two colourful groups, one of which was the Process-  
Church of the Final Judgement. They proselytised on the  
streets.
- E Q As a result of that did you decide to write an article about  
them? A. I did.
- F Q And did you have an interview with a member of the church?  
A. I did.
- Q What was the name of the person with whom you had an inter-  
view? A. A person called Father Christian. I gathered his  
former name had been Mr Jonathan De Peyer.
- G Q Where did that interview take place? A. To the best of my  
recollection, it took place at the Process church in Boston.
- Q At their headquarters? A. At their headquarters.
- H Q I want to ask you about some of the things that were said  
during the course of your interview with Mr Jonathan De Peyer.  
Was there any reference to Mr Charles Manson in that?  
A. There was, yes.

MR T. GERAGHTY:  
Examined.

Q I want you to tell us what was said: what you asked and what the answer was, or how the reference to Mr Manson came up. A. The reference to Mr Manson resulted from my knowledge that a book had been written.

B MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I imagine you are referring to The Family? A. Yes, The Family - and I asked Mr De Feyer about the allegations made against his organisation in that book.

MR BRITTAN: And what did he say about Charles Manson? A. In varying degrees he admitted that there had been contact with Mr Manson.

C Q Did he say in what form the contact had been? A. The most definite contact which he described related to an article which Mr Manson had been invited to write for the Process-church's magazine.

Q Did he say anything about any personal contact between himself and Mr Manson? A. That was slightly ambiguous. He admitted that he may have met Mr Manson.

D Q He himself may have met Mr Manson? A. Yes, when both were in San Francisco; but he did qualify the content of that meeting by saying he met many other people while he was in San Francisco as well.

E Q Did he indicate the context in which he thought he thought he might have met Mr Manson in San Francisco, where and so on? A. Yes. I think it was to the effect that he was handing out literature and may have met Manson in that situation.

Q Did he say anything else about the possible contact between Manson and himself or anyone else of the Process-church? A. Is it possible for me to refresh my memory by reference to contemporaneous notes?

F MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes, certainly.

MR BRITTAN: Yes. A. The document to which I am referring is the original which I wrote before publication in Boston. This was some time ago.

Q I should ask you: At the time of the interview with Mr De Peyer did you make any note? A. I took a shorthand note, yes.

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: And this article is the product of that shorthand note, is it? A. That shorthand note, and a note of an interview with Mr Sanders, the author of the book "The Family", also.

H MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Was this article printed in the Boston Globe? A. Yes, it was. I think that was the extent of the contact with Manson.

MR T. GERAGHTY:  
Examined.

A MR BRITTAN: Did you ask Mr De Peyer anything about Mrs De Grimston and the description that she was alleged to have given of herself - the name she is alleged to have given? A. Yes. He told me she was styled Hecate.

Q Did you ask him anything about Brother Eli, or Mr Victor Wild, as his real name is? A. Yes. Brother Eli, I gathered, had been a member of the hierarchy of the church - an "Inner Processean" I think was the technical description.

B Q Did he say anything about Brother Eli and Manson? A. I think his comment about Brother Eli was to the effect that Brother Eli's Satanic instincts had made him incapable of accepting the discipline of the church and he had dropped out. What Mr De Peyer actually said - my note reads - was: "For about two months Brother Eli was an inside member of Process. He left us because he didn't like the discipline requirements".

C Q Did he say anything about Brother Eli and Manson? A. I can't recall.

D Q Did he say anything about his father's attitude and acceptance towards him being a member of the Process? A. Mr De Peyer said that his family had objected to his becoming a member of the church, that they had opposed this, that they had made active attempts to persuade him to resume his former life in London before his conversion, and that his parents - his father - was now reconciled to his (Mr De Peyer's) position in the church, that reconciliation having been assisted by the fact that Mr De Peyer's wife had had a child.

E MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Whose wife had had a child? A. Mr De Peyer's wife had had a child. In other words, De Peyer senior had become a grandfather, and that had apparently assisted the process of reconciliation between grandfather and father, father and son.

F MR BRITTAN: I should ask you this: At the time of this interview how old, roughly, was Mr Jonathan De Peyer? A. I would say about 29, 30.

G Q You told his Lordship and the members of the jury about direct contact between Manson and Process, so far as there may have been. Did Mr De Peyer say anything about any relationship between the ideas of Manson and the ideas of the Process-church? A. Yes, we had a long discussion about that.

H Q What did he say about that? A. He suggested that Manson had taken some of the doctrines of the Process-church and had distorted them. He identified Manson as someone who would follow Satan - or have an affinity with Satan I think would be the phrase - rather than one of the other three deities, who were described to me as Jesus Christ, Lucifer -



MR T. GERAGHTY:  
Cross-examined.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did not Jehovah get mentioned?  
A. And Jehovah. It is almost like a religious bridge game, with respect.

Q If I may say so, the jury and I are only too familiar with it. A. I am so sorry.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Not at all.

B

Cross-examined by MR KEMPSTER

Q While I accept that you saw members of the Process in Boston proselytising - that is, presumably, stopping people in the streets and talking to them - A. Yes.

C

Q -the timing of the article you say you wrote was related, was it not, to the publication of Mr Ed Sanders' book The Family? A. No.

K. Trip  
again

Q It was not related to it? A. My attention was drawn to the Process in ignorance of any alleged involvement between the Process-church and Manson, or a book by a man called Sanders. Only when I began making further enquiries did I discover that.

D

Q So that it was, as it were, fortuitous that your article was written at a time when the book The Family was on the book-stalls in America? A. Yes, but having discovered, of course, there was litigation concerning the book brought by the Process-church at that time in the United States I was extremely careful in the article I wrote.

E

Q But the allegations against the Process made in the book, would it be fair to say, added a certain spice of interest to the readers of the article? A. They added a topicality.

Q Very well. Coming for a moment to your discussion with Mr De Peyer, when he told you he might have met Manson - A. Yes.

F

Q -would I be right in thinking that this was in the context of his being on the streets in a city again proselytising or handing out literature and meeting hundreds, perhaps thousands, of people in that context? A. Yes, the literal interpretation of his words would be that.

G

Q It is difficult, perhaps, looking back, but was what he was saying to you something like this: "Having regard to all the people I met on the streets I couldn't eliminate the possibility that one of those might well have been Manson"? A. We are now moving into an area of interpreting his words.

Q Yes. A. With respect, there is some ambiguity there. It may be that that is a correct interpretation.

H

Q But you think there is another? A. I do sometimes find that if someone is faced with an embarrassing question from a reporter he will prefer to put his answers in the conditional tense rather than to be definite.

MR T. GERAGHTY:  
Cross-examined.

A MR KEMPSTER: Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Not only those who become reporters have that trouble. A. Very true, my Lord.

R MR KEMPSTER: At all events - I do not want to pursue this too much - at least this was in the context, was it not, of (I used the expression once, perhaps inadvisedly) a street mission; at any rate, handing out literature, stopping people in the street, meeting lots of people, might have met Manson? A. That was the context within which he put it.

Q When you came across the book The Family, you were apparently interested enough to arrange an interview with the author?  
A. I was.

C Q Mr Ed Sanders? A. Yes.

Q Did you find out anything about Mr Sanders' previous literary activities? A. No, Sir. I gathered he was a poet with a group, I think, which was known as the Yippie movement, but if you say, "Did I take an interest?", I did not read any of his earlier works.

D Q You did not read any of what passes as poetry? A. No, I did not. I found the style of The Family, although interesting, a little obscure.

Q Your attention was not drawn, for example, to a book that his researcher told us about yesterday, called Shards of God? A. No, I have never hear of it.

E Q Before you are re-examined or leave the witness box, might I look at your contemporaneous notes? A. You are welcome. (Same handed down).

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: To get it quite clear, this is really the draft of your article, is it? A. Yes, it is.

F MR KEMPSTER: Your Lordship is absolutely right about that. I hope your Lordship will grant me a moment's indulgence?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes.

G MR KEMPSTER (to the witness): When you discussed the possibility that Manson might have taken the Process doctrines and distorted them, was there any discussion about other sources of inspiration that Manson may have taken and distorted? A. Yes, a record made by the Beatles and, according to Mr Sanders - my reference in that article is taken from part of what Mr Sanders told me - and according to Mr Sanders' book, Manson apparently heard secret messages on a record made by the Beatles called Helter-Skelter.

H Q You may have misunderstood my question. I was not asking you about your discussion with Mr Sanders but with Mr De Peyer, when you told us that he had talked about the distortion of the Process doctrine possibly. In your discussion with Mr De Peyer did the question arise of Manson having distorted

MR T. GERAGHTY:  
Cross-examined.  
Re-examined.

doctrine from other sources? A. I don't recollect, but it may be possible.

Q For example, the Scriptures? A. Possibly. You mean, the reference to Manson's belief that he was the Son of Man?

Q Yes. A. That, again, is derived from Sanders' book.

B Q Again I am asking you whether you recall the conversation with Mr De Peyer, and whether generally you were discussing the ideas that Manson may have developed? A. Yes. If I may say so, our conversation was concerned not merely with Manson but with the doctrine of the Process-church, and it turned, in this context, upon the Process-church's problem in dealing with someone whose instincts, affinities, were with Satan rather than with one of the other deities of the church. C Mr De Peyer, who said of himself, "I have a great affinity with Satan", was able to explain, from a point of view of empathy, the problem of dealing with people like Manson or Brother Eli and the problem that such people face in dealing with their own Satanic instincts. It was a general, perhaps slightly philosophical discussion, rather than a sort of game of spotting the genesis of Manson's own particular attitudes. D

Q Would it be fair to say that Mr De Peyer was speculating in what way he, or the Process, might have been able to assist Manson, had they had the opportunity? A. Yes.

Re-examined by MR BRITTAN

E Q Mr Kempster was asking you about the answer you gave to me about the possible meeting between Mr De Peyer and Manson, and he put to you the suggestion that Manson may just have been met in the sense that there were thousands of people who were, and you said that that was an interpretation. F I would like to ask you what interpretation you yourself put on the answer given by Mr De Peyer. A. I had, and still have, some doubts about the truth of this whole affair, of the links, the alleged links or non-links, as between members of the Process-church and Manson, and what the implication of those may have been. I do know, from my experience as a reporter - and I do apologise if it seems like a platitude - that if an organisation or a person, whether it be a Minister of a Government or anyone else, is in an awkward situation he is not likely to say to you, to G confess all to a reporter when he knows that that reporter is sitting in front of him with a notebook taking a short-hand note, and is about to publish it to the world.

Q So you suggest he underplayed; is that what you are saying? A. I think that is a possibility, but I could not prove it.

H (The witness withdrew)

MR HOWARD JOSHUA PEARLSTEIN, Sworn,  
Examined by MR NEILL

Q May we have your full name? A. Howard Joshua Pearlstein.

Q And your address is where? A. San Francisco, California - 1010 Ashbury Street.

B Q Are you, or have you been for some time, a resident in San Francisco? A. Yes, for 11 years.

Q I think you are now working for a firm of advertising agents in California. Is that right? A. No, that is not correct.

C Q What are you doing now? A. Right now I am currently finishing a novel for publication in the fall.

Q But have you recently been working in advertising? A. I have worked frequently in advertising in the past 7 years.

Q Have you also, in addition to working in advertising, written for television? A. Yes, I have.

D Q And have you written for newspapers? A. Yes.

Q And were you at one time the assistant editor, I think it was, of a newspaper called the San Francisco Organ? A. I was associate editor. It was called merely The Organ.

E Q I want to go back to 1967. You said you had been in San Francisco for 11 years, so you would be in San Francisco at that time, would you? A. Four years. I had been away for about 9 months.

Q When you were in San Francisco did you hear about a group called Process? A. Yes, I did.

F Q Having heard about a group called Process, did you become interested to find out more about them? A. Yes, I did.

Q Did you go to an address in San Francisco with a friend of yours? A. Yes.

Q Can you tell us what that address was? A. It was 407 Cole Street.

G Q When you got to 407 Cole Street with your friend did you there meet a group of people whom you discovered were the Process? A. I met a group of people who referred to themselves as "the Process". I later discovered they were not in fact the Process which is currently involved in this action, although there was an indication of relationship.

H MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "I met a group of people called 'the Process', who were not the people involved in this action"? A. Most of them, no.

MR NEILL: So that there is no mistake about it: at that time

MR H.J. PEARLSTEIN:  
Examined.

A you are saying they were not the same, but at a later stage did you see members of the Process who were connected with the Process-church of the Final Judgement in this case?  
A. Yes, I did.

Q What happened? Where did you see the other group first, the ones that were the Process-church of the Final Judgement?  
A. In that house.

Q Did there come a time when some persons came to that house - that is, 407 Cole Street - from England? A. Yes. I was told by some of the people who were there, they referred to it as, "The people from England are coming". I did not know most of the people in the house. I think about four or five left at that time.

C MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: They said, "Some of the people from England are coming"? A. Yes.

MR NEILL: We have heard about the people coming from England. Did you see the people when they came from England? A. Yes, I did.

D Q Do you remember any particular people who came from England, either by their ordinary name or by the name they had in the church? A. The first man I met was a man who was mentioned several times before I met him, either as Hugh Mountain or Father Aaron; and, in fact, until the second time I met him I was in doubt as to which was the proper name he was using. He was using the name Father Aaron.

E Q At any rate, let us call him Father Aaron for the moment. He was one of the people who arrived at 407 Cole Street from England? A. Yes.

Q In addition to Father Aaron, who else arrived from England at 407 Cole Street? A. One other man, Father Alban.

Q And is that Mr Fripp? A. I am given to believe that, yes.

F Q Whatever the position was before, after the two men from England arrived at 407 Cole Street was there one group or were there still two separate groups, one from the Process and another called another Process? A. No. The people who had apparently been given to other methods had left. I did not see them again.

G Q From now on we can call it all one group? Would that be right? A. Yes, although I do not mean to suggest that Father Alban and Father Aaron lived in that house.

Q They did not live there? A. So far as I knew they had residence on Geary Street in the church itself.

H Q But did they come frequently to Cole Street? A. Yes, I would assume so. I was not in continual contact at the time.

MR H.J. PEARLSTEIN:  
Examined.

It was an occasional contact. They seemed to be present frequently.

MR NEILL: You have been in an aeroplane for some hours. Would you, with my Lord's permission, like to sit down?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If you want to sit down, tell us so. A. This is fine. I have been sitting for ten hours.

MR NEILL: In the house, actually living in Cole Street when you went there, were there any people you got to know the name of? A. There was a couple, Victor Wild and his wife Josie. They were the only people who remained from the previous group. There was a man named Howard Spikel - S-p-i-k-o-l, a man whom I only knew as Andy.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Was that his sacred name or his ordinary name? A. I believe that was his name given at birth.

MR NEILL: One of the documents we have seen in this case - the jury have not seen it yet, but we have had it disclosed in this case - is the San Francisco Chapter Book. It may help you to remember one or two other names. Would you look at a copy of the chapter book. (I am not going to refer the jury to this, my Lord). (Same handed). Is this a book you have seen before? A. Yes, about a week and a half ago.

Q Not until then. A. Yes.

Q If you would look at it, this is called the Book of the Acolytes, Initiates and Messengers of the Process-church of the Final Judgement. This is the San Francisco Chapter. If we turn to the second page one sees: December 10, 1967, Victor Wild, 407 Cole Street, San Francisco. That is the address you have been talking about. Then a number of other names: Barsted, Andrews, Athéan and so on. Do you remember those names? A. I believe that James Barsted became Brother Barnabas when I knew him, was acquainted with him.

Q If you turn on you will find you are right about that. On the last page but two or three in that book you will see there: January 21st, under the list of messengers, that James Barsted is now Brother Barnabas? A. Yes.

Q And Victor Wild is now Brother Eli? A. Yes.

Q Both of them at 407 Cole Street. Is that right? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: They are both commissioned, so to speak, in January 1967.

MR NEILL: January 21st. Is that right? So that we all understand this little book, it starts off with the acolytes, then it has the initiates; and if we want to we can trace Mr Wild's process (if that is the right word) from being an

initiate on December 17th - that was a week after he became an acolyte - and on January 21 he becomes a messenger and Brother Eli. Perhaps you would like to keep that with you in case there are names to which you need to refer as we go along; but how many people were there in the Process after Father Aaron and Father Alban came from England who were living at 407 Cole Street? A. Six or Seven.

Q So that we are clear about the time, do you remember where this was in relation to the end of 1967? Was it by the end, or 1968? A. It was late fall.

Q Late autumn? A. Yes.

Q We have the date December 10. Would that have been about the time we are talking about? A. Yes. I believe I encountered them some time before this, perhaps a month or so.

Q What I am particularly asking you about is the time when Father Aaron and Father Alban come from England, certain earlier members leave, and from then on we have the one group, which is the one we are concerned with in this case.

A. It would have been prior to this date that they arrived. The last name under December 10 is Simon. He was a teenage boy from I believe Chicago, and he arrived after the two men from England arrived.

Q Therefore you suggest or say that Father Aaron and Father Alban would have arrived before the date given in the chapter book, because Simon arrived after them? A. Yes.

Q Simon: what age was he? A. I was told he was 14 years old.

Q Could you form a view yourself of his age? Is that about right? A. He appeared to be, yes.

A Q Before Father Alban and Father Aaron arrived, what were the people in 407 Cole Street wearing? A. Clothes that were not deviate in any way from normal clothes of the area.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Ordinary clothes, in other words? A. Yes.

MR NEILL: After Father Alban and Father Aaron arrived, was there any change in what they were wearing? A. Yes. The members began dressing in black.

B MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: After Father Alban and Father Aaron arrived, they all changed to black, did they? A. Yes, they did.

MR NEILL: What is your recollection of exactly what they wore? Were they wearing jackets or trousers? A. It was not a uniform per se. It would be black slacks, black pants, black either shirt or sweater. There was no uniformity between one and the other, except for the colour of the clothing.

C Q At that time were they wearing any kind of signs on their clothing? A. I assume when they started to become formal members of the church they began to wear a silver cross suspended on a chain.

D Q In addition to the silver cross did they wear anything else? A. No.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We have been told that the silver cross had a serpent on it, representing Satan. Did you know about that? A. No, not at that time, not that I saw.

E MR NEILL: You did not in fact yourself become a member, did you, Mr Pearlstein? You were just an interested visitor; is that right? A. That is correct.

Q You told us when you first went to 407 Cole Street you went with a friend of yours. A. Yes, I did.

F Q Did he become a member? A. When you say I went with a friend, there was a man named Sherwood Nance, who introduced me to what was happening at that place. Along with the two of us another man accompanied us, or both Mr Spikol and myself accompanied Mr Nance. Mr Spikol became a member.

Q Mr Spikol? A. Yes.

G Q But Mr Nance did not? A. No, he did not.

Q Mr Spikol had been a friend of yours, had he? A. Yes, he had.

H Q What stage in the hierarchy, do you know, did Mr Spikol reach? A. It is difficult to remember the stages. I know he became an initiate. I do not know for certain that he became a messenger.

Q After Mr Spikol became an initiate, did you notice any change in your ability to have access and talk to Mr Spikol?



A. There was no change in access to him. We had a discussion at one time. He had said he is now in a great fraternity, such as it is, and I was not interested in an exclusive fraternity, and I remarked to him that he was becoming less able to communicate with people who were not members of the group.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You said that to him? A. Yes, I did.

B MR NEILL: We will come in a little while, Mr Pearlstein, to look at some of the literature that I think you saw when you were in San Francisco. We have seen some of it, describing a particular individual as a Jehovian, another individual as a Luciferian, and another individual as a Satanist. When you were meeting the Process Church in San Francisco, did you come across categories like that? A. In the literature, yes, I read of the categories. I was told of the categories. That chapter was, as far as I know, predominantly Jehovian. I was told that Father Aaron was Luciferian.

Q So the chapter was predominantly Jehovian, but Father Aaron was a Luciferian; is that right? A. I was told that. I had assumed that he was also Jehovian.

I MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Could you be both? A. I don't know. I was not any of them.

Q Did you meet a Satanist? A. Not to my knowledge.

E MR NEILL: We will come to them later. In addition to these premises at Cole Street, were there any other premises in San Francisco which, as far as you knew, the church (or the Process, as it was called then, I think) owned or had access to or used? A. There was a building on Geary Street in San Francisco. When asked about it last week, I did not recall the address. I could describe the area, but the address that was given to me was the 2400 or 2600 block. It was the area that I was referring to. They were called the Process then. At that time they then filed with the State of California to be called the Church of Christ in Satan.

I MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: There was a building on Geary Street. A. Which was the religious centre for services.

Q You mentioned a name just now. I did not get it. The Church of what? A. I was told by Victor Wild that the two representatives from England had filed with the State of California .....

Q An application, did you say? A. Yes, for the corporate status of a church, to be known as the Church of Christ in Satan.

H MR NEILL: Did you say "in Satan" or "and Satan"? A. "in Satan" is what I was told. The State refused to charter a church with that name. At that time it was the first time I heard the name the Church of the Final Judgement.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "The State refused and then I heard of the Church of the Final Judgement". Is that right? A. Yes. That was the sequence.

MR NEILL: Can you help us at all when it was you first heard the name Church of the Final Judgement; about the end of 1967, beginning of 1968, or when? A. Yes, it would be probably in around late November or December 1967, possibly into 1968.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Late 1967 or early 1968?  
A. Yes, in the time we are now discussing.

B MR NEILL: We have heard about Cole Street and we have heard about Geary Street. I think you told us that Father Alban and Father Aaron were, as far as you knew, living at Geary Street; is that right? A. As far as I knew, yes.

Q What were the premises at Cole Street? A. It was a flat.

Q I think you told us there were about six or seven people there; is that right? A. Yes.

C Q Were they all men or some women, or what? A. In residence at the house, as I recall, the only woman was Josie Wild, Victor's wife.

Q Josie Wild was Mrs Wild, Victor Wild's wife? A. Victor Wild's wife.

D Q Did there come a time when the Cole Street flat was left and those living there moved to another and larger flat in Oak Street? A. Yes. That was about a block away.

Q Again, whenabout would that be? A. That would definitely be into 1968, possibly February.

E Q I think we can pause there for a moment before we move on in time. Can you tell us, from what you saw yourself, what the people at Cole Street, after Father Alban and Father Aaron arrived, were doing? A. They were having what I would call encounter sessions, distinct from the ones before, with theological overtones, with the entire mythology that they embraced.

F Q Did you actually stay and listen to some of these?  
A. No, not to actual classes.

Q But you heard some of what was going on, did you? A. People there discussed it. I was interested in the concept of the church. I stayed around. I found myself unable to reconcile myself with the mythology of the church and with the way it was moving.

G Q Tell us quite shortly - we may want to know what they were teaching at this time in California - what was the teaching?  
A. I cannot respond to the teachings in the classes. I did not attend the classes.

H MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What we really want to get at is what was the idea they were putting over, or trying to put over? A. That the end of the world, in fact the end of the universe, was at hand; that man had pretty thoroughly ruined the planet; that Jehovah was saddened, and had given the go-ahead to Satan to end it.

MR NEILL: That was the gist of it, was it? A. Basically that. This fits into what was called the Game of the Gods.

Q What was the Game of the Gods meant to be, do you think?  
A. As I understood it, it is in Christian terms the same thing as the Hindu mythology of Shiva, Vishnu and Brahma.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Now I am getting in very great difficulties myself. I don't know about you.

A. I use those terms because -----

B Q I am not blaming you at all, but somebody will have to explain to me. Perhaps the Jury are getting on better, but I am not.

A. That Jehovah and Lucifer and Satan were not to be regarded in context of good and evil, but as creative and destructive forces.

C MR NEILL: You mean each of them was both creative and destructive, or one or more of them was creative and the others destructive?

A. No. Jehovah would be the creative force, that Lucifer would be a sustaining life-filling force once creation had taken place, and that Satan would embody the destructive force.

Q So Jehovah having given the go-ahead to Satan would mean that the destructive force was to follow - is that right - or take effect? A. Yes. They said that they perceived that to be happening.

Q They were having sessions or classes, or whatever one calls them, inside Cole Street; is that right? A. So I believed. They may well have been in the Geary Street church.

E Q I was just asking what happened in Cole Street. They would be having classes. Would they be for the six or seven who were there already, or would new people be invited to come? Were they trying to get new recruits or not? A. Yes, they definitely expended energy to new recruits.

Q That is Cole Street. Did you ever hear what happened at Geary Street, Brother Eli or anybody? A. There were what they termed Processcenes. It was combined into one word.

F Q What was the nature of them? A. It was a coffee shop-type situation, discussion being theological, their theology generally. People would meet, new recruits or people who were interested in the church would come there and talk with members of the church. It was an open house-type situation.

Q Did you go there yourself? A. Once I did, yes.

G Q Was what you described earlier as the mythology of the church being explained? A. Father Aaron read a poem about Lucifer. There was some discussion, just talk, prior to that. He read the poem. I thought it was a bad poem. I had written a poem the night before, and I read mine back to him. He came over to the table I was sitting at, stared intensely at me and said "What do you want?"

H MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "I read a poem back. He came to my table and stared intensely at me". A. He always stared intensely.

Q Did he? A. Yes, that I saw. He asked me what I wanted, and I replied "Nothing". He did not like that.

MR NEILL: Anyhow, that is the only time I think you went there. You have told us a little bit about Cole Street and a little bit about Geary Street.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What we have just been told happened at Geary Street, I gather? A. Yes.

B MR NEILL: Yes, and I had earlier on asked about Cole Street.

Q In addition to what was happening at the flat at Cole Street and the Geary Street premises, did you see members of the Process Church, as it had then become, out in the streets? A. Actually, no, I did not. I would visit the Cole Street house and people would return from ostensibly having been in the streets. I cannot recall encountering them on the streets.

Q You had not seen them yourself on the streets, but they came back having been out on the streets. We have heard that at one period Process literature, booklets, and so on, was being sold on the streets. Did you see people coming back from having sold literature? A. Yes, most frequently Brother Eli or Victor. I am not exactly sure of the time in our relationship when he changed his name.

Q At any rate, during this time you were visiting the San Francisco chapter, as it was called, there were occasions when some of the brothers had come back, having been selling booklets, and so on; is that right? A. Yes.

E Q Can you tell us the names of any of the booklets that you saw them come back with, or having been out selling? A. Most specifically the magazine you have seen here, the Process magazine.

Q The issue that was current then was the issue on Sex. Perhaps you ought to see a copy of it and make sure that we are talking about the same thing. That is the yellow or orange one. A. Yes, and there were two others; I believe the one before that and the one after that.

Q Also the one before that, the one on Mindbending; do you remember that? A. I cannot recall it offhand. I would need to see it to know if that was one.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That sort of thing? A. No, I have not seen that issue.

MR NEILL: Did you see that one, the purple one? A. No, I am not familiar with that.

H Q So it was the Sex one that you remember. You say there were one or two others, but we have not so far identified them. A. There was one. I don't know what its title on the cover is. If there is one titled "The Game of the Gods" on the cover, then that would have been the other one.

Q Would that be one you saw? ("The Gods on War" held up).

A. No. They were specifically magazines. I saw three booklets - I don't know for a fact that they were selling them at the time - approximately the shape of the one underneath the one you just picked, one called "Jehovah on War", one called "Lucifer on War" and one called "Satan on War".

Q You saw those booklets? A. Yes. I did not know that they were being sold. I saw them in the possession of several of the people who lived in the house.

B Q I think at one time, before it was put together as "The Gods on War", all three volumes were sold earlier in separate booklets, "Jehovah on War", "Lucifer on War" and "Satan on War".

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: This is the omnibus volume.

MR NEILL: The omnibus volume, the collective work.

C Q You saw people come back, having been out, and you remember specifically the magazines. In addition to that, do you know, from your own knowledge, anything about the activities of the two men who had come from England - that is Father Aaron and Father Alban - what they were doing? A. At first they were organising the others into rebuilding the church, painting it, sanding it and things like that. I was given to believe by Victor Wild that they were filing the State of California for, I assume, tax exemption church status. I was told by several people in the Cole Street house that they were out on the street spreading the story.

D Q The story of the church? A. Yes, the story of the Game of the Gods, the entire mythology.

E Q That was on the streets in San Francisco. That is what you understood? A. Yes.

Q So far we have had the Jehovahians, who you thought the chapter was mainly composed of; we have had Father Aaron, whom you thought might be a Luciferian. At that time were there any in the third category mentioned in the Sex magazine - Satanists? Were there any Satanists at that time in San Francisco?

F A. Not in the Process that I knew of.

Q After the move to Oak Street, did a new group come to San Francisco from somewhere else? A. Yes. It was a Luciferian group from New Orleans. I was given to believe they had some trouble with the police there.

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "After move to Oak Street, Luciferian group arrived from New Orleans", where you say they had had some trouble with the police? A. That is what I was told, yes.

H MR NEILL: In Oak Street when the Luciferian group arrived and the predominantly Jehovahian chapter there before that, did they all occupy the same part of the flat, or were they split in some way, or how was it organised? A. The times I went there, during social times, it seemed to polarise into one group at the back of the house. It is what is known as a "railroad" flat: a long hall with rooms leading off the side of it, so that it was long and narrow.

Q It was a long, thin flat, was it, with rooms out on either side of a central passage? A. Yes, seven or eight rooms.

Q I think you are telling my Lord and the Jury that the two groups seemed to split apart, or, at any rate, polarise, so that you had the Luciferians occupy one lot of it and the Jehovahians another lot; is that right? A. Yes. There was a morning service in which all partook, and there was work done around the house, which was according to duties that were assigned within the house, but on the evenings that I was there it seemed to be that way: the people from New Orleans being in the room in the back of the house frequently, and the Jehovahians so-called being in the front of the house. They were not talking about the same things.

Q After the move to Oak Street, how much longer did the chapter stay in San Francisco, roughly? A. I don't know the exact date of the move. I was away from contact with them for some time. I would estimate two to three months; perhaps less, perhaps six weeks to two months. I do not believe that the people from New Orleans were there all that time.

Q I think you told us you were away for a while yourself from San Francisco. When you came back, did you go and see Brother Eli again? A. Yes. I went to the new house. An acquaintance of mine told me that they had moved to the Oak Street house.

Q You were not actually there when the move took place. When you came back, you found they had gone to Oak Street? A. Yes.

Q You went to Oak Street, which you told us was not very far away from Cole Street. Did you there see Wild? A. Yes, I did.

Q Or Brother Eli. Did Brother Eli tell you something about whether they were going to stay on in San Francisco or not? A. I had been there once or twice before that at the Oak Street house. Then he told me they had received a message to go to Los Angeles the next day, and that they were leaving the next day.

Q Did he say who that message had come from? A. He implied it was from the founder. He never mentioned Robert De Grimston by name.

Q How was he described in your presence? A. "The founder". He had a way of saying "him" with a capital H, and I knew who he meant.

Q Earlier on, when we were back in Cole Street and before the New Orleans party had arrived, you had been talking about six or seven people living in the flat. At this time, at the time of the move, how many were there in Oak Street, roughly? A. Perhaps 15, perhaps more.

H Q 15 or more. A. Once the people from New Orleans had arrived, there was an overcrowded situation.

Q Was this young boy Simon, or the 14 or 15 year old Simon, still there? A. I did not see him.

Q At this time what were the 15 or so people there wearing? Were they still wearing black or something else? A. They were wearing black.

Q With the cross? A. Yes.

Q Anything else on their clothing? A. No.

Q You went to the house and I think you told us Brother Eli said that they had got this message that they must move the next day to Los Angeles; is that right? A. That is correct.

Q Did Brother Eli then ask you to do something for him? A. Yes. He said, "We are going to be strange-looking, all of us in black, and in a caravan", by which I took he meant a sequence of cars within sight of each other.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "Going to be strange-looking, all of us in black" ----

MR NEILL: -- "going in a caravan", by which you thought not what we would call a caravan but a sequence of cars? A. Yes.

MR KEMPSTER: A convoy.

MR NEILL: A convoy, yes. A. And he said "And I want us to be clean", meaning, in the language of the time, not to be in possession of anything that was against the law. He said "I have some opium and some mescaline. Can you get rid of it for me?" That amazed me, since at the time when I guess the period of initiation started he had become celibate and given up smoking, tobacco or drugs. I had presumed he had continued that.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You mean you presumed he had gone on to the drugs? A. No; that he had continued an ascetic manner of living.

MR NEILL: He asked you, because he wanted to be clean for the journey, "clean" in the sense of without anything against the law, if you could dispose of these two things for him; that is, the opium and a quantity of mescaline? A. Yes.

Q What did you say to that? A. I had been in the back of the house with the people from New Orleans a week prior to that.

Q Before you spoke to him, you had been talking with the Luciferians at the back. A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "I had been at the back of the house with the Luciferians"; is that right? A. Yes; and they had been talking in a manner relatively consistent with the way the people in what is known as the Haight Ashbury at that time talked about drugs, about parties, about swimming and things.

I am afraid you will have to explain that for me. First of all, what was the Haight Ashbury? A. It was the centre of what became known as the youth culture for a while in San Francisco.

MR NEILL: It is a district in San Francisco, is it not?  
A. It is a district. It became almost the generic for what became known as hippie.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: They talked like hippies; is that right? A. Yes. They were consistent with the community. The Jehovahians had not been. It was a very hedonistic community.

MR NEILL: These people, the Luciferians, were talking like what you described as Haight Ashbury people, like sort of hippie language; is that right? A. Yes. They were talking about parties, about drugs, about swimming, dancing, about pleasurable activities, rather than talking about points of theology and asceticism, which the Jehovahians talked about frequently.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "Parties, drugs and other pleasures"; is that right? A. Yes.

Q Rather than what - high theology? A. You could call it that, yes.

Q Anyhow, Father Eli said to you, "Can you dispose of some opium and mescaline for me?" A. Yes.

MR NEILL: You told us you had been talking a little earlier with the Luciferians and have been explaining how they had been talking. What happened when Brother Eli asked you this question? A. I went back because it is prefatory to my response. I said, "I will see what I can do", and I walked into the back room and said "Hey, Brother Eli has some opium and some mescaline", and they reacted positively.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What does that mean?  
A. They talked about "that would be interesting to take"; a lot of chatter. There were about six or seven people there, just chatter about "It would be good to use those drugs and have a party". That is not a direct quote, but that was the attitude.

Q The substance of it? A. Yes.

MR NEILL: Having had that talk with them, what did you do about the drugs, or did you do anything about them?  
A. Nothing. I presumed they would take care of it. They knew where it was.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You did not actually take over the drugs from Eli? A. No.

MR NEILL: He asked you about it in the front of the house?  
A. Yes.

Q You then, having already spoken to the Luciferians, went back to the back of the house to see what you could do about it with them; is that right? A. Yes. I did not know what else to



do. I would not have known where else to take it; but he had asked me to do something for him, and I figured if I could, that would solve the problem.

Q In view of their response, you did not take any more steps yourself; is that right? A. No. I said "Good night" and I left.

Q At that stage was there any other conversation you remember among the group of Luciferians? A. There was a quote which I quoted in the article I wrote. It seems rather out of place in this Court.

Q You later wrote an article in the newspaper the "Organ", on which you were associate editor? A. Yes.

Q I think you must not be diffident about it, Mr Pearlstein. Tell us what it was that was then said and which you printed in the newspaper. A. All right.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: By now we have gone past surprise or shock in this Court. A. I have not been here before. They were talking in lockerroom manner, very easy. One of them said, "Let's take all the drugs and go gang-fuck those prissy Jehovian bitches".

D Q This is one of the Luciferians? A. Yes. I could not identify him.

Q Never mind. One of the Luciferians said "Let's take all the drugs" - right? A. "Let's take them", referring to the drugs.

F Q -- "and go and fuck those prissy Jehovian bitches" - right? A. That was the exact words.

MR NEILL: I think, when you first told us, it was "gang-fuck", the phrase you used; is that right? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The phrase "gang-fuck", was that your phrase or theirs? A. That was theirs.

Q How many female Jehovians were available; do you know? A. No, I would not know. I would imagine several. They used the plural.

MR NEILL: That was in 1968 we are talking about now. Mr Wild, or Brother Eli, having said that they were going off to Los Angeles the next day, did they in fact go? A. As far as I know, yes.

Q I think you saw Brother Eli again, but did you see any of the others of the Process Church yourself after that? A. No, I did not. He returned to San Francisco alone. I would say in late May.

H Q I want to turn now, if I may, Mr Pearlstein, to something slightly different. You were, as you told us, or have been, resident in California, in San Francisco, for some eleven years

or so. Are you acquainted with any or aware of the fact that there are motor cycle gangs in San Francisco? A. I am not acquainted with them. I know who they are. I mean I have seen them frequently.

Q You have seen them frequently? A. Yes.

Q I wonder if you could be given a copy of the Fear issue of this Process magazine, and if you will be kind enough to turn to page 23. Do you see there a reference to "Satan Rides Again with the Hells Angels"? A. Yes.

Q Two things about that. Is the name "Hells Angels" the name of any motor cycle gang in California? A. Yes; it is the name of one specific gang. It consists of several chapters around Northern California.

Q The first quotation given on that page is from a Mr Hunter S. Thompson. Do you see that? A. Yes.

Q Have you read a book by Mr Hunter S. Thompson on the Hells Angels? A. Yes.

Q And is that about that gang you told us about, the specific gang in California? A. Yes, it is.

Q "California Labour Day Weekend", and so on. I think the Jury can read it for themselves. It appears to be a citation from the book. So we can identify it, is that the book? Perhaps you ought to just have a look at it. This is an English edition of it, "Hells Angels M.C", presumably "motor cycle".

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What are levis? "wearing chains, shades" - which I suppose are eye-shades - "and greasy levis". What are levis? A. They are blue jeans made by a San Francisco company founded by a man whose last name was Levi. Yes; it is a different edition, but the same book.

MR NEILL: That is the book we are talking about. That describes the activities of that gang. In the book there is reference to another gang called Gypsy Jokers. Have you ever heard of them? A. Yes. They are a smaller gang. The Hells Angels are the oldest of the gangs. They go back to just after the Korean conflict, returnees from that conflict, soldiers formed together, riding motor cycles. So that would put it about 1953.

MR. H.J. PEARLSTEIN:  
Examined.

Q. We have got a description of what the Hell's Angels get up to from what is set out by the Process journal on this page. Would you like to look through it quickly? It gives us a pretty good indication of their activities. From your knowledge of California, does that accord with your understanding of what they do? -- A. It is very consistent with the image they portray. These quotes tend to and Henry Johnson's book tends to make them somewhat more glamorous than some people consider them - yes.

Q. This makes them rather more glamorous than some people consider them, but to put it in plain terms, what sort of name have they got in California - these men called Hell's Angels? -- A. I would not say they have only one name.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think counsel means "reputation".

MR. NEILL: Yes, their reputation. -- A. Basically they are very physical people, tending to violence. A lot of people whose cars have been broken down late at night have been helped by Hell's Angels who have come up and repaired them. That is what I meant when I said there is a very mixed opinion about them. They like to fight. They really enjoy fighting and they do so frequently.

Q. The descriptions of violence here - they are described as Satanists - the Satanist's prayer: does that agree with the descriptions you have heard about them? -- A. The Satanist's prayer - no. They do not have much of a conceptual level. I mean as far as I know they tend to embrace Satan as they tend to embrace swastikas, because they frighten people. That is one of their major features. They like to have people react violently and with fear.

Q. There is a man in the photograph in the Process Church magazine who has the swastika on his helmet; do you see that? -- A. Yes.

Q. We have got it on page 4 as well.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: There is another on his tunic, or is that the Process symbol on his tunic? -- A. That would be a one per cent symbol.

Q. What is a one per cent symbol? -- A. One per cent refers to the one per cent of society who will never be reformable or adaptable to society. They wear it as a badge.

MR. NEILL: You told us a little earlier about this message which Brother Ely told you that they had received from the Founder or from Him? -- A. That was the implication.

Q. Did Brother Ely ever tell you anything else about Him or the Founder, about what part he played in the organisation? -- A. I think you are referring to the line in the article I wrote which said: I was talking to him one day and I said "I cannot accept" - "I do not join groups", and he said: "But we have the Christ".

Mr. H.J. KEMPSTER:  
Examined.

R. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Ely said that? -- A. Yes; he said: "He is 40 years old".

Q. When he said "We have the Christ", to whom did you understand him to be referring? -- A. I did not at that point. I asked him - I said, "Are you referring to De Grimston?"; and he declined to answer. He would not identify De Grimston as such. Either he implied it or I inferred it. It seemed to fit, but all he would say is: "He is 40 years old and he is with us".

Q. You say he implied, as you understood it, when he said he had the Christ, that he was referring to De Grimston. Is that what you are saying? -- A. I really cannot tell whether it was an inference on my part or an implication on his. I assumed that was what he was speaking of.

C MR. NEILL: Did Brother Ely ever tell you of an occasion when he had met or had come near to De Grimston? -- A. Yes. This was in late May of 1968.

Q. That is after the chapter at San Francisco had moved to Los Angeles and this was an occasion when you saw Wild when he came back to San Francisco? -- A. Yes.

D Q. Did he tell you on that occasion something about a meeting or something of that kind he had with Mr. De Grimston? -- A. Yes. He said he had been in a room adjacent to the room he was in - De Grimston was in - and that he had been overwhelmed even to physical trembling by that closeness, even through a wall, and by his knowledge that the Founder was that close. He said he had never been in the same room with him or never spoken with him. I think this was in relationship to the fact that he assumed that Robert De Grimston would be in Los Angeles prior to his leaving and he was looking forward to meeting him. I had asked him if he had met him.

E Q. You told us a little bit about Brother Ely and you told us something about the motor cycle gang. Did Brother Ely ever say anything to you about the motor cycling or motor cycle gang? -- A. Not about gangs per se. He was projecting into the future and in a copy of the article I have the exact quote. To recall to the best of my ability, he said: "When we really get moving or started" ---

MR. NEILL: Subject to any objection I would ask that he have a look at his article.

C MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If the article represents a note of what he said, is there any objection to his looking at it to refresh his memory?

MR. KEMPSTER: It is not a contemporaneous document.

H MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I entirely agree.

MR. KEMPSTER: If he wishes to refer himself to his article and he thinks it will help, we do not mind. It is the Organ obviously.

MR. H.J. PEARLSTEIN:  
Examined.

MR. NEILL: It is right that it was written some time later. That is quite clear.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It was not a note made at the time in the policeman's sense.

MR. KEMPSTER: I would be interested to know exactly the date of the article.

B MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Perhaps we can find out.

MR. NEILL: Perhaps he could have a copy of it.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do you want a copy or have you got it?

C MR. KEMPSTER: I have the article but not the newspaper itself and I do not know the date it was written.

MR. NEILL: Can you put us out of our misery and tell us the date? -- A. It was published in March 1971 and it was written in January of that year, 1971, so that I would put it two and a half to three years after the time it deals with.

D Q. Refreshing your memory from the article - have you got it in front of you now? -- A. Yes.

Q. What I was asking you about was whether there was an occasion when Brother Ely said something about motorbikes. The only comment he ever made to me about that was when he said: "When it really gets going we will have a mobile conversion unit with messengers in jackboots on black Harleys".

I MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: A Harley being a make of motorcycle? -- A. Yes. He went on to say - "wearing black leather jackets with the Process symbol in studs on the front and the cross in studs on the back".

Cross-examined by MR. KEMPSTER.

Q. Have you met Mr. Ed Sanders? -- A. Once, when we were introduced and we spoke.

Q. Will you please speak up. I want the jury to hear your answer. -- A. Yes. I had conversation with him on one occasion.

G Q. When was that? -- A. That was in 1971, in the spring, I would say April or May of 1971.

Q. Did you see the American edition of The Family written by Mr. Ed Sanders? -- A. Yes. Originally a year after its publication I saw the expurgated edition and just recently in the past two weeks I saw this version, the original version.

I Q. This is the American version I am holding up. -- A. Yes. There were two versions in the United States.

Q. Yes, after proceedings by the Process? -- A. Yes.

Q. This was published, it appears - we have not got the month - in 1971? -- A. Yes.

Q. Both this book and The Family you accept contain the precise words about the Jehovian bitches and about the motorcyclists on their Harleys that appear in your article? -- A. Yes. He came to me for background on the book he was doing.

B MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Sanders came to you for the background? -- A. Yes.

MR. KEMPSTER: Did you give him a copy of your article that you had prepared for the Organ? -- A. He already had one.

C Q. Then you must have seen Ed Sanders after March 1971? -- A. Yes. As I said, it was April or May 1971.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: He said it was the spring of 1971.

MR. KEMPSTER: Yes. I referred to March because March was the date when he said this article was published in the Organ.

D MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I have spring of 1971.

MR. KEMPSTER: As Mr. Ed Sanders had a copy I assumed it must have been after March 1971? -- A. The date March is printed on the cover in the United States as the pull date. It was on the stands in the month of February. It says March on the front which means when the March issues come out they remove it, and during March they say April. That is just the system.

E Q. Did you also see Mr. Larry Larsen? -- A. Yes; it was Larry Larsen who had contacted me.

Q. I take it you confirmed that what you had written in your article and published in the Organ was the truth; you said that to Mr. Sanders, did you? -- A. Aside from those things which I identified as hearsay in the article, yes; they were facts.

F MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Let me try and get that put a little more simply: "My article is accurate except so far as I state it is hearsay"; is that right? -- A. In the article I stated certain things about the Process and identified them as hearsay in the article.

G Q. "I identified certain things in the article as hearsay". -- A. Yes.

Q. "Otherwise it is accurate"? -- A. Yes.

H Q. "To my own knowledge"; is that what you are saying? -- A. Yes.

Q. "Otherwise the matters stated in the article are within my own knowledge"; is that right? -- A. Yes.

MR. KEMPSTER: Just to get something out of the way, you described a young boy, I think it was Simon who you thought was about 14, whom you saw in Cole Street? -- A. Yes.

Q. Did you learn that in fact he had run away from his parents? -- A. I was told that. I do not know that as a fact.

Q. A lot of the things you have mentioned to the court you have been told. Were you told that? -- A. Yes; I was.

Q. Were you told after some weeks that the members of Process had managed to persuade him to go back to his parents? -- A. I was not told that, no.

Q. You just thought that he had disappeared; you did not see him any more? -- A. Yes; that is correct.

Q. While he was at Cole Street he was being fed and looked after by the members of the Process? -- A. Yes.

Q. So much for that. Mr. Wild: you have talked a lot about Mr. Wild and you have told my Lord and the jury that when you say he asked you whether you could dispose of some drugs for him this surprised you? -- A. Yes; it did.

Q. I would like to take that in two stages. You told my Lord and the jury that when he had become, as I understand it, a member of the Process, he had renounced sex, tobacco and drugs? -- A. During his initiation, yes.

Q. So you were surprised on a personal level to find that he had such things still in his possession? -- A. Yes; I was.

Q. Dealing with that again quite personally, you told us that he came back shortly after the group had moved on to Los Angeles? -- A. Yes.

Q. Did you learn from him at that stage that he had ceased to be a messenger or whatever grade he had reached with the Process? -- A. He told me at that time.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think he has already told us that.

MR. KEMPSTER: I am sorry, my Lord. My only note is that he came back from Los Angeles. Another witness ----

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It may have been an earlier witness.

MR. KEMPSTER: Yes, my Lord. An earlier witness told us he could not take the discipline, but not this witness. (To the witness): He told you that he had ceased to be a member? -- A. He told me that he was questioning his faith and he had to discover where he truly lived - I do not know the exact words, but that he had to get to his centre and find out which way he wanted to go before he could rejoin.

Q. So he felt he had to leave the community to think things out again; is that the effect of what he said to you? -- A. I got

the impression it was mutual.

- Q. You got the impression that the Process too thought it would be as well if he left their company for a while? -- A. He seemed to be suffering from the separation. I would not have thought he would have done it by himself.
- Q. You mean you had the impression that they had, as it were, put him on compulsory leave or something? -- A. No: that Ely and the people with whom he talked had a talk that went perhaps a little deeper than he wanted to go.
- Q. That is this man Wild personally. Generally from your observation of the members of the Process after the arrival of what you have described of the two men from England, Alban and Hugh Mountain, what was the attitude of the Process to, for example, drugs? -- A. The first mention or solution that I heard of drugs was some time after the two men, Alban and Aaron, arrived from England, at which time they apparently gave instructions that people who were using them, including nicotine and caffeine, were to cease using them.
- Q. You mean you were not even allowed to have ordinary coffee, let alone tobacco? -- A. I am sorry, I mean I could be corrected about the coffee, but I know tobacco.
- Q. You may be right. I am not questioning it. -- A. It is not a clear memory, but I know tobacco for certain. I could swear to that.
- Q. That was their attitude to drugs. Coming on to matters generally, was the regime sanctioned by these two gentlemen one of depravity or one of strictness, just in general terms, in a personal way of life? -- A. It was very strict - very disciplined.
- Q. In the context of your description of the teaching of the Church as you understand it, namely, that the end of the world was at hand - do you follow me? -- A. Yes.
- Q. How was that reflected, as far as you could see, in the behaviour of the members of the Process you came across? How did it affect their behaviour as citizens? -- A. There was talk that - Victor again and some unidentified others in various ----

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am not either hearing and what I am hearing I am not following.

MR. KEMPSTER: Shall we try again. We have this doctrine that the end of the world was at hand. Was that reflected in any particular way in the conduct as citizens, men and women, of the members of the Process Church? -- A. There were some who said "Help bring it on"; there were some who said, "Become aesthetic and remove yourself from it".

- H Q. Some said "Help to bring it on", and some said "Become aesthetic", but what about their actual behaviour, as far as you could observe, both living in the community or if you ever saw them when they were out and about in San Francisco? Did it appear to make them behave differently from other people?



-- A. They tended to become isolated. They tended to have less in common with people outside the community. They tended to become absorbed in the community, in the theology of it.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do try to keep your voice up because it is very difficult for the jury. -- A. Yes.

MR. KEMPSTER: Then we come to the time when you say a group of people arrived from New Orleans and you heard that they had been in trouble with the police. Do you know what sort of trouble? You would not know, but what were you told? -- A. It was centering around drugs.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Selling drugs? -- A. No, centering around drugs.

MR. KEMPSTER: What this means you do not know - is that right - when you say "centering around drugs"; you were told no more? -- A. No. It did not sound to be major in terms of what the United States calls Class A narcotics. It sounded like, "Why don't you guys get out of town" from the police.

Q. When they reached the chapter in San Francisco did they come under what you have described as the strict regime that applied in the San Francisco chapter? -- A. No. They seemed to have their own.

Q. Their own what? -- A. Their own regimen.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Their own regime? -- A. Apparently.

MR. KEMPSTER: Can you name any of these persons? -- A. No; I could not, not with certainty.

Q. Have you seen any one of them since? -- A. I doubt it.

Q. How do you know that they were members of the Process at all? -- A. Because other members of the Process told me they were from the New Orleans chapter.

Q. Who told you this? -- A. Victor; some of the women in the house.

Q. Can you identify any of the women? -- A. I cannot remember their names - people in the house who were wearing the uniform who had been around the house, who lived there.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "Some of the women told me the people from New Orleans were Process"; is that right? -- A. Yes.

MR. KEMPSTER: At this time was, for example, Mr. Fripp regularly to be seen on the various premises occupied by the Process? -- A. Not regularly, no. I never personally encountered him at the Oak Street house.

Q. You just encountered him at Geary Street? -- A. I am sorry, I encountered him once at the Geary Street house prior to the arrival of the people from New Orleans.

Q. When you saw these people arrive from New Orleans I think you started to describe the regime in the house, that is, everyone joined in, in the morning, in a service of worship; is that right? -- A. That was the tradition in the house; I was told that was continued when they came in.

Q. As far as you were told, you were told that everyone worshipped together; is that right? -- A. Yes.

B Q. You were told or saw that everyone shared in the duties of running the house, keeping it clean and in order, cooking and so on; is that right? -- A. That is correct.

Q. Did these newcomers from New Orleans, so far as you know or have heard, join with those already there in discussions? -- A. What sort of discussions?

C Q. I am not specifying the nature of the discussions at the moment. I am just asking you generally whether they joined in discussions on, for example, Process doctrine? -- A. I would not know that.

D Q. You do not know. Also would the newcomers share - or do you not know - in the work on the streets of spreading the Process beliefs and selling magazines? -- A. I do not know that either.

Q. When you say that you thought their regime differed from that of those who had previously been in the house, in what way? -- A. The structural relationship in the group was markedly different from the structural relationship of those I had known before. It was an entirely different rhythm.

E Q. Would it be right to say that the group that arrived from New Orleans had previously been together for some time and were friends? -- A. I cannot attest to how long they had been together. They were much more relaxed in encountering new people. They might have been together some time. They were friendlier in that manner of encountering people - more relaxed.

F Q. My suggestion was that they arrived as a group and, knowing each other, tended for social purposes perhaps to consort with each other? -- A. That might well be the case. I do not know either way.

G Q. On the occasion when you learned from Brother Ely that they had a message to leave San Francisco and you say he offered you or invited you to help him to dispose of some drugs and in the end you did not take any drugs from him, have you any idea what happened to those drugs? -- A. No idea whatsoever.

Q. Did you see the drugs that he was asking you to dispose of? -- A. No; I did not.

H MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Were you told the quantity? -- A. Yes. He had one gram of opium and 20 hits, meaning 20 doses.

Q. 20 doses of Mescaline? -- A. Of Mescaline.

MR. KEMPSTER: Am I right that at this time you had been away from San Francisco for some weeks prior to it? -- A. No. I had been in San Francisco but I had been away from encountering the Process.

Q. You had not seen anything of the Process for some weeks? -- A. That is true.

B Q. When you came to this house in Oak Street, why did you come? Why did you visit it? -- A. I do not think I had a clear motivation. I had been told where their new house was. I noticed they had moved from the old house. I mean in terms of "Why?", as having a specific function.

Q. Anyway after the absence of contact with Process for some weeks you came to this house? -- A. Yes.

C Q. Let us put it like this. You saw an old acquaintance of yours whom we are calling Ely; is that right? -- A. Yes.

Q. Did you see anyone else there you had seen before? -- A. Yes, Brother Barnabas.

I Q. Anyone else? -- A. There were familiar faces there - not people who had lived at Cole Street, but people whose faces were familiar to me but whose names I did not know.

Q. Familiar faces - familiar from what period of time? -- A. From the time it was apparently the end of the Cole Street house, prior to the move, I would imagine, the time before this period of weeks when I had not encountered the Process.

E Q. They were familiar faces to those you had seen earlier on at the time that Father Alban and Hugh Mountain were imposing their regime and making everyone wear black - from that time? -- A. I do not know that they were imposing a regime - people I had seen who were around the Cole Street house, although not residents of the Cole Street house as I knew it.

Q. Not as residents? -- A. No.

Q. When you came back after an absence of some weeks of contact, you recognised as residents Brother Ely and Brother Barnabas; that is right, is it not? -- A. Yes; that is correct.

Q. You also saw some familiar faces, faces which you had known not as residents but as visitors at Cole Street? --

A. Yes.

H

(Adjourned for a short time).

MR KEMPSTER: You remember before the luncheon adjournment you told me that when you came back to this house in San Francisco, Oak Street I think, after an absence of some weeks you recognised as former resident members of the Process Brother Eli and Brother Barnabas; and you also recognised certain other faces there as persons whom you had previously seen attending Process activities? A. That I had seen in the house - not specifically attending formal functions.

Q You had just seen about the house? A. Yes.

Q Is it right that in fact the Process kept what one would call open house for persons interested in their beliefs and practices, to come and enquire and so on? A. These were people who were wearing the uniform of the Process, whom I had seen.

Q People you had seen dressed in black? A. That is correct.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: By that time had capes developed, or were they still in their black trousers and sweaters? A. Aside from Father Alban and Father Aaron, no.

Q Do you mean Fathers Alban and Aaron were wearing capes? Is that what you are saying? A. I was told that they did.

Q You had never seen them? A. Not in streetwear. As I mentioned before, I had not seen them in the street, only indoors.

Q But you had seen the capes indoors? A. No. I had been told that that was the outfit that was being worn.

Q Did you ever see any of these capes? A. Not that I can clearly recollect, no.

MR KEMPSTER: When you paid your visit to the Process at Oak Street, did Brother Ely draw your aside and mention his difficulty with these drugs, or was there some sort of public pronouncement? A. It was private.

Q It was a private matter, and he was asking for your personal assistance? A. That is correct.

Q Is it right that following his request for help on this private matter you say you went into the house somewhere and asked the company at large whether they could suggest a way of disposing of these drugs? A. At that time I was already in the house. I went back into the other portion of the house and I did as follows, yes.

Q Did you think yourself that if he had wanted help from the other people in the house Brother Eli could have approached them himself? A. I have no idea. I have no idea why he approached me, except I was living in the outside society.

Q If he had approached you, as you might have thought, because you were in the outside society, why did you refer the problem

to those whom, as I understand it, you believed also to be members of the Process? A. Because I had no idea what else to do with these drugs.

Q Were the people you referred to also in the house perhaps also members of the outside society? A. I have already stated they were identified to me as Process members from New Orleans.

Q The people you spoke to? A. That is correct.

Q But some people had been identified to you as Processeans from New Orleans some weeks before, had they not? A. No, that is not correct. I never said that.

Q If I have misunderstood you, of course I will accept your correction, but I thought that some weeks before this occasion this group of people you had been told arrived from New Orleans? A. No. Some weeks before I had last seen these Jehovahians I had talked to at the Cole Street house I was given the address of where they had moved to, and during a period of approximately a week I encountered these people several times there. It wasn't some weeks before, apparently it was the final week and a half at that house.

Q You encountered them at Cole Street? A. No, at Oak Street. The incident to which you are referring happened on the night before the departure. I had been there perhaps five days before and perhaps two days before that.

Q So that the people to whom you referred Brother Eli's drug trouble were people whom you believed to have come from New Orleans? A. That is what I had been told, yes.

Q You had been told that a day or two or a week before? A. That is correct, and they verified it, they spoke of it at New Orleans.

Q You described what you say they said, and they used this obscene expression about other women. Was this followed by some sort of mass rape in the house, do you know? A. I did not stay. I would not have presumed so.

Q You did not presume so? A. No.

Q Why not? A. It did not seem to be a serious constructive suggestion for an evening's entertainment.

Q Was it just a joke? A. I don't know whether it was just a joke. It was just a comment.

Q You did not, as it were, take it as a serious suggestion, as a sort of guidance of the evening's activities? A. No one got up from where they were sitting as they said it, no.

H Q You would be very surprised, I expect, to learn that anything had happened, would not you? A. At that time, in that particular cultural area, I would not have been surprised at

anything that had happened; but I did not expect that that was what was going to happen, no.

Q Did all the people - or do not you know - to whom you were bringing Brother Eli's problem leave the next day for Los Angeles, or do not you know? A. I don't know whether they left for Los Angeles.

Q You do not know who left for Los Angeles? A. I know the house was vacated.

Q Is it right that in this house the Process was training, or seeking to train, people who had been recruited either in New Orleans or San Francisco? A. It was my understanding that the people in the house were already initiates, they all wore the cross.

Q And they were undergoing training? A. If there was further training, yes.

Q You told my Lord and the jury that in 1971, about April, you had this discussion with Mr Ed Sanders about the subjectmatter of your article in The Organ? A. That is correct, in April or May.

Q Is The Organ what is known as an underground newspaper? A. I imagine it could be termed that.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You mean April or May 1971?

MR KEMPSTER: Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What was your answer? A. It could be termed that, yes. It was not - the connotation of "underground" as political would not characterise it; the connotation of "underground" as other than the general thrust of the mass media would.

MR KEMPSTER: It dealt with rather different topics from the New York Herald Tribune, did it not? A. I am sorry, I don't understand what you are saying about the New York Herald Tribune.

Q I was suggesting that perhaps the New York Herald Tribune would deal with national and international news. A. That was a newspaper. This was a monthly magazine.

Q When were you next, if at all, asked by anybody whether what you had written in The Organ, which was published in March 1971, was true? A. That would have been the week before last.

MR KEMPSTER: The week before last.

MR NEILL: Thank you.

(The witness withdrew)

REV. M.G. SULLIVAN:  
Examined.

THE VERY REV. MARTIN GLOSTER SULLIVAN, Sworn,  
Examined by MR BRITTAN

- Q Are you the Very Rev. Martin Sullivan, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral? A. Yes.
- Q And your address is, of course, The Deanery, St. Paul's, London, E.C.4? A. Yes.
- Q Have you been a clergyman of the Church of England for 42 years? A. Yes.
- Q And were you serving in New Zealand, where you were born, until 1962? A. Yes.
- Q Did you then come to England, first of all to Bryanston Square. Then Archdeacon of London and Canon of St. Paul's, and finally succeeding Dean Matthews as Dean of St. Paul's in 1967? A. Yes.
- Q Has it been a speciality of yours to work among young people? A. Yes.
- Q Is it right that you make a practice of visiting schools and youth groups in order to get to know and advise young people? A. Yes.
- Q It is right, is it not, that you have been asked to read certain publications of the Process-church of the Final Judgement? A. Yes.
- Q Am I right in saying that the ones you have read are The Gods on War, and the Process magazines of Mindbending, Love, Fear, Death, Sex, Freedom of Expression; and also And now the Judgement, The Gods and their People, and Christ has Come? A. Yes.

MR NEMPSTER: One of those mentioned is called Love. That as only been alluded to I think by me, and it was only the back page.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I have never seen it.

MR BRITTAN: I do not think it will arise.

- Q First of all, could I ask you what your general impression of the literature that you have read is, so far as the philosophy of its publishers is concerned?

A. I think it would be true to say that, when I first came to read this, I tried to do so objectively and detachedly, but I became a little confused in the motivation behind the minds of the writers. I wasn't sure, indeed, what they were saying to me on the subject: whether they were commending certain practices or condemning certain practices.

A I say that because there is one article in particular  
in this magazine that made me think on these lines. It is  
page 15 of the Process issue on Sex. This is a long piece,  
and it goes into a great deal of detail describing the kind  
of sexual activities that may be open to people who seek  
then, even - even- asking if people prefer a touch of  
necrophilia. So that it is a journey through the night, in  
a dark alley, through a cemetery, with sexual activities on  
the tombstones, in a ruined church with a touch of the kind  
of black mass about it; and then, at the end, one or two  
questions are asked. But my concern about this piece -  
for myself and, indeed, for anybody who reads it, and part-  
icularly anybody who is untutored, who picks it up out of  
context - is this, that it may be commending this kind of  
thing. There is no direct statement that I can find here,  
in this particular passage, which warns one about the  
issues which are involved in this. And, if I may say so, I  
was concerned about the kind of almost  
stroking of the words in the description, that is very  
detailed, that is given in these three columns on page 9.

Q What sort of effect do you think that that might have in  
the hands of the young and immature?

A. Therein lies my concern. I think I ought to say that all  
of us retain memories of what we read. Even a sophisticated  
person who reads this will retain memories of it, which may  
adversely affect him. It is the sort of thing, I believe, that  
could adversely affect a person like myself, or anybody else.  
But if you are an unsophisticated, naive person, I would be  
afraid that this might affect such a person very badly;  
and I would want, if this were put into the hands of such a  
person, to have a corrective in order to get a proper  
balance, and it is the corrective that I miss from these pages.

Q What about if it came into the hands of somebody who was not  
altogether stable, or had serious personal problems? Would  
that be more or less dangerous?

A. I have another anxiety about that. If this were to come  
into the hands of a stable person who has these kind of  
problems, I do not see that it helps that particular person.  
What it does is it treads the ground all over again. If I  
am a stable person, worried about this issue, I want to be  
left out of it.

Q And if it came into the hands of an unstable person? A. Well,  
I am of the opinion that it could be a dangerous and damaging  
document.

Q Do you think that the impact of the document is in anyway  
affected by the fact that it is given the cloak of religion,  
that it is put forward as the document issued by a religious  
organisation?

A. I think this is very important. If one uses the word  
"church" in a document and suggests that a body like the  
church puts, however gently, its imprimatur upon it, people  
I think may be inclined to read it believing that it is  
representing a viewpoint of which the church perhaps approves.



Q Are there any other particular points that you would like to make in relation to the Sex issue of the magazine?

A. No, I do not think so, because I felt that this particular passage was the one that concerned me most, and the one I felt was the most damaging and dangerous in this particular issue. I say that. I think people who read it will understand there is a certain guying of the Church to which I belong - I don't object to that - and I am trying to be balanced about it; but in this particular one I was very disturbed to read this reference to necrophilia, all the kind of fringes of the subject.

Q Yes. Would you be good enough to take the Mindbending issue now. Would you look at page 27.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: All the pages are not numbered. There is a centre spread with the inverted swastika, and on page 27 is a picture of this gentleman, Robert de Grimston, whom we have not seen. A. Yes, I have it.

MR BRITTAN: There is a passage which I believe you have read, questioning the concept of normality and matters of that kind. Before I ask you to comment, would you also turn to the Freedom of Expression issue of the magazine, page 25, towards the bottom:

"Jehovah and Lucifer have returned to the scene of the failure; but now they are not working in opposition, but in conjunction and cooperation. And their purpose?

"To root out the grey forces utterly from every sphere of society and destroy them. To bring the world and every individual in it to a full recognition of their total failure before God. To annihilate the irrelevance and rubbish that clog men's brains. To bring every grey government to its knees and to replace it either with utter chaos and anarchy or with a militant dictatorship working in accordance with the will of Jehovah."

"Jehovah and Lucifer are sick of a world which has suppressed all knowledge of their existence. They are back to bring humanity to its logical end; and to oppose them is to invite spiritual death".

I wonder if you would care to comment on the language of the two passages to which I have drawn your attention?

A. Yes. I have read this passage with some concern also.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: This is page 25? A. Yes, page 25, the two last paragraphs. If I may digress for a moment and point out why, it is because I saw in my copy of the one to which you have referred, Mindbending, explicit aims of the Process-church. I don't see them stated in the area which I examined in my own copy in the one which is now in front of me, but if I would be permitted to refer to my own copy it would help me.

Q Yes. Which one are you now looking at? A. I am now dealing with Mindbending, in order to come to this one, Freedom of

Expression. In my copy of Mindbending, on the last page the editors are named in their various capacities: Managing, Executive, Adviser and so on. Then in the next section, headed "PROCESS", these words occur [back cover]:

"The voice of the extremes. Stands against mediocrity and suppression. Exposes the Grey Forces".

Then in this particular issue we have just been looking at, Freedom of Expression, on page 25:

"To root out the grey forces utterly from every sphere of society and destroy them".

Now, I read about 12 volumes, 12 issues, of this Process magazine, several hundred pages, and I wanted to trace the relationship between the understanding or definition of the Grey Forces and this reference. As far as I can make out, the Grey Forces refer to what appear to me, anyway, to be the sort of normal organs of human society.

Q What is ordinarily understood as "the Establishment"?

A. Well, I would hesitate to use that word, because I think it might refer to bodies that would not call themselves an establishment but are the normal organs of human society, every democratic enterprise. It may be anybody that is exercising itself for the common good. If that is so, the purpose of this body is to root out such forces.

I think it has a bearing, because it goes on to say:

"To bring the world and every individual in it to a full recognition of their total failure before God" -

a wholly admirable statement, which all of us, I think, could agree needs to be done to every one of us. But then it goes on:

"To annihilate the irrelevance and rubbish that clog men's brains",

without reference to what that may be. But then:

"To bring every grey government to its knees and to replace it either with utter chaos and anarchy or with a militant dictatorship working in accordance with the will of Jehovah.

"Jehovah and Lucifer are sick of a world which has suppressed all knowledge of their existence. They are back to bring humanity to its logical end; and to oppose them is to invite spiritual death".

My concern about this passage is the inducement to violent reaction, to violent activity: "To bring every grey government to its knees". And then "to replace it either with utter chaos and anarchy or with a militant dictatorship". I felt that that statement was a dangerous and damaging one.

MR BRITTAN: Are there any other comments you would like to make on those two issues of the magazine before I pass on to some other of the literature that you have been kind enough to look at? A. No. I think those two points that I referred to are the issues I wanted to bring out.

You recall you looked at a book called The Gods on War, which had references to three gods and their attitude to war. Would you turn to page 84 and do you see passage in the middle of that page which reads:

"Feel the firm grip on the swordhilt, the cold hardness of the steady gun butt. Smell the blood and the cordite. Hear the battle cries mingled with the screams of those that die. And see the surging of the armies joined in mortal combat; and the smoke, the all-enveloping smoke that swirls and billows, and then hangs suspended, blotting out the sun".

What did you feel about that passage?

A. I was concerned also about this passage. I do not deny that it could represent a very powerful and graphic description of war. Any of us who have been in war know that that description is something that we understand. But once again, stated as it is here, The Gods on War, suggesting that I who read this might feel the firm grip, hear the battle cries, see the surging of the armies - this is a dangerous statement, because it suggests that this may be what we are heading for, and perhaps it is a good thing we should head for in order to have this final desperate and bloody encounter.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It suggests there is some virtue in these activities? A. Almost, my Lord, yes; and this is what worries me, because my attitude towards war of this kind is that there is no virtue in it whatsoever, that nobody could possibly commend.

MR BRITTAN: It is right to say, is it not, that you served as a chaplain to the New Zealand Division during the war? A. Yes.

Q So that you know what you are talking about. Is there any other comment you would like to make on this book, The Gods on War, pictures and anything else in it?

A. No, except again I am bound to say that a document like this would need to be very carefully read and very carefully estimated in order to understand it; and I take leave to suggest that if we are going to use words like "the gods", if we are going to talk about Jehovah, without defining him, and Lucifer and Satan, it is very important to preface what we have to say much more clearly than has been done in these documents in order that the reader may not get false impressions.

Q Do you think that, as it stands, that book gives a clear impression of what the authors want and what they do not want, and what they are advocating and what they are not?

A. All I can say is that it did not give that impression to me.

Q A lot has been made in this case of the demarcation between what is described and what is advocated. Do you think that that book, in its effect, makes a clear distinction of that kind?

B A. One of my concerns and worries, as I read this literature carefully - I spent a long time on it and made notes on it - and thought about it, was that I found this distinction was blurred. There is no doubt one could turn here and there and find the line of demarcation clearly ruled. But frequently it was blurred, and I found myself turning back to the beginning to make sure what it was that I was expected to be understanding and who in fact was advocating or condemning this line of conduct, this attitude, this behaviour.

Q Would you now look at the book The Gods and their People, pages 8 and 9:

"Satan...instills in us two directly opposite qualities; at one end an urge to rise above all human and physical needs and appetites, to become all soul and no body, all spirit and no mind, and at the other end a desire to sink beneath all human values, all standards of morality, all ethics, all human codes of behaviour, and to wallow in a morass of violence, lunacy and excessive physical indulgence. But it is the lower end of Satan's nature that men fear, which is why Satan, by whatever name, is seen as the Adversary".

E

What did you feel about the language of that passage?

F

A. I found, in fairness, when I read this, here is one of the passages where the line is a little clearer. I was still very confused, but I am bound to say the suggestion is made here there are two ends of Satan's nature, and there is an implied warning, I thought, against the lower end. But what I could not understand is how I am to deal - this is where the blurring comes - with two Satans. I have got one under the guise of subhumanity and one under the guise of superhumanity, and I didn't see what role they were playing and whether it was the same person working on me in a dual capacity. I found this rather confusing. But I am in duty bound, I think, to say that it was a little clearer here: at least I knew there was an upper and lower Satan, as it were.

G

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: There are two quite inconsistent statements, are there not? A. They are two different statements. What concerned me was that they are under the same banner.

H

Q I follow that. A. I was not sure what role Satan is playing here. Perhaps it is a dual one.

REV. M.G. SULLIVAN:

Examined.  
Cross-examined.

MR BRITTAN: Taking the literature as a whole, would you allow it to be distributed in St. Paul's Cathedral? A. I couldn't. In fairness I should say we don't allow people to distribute literature anyway unless we know who they are and what they are up to, because there are many people who would be happy to do it if they had the opportunity.

Q I am sure. A. But if I was shown the literature and asked if it could be distributed as it is, then I would have to say "No", because I think it would lead to a great deal of confusion on the one hand, and I think could - could - lead to mischief on the other.

Q Do you think it would help your activities with young people or harm them if that literature were made available?

A. I should say to you that I am constantly thinking about what I should say to young people and how best, in my own way, I can help them in the difficult times in which they live. There is absolutely nothing in the literature I could possibly use, and there is a very great deal that I think I would be obliged to warn young people against.

MR BRITTAN: Warn young people against.

Cross-examined by MR KNEEBSTER

Q You were being asked finally by Mr Brittan about the Process publication, The Gods and their People. That is the white booklet with the gold lettering. I have no doubt you read the book as a whole? A. Yes.

Q Did you agree with the passages that appear on pages 10 and 11? A. Yes, I did.

Q It is right advice, is it not, to people that they have a choice, and that it is helpful to recognise the powerful forces motivating each one of us? A. I think I would say, on page 10, that the choice is indicated. Yes, we have a choice. But I don't think it is clearly stated what we should do about the choice. We are given the options. We can suppress, disown, pretend they are not there, justify them. It does not say, it seems to me - at least, I didn't get this - that there was a very clear indication, for example, back on page 9, there is a particular Satan (if I may use the terminology in the literature) whom I should obey and serve. I have a choice between the Satan with lust to indulgence and the choice between Satan detachment and asceticism. But I don't see here that I am told which of these two I should follow.

Q I suggest to you that the authors of this book are saying quite clearly in this publication that the reader should recognise what is in him and then, having recognised them - I am quoting from the foot of page 10 - "accept them as part of ourselves, tackle them with awareness and understanding, and finally to rise above them"; and it says Christ is there to give us the courage and faith to face such problems. Then:

"The choice is ours. Christ and a path of vision and reality, sometimes painful, always intense; or anti-Christ",

and so on. Here the authors are making it reasonably plain to readers that Christ is the path whereby men may have the courage to recognise the forces within them and rise above them?

A. I think that is a reasonable interpretation; but I think I must continue to point out that there is a blurring. On page 9 there is no reference to Christ at all. Suddenly he appears on page 10, as "the Emissary of the Gods". I do not want to quarrel with that theological implication, but I am uneasy about it. I ought to say that. Suddenly he comes in. But I find, with respect to the authors, that it might have been better if they had cleared this mist a little earlier, so certainly people like myself would not have been under any misapprehension.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: When we speak of "authors", in the plural, I thought the author was Mr de Grimston, whom we have not seen. Is not that right? Were not we told that?

MR KEMPSTER: The evidence was that this came from Mr de Grimston. Your Lordship is quite correct.

MR BRITAIN: Recorded by him.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Quite right, recorded.

MR KEMPSTER: If I used the plural instead of the singular, I apologise.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: No, I am not complaining; but in fact all we have been told is that there is only one author, Mr de Grimston, who has not so far, at any rate, given us the benefit of his exposition of his own recording.

MR KEMPSTER: No.

Q The second page, the first bit of text we have in the book - this appears in nearly all the Process publications - is:

"Christ said: love thine enemy".

Is that right? Just as you open the book, before you see this photograph. A. Yes.

Q I think you yourself wrote to the Spectator - it is this week's, is it not, March 23 - a letter? A. Yes.

Q And did you say in that letter - it is called "Doubt and Conviction" - A. It is a piece, not a letter.

Q A contribution? A. A contribution.

Q -"We are called upon to know our own minds and with all the resources at our disposal to think out things for ourselves". Is that right? A. Yes.

Q I think you went on to comment, at the end of your contribution: "It is the young who are pushing these matters to the limit. They will listen to those of us who are older if we speak from deep conviction", and so on.

So would you perhaps agree that the author, singular, of these publications can be said to be seeking to explain to readers what the forces inside individual human beings are and to recognise them? A. As you have pointed out, that contribution I think is headed "Doubt and Conviction".

Q Yes. A. Then I think what I was trying to say was that there is a constant clash and tension between doubt and conviction, and I was pleading that people should be prepared to face up to this clash and conflict, that if you have a doubt you must be prepared to examine it and not run away

from it. If your conviction is there, examine its worth

and its depth. If I may say so, I think that's a slightly

different approach from what is being said here in the context

of which I wrote that particular piece for the

Spectator.

Q I am sure it is not susceptible of misunderstanding, so I accept what you say. I think you were criticising the passage on page 15 of the Sex issue, particularly if it was read in isolation. That is the nasty bit about the journey through the night. A. Yes. I was criticising that.

Q Not, I would suggest, an attractive picture. A. You mean the picture or the piece?

Q The piece. A. No, the piece I did not find attractive.

Q I mean in the sense that it could hardly be described as stimulating, could it? A. With respect, I think it could. I think paragraph 4 is a fairly stimulating passage to some people. May I read it.

Q You can read it to yourself. I don't know whether we want it read out in Court. So far we have spared everyone going through this. If you do think so, I am sure the Members of the Jury will read it themselves. A. May I therefore say I think paragraph 4 does suggest that.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It has been accepted by one of the witnesses for the Plaintiffs that this whole piece on page 15 is filth. Would you dissent from that? A. I think it is very close to it, my Lord. I felt so when I read it.

Q And seeing that it emanates from the same source as "The Gods and Their People", about which you have just been asked questions, may it not be an example of a very old practice, of disseminating filth with a top-dressing of morality? A. If I may say so, it is the top-dressing that I thought was the insincere part of the whole piece, apart from the content.

MR KEMPSTER: When your Lordship says "the same source", these pieces are not attributed even by way of recording from Robert De Grimston.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: They may not be Robert De Grimston personally, but they all come under the imprint (if that is the right word) of the Process Church of the Final Judgement, don't they?

MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, this leads me to my next question. Apart from the reference in the Sex issue to the Church of England, is there any mention of the word "church"? It is on page 29, an example of the grey forces.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is right.

MR KEMPSTER: That is the only place where the word "church" appears, I think. I was just suggesting that these magazines do not in themselves, if you just rely on a reader who is looking into one of these magazines, have the authority of what purports, in the magazines, to be a church. A. My impression was that they are all called Process, which is the name of the magazine, I imagine, but they have the address of the organisation. On page 3, "Donations as usual to the Treasurer, The Process, Balfour Place", which is the address of the Process Church. Adding these two together, I hope not unwisely, I came to the conclusion that they emanated from the same source.



Q Certainly they come from the same source. I was inviting you to consider the situation of a reader, which I think is what you have been inviting us to consider, with no instruction at all, coming quite fresh on this publication, who reads it and does not see anything in it attributing the authority of a church to them; the authority is that of the Process. Is that right?  
A. I suppose that is possible. One may go on to say if you tear the page out, and it may well have been torn out.

Q Yes, I suppose it might have been. A. What I am saying is that if somebody picked it up and tore out, I agree. All I can say is that I read it under the banner of Process and came to the conclusion it was the Process Church writing a piece about sex.

Q I expect you were asked to consider the publications of the Process Church, were you not, so naturally that was at the back of your mind? A. Well, I found that each magazine directed me to do one of three things, or three things: to come to the place from which the magazine operates and the church works; to give to it, if I possibly can; and to identify myself with the movement if I wished by way of baptism.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Mr Kempster, where is all this leading us? We have had evidence days ago that the Process Church of the Final Judgement was incorporated in January 1968 in Louisiana. We have the document.

MR KEMPSTER: We also know that these publications, particularly the Sex issue, was in fact produced in 1967.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I dare say.

MR KEMPSTER: I am only seeking to make the point - I don't want to labour it - that these magazines in themselves do not bear the imprimatur of what purports to be at that stage a church. I am not seeking to remove any responsibility on the part of the Plaintiffs for them.

Q Mr Sullivan, am I right in thinking then that you would agree that recognition of the force that motivate men assist men to rise above them and to control them? A. Yes, and I also recognise that there are forces within men which cause them to fall below that standard.

Q Yes, but is <sup>it</sup> right to say, in your view, it does not help a man to live a good and helpful life, or a life in accordance with the will of God, to ignore the more distasteful side, as one might put it, of his own character? A. No. I think that is very proper, except, as a Christian, I might be allowed to add a gloss to that, and it is that I do not spend my time contemplating evil or the worst side of my nature. I try to overcome evil with good, every influence I can have, every bit of literature I can read, every fellowship of people with whom I can associate.

Re-examined by Mr BRITTAN

Q wonder if you could look at the Mindbending issue again, page 3? A few minutes ago Mr Kempster was pointing out to you that in the Sex issue there was no reference to church and asking you about that. Do you see on page 3 it says, diagonally, "Jehovah, Christ, Lucifer", and if you turn it round it says "Revelations every Sunday"? Do you regard that as being an advertisement of a secular or religious organisation, "Revelations every Sunday"? That purports to be a religious or a secular organisation?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It might be an advertisement for a Sunday paper, might not it?

M BRITTAN: Yes, it might. A. When I read it, I was agnostic as to what they were, but I suppose at the back of my mind I wondered what they were.

Q You see on the front cover of Mindbending, at the top left-hand, it says "Process Three"? A. Yes.

Then the Sex one has "Four". I wonder if you could look at Fear. A. Yes.

That says "Process No.5", does it not? A. Yes.

Q If you turn to the inside page, page 2, of Fear, do you see it says at the bottom of the page "The Process Church of the Final Judgement", underneath the pictures? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: At the bottom is a gentleman we have been told is Mr De Grimston.

E MR BRITTAN: That is in the same series, is it not, as Three and Four? A. Yes.

Q A number of questions have been put to you by Mr Kempster on behalf of the Process Church about its teaching, and a number of points have been put to you about its philosophy. Has anything that has been put to you or shown to you altered your view as to the potential dangers of this literature, particularly in the hands of immature and young people? A. No.

(The witness withdrew)

Mr PAUL FITZGERALD, Sworn

Examined by Mr NEILL

G Q Are you Mr Paul Fitzgerald? A. I am.

Q Are you a partner in the law firm of Fitzgerald, Horne & Morganson of 9501 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California? A. That is correct.

H Q Before you were in your present firm as a partner, had you spent six years with the Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office as a deputy public defender? A. Yes.

Q Did you rise to the position in that office of a chief trial deputy? A. I did.

Q Did you represent, first of all as a public defender, a young woman called Patricia Krenwinkel, who was one of the accused in what has been called the Manson trial? A. Yes.

Q While you were defending her as a public defender, did you go into private practice and continue to represent Patricia Krenwinkel? A. Yes, I did.

Q Did you, in addition to having Patricia Krenwinkel as your own special client (if I may call her that) also assume the leadership of the defence team for the various members of the Manson Family in the Tate murder? A. I did.

Q So we can just follow it, as the head of the defence team in effect, were you present in Court during the Manson trials? A. I was.

Q Before I turn to ask you a number of questions, I ask you to bear two things in mind. As far as this Court is concerned, all that we know about the Manson trial by way of evidence is that there is an admission for the purpose of this case that Charles Manson has been convicted of a number of murders in Western America committed by and with the assistance of a number of young people who lived under his influence and called themselves "The Family", and that among the murders committed by members of the Family were the murders of Sharon Tate, the wife of Roman Polanski, and certain guests in her house. A. I will bear that in mind, and that is correct.

Q Would you also bear in mind that this case was introduced to the Jury by Counsel for the Process Church of the Final Judgement on the basis that the book that we are going to look at in due course called "The Family" might well be the product of the author's diseased imagination? That is what the suggestion was, you see. Perhaps you will bear that in mind? A. I will bear that in mind.

Q First of all, and I want to deal with this really quite shortly, but I think perhaps my Lord and the Jury ought to have a little evidence about it, about who Manson was and what the offences were of which he was in fact convicted. Can you, first of all, give us one or two dates? When was it that the Tate murder, as it has been called, took place? The exact date does not matter, but the month is good enough. A. The Tate murders that you refer to involved the death of Sharon Tate Polanski, Thomas John Sebring, Abigail Folger and Voityck Frykowski. Those murders occurred in the early morning hours of August 8th, 1969.

Q As I followed what you were saying, is it right that there were four people who were murdered on that occasion? A. Excuse me; there was an additional individual that was also killed. His name was Stephen Parent. There were a total of five.

Q Was Manson charged with those murders, I think in fact by way of a conspiracy to murder, was it not? A. Manson was charged with those five murders, an additional two murders, and also with conspiracy to commit all those murders.

In due course was he convicted? A. Yes. The case proceeded to trial in June 1970. He was sentenced to death in April 1971, approximately ten months later.

In addition to Charles Manson himself, were there other persons also convicted of murder? A. Yes, there were.

Q Perhaps you would just tell us their names? A. Those people were: Patricia Krenwinkel, Susan Atkins and Lesley Van Houten.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: They were convicted as well, were they? A. They were. I must point out that there was an additional defendant, whose name was Charles Wadson. At the time of the original trial he was in another jurisdiction and resisted efforts to be extradited. He was tried and convicted in a separate trial.

MR NEILL: But of the same offences? A. Of the same offences, yes.

Q So that we can finally understand it, there were the five persons who were killed in what I have called the Tate murder. A. Yes.

Q There were two other persons who were murdered on a different occasion. A. Two days later.

Q They took place in August 1969? A. That is correct.

Q And the persons convicted were Charles Manson, another man called Wadson, and then these three women - Krenwinkel, Atkins and Van Houten; is that right? A. Yes.

Q What I am going to ask you to do is to look with me at a number of the documents of the Process that have been produced in this case, and I am going to refer you to various passages and various passages which indicate the teaching of the Process, and then invite your help as to whether, with your knowledge of the Manson case, there are any features of similarity to which you can draw attention. Do you follow that? A. I do.

Q I would like you, if you can have it, to have the five volumes of Process itself - that is, Process Freedom of Expression, Mindbending, Sex, Fear and Death - the collected works called "The Gods on War", and the booklet "If a Man Asks". A. I have only four of these booklets: Mindbending, Sex, Fear and Death.

Q I won't take time. I will leave out Freedom of Expression, because we will have, I think, enough to go through with the others. The first heading I want to deal with is the suggestion in the Process teaching that we are in the latter days and that the end of the world is at hand. I would like to look together with you at some of the references, but not by any means all of them, and then I want to ask your help about Charles Manson and the Family. Can we start with "The Gods on War"?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We are dealing with the general topic of the end of the world, are we?

MR NEILL: The end of the world, my Lord, coupled with death and destruction.

Q "The Gods on War", the photographs -- I expect you are familiar with these booklets, are you? A. I have seen this, but not read it. I have flipped through it.

Q You can see the nature of the photographs. We can just go through those very quickly. If we can turn to specific passages, page 26, the fourth paragraph, "But now in the Last Days". Do you see that? A. Yes, I do.

Q On the opposite page, "And in the Last Days, according to the prophecies of ancient times, My Army shall come upon the field". Then towards the end of that book, at page 95, "For in the great cataclysm of the Latter Days". That is the last big paragraph on that page. A. Yes, I see it.

Q As far as death and destruction is concerned, there is a passage dealing with Satan, the God of War, beginning in particular at page 86.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What are we looking at on page 95?

MR NEILL: The last main paragraph, where it says, "For in the great cataclysm of the Latter Days". Does your Lordship see that?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes.

MR NEILL: There is another reference to the end just above, "The Lord Jehovah decrees the End and the violence of the End", and so on.

Q Then the whole of the passage on Satan. Have you had an opportunity of reading that before you came, the passage on Satan? A. No. Is that the passage at page 86?

Q Yes, beginning at page 86. Would you just glance through it? It is really for convenience of reference. We have been through it two or three times. Perhaps you could read it quicker to yourself. A. I have read it.

Q You see the nature of it, and the next page, and page 89 and page 90. You see the nature of the photograph on the opposite page. A. Yes.

Q Let us put that on one side and turn to the Process magazine, starting with the Mindbending issue. I will forget about the Freedom of Expression one. At page 17 you see there is a game called "Job". Do you see on the right-hand page the word "Visions", right up at the top, next to "Nervous Breakdown"? A. Yes.

Q Just below that there is a picture of a man with his hand out. A. Yes.

Q And he is saying: "Describe visions of the End of the World". A. Yes.

- Q Then the Sex issue. Do you see the back cover of the Sex issue? A. Yes.
- A Q Which appears to represent - I think one of the witnesses agreed with this - souls in torment. Then the Fear issue of Process, if we go on to the Fear issue and look together at page 27 of that. This is an article or piece called "The Adversary". Do you see that? A. Yes, I do.
- Q On the right-hand page, about seven lines down the first column, "But now is the time of the End". A. Yes.
- B Q Then finally the Death issue, dealing with death, and specifically at page 45 and following, we have got this series of articles starting "After the deluge". Do you see that? A. "After the deluge", yes, I do.
- C Q Then the last document I want you to look at on this point. If we could now turn and look at "If a Man Asks", and look at page 14. You see the last line but one: "And you shall stand amidst the Devastation of the End, undismayed and undiminished". Page 15: "you shall know the agony of the Final End", the third line down of the second paragraph; and page 21 - this is in the second question that the man asks - "What is your religion? How is it different from other religions?" and what is said about it is: "Ours is the fulfilment of all religions. Ours is the Religion of the End, the Final End. Ours is the Religion of the Final Judgement". At page 31: "Ours is the Religion of the End. And we shall bring about the End. For the End must be". Finally on this at page 44, do you see at the end of that it says: "For a tree that brings forth corrupt fruit, however harmless and pure each twig or leaf may seem to be, is hewn down and cast into the fire, and such is humanity, such is the world of men. A few shall be saved, but that shall not save the tree".
- D What I would like your help about is this on this point, Mr Fitzgerald. Those references we have seen - and these are only examples - to the end and the latter days and to the few being saved, from your knowledge of Manson and the Family and their philosophy, is there any parallel with what he did?
- E
- F MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, before the witness answers, may I formally object to evidence being given in this form. This is, at best, second or thirdhand evidence, based on testimony in another Court. It is not his personal knowledge. It is what he has heard by reason of his professional employment in another trial, and in my submission he cannot, on that basis, give evidence which is only his conclusion as to the effect of other people's testimony.
- G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I suppose, first of all, he can give evidence of the state of mind of Manson as he learned it to be. The state of mind of Manson is a question of fact, like Manson's digestion, isn't it?
- H MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, I would respectfully say that if the Defendants wish to give Mr Manson's state of mind, that is best adduced from Mr Manson.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: He has been executed, has he?

MR KEMPSTER: No. If he had been, other considerations might apply; but I think there was some change - Mr Fitzgerald will know all about this - in the application of the death penalty in California.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think he can give evidence about this gentleman's state of mind. (To the witness): He was found guilty? A. He was found guilty and sentenced to death, but the California Supreme Court intervened and held that the death penalty was a cruel and unusual punishment in the modern day.

MR KEMPSTER: Your Lordship is ruling that evidence can be accepted from this witness of Manson's state of mind?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: At the moment I am thinking about it.

MR KEMPSTER: I thought your Lordship had ruled.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Not yet. What do you say about this?

MR NEILL: My Lord, in my submission, it is quite unreal to suggest that the Defendants are in a position to call Mr Manson to prove this. I can ask this gentleman further questions about it, but I can say this, on instructions, that he had a number of interviews with Manson, which lasted over a period of time, and he had a very very detailed knowledge - if need be, I can ask him more about this - of the Manson trial and the evidence that was given at it, all the features of it. He interviewed all the witnesses called for the defence, certainly all the main defendants.

In my submission, particularly in view of the way the case was presented to the Jury, on the basis that the whole of this might be a complete cock and bull story, the whole of this book, the only sensible way of your Lordship and the Jury hearing about it is from somebody who can, from his own knowledge of the facts of the Manson case, point to what I am going to submit in due course are the very striking similarities between the teaching and the precepts of this church and the way of life and the thoughts and philosophy (if that is the right word for it) of Manson and the Family.

It was pleaded in the case that one of the matters advanced was the similarity between Manson and the Process. In my submission this is something which the jury ought to know about when they are going to make up their minds at the end of the day really on two issues. One is whether it is the proper inference to draw that this teaching had an actual effect on Manson. Secondly, if it is a proper inference to draw, that this kind of teaching is, as I would suggest, a very dangerous kind of teaching which may result in the kind of activities of Manson.

I am not in a position - I say this at once - to call any of the persons who were convicted at the Manson trial. I am calling in my submission a person who knows more about it than anybody else apart from them, the senior member of the defence team in the Manson trial, as a person to give your Lordship and the jury the best assistance that can be given as to what the Manson case was all about and what the features were which developed in the course of the hearing about the Manson story.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I would have thought he was entitled to do that. He plainly is in this context an expert. He can tell us about the issues at the trial obviously, and that evidence must I would have thought inevitably involve references to Manson's state of mind at the relevant time. I do not think I can exclude this.

MR. NEILL: I am grateful to your Lordship. (To the witness): We have been looking together at references in the Process teaching, if I may call it that, about the latter days and the end of the world at hand. That is not a matter in issue in this case, that it is part of their teaching that the end of the world is at hand. From your knowledge of the Manson case, were there any features of his philosophy which were similar to that? -- A. Yes; there were.

Q. Can you tell us about that? -- A. There are a number of similarities between the apparent doctrine of the Process Church and Manson's beliefs. Firstly, Manson believed that the end of the world was imminent; it was almost upon him. He further felt that he was some sort of a prophet and that it was his almost spiritually ordained duty to ferment, to encourage, to promote, this final catastrophic event that would result in the end of the world.

Secondly, he felt and believed that he and his chosen few, that he referred to as his family, after having instigated and promoted this inevitable event, would escape to a place of safety, to a desert area in California.

Thirdly, that he and his group, at the conclusion of devastation that would result from this catastrophic end of the world, like war, would return and live in a sort of everlasting peace and harmony.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Can we summarise this, because I am afraid I have not made a note of this. Are you saying that your experience of appearing in the Manson trial has satisfied you that there was much in common between the so-called



MR. P. FITZGERALD:  
Examined.

teaching of this so-called church and the beliefs that Manson claimed to hold? -- A. I am, my Lord.

NEILL: Particularly - it is what I am dealing with at the moment - with regard to this end of the world teaching?

KEMPSTER: My Lord, I may not have done justice to my submission to your Lordship just now. I do not wish to dishonour it. Your Lordship or my learned friend said this was pleaded. It is pleaded in these words: "These defendants will contend that there were marked similarities between the first plaintiffs and the Charles Manson group in the combination of an absolute leader, the use of exotic garb, the subtle but persistent breakdown of personality in the group sessions, and the use of drugs". There is nothing about the common doctrine about the end of the world.

C MR. NEILL: May I turn then to the next point I wanted to ask you about, and that was the references in the Process literature on the same kind of point to black magic and witchcraft.

MR. KEMPSTER: There is nothing in paragraph 26 about similarities relating to witchcraft.

D MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I quite obviously had better look at paragraph 26.

MR. KEMPSTER: It is on page 43 of the pleading, paragraph 26.

E MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: These are part of the particulars of justification, are they not? "These defendants will contend that there were marked similarities between the first plaintiffs and the Charles Manson group in the combination of an absolute leader" - you say they do not there specify the end of the world?

MR. KEMPSTER: The end of the world or magic, which my friend says he is now coming to.

F MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I seem to have seen magic somewhere else, I think. I think that is right, is it not, Mr. Neill?

G MR. NEILL: It is perfectly right that I have not specifically pleaded that, but your Lordship will remember that when I first cross-examined I think each of the witnesses, certainly Mr. Fripp and I think other witnesses at other stages of their cross-examination, I put to them what I submitted were the main things which fascinated Mr. Manson and I put that with a view to pointing out in due course the similarities between the two. That was not objected to. I only got to this stage, that each of them said they knew nothing about it, except what they saw in the newspapers.

H MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The fact remains that you did not include magic among the matters on which you relied as justification.

MR. KEMPSTER: Indeed, certainly, my Lord, no.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Or for that matter the end of the world.

KEMPSTER: No. It has not been specifically pleaded. I accept that.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: However, I do not see why this gentleman is not entitled to say what I tried to summarise just now, that there appeared to be a similar body of dogma, if that is the right word, in common between Manson and the Process Church. (To the witness): That is right, is it not? -- A. It is, my Lord.

MR. NEILL: Perhaps we can try and deal with it fairly shortly. Having got it as a general proposition, can I now turn to the particular elements of it. I was coming to deal with the element of black magic and witchcraft. I am only going to take one or two references.

MR. KEMPSTER: I am sorry to appear to be difficult but I hope not obstructive.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Let me make a note of it and then you shall have a splendid opportunity.

MR. NEILL: My submission is that if this is to be relied on, as your Lordship has already ruled in principle it may be, then it should be pleaded.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I have no doubt that if you want it, an amendment can be provided overnight.

MR. NEILL: May I undertake to do that, my Lord.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes, do.

MR. NEILL: I only want to deal very shortly with this. If you take again the second issue of this Process magazine, on the front cover do you see the bottom picture, which after a little hesitation we established was a representation of a black mass - do you see that? -- A. Yes; I see it in the lower centre portion.

Q. That is right. At page 15 there is the Satan advocates piece, there is a reference at the bottom of the second column: "Is your place in a ruined church high on a hill, no glass and tall slotted windows - perfect for celebration of a black mass". Finally at page 32 - I am not going to trouble you with other references - among the Process scenes which are there being advertised as taking place at No. 2 Balfour Place are various things including the last of them, "Black magic". Do you see that on the right hand side? -- A. Yes, I see it, under "Drugs".

Taking  
Q./ those references to black magic and in other documents I am not going to take time over to witchcraft, was there anything about the philosophy of Manson as it emerged at that trial which is similar? -- A. Yes, and I will try to be very brief. Manson believed that he had black magical powers: that he could cause disease and death by way of ritual incantations and by way of a so-called evil eye. He, and also his members and followers, participated in ritualistic sexual orgies in the night time involving young girls in remote settings where the participants were variously clothed

MR. P. FITZGERALD:  
Examined.

at those portions of time that they were clothed, in black garments,

I think that is sufficient on that. Now can we turn to one of the matters which we have just been reading out of the pleadings, and that is the similarity said to exist in relation to an absolute leader. Let me remind you about the Process Church. There is there a constitution which refers to the Teacher and we have had evidence about the role of Mr. DeGrimston and Mrs. DeGrimston and the fact that those two combined were known as the Omega. Is there anything in the idea of a leader or an absolute leader which finds a parallel in the Manson philosophy? -- A. There is. Manson professed to be and was an absolute total leader, an absolute total leader in both the military sense, in the sense that when he ordered people to do something he expected absolute and total obedience and, if obedience was not forthcoming, there was immediate expulsion and the individual was ostracised, but in addition he was a spiritual leader; he was conceived -- he said that he was Christ; he said that he was their spiritual leader and was ordering them both temporally and spiritually, if you will.

Q. We have heard reference even this afternoon to the fact that in the Process Church many of the teachings were said to be recorded. We have seen that in the Gods of War document? -- A. Yes.

Q. If we look at the Process magazine, "Fear", again you will inside the front cover the picture of Robert DeGrimston in what appears to be some sort of halo? -- A. Yes.

Q. As to what you have been saying just now, does that find a parallel ---

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am getting a little disturbed as to where this is taking us. After all, history is studded with examples of unstable people who suffer from the delusion that they were somebody else or something of that kind. The lunatic asylums are full of them.

MR. NEILL: Indeed, my Lord.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: This feature is probably common enough apart from Mr. Manson, and Mr. DeGrimston I suppose.

MR. NEILL: I think it is, my Lord.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Every aspect of insanity exhibits similar features. I wonder how usefully we are employing time by going into detail about this. The fact, if it be the fact, that Manson's philosophy resembles that of DeGrimston, you have not brought Mr. Manson here, but equally Mr. DeGrimston has not been brought here, so are we not dangerously near a territory of speculation about this?

R. NEILL: What I submit to your Lordship is that, if one goes through it point by point, obviously if you have one feature, namely, the fact that there may be a similar belief in an absolute leader or there may be a similar belief in

A Christ-like figures and so on, then the point can be made  
that that could include a very large number of other bodies;  
but if, as I was seeking to do, one finds similarity in  
a number of particulars, then of course it takes on a  
different aspect. That is my submission about it. Although  
I am trying to do it quite quickly, it is important that  
one should in fact establish these points one by one to see  
how far they take one. At the end of the day it may be said  
that it does lead the way I am suggesting, but in my  
B submission one must take it further than just these one or two  
points I have dealt with already.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Let us look at the actual  
allegation of which complaint is made. I think we are getting  
a little wide of the mark at the moment. The pith of it -  
I invite interruption if I am going wrong about it - is this:  
C "But what was it that caused Manson's death-trip? The  
factors that seem to have fed the violent freak-out shall be  
termed here sleazo inputs". Then it refers to three  
groups of which the Process Church is one. Are we really  
going to gain much by careful comparison of Manson's  
illusions as this gentleman understood them to be ascertained  
and the - I am trying to avoid the word "literary" -  
productions of the Process Church.

D MR. NEILL: The matter on which particular emphasis was put when  
this case was first put to the court is this phrase "sleazo  
inputs", which I think has been interpreted - I do not quarrel  
with it - as a malign influence. Therefore one has to look  
to see what the facts are about the Process Church, and one  
has to see what the facts are about Manson. If, as I am  
going to invite your Lordship to say or the jury to say  
at the end of the day, there are very strong points of  
E similarity between them, then in my submission I have  
established that the input of this literature which we spent  
last week looking at had a certain effect, or it is a  
reasonable inference that it had an effect, on Manson and his  
group.

F MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes, but I should have thought  
your difficulty is likely to be that these - I am trying to  
find some neutral language - symptoms of eccentricity might  
be shared by several groups of highly eccentric people. I am  
using the most charitable words I can find. That being so,  
I do not think that a minute examination of these very  
expensively produced publications is going to help anybody.

G MR. NEILL: If your Lordship feels that it is enough to leave it  
in the form that there are similarities ---

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: There are points of similarity  
certainly, but to establish there are points of similarity  
is a long way from drawing the inference that this particular  
body of eccentrics influenced the murderer Manson.

H MR. NEILL: Not by itself, my Lord, but perhaps I should not make  
my submissions on that at the moment. Perhaps I can do it in  
this way. (To the witness): You have indicated that there  
were a number of respects in which the Process teaching,  
as you have looked at it and seen it, and what Manson's  
philosophy indicated, were points of similarity. I wonder if

I can do it this way, subject to my Lord's guidance. Could you list those points of similarity without at the moment developing where they appear in the Process Church, and then, if need be, you can be asked questions about it. So far we have dealt with the latter days and we have dealt with black magic and witchcraft. I was just about to deal with the fact that the messages which Mr. DeGrimston was setting out in his book were said to be recorded. We have just dealt with the absolute leader. -- A. Yes.

Q. In addition to those factors in common, were there other factors which you can point to of similarity between the Process teaching, as you follow it, and what Manson and his followers believed in? -- A. Yes, I think so. You must understand that in answering these questions in terms of making references to the beliefs of the Process Church I am referring only to my understanding as a result of reviewing these documents. With Manson's beliefs I have a little more familiarity and they are a little clearer in my mind.

Essentially I see striking similarities in other areas. They used a similar symbol. Manson used a swastika-like symbol which is similar to that of the Process. It is my understanding that both of them - Manson had a very high admiration of Hitler and shared Hitler's views of aryan supremacy. Manson had peculiar beliefs about the raising of children, a sort of laissez-faire method of child raising, that it is my understanding the Process has as well.

Manson was a very firm believer in and advocate of the use of fear as an instrument of sort of personal change in the psychiatric therapeutic sense. It is my understanding that fear was a prominent factor in the Process doctrine.

I understand that the view of the Process in terms of animals were strikingly similar to Manson's. Manson believed the worst sin of all was to injure or kill an animal; it would be far better, in his view, to kill or injure a human being than an animal. He went out of his way to be very kind and solicitous of animals.

It is my understanding that there were similarities in the area of the two different groups' relationships with motorcyclists or bikers. Manson actively courted very violent members of outlawed motorcycle gangs to put fear into other people and to also act as a sort of militant arm of his organisation.

There are also similarities, as it is my understanding, in the breakdown of individual identities of members of both groups to the end that an individual is made to fit a group model. In that connection, Manson believed that drugs could be used to control separate identities and advocated the use of certain psychedelic drugs.

In terms of the clothing that was worn, frequently during the night time the Manson people wore black clothing that was similar to some of the photographs I have seen of Process members. It is my understanding that the Process believes in reincarnation. The Manson people and Manson

MR. P. FITZGERALD:  
Examined.

himself were believers in past lives: that they had previous identities, many of them biblical identities.

A

Those are as best I can think of them.

Q. Finally perhaps there is this. One of the publications - we have not actually looked at it - which I think advertised the Process magazines of Process was called "The Unity of Christ and Satan". Have you seen that referred to? --  
A. Yes; I have. That also was a similarity. Manson believed that in addition to being Christ he was also Satan, and he believed there was a unity of Christ and Satan; that they coexisted in the same person, and consequently there was no evil. There was simply activity by the same person.

B

C

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am afraid I have not taken a note of all those points, but, as money seems to be no object, perhaps I can have a transcript of that bit, can I?

MR. NEILL: Certainly, my Lord. What I will undertake to do in any event is to provide your Lordship with the amendment in the morning.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes; I must have that.

D

MR. NEILL: That will in a sense summarise what Mr. Fitzgerald has been saying. I want to turn now to something different.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Will it take a long time?

MR. NEILL: It will take a few minutes, my Lord.

E

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Then I think it is better to break now.

MR. NEILL: There is one matter with regard to the evidence where I will wish to make a submission to your Lordship and I think my learned friend will also. I think it ought to be made in the absence of the jury. Although it does not arise immediately, I was wondering whether it would be convenient if the jury were kept out of court in the morning, and I can make my submission then.

F

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Certainly. How long do you think you will be with your submission?

MR. NEILL: I should say quarter of an hour. It is not very long.

G

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Then we had better say that the members of the jury attend at 11 o'clock.

(Adjourned till tomorrow morning at 10.30).

H

# **SEVENTH DAY**

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice.

Thursday, 21st March, 1974.

Before:

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON  
and a Jury

Between:

THE PROCESS CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT, (A corporate body)  
CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIPP, Plaintiffs  
CHRISTOPHER DE PEYER  
and  
WENDY ANN PEACH

1972 P. No. 2039

--and--

RUPERT HART DAVIS LIMITED, and  
ED SANDERS

First Defendants  
Second Defendant

and between:

SAME -AND- SAME

1972 P. No. 1603

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman,  
dated the 19th day of October, 1972)

(Transcript of the Shorthand Notes of The Association of Official  
Shorthandwriters, Ltd, Room 392, Royal Courts of Justice, and  
2, New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.2.)

MR. MICHAEL KEMPSTER, Q.C., and MR. PETER BOWSHER, (instructed by  
Messrs. Joynton-Hicks & Co.) appeared for the Plaintiffs.

MR. BRIAN NEILL, Q.C., and MR. LEON BRITTAN, (instructed by  
Messrs. Goodman, Derrick & Co.) appeared for the First  
Defendant.

The Second Defendant did not appear and was not represented.

EVIDENCE SEVENTH DAY



B MR. NEILL: My Lord, at this stage of the case I hope your Lordship will think it convenient to do it now so that the jury do not have to come into court and go out again - I would seek to make an application with regard to the admission of evidence under the Civil Evidence Act, 1968. The evidence to be given, if given, is by a witness to be called by me, and the nature of the evidence is oral statements made to him by members of the Manson Family. In my submission, that evidence, or at any rate most of it, would be admissible under section 2 of the Civil Evidence Act.

C May I turn to sub-section 1 of section 2, which provides: "In any civil proceedings a statement made, whether orally or in a document or otherwise, by any person, whether called as a witness in those proceedings or not, shall, subject to this section and to the rules of court, be admissible as evidence of any fact stated therein of which direct oral evidence by him would be admissible".

Sub-section 2 I do not think matters.

D Sub-section 3 provides: "Where in any civil proceedings a statement which was made otherwise than in a document is admissible by virtue of this section, no evidence other than direct oral evidence by the person who made the statement or any person who heard or otherwise perceived its being made shall be admissible for the purpose of proving it". I do not think the proviso matters.

E As I understand it, what section 2(1) is saying, so far as an oral statement is concerned, is that the fact that someone has made a statement orally can be proved by them or can be proved by someone to whom the statement was made if it relates to something on which they can give direct evidence themselves.

F What I am seeking to do is to call a witness called Mr. Gardener who will give evidence as to what four named members of the Family said to him when he interviewed them he being an Under Sheriff in the enforcement authorities in California.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Your first proposition is that the matter that you want to tender falls within the language of sub-section 1.

G MR. NEILL: Yes, my Lord. I have to show your Lordship that. I would submit that it is admissible evidence under section 2(1), but that is of course subject to the rules of court. You have in the ordinary course to give a notice of any evidence which you wish to put in under this section. I have not given notice. You have to give the notice before the case is set down. The reason for that is that this information has only come into my possession within the last few days. I have provided my learned friend with a copy of the document, which H I am going to show your Lordship now, at yesterday's midday adjournment. I accept he has only had it for a very short time.

May I look now at the rules relating to this, because, although there are these rules, there is in your Lordship an overriding discretion.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is what I was thinking of.

MR. NEILL: Will your Lordship turn to the 1973 Annual Practice, Order 38, Rule 21, at page 572: "(1) Subject to the provisions of this rule, a party to a cause or matter who desires to give in evidence at the trial or hearing of the cause or matter any statement which is admissible in evidence by virtue of section 2, 4 or 5 of the Act must (a) in the case of a cause or matter which is required to be set down for trial or hearing or adjourned into court, within 21 days after it is set down or so adjourned, or within such other period as the court may specify". Then I do not think the rest of that matters. I do not think there is anything else I need look at in that rule.

We come to rule 22 which says what must be put in the notice: "(1) If the statement is admissible by virtue of section 2 of the Act and was made otherwise than in a document, the notice must contain particulars of (a) the time, place and circumstances at or in which the statement was made; (b) the person by whom, and the person to whom, the statement was made; and (c) the substance of the statement or, if material, the words used".

Paragraph 2 does not matter because that is related to documentary matters.

"(3) If the party giving notice alleges that any person, particulars of whom are contained in the notice, cannot or should not be called as a witness at the trial or hearing for any of the reasons specified in rule 25, the notice must contain a statement to that effect, specifying the reason relied on".

Rule 25 gives the reasons for not calling a person as a witness, that the person in question is dead, or beyond the seas and so on.

Rule 26 gives the person who receives the notice the right to give a counter notice. He can say: "I want the person who made the original statement called as a witness", but he cannot give such a notice if the witness cannot be called for the reasons given in rule 25.

Then we come finally to rule 29 which gives your Lordship this discretion: "(1) Without prejudice to section 2(2)(a) and 4(2)(a) of the Act and rule 28, the court may, if it thinks it just to do so, allow a statement falling within section 2(1), 4(1) or 5(1) of the Act to be given in evidence at the trial or hearing of a cause or matter notwithstanding (a) that the statement is one in relation to which rule 21(1) applies and that the party desiring to give the statement in evidence has failed to comply with that rule". Then I do not think (b) matters.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Paragraph (2) does, does it not?

MR. NEILL: Yes: "Without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (1), the court may exercise its power under that paragraph to allow a statement to be given in evidence at the trial or hearing of a cause or matter if a refusal to exercise that power might oblige the party desiring to give the statement in evidence to call a witness at the trial or hearing an opposite party or a person who is or was at the material time the servant or agent of an opposite party". I do not think that arises here, my Lord.

Therefore I submit the position is that the evidence is admissible under section 2(1) of the Evidence Act, but I have not given the proper notice. Further than that - I will tell your Lordship the details in a moment - if I had given the proper notice I would have put in the notice the fact that one of the original speakers was dead and the others were not available or were beyond the seas. Therefore there would not have been room for a counternotice. Therefore the plaintiffs in this action are in no way embarrassed or prejudiced by the fact that a notice was not given, because, if I had given a notice, it would have been ineffective. Having said that, may I now show your Lordship - unless my friend objects - the nature of the evidence. This is one of the witnesses who is coming today. May I show your Lordship the nature of the evidence this witness would give if your Lordship allowed it to be given. (Document produced).

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Had I better read it to myself?

MR. NEILL: I think that would be right, my Lord.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: (After a pause): On page 2 "any" should be "many", I suppose.

MR. NEILL: May I just add this, my Lord. My learned friend's clients last summer, I think it was, gave a notice under section 2 themselves relating to a witness called Fromm. That was a notice which was given in time under section 2 and related to a written statement. That deals with the same kind of matter as the statement your Lordship has, but it is the other side, if I may say so, that is, to the contrary sense. If your Lordship thought it right to admit this evidence, I certainly would not object, notwithstanding my learned friend opposes this application, if he sought to put before the jury that evidence which so far he has not yet put forward. This is the other way round. I do not think it would be right for me to say that I shall have my evidence in and I can object to my learned friend putting his evidence in, although he has closed his case. If he seeks to do that, I would say at once that I would not seek to oppose it. That is the only fair thing to do. Although this evidence comes late in the case, it was a matter on which I could have given a notice, but it was not given because I simply did not know about it.

May I tell your Lordship this about the four persons named. The first one, Zero, is dead. These matters can be proved by Mr. Gardener. The woman Van Hooten was one of the convicted persons mentioned by Mr. Fitzgerald yesterday. The

other two, Moorhouse and Lake, are in the position that their present whereabouts are unknown. They are known to be overseas, but I cannot give your Lordship their addresses.

I submit this is a matter which is admissible: that although no notice was given my learned friend is not prejudiced by that fact because the notice would have disabled him from giving a counter-notice and it would therefore be possible for your Lordship to admit it.

B MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I suppose in exercising the discretion which is given me under rule 29 I have got to form some estimate myself of its probable weight, have I not?

MR. NEILL: Yes. I think your Lordship has to. I think that would be right. I think your Lordship has to form some estimate. On the other hand, in a case tried with a jury, Unless your Lordship came to the conclusion that it really had no weight at all, I would respectfully submit that, although with adequate warnings and so on, it is something which ought to be admitted.

L MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Supposing I admit it, I shall have to tell the jury that to act on such evidence might be a very dangerous course to take - something comparable to the accomplice warning one gives or the warning one gives in sexual cases.

MR. NEILL: I would accept that, my Lord. One would want to warn the jury that they should be slow to look at it.

E MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: For all one knows it might be only gossip by someone who was anxious to ingratiate themselves with the Under Sheriff.

MR. NEILL: The witness will be able to tell your Lordship more about the circumstances in which these statements were given. I do not think there is any reason to suppose they were given to ingratiate themselves with the Under Sheriff.

F MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I was only putting that as an example.

MR. NEILL: Yes, my Lord. I have not included in this the evidence which he himself would give. I have only set out the statements made, but his own evidence will explain in more detail the circumstances in which these interviews took place.

G MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes. I am wondering whether, before I can consider whether I should exercise my discretion, if I were disposed to do so at all, I ought to hear his evidence.

MR. NEILL: I wondered if your Lordship might take that view.

H MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I should have thought it was one of the matters to be taken into account in relation to the

discretion. What do you say about this, Mr. Kempster?

MR. KEMPSTER: My Lord, I would invite you to exercise your undoubted discretion in the sense of refusing this application, quite apart from any evidence that Mr. Jack Gardener could possibly give.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I do not yet know what that is.

MR. KEMPSTER: No, but I mean the evidence that is material, because, as your Lordship has already observed, the prejudicial value of material of this nature quite outweighs any probative value.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am always hearing that phrase being used, and I am never quite sure what it means. The evidence against anybody is prejudicial, is it not?

MR. KEMPSTER: The fact that it is said can have a prejudicial value whereas jurors may not appreciate its weight as evidence. I would be happier with evidence of this nature before a judge alone, if I may say so, than before a jury, because the judge understands the weight to be given to evidence of different character. Your Lordship will notice too that here it is sought to give evidence of quite fresh allegations involving the passing of money.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes; that is true.

MR. KEMPSTER: Which are not pleaded, and en passant I have not yet received the amended pleading promised yesterday.

Further, the status of Christopher Zero, Ann Moorhouse and Diane Lake is not established in evidence. The only evidence we have had is about Van Hooten, which we had from Mr. Fitzgerald yesterday. Further, at least one of the proposed speakers appears to be an admitted mental case, if your Lordship will turn to page 2, because he was interviewed in a mental institution.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is the Snake?

MR. KEMPSTER: Yes.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: She is referred to in the book.

MR. KEMPSTER: She is referred to in the book, but I apprehend that the book at least as yet has not received any authority as evidence.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Not at all, but I have read it.

MR. KEMPSTER: May I then invite your Lordship to consider the terms of the statute, section 7: "(1) Subject to rules of court, where in any civil proceedings a statement made by a person who is not called as a witness in those proceedings is given in evidence by virtue of section 2 of this Act (a) any evidence which, if that person had been so called, would be admissible for the purpose of destroying or supporting his

credibility as a witness shall be admissible for that purpose in those proceedings; (b) evidence tending to prove that, whether before or after he made that statement, that person made (whether orally or in a document or otherwise) another statement inconsistent therewith shall be admissible for the purpose of showing that that person has contradicted himself". Then there is a proviso.

B  
C  
I  
E  
F  
C  
H  
Your Lordship will readily appreciate that if my learned friend's clients had complied with the rules we should have been concerned to make the most searching enquiries in the United States to establish matters coming within the ambit of section 7. That opportunity we would not be afforded were your Lordship to accede to this application. That is another ground in my submission why it would not be just at this stage in the trial, without notice, to admit evidence of this quality, the quality of which is apparent on its face, because we are told - not that I accept this - that they are members of the Family and that at least one of them must be a convicted person and another is, on the face of it, insane. To have evidence at second hand from such sources put before a jury where the other party has not had an opportunity of seeking the evidence which the statute permits him to put in at such a juncture in my submission would not be just.

I  
E  
Further, had we had notice of evidence of this nature at the proper juncture, not only might I have considered putting in the evidence in respect of which a proper notice had been given, but of making further enquiries in the United States and possibly calling witnesses or inviting the court to allow evidence to be given abroad. There are so many factors that would have been involved had we had notice of an application of this sort that in my submission it would be quite unjust and improper to accede to this application.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: One of the things puzzling my mind is this. I am speaking quite openly now. If you have a similar notice relating to the same subject matter which challenges the document I have already been shown - it is a matter for you - it might be of some assistance in exercising my discretion to look at your material. I do not know. That is a matter for you to decide.

MR. KEMPSTER: If your Lordship thinks it would assist you -----

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I do not know. I have not seen it.

C  
MR. KEMPSTER: I would have thought not. It is merely a statement from another person we would have to establish was a member of the Family, who said that she had never heard of the Process. That is all. I have not sought to put that in.

H  
MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I realise that. What I have in mind is this. If you have material which diminishes the weight, if any, of the contents of the statements I have been shown, it might help in the exercise of my discretion in deciding whether or not to let those go in. You see what I have in mind.

MR. KEMPSTER: I do, my Lord. Your Lordship will appreciate that I

have no material and have not had an opportunity of obtaining any material coming within the ambit of section 7.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am not asking you to do anything.

MR. KEMPSTER: I quite appreciate that, my Lord.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am only suggesting it might be of assistance.

B MR. KEMPSTER: Further, your Lordship will appreciate - I think in the absence of the jury it may be thought fair to say this - that that evidence was not adduced and it would be difficult to adduce at this juncture because no allegations of this nature or anything approaching them were put to any of the witnesses called by the plaintiffs.

C MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is true.

MR. KEMPSTER: It would seem the whole trial would have to be reopened and to do any justice to my clients I would have to invite your Lordship to impose terms which would involve an adjournment.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I shall wait for that.

I MR. KEMPSTER: There is one illustration that might be helpful in an application under this section which came before Mr. Justice Pennycuik, Samelbye v. Stokel, (1971 (1) All England, page 940). There he required the original witnesses, that is, the persons named, to be made available for cross-examination. Obviously that would not be appropriate here.

E MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Obviously any judge would so require if there was a chance of such a direction being effective, but in this case it obviously would not be.

MR. KEMPSTER: No.

F MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We do not want to import Snake for this purpose, do we?

MR. KEMPSTER: No. I have no real personal feelings about Snake. Your Lordship will realise that although we could not invite your Lordship to put it on terms that Snake was to be imported, we would want to make very searching enquiries coming within the ambit of section 7.

G The statement in respect of which we gave notice is now available, my Lord. (Same produced).

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Have you seen this, Mr. Neill?

MR. NEILL: Yes, my Lord.

H MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: (After a pause): Will you just remind me of some of the dates. When was this interview with Christopher Zero?

MR. KEMPSTER: That is put at October 12th, 1969.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What was the position of Manson then?

MR. NEILL: He had not actually been arrested. The murders took place in August. He was still being pursued, I think, at that time. This was a man who had been arrested earlier. Zero was killed, as I understand it, or at any rate died two weeks after that statement.

MR. KEMPSTER: I cannot accept that. I hear what my friend says. I do not know whether he is alive or dead.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: This is really on both sides just the kind of material that one gets from psychiatrists in pleas about diminished responsibility, is it not?

MR. KEMPSTER: Yes, my Lord.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think it would be unsafe to let all this stuff go in front of the jury, subject to anything anybody would want to say.

MR. NEILL: Would your Lordship at any rate allow me to call Mr. Gardener when available? Your Lordship can see that I have not filled in the details of the circumstances in which he came to get these statements.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If you like I will reserve my decision about the discretion - indeed, I think I suggested it.

MR. NEILL: Yes, my Lord.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: -- until I have heard his evidence.

MR. NEILL: If your Lordship pleases. May I introduce that at the right moment and ask your Lordship to see him in the absence of the jury?

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Very well.

MR. NEILL: While the jury are still out and in view of what my learned friend has just said, may I hand your Lordship the proposed amendment relating to the further and better particulars of the defence. If your Lordship allows the other evidence, then I will have an amendment available to deal with that. I am sorry Mr. Kempster did not have this amendment earlier.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: There is no objection to it as an amendment, obviously, is there?

MR. KEMPSTER: No, my Lord.

MR. NEILL: Again as a last matter, which is really nothing to do with the matters I have been raising, your Lordship did ask whether my learned friend and I could reach agreement about the paperback book. I have shown my learned friend the statement from the witness who will deal with it and he does



feel able to accept that. I am afraid I shall have to call  
tence about it.

ICE MELFORD STEVENSON: All right.

LL: Perhaps the jury could now come back.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes.

(At 11.33 a.m. the jury came into court)

KEMPSTER: I am told that one exhibit has not yet reached the  
jury, one of Mr. Sanders' early works called "Shards of God".  
It was identified by his research assistant.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We have not got to read it, have we?

KEMPSTER: I am not inviting you to read it, but I may in due  
course make some reference to it, so I would like the jury to  
have it.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I cannot for the moment recollect  
it, but you asked one of the witnesses about it?

KEMPSTER: Yes, my Lord.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You asked him about poems.

KEMPSTER: Yes, I asked him about poems, and the witness was not  
aware of the exact nature of Mr. Ed Saunders' poetical works,  
but he was aware of this work "Shards of God" and identified it.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I do not want to inflict on the  
jury or indeed on myself the task of reading any more of it,  
other than the poems.

MR. KEMPSTER: I can well understand your Lordship's feelings and  
I endorse them, but in due course it will be my unpleasant duty  
in the context of damages to refer to this. Your Lordship  
has heard the expression "diseased minds". Just to make the  
very briefest of references will I think be necessary.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Has it been properly put in?

MR. NEILL: It was identified by a witness who said he had read it.  
I think it is fair to say that. I did not know we were going  
to have copies of it to read.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am not going to read it all.

MR. NEILL: I do not think we can object to it, my Lord.

MR PAUL FITZGERALD, Recalled,  
Examination-in-chief by MR NEILL Continued

- Q You remember that last night you were giving a list of the aspects of the Manson philosophy and the Process teaching, where you were suggesting there was a similarity? A. Yes.
- Q The only other thing I want to ask you very shortly is this. For the purpose of writing the book The Family - the book Mr Sanders wrote - did you make certain material available to him? A. I did.
- Q Do not go into detail, but could you generally indicate what material you made available to him? A. Before the trial began, pursuant to legal motions for discovery the prosecution provided me with all of the official police reports and documents relating to the case. They also provided me, in addition, with a number of witness statements and statements of the interviews with people connected with the case. They also provided me with diagrams, photographs and reports of scientific evidence. That in turn I made available to Mr Sanders.
- Q Would it be right - there will be an objection if I put it too shortly - did you make available to him the material you had relating to the case; in other words, that which you had been given by the prosecution? A. Yes.
- Q Your files you had collected in the course of preparing the case? A. Yes - all but confidential conversation with my clients.
- Q I follow. So that anything which was not confidential and related to discussions with your own clients, all other documents, court records, statements and so on, you made available to Mr Sanders? A. Yes, I did.
- MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: May I ask a question first? I suppose, in the course of preparing for Manson's defence, you were seeking deliberately for matter which went not only to the issue of guilt or innocence but also to matters which might go to mitigation, were you not? A. Yes, indeed.
- Q And when you are collecting material that may be useful in mitigation you are anxious to collect anything that anybody says, qualified or not, as may be put into an ultimate plea, either written or oral, in mitigation. Is not that right? A. Yes, my Lord.

Cross-examined by MR KEMPSTER

- Q Did you know Ed Sanders well? A. I would say I came to know him well. Before I would say January of 1970 I did not know him well.
- Q You got to know him well? A. I did.

Q Were you a collaborator in writing this book? A. No.

Q Did you receive any proportion of the royalties from it?  
A. None whatever.

Q Mr Sanders researcher, Mr Larsen, was apparently employed  
by you in connection with this case? A. That is correct.

Q Who paid him? A. I paid him.

Q Did Mr Sanders pay him too? A. I have no personal knowledge  
of that, but that was my understanding.

Q So that he was working, as it were, contrary to Scripture,  
for two masters? A. Correct. There was an agreement that  
materials obtained and information obtained on behalf of Mr  
Sanders would be made available to me.

Q Did you get to know, in your discussions with Mr Sanders,  
that one of the big points in the book he was writing was the  
idea that there was a connection between the Family and the  
Process-church? A. Yes.

Q Were you rewarded, if not financially, for your pains by  
the dedication in the front of the book: "For my friend Paul  
Fitzgerald"? A. Quite the contrary. It caused me some con-  
siderable embarrassment.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I had not noticed that. I see.  
Did you get an autographed copy? A. I did.

MR KEMPSTER: Would it be fair to say that at the time you were  
coincidentally conducting the defence of Miss Krenwinkel  
and assisting Mr Sanders you were doing your best to find  
every nasty bit of material about the Process you could  
possibly find? A. No, I don't think that's correct.

Q How would you express it? A. The connection between Manson  
and the Process was more of interest to Mr Sanders than it  
was to me. I had no axe to grind with respect to the Process.  
That was really a preoccupation of Mr Sanders, not mine.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I suppose it was all material  
which, from your point of view, was potentially useful in  
mitigation? A. Yes; and also useful in establishing the  
mental state of Manson and the other members of the group,  
with a view toward diminished capacity and possible sanity.

Q When you are engaged in a task of that kind it is sometimes  
surprising, is it not, to find what psychologists can  
sweep up? A. It is.

MR KEMPSTER: I think you knew, or got to know, that Mr Sanders  
was a poet, did you not? A. Yes, I did.

Q Are you familiar with any of his poetry? A. Very little.

MR P. FITZGERALD:  
Cross-examined.

MR KEMPSTER: I will show you one or two documents and ask you whether you are familiar with those works. (Same handed).

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If we are going to be treated to any of Mr Sanders' poetry it will be with the utmost resistance from me.

MR KEMPSTER: I wondered how your Lordship would appear to know the nature of these proposed scripts, or is it what your Lordship fears?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Anticipation. I will not say intelligence. (The witness looked through the document he had been handed).

MR KEMPSTER: I promise your Lordship not to give a reading at all events. A. I have reviewed this material. I have not seen this poetry before.

Q You have not? A. I don't believe I have.

Q Very well, I will have it back. (Same returned). Did you know him as a magazine editor? A. I did not know him as a magazine editor. I knew that he was an editor in the past of a magazine of the arts in New York City.

Q Called? A. I don't recall, but it was some profane or obscene name.

MR KEMPSTER: Perhaps this will help. Would you look at that? (Same handed).

MR NEILL: I do not know to what this is going.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Nor do I. What is this?

MR KEMPSTER: I am waiting to see if this refreshes the witness's memory about the title of the magazine, edited by Mr Sanders. A. It does refresh my recollection.

Q What is the title? A. "Fuck you".

MR KEMPSTER: Thank you. That will do.

MR NEILL: To what issue this goes, I cannot, with respect, begin to see.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Nor I.

MR KEMPSTER: I will happily tell your Lordship and my friend. I will be submitting, in due course, by reference to the documents in the Defendants' files showing their description of Mr Sanders, that they must well have known the sort of author that he was, and therefore must have known what degree of reliability to attach -

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Do you need, for that purpose, to go any further than The Family itself?

MR P. FITZGERALD:  
Cross-examined.

YSTER: Perhaps not, my Lord. It may be unnecessary, that was certainly the purpose for which I was putting e to the witness.

JICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is what I thought.

ASTER (to the witness): Is it right that yesterday, n you were giving us a sort of recitation of similarities, you put it, between the Process and the Charles Manson up, you were adopting the similarities set out in Family? A. In part.

should have thought in whole, were not you? They are all mentioned? A. That may be, but I based my opinion on certain other Process literature and certain other information.

am sorry to interrupt you, but I thought you told my Lord and the jury yesterday that your personal knowledge of the Process was confined to their literature? A. I may have. If I did I apologise, that is in a sense incorrect. I have had discussions with people about the Process as well.

see. Were there, in 1966, 1967, 1968, if I may borrow an expression of my Lord's, a number of eccentric religious groups in Haight-Ashbury and other places in California? A. Oh yes.

At a guess, how many would you think? A. 20 to 100.

JUS JICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It is quite big business, is it not, in the less civilised area? A. It is indeed.

KEMPSTER: Again in general terms, it has never been very difficult, has it, to obtain pornographic material in California, if you are after that sort of thing? A. No, it has never been difficult, and it is not now.

Did you yourself make any investigations into Manson's personal history and the sort of things he had been interested in, for example while in prison? A. Yes.

1 Is it right that from 1960 to perhaps 1968 or 1966 Manson was in jail? A. Yes.

2 Can you tell my Lord and the jury what they were? A. It was my understanding that he was interested in the religion or the church or the philosophy of Scientology, and that he was interested, to a lesser degree, in the Christian Bible.

MR KEMPSTER: Thank you.

MR NEILL: Thank you, Mr Fitzgerald.

(The witness withdrew)

MR P.V. TIMLETT:  
Examined.

MR PETER VALENTINE TIMLETT, Sworn,  
Examined by MR NEILL

- Q Are you Mr Peter Valentine Timlett? A. I am.
- Q Do you live at 12, Aspley Hill, Woburn Sands, Buckinghamshire?  
A. I do.
- Q And are you the Assistant Sales Manager (Paperbacks) in the Export Department of Granada Publishing? A. I am.
- Q I want your help, if we can have it, about what was called the open market edition of this book The Family. That was the one which was a paperback edition, not the hardback, sold in the open market. First of all can you explain to my Lord and the jury, in this context, what "open market" means?  
A. In this particular context the open market in effect means the entire world selling markets with the exception of the British Commonwealth and the United States.
- Q The sales by Granada Publishing of the paperback edition: would they be done direct or through some sort of other party?  
A. In most cases direct; but in some cases through other parties.

- D Q Could you have a bundle which I think has been called 1D? This is the Rupert Hart-Davis inter-office memos.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It is called P.6. The jury have it.

MR NEILL: I am grateful. The last page of that sets out this. This is a note. The edition we are talking about is not the hard cover but the one in (b), the paperback open market edition. That indicates that the print run was 20,000 units. Would that be right? A. So far as my knowledge goes, yes, that is correct.

- I Q All I really want to know from you is this. Although the open market relates to the whole world except the United States and the British Commonwealth, first of all did any of that edition of The Family go either to the United Kingdom, Australia or New Zealand? A. No, it did not.

- Q But did some of them go in fact to South Africa? A. Yes, they did.

- Q Can you give us the number of those that went to South Africa?  
A. Yes. It was precisely 3,225 copies.

- G Q But would I be right in suggesting that, apart from those 3,225 copies, none went to the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand or, indeed, any other part of the British Commonwealth?  
A. Of the open market edition, none went to the countries you mentioned.

- H Q It says there: Closing stock, 8,354 odd. What happened to those? A. That was outside my department. I cannot answer. I have an understanding they were pulped.

MR P.V. TIMLETT:  
Cross examined.

MR NEILL: I have a certificate. (Same shown to Mr Kempster).

MR KEMPSTER: This is a promise to destroy.

MR NEILL: Yes.

Cross-examined by MR KEMPSTER

Q Is a copy of the open market edition of The Family available? (Same handed). I do not think the jury have one at all; we are very short of these. We will try to make that good to the members of the jury in due course. Mr Timlett, this is the book which is advertised on the back as "A Feast of Evil", is it not? A. Yes.

Q Then do you see the prices given at the bottom? A. I do.

Q Will you read out, because the members of the jury have not got copies, the quotations and the prices? A. It says:

U.K.	40p.
Australia & New Zealand	\$1.25
Singapore	\$4
Canada	\$1.25
South Africa	95 cents.

Q And none of these were to go to any of the places mentioned? A. At the time the cover was produced, that would not have been correct. At the time the cover was produced the intention was that there would be copies left over, after the open market edition, which would become part of the stock used for the subsequent world editions. Actually these prices are put on every single book that we publish... regardless of what markets we may or may not sell them in.

Q Do you know personally where these copies went? A. The open market edition?

Q Yes. A. Yes, I do.

Q From what documents? A. From documents I have in my office.

Q Have you brought them? A. No, I have not brought them.

Q Were you asked to bring them? A. No, I was not asked to bring them.

Q Do you know yourself the nature of the agreement between the author, Mr Ed Sanders, and Rupert Hart-Davis? A. No, I don't.

Q So that it is no good asking you about the extent of the licence? A. I am afraid not.

Q Do you know anything about the terms of the agreement between Rupert Hart-Davis and Granada giving subrights to Granada in respect of paperbacks? A. No, I do not.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: So that I can understand it, Rupert Hart-Davis - which, of course, was a very respectable imprint, was not it? - is now owned by Granada? A. That is correct.

MR KEMPSTER: As a matter of a simple answer, do you regard Granada as putting out respectable books? A. I do.

Q Panther imprint? A. Yes.

MR KEMPSTER: These are a couple of your works on sale at the moment?

MR NEILL: Again, my Lord, what conceivable issue can this be going to if we are going to introduce a lot of other books?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is what is worrying me. To what issue that the jury may have to decide does all this go?

MR KEMPSTER: I would apprehend that an issue, as I understand it, in this case is that Process publications could have some effect on some susceptible individuals. I understand that is an issue.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That has certainly been raised; but what I do not at present understand is what activities of the Granada concern, outside the dealing with The Family, have to do with that issue or, indeed, any other issue in this case.

MR KEMPSTER: I was going to suggest there was an enormous flood of publications on the market which might have some such effect; but if it is unnecessary I will leave it.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The greater the flood, the lesser the significance of The Family. Is not that right?

MR KEMPSTER: So far as I know, we are not gauging the effect of the book The Family on other people, we are gauging what The Family said about the Process.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am sorry -

MR KEMPSTER: I am sorry, I did not understand your Lordship's question.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We are each failing to understand the other.

MR KEMPSTER: I think so.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I was in particular failing to understand the object of the last few questions you have asked.

MR NEILL: I do not want this left in doubt. If my friend wants these documents, and he does not accept this business about



MR P.V. TIMLETT:

Cross-examined.

Re-examined.

res, they had better be brought; but I would like to know  
e wants figures brought here.

STER: I do want them.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The figures are the figures about  
sales of The Family?

LL: Yes, in his open market edition, if he is not accepting  
Timlett's evidence about it and wants to see the  
pers from which Mr Timlett gave them.

KEMPSTER: I do. This has always been made clear to the other  
de.

Re-examined by MR NEILL

NEILL (to the witness): Can you do that?

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: At the moment all I have is  
that there were 20,000 units printed, 3,225 went to South  
Africa, and there was a closing stock of 8,354, which were  
probably pulped. That is all right, is it not? A. Yes.

NEILL: And none went to the Commonwealth of the ones which  
were sold? Whatever one says about the South African ones,  
all the others sold went to places outside the Commonwealth?  
A. It can't happen any other way.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: There we are.

NEILL: Some question was asked about the cover which indic-  
ated a sterling price. Is that a cover that is or are those  
figures specially printed for that particular book, or is  
that some general thing? A. It is a general price panel  
which is put on all editions of all our paperbacks.

R JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It represents what the public  
will be asked to pay? A. Yes.

Q Until they are amended? A. Yes.

Q They are outside some rather unpleasant shops? A. Indeed.  
The price can appear on a book for a country in which we  
have no intention of selling it, because it is too awkward  
and too difficult to do it otherwise, it is too open to error;  
so that we put all the prices on the back.

MR KEMPSTER: I am sorry, my Lord, I may have a supplementary.  
It involves putting another book, the back of a book, to the  
witness, but there the pricing is different (same handed).  
It does not bear the same legend: United Kingdom, Australia &  
New Zealand, Singapore, , Canada and South Africa.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What I want to know is, what has  
this to do with us, with me and the jury?

MR R. MAXWELL:  
Examined.

MR KEMPSTER: With you and the jury, my Lord: to try to ascertain where these volumes went.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It is going to be anybody's guess in the end.

MR KEMPSTER: My Lord, all right.

MR NEILL: Thank you very much.

(The witness withdrew)

MR RONALD MAXWELL, Sworn,  
Examined by MR BRITTAN

- Q Is your name Ronald Maxwell? A. Yes, it is.
- Q What is your address? A. At present I live in Spain. My address is Apt.1(I) Los Boquerones, San Pedro de Alcantara, Marbella.
- Q Were you, until August 1973, a newspaper journalist, being a reporter on the Sunday Mirror newspaper? A. That is right.
- Q Prior to that, had you worked on the Sunday Dispatch? A. That is correct.
- Q And is it right that you were used to doing investigations in depth of various matters? A. That is correct.
- Q And it is right that there was a time in 1969 when you investigated the Process-church, who are the Plaintiffs in this matter? A. That is right.
- E Q Is it right that in about June 1969 you visited the Balfour Place headquarters of the Process-church? A. Yes, I went there a number of times.
- Q When you went there, what did you find at those premises? Could you describe it? A. The building was a very large house, with a panelled hall. There were two entrances, one through the front door, another down below which led to a coffee bar, which was open to the public. Inside a hall on the street level there was a table from which they sold all sorts of publications; and in the hall was a very large photograph of Robert de Grimston. In this photograph he had a beard and deliberately looked like Jesus Christ.
- Q Was there anything special about the lights? A. Yes. There were two lights directed at this photograph, and they reflected in the glass and gave the effect of a halo just behind his head.
- Q Would you say that the house was sparsely furnished, or lavishly furnished, or what? A. There was very little

H

MR R. MAXWELL:  
Examined.

furniture on show, but everything seemed very expensive. The house itself was very, very expensive. Balfour Place is a small road parallel with Park Lane in Mayfair. It was a large and expensive house with good furniture. The coffee bar was very expensively fitted also.

Are there any photographs, other than that of Robert de Winston? A. Yes, there were photographs of a place which I believe is pronounced "Stool", X-t-u-l, which the members claimed was a place of magic, in Mexico.

Have you heard a lot about that. Did you have discussions with people at the coffee bar? A. Yes, I did.

What about? A. About the Process. Initially they said I would need to study their literature and also attend some of their meetings.

Do you recall meeting Mr Christopher De Peyer? A. Yes, I do.

Did you try to discuss matters with him? A. Yes, I did. At the time I did not know he was Christopher De Peyer because he did not use that name, he used I think it was Brother Jonathan, or something like that. But when I met his father I learned Christopher was this particular brother in the Process.

What did he say to you?

R JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am so sorry. I have got confused about sacred names. I thought that the other De Peyer was Jonathan. A. It may have been. I cannot remember exactly.

MR BRITTAN: The conversation was with Christopher De Peyer? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I know. What I am slightly concerned about at the moment is that I personally have got the so-called sacred names muddled up. Is Jonathan right for Christopher?

MR BRITTAN: No.

MR NEILL: Christopher De Peyer is Father Lucius, as I understand it; and Jonathan De Peyer is Father Christian.

MR BRITTAN: I think the witness confused the sacred name with the brother's.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is what I thought.

MR BRITTAN: You were telling us what Mr Christopher De Peyer said. A. After reading some of the magazines and books that I bought from them - they were all very expensive, by the way.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What did they cost? A. That one down there I think is £2.

MR R. MAXWELL:  
Examined.

or The Ultimate Sin? A. Yes. I don't think there were under about £1.10 at that time, and some were between and £4. I then tried to talk to him about the things I read, but I found it impossible to learn anything. If I told him about an article in the magazine his reply would be something else from the article in the magazine.

TTAN: So that you did not get very far with Mr De Peyer? If I said I did not understand what he was saying, he would say: "You'll have to come into the group, and as you go farther into it you will learn what it means".

Part from Mr De Peyer, you said you spoke to other people there: did you notice anything distinctive about their faces and voices? A. They were all the same. They had no expression, no expression in their eyes or the way they behaved. They had no individuality.

What about their physical movements? A. All very careful, very slow and gentle. They were all very gentle in fact; but all the same, you could be talking to one and think you were talking to another.

Did you ever attempt to talk any of them about Robert or Mary Ann de Grimston? A. Yes, I did.

What sort of reaction did you find when you tried that? A. When no one could explain anything to me I asked if I could see them, to have it explained by them, and they were always not available or not in the country, or they could not be seen by anyone.

Did you ever attend a therapy session? A. Yes, I did.

At Balfour Place? A. Yes.

How many people were there? A. So far as I recall, between 15 and 20; but some of those were actual Process people who were living on the premises, and others were not.

Q What was the general atmosphere, would you say, at those sessions? A. It was in a room upstairs. It was very dim lighting. They had joss sticks burning. In the middle was something with a black cloth over it. The session was led by an attractive blonde girl in a black dress, and wearing black boots. The dress she was wearing was very clinging from the waist down.

Q Clinging? A. Yes. And this, with the boots and the joss-sticks and the lighting, it was rather a sensual atmosphere.

Mr R. MAXWELL:  
Examined.

1 atmosphere? A. Yes.

ou describe the whole occasion as being quietly sober  
trical or what? A. At times it was like a sort of  
ist meeting. We were all given tin cans at one point  
ons to beat on with.

u all beat on the tin cans with the spoons? A. Yes,  
on the floor and beat on our tin cans.

was done on instructions from the lady with the boots,  
t? A. Yes, that is right. The boots were not as  
n then as they were a year or so later.

ICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It was on instructions from Blondie?  
Yes.

did you say; boots were not as fashionable? A. People  
ll referred to them as "kinky" boots in those days.

TTAN: Apart from the noise that you described that you were  
sing, there were also chants, were there? A. Yes, there  
re chants about Satan, Lucifer and Jehovah.

you remember at one of these sessions anybody saying any-  
ing about the Jews? A. Yes. One of their beliefs was  
hat the Jews in Germany were killed because they wanted to be  
illed, and they wanted to be killed because they had guilt  
eelings about the crucifixion.

The Jews in Germany? A. Yes.

Did you hear that being said at one of the sessions?  
A. I think I first read it in one of their publications, or some  
reference to it, and then I tried to discuss it at one of the  
sessions.

And did they express that view? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Can you remember which publication  
that was? A. I cannot.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: There is some reference to anti-  
semitism somewhere in one of them, isn't there?

MR BRITTAN: Yes, my Lord.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "I read that in one of their  
publications", you say, "and I asked about it at one of the  
sessions". A. Yes.

Q Who did you ask? A. I asked at one of these meetings, and  
I also asked the various members that I talked to in the hall  
and in the coffee bar.

Q Did you get an answer? A. Not one that I could understand.

Cross-examined by Mr KEMPSTER

well, you for a number of weeks specialised in the  
s, didn't you? A. That is correct.

half of the Sunday Mirror? A. Yes.

you tell my Lord and the Jury the sort of thing the  
rs of the Sunday Mirror like to have on their breakfast  
s on Sunday mornings? What is the sort of thing that sells  
newspaper? A. I think different things sell it to  
rent people.

sort of people were you aiming these articles at?  
One of the reasons that prompted us to do these articles  
the complaints we had from Mr De Peyer about the money  
his children had handed over to the Process, which I  
eve amounted to about £30,000 by Mr Christopher De Peyer.  
of the aims was to warn people about the Process.

MICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "One of the things that prompted  
se articles was a complaint" -- that is from Mr De Peyer,  
ior? A. That is correct, yes.

handed over £30,000; is that right? A. His elder son  
l handed over all his money. Mr De Peyer said that he was  
the process of trying to alter a trust so that a second  
n could not hand over his money.

u said something about £30,000. A. I believe the figure  
nded over by Christopher was £30,000.

KEMPSTER: So we have a situation where you have complaints  
at one or may be more young men were so devoted to this  
organisation that they were parting with their money to it;  
s that right? A. This organisation was referred to at  
imes as "the Mindbenders", and they seemed to have been so  
ltered in character that they handed over their money. I  
ould not call it devotion to the Process.

So that you felt that you should warn the readers of the  
Sunday Mirror, or the parents at least, to get their children's  
trusts altered in time; was that it? A. No. If anyone's  
children became involved in the Process, we wanted to warn them  
that they were possibly becoming involved in something dangerous.  
We also wanted to draw attention to the fact that the Charity  
Commissioners had accepted the Process as a charity, which  
seemed quite wrong.

You mentioned, I think, at the outset of your evidence that when  
you went into the Process premises, you saw a large photo of  
Mr De Grimston, you said "deliberately looking like Jesus  
Christ". A. Yes.

How did he do it? A. By the way his hair was grown and by  
the way his beard was grown. I saw a photograph of Mr De  
Grimston before he changed his name, when he looked quite  
different. He had quite short hair and it seemed to be rather  
a receding chin, and did not look at all like Jesus Christ.

You saw him, did you? A. I saw one of those photographs.

Q You saw Mr De Grimston? A. I saw a photograph of Mr De Grimston before he grew his hair and his beard.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Where did you see that?  
A. I cannot remember who produced it. I cannot remember where I got it from. It is still in the Mirror library.

MR KEMPSTER: Would it be fair to say that quite a lot of young men with beards, certainly ones you may see about London, could be said to look like Jesus Christ, in as far as we know how he looks? A. I would not have said so, no.

Q Did you want to suggest to the Jury that it was a Process belief that Mr De Grimston was Jesus Christ? A. There seemed to be a belief that one or other of them was in some way Jesus Christ reincarnated or descended from him, and the presentation of the publications of Jehovah and Lucifer talking through Mr De Grimston ----

Q Did not Jesus Christ also talk through De Grimston?

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am trying to take a very careful note, because this is important evidence. "There seemed to be a Process belief that one or other of them was or was descended from Jesus Christ" - right? A. Yes.

MR KEMPSTER: When you say "descended from", you don't mean lineally, do you? A. I don't think so. They seemed to be of the belief that they had been recreated or reincarnations of Christ.

Q Did not you write to your readers to the effect that Mr De Grimston passes on messages which are claimed to come from, among others, Christ? A. Yes.

Q Is that consistent with him also being Christ? A. The way in which it is presented in the publications, it could be one or the other.

Q Did you ever suggest in any of your articles a warning that Mr De Grimston was thought to be Christ? A. No, not that I recall.

Q That was quite an important matter, if it was true, was it not, part of the warning? A. Before publication, as you know, things are gone through very carefully to prevent a newspaper landing up in Court similar to this one.

Q So it was quite all right to say, for example, Mary Anne -- that is Mrs De Grimston. A. Yes.

Q -- was the illegitimate daughter of a Scots mill girl? A. Yes, that is quite in order if it is correct.

Q What was the warning given by that information to the readers? A. There was no particular warning in that. The warning was contained in the thing that was removed by the Sunday Mirror lawyers.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You did publish the assertion, did you, that she was the illegitimate daughter of a Scots mill hand; is that right? A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Just remind me, if you would be kind enough. Was it Miss Ventris that said she was the Virgin Mary?

MR KEMPSTER: I think Miss Ventris said Mrs Coale, the fourth Plaintiff, claimed to be the Blessed Virgin, and I interposed at that stage.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I thought it was Mrs De Grimston.

MR KEMPSTER: No; Mrs Coale. Your Lordship will recall my intervening to say this had not been put to her, and your Lordship made some observation.

MR BRITTAN: Mrs De Grimston was described by one of the witnesses as Hecate.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: She has been Hecate for some time, yes.

MR KEMPSTER: Let us come back to the other matter that may have been part of the warning to the parents or young people about this. It was probably a communication course, wasn't it, where there was a blonde woman in a black dress conducting it?  
A. I would not call it communication.

Q Did not the Process call it a communication course?  
A. They just called it a meeting.

Q You say she was wearing kinky boots? A. At that time they were still called kinky boots.

Q Would your readers have been interested to know that she was wearing boots that you thought kinky? A. We said she was wearing black boots. At that time, black boots were always referred to in bar-room conversation as "kinky" boots. By the following summer they were not.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We are talking about 1969?  
A. The summer of 1969.

MR KEMPSTER: September 1969.

Q You did some chanting, you said - in honour of whom?  
A. Satan, Lucifer and Jehovah.

Q Did you chant in honour of Christ? A. I can only recall Satan, Lucifer and Jehovah. I cannot recall Christ.

Q May I just invite you to look at your article for a moment and refresh your memory? I have put a line under it. (Copy of article handed to witness). A. (After a pause): Yes, I see it.

Q Refreshing your memory, would you say that you were also chanting in honour of Christ? A. Yes. If that is what I said then, that is correct. Bear in mind this is five years ago.

Q It is indeed. Do you know, or did you lose interest after you had written these articles, that Mr De Peyer, Senior is quite



reconciled with his sons? A. Mr De Peyer's main object at the time was to try to maintain contact with his sons. He did not want to break off with them completely, although he wanted to get them out of the Process at that time. He indicated to me that he would be happy as long as he could keep in contact, but the Process he thought was taking his sons away from him.

Q I think my question was, did you keep sufficient touch with the Process, or the De Peyers, to know that he was now quite reconciled? A. No.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Did you obtain any information about the sources of finance apart from Mr De Peyer's £30,000? A. I talked to a number of parents whose children had given money to the Process; in fact, a meeting was laid on by Mr De Peyer.

Re-examined by Mr BRITTAN

Q No attempt was made to bring this out when I asked you questions originally, but Mr Kempster has cross-examined you about what you said about the origins of Mrs De Grimston. Did you have reason for believing what you said to be right or not? A. Yes; I had her birth certificate.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You had her birth certificate? A. I had her birth certificate, my Lord.

(The witness withdrew)

Sir MARTIN ROTH, Sworn

Examined by Mr NEILL

Q Sir Martin, is your full name Martin Roth? A. Yes.

Q And your address? A. Elmfield Lodge, Elmfield Road, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Q Your qualifications are what? A. I am a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of London, I am a Fellow of the Royal College of Psychiatrists, I am a Doctor of Medicine, the University of London, and I am an Honorary Fellow of a number of foreign learned societies.

Q Sir Martin I just really wanted to ask you one or two things only, because we have had the evidence of Professor Gibbens relating to the literature. I just wondered if you could help about, first of all, this: one of the activities of the Process Church of the Final Judgement was to carry out therapy sessions. Have you had an opportunity, in addition to reading their other literature, of reading the book which deals with the sessions and how they are conducted? A. I have.

MR NEILL: That is not something that has been inflicted on your Lordship or the Jury so far.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: No.

MR NEILL: I don't think I need to go into this in detail. I

Sir MARTIN ROTH:  
Examined.

ant you to give us your general help. Unless you are asked questions about it, I don't want you to go into great detail about it. Having read the literature about the conduct of group sessions, can you help my Lord and the Jury as to how far they follow what I may call conventional psychiatric practice and how far, if at all, you think they would be helpful or unhelpful to the patients? A. The impression is given by the term "group sessions" that a form of treatment, based on psychological theory, is being utilised. The term has some resemblance to the term "group therapy", and I think that this would tend to create the impression that it had some kinship with group therapy as administered under the direction of a professionally qualified person, not necessarily medically qualified.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I notice that Sir Martin is I think referring probably to the report.

MR NEILL: Perhaps he ought to have it.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think he has got it. What I am after is this: I don't want to write down all his evidence if it is all in typescript already.

MR NEILL: My Lord, he is referring to a Process document.

THE WITNESS: I am referring, my Lord, to a document which details the manner in which the group sessions are to be conducted, and provides details about the instructions that are given to individuals called telepaths and questors.

MR NEILL: Sir Martin, I had not observed this. I think you are referring to a piece of paper in front of you which is your own production; is that right? A. In front of me, yes, is my own production.

Q I think for the moment perhaps you ought to hand that over.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I was not taking any exception to his looking at it. I was only trying to save myself the trouble of writing.

MR NEILL: My learned friend has not seen this. I don't know whether he would wish to say anything about Sir Martin referring to it.

MR KEMPSTER: I have not seen it. I really cannot comment.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We had better go on.

MR NEILL: What you were telling us about, Sir Martin, was this, the reference to telepaths and questors. A. Yes.

Q That appears in the publication of the group sessions. I think you had some comment about the use of words such as "telepath" and "questor". A. The term "telepath" is unfortunate in this context, in that it tends to reinforce one of the most consistent delusional or illusory beliefs of mentally disturbed individuals or deranged personalities. This belief is that their minds with all their innermost secrets can be read by others and the contents of their minds can be broadcast to

others. This belief I consider could enhance the anxiety felt by damaged and sick people.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: "'Telepath' tends to reinforce the delusional condition of deranged persons"; is that right?

A. The delusional idea that many sick individuals have. This is a very common delusion, my Lord, one of the most common delusional ideas that are expressed by either frankly sick individuals or personalities who are very maladjusted, the belief that their minds can be read by occult means and that their secret thoughts can be broadcast to others. This recurs very very frequently in their communications.

Q You say the therapy or the group sessions directive that you have read discloses practices likely to promote that state of affairs? Is that what you are saying? A. I was referring specifically to the term "telepath". There are other ingredients which I would regard as making it quite clear that these sessions have no relationship whatever to the forms of care that are provided by trained individuals.

MR NEILL: Perhaps you could explain the other features?

A. The first point to which I would like to draw attention is that in any form of true group therapy, there is emphasis upon the need to encourage free communication by the participants in order that they may gain self-knowledge and mutual understanding from this process of free interchange of ideas. In this document what I find is a constant emphasis upon agreement, agreement which is written down and which is arrived at by means that are nowhere made plain. Now, I would consider that this is just the opposite of what one is trying to do in the course of treatment aimed at conferring self-knowledge. This is much more like indoctrination of individuals which is aimed at getting them to give their assent to some belief which has little relationship to their conflicts, anxieties, difficulties. My Lord, I say this with a little reserve because the content is so vague that it is only my reading; it is not very easy to judge precisely what happens; but, for what it is worth, this is the impression that I gain.

Q Do the forms of the questions and answers which you have studied in the material that they were using indicate the kind of treatment that was being given? A. If I have interpreted these suggested questions and answers correctly, once again we have a series of pre-set suggestions emanating from the persons in charge of the session rather than any free communication in which the individual is asked to disclose his own anxieties, conflicts, difficulties.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Would it be a fair summary of what you are saying that the literature, or I think the "directive" is the word, you have seen about group sessions suggests that they are directed to mass indoctrination, or group indoctrination? Is that right? A. That is the impression, my Lord.

MR NEILL: One last thing, Sir Martin, I want your help about. At one time we had evidence about this, that an E-meter, as it used to be called, and I think in the Process Church of the Final Judgement it was called alternatively a P-scope -----

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: A what?

A P-scope, but I think it is what other people might  
in E-meter. Is that right? A. Yes.

you any comment to make about the value or otherwise of  
machine or apparatus for the purpose of treatment?  
This instrument can give information about one fact alone;  
is, the amount of perspiration that occurs in the skin  
the hand, or the skin of any surface on which the electrodes  
placed. Therefore, the claims that are made that with the  
of this instrument hidden conflicts in the mind or other  
tal processes can be revealed can only be based either on  
orance or it can only be intended to mislead. I cannot see  
an instrument of this nature, which is providing such crude,  
reliable and inconsistent information about what is happening  
the person, could be used either in any acceptable form of  
agnosis or treatment.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We have been told about the patient  
r victim, or whatever word you choose, holding a cylinder  
hich is connected by a flex to something or other; I am not  
sure to what. Have you ever seen an E-meter? A. I have  
seen apparatus which is identical in its essential features,  
my Lord, because there are many methods of doing exactly the  
same thing, of measuring the skin resistance. This has been  
used in a great many experiments, but its limitations are well  
recognised as a means of securing information about the state  
of mind of people.

Cross-examined by Mr KEMPSTER

Sir Martin, may I see the documents that you have been reading  
that have come from the Process? A. I have not read  
anything.

Q You have not read anything? A. I have, of course, read  
the document which describes these instructions.

Q That is right. That is what I wanted to look at.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: He has read the practice direction  
about group therapy.

THE WITNESS: Group session. You have that, I believe. I don't  
know. I have not got one here.

MR KEMPSTER: I am sure I have, Sir Martin, but I have got an  
awful lot of documents. I am trying to identify it. I  
wondered if you had it with you. A. I have not it here.

Q I wonder if Mr Neill can tell me. (Counsel conferred).  
These I take it are documents that would pass between the  
members of the Process who were setting out to give these  
sessions; is that right? A. I take it this is the intention.

Q They are not documents that are distributed to those my Lord  
has referred to as the patients or the victims; they are not  
designed for them? A. I have no knowledge of that. I do  
not know their distribution.

Q They don't appear to be designed for (shall we say) the patient,  
do they; they appear to be guidance for the therapists or  
telepaths, or whatever they are.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: They are practice directions.

MR KEMPSTER: Yes, my Lord. I accept that.

Q So that is for the professionals? A. On the other hand, there are instructions which are aimed at the Processeans. I cannot, from having read that document, state categorically that Processeans - these are the individuals who are to be submitted to the care of these group sessions - have no access to these documents. I do not know. It may be that they are denied access, but I cannot say from my knowledge.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I have not seen this document and the Jury have not, and I am sure we are united in an unwillingness to look at it. Is my general description of it as a practice direction about right? A. It is, my Lord.

(Adjourned for a short time)

SIR MARTIN ROTH:  
Cross-examined.

KEMPSTER: You made one or two comments about this device which insured perspiration. I suppose there is a link between perspiration and some sort of mental or other activity? -- It is a very crude indicator of anxiety.

Has this been used from time to time by psychiatrists for many years? -- A. It has been used, but the information it provides is inconsistent and unreliable.

With regard to the indoctrination point, I have just been looking at these documents and forgive me if I have not looked at them before, because I do not think they are referred to in the leadings or anything we have before us. I see there are standard questions: "What are you here to achieve? To shoot rabbits. Why are you here to shoot rabbits? Because they are too noisy". Then we get on to ferrets. Then there is something about lobsters. Can you help my Lord and the jury -----

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is this designed to demonstrate what a serious body it is?

KEMPSTER: Can I reserve my answer to that question. It is really designed to invite the comment of the witness as to how this sort of question and answer performance imparts any sort of doctrine? -- A. May I answer in two parts. I should like to reply to the quotations you have given me by saying that they strike me as banalities which are given the quality of profundities by the context - quite misleadingly. In the second part of my reply I would like to say that there are more ominous questions which are addressed in different parts of the examination on pages I cannot name because the document is not ordinarily numbered according to pages.

R. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think you are being offered another one now. -- A. I see, my Lord. I have a copy before me. The question is put to the Processans: "What is your most intense emotional state?", and the answer suggested is: "Paranoia". "Why is paranoia your most intense emotional state?". The answer suggested is: "I am being watched". Further down the page the example quoted is: "What does your will to destroy stem from?". The answer suggested is: "My love for God". There are other statements in a similar vein.

At a later stage, S.F.9, Session format, subject line of decisions: "What are you creating?", and the answer given is: "Trouble". "Why are you creating trouble?". The answer suggested is: "To destroy others". Further on those questions are made to reply that they have an inclination to kill someone. A further question is then addressed: "Why did you decide to have an inclination to kill someone?". No answer is suggested to that.

MR. KEMPSTER: Is this process of question and answer in some form at least a common practice in psychiatry? -- A. No.

Q. What is the normal form, if there is such a thing, when you are dealing with a person who perhaps needs confidence or is troubled or is in the sort of conditions which you have to deal with clinically? -- A. There is no body of men who are expected to

SIR MARTIN ROTH:  
Cross-examined.

hold themselves responsible to some professional organisation that provides such a set form of questioning and answering, to my knowledge. Neither those with medical qualifications nor those who belong to some non-medical organisation that represents therapists set their questions and answers in this fixed, rigid form. This is not the manner in which therapists undertake their work, as I understand it.

B Q. Would I be right in trying to interpret you in saying that the question and answer should fit the patient and not the precept; is that it? -- A. Yes.

Q. Have you ever been present at a session where a member of the Process was carrying out any of the instructions set out in these documents? -- A. No; I have not.

C Q. Do you know whether or not the procedures set out in these documents have or have not helped people? -- A. I have no objective information about that, but in the document reference is made to emotional disturbance that might occur in the course of these sessions. In my judgment, for what it is worth, the measures that are recommended to deal with this emotional disturbance are quite inadequate to protect ordinary men and women. They would be even less adequate to protect individuals who suffered from some form of emotional disturbance.

D Q. Is it your professional opinion that these procedures are -- first of all, you do not think they are calculated to help; is that right? -- A. Well, I do not know what the calculation of those who are responsible for it is.

E Q. Looked at objectively? -- A. I beg your pardon?

Q. Looking at it objectively, without considering the motives of those who drew them up, you do not think they would be efficacious in any situation?

F MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You used the words "calculated to help".

MR. KEMPSTER: I think that was an equivocal expression. I was trying to alter that. (To the witness): Looking just at the documents, are you suggesting that they could in no instance be of assistance? -- A. I would not go as far as that because I have had no opportunity to study the effect of these processes, but what I am saying is that the procedures described here could in my judgment lead to serious emotional crises, including crises that carried some suicidal danger -- the danger of self-destruction for those who were subjected to these measures. In my judgment the steps recommended to deal with those disturbed in such a serious way would be quite inadequate to deal with the risks which materialise.

G H Q. I think you have said that in fact you have had no contact with anyone who has been treated by the members of the Process, nor have you attended any session in fact conducted by them?

SIR MARTIN ROTH:  
Cross-examined.

A. No, but I believe there would be general agreement among all those who have knowledge of psychological methods influencing people who are sick that, in the course of such relationships with people, emotional disturbance with a suicidal risk is not an uncommon event. Even in orthodox forms of psychological care such risks arise, but I believe that in the hands of a medical psychotherapist or a non-medical psychotherapist who was affiliated to some reputable body appropriate steps would be taken to avoid a serious or fatal end. I cannot, as objectively as I can see it, regard the steps recommended here as constituting an adequate protection for those who would be at risk in these situations.

(The witness withdrew)

MR. GEORGE CHARLES HESSE, Sworn.  
Examined by MR. NEILL.

Are you Mr. George C. Hesse? -- A. Yes.

What does the "C" stand for? -- A. Charles.

Are you a District Attorney Investigator in Santa Clara County, 232 East Gish Road, San Jose, California? -- A. Yes.

R. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I think perhaps we ought to know - I do not know it - what a District Attorney Investigator is. I have never heard of it before.

MR. NEILL: Yes. I am going to ask him to describe his office. Perhaps we can hear what you do, Mr. Hesse. You are a District Attorney Investigator for the Santa Clara County? -- A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell us what you do in that capacity? -- A. I conduct investigations for the prosecutor. The District Attorney is the prosecutor for the County and I act as his investigator.

Q. Have you in the course your duties made a study of the motorcycle gangs in California? -- A. Yes; I have.

Q. I think as one of your duties are you the chairman, if that is the right word, of a monthly seminar for law enforcement officers all over California, brought together for the purpose of sharing information about these gangs? -- A. Yes.

Q. I want to start by asking you about a man called Victor Floyd Wild. Is that someone known to you? -- A. Yes.

Q. I do not want to go into all the gangs in California, but is there one gang called the Hell's Angels? -- A. Yes.

Q. Is there another gang called the Gypsy Jokers? -- A. Yes.

Q. From your knowledge - you will tell us what your knowledge is in a moment - are you able to say whether Victor Floyd Wild has any connection with either of those gangs? -- A. He was a member of the Gypsy Jokers in San Jose - the San Jose chapter.



MR. G.C. HESSE:  
Examined.

MELFORD STEVENSON: Where? -- A. In San Jose.

Can the witness be handed a copy of Process No. 5, the issue of the Process magazine, page 23. Mr. Hesse, I do not know whether you have seen that magazine before or not?  
No.

I see on page 23 there is what appears to be a bird of prey at the top of the page and then the words in capital letters: "Satan rides again with Hell's Angels" and then on the left-hand side a quotation from a book by Hunter S. Thompson, which is a book which we have been told was about Hell's Angels in California? -- A. Yes.

Is that a book you are acquainted with? -- A. I have not read it. I have gone through it.

Want to ask you one or two things about the Hell's Angels and the other gang. From your knowledge of the Hell's Angels in California, what are their activities? -- A. At the present time?

I would like you to go back, if you would, to the period 1968, 1969, 1970, at the time just before this magazine? --

The Hell's Angels originally started as a group just to ride motor-cycles and they used to drink quite heavily. They could be involved in a rape from time to time, a theft of a motor-cycle. Most of the motor-cycles are stolen that they ride. They progressed - became more organised. They started to work more as an organised gang rather than individuals. The activities became more violent as time went on. It started more or less with the intimidation of witnesses who were going to testify against them in other activities such as brawls in bars and possible rape cases. It went from intimidation to the actual murder of some of these people. They have been involved in extortion, assaults, auto thefts, a great number of thefts of explosives, thefts of weapons. Now they are more organised they have contacts now with even some of the organised crime figures on the West Coast.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: By "the organised crime figures", do you mean gangsters? -- A. Yes.

NEILL: That is a picture of the Hell's Angels. Can you tell us something about the Gypsy Jokers. First of all, do the Gypsy Jokers still exist now as a gang? -- A. Not in the San Jose area. In Northern California and the southern part of Oregon they still exist, yes.

In the San Jose area what happened? -- A. They were forced out as a group by the Hell's Angels. The Hell's Angels are more powerful and they told them that they could not ride - that they could not have what we call fly colours, which are the writing and insignias they put on the back of their jackets.

Before they were forced out of the San Jose area, I would like you to tell us what activities they were engaged in, that is,

MR. G.C. HESSE:  
Examined.

no Gypsy Jokers? -- A. Their activities were very much the same as the Hell's Angels up until the time they were told that they could no longer ride, which was prior to the organised crime contacts, so the information that would apply to the Hell's Angels regarding murders, intimidation of witnesses, thefts and such would also apply to the Gypsy Jokers. They are two of several of the groups in California.

You mentioned Mr. Wild as being a member of the Gypsy Jokers. Can you tell us how you know that? -- A. We have records which were compiled by the Attorney General's office of the State of California, and also by the local law enforcement agencies. These records were compiled of individuals who were actually observed to be flying colours and were positively identified. We have problems -----

You said "flying colours". I wonder if you would just explain what that means? -- A. Yes.

.. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: It means wearing the emblem on the back.

R. NEILL: Yes, my Lord. Your Lordship is ahead of me. I will not ask any more about that. (To the witness): You were going on to say something.

IR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You were talking about Mr. Wild in particular. -- A. Mr. Wild's name has appeared on several of the lists as confirmed, riding with the club. He has definitely been seen in the past, remembering now this is back around roughly 1966, 1967, 1968; he has been identified as being a member of that group.

MR. NEILL: Apart from being a member of that group, have you any knowledge yourself of any business he has had? -- A. Yes. At one time Mr. Wild owned the leather shop at 74 East San Fernando in San Jose, and I know he moved to Colida and started a leather shop there, but I lost more or less contact with him because he left the organised biker group and therefore he was not really in my interest at that time.

Q. When you say at one time he had this leather shop, can you tell us the year approximately when he had the leather shop? --  
A. I believe approximately 1965 or 1966.

Cross-examined by MR. KEMPSTER

Q. Do you know Mr. Wild personally? -- A. I have never talked to him.

Q. He is a name that you have seen on documents? -- A. Yes.

Q. Is that right? -- A. I have.

Q. Doing your best to think back to the documents, can you help us as to when he, as you say, left the biker group? -- A. He was still listed on a roster in 1969. Now that does not

MR. G.C. HESSE:  
Cross-examined.

essarily mean he was still active at that time. The list made; he was a confirmed member and it is not redone on a thly basis.

presume it is carried forward until something causes you to like him off? -- A. Yes, unless we know that he no longer is member -----

n he stays on? -- A. Yes.

o you know when that particular list was compiled on which his ame appears till 1969? -- A. I believe the first time his name asmt on the list, as I recall, was 1969.

JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: He was not on thdlist in 1969? --  
A. Yes.

KEMPSTER: As I understood you just now, you said, or I thought you said, that his name appeared first on the list in 1966, or am I wrong about that? -- A. No. To my knowledge it was about that time. Some of the lists have gone back further than that but I no longer have those lists.

Would it be fair to say then that the list on which his name appears until 1969 was compiled not later than 1966? -- A. No. It may have been compiled after 1966.

Even though his name was on it in 1966 or perhaps before? --  
A. I may have misunderstood your question.

R. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Remind me of Mr. Wild's sacred name.

R. NEILL: Brother Ely.

MR. KEMPSTER: I think you said - if I misunderstood you please correct me - that you have seen records in the Attorney General's offices showing that he has been observed at some stage flying the colours of the Gypsy Jokers? -- A. Yes.

Q. That is right so far? -- A. Yes.

Q. And that his name appeared on the lists between 1966 and 1968, and then in 1969 it disappeared? -- A. No. If I said that I had not understood the question. His name, as far as I knew from my personal knowledge - in approximately 1965 or 1966 he was a member, but that did not come from the list. The list that I referred to is one list which was approximately 1968 in which he was still listed.

Q. Was that compiled in 1968? -- A. That was approximately 1968. There was no date on the list, but from my own memory it was approximately 1966 - I am sorry, 1968. Early the following year a new list was made up and his name did not appear. That would be early in 1969.

Q. Does that mean that someone had then discovered that he was no longer a flying member, if that is the appropriate expression?

-- A. Yes. Normally that comes about by his not being observed in the club activities over a period of time.

Q. How long was the period of time? I suppose it could vary enormously? -- A. It can vary enormously. It depends on the amount of activity that they have and the opportunity to observe the group as a whole.

Q. So that really looking at the lists would it be fair to say this: it is difficult to tell from the lists or to make a reasonable assumption from the lists as to when Mr. Wild ceased to fly the Gypsy Joker emblem or whatever it is? -- A. You would have to assume it was sometime prior to 1969.

Q. To qualify for that list would he actually have had to ride a motor-cycle, with or without a steel helmet, or would it be enough if he had a badge on his back? -- A. During that period of time there were some bikers who did not have motor-cycles, although in the Gypsy Jokers and the Hell's Angels it was required that they have a motor-cycle.

Q. So he must have had a motor-cycle? -- A. One available to him. That would not necessarily mean he had to own it, but he had to have it available to him.

Q. As I understand it, all he had to do was to steal one in order to qualify? -- A. Yes. That would qualify him. That is how most of them did qualify.

Q. I hope I have got this date right. The Gypsy Jokers were forced out by the Hell's Angels in 19 - when? -- A. Roughly 1967, 1968, 1969 - roughly in there. It was a gradual thing. It was not all of a sudden. They started a war between the two of them. There were several members killed. I believe, to my recollection, it was about 1969 or 1970 when they actually ceased to exist as a club in the San Jose area. Some of the members moved up into Northern California and joined a chapter - they call it a chapter - in Northern California. Some of them went into Oregon.

Q. So they had been eliminated by 1969; can I put it like that? -- A. From the San Jose area, that is right.

(The witness withdrew)

MR. NEILL: My Lord, I still have an adjourned application to your Lordship, the one we were dealing with this morning. That is an application which I think I ought to continue in the absence of the jury.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is this a question of whether I should allow that evidence?

MR. NEILL: Yes.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am not going to. I hope that is clear.

MR. NEILL: Yes, my Lord. That being the position, subject to these documents - I am not clear what the position is about them, the ones which my learned friend mentioned this morning - they have been sent for but I do not think -----

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Those are the documents about sales?

B MR. NEILL: Yes, about the sales of this paperback. That is something which I do not think the witness has come back for, but that is something which I think can be interposed obviously at a convenient moment.

MR. KEMPSTER: I am quite content with that.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes.

C MR. NEILL: Subject to that, that is the case for the defence. I anticipate there will be - my friend and I both take this view - a number of matters before both of us address the jury that it would probably be convenient to clear up - there are one or two matters of law - before your Lordship. That being so, I was wondering, if this was the right moment to do it, how far we would get beyond that today. It will not take very long.

D MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If you mean you do not think an address to the jury is likely to get very far today - is that what you are saying?

MR. NEILL: Yes, my Lord, I am. I could start, but the time we have cleared these other matters up -----

E MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You could start, but then you have to interrupt yourself or be interrupted by me.

MR. NEILL: Indeed, my Lord.

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: What you are suggesting is that I should ask the jury to come back at 10.30 tomorrow morning?

F MR. NEILL: I do not know how long my friend thinks we will be. I do not think we are going to take an hour and twenty minutes or an hour and a half on these matters, but on the other hand it is certainly going to take more than half an hour. I would respectfully suggest probably a sensible way would be to start off with the jury again tomorrow morning. I have asked for several indulgences already, my Lord, so I am not asking for anything.

G MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Can you make a useful contribution to this discussion, Mr. Kempster?

H MR. KEMPSTER: That is a great challenge, my Lord. I think we could make our submissions to your Lordship and obtain the necessary rulings well within an hour. On the other hand, to have the jury waiting for an hour -----

MR. JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That would be ridiculous, I agree.

I am afraid, members of the jury, it will have to be 10.30 tomorrow morning. Indeed it is just possible the discussion which will take place in your absence will shorten the whole thing. It will if I have my way.

(At 2.40 p.m. the jury left the court)

(Counsel made submissions to his Lordship)

(Adjourned till 10.30 tomorrow morning)

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

# **SUMMING- UP AND VERDICT**

Judge's Summation

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice,  
Monday, 25th March, 1974.

Before:-

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON  
and a Jury.

Between:

THE PROCESS-CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT  
(a corporate body),  
CHRISTOPHER ALFRED FRIFF, Plaintiffs  
CHRISTOPHER DE PEVER and  
WENDY ANN PEACH

-AND-

1972 P. No.2039

RUPERT HART-DAVIS LIMITED and First Defendants  
ED SANDERS Second Defendant

and Between:

SAME -AND- SAME

1972 P. No.1603

(Consolidated pursuant to the Order of Master Waldman  
dated the 19th day of October 1972)

(Transcript from the Shorthand Notes of The Association of  
Official Shorthandwriters Ltd., Room 392, Royal Courts of  
Justice, and 2, New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.2)

MR MICHAEL KEMPSTER, Q.C. and MR PETER BOWSHER (instructed by  
Messrs. Joynson-Hicks & Co.) appeared for the Plaintiffs.  
MR BRIAN NEILL, Q.C. and MR LEON BRITTAN (instructed by Messrs.  
Goodman, Derrick & Co.) appeared for the First Defendants.  
THE SECOND DEFENDANT did not appear and was not represented.

S U M M I N G - U P  
and  
V E R D I C T



A MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Now, Members of the Jury, at  
long last it becomes my duty to sum up in this case; and  
may I, at the very outset, say something about our respective  
tasks, yours and mine. My duty can be very simply described:  
B it is to tell you what is the law that you have to apply to  
this case, and my direction as to the law is something that  
you have to follow. But yours is an utterly different task.  
C The reason why you have been brought here and made to sit day  
after day in that intolerable jury box - in relation to which  
I feel the deepest sympathy for you - is that you may, and  
must, act as judges of the facts. The facts are your  
D province, and your duty is to decide the facts on the  
evidence that you have heard and, of course, on the documents  
which it has been your painful duty to examine.

May I say, without any intention to be discourteous to  
E Counsel on either side, that what they say about the facts  
does not matter. It is the evidence that you have to act upon.  
Indeed, what I say about the facts does not in any sense bind  
you. I shall, of course, have to go through some of the  
F evidence. (Let me at once relieve your minds by saying I  
shall not go through much of it). I shall not do so with the  
hope or intention of persuading you to go one way or the  
other, but solely in the hope that I may help you in your  
G task of deciding the facts and arriving at a verdict one way  
or the other in relation to each of these Plaintiffs.

H I have made those observations at the very outset of  
what I have to say because I am most anxious that our  
different - very different - functions should not be in any  
way confused.

A           You do not need to be told, but it is my duty to repeat,  
that this is an action for libel, in respect of which these  
B           Plaintiffs are asking you to award them money in the form of  
damages. Libel, as you have been rightly told, more than  
C           once, can be sufficiently described - at any rate, for the  
purpose of this case - as the publication in a permanent form  
(for example, a book such as we have had to look at) of any  
D           imputation which may tend to lower a plaintiff (that is the  
person complaining, and in this case there are four of them)  
E           in the estimation of right-thinking people, right-thinking  
people generally. You are here as the representatives of  
F           right-thinking people. I think that is a somewhat difficult  
position in which to place yourselves, but that is what you  
have got to do. You have to consider, quite separately,  
the cases of each of these Plaintiffs - this body which calls  
itself the Process-Church of the Final Judgement, Mr Fripp,  
Mr Christopher De Peyer, and the lady who is now Mrs Coale,  
although she was, of course, at the time the action was  
started Wendy Ann Peach. They have all got what have been  
called "sacred names", but I think perhaps, for the purpose  
of our consideration of the case, it is simpler, so far as  
we can, to stick to their real names.

G           If you come to the conclusion that they have indeed  
been the victims of libel, then you would have to consider  
what sum or sums would be proper to compensate them for the  
injury to their reputation, including, of course, the injuries  
to their feelings - not an easy problem to approach, but that  
H           is what you have to do. And the remedy they seek, as I have  
already indicated, is the remedy of damages, a monetary award.

A        The amount, the scope, of any award of that kind is  
utterly and entirely for you. Let me begin by referring to  
the last matter that Counsel for the Plaintiffs dealt with.  
That is the question of exemplary damages. It is, of course,  
B        something quite distinct from compensation, and it arises  
if you were to come to the conclusion - assuming that you  
are in favour of the Plaintiffs at all - that the amount  
that you would ordinarily regard as adequate to compensate  
C        them for the wrong they have suffered is not enough but that  
it was necessary to leave the sphere of compensation and  
enter the area of punishment. It is, I think, the only  
example in our Civil Law where considerations of punishment -  
D        with which, of course, the Criminal Law is primarily concerned -  
have to be taken into account by a jury. You may think - I  
do not know - that on the facts of this case, as you have now  
learnt them,        the question of exemplary damages (that  
E        is to say, going beyond compensation but embarking on the  
consideration of the punishment of the Defendants) is really,  
on the facts that you have had placed before you, a matter  
of more theoretical than practical importance. Of course  
F        Counsel for the Plaintiffs is perfectly entitled to point,  
as he did a few minutes ago, to those inter-office memoranda  
which make it quite plain, first of all that these  
G        Defendants knew that what they were publishing was defamatory  
in the sense it was likely to injury the reputation of the  
people to whom the matter referred. It is fair enough  
to say that they did that with their eyes open. They had  
H        that correspondence with the American lawyers and the American  
representatives of I think Mr Ed Sanders, and we know that the

A American publication put out by Messrs. Dutton was either  
stopped or so expurgated that the question of damages did  
not arise. But, of course, two views can be taken of behaviour  
of that kind. It may be that it is a somewhat unpleasant  
B piece of conduct to publish anything that is defamatory of  
another body. Another view of the same matter, of course -  
although it has not seriously been raised in this case -  
is that there is something to be said for the public being  
C made aware of vicious, harmful and undesirable practices if  
they are pursued; and you may think, on the facts that have  
emerged in this case, that the question of exemplary damages,  
whatever view you take of the rest of it, is not of great  
D practical significance. But I repeat and emphasise, it is  
entirely a matter for you.

Now let us look a little carefully at the parties in  
this case which you have to consider. On the one side this  
E so-called church, an incorporated body, incorporated in June,  
1968, in the State of Louisiana, and it is proper for  
me to utter a word of warning, which I hope you will not take  
amiss, at the very beginning. Of course it would be quite  
F <sup>to</sup> wrong/approach~~the~~ the consideration of a case of this sort  
with the reflection that, if people hold beliefs which you or  
I (I know not) may regard as eccentric or even bordering on  
G insanity, that is something which justifies the complete  
rejection of their claim. They are entitled, as is every  
plaintiff in these courts, to the careful consideration of  
what they put forward. And I think it is relevant and  
H instructive to do as the Plaintiffs' Counsel did on Friday:  
to look at that document of incorporation, the Articles.

A I will not trouble you to get it out now because I know how  
troublesome it is to refer to documents that are not con-  
veniently to hand, but I will remind you of certain passages  
B in it. It contains a great deal of verbiage, and a number  
of rather pompous words which are not infrequently, I think,  
to be found in documents which emanate from American lawyers,  
but it starts off, you see, by saying:

C "The Process-Church of the Final Judgement,  
domiciled in...Orleans...duly represented herein by  
Father John (C.A.Fripp)" -

that is the gentleman, of course, we saw in the witness box -  
-"Chancellor of the Church" -

who started his career as a chartered accountant, but for-  
sook it for the pursuit of this form of theology, if that is  
the right word. Father Micah was also, apparently, a founding  
member. It is described as a "religious non-profit  
corporation", incorporated (oddly enough) in the first  
instance for 99 years. Then, in the third Article, we find  
its Objects and Purposes set out, and I am going to trouble  
you with them, because some of them are not without their  
importance in relation to the matters you have to consider  
in this action. They say it

- "has been called into existence by GOD to be made  
known to all men that the latter days are upon us".  
It "is organised to be operated exclusively as a non-  
profit religious institution for the administration  
of assets, funds...property" and so on.

Among its objects is occult - "occult research". Its next  
purpose is said to be:

"To maintain, own and operate institutions of  
spiritual learning on all levels, and in these  
institutions...to teach all branches of the academic  
arts and sciences as well as the occult arts; to  
instruct the young of The Americas in all branches  
of science and the occult mysteries".

And it goes on to emphasise it:

"The...Church shall have as one of its purposes the power to receive grants from other foundations and persons to expedite spiritual and occult research in all areas of discovery".

Then it goes on to deal with stipends and grants, and

"the discoveries that are made through its facilities in the areas of science and of the arts and in the occult and magical arts" - "magical arts" - "and to dispose by sale, lease or other contractual arrangements of the fruits of its labor".

I suppose that is a polite way of saying they are going to sell those magazines. It goes on to refer to further objects;

"to operate its own media for printed matter... (a) typesetting equipment; (b) printing presses and equipment", and so on.

Then when you get to Article IV there is a bit more about its constitution:

"The offices of this incorporation shall consist of a Teacher and a Pontiff and a Master Treasurer and a Chancellor" -

we know that the Teacher is Mr de Grimston, whom we have not had the pleasure of seeing; and the Chancellor is Mr Fripp -

"who shall be members of all Councils and Consistories of the Church ex officio...And the High Pontiff...shall rule over the entire Church and hold office for life on election by the High Council" -

of which each of the Plaintiffs are members -

"And the Pontiff shall exercise supreme power in all matters of administration... And the Teacher shall appoint Masters to rule, administer and govern all of the Spheres",

and he shall issue things called "bulls of authority" for the consecration of Masters. It goes on to talk about the "High Council"; and later on, after referring to various Chapters, which include matriarchs and patriarchs, and the establishment of those Chapters, it says

"appointed directly by the Teacher who is the Voice of GOD on Earth and the Teacher of all faith and morals unto the faithful".

A Then it goes on to provide about the Council of Masters and  
its composition, and so on. Later on you find the various  
grades identified: the initiates, the acolytes and similar  
B ranks or grades. I am not going to inflict all the detail  
of it on you, but that is the nature of the corporation  
which says their reputation has been damaged and that they  
ought to receive a substantial sum of money.

C It is interesting to note, too, that Members of the  
High Council may resign by written resignation, but these -  
that is, the resignations - shall not be effective until  
accepted by the Pontiff. At the end are signatures of the  
various officials, including Father John or Mr Fripp.

D Members of the Jury, I have troubled you with that in  
some little detail because I think it is important to bear  
in mind the claims to the divine authority which this body  
makes through its Teacher, Mr de Grimston, whom, as I say, we  
E have not seen.

F I ought, perhaps, to mention that there is a re-  
statement of the constitution - the copy in my bundle is  
dated 20 August 1969 - that, it is interesting to observe,  
is signed by Wendy A. Peach, C. De Peyer and C. Fripp,  
the three individual Plaintiffs in this case. Then there  
follows, in the bundle I am looking at, the letter from the  
G Charity Commissioners - who are, of course, a body in this  
country - recording that the Process-Church has been  
registered here as a charity. The letter includes a request  
that a statement of account of the affairs of the charity  
H covering the charity's last completed accounting period may  
be sent to the Commissioners at the end of the year. Well,

A at an early stage of this case some reference was made to  
the accounts, but we have not seen them. We do not know how  
much money was collected, on what it was spent; and, looking  
B at it purely as a matter of material loss, I hope it is  
accurate to say that there has been no evidence before us  
that any donation or subscription or form of income has been  
lost on any view as a result of the publication of the  
C matters complained of in this case. But I think I am right  
in saying again, in reference to any figure we have heard,  
that the father of the De Peyer brothers was incensed because  
the brother in question had parted with £30,000 to the  
Plaintiff Corporation.

D We also know, of course, that the three individual  
Plaintiffs, Fripp, De Peyer and Mrs Coale, as she now is,  
all gave the same address in New York where, I suppose, they  
are all established together.

E What of the Defendants? They are publishers. As  
publishers of course they bear responsibility for what they  
publish and sell to the public. I am not going to read out  
again what we have heard more than once in this case, those  
F long passages set out in the Statement of Claim of which com-  
plaint is made; and I dare say you have all read at any rate  
parts, if not the whole, of this book which is the foundation  
of this action. You may think - I do not know - that it is a  
G most unpleasant book, the kind of book that is likely only  
to be put out by publishers--what in the trade is called an  
imprint, which is somewhat grubby; you would not have  
expected publishers of very high standing to produce a work  
H of that kind. Of course, you are not here to punish them



A for errors of taste. The question here is: What damage, if any, has been done to the reputation of the Plaintiffs?

B We have had some particulars of the home sales. I think they came to 1,929 home sales, and of the paperbacks we were told 20,000 were printed, there were no sales to the Commonwealth, but in South Africa we have been told that (I think it was) 3,225 copies were at any rate sent out. So that, at the highest, it is a sale altogether of 7,225 copies. I have already referred - and you have just been referred by Counsel for the Plaintiffs - to the fact that they obviously disseminated this rather disagreeable piece of literature, if that is the right word, with their eyes open knowing exactly what they were doing, and realising that it might result, as it has resulted, in a claim for damages for libel.

E As I say, there are two views about that. It may well be thought undesirable to deter the publication of matter which it is desirable the public should know or have before it; but if someone is improperly injured in his reputation then, of course, it would be right and proper that you should award damages.

G "But", say these Defendants, "we justify the admittedly defamatory matter which is contained in this book. We say that in substance what we published is true; alternatively", they say, "even if it isn't all true we have proved quite enough to render that which is untrue utterly unimportant".

A  
B  
C  
D  
E  
F  
G  
H  
Let me make, I hope, quite clear to you - and this is a matter of law - the position about justification in a libel action. It is open to a defendant to say "That which I published is true", but when he does that, the burden of establishing it is true rests on the defendant. When defamatory matter is published, so far as the law is concerned it is presumed to be untrue unless and until the defendant proves that it is true; and the burden rests on the defendant to satisfy you that it is true.

The next important question, the next vital matter for you to bear in mind throughout your consideration of this case, is the burden which rests on the Defendants in this context. What is that burden? I don't know whether any one of you have ever had to sit on a jury in a criminal case, considering whether a criminal charge has been established, so that you find an accused person guilty. If you have, you will have heard Counsel on both sides and the Judge remind a jury, and indeed probably remind them half a dozen times, that they must not convict unless they and each of them feel sure that the defendant is guilty. Sometimes the phrase is used that a criminal charge must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt, meaning a doubt for which reasons can be given; but in this case, in a civil case, where you are considering this plea of justification, the burden which rests on the Defendants is a quite different one and a lighter one. These Defendants do not have to prove the truth of what they said so that you feel sure in the sense I have just indicated; they have to establish it on what the law calls the balance of probabilities; in other words, they have to show that it is more probable than not that that which they have disseminated is true. I hope I have made clear the distinction between the burden of proof in a criminal case and the

burden which rests on the Defendants in a civil case such as this is.

A  
B  
C  
D  
At this point it is necessary for me to introduce you to another refinement of the law of libel which must figure, I think, significantly in this case. It arises from a statute which was passed in 1952, which contained, among other things, a provision - and I leave out words that don't matter - "In an action for libel in respect of words containing two or more distinct charges against the plaintiff" - we have got many more than two here - "a defence of justification shall not fail by reason only that the truth of every charge is not proved if" - and this is important - "the words not proved to be true do not materially injure the plaintiff's reputation having regard to the truth of the remaining charges".

E  
Those words are very important in this case, and you will notice that they postulate a scale or a standard by which the relative gravity or value of the different charges is to be measured. You, Members of the Jury, are the people that measure it.

F  
G  
H  
I will give an example. Forget about this case for the moment. Supposing there was an alleged libel containing six quite distinct charges, and you were to come to the conclusion that three of them were proved to be true on the balance of probabilities, but the other three were not proved to be true but really did not matter having regard to the gravity, as you saw it and as you assess it, of the remaining charges, in those circumstances, you would be justified, because of that section to which I have just referred, in saying that the libel has been justified, and that would result in a verdict for the defendants. I hope I have made that clear.

B That is the approach to the question of justification  
that you ought to adopt in this case, and it is for you, using  
your commonsense and your experience of the world. That is why  
juries are brought into these cases, because you are not only  
entitled, but you are required to apply your experience of the  
world and your knowledge and your own assessment of people and  
witnesses in arriving at answers to these questions for your-  
selves. So you have got to decide whether the Defendants have  
satisfied you that in substance they have justified the matters  
of which complaint is made in this case.

C I think it is convenient at once to start examining  
the defamatory meanings which the Plaintiffs themselves say are  
embodied in the words of which they complain. I hope you have  
got in front of you that list of defamatory meanings alleged  
D by the Plaintiffs, because this is what they say the words in  
the book complained of amount to. I repeat that I am not  
going to read again the horrible prose which is reproduced in  
the Statement of Claim. You have heard it often enough, and  
E your minds are full of it.

F If I may say so, (a) is plainly the most important  
of all these alleged defamatory meanings. This, of course,  
arises from that passage in the book which talks about "sleazo  
input", and it has been agreed in this case that "sleazo input"  
means, or at any rate can be regarded by us as, a malign  
influence. The meaning of which the Plaintiffs complain, the  
G meaning which they say, and I don't think it is really disputed,  
the words bore, is "That the first Plaintiffs" - that is the  
Process Church - "were a malign influence upon the notorious  
murderer Charles Manson". I think it is important to bear  
H in mind the word "a" there, "That the first Plaintiffs were a  
malign influence upon the notorious murderer Charles Manson",

A because you won't forget, of course, that the book itself refers to three quasi-religious bodies which are said to have been a malign influence on Manson.

B The general answer which the Defendants make was, first of all, that they were only one of three bodies alleged to have had a malign influence upon him. It is obviously quite impossible to assess what, if any, contribution any one of those particular bodies made. You cannot distribute the responsibility, if responsibility there was, between them, but it is said that C the Process Church was the first of the rather odd religious movements that Manson encountered.

D The Defendants ask you to say, or the Plaintiffs assert, that the church had some influence on Manson, a malign influence. Let me remind you: there is no question here of an intention to influence Manson in particular, and there is little or no evidence of any direct contact between Manson and the Process Church, but what is said here - and I will go later on E into the evidence that is relied on in support of it - is that here was a body disseminating literature of a particular kind, disseminating teaching of a particular kind, which was likely to have a profound and sinister, or perhaps "sinister" is too F strong a word, but disturbing influence on people who were unstable, people who were immature, people who were young and people who (if I may say so) had not got the sense to avoid the unpleasantnesses of life.

G You won't forget the argument - it is for you to say what you think of it; it is not for me - of some rather reckless H person who distributes a number of boxes of matches to a group of little boys, and one of them in the result sets fire to a haystack; and, say the defendants, the person who so distributes that dangerous inflammatory substance must bear a measure of

A responsibility and can fairly be regarded as having a malign influence on the little boy who ultimately sets fire to the haystack.

B The Defendants, of course, also point out the history as we have had it of the development - or "growth" is perhaps a better word - of the Process Church, how they all dressed in black at one point, how it toned down a bit later on and they changed it to blue, in which some of them appeared in Court, and we have heard about the sign of Satan embroidered on their garments in New York, although apparently that sign was abandoned after, I think, about two and a half years, emphasising, of course, their theory that Satan was one of their Gods; and we had the evidence of that Mr Fitzgerald, the lawyer who conducted the defence, or, at any rate, led the defence of Manson and his co-defendants when they were being tried for murder. He gave evidence as a result of a fairly long study obviously of the activities and beliefs of Manson and his associates as he learned them.

E He was asked: "From your knowledge of the Manson case, were there any features of his philosophy which were similar to that?"; that is to say, the doctrines of the Process Church. F He said: "Yes, there were. (Q) Can you tell us about that? (A) There are a number of similarities between the apparent doctrine of the Process Church and Manson's beliefs. Firstly, Manson believed that the end of the world was imminent". That is common, of course, no doubt, to a number of religious G organisations, but it does, you will observe, figure very prominently in the literature of the Process Church. "It was almost upon him. He further felt that he was some sort of a prophet and that it was his almost spiritually ordained duty H to ferment, to encourage, to promote, this final catastrophic

A  
B  
C  
D  
E  
F  
G  
H  
event that would result in the end of the world. Secondly, he felt and believed that he and his chosen few, that he referred to as his family, after having instigated and promoted this inevitable event, would escape to a place of safety, to a desert area in California. Thirdly, that he and his group, at the conclusion of devastation that would result from this catastrophic end of the world, like war, would return and live in a sort of everlasting peace and harmony".

I went on to say "Can we summarise this", but I am afraid I was not very successful. At any rate, that is the view put forward by Mr Fitzgerald of what he calls "the philosophy of Manson", which it is said finds many many echoes in the various documents we have had to look at which embody the teaching of the Process Church as (the word is) revealed to Mr De Grimston.

You will remember, too, the evidence of Professor Gibbens and the Dean of St. Paul's. I am not going to trouble you again with all that literature which appears in the Process magazines, although it is relevant to remember, and I think important to bear in mind throughout your consideration of this case, that at any rate for a very long time - in the case of the Sex issue I think something like two years - the sale of those publications on the streets was the chosen vehicle for disseminating their views.

I don't suppose that any of us will ever be able to forget page 15 of the Sex issue with the matter that it contains, the matter which Mr Fripp had to accept in cross-examination was filth; and you won't forget the comment upon it made, I think, in the first place, by Professor Gibbens, a Professor of Psychology at London University, who pointed out with emphasis that in the course of that closely printed filth

A  
B  
C  
there was not one word to reconcile the matter set out with any moral teaching, any suggestion that it was a bad and dangerous line of conduct to pursue; on the contrary, the most appalling sexual depravity is there set out in detail, and indeed in the printed matter, as well as in the page that precedes it, and on the cover of that issue, are set out, with a wealth of detail, the attractions of the black mass: the naked woman lying on the altar and the cross of Christ turned upside down, and so on. We have had the advantage, of course, of the evidence of the Dean of St. Paul's, pointing out that matter of that kind in the hands of young, unsophisticated and impressionable people may, in his view, be harmful. I think he said it caused him grave concern.

D  
E  
F  
Although I am not wishing for one moment to underestimate the value of the evidence we had from those eminent gentlemen, Professor Gibbens and the Dean of St. Paul's, you may think - and again it is a matter of fact for you and you alone - it was not necessary to recruit eminent professors or great church leaders to state what, on one view of this case, you may think is blindingly obvious. Here it is perhaps very good subject-matter to which you can without much difficulty apply your commonsense.

G  
H  
If that leaves you with very much doubt, you are, of course, entitled to consider the evidence of that young woman Miss Ventris. She may have struck you as a rather good example of an unsophisticated person; I don't know. I think it is perhaps worth reminding you of how she described the impact on herself of her association with the Process Church. She has apparently now turned to Buddhism instead, but fortunately we have not got to go into that; we can confine ourselves to her activities with the Process Church, with which she came into



A contact, she told us, in 1965 or 1966, because she heard  
someone talking about it at a party. She attended the premises  
in Wigmore Street, and there she says: "I first saw Robert  
De Grimston. He gave me an interview. I can't remember what  
happened. I had to sign some document about responsibility of  
joining if I joined and got ill. It was my responsibility. I  
B think it specified mental illness".

C That piece of evidence was not in any way challenged,  
and if it be true that it was thought necessary to make a  
potential convert sign a document that she was joining on her  
own responsibility, and if she got ill, no-one else would have  
to carry any responsibility, and that it specified mental  
D illness, it is for you to consider whether or not it does throw  
some light on the technique of the Process Church as applied  
to its converts.

E She said: "I signed on to do a course of sessions,  
individual sessions. After a few months I joined a communica-  
tions course. Mary Anne De Grimston conducted the sessions  
with me. The idea was to eliminate personal problems by a  
series of questions, 'What is your Problem?', 'What are you  
achieving?', and there was an E-meter, a form of lie detector.  
F I held a cylinder, with a flex attached to a dial, and  
Mrs De Grimston could see the dial".

G You remember what Sir Martin Roth, the psychiatrist  
from Newcastle, said about the E-meter. He described it - I  
am paraphrasing - as a perfectly useless and defective piece  
of apparatus, and I think suggested that it was really designed  
to impress the patient with the idea that something tremendously  
H significant was happening.

She went on to say: "I had sessions with other people.  
They were the same; in a way very friendly, in a way very

ferocious. Mrs De Grimston was determined she would get you through the questions you were answering. The first series made you more and more depressed, till you reached a certain point. That happened. If I was desperate, I could ring up Mary Anne De Grimston. You could do physical exercises with a therapist, being led round a room and touching certain objects under direction: walls, books, etc. It was called physical reorientation. I felt marginally better when in contact with reality. I was touched. The therapist's finger moved around your body from place to place. You gave a response each time you were touched. It was on ordinary parts of the body; not sexual parts. I have had a hundred or so sessions over a year and a half. I was 18 or 19 at this time". You remember that before she went to the Process Church, she was apparently already in the hands of a psychiatrist, I suppose receiving some sort of treatment.

"The communication course was an exercise in communication in pairs under supervision. First, you had to look into each other's eyes. You had to acknowledge communications. You said 'All right, thanks; fine'. They progressed to more difficult ones like expressing strong emotions which were presented to you. Some would be very angry and shout at you. That was the practice. They would pretend to be a patient in a serious way. Then behaving badly. Then there were insults which were shouted at you"; and she gave some examples of them.

"You had to avoid being upset. I went twice a week for about a year. I had intensive treatment at that time, with different partners. I was discouraged from having contact with the outside world. We were the elect and we were to survive the holocaust, which was expected within 50 years. Some of it occurred in Balfour Place. I was then living on an allowance

from my mother of £10 a week. After we moved to Balfour Place I had to give the £10 a week to the Process. The inheritance I had got whittled away. I spent it on sessions. Before we moved we paid for each session 3 guineas. They were sessions of two hours, the total being 6 guineas. Balfour Place started about a year and a bit after I started. Then I did not pay for services at the beginning. The communications course was £100 or so. We seemed to stay in a group of about 20. There were five or six of my age, most older, the oldest I think 35. My contact with my mother still continued because I was still a minor. They suggested I should get a job as well. I did so", and she told you about earning money at a florists, I think, in Oxford Street, and she had to give over the money that she earned; "but they were not very grateful". The secretary who received the money apparently was Christopher Fripp. "The De Grimstons lived at the top of the house. The De Grimstons were running it. It was very strict. At first she was very kind and then very severe. There were accusations of personal weakness. Mostly I felt that the accusations were quite true. My feeling of weakness had nothing to do with my involvement with the Process. They seemed to be in favour of reincarnation. She said 'I might have been a German'. Then there was mentioned a switch to religion. Mary Anne said, 'How do you feel about becoming a religion?' She said that to the group at Wigmore Street. The group was surprised and we burst out laughing, but had to go along with it. You could not deviate if you belonged to the group. Several people left.

"In the summer of 1966 I went to the Bahamas in a group. Christopher De Peyer also went. Most of us went in a bunch. I arrived before the De Grimstons and Fripp, three weeks before. We had a nice time in the Bahamas. When the

B  
C  
D  
E  
F  
G  
De Grimstons and Fripp arrived it was not a nice time. There was a tightening up of discipline all round. We began courses and sessions. Then we moved to Mexico, Mexico City. Then Sisal and Xtul. There was a short time in the village and we all moved to Xtul in the end. The first part of the day was spent in manual labour and the afternoons to ourselves. There were discussions and spiritual meetings. I remember the temple at Xtul. We had vigils there and self-flagellation. I flagellated myself with a knotted rope. When you had sinned, you expiated like that. It was a sin to disagree with the dogma of Process or to fall asleep during meetings. You went off to the temple and you flagellated yourself. It was obvious when it was happening. It was usually about six strokes. Most gave themselves more, up to about 60. One or two got hysterical. Most of the men had bruises on their backs. I saw them when they were stripped for washing. If on all night vigil, it went on for many hours. De Peyer introduced the idea of self-flagellation to me. At first there was only one rope available, and then we had to queue. Mary Anne suggested we should wear ropes all the time. In the end we did. I am sure she did not flagellate herself. I don't think he did, but Fripp flagellated himself badly. I thought he must be a masochist. A girl who beat herself and got hysterics required my help and I slapped her face. She was a girl of 19 or 20. Most of us were referred to by characters in the New Testament. Mary Anne suggested Jezebel for me".

H  
Then she went through a number of members of the Process and identified their names. I don't think that adds very much to it. Fripp at that time was Aaron and De Peyer was Ahab, and somebody else was Caleb; but Mrs De Grimston, she said, did no work. "She was very particular about her meals.

A They had to be different from us and had to be served at the right time. If late, she was angry. We had to bring water from a well a mile away for her to wash. The weather was fine. I remember somebody called Claudia. The Seniors lived in a separate room and had large mugs for their tea". Then she referred to some row about having the wrong mug.

B Then ultimately apparently a solicitor called Greenby, who was, I think she said, employed by the parents of one or more of the people under age who were at Mexico, came and fetched her home, and she said she was very glad about it.

C I have troubled you with that detail, a little tedious, but it may be important for you to consider as an example of the kind of thing about which the Dean of St. Paul's and Professor Gibbens were speaking when they referred to the influence that the publications of the Process were likely to achieve on unsophisticated minds. You will remember how D Sir Martin Roth, the psychiatrist, spoke. I need not refer to it in detail, but he spoke at some length about what, in his E view, were the dangers attendant on the conduct of sessions carried out in accordance with the book of practice directions. We fortunately have not had to go through it ourselves, but he F had it in front of him. He indicated that that technique, administered by unqualified people, resulting (his phrase was, I think) in the indoctrination of individuals, might have very serious consequences. He also spoke at some length about the G E-meter. We need not worry about that.

H You will do well to recollect, I think, the evidence of Miss Ventris, coupled with the evidence of Sir Martin Roth, the Dean of St. Paul's and Professor Gibbens about the probable impact of the sort of propaganda to which the young members of the Process were exposed.

You had some fairly particular evidence, you will recollect, from Mr Geraghty, the journalist who investigated the Process for, I think it was, the Daily Mirror. He said: "I had an interview with a member of the church, Father Christian (Jonathan De Peyer), at the Process Church in Boston, the headquarters there. There was a reference to Charles Manson. The reference to Manson resulted from my knowledge that 'The Family' had been written. I asked De Peyer about the allegations made about the organisation in that book. In varying degrees he admitted there had been contact with Manson. The most definite contact was that Manson had been invited to write for the Process Church in its magazine. He admitted he may have met Manson, but it was all slightly ambiguous" - it is fair to the Plaintiffs to recollect that he did emphasise that it was all slightly ambiguous - "when they were both in San Francisco. He qualified that by saying that he met many other people in San Francisco as well. He was handing out literature, and that was the situation. He told me Mrs De Grimston was styled 'Hecate'. I asked about Brother Eli. He had been an Inner Processean. He commented that Brother Eli's Satanist instructor had made him incapable of accepting the discipline and that Eli had dropped out. De Peyer said his family had objected to his becoming a member of the church and had attempted to persuade him to resume his former life in London, but his father was now reconciled to his position in the church. De Peyer at this time was between 29 and 30. De Peyer suggested that Manson had taken some of the doctrines of the Process Church and had distorted them, and identified Manson, who had an affinity with Satan rather than one of the other deities".

I will deal with other parts of the evidence which may or may not be relevant to this first complaint that the

first Plaintiffs were a malign influence on Manson when I come to deal with other sub-paragraphs of the meanings alleged by the Plaintiffs. But one has to face the fact, does one not, that the Defendants' case about the Process Church - and for this purpose I am not distinguishing between the Process Church and the individual Plaintiffs - is a matter of inference?

You may think there is no direct evidence of it, and it is a matter of inference to be drawn, if drawn at all, in part from beliefs held in common, in part from the technique of (I think the right word is) domination which the Process Church adopted; and it is a matter of common knowledge, and I suppose it is relevant for you to bear in mind, that with people of the kind with whom they are dealing, there is always a tendency to imitate. If an example is set, that example I suppose may be said to exert an influence.

So that the Defendants' case in regard to that first statement that the first Plaintiffs were a malign influence on Manson is entirely a matter of inference for you, and it is for you to decide whether, on the balance of probabilities, you think the Defendants have established that case. It has been described by the Defendants' Counsel as the crux of this matter, and you may think it is very important. If the evidence you have heard satisfies you, on the balance of probabilities, that they were a malign influence on Manson, then you would in regard to this matter, of course, find in favour of the Defendants.

Then comes the next allegation, "That the first Plaintiffs indulged in violence, sexual orgies, satanic ceremonies and occult rituals". As to that, the Defendants, of course, relied on the passage from the constitution which I read out to you at the beginning of this summing-up. You

remember the references there to occult sciences and magic and the picture of the black mass on the cover of the Sex issue, and the article written in the terms on page 15 by someone who is described as "Satan's advocate". That, they say, justifies the use of that phrase "satanic ceremonies and occult rituals".

B As to "sexual orgies", again reliance is placed on that Sex issue, and it is for you to say, first of all, how important that particular meaning is in relation to the other matters complained of, and whether you think, again, that the literature you have examined justifies that statement.

C Then "That the first Plaintiffs used pain, fear, drugs and sexual initiation rites to secure instant obedience from their followers". As to pain, we have heard, of course, about the flagellation and fear and domination by Mrs De Grimston. As to drugs and sexual initiation, you may think we have heard little or nothing, unless, of course, again, you would regard that picture on the cover of the Sex issue as justifying that statement. But the words "to secure instant obedience from their followers" you may think is fairly clearly established from the evidence of Miss Ventris, if you accept it. It is a matter entirely for you to consider. If you take out "drugs and sexual initiation" you may think - I do not know - that that meaning is established, but does not add very much to the others.

G Then the allegation (d), "That the first Plaintiffs encouraged and wanted war". I am not going to take you through any of this literature at any length. You have not got to look very far. If you care to turn to page 104 of "The Gods on War", you may think you don't have to go very much further.



A This, bear in mind, "The Gods on War", is recorded by  
Robert De Grimston. At 104: "I am the body and the soul of  
man. Whilst the Fiend of the body is enslaved by the fearful  
mind, the soul is imprisoned. Only when the Fiend is released  
B can the soul be free. So I, Satan, am come to release the  
Fiend, to let him loose upon the earth for the latter days, so  
that the world shall end with nothing less than the ultimate  
destruction of total War. And those who accept the End, and  
C play their part, together with the Fiend, in bringing about  
the End; those who stand proud and fearless in the midst of  
the End, and wield with Me the Sword of Ultimate Destruction;  
they shall rule with Me when humanity is dead; and after, seek  
D freedom with Me in the conquest of the Universe. But those  
who seek to stay My hand, to chain the Fiend, to cripple the  
engines of death and prevent the inevitable End, they shall be  
doomed to failure; dismal, futile, worthless failure. For the  
E End must be, and none shall prevent or postpone it". Then  
there is the final paragraph: "And stride with Satan's Army  
to the End"

F You will remember the importance of the figure of  
Satan in "The Gods and Their People", which the Dean of  
St. Paul's dwelt on at some length - that is page 9 - where  
Satan occupies two out of four parallel columns, and under  
"Satan" there is: "Detachment, Mysticism, Otherworldliness,  
G Magic, Asceticism, Superhumanity", and under "Satan" on the  
left are the activities which would be perhaps more normally  
associated with him.

H As I say, I am not going to trouble you with the  
detail of literature which you have had to attend to so  
carefully through all these days, but there is the material

A  
relied upon to justify the statements that the first Plaintiffs encouraged and wanted war. I don't think I need say any more about it.

B  
Then (e), "That the first Plaintiffs wanted to assist to bring about the end of the world and believed that they, the first Plaintiffs, would be the sole survivors of the end of the world".

C  
Now, look at "If a Man Asks". I am looking at the last paragraph on page 44 at the moment. "For a tree that brings forth corrupt fruit, however harmless and pure each twig or leaf may seem to be, is hewn down and cast into the fire. And such is humanity; such is the world of men. A few shall be saved, but that shall not save the tree".

D  
Then at page 49, in very heavy print: "Who shall be doomed for all eternity and who shall be raised up in the Final Judgement of the world of men? Say to him Christ said: 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth'".

E  
Then if we go on to pages 56 and 58: "But when judgement, condemnation, chastisement and destruction are required from them, the meek do not hesitate to strike, with devastating power and precision, at the very root of that which is to be brought down and destroyed. And the meek are not the cringing and fearful. Because they do not feel inadequate, they do not Have to assert themselves. Because they do not feel insignificant, they do not Have to draw attention to themselves. Because they do not feel basically wrong, they do not Have to be always right. Because they do not feel stupid or ignorant, they do not Have to know better than everyone else", and so on. Then there are further indications of the meek taking a pretty active part in the end of the world;

F  
G  
H

A and they say: "And such is the road to Salvation. For it is written: 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth'".

B Then, of course, "The Gods on War", in which you may think it is tolerably clear that the end of the world was to be talked about and to be brought about by the war which the Plaintiffs wished to encourage; at least, that is the substance of the matter as the Defendants in this case construe it, and they say that is the only sensible way of looking at it.

C Then (f), "That the first Plaintiffs believed Robert De Grimston to be Christ". You have had some evidence about that from Mr Maxwell. I will remind you of what Maxwell said. and how he described his visit to Balfour Place. He said: "I  
D visited Balfour Place, a very large house, a panelled hall, two entrances. I went through the front door. Coffee bar below. Inside the hall there was a table on which all sorts of publications were sold. There was a very large photograph of  
E Robert De Grimston with a beard, deliberately looking or made to look like Christ. There were two lights directed at the photograph, which gave the effect of a halo behind his head. Everything was very expensive. The coffee bar was expensively  
F fitted. There were photographs of Xtul, and members claimed that it was a place of magic in Mexico. I had discussions with people at the coffee bar about the Process. They said I would  
G have to study their literature and attend some of their meetings. I met Christopher De Peyer. I tried to discuss matters with him". Then he told us the books were sold for £2, £1. 10. 0. and £3, I think he said. "I tried to talk to him about the  
H things I had read. I found it impossible to learn anything. If I asked him about anything, his reply would be something else

A  
from the magazine." It is for you to consider whether you  
think that answer rings rather true when you heard these  
gentlemen cross-examined in this case.

B "If I did not understand, he said you will have to  
come into the group, and as you get further into it, you will  
know what it means. All their faces and their voices were the  
same. There was no individuality among them. Even their  
C physical movements were the same. They were slow and gentle.  
As to Robert and Mary De Grimston, I asked to see them, but  
they were never available and could not be seen by anybody.  
I attended a therapy session with 15 to 20 people. Some  
Processeans were living on the premises and some were not.  
D There was very dim lighting; joss sticks were burning. In the  
middle was something with a black cloth over it. The sessions  
were led by an attractive blonde girl in a black dress,  
E wearing black boots, very clinging from the waist down. There  
was a sensual atmosphere, like a revivalist meeting. We all  
got tin cans and spoons and had to beat them. We sat on the  
floor and beat on our tin cans on the instructions from the  
F blonde lady. Boots of that kind were not yet in fashion.  
They were what later became known as 'kinky' boots. There were  
chants about Satan, Lucifer and Jehovah. One of their beliefs  
was that the Jews in Germany wanted to be killed because they  
G had guilt feelings about the Crucifixion. I read that in one  
of their publications. I asked about it at one of the  
sessions, but I did not get any answer that I could  
H understand".

A Then on the alleged identity of de Grimston and Christ,  
you remember he referred to the Fear issue of the magazine,  
which contained that quite remarkable photograph inside the  
cover - I think it is not the only one of its kind - where  
B you are invited to take the view that de Grimston is there  
deliberately photographed in a way calculated to cause con-  
fusion between him and the popular conception of Christ.

Then (g), that is:

C "That the First Plaintiffs have as their leader a woman  
who believes herself to be the reincarnation of  
Goebbels".

No attempt has been made to justify that, and it is quite  
plain that that must be thrown away; but the rest of the  
D statement:

"That the First Plaintiffs...support and encourage  
sycophantic devotion to her",

of course again depends on the evidence of Miss Ventris.

E Then (h):

"That the First Plaintiffs worship the god of human  
sacrifice, blood-shed and theft",

again reliance is placed by the Defendants there on The  
F Gods on War. There was a particular passage, at page 61 to  
which your attention was drawn. It is not the only one:

G "Blood is the currency of WAR, and nothing less than  
bankruptcy the stake. Death is the master of the game;  
not death at the end of life when life has been lived  
and glorified; not as the natural termination when  
all has been fulfilled; but death when life is just  
beginning, death when joy is on the threshold, death  
when only life is meaningful",

and so on. And the last paragraph:

H "And the materials of WAR are men; strong men, noble  
men, brave men, handsome men, lords of all creation.  
And in WAR they are nothing".

A That is relied upon as an indication of the admiration of human sacrifice, as revealed again by Mr de Grimston, whose picture again appears in the frontispiece of this book.

B As to human sacrifice, of course once again the Plaintiffs rely on the picture on the front of the Sex issue, which was ultimately admitted by more than one witness to be a picture of the black mass, the naked woman lying on the altar, being, I suppose, the human sacrifice.

C Then (j):

"That the First Plaintiffs were divided into three groups" -

that, I think, is common ground -

D -"one of which indulged in beating each other and in self-flagellation"---

MR KEMPSTER: I am sorry, my Lord, I believe you have missed out (i), I am sure inadvertently, about the "followers of the First Plaintiffs injured a recalcitrant follower".

E MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: We were expressly told that that was not justified.

MR KEMPSTER: Yes, certainly.

MR JUSTICE STEVENSON: I am sorry, I ought to have said so.

F MR KEMPSTER: I thought your Lordship was going through the meanings.

G MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I had forgotten to remind the Jury that the Defendants certainly made it quite clear that (i) - that is, the shock treatment one - no attempt has been made to justify. I am obliged, I ought to have mentioned that and I had inadvertently forgotten.

H Then (j):

"That the First Plaintiffs were divided into three groups" -

that, as I say, is common ground -

A        -"one of which indulged in beating each other and in self-flagellation and another composed of people who were cold, calculating, cruel and violent".

B        We have had no evidence, I think I am right in saying, of beating each other; but we certainly have had evidence of self-flagellation. Indeed, it is not disputed; and if any C        corroboration of it were wanted, of course, there is a gentleman on the right of the Sex cover wearing his knotted rope, which was part of the uniform which apparently was issued after the one rope, for which they queued, was not enough. D        So that we certainly have some evidence as to self-flagellation. The adjectives "cold, calculating, cruel and violent" are, I suppose, descriptions of the characteristics of different groups.

      Then (k):

E        "That the First Plaintiffs were interested in voodoo". Voodoo, I think can be fairly described as witchcraft and sorcery emanating mostly, I think, from native Africa. Again the cover of Sex is relevant there; and so, of course, is one of the pages of Sex where the various "Process scenes" F        are advertised. That is at page 32. In the middle there is a photograph of Process House in the circle; and, among other attractions, the "Trials of the Pope, The Royal Family, Sex, Hitler, The Hippies, Drugs" and "Black Magic".

G        You will also remember the correspondence - there is a big bundle of correspondence, I do not want to inflict much on you - with outside speakers. The second letter in my bundle of that correspondence, which is dated 8 October 1968, H        is addressed to a Miss Justine Glass by somebody called Sister Mercedes Leah and says:

"Thank you for agreeing to talk here, at The Process, on Tuesday, 12th November, on the Sixth Sense and Witchcraft. I look forward to making your acquaintance, and hearing you speak on this fascinating topic".

Then Mr Smythe is addressed in the next letter:

"Thank you for agreeing to speak here on Tuesday, 29th October, on witchcraft... We have a fairly small, but receptive audience who like to attend our meetings".

Father Dominic Luther writes on 28 July to:

"Dear Miss Godfrey-White, We look forward to having you here on Tuesday, August 13th to speak on 'Ceremonial Magic'".

And on 18 July<sup>1968</sup>/someone called Mr Gerard Noel is written to:

"Enclosed is a list of our current Process scenes", and on August 13th they were to be treated to "Ceremonial Kabbalistic Magic". Frater Methratten of The Hermetic Order of the Sacred Word was apparently going to be the lecturer. Then on 4 May 1968 someone called Romeo Ferrao is writing to Brother Dominic:

"Thank you very much indeed for allowing me to visit the Cavern" -

I think that was the name of the coffee bar -

"-and to talk to you about the Order of the Cubic Stone. I suggest you write to Robert Turner and ask him to lecture at the PROCESS".

Then on 11 March 1968 Brother Dominic Luther again is writing to Francis Huxley:

"We at The Process saw your appearance on television a few weeks ago and were impressed both by your experiences with Voodoo and with your presentation of them".

On 14 February, again Brother Dominic Luther is writing to a Mr Larkman of Luton:

"We at The Process have a series of weekly scenes on Tuesday evenings during which we examine unusual subjects, often associated with religion and the black arts".



Well, Members of the Jury, you may think that those documents, this advertisement and so on, go some way to justify a statement "That the First Plaintiffs were interested in voodoo".

Then as to (1):

"That some of the followers of the First Plaintiffs suggested a mass rape or sexual orgy upon certain females 'bf the First Plaintiffs".

That, of course, is largely based on the evidence of this young man Mr Pearlstein. You will recollect what he said about it. I have his evidence in a transcript. He described, if you remember, that Father Eli asked him to dispose, on his behalf, of a quantity of opium and mescaline because he was leaving with a party for Los Angeles. He said, "Can you get rid of it for me?". Mr Pearlstein said: "That amazed me, since at the time when I guess the period of initiation started he had become celibate and given up smoking, tobacco or drugs. I had presumed he had continued that". Mr Neill said:

"He asked you, because he wanted to be clear for the journey, 'clean' in the sense of without anything against the law, if you could dispose of these two things for him; that is, the opium and a quantity of mescaline? (A) Yes. (Q) What did you say to that? (A) I had been in the back of the house with the people from New Orleans a week prior to that".

Then I came in, quoting him:

"I had been at the back of the house with the Luciferians"; is that right? (A) Yes; and they had been talking in a manner relatively consistent with the way the people in what is known as the Haight Ashbury at that time talked about drugs, about parties, about swimming and things".

He is asked to explain that and he said it was a district in San Francisco. He said:

"It became almost the generic term for what became known as hippie".

Then he is asked not to be diffident about what the Luciferians said. He is asked:

A

"At that stage was there any conversation you remember among the group of Luciferians? (A) There was a quote which I quoted in the article I wrote. It seems rather out of place in this Court".

He had to be encouraged not to be shy here. He is told:

B

"I think you must not be diffident about it, Mr Pearlstein. Tell us what it was that was then said and which you printed in the newspaper. (A) All right".

I tell him:

C

"We have gone past surprise or shock in this Court. (A) I have not been here before. They were talking in lockerroom manner, very easy. One of them said, 'Let's take all the drugs and go gang-fuck those prissy Jehovian bitches'. (Q) This is one of the Luciferians? (A) Yes. I could not identify him. (Q) Never mind. One of the Luciferians said, 'Let's take all the drugs' - right? (A) 'Let's take them', referring to the drugs. (Q) - 'and go and fuck those prissy Jehovian bitches' - right?".

D

Mr Neill asks:

"I think, when you first told us, it was 'gang-fuck', the phrase you used; is that right? (A) Yes".

Then he is asked:

E

"The phrase 'gang-fuck', was that your phrase or theirs? (A) That was theirs. (Q) How many female Jehovians were available; do you know? (A) No, I would not know. I would imagine several".

F

That is relied upon as justification that "some of the followers of the First Plaintiffs suggested a mass rape or sexual orgy upon certain female followers of the First Plaintiffs".

G

The next two, (m) and (n), which have been read to you already, about the Gypsy Jokers and so on, are not justified, but we have got, of course, the amendment of the Deference which says [page 43, No.26]:

H

"These Defendants will contend that there were marked similarities between the First Plaintiffs and the Charles Manson Group in the combination of an absolute leader, the use of exotic garb, the subtle but persistent breakdown of personality in the Group sessions and the

use of drugs, the distinctive symbol used, the interest in the excitement of speed, especially as exemplified by motorcyclists" -

and you remember to support that there is reliance on the illustration in the Fear issue, page 23. You have all got that illustration in mind, I need not remind you of it. It is not worth going through the whole thing again.

- "especially as exemplified by motorcyclists and the teaching of the First Plaintiffs and the Charles Manson group relating to the end of the world" -

that I have dealt with -

- "black magic, witchcraft, animals, reincarnation and the unity of Christ and Satan".

You have had abundantly explained to you from the literature what the so-called teachings of this body are about all those matters. So far as the animals are concerned, you, of course, have been through that very unpleasant volume about vivisection, and you will find in one of the letters to the outside speakers an appeal to a lady in Tunbridge Wells whose interest is enlisted in that respect.

Members of the Jury, it is no easy task that faces you to put within a scale of values the relative gravity of the matters complained of here so far as you think they are not justified. If you think that grave matters - in particular the malign influence, the alleged malign influence, on Manson - is a justified or a justifiable inference here (and that has been described as the crux of this case) you may think that the other accusations add very little to it. If you were to come to that conclusion you may think that the right answer here would be a judgment for the Defendants as against each of the Plaintiffs. For myself, I can find no basis for directing you that the position of the individual

Plaintiffs differs. They are, of course, all members of what may be described as the governing body of the Plaintiffs' church, and they have all accepted responsibility for, and acceptance of, its teachings. So that it is a little difficult, is it not, to except any one of them from responsibility for those teachings if you are satisfied as to the quality and effect of the matter that was disseminated by the Plaintiff church? I hope that that is not unfair to any one of the individuals. I am most anxious not to be unfair. I repeat, it is entirely a matter for you.

Now may I go back for a moment to the question of damages. Supposing you think that there is surviving here in all this material a defamatory imputation which injures the reputation of the Plaintiffs, or any or all of them, but which has not been justified in the sense in which I have explained justification to you, then, and only then, would you have to consider the question of damages. I have already dealt - and I hope dealt sufficiently - with the possibility of exemplary damages, which I have referred to in this case as "theoretical". I do not know whether you agree with me. But supposing you take the view that the Plaintiffs here have indeed established a defamatory imputation or imputations which the Defendants have failed to justify, of course you would have to consider the question of damages. You have got to consider to what extent, if at all, the reputation of any of these people has really been injured by that which was published. You have got to consider, too, whether people who are responsible for all the literature we have been looking at, those advertisements of films - I need not remind you - are really in a position to claim that their reputation is significantly injured by

A anything that has been put into that book. As I say, you  
would be wise, I think, to approach this case on the  
assumption that the allegation of malign influence on Manson  
is the crux of this case.

B But supposing you think that that allegation is not just-  
ified, you feel unable to draw the inference which the  
Defendants invite you to draw from the material they put  
before you, then you obviously have got to address your minds  
to the amount of damages that you ought to award. The only  
C advice I can give you about that is: In any event be moderate.  
And you may think - I do not know, and I am not seeking to  
put any idea into your heads - that having regard to all the  
material we have had to examine in this case, its quality, its  
D likely effect on the young and the impressionable which these  
people disseminated, if they have indeed been the victims of a  
defamatory imputation any damage they have suffered would be  
suitably recompensed by the smallest coin in circulation. It  
E used to be a farthing; of course it's a ha'penny now. But I  
am not seeking to influence you in that respect in any way;  
I am only mentioning that in order that you may have all the  
possibilities before you.

F A thought has occurred to me. Once you retire to consider  
your verdict you cannot disperse until you have arrived at it,  
and it might well be useful if we now adjourn until ten past  
G two. I will then add a few words, and you will then have the  
afternoon to consider your verdict.

(After a short adjournment):

H MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Now, Members of the Jury, I think  
there are only two things I need to add to the observations I  
made before we adjourned. Of one you have already been told,

A but it is, perhaps, desirable that I should remind you of it.  
Mr Ed Sanders, the author of the book, need not enter into  
your calculations so far as your present task is concerned,  
because, as you were told at an early stage in this action,  
B judgment by default was signed against him, he just did not  
appear in the action, and the result of that is that the  
Plaintiffs are left, if they are so minded, to go on and  
invite another Court to assess damages against him. So that  
C need not worry you, it need not affect your calculations in  
this case.

The other is this, as you have already been told. I  
think you have all got copies of the Questions which have been  
agreed with Counsel, have you not?

D MR NEILL: I do not think so. Copies are being made available.  
(Copies of Questions for the Jury circulated).

E MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I thought they had already been  
distributed. First of all, you realise that this deals, and  
deals only, with the cause of action in libel because, as you  
have already been told, the issue about inducing a breach of  
F contract is out of the way, so that there is no need to worry  
about that. These questions deal with the position of each  
of the Plaintiffs in turn: "Do you find for the First Plaintiffs  
for for the Defendants?", the First Plaintiffs being the church.  
"If" - and you observe that word "if" - "for the First Plaintiffs  
G what sum do you award by way of damages?". Those are two very  
simple questions. Then (3) is the corresponding question in  
relation to the Second Plaintiff, Mr Fripp. (5) and (6)  
relate to Mr De Peyer; and (7) and (8) to Mrs Coale or Miss  
H Peach. Then, if your copy is like mine, you will find a  
reference to inducement of breach of contract struck out.

A

I emphasise there is nothing for you to worry about. Have you all got this?

A JURYMAN: Yes.

B

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: If that be so, will you be good enough to retire and consider your verdict. You may want a lot of literature with you, I do not know. You certainly want the pleadings. You may want the book. You may want the volume about outside speakers, and I am prepared to listen to any suggestions from anybody. Do you want them to have The Shards of God?

C

MR KEMPSTER: I thought it would be wise for the members of the jury to take anything, because it is difficult to foresee what may be thought relevant.

D

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am only thinking of their portage capacity.

MR KEMPSTER: Doubtless the ushers can assist them.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: The ushers, in the plural.

E

(The Jury Bailiffs were sworn)

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I ought, perhaps, to have mentioned that, of course, what is required is a unanimous verdict. There is no machinery in civil cases -

F

MR KEMPSTER: Forgive my interrupting, my Lord, but there is, under the Courts Act.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Is there now?

MR KEMPSTER: Yes; but that occasion has not yet arisen.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: In a civil case?

G

MR KEMPSTER: Yes, on a majority verdict.

MR NEILL: I agree with that.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: I am very grateful to be corrected. I missed that.

MR KEMPSTER: It is sec.39(1) of the Courts Act 1971. You will find it in Vol.2 of the White Book, Part 9.A.

H

(The Jury retired at 2.15 and returned into Court at 5.20 p.m.)

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Members of the Jury, I don't know whether one of you has been appointed to speak as foreman.

A JUROR: Not as Foreman, but .....

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: To speak.

THE JUROR: Yes.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: You have now been out for three hours. I am not pressing you to hurry anything, but I think the time has now come when I can properly tell you that I could receive verdicts on which at least ten of you were agreed. But, having said that, it is most desirable that you should, if possible, be unanimous.

I would like to add to that that I am terribly sorry - it is not my fault - that the arrangements in this building are so antiquated that there is no provision for your getting any refreshment, and the rules require that you should not disperse before you have reached a verdict, if you can. Of course, it is a profound misfortune from everybody's point of view if you cannot reach a verdict, because then the case has to be tried again, which is a horrifying prospect. So I must ask you, I am afraid, to reach, if possible, a unanimous verdict. I have already indicated that I can take verdicts on which ten of you are agreed, if that is possible, but I don't want to put any kind of pressure on you of any kind.

The only other thing I would like to say is this: if there is any point on which I can help you, I shall be very happy to do so. I don't mean by that that I want to know what you have been talking about or what has been passing between you, but if there is any point which you can formulate on which I can be of any help, then I shall be happy to try. I don't think I can say any more.

THE JUROR: No. I think, my Lord, if we were to be given possibly an extra half hour, we could come to a decision, in the light of what has happened over the last hour or so.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That is very valuable information. If you can come to a decision in half an hour, no-one can complain. Will you try?

(The Jury retired at 5.30 p.m. and returned into Court at 5.55 p.m.)

#### V E R D I C T

THE ASSOCIATE: Mr Foreman, are you all agreed upon your answers to the questions before you?

THE FOREMAN: We are.

THE ASSOCIATE: I will now put the questions. Do you find for the first Plaintiffs or for the Defendants?

THE FOREMAN: For the Defendants.



THE ASSOCIATE: Do you find for the second Plaintiff or for the Defendants?

A THE FOREMAN: For the Defendants.

THE ASSOCIATE: Do you find for the third Plaintiff or for the Defendants?

THE FOREMAN: For the Defendants.

B THE ASSOCIATE: Do you find for the fourth Plaintiff or for the Defendants?

THE FOREMAN: For the Defendants.

THE ASSOCIATE: And are those the verdicts of you all?

THE FOREMAN: That is the verdict of us all.

C MR NEILL: My Lord, in those circumstances, I would ask for Judgment for the Defendants. My Lord, there is a sum of money in Court, and I would ask that that should be paid out to the Defendants' solicitors.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes.

D MR NEILL: And, my Lord, there is also a sum paid in by way of security for costs. Subject to anything my learned friend wishes to say, I would ask that that sum also should be paid out to the Defendants' solicitors.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Yes. You cannot resist that, can you, Mr Kempster?

E MR KEMPSTER: I think not, my Lord.

MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Nor do I. Do you make any other application?

MR NEILL: Judgment for the Defendants with costs, my Lord.

F MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: That equally you cannot resist, can you?

MR KEMPSTER: I understood that was what I was assenting to earlier.

MR NEILL: Yes. Perhaps I did not use the word "costs". I am sorry.

G H MR JUSTICE MELFORD STEVENSON: Thank you, Members of the Jury. You will be sorry to hear that that is the end of your duties to this Court on this occasion, and you are discharged. For what it is worth, you have the thanks of the community for your services. You have had a quite exceptionally hard time, and I can only apologise for the unbelievable discomfort to which you have been exposed because of the furniture of this Court. Thank you very much.