```
1
             IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON
 2
                  FOR THE COUNTY OF MULTNOMAH
 3
     KERRY LEWIS,
 4
                 Plaintiff,
 5
                                              ) No. 0710-11294
     VS.
 6
     CORPORATION OF THE PRESIDING BISHOP OF
     THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-
 7
     DAY SAINTS, a foreign corporation solely) Volume 20
     registered to do business in the State
8
     of Oregon; CORPORATION OF THE PRESIDENT )
     OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-
9
     DAY SAINTS AND SUCCESSORS, a foreign
     corporation solely registered to do
10
     business in the State of Oregon; THE
     BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, a congressionally
11
     chartered corporation, authorized to do )
     business in Oregon; and CASCADE PACIFIC
12
     COUNCIL, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, an
     Oregon non-profit corporation,
13
14
                 Defendants.
15
16
                      TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
17
                 BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled
18
    matter came on regularly for trial before the
19
     HONORABLE JOHN A. WITTMAYER, Circuit Court Judge of the
20
     County of Multnomah, State of Oregon, commencing on
21
     Thursday, April 8, 2010, and a Jury.
2.2.
23
24
25
```

finished with their arguments at a natural time for us to 1 2. take a break, so we're probably going to interrupt their 3 arguments for our morning and afternoon breaks and for 4 our lunch break. I want to use the time as efficiently 5 as we can because there's a lot of material to cover. 6 So with that then, Mr. Clark, closing argument 7 on behalf of plaintiff. 8 MR. CLARK: Thank you, your Honor. 9 Good morning. 10 THE JURY: Good morning. 11 MR. CLARK: What I said at the beginning of 12 voir dire about every witness was going to be nervous 13 still sometimes applies to lawyers. I want to start off 14 by thanking you for your hard work. 15 I tell people that our system does not 16 guarantee justice, but it guarantees a chance at justice. 17 And that chance is increased and heightened when you have 18 to deal with a jury that pays attention, and you have. 19 And on behalf of Mr. Mones and on behalf of Mr. Lewis, we 20 thank you. 21 I also want to tell you that I've given --2.2. I've asked Ms. Sailey to feel free to interrupt me if I 23 get going too fast, which I sometimes do, so don't hold 24 that against her or hold that against me. 25 We talked in this case about a theme, and that

2.

2.2.

theme was that youth organizations must do everything possible to protect children.

John, can we pull up the thematic chart, the first line?

Youth organizations must do everything feasible to protect children. I've inserted the word "feasible" instead of possibility because feasibility has been used a lot in this case. That is a general principle with which I think virtually every person in this courtroom agrees and several of the witnesses did agree.

Next line. Some risks to children can be eliminated or limited. We know that. We know that if Boy Scouts are going on camping trips, some of the risks can be eliminated by warnings, by proper preparation, by training, some risks can be eliminated or limited.

We know that if a risk cannot be totally eliminated, a youth organization must warn children and parents and other protective adults about those risks.

So you warn about lightning, because it cannot be totally eliminated. You can train about it, but you still warn because you want people to know. If there's an outbreak of E.coli from a camp, you pick up the phone and you call the parents of the kids who are there because you want them to know about a hidden danger that

2.

2.2.

they don't know about. So if a risk cannot be totally eliminated, the youth organization must warn.

All of which leads to a youth organization cannot keep secrets about hidden dangers to children. That is the community rule that I'm going to come back to again and again in this closing argument. You cannot keep secrets about hidden dangers to children.

You may remember that my opening statement used thematic questions, what did they know, when did they know it, what did they do and not do about it? I'm going to use that structure in my closing argument as well both at the national level and locally.

So just to summarize, can you pull up, John?

The national level, what did they do, when did
they know it, and what did they do and not do about it?

What they knew was that they had a serious problem with
pedophiles in Scouting; that thousands of boys were being
abused; and that if nothing changes, nothing changes.

And more boys like Kerry Lewis would be abused.

When they knew this was by at least 1965 and certainly for decades before that. We only have starting in 1965 here, but there's evidence that these files went back further in time than that. And certainly they knew it before Kerry Lewis was abused in 1983 and 1984.

What they did and did not do about it was to

2.

2.2.

warn anyone or take any other reasonable common sense steps to change the system and protect kids like Kerry Lewis, to protect kids like Kerry Lewis from people like Timur Dykes. And so with parents like Kerry Lewis' putting their trust in the Boy Scouts of America, the Boy Scouts of America breaking that trust, more Boy Scout abuse.

The summary of the local scene looks like this. What they knew. They knew that their charismatic Assistant Scoutmaster, Timur Dykes, to whom kids flocked like bees to honey, they knew that he had molested — that he had admitted to molesting 17 Scouts, including Boy Scouts and Cub Scouts.

I want to highlight here one of the most significant things that happened in the last week was when shaky Adrian Leech got up there and talked about what happened to him as a Cub Scout by Timur Dykes. We showed you on the roster the Leech brothers, and the next name down was Kerry Lewis.

They knew that Boy Scouts and Cub Scouts were being abused by Timur Dykes. All of the leaders of that troop had to do was go to the roster and look at the list and say who might have been within this guy's poisonous reach. And there, right there on the list was Kerry Lewis. He transferred in September.

2.2.

This was January, five months later, and they knew that these boys had been abused going back in time. All they had to do was look down at the list and there was Kerry Lewis. The law calls that foreseeability.

I'll talk about that idea in a little bit.

When they knew this was by January 31, 1983 when Mr. Dykes made his confession, his admission to Gordon McEwen. What they did not do about it was to publicly warn the Scouting community or the parents of the other 13 boys in the troop or the parents of the kids on the Cub Scout roster, the other kids on the Cub Scout rosters.

They didn't warn the parents of boys who were reasonably forseeably in Timur Dykes' grasp that he's dangerous to boys. Everything that you thought about Timur Dykes is wrong. You've got to forget it. He's food poisoning. And we're calling to tell you that your kid may have eaten the bad food. They didn't do that.

If they had taken reasonable steps to do things like that, Kerry Lewis' abuse would have been prevented. We wouldn't have been here — we wouldn't even be here. So that's what they knew, when they knew it, what they did and did not do about it in summary, nationally and locally.

Now, I want to go back through some of the

2.

2.2.

evidence in detail at the national level. This will take me some time, then I'll shift and do the same thing at the local level going back through some of the evidence and some of the testimony.

Then after I've done the national and the local, I'm going to talk about some of the links between the national and the local. Then I'm going to talk about causation and damages. Then I'll finish with a few remarks about what this case means. That's kind of a roadmap of where I'm going.

So what they knew at the national level was the existence and scope of the pedophile problem. That's what they knew at the national level. This isn't going to work, is it, John? I'm sorry. Sorry about this.

And the first testimony I want to highlight is that of Mr. Nathaniel Marshall, Boy Scout representative who sat through this trial. And he admitted that they were keeping these files back to 1925.

Although, he refused to answer the simple question of whether they knew they had a problem, five times Mr. Mones had to ask him, did you have a problem with abuse in Scouting? He never got a straight answer.

The only person in this courtroom who has admitted that he has a problem and needs to do something differently is Kerry Lewis when it comes to his drug and

2.

2.2.

alcohol problem. The other side can't even say the word "problem," let alone admit it.

But it was there in 1925 that they were keeping the files. As Dr. Schoener said, you don't keep a national system unless you've got a national problem. They knew that by 1925.

By 1935 -- can we have the article up, John?

By 1935, the New York Times was writing an article about the Boy Scout's red list. And the head of the Boy Scouts of America is explaining what the red list is. 2900 files are referenced in that 1935 article.

Now, remember, this wasn't primarily any kind of a public discussion or public announcement by the Boy Scouts about child abuse. The purpose of all this was to put the public at ease. Remember, this was the 1930's. There are no Communists in Scouting.

We have no reds in Scouting. The red files don't mean we have Communists. We've got some pedophiles, but we don't have Communists. That's what that 1935 article says, but it documents the problem.

Mr. Grant Robinson, the former Cascade Pacific Council executive, sat there and admitted that when he was at an earlier Council, I believe it is called Lone Pine, but I could be wrong about that — by the way, this is — I meant to say this up front.

2.2.

Everything that I'm going to tell you is based upon my notes, my recollections of the evidence and what I could get through with the transcript. If I misstate something, that will be accidental, and I apologize for it. And you go with your notes and your recollection.

I'm doing the best I can with the notes and the recollection that I have.

Mr. Robinson said that in 1960, whatever Council he was with, he was told basically there's an issue with pedophiles in Scouting, with child abuse in Scouting, 1960. So we got 1925, 1935, 1960.

Do you remember the kind of gum-shoe, former LA detective that came in here, Mr. Dworin, long-time head of the child sex crimes unit for the LA Police Department, interviewed thousands of pedophiles and thousands of kid victims. And he came in and had done a remarkable thing.

He'd been through all of these files in a systematic way. I think he said it took him 65 hours. He gave you a list of what was in those files for the knowing, the profile of the pedophile, how they operated, multiple victims, who the boys were, how it happened, where it happened. He documented it. Something they could have done at any time in the last 85 years and they never did.

2.

2.2.

Dr. Schoener, who regularly consults, unlike Professor Warren from the University of Virginia, primarily targets violent sexual offenders and studies them, Dr. Schoener consults with youth organizations about how to keep their organizations safe.

We've been doing it for a long time. And he says that if you've got a national file system, you've got a national problem. And it is not enough to just keep the list. At some point it has to register that you've got to change what you are doing. What you are doing isn't working. So Dr. Schoener talked in some detail about that.

Remember, he'd been an expert witness in a prior case for the Boy Scouts of America. And he never knew about the files. This was the first experience he had with the files. And they put him on the stand as an expert witness several years ago and didn't tell him about the files. And he said this is an astonishing body of knowledge.

What you could have done with that knowledge was incredible. That's some of the testimony. We've got the files themselves here, 1250 P files, roughly 1,000 of them involving child sexual abuse.

Now, we also know that from 1925 to 1935, if Mr. Marshall is right, is that in 1925, when they started

keeping the files, and the New York Times articles said 1 2. they had 2900 of them by 1935. And about one-third of 3 those, something like 900 were related to child abuse, 4 you know you've got from 1965 to 1985, you know you've 5 got roughly 1,000. 6 You know you've got 900 between 1925 and 1935, 7 so what about between '35 and '65? Well, let's see what 8 the official Boy Scout statistics shows. 9 Oh, I'm sorry. This doesn't go back that far. 10 My fault. My mistake. Scratch that. 11 I'll get you the citation later on. I 12 apologize for the exhibit that shows that between 1935 13 and 1965, the Boy Scouts of America's official records 14 show a few hundred files for the Perversion category, 15 just a few hundred. 16 But by the New York Times article and this 17 statistic, if you extrapolate, you easily get -- because 18 we're got 2,000 here, and if you look at another 30 19 years, and you assume that's a conservative, half the 20 number, you've got 2,000. 21 So my point in all this is it is not 2.2. unreasonable to suggest that by 1985, they had between 23 3,500 and 4,000 files dealing with child molesters. If you just take '65 to '85 and extrapolate it 24

back, and these are just the ones, just the ones that got

25

2.

2.2.

reported, just the ones that got caught. I'll talk more about this in a minute.

So this was just the tip of the iceberg. How do we know that? Well, first of all, logically. They had no system in place to educate or train people in reporting. So how these people got reported is blind, dumb luck.

Somebody — some pedophile's plan went bad and somebody found out. But there was no systematic encouragement for these people to report. This just happened. These files just happened. There was no training about them. They didn't say we've got this system. And if you need help, this is what you do. They didn't say that to parents and local chartering organizations. So that's one reason we know that these numbers have to be low.

Second reason is the mental health reality.

You heard Dr. Schoener, Dr. Conte, I think even Dr.

Sebastian admit that only a small percentage of child abuse is ever reported. The studies, I think show something like six percent, a tiny fraction is ever even reported.

Thirdly, we know that this is not the whole universe because they've admitted they destroyed files either because a person got old, a person died, or for

2.

2.2.

whatever other reason, noble or ignoble, they destroyed files. So we know we're not dealing with a complete universe here, just the tip of the iceberg.

So by 1965, and certainly before Kerry Lewis was abused, the Boy Scouts of America knew that thousands of boys were being abused in their program by thousands of pedophiles and nothing changed.

Now, I want to anticipate the defendants' argument here, that their problem was no worse than that of society in general. Well, first of all, if we hadn't sued them, how would they know?

In 85 years, they never did what Mr. Dworin did in three weeks, in 65 hours, they never did that. They never looked in the files to see what was there until they got sued. We got these files, brought them in to show them to you, and then all of a sudden, they've got statistics. They've got an analysis, all of a sudden, and they can talk about what they mean and what they don't mean.

So how would they have known? Mr. Marshall said they never kept statistics on the abuse. They never did an analysis of it. He admitted that on the stand.

Why didn't they hire someone like Dr. Warren, a high-powered academic with seven research assistants in 1975 and say, you know what, we've been keeping these

files, but things don't seem to be getting better.

2.

2.2.

Why don't you take a look and tell us if you can give us any advice on what changes we might want to make. But the files just kept growing and the professors kept busy on other projects because they didn't ask. No worse than the problem in society at large. Well, you know what, ladies and gentlemen, the parents of boys in Scouting expected better than society at large.

They didn't put their kid in Smilin' Jack's

Day Care Center. They entrusted their boys to the Boy

Scouts of America and the Boy Scouts of America promote

trust. That is their stock-in-trade. On my honor. That

is their stock-in-trade. And that's why the parents put

the boys there. They better be better than society in

general. It is an amazing argument.

The Lewises, the Severs, the Dreberts, the Leech parents, real names, real boys, real lives trusted the Boy Scouts. And the response is hey, it is no worse than the society at large. They had the ability to be better than the society at large. They had a closed system.

If you think about it, they have the ability to keep people out; adults, children, whoever they want. They have a closed system. They control it. You have to be a member. Remember, Mr. Dale, the gay Scoutmaster, he

2.

2.2.

doesn't get to be a member because the Boy Scouts of
America went to the United States Supreme Court to prove
their right to select their own membership, their
leadership. They have a closed system.

If I catch a disease walking around downtown, that's one thing. But if I'm in a clean unit at Good Samaritan Hospital, I expect better. I don't expect to catch any old germ like I would if I was walking around on the streets. They had a closed system.

They had the ability to implement one, a training program. They've got a highly organized, vertically integrated corporate structure. They've got national. They've got regional. They've got councils. They've got districts.

They've got a highly integrated corporate structure from top to bottom, and they could have implemented a program any time they wanted to. And as proof positive of that, I will remind you of the drug problem they've got in the Cubmaster Handbook that I asked Dr. Wiest about.

They thought it was a good idea to warn young boys about the dangers of drugs. They've got several pages in there. They train Scoutmasters on it. They trained volunteers. It is in the Cubmaster Handbook.

They had the ability to do that. They did the same thing

2.

2.2.

with homesickness, vandalism, hazing, sex curiosity, all of these things that boys bump into. That's all in the material. They had the ability to do it.

But nobody pulls their child out of Scouting because the Boy Scouts warn the parents that a child might get homesick. But the Boy Scouts of America believe that if they told parents and charter organizations about their pedophile problem, they would lose members. That's why they did warnings about drugs, but not warnings about pedophiles.

You heard from Mr. O'Connor who came down here from Alaska. And you will see in those Chicago Tribune articles that have been admitted into evidence, the Boy Scouts of America in the 1970's were obsessed with keeping their membership up.

Remember, he talked about the 3M's: Money, membership, manpower and the PR angle of all of that.

They were obsessed with keeping their membership up.

That's the reason that they didn't put child sex abuse in there with drugs, vandalism, homesickness, and the other problems they warned about.

What you are seeing is a pure and simple concern for the organization, the best interest of the organization over the best interest of the children.

There it is plain and simple, right there in front of

1 you.

2.

2.2.

Mr. Wolff, the man from the Big Brothers and Sisters who came in here and talked with us not only about what is feasible, but what they did with the Big Brothers and Sisters shows the lie of the Boy Scouts' position that it wasn't a good idea.

Big Brothers and Sisters did it, they did it just fine. They took the leap of faith to do the right thing and put the interests of the safety of children ahead of the well-being of the organization. And they were 40 years younger than the Boy Scouts of America. If Don Wolff had been president of Boy Scouts of America in the 1970's, we wouldn't be here.

When Dr. Warren was really pushed several times, Mr. Mones had to ask her the question, when she was really, really pushed about, are you saying this was feasible or not feasible, she finally said, in short, feasible but not advisable.

Possible, but not a good idea. Possible, but not a good idea to warn parents in charter organizations about the pedophile problem. That sometimes it is okay to keep secrets from parents and trusted community leaders about hidden dangers to children. Sometimes it is okay to do that.

That is reason number one why you should

2.

2.2.

return a verdict for punitive damages because it is not okay to keep secrets about hidden dangers to children. They had the information. They kept the secrets. Feasible, but not advisable.

Her explanation on this when pushed was if you trained about Scout leaders, you would also have to train about doctors, nurses and coaches. Fine. I don't know that the Big Brothers and Sisters program was limited.

It was — you talked to them about dangers from trusted adults. You can devise a system. They did it. Big Brothers and Sisters did it. So by that reasoning, you should not warn about axes or knives because then you might also have to warn about hacksaws and broken glass and razors.

It makes no sense. It is an insult to your intelligence, what she said and because it might cause a panic. Now, we're getting closer to the truth. It might cause a panic. Big Brothers and Sisters found a way to do it. It didn't cause a panic.

What the Boy Scouts of America are really saying is that they don't trust the parents with this information. That has to be a logical implication of their argument. It might cause a panic, so we'll keep it to ourselves.

We know better than parents. That sounds like

2.

2.2.

large religious institutions 25 or 30 years ago. We have to keep this information from the faithful or it will cause scandal because parents can't handle this information.

The corporate board rooms of auto manufacturers will hang onto this information because our consumers are too foolish to understand what to do with this. Like Jack Nicholson playing Colonel Jessup in that movie about the Marines, where he's ordered a lazy Marine to be eliminated, and Tom Cruise is trying to get at the truth, and he looks at him and says, son, you can't handle the truth. We'll handle it for you.

There's several problems with the percentage analysis that Mr. Xochihua put up there at one point. I think, if I recall that the number, but I think it was a very tiny fractional percent. I think it was .0001 percent of all adults in Scouting abuse children.

I think that's what the suggestion was. You remember Dr. Schoener's jaw dropping and saying, you are not suggesting that that's the whole universe, are you, that your numbers represent the actual numbers of people out there abusing children?

Again, we know these are the only ones that got caught. We know that files were destroyed. We know that one of these, one of these files often contains the

2.

2.2.

names or — not the names, but the fact of many boys who were abused, multiple victims. One file often shows repeat offenses over the years. If a man abused three times over a 15-year period of time because he was put on probation, he's in there one time.

So this number can't be right. Apart from which, if you do the math, X over Y, and Y is an inflated number, as we know the membership numbers for the Boy Scouts of America were inflated, then this doesn't work.

The Chicago Tribune article suggests that in Chicago alone, the numbers might have been off by as much as 25 to 50 percent with ghost units. Sacramento, Florida, look at the numbers of places, how widespread this was in those Chicago Tribune articles.

These numbers are nothing more than smoke and mirrors. But the final problem and the more serious problem about this percentage analysis is that it focuses on the wrong target. It focuses on the percentage of these instead of the numbers of boys.

Dr. Warren said she was not even asked to do a calculation as to how many children might be represented in these files. She wasn't even asked. It wasn't part of her assignment. The number of kids don't matter to the Boy Scouts of America. That's what that testimony highlights. Just like for the last 85 percent, it wasn't

1 important for them to hire someone like Dr. Warren. 2. If you've got -- it is not hard to do the 3 math. If you've got five victims per pedophile, if 4 you've got 10 victims per pedophile, if you've got 20 5 victims per pedophile, if as Dr. Sebastian said in one of 6 her studies that she cited, you got 100 victims per 7 pedophile, and you've got, I don't know, 2,000, 3,000, 8 4,000 files, what are those numbers? 20,000 kids? 9 40,000 kids? Sixty? The largest universities in the 10 United States have 60,000. That's how many we're talking 11 about. 12 But whether you believe it was 20 or 80 13 doesn't matter. The point is they are real lives. Thev 14 are real boys. And nothing was changed. 15 By the way, now that you have the jury 16 instructions, you have a jury instruction on hypothetical 17 questions. I'm going to ask you a hypothetical question. 18 What if the Boy Scouts of America down in 19 their corporate offices in Texas and in their regional 20 offices and district offices and the Council offices, 21 what if those buildings, instead of being filled with the 2.2. names of little boys and teenaged boys and young men, 23 were filled with hundred dollar bills. 24 And suppose 20,000 times over the last six 25 decades a petty thief had broken in and taken a

2.

2.2.

hundred-dollar bill over and over again, do you suppose that they wouldn't have fundamentally changed their security system? And would it have been more than just keeping a list of the thieves to make sure they can't get back in the building again. They would have changed something.

You don't just get to keep a list. But when pedophiles walk in the Boy Scout system and stole the lives of little boys over and over and over again, they kept a list and nothing else changed.

And I mentioned these numbers, 10,000, 20,000, 50,000 boys, it is a lot. And if you think about — when you are thinking about punitive damages, this is punitive damages consideration number two, think about the social costs foisted on the rest of society by what they did: The drugs, the alcohol, the broken families, the crime, the mental health costs, the suicides. Punitive damages verdict says you are going to levy a fine on them for imposing that cost on society.

What else they knew from the files — by the way, these files, these boxes of files for no particular reason that I can figure out have sat right there during the whole trial, day after day after day right there.

The elephant in the room, the lead weight at the center, and they sat there. Very seldom has anybody

1 come over to open these boxes and see what's in them. 2. Much of that has been done on the screen. This is not a 3 bad analogy to what happened in the Boy Scout offices. 4 They sit there, unopened, unexamined. The elephant in 5 the room. 6 And even though you've heard from several 7 experts about these files, and we've tried to show you 8 some of what's in there, I encourage you to spend time 9 with this material. 10 As far as we know, you are the first jury 11 anywhere to see these files. You are now the guardians 12 and custodians of them as you are the quardians and 13 custodians of the public interest and of community 14 safety. Satisfy yourselves as to what is in those boxes. 15 You can be sure that if there were good files 16 in there, they would have shown them to you. There are 17 no good files. Sometimes the system worked the way they 18 intended and a Scoutmaster would be kicked out forever. 19 Other times, far too often, it didn't work the 20 way it was supposed to. But there are no good files. 21 These are all bad files. They are all stories of

There will be 12 of you deliberating. You

tragedies. But take what works from the experts and

leave the rest and satisfy yourselves. Get your hands

2.2.

23

24

25

dirty.

2.

2.2.

heard Mr. Dworin, the LA cop, say that he got through these in 65 hours. You don't need to spend 65 hours. I'm not suggesting that. But there will be 12 of you deliberating. If you took two hours and you split the files up, and you each looked at 20 collectively, and you would have looked at 240, which is about 20 percent of the files, a little higher than that.

If you wanted to spend three hours, you might get through a third of them. But whatever you do, I encourage you to look through them in some systematic way. Make them yours. Understand them. And then you decide what they knew and when they knew it.

Here is some of what we know was in those files. One, most of the situations involve multiple victims. 578, Exhibit 31, 36, 40 and 520.

Secondly, the abuse often happened in the Scout leaders' homes or apartments, 40, 34, 614, 406, 456, 507. And remember, no Boy Scout prohibitions on this.

In the 1980's, there was no rule against this. Witness after witness after witness said that. The president of the Cascade Pacific Council with no prohibitions against this said that the parents should be in jail. The parents are the criminals. Blame the parents. Blame the victims. How many times did you hear

that in this case?

2.

2.2.

If the Scout defendants had one theme in this case it was blame the victim. Blame the parents. There was no prohibition on spending the night in Scout leaders' homes, and it happened.

Sometimes Cub Scouts and Webelos were abused, 645, 524. And I'm going to suggest that Timur Dykes'

I.V. Files tells that story even if it doesn't show it, because we know that Timur Dykes abused Cub Scouts.

That often it was single, young men, just like Timur Dykes. These are all, by the way, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom, all just like Timur Dykes, 359, 61, 436, 863, 963. Unregistered leaders were abusing, what they call Adult Scout Volunteers, 543, 589.

If you believe everything they say about what they did about Timur Dykes was they put him on a kind of probation. He became an Adult Volunteer because you've heard, you heard several boys testifying that after January of 1983, Timur Dykes was involved in Scouting. Joel Drebert said he heard Timur's back.

You saw a photograph of Eagle Scout Joe Severs with Timur Dykes there working on the Eagle project.

Kerry Lewis talked about everything that happened after January of '83. At best for them, Timur Dykes was an Adult Scout Volunteer after January of 1983. Adult Scout

Volunteers abused, and the Boy Scouts knew it. 1 2. Men on probation, whatever that means, you 3 heard Dr. Schoener say, what do you mean by probation? 4 What are the terms? Who sets it? What can that possibly 5 mean? Like transferring an abusive priest from one place 6 to another and telling him not to do it again. 7 what probation means, 276, 480, 524, 34. 8 I want to give you a slight disclaimer on all 9 these numbers. This is the best we've been able to do 10 and come up with these numbers. If any one of them is 11 off or if it doesn't seem to represent what I've said to 12 you it represents, I'm sorry. These are our best efforts 13 to match the files with the categories. 14 So that's what they knew about the national 15 pedophile problem. They certainly knew it by 1965 and 16 1970. That is exactly what I told you in opening 17 statement that the evidence would show, that they knew 18 they had a pedophile problem on their hands and they knew 19 it by 1965. 20 Now, I want to turn to this concept of 21 foreseeability. 2.2. John, can you pull up jury instruction 23 on foreseeability? 23 24 "A person is liable only for the reasonably 25 foreseeable consequences of his or her actions. There

are two things that must be foreseeable.

2.

2.2.

"First, the plaintiff must be within the general class of persons that one reasonably would anticipate might be threatened by the defendant's conduct; second, the harm suffered must be within the general class of harms that one reasonably would anticipate might result from the defendant's conduct."

That's the law on foreseeability. Now, notice that it is called foreseeability. Foreseeable consequences. Not actually foreseen. I want to talk to you about the difference.

A reasonable possession — a reasonable person in the possession of this knowledge could reasonably have foreseen that if nothing changes, nothing changes. If nothing changes, there will be more abuse. That was foreseeable.

Now, I'll show you on other instructions later, the Boy Scouts of America did not need to know that this particular kid would be abused on that particular day by that particular pedophile, only that it was foreseeable that without changes, more abuse would happen. It is a common sense standard.

Boy Scouts made a deliberate and knowing decision not to make changes, even though it was foreseeable that more kids would be abused. Big Brothers

2.

2.2.

and Sisters made a deliberate decision with the same information. Exactly the opposite kind of decision.

It might be foreseeable, may or may not be foreseeable that if you are driving down the Terwilliger Curves talking on your cell phone or on your Blue Tooth now and drinking a cup of coffee, that you might have an accident.

But putting them in the Terwilliger Curves, speeding, with a cup of coffee in one hand and a hamburger in the other hand, a cell phone under his shoulder, driving with his knees, and turning around talking to his kids in the back at 70 miles an hour, and it is completely different kind of foreseeability analysis.

The foreseeability analysis changes, as you will see, when you look through the jury instructions carefully based on the same or similar circumstances that somebody is in.

And the reason for this approach is so that we don't reward the old head-in-the-sand attitude, not whether this person actually foresaw it, but what a reasonable person standing here looking at these files would have foreseen it. Reasonable is the community standard. It is your common sense.

We don't want to reward hear no evil, see no

2.

2.2.

evil, speak no evil. So we ask what was reasonably foreseeable. We have proved a lot more than foreseeable. We've proved that they knew, in fact, about the pedophile problem.

Somebody had to read those files when they were being created, and that somebody was usually the somebody in the position of Paul Ernst, through the registration director, whose name you will see on most of those documents. Somebody at Boy Scouts of America knew that, and you will see from another jury instruction I'll show you later that if a corporate agent knew it, the corporation knew it.

Now, I want to talk to you about the phrase "knowingly allowed," because we have proven to you that they knowingly allowed child abuse to continue.

It is important because one of the issues that you will have to decide that the Boy Scouts of America has raised in the face of all of this evidence, all of this history, all of these wrong decisions, all of this abuse of the boys, one of their defenses is Kerry Lewis should have sued them sooner. He waited too long. The statute of limitations has passed.

So I want to talk to you about this idea of knowingly. Can you put that jury instruction up, please? Actually, hang on just a second. Drop that down for just

1 a second. Let's go with the one above that. Nineteen. 2. Scout defendants contend that this case is 3 barred by the statute of limitations. "To prevail on 4 this defense, these defendants must prove by a 5 preponderance of the evidence that their conduct did not 6 knowingly allow, permit or encourage child abuse." 7 Well, wait a minute, why do the defendants 8 have to prove that? I thought the plaintiff had the It is a defense. The defense has the burden of 9 10 raising it, pleading it and proving it. 11 So they've got this double negative here. 12 They have to prove that their conduct did not amount to 13 knowingly allowing, permitting or encouraging child 14 abuse. And the definition of knowingly for that statute, 15 "Does not require actual knowledge of a particular act of 16 child abuse, or actual knowledge of a particular child 17 being abused." 18 You don't have to walk in and see it happening to be liable under the statute of limitations. You just 19 20 have to knowingly allow child abuse to occur or continue. 21 And it is the defendant's burden of proof on this. 2.2. So when they stand up and say, Kerry Lewis 23 should have sued them sooner, ask yourself that question. Well, did they knowingly allow it? Have they proved to 24 25 me that they didn't knowingly allow it?

2.2.

You might remember Exhibit 1448, that was the letter that the defense expert, Dr. Lorah Sebastian, back when she was still advocating for children, wrote to the Oregon legislature and said essentially, you need to change the statute of limitations because oftentimes people don't understand because of the shame, the guilt, the embarrassment, they don't understand until later in life that they might have a claim. That's a paraphrase, but that's essentially what she said.

She wrote that letter to the legislature. And the legislature in its wisdom created this extended statute of limitations. But because they didn't want to apply it to just any garden variety slip and fall case, but the more serious category of child abuse, they used a higher standard, this knowingly.

So I want to highlight that for you, tell you what it means, tell you what it doesn't mean. It doesn't mean you have to walk in and see this child being abused and remind you that it is the defendants' burden of proof.

So we are not saying they should have known. We are saying they did know. They did nothing to change their system. They knew that petty thieves were breaking in and stealing little boys. They did nothing to change their system.

2.2.

As long as we're talking about jury instructions, let's plow on through a couple more. The negligence, please, No. 22. This is a long instruction. I'm not going to read all of it. I'm going to highlight a couple of things. It talks about reasonable care.

Again, this word "reasonable," the mythical

Again, this word "reasonable," the mythical reasonable person. Who is that reasonable person? Well, that's reflected in your community judgment. What would a reasonable person do under the circumstances?

"In deciding whether a party used reasonable care, consider the dangers apparent or reasonably foreseeable when the events occurred. Consider the dangers apparent or reasonably foreseeable when the injuries occurred. Do not judge the party's conduct in light of subsequent events; instead, consider what the party knew or should have known at the time."

Now, in our case, should have known doesn't count because we're dealing with knowingly under the statute of limitations. So a person or organization is negligent when the person does something that a reasonably careful person would not do or fails to do something that a reasonably careful person would do. It is a common sense standard.

But what you need to know -- let's pull up 25. Remember, the other one said same or similar

2.

2.2.

circumstances. This one says when determining if the risk of harm to plaintiff was foreseeable, you may consider any specialized knowledge of the defendants. You may consider those files when you are trying to figure out what they knew and when they knew it and what was foreseeable and what they knowingly allowed.

Even the Cascade Pacific Council president agreed that if you know you've got food poisoning at a camp, your obligation shifts. You've got a duty to do something differently based on the information that you have. Specialized knowledge.

Mattel Toys doesn't get to sit on the knowledge that the doll's arm is breaking off and choking little girls. They have specialized knowledge. Their duty to act is greater. Toyota can't hide stuck gas pedals. They've got specialized knowledge.

Where you stand depends upon where you sit. Remember, we talked about that in voir dire. Where you stand depends on where you sit. And if you are sitting over here and you've got access to those files, your obligations are different.

It was utterly fascinating that Dr. Warren came in here and said that the small country private school that has never had an allegation of child sexual abuse before is in no different position in terms of the

2.

2.2.

standard of care than the Boy Scouts of America with their thousands of incidents of experience.

She actually put those two institutions in the same category in terms of the standard of care. Well, that's not the law in Oregon. The law in Oregon is any specialized knowledge is important in the analysis.

This is why the Boy Scouts of America train about axes and knives. Because they have specialized knowledge based upon their experience that sometimes an eight-year-old-boy swinging an axe is not a good idea.

And you've got to change how that happens out there. You've got to have an adult show him. You have to wait and say, you know, you can use a hatchet, but not an axe, whatever the rules are going to be.

But then again, axes and campfire accidents don't hurt your reputation. Child sexual abuse does, if that's what you are concerned about, if you are concerned about money, manpower and membership.

I talked to you about what they did not do already, part one. They didn't make any changes in their system. I told you it was feasible. I explained to you how they could have done it and how they did it with the Cub Scout programs on drug training.

I want to talk a little bit more about this idea of training. In opening statement, we made it very

2.

2.2.

clear that one of the things we were going to try to prove to hold them accountable was that they should be educating, warning and training.

It was a central theme in our opening statement. And in response to those claims, what do they show you? After two years of litigation and all of the National resources, the Council-level resources, the experience, the data bank, the thousands of Scouters they could have drawn on to show you what they did to train or educate about child sexual abuse, what do they show you from 1925 to 1965 about their training?

Two public service ads buried in Scouting magazine in the 1980's. That's what they show you. That don't even talk about abuse in Scouting. Two public service ads.

Oh, and a nice man named Linnard Bybee who came in and talked about the child abuse training that he had received in 1981. And he showed you his certificate. He showed you his uniform.

Two public service ads and a nice man named Linnard Bybee, that's what they can produce to show you their training program. No training materials. No literature. No National or Council Executive who explains to you their comprehensive system of training and education. Nothing.

2.2.

Are they really suggesting that that was evidence of a reasonable response to what they knew?

Remember, all of the people who say they got no training in childhood sexual abuse. Earl Wiest. McEwen.

I think all of the Scout Executives said that there was no training given in those years other than what they have shown you. Virtually every local Scout witness came in and said they never got — Jack Powell. He couldn't even remember if he gave child abuse training.

Remember, he said no, I didn't. I asked him, didn't you do that sort of stuff as a police officer? Virtually every local Scout witness said and most importantly, if nothing else, two of them, McEwen and Wiest, said they never got training in child sexual abuse. If they'd been required to take it, they would have taken it. They both said that.

Compare that with what the Big Brothers and Sisters did. They studied it. They wrote materials. They held national conferences. They invited other youth organizations. They trained and they discussed. They made it a priority. The implication of the evidence is even that they attempted to work with the Boy Scouts of America and got nowhere.

But what the Big Brothers and Sisters did is

2.

2.2.

what was possible, what was feasible and what was advisable. And it is what the Boy Scouts of America knowingly chose not to do because it might cause a panic, because we know better than parents.

All right. We're going to jump into more jury instructions. I keep using the word "they," and I did it in opening statement deliberately, and I've done it in closing statement deliberately. I've used the word "vague." Now, I want to tell you specifically using the law of agency who is "they."

"They" in this case is the BSA National or the CPC or both of them and their agents. So I want to talk about the law of agency. The troop leaders at the local level, the charter representatives, the Scoutmasters, the Scouting coordinators, the members of the Scouting committee, all of those local people who are carrying out the Scouting program.

Those who in this case have said over and over again that they followed the Scouting program to the letter, if not the stitch, where the patches go, how do you progress through the membership, what's the statement of religious principle?

All of these people say, we followed the Scouting program. Those are the people who are carrying out the Scouting programs. They are the representatives,

2.

2.2.

especially McEwen and Wiest, are the representatives of the Scouting organization. And we have proved to you that they were agents. So let's look at the law of agency.

There's a lot — there's several of them, and I want to highlight only two of them. They are all important. By highlighting any of these instructions, I'm not suggesting the others are not important. They are just the ones that I need to talk to you about.

The first concept is No. 32 — contained in No. 32. "A person or entity is an actual agent when a principal, through words or conduct, gives that person or entity the authority to act on the principal's behalf subject to the principal's right to control, and that person or entity agrees to act on the principal's behalf."

The phrase I want to focus on is this notion of right to control. And we've proved to you in this case over and over again that the Boy Scouts of America had the right to control the details of the Boy Scouting program.

Wiest and McEwen both said over and over again they would have followed any child abuse training; that it was mandatory. They would have done that.

I got a little bit through a document with

2.

2.2.

Mr. — with Dr. Wiest and I stopped because I was getting confused and he was getting confused, so I just stopped. But I want to put it up there before you. It is Exhibit 1409, page 10. And it is a mind-numbing document to read through. You can spend as much time with it as you think is necessary.

But what I want to show you here, this is just the -- on a standard troop charter, this is just how you fill out the application. It comes from the Boy Scouts of America, how to do this, how to fill out this application for troop charter. Remember, annual troop charters? How do you fill it out?

If you go through here, you will find something like — see the yellow highlights? John is going to circle them through here. If you will go through this document, you will find something like 15 to 20 places in this document alone where the boys use the word "must" or "shall" or other mandatory language. Fifteen to 20 times, depending upon how you count the language just in this document, the right to control is evident and apparent.

Annual vetoes over leader appointments. Can't get to be a Boy Scout leader without the Boy Scouts of America's approval. Advancement requirements. When do you go from being a Star to being a Life? When do you go

2.

2.2.

from being a Webelos to being a Boy Scout? The ages of the boys, the uniforms, the structure, the oath, the religious beliefs, it is all dictated from on high.

Now, I'm sure we're going to hear that the LDS troops were different, but all of those changes had to be approved, requested, negotiated and approved by the Boy Scouts of America.

The 10th Ward didn't get to decide on its own that they were not going to move boys directly from Webelos into Boy Scouts of America, but they were going to have this Blazer category. That had to be negotiated at the higher level. The Boy Scouts of America always had the right to say do it our way or you don't get a charter. You mandate this training or you don't get a charter. Sorry. That's the way it is.

The Boy Scouts had the ability, the right to control. And it is really interesting if you think about it. The difference in attitude on this question between the National Boy Scout brass and the local witnesses.

The local witnesses you heard from over and over again said yes, it was the Boy Scout program. We followed the Boy Scout program. Dr. Wiest showed us how to put the uniform on. There's a right way and a wrong way. Jack Powell, the police officer, several times said yes, it was the Boy Scout program. The local witnesses

seem to have no problem with this idea.

2.

2.2.

But the Boy Scouts from the National level are playing this sort of word game with you. So what is at stake here? Why all of the elbowing about this issue? Why extend this trial by days because we've all got to get in our evidence about right to control? What is going on here? Why would they make this argument that only a lawyer could love? Because it had to be a lawyer that invented it because it is a liability concern.

If they admit the obvious, then what McEwen and Wiest did and didn't do is what the Cascade Pacific Council and the Boy Scouts of America did and didn't do.

If, on the other hand, they can hold onto this legal fiction that they have no right to control these people, then they can say they are not our agents.

Note the jury instruction says right to control. It doesn't say what percentage of time it has to be exercised. It simply says the right to control. And we have shown you seven ways from Sunday that they have the right to control.

If they admit they have the right to control, then they would have to explain why they didn't make child abuse training mandatory. And if they mandated child abuse training, then they would be admitting that these people were their agents. And every time a

1 Scoutmaster abuses a boy, they would be fighting 2. liability. So they create this legal fiction and they 3 fight for it. Once again, they put the interests of the 4 organization over the interests of the boys. 5 Imputed knowledge. No. 29, please. 6 corporation cannot know anything except through its 7 agents. A corporation is said to have knowledge of facts 8 that its agents learn within the scope of their agency." 9 So if Gordon McEwen and Earl Wiest were 10 agents, what they knew is what these Scout defendants 11 knew. If the Boy Scouts of America had the right to 12 control Gordon McEwen and Earl Wiest, then what they knew 13 is what the Boy Scouts of America knew. And the 14 defendants know this, which is why they have fought so 15 hard in this case on the issue of right to control. 16 The defendants would have you believe that 17 they are just down there in Irving, Texas, printing 18 literature like some pamphlet company, sending it off 19 into the world and hoping that it does some good. 20 They have a vertically integrated corporate 21 They maintain the right to control it from structure. 2.2. the top to the bottom, from where the patches go on the 23 uniforms, to where James Dale can be a Scoutmaster 24 because he's gay.

I think Mr. Smith said in opening statement

```
1
      that the local charting organizations owned the troops.
 2.
      I think that was his phrase. And that's an interesting
 3
      way to put it.
 4
                 I own my car. I can do with it what I want.
      I can change the engine. I can rent it out for
 5
 6
      commercial purposes. I can paint it. I can gear it up.
 7
      I can gear it down. I can loan it to a friend, even a
 8
      gay friend. I can do whatever I want to it. I can put a
 9
      political bumper sticker on it.
10
                 Local charter organizations can't do those
11
      things with their car. They can't change the Boy Scout
12
      program, the Eagle requirements. They can't bring in
13
      20-year-old Scoutmasters. They can't decide to create a
14
      new troop out of their old troop called the Portland
15
      Men's Gay Chorus Troop. They can't refuse to pay the
16
      membership fees. They can't take their kids on a
17
      500-mile trip without a trip permit. They can't do away
18
      with the troop committee.
19
                 So much for owning your own car.
20
                 THE COURT: Is this a good time for a break?
21
                 MR. CLARK: This is, your Honor.
2.2.
                 THE COURT: I'm watching a clock.
                                                    It is a
23
      good time as far as I'm concerned. We're going to take a
24
      15-minute break, folks.
25
                              (Recess.)
```

1 THE COURT: All right. 2. Go ahead, Mr. Clark. 3 MR. CLARK: Thank you, your Honor. 4 I want to move now to the same construct, what 5 did they know, when did they know it, what did they do 6 about it at the local level, Portland, Oregon, early 7 1980's. 8 What they knew was that Timur Dykes was a 9 serial pedophile, serial child molester who abused Boy 10 Scouts and Cub Scouts after working on Scouting projects 11 at his apartment, including often sleepovers. 12 what they knew. 13 It is uncontested that they knew that 17 14 Scouts had been abused. If you listened carefully to 15 Gordon McEwen's testimony, I asked him the question, that 16 wasn't all the boys in the troop, right? There were more 17 boys than that in the troop, and he said right. 18 were more boys than that in the troop. And we know that 19 all 17 of those were Scouts. 20 They knew that Timur Dykes was the Pied Piper. 21 They knew that kids loved him. Remember, Gordon McEwen 2.2. even laughed in his deposition and said he had a big, old 23 boa constrictor. He used to feed it rats. They knew 24 that this guy was a kid magnet.

Now, in the right kind of situation, parts of

2.

2.2.

that can be a good thing. I'm going to talk more about mentoring. But they knew that Timur Dykes was a Pied Piper. Dr. Wiest said he had lots of interests that boys liked, mountain climbing and sports. He was widely respected by the entire community.

If you look, if you look in Detective Shipley's report, several times it talks about how well-respected and well-loved Timur Dykes was by the people involved with Scouting at that LDS Church.

They knew the boys were being abused on sleepovers. If you look at Detective Shipley's report, which for those of you are interested is 1324, Exhibit 1324, if you are interested in that, it says a lot of things, but it says two things that are particularly — three things, that are particularly of note.

One of them is it is all through the police report that this abuse with the Lashbaugh boys happened on a sleepover at Timur Dykes' apartment after working on Scouting projects. And since Colleen Lashbaugh, the mother, is the one that came to Gordon McEwen, you can safely assume that Gordon McEwen knew all those things.

The other interesting thing that Shipley's report shows you, you'll see it in there, showed it a couple of times during the trial, something to the effect of Mr. Dykes doesn't know why he's done this.

2.

2.2.

He has known these boys for years through church service, but never had any problems with touching them until he became involved with the Boy Scouts as a Boy Scout leader. That is an incredible statement.

And when, as the defense will do, they suggest to you that the responsibility for this abuse lies somewhere else, here than here, like the church, go back to Detective Shipley's report and look at that line.

Timur Dykes is speaking through that police report.

He's telling you what was the source and the context of this abuse. He doesn't know why, but he does know it was never a problem when he just knew them through church. It became a problem when he became a Scout leader.

They knew that there were multiple victims. Seventeen to be exact. They knew that Cub Scouts were being abused. I'm going to spend some time on this — actually one more thing.

They knew that the time frame of the abuse went back years. They knew that because Bishop McEwen said he talked to every one of the 17 boys as well as their parents, which means he would have talked to Adrian Leech, who was up here earlier in the week. Adrian Leech said that he was being abused by Timur Dykes, I think he said from the time he was eight or nine, for years.

1 So they would have known that this abuse 2 wasn't just a recent thing; that it went back in time. 3 In the Shipley report, the Lashbaugh kid tells him some 4 of this happened last fall. I think he even said August. I could be wrong about that. I think he said the fall. 5 6 Why is that important? Because Kerry Lewis 7 was a Cub Scout in that same troop, that same pack, and 8 he'd been for most of 1982. Until the fall of 1982, 9 Kerry Lewis had been in that Cub Scout pack. 10 All they had to do was look at the roster and 11 there's Kerry Lewis' name waiving at them. Now, Dr. 12 Wiest said they didn't always keep rosters of the 13 rosters. Mr. O'Connor from Alaska told you that's not 14 true. They had to keep copies of the rosters. But even 15 if you believe what Dr. Wiest says, remember that he also 16 said this was a small community. We knew those boys. 17 knew who those boys were. 18 And remember, McEwen is the head of all of the 19 units, not just the Boy Scout troop, but all of the 20 units, the troop, the pack, the Webelos. He's the head 21 of all of those Scouting units. He has responsibility 2.2. for all of them. 23 John, did I miss pulling up the roster? Can I 24 have 1410, page 11, please? 25 This is the roster I've been talking about.

2.

2.2.

It is Exhibit 1410. It is page 11. I point it out to you because there's a lot of rosters. And it is hard to get through them sometimes.

1410, page 11, expiration date 1983, which means that this is the Scouting year 1982. We now know why these expiration dates are what they are, by the way. It had to do with inflating membership numbers and recruiting at the end of the year.

And here is the list of kids. So he says he talked to the Leech brothers, Matthew and Adrian Leech. If he didn't talk to Adrian Leech, he talked to Matthew and Paul, the older brothers. But he knew that Adrian Leech was on the list because he talked to the parents. And Adrian Leech said my parents talked to us and said we were all on a list.

So McEwen knew that Adrian Leech and Matt Leech had been abused, Cub Scouts. And right there underneath there is Kerry Lewis who, up until a few months earlier, had been a Cub Scout in Pack 719.

Foreseeability. Who might have been -- who else might have been abused? Who else should we warn? Who had a close relationship with Timur Dykes? Just go to the list, folks. It is right there.

All of this fog that has been thrown your way about Troop 815 and 719 and how Cub Scouts have no

2.

2.2.

contact. How many times did you hear Cub Scouts have no contact with Boy Scout leaders? Can't happen. Didn't happen. Not the practice. Very, very rare to have anybody from 815 in 719 or vice versa.

All of that, we knew, we have litigated against these people for two years, we knew they would come in here and tell you it is impossible that what Kerry Lewis is telling you is impossible, couldn't have happened.

Boy Scout leaders didn't have contact with Cub Scouts. Well, apparently one Boy Scout leader at that troop did and they knew it because he was abusing Cub Scouts over and over again. You heard it can't be.

Kerry Lewis couldn't have had that kind of a relationship with Timur Dykes. He was only a Cub Scout.

When they knew all this was by January 1983, and there's no real dispute about that. So they knew in January 1983, that Timur Dykes was a danger to boys, and it was foreseeable that without warnings, he would do more harm. He was food poisoning.

And it was reasonably foreseeable if they don't get on the phone and call and tell parents there's been an outbreak of E.coli, then more kids are going to get sick, and they didn't do it.

What did they do? Gordon McEwen talked one on

2.

2.2.

one with the boys and the parents. Never a group meeting. One on one. Keep it secret. Keep it quiet.

Talk to the parents of the 17. Cooperated with the police, question mark. Put a question mark there because it doesn't seem very convincing.

Detective Shipley said he knew about initially two or three, and then I think he eventually said four or maybe six, but I never knew about the 17. For whatever reason, noble or not, secrecy or bad judgment or because he wasn't trained, Gordon McEwen didn't tell Shipley about the 17.

They released Timur Dykes from his sacred calling. That's the slap on the wrist, the religious slap on the wrist that I talked to you about in opening statement. I want to talk about this for just a minute.

He was disfellowshipped, whatever that means. And none of this, none of this should be taken to apply any disrespect to the LDS Church. But disfellowshipped does not mean excommunication.

It apparently means that you can attend church but not speak and cannot take the sacraments. But most importantly, it is done in secret. Something the Boy Scouts of America would have known because 50 percent, 25 — I think the Cascade Council president Eugene Grant said something between one—third and one—half of all

Scouting units in the country were operated by LDS Church.

2.

2.2.

Boy Scouts knew about the LDS disclaimer. The Boy Scouts had the right to say you can do what you want to as a matter of doctrine and religious belief, but if you are going to run our program, here is what you do when a situation like this comes up. And if that doesn't work with your religious beliefs, that's fine. We respect your religious beliefs. You can have your own program.

Here are our rules. They didn't do that. So this discipline, this slap on the wrist was done in secret. Nobody even knew why. For all of the church community knew, Timur Dykes had a sexual relationship with his girlfriend outside marriage. Macho, young guy.

What do you suppose most macho, young guys in the LDS Church are disciplined for in their early 20s?

What would the congregation have thought? It was the Scouts' responsibility to make sure the local organization was trained to tell them what happened and why.

Dr. Wiest said he didn't even know why for several weeks. And after apparently some period of time, some break, he's back working with boys. Joel Drebert, the carpenter from South Dakota, told you a very moving

story about coming to church one day and hearing the 1 2. other boys, Timur is back, or was it, Timur is back. 3 Joe Severs is working with Timur Dykes a year 4 later on his Scouting project, on his Eagle Scout 5 project. Kerry Lewis tells you a continual story of 6 Timur Dykes being in Scouting. 7 So let's look, by the way, at what the 8 documents say because you've got the testimony of all of 9 these people who were there, that after a brief period of 10 time gone, Timur Dykes was back because of this slap on 11 the wrist. 12 Let's go to 1409, page 5. These are some 13 other rosters that you are going to want to know about if 14 you want to follow Timur Dykes' history. This is for the 15 year 1980. You can't tell it from there, but you can 16 tell it from the handwritten notes. 17 It is 1409, page 5. This is the one that Dr. 18 Wiest didn't even remember. This was the time when Timur 19 Dykes served as Scoutmaster, not as Assistant 20 Scoutmaster, some years earlier. And he's on here as 21 Scoutmaster, SM. There he is during 1980. 2.2.

And then, all of a sudden, for some reason in May of 1980, he's scratched off and David Rose comes in as the new Scoutmaster. I'm sorry, the one above. John McIlmoil comes in as the new -- I can't tell if that's SC

23

24

So

Plaintiff's Closing Statement

1 No, I'm right. David Rose is Scoutmaster, 5/80. 2. So Timur Dykes is out and David Rose is in, 1980. 3 Somebody took great care to make a note of the 4 fact that Timur Dykes was no longer Scoutmaster in 1980. 5 It is important to keep these records current and 6 accurate, right? That's what they did. If you thumb 7 through these rosters, you'll see over and over and over 8 again where people, the dates are changed, the addresses 9 are changed. 10 Then you go to 1409, page 7, this is when 11 after apparently a year-and-a-half absence from Scouting, 12 for whatever reason, Timur Dykes comes back as Assistant 13 in December of '81, which by the way, is absolutely 14 consistent with what Helen Caldwell told you. 15 They moved to Portland in late '81, in the 16 fall of '81. Got involved in the church community. One 17 of the first things that happened was they got a visit 18 from the home teacher, Timur Dykes. He pretty quickly 19 started talking to Kerry Lewis about Scouting. Makes 20 sense. 21 In December of '81, Timur Dykes, he's 2.2. Assistant Scoutmaster. He's back in Scouting. And 23 knowing the way he thinks now, he would be there talking

And that's where that relationship grew.

to young Kerry Lewis about Scouting.

24

again, somebody has taken the time to write in by hand 1 2. here because it is important to know who your leaders 3 are. Timur Dykes, 12/81. 4 Let's go to 1409, page 11. This is for the 5 year 1982. Timur Dykes, Scout Assistant, the year that 6 Kerry Lewis is a Cub Scout. The year that Timur Dykes is 7 abusing the Leech boys. The McIlmoils -- not the 8 McIlmoils, the Lashbaughs, Joel Drebert, Joe Severs. 9 This is the year that is happening, folks, right there. 10 And then they say -- so this is 1982. Let's 11 go to the next one, please. The next one is 1409, page 12 This is the roster for year 1983. Expires in 13 This is the year for roster 1983. You 1984, January. 14 see Timur Dykes there as a Scout assistant. You see no 15 handwritten changes. 16 It was important to make handwritten changes 17 to keep the records clear, but they didn't do it in 1983. 18 I suspect you are going to hear that it was a mistake, an 19 oversight. But it was done everywhere else. 20 And wouldn't you think that with something as 21 profound as being removed from Scouting, from molesting 2.2. boys, they would make darn sure if they really intended 23 to take him off the list, they would make darn sure that 24 he was documented there. They didn't do it.

I'm going to suggest the reason they didn't do

2.

2.2.

it is because he wasn't removed from Scouting. He was given a religious slap on the wrist, told to take some time off, and then in a few months he's back.

The other way we can know this is the most official document you can find from Boy Scouts National or Cascade Pacific Council is Timur Dykes' I.V. File, which is 1313, Exhibit 1313. Now, remember, this is created in March of '87. They don't even create a file until four years later.

Tim Van Dykes, all this information and his interests, rock climbing and reptiles, these are things Scouts knew about him. Rock climbing, reptiles were his interests. And Troop 719, Portland, Oregon, Scout assistant, date registered, January '84, date resigned, 1985. Sexual molesting of young boys.

It doesn't say 1981. It doesn't say kicked out in January 1983. It says registered. And I'm going to suggest what it means is re-registered in '84 and resigned in '85.

That is the conclusion you have to draw from that evidence. And it is the most consistent with what all those boys said. After a short period of time, six months, nine months, a year, three months, who knows, but after some period of time, Timur Dykes was back in Scouting.

2.2.

Now, they may say this is a mistake. I don't know. They haven't explained this. But there's a simple way to clear it up. They are in control of all of the annual registrations, those pieces of paper that everybody testified they had to fill out every year and send off to the Boy Scouts to make sure they are still approved for leadership.

These defendants have not produced one piece of paper, one registration for Timur Dykes. Now, either it was lost, or something else happened to it, but they haven't produced it. And what the witnesses have testified to, the boys who were there is most consistent with this documentary evidence. What the documentary evidence says is that Timur Dykes was the official Scout assistant all through 1983 into 1984 and maybe into 1985.

They did not tell the parents of the other 13. Remember, 17 out of, I think the evidence was 30 members, they didn't tell the parents of the other 13. They didn't tell the parents of the non-LDS boys.

Remember, there was testimony that not all of the boys in the troop were LDS. So how would those parents know about the religious slap on the wrist? They didn't tell them. They didn't tell the parents of the other Cub Scouts in Troop 719. And most importantly, they didn't tell the parents of Kerry Lewis right there on the roster next to the Leech brothers.

2.

2.2.

The Scout defendant's position in this case is it was not foreseeable that a guy who had molested 17 Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts would molest others if those parents weren't warned. But notice an interesting thing.

For all of the long, intelligent and sometimes hard-to-follow explanations that Professor Warren from the University of Virginia with her seven graduate interns gave you, she had a lot of words, she said a lot of things, she never once gave an opinion that this met the standard of care in 1983.

She says she wasn't asked. You remember she didn't know anything about the facts of this case. That wasn't part of her assignment. That means they've offered you no expert testimony whatsoever that they met the standard of care in 1983.

They couldn't even get Professor Warren to hold her nose and say that. They couldn't or wouldn't find an expert to say they met the standard of care in January of 1983 at the local level. Because it is foreseeable. That series of events is foreseeable.

When you are keeping the local negligence claim — when you are deliberating on the local negligence claim, keep that in mind about what they did not produce in terms of evidence.

2.

2.2.

You may recall in my opening statement that I made a suggestion to you that you would want to watch — shifting to another area now — that you would want to watch for parallels between the national and the local.

I already gave you some of those. That was the list of the files about the attributes of what they knew about the way pedophiles operated and a number of those places it exactly matches up with what happened with Timur Dykes.

That's one of the links I wanted to talk to you about. But the second link I want to talk to you about — the reason that that's important is because these files represent the pedophile's playbook.

You don't see the trends from below, from on the ground. If you are McEwen or Wiest, you don't know this. The chartering organizations don't know this. You only see the trends from up above where the Boy Scouts of America were.

And as Mr. Wolff told you, see what you can learn. Every abuse — I think he said every abuse incident that came in, we studied. We tried to figure out what could we learn from it because they knew this is the pedophile's playbook.

So there's one link. What was happening at the National level and what was happening at the local

2.

2.2.

level, all of the various aspects of Timur Dykes' MO that paralleled what was happening in the national files.

But, second, I want to talk to you about Gordon McEwen and Earl Wiest and show you a link between the national negligence and what happened locally.

When Gordon McEwen was pressed with the question of didn't you think that a guy who had molested 17 would molest more, he said pretty directly, pretty candidly, I didn't let that register. I didn't let that register. He hadn't been trained to let that register.

Do you remember Dr. Wiest told a powerful story about a year later, a year after he knew because he eventually knew what was going on with Timur Dykes and the reason for the allegations a year later, do you remember he said he was in a restaurant with his wife, and they looked across the restaurant and there was Timur Dykes with a young mother and a small boy.

He said, I got an uncomfortable feeling in my stomach. I think he said something like that. I was uncomfortable, and I didn't know what to do.

All of that training, the Scoutmaster training, the Wood Badge training, the dedicated, committed Scout leader, that Dr. Wiest obviously was, taking training and giving training and trying to help boys, that he doesn't know what to do? Because he hasn't

been trained.

2.

2.2.

If the BSA had simply done what the Big
Brothers and Sisters did, which was to train its
volunteer and its professional staff, both of these men
would have known what to do. And whoever that little boy
was sitting with that mom, that who, the minute Timur
Dykes laid eyes on him, it was game over, whoever that
little boy was could have been spared, along with the
other 17, along with Kerry Lewis.

They didn't even know about the national problem. They both testified, they never heard about the files. Heard nothing about the national problem. So the Boy Scouts keep its pedophile problem hidden from the chartered organizations. When it all goes bad, they come into court and claimed the chartered organizations.

You have to wonder when they formed these partnerships with schools and rotaries and Methodist Churches and Catholic Churches and LDS churches and Future Farmers of America, do they shake hands and look them in the eye and give them that Boy Scout look, and say we're partners, but, by the way, if it goes bad and something happens and there's a lawsuit, you are on your own? We're not partners anymore.

They hid the pedophile problem from parents and from chartering organizations. That's punitive

damages fact number three.

2.

2.2.

I want to go briefly through, as a transition, to the section where I'm going to talk about Kerry Lewis' damages. I want to talk briefly about the legal notion of causation, which means we've got to pull up some more jury instructions.

Would you pull up 26, please? I want to talk to you about the idea of causation in the law. It a little bit different than you might be used to it on the streets.

What is a cause of something? "A cause is defined as an act or omission that is a substantial factor in producing or bringing about the injury and damage. A substantial factor is an important or material factor and not one that is insignificant."

So substantial factor, that's the test. Was the Boy Scouts of America's negligence a substantial factor in Kerry Lewis' abuse? And you'll note from Instruction 27 that there can be multiple causes.

If you find the Scout defendant's acts or omissions were a substantial factor in causing the injury, you may find that the defendant caused the injury, even though it was not the only cause.

So substantial factor is the test that you are looking for and it shows up in two places. One is what

2.

2.2.

they did that caused — was it a substantial factor in Kerry Lewis' abuse? And you say yes.

And, two, did the abuse by Timur Dykes cause Kerry Lewis' damages? Was it a substantial factor in bringing about his damages? Was the negligence a cause? Yes, it was.

The parents both testified they knew nothing about the Boy Scout's national pedophile problem. And if they had, they would have done things differently. They are down there in Klamath Falls, and they've got Kerry Lewis back in Scouting because they think they just had a narrow miss in Portland.

They don't know about this. They don't know about Timur Dykes. When they found out about him in Tillamook, they ended that relationship. Causation. If they had known, they had been warned, they would have done things differently. And then causation of Kerry Lewis' damages, that what happened to him by Timur Dykes was a substantial factor in causing his damages.

Dr. Sebastian, I think really said -- I believe she really said that the abuse caused Kerry Lewis no damage, that she couldn't come to a professional opinion that it did.

So let's talk for a few minutes about the damages. Folks, I'm sorry this is going longer than I

2.

2.2.

expected, but it is. I told you in opening statement that in this trial, you would see a different face of the Boy Scouts of America than you were used to. I want to talk about another face. I want to talk about the face of Kerry Lewis.

It is a nice face. It was a nice face as a little boy. And I want you to imagine a 12-year-old boy, young, maturing face, has sulfuric acid thrown in his face and it becomes deformed and burned and scarred. You've seen people with horrible burns on their faces.

Remember, in voir dire, we talked about invisible injury? I'm going to suggest to you that what happened to Kerry Lewis was like acid in the face, only it was the inside face. The psychologist called it the psyche. Spiritual people call it the soul. Whatever you want to call it, the inner face of a young boy was deformed and scarred.

Can we have 1341, page 3?

Again, he went from all of the confident and energy and enthusiasm in the world, a self-image, you heard it, he said the "best in the west," that was his self-image from being trusting and eager and interested to secretive and withdrawn and private.

By the time he's in high school, he's doing drugs and alcohol. He's readily involved with girls and

1 sex. He's got a loss of motivation. Loss of grades. 2. What happened, I asked him. There was nothing 3 to fill the void of Timur Dykes. He tried. You remember 4 soccer, wrestling. He dropped out of both of those. 5 and two in wrestling, he dropped out. Lost his 6 motivation. He was, as he said, hollow. Interesting 7 word, "hollow." So what did you do when you felt hollow? 8 I started drinking and partying and hanging out with 9 girls. He's no longer the best in the west. 10 Timur Dykes had told him you are going to be 11 I don't have to worry about you. You will be 12 somebody. You are going to be all right. And what he 13 said was that was a lie. Everything about Timur Dykes 14 was a lie, and so I was a lie. Did you hear him say 15 that? I was a lie. 16 It is a kind of incest really being abused by 17 a trusted adult. And it means that the whole 18 relationship by definition is a fraud. So Kerry Lewis 19 felt like a fraud. He was a lie. 20 I'm going to put a cold list of some of the 21 areas of his damages up here on this paper. And it is a 2.2. good example of the limits of words. Labels and words 23 don't describe experiences, but this is the best we've 24 got.

We've got the self-concept and the

2.

2.2.

self-identity. We've got drug and alcohol issues. I want to talk about those for a second. What do you know about, by common sense, about drug and alcohol problems? It is an escape. It is a filler. It works for a while, and then it began to eat him alive.

People in the 12-Step Program say, I took a drink, the drink took a drink, the drink took me. I took meth, meth took meth, meth took me. He's in the United States Navy and he weighs 95 pounds because what he's done to meth and what meth has done to him. And the insanity of that drug and alcohol culture lasts for a decade or so, and he still struggles with it.

Although, his denial is broken and he knows what he has to do. Now, what about the causal link here? Dr. Sebastian said there's no causal link. It is all genetic. It runs in the family. Bad genes. Bad family. Bad examples. Klamath Falls.

Dr. Conte went through very carefully and explained Kerry Lewis never saw his grandparents model drinking behavior. And prior to his own drinking, he never saw his parents model problem drinking. They both testified that they developed some problem drinking when their marriage began to break up. And by that point, Kerry Lewis was already involved. It is not a modeling thing, at least not for him.

1 They point to his brothers. Dr. Conte 2 explained why that can be explained for modeling. 3 Younger brothers modeling what big brother does. 4 Interesting that the sister doesn't have alcohol or drug 5 problems. 6 Clearly, at least the early onset, even if 7 Kerry Lewis was going to have a substance abuse problem, 8 the early onset, the intensity and the duration were 9 impacted by the abuse. That's the clear testimony of 10 what Dr. Conte said. Of all of the things that you know 11 about child abuse survivors, what's the first thing that 12 comes up on the list? Drug and alcohol issues. And 13 there we have it in this case. 14 I didn't hear Dr. Sebastian say that even if 15 you are going to have a drug or alcohol problem, the 16 child abuse is the prescribed remedy; that it helped him; 17 that it is what we hope happens to a kid who is going 18 through a tough time with drugs and alcohol. 19 I don't even think Dr. Sebastian said that. 20 Obviously, the drug and alcohol issue was connected to 21 the abuse. It cannot not be. And Dr. Conte explained 2.2. why. 23 Then you've got guilt, guilt for what he did 24 to his brothers, quilt for lying to his parents, quilt

for the wasted years, for the impact on the relationship

1 with his daughter, quilt because I allowed it to happen. 2. A universal feeling for child abuse survivors, according 3 to Dr. Conte. 4 Guilt and shame. Guilt says I made a mistake. 5 Shame says I am a mistake. There's something 6 fundamentally wrong with me. Kerry Lewis said I feel 7 like the whole world got an instruction manual and I 8 didn't get one. I always felt behind. I always felt 9 like I didn't quite get it. 10 He used the word "emasculating," this abuse 11 was emasculating. For a man to be emasculated, for a boy 12 to be emasculated is profound. It is like -- it is 13 almost like saying I've been castrated. It is 14 emasculating. He feels hollow. 15 Relationships with girls and women. He has no 16 understanding of intimacy and he never has. He doesn't 17 know how to be emotionally available. I'm not talking 18 about the normal sort of men-don't-get-it kind of thing, 19 where men don't know how to be emotionally available. 20 This is something different. According to what Dr. Conte 21 said, this is something different. 2.2. He didn't have any steady girlfriends in high 23 school. He didn't have the normal development 24 experience, that combination of awkward friendship and

then romance and then sexuality, where it all gets

1 blended together, and we call that intimacy.

2.

2.2.

He never had that. He went immediately to prove his masculinity, according to Dr. Conte, to sleeping with girls, having relationships with girls' bodies. That was his first experience with intimacy.

How much is that worth? Not knowing how to be intimate in a romantic relationship. How do you put you a price on that? Relationships with men, with boys and men. Dr. Conte was eloquent in talking about the loss of a transitional figure, the mentor.

Societies have different ways of turning boys into men. Some traditional societies, it is done through a right of initiation with a tribe. In the Western culture, it is usually been done through the idea of a mentor.

We're going to spread the load off the fathers and we're going to allow groups of good men to help turn these young boys into men. That's what coaching is about. That is what Big Brothers and Sisters are about. That is what Boy Scouts of America is supposed to be about.

Can I have slide one? This is what Boy Scouts of America is supposed to be about. You see it here with Timur Dykes and Kerry Lewis and you see it there in the handbook.

2.2.

Timur Dykes was a hero to Kerry Lewis. He said he was bigger than life. He taught him practical skills, ropes and knots and climbing. Gave him an identity as a climber, but he also talked to him about God and faith and problems. And then suddenly, one day, he was gone in Tillamook. He's yanked out of Kerry Lewis' life.

And Kerry Lewis learns that not only was his hero gone, it would have been better if Timur Dykes had been killed in an auto accident in terms of its impact on Kerry Lewis. Not only is my hero gone, but he's a fake and a fraud, and the whole relationship has been a lie, and I have been a lie.

So Kerry Lewis doesn't trust men. He doesn't know what it is to have a group of five or ten men in your cell phone that he can pick up and call any time and say I need help. I don't know how to do this. You are a good dad. I don't know how to do what I need to do with my daughter, will you help me?

He doesn't have a group of men that he can call and say, I've got this thing with drugs and I want to get clean, how do I do it? He doesn't know how to ask for help. He doesn't know how to be real and vulnerable.

Although, he is learning and he made a courageous effort to sit up there and bear his soul to

2.

2.2.

you and be vulnerable to you and real and authentic, he couldn't name five friends, male friends. He could name three.

The only two people he could say he'd been authentic with, the men that he'd been vulnerable and authentic with are two lawyers, one of whom he's known several months and one of them he's known less than two years. How do you measure that loss?

And then the last area is achievement and career. I'm going to cut this short by just giving you one example, one contrast. His brother, Joshua, came here and testified.

Remember, Joshua, 32-year-old, young jet mechanic. Five years younger than Kerry Lewis. He struggled with drugs for a while. Got himself cleaned up. Went into the Army. Served honorably. Came out with all kind of service awards. Went through Lane Community College at the end of his military career.

3.87. Got the job of his life. Loves his job. Jet mechanic, just like my dad.

That's where Kerry Lewis should have been five years ago. Even if you believe he was genetically predisposed to drugs, here he is five years older and he's still finding his way.

How do you put a value on a scarred soul? How

2.

2.2.

do you put dirty dollar value on a scarred inner face?
And that's your job.

As I told you in voir dire, we didn't invent this system. If it was up to Kerry Lewis, you would all have a blue button and an orange button, and if you push the blue button, we would go back in time and undo what was done to Kerry. And we would be asking nine of the 12 of you to push the blue button.

But we don't have blue button justice. We have monetary justice. It is a certificate, a coupon of justice. It is the best analogy I can come up with. It is what we ask you to do to value somehow, value these losses, that pain and suffering, which is not over, by the way.

You've heard Dr. Conte. He's got a lot of work to do. How do you put a dollar figure on that?

Somebody asked in voir dire, what's the formula? It is a very good question. And the answer that his honor gave you is that there is none. There's a jury instruction on it, and you should follow that closely, but it doesn't have a formula in it.

You have to use your common sense and your instincts and your judgment. They call it an award of economic damages, what your award will be. An award is something that you earn.

2.2.

I'm going to suggest this is more like restitution. We are asking you to make them pay back what they took from him to the tune of \$4 million. His restitution, pay it back. Any of you who saw that fly fishing movie called The River Runs Through It, you may remember it had Brad Pitt in it. It wasn't one of Brad Pitt's early, big movies.

Had a scene were Brad Pitt and his brother had stolen a drift-boat — a row boat, and they take it down the waterfalls and they busted it all up. And their very strict Scottish, Presbyterian, minister father said you will work off every cent of its value.

And what we are asking you to do is to say to the Boy Scouts of America and the Cascade Pacific Council, you are responsible for every cent of the value that you took from this man. And you tell youth organizations that if you put the interests of the organization ahead of the interest of the children, that in Portland, Oregon, you will be forced to pay every cent of the value of the damage and harm.

Let there be no doubt about this, what this jury thought happened in this courtroom in the last three weeks. And I want to conclude with just a few more thoughts, particularly on the punitive damages question. Child abuse thrives in secrecy. And it is nourished and

1 fed by secret systems.

2.

2.2.

The Boy Scouts of America has planned and schemed and fought to protect its secrets for decades.

And now, when a gutsy little guy has the nerve to stand up to them and say you are not going to call me a liar, now is the time to reckon.

It took a lot of persistence and hard work to get those files to you. And what they mean, what they signify is huge. The secrets are out. They kept their secrets. They kept them hidden. And you need to speak with them in the language that they will understand, the language of punitive damages.

And you take their secrets and you shout them from the rooftop of this courthouse that we're not going to allow youth organizations to keep secrets about hidden dangers from children.

You say to them, if you break the community's rules, you will pay every cent of the harm you have done because you don't get a second chance to protect children. That's the compensatory damages piece.

But the second message from you should be that the Boy Scouts of America were held accountable by a jury of diligent and attentive citizens who refused to play the secrecy game and made the secrets public so that youth organizations know you can't put the 3M's ahead of

Plaintiff's Closing Statement

1 the safety of children.

2.

2.2.

And you do all that with a powerful, compensatory damages verdict and a "yes" on the punitive damages verdict form. Give voice to Kerry Lewis' inarticulate words, that voice that was silenced for so long.

As an old saying, speak your truth even if your voice shakes. Add your voice to Kerry Lewis' and tell the world that this is not okay, what they did is not okay. They broke the community's rules.

You are the conscience of the community. The jury system is the most powerful mechanism in the democratic world for reform. It doesn't mean it is easy.

You think the early cases involving the Catholic Church were easy for these people to stand up and say what happened to them, for juries struggling to find the truth to know what's the right thing. It wasn't easy. It couldn't have been easy.

But 5,000, 10,000 men and women across this country stood up and say what happened to them, the juries began to hold them accountable. No disrespect to the Catholic Church, after all of the good and honorable things that they do, but they had a problem and it needed to be cleaned up.

And the Catholic Church is a sacred place that

Plaintiff's Closing Statement

2.

2.2.

it was 25 years ago, not because the bishops got the Holy Spirit, but because the bishops got sued over and over again by courageous men and women and held accountable by juries who wouldn't put up with it.

And now it has spread. And the rest of the world's democracies are demanding accountability. It started in the United States of America with juries just like you.

This is also an important case for the Scout defendants, not only youth organizations and organizations that take care of senior citizens and another vulnerable class of people. Physical or mental handicapped organizations, not only will they learn that they can't get away with putting the 3M's first.

But by the right verdict here, you can stand with the thousands and millions of good men and women and boys in the Boy Scouts of America at the troop level and at the chartering organization level who believe in Scouting. And you stand with them and not with a corporate culture that values the 3M's over the safety of boys.

We ask you to return a verdict of \$4 million for what happened to Kerry Lewis. And we ask you to send a powerful message with a "yes" on the punitive damages verdict, so that everybody will know that it is wrong to

Plaintiff's Closing Statement

```
1
      keep secrets about hidden dangers to children.
 2.
                 Thank you for your attention.
 3
                 THE COURT: Mr. Smith.
                 MR. SMITH: Can I have just a couple of
 4
 5
      minutes, your Honor, to set the courtroom up?
 6
                 THE COURT: Yes, sure you can.
 7
                 MR. SMITH:
                             Thank you.
 8
                           (Brief recess.)
 9
                 MR. SMITH:
                             Thank you.
10
                 THE COURT: Jurors, it is my expectation that
11
      we're going to interrupt Mr. Smith's argument for lunch
12
      before he's finished.
13
                 Are you expecting that, Mr. Smith?
14
                 MR. SMITH: No, I don't think I'll finish.
15
                 Good morning, folks. Sorry for the
16
      interruption there. We've been together four weeks.
17
      you know my name is Chuck Smith and I represent the Boy
18
      Scouts of America.
19
                 When you first came here, I don't know if you
20
      expected to hear about the Catholic Church, but I want to
21
      start by making a comment here and be right up front
2.2.
      about it.
23
                 This is not a case against the Catholic
24
               There's absolutely no similarities between this
25
      case and the Catholic Church. And if you've been reading
```

in the media lately, I would ask you to set those incidences aside involving the Catholic Church.

2.

2.2.

That emphasis and my client's pain is misplaced, and when Dr. Warren was asked about it, she made short work of it. She said there's virtually no comparison whatsoever, and that's the end of it. This is not a case against the Catholic Church.

You folks have been very patient. We've been here four weeks. And I'm kind of — I wondered that on the first interview and this case was discussed with you, if you really knew what you were in for.

The court told you and told us it is going to be a long trial. We're going to have some long days and you are going to work hard. The court has worked hard. Staff has worked hard. The court reporter is working hard. And you folks have been working hard.

I know you've been taking notes. You've been paying attention. There's been questions submitted, and I hope, I think, I don't know, it is probably 10 or 12 questions submitted, I don't remember, I would hope that they were all answered and to your satisfaction.

We've all been working hard, even the attorneys. But now, we're getting close to the end of our work, the lawyers are and his Honor is at least for a while. And it is going to be turned over to you, and you

are going to have more hard work.

2.

2.2.

We're supposed to be careful about thanking jurors for their service, but I think I can speak on behalf of the court and the staff here and the lawyers involved in this case and the parties they represent, that we do appreciate your service and the time you've taken out of your personal lives and your jobs and away from your families to be of service to the court and these parties. We all appreciate that.

You should make no mistake about this, and I'm sure it is evident from Mr. Clark's comments that this is the time for argument. And I hope to touch on some areas in this case. And the evidence you've heard and the documents that you are going to review, I hope to convince you of the merits of my client's case.

But make no mistake about it, folks, that's exactly what it is. It is argument. And what I say is not evidence. And you take into the jury room your notes and your recollection of the evidence. And if it was different from what I suggest to you, by all means, disregard what I am suggesting.

I'll try to touch on the evidence and I'll try to remember as best I can, but if your memory and your notes differ, you are to go by your memory and your notes.

1 Mr. Clark is going to have an opportunity to 2 stand up and rebut, give a rebuttal argument after I'm 3 done and after Mr. Xochihua is done. So I would ask that 4 if I touch on something that you think is significant, I 5 would ask that you hold it in your memory. And after you 6 hear the remaining arguments in the case, that you take 7 whatever you believe is significant that I might touch 8 on, take it into the jury room at the appropriate time 9 and deliberate accordingly. 10 Another thing that I'm sure is obvious, ladies 11 and gentlemen, this is not my case. It is the

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

The reason I touch on that is simply this, and I don't mean to be standing quite so close here, right on top of you, I'll move this back a bit, but there are things that happen in a four-week trial, I guess we haven't been here 28 days, but it seems like it, for over a four-week time span.

plaintiff's case, Mr. Kerry Lewis. It is the Boy Scouts

of America's case, and it is the local Council's case.

Lawyers do things in court or witnesses testify in a certain fashion or there's objections made or something like that, and you, as jurors, might take offense to that, and that's perfectly understandable.

And the reason I'm touching on it is because if there's something that I've done personally during the

1 course of this case that you might have taken offense to, 2. either an objection to something that you wanted to hear 3 or a manner, objection, or some kind of cross-fire 4 between counsel and the parties, I would ask you not to 5 hold it against my client, the Boy Scouts of America. I 6 think you'll find that is fair enough. I would hope so. 7 The court has instructed you on the law 8 already. And I am not going to talk a lot about the law. 9 We talked about your responsibilities as prospective 10 jurors during the voir dire portion of this case. 11 And I hope you recall that we did ask, and I 12 did ask on behalf of the Boy Scouts of America that you 13 folks wait until you hear all of the arguments, all of 14 the evidence, the court's instructions before you start 15 making up your mind about the case. And I trust that 16 you've done that. 17 The court has told you that you are not to 18 allow bias, sympathy, prejudice, emotions appeal to your 19 better judgment, and we trust that you'll do that. You 20 are not to allow quesswork or speculation to enter your 21 deliberations, and I'm sure you'll do that. 2.2. The court has instructed you about agency and 23 about control. And I'm not going to flash these things 24 up on the screen. I'm not very good at doing that kind

of thing. You probably saw that during the course of

25

this trial.

2.

2.2.

But you'll have those — you'll have an opportunity take those instructions with you into the jury room, and I would ask that you look at them closely and review them closely when you are looking at the evidence. And look at the instruction involving burden of proof. And remember the court's words about burden of proof.

I want to talk to you a little bit, too, about the fact that you don't have to set aside your common sense when you go into that jury room.

And with regard to that, what about this fellow, Larry O'Connor, who testified here a few days ago? What has a regrettable situation got to do in my client's history back in the '70s about inflating membership lists?

What does that got to do with this case? What does it got to do with claim of sexual abuse against

Kerry Lewis crept into this case because a comment about public relations and the Boy Scouts concern about public relations?

Well, from a common sense standpoint, why wouldn't the Boy Scouts be concerned about public relations? Everybody is concerned about public relations. Nobody wants bad press. Nobody wants bad

opinions. Nobody wants bad reputation, whether it is your neighbors, your family, your friends, whatever.

2.

2.2.

But please recall the cross-examination about that evidence and how those people were treated. People were fired. People lost their jobs and so forth. You heard the cross-examination.

That's something that happened back, many, many years ago. And the idea of holding the Boy Scouts responsible or trying to personalize them for something like that now by letting that kind of evidence creep into the case, I would submit to you from a common sense standpoint, doesn't wash in this case.

What about Timur Dykes? Counsel is right. He fooled everyone. The consummate conman. He fooled his church. He fooled his parishioners who were with him. He fooled the Lewis family. He fooled the Scouts. He fooled the Scouting program.

He fooled Adrian Leech and even after Adrian

Leech and his family and his mother knew about his

situation, Adrian Leech was still working with him and

still going to his apartment. He fooled law enforcement.

And he even fooled this court, not Judge Wittmayer, but

another judge who you've heard testify. He even fooled

the court.

He was able to escape notification of my

2.

2.2.

client until 1987 is the first we heard about that. It has been suggested that that's when the lawsuit was filed.

Take a look at his file and you'll see what is in it. I'm not so sure that is correct, that the first notification that the Boy Scouts of America knew about this fellow was back — was 1987. So he has a long history of fooling people.

You'll find in the I.V. File that there appears to be an error or mistake. I would submit to you it is a mistake. It is Exhibit 1313. And it talks about him being registered in 1984 and leaving the registration roles in 1985.

And I would submit to you clearly, that's a mistake. There's no rolls or no registration rolls that would have him on them in 1984 that we know of. Why not? I do not know why. We can't explain why. That's some 30 years ago. But it appears to be a clear mistake in terms of his registration.

I told you in opening statement, ladies and gentlemen, what I believed the evidence would show. We talked about, and I talked about it the very foundation of the Boy Scouts of America's program, the charter organizations and how it is established in local communities and how those are formed.

2.

2.2.

And the local charter organizations around this country and here locally consist of school districts, it consisted of law enforcement, auxilliary, Elks clubs, banks, churches such as the LDS and various youth organizations.

Most importantly, ladies and gentlemen, I think I communicated to you, or I tried to tell you in opening statement the foundation of these charter organizations, our parents, and to suggest that we don't trust parents is wholly contrary to the Boy Scouts program.

We rely heavily on parents. You've heard evidence of that effect. It has been suggested in closing argument that we don't trust the parents. That just defies common sense from the Boy Scouts of America's perspective.

We rely on parental involvement. It is one of the ways that we rely on the knowledge of local volunteers, the people from the community, people that are known by parents, people that are members of or involved with charter organizations, are people that are supposed to be known locally, and that's what we count on. It is kind of our first line of defense. I told you that in opening statement.

And we talked a little bit about the structure

2.

2.2.

of the Boy Scouts of America and how that works. The local charter organizations form a unit. They select their leaders. They determine the activities. They carry them out, and they do so on a day-to-day basis.

You've never heard one shred of evidence in this case, ladies and gentlemen, that the Boy Scouts of America are involved on a day-to-day basis at the operational level telling folks like the LDS Church how to run their unit or their troop units. I'll talk to you a little bit about you that later.

But Mr. Schoener testified, in response to a question, he talked about, I believe you'll recall, and I wrote this down as a quote, the all-powerful Congressionally chartered Boy Scouts of America.

That all-powerful organization, ladies and gentlemen, the evidence is, the ground floor of it consists of one million-plus volunteers annually, everyday people, just like ourselves in this courtroom, volunteering their services.

And above all, I hope I made it abundantly clear in opening statement that the Boy Scouts of America, folks, are not here to blame anyone. And I don't mean maybe. We're not here to blame Mr. Lewis' parents, his father, Jimmy Lewis. We're not here to blame his mother, Helen Caldwell. We're not here to

2.

2.2.

blame the plaintiff himself. We're not here to blame the LDS Church.

We're not making any excuses for our program. And you've heard no excuses from us, contrary to what's been suggested. And I want to assure you again, we're not here to blame anybody for what has happened here. I would submit to you, respectfully, that's not what the evidence shows.

What the evidence does show, and I hope it has been made abundantly clear in that regard as well, we are dealing with a period of time some 25 to 30 years ago, aren't we? And in the early '80s, we tried to bring to your attention and bring you the evidence of what was the standard of care during that period of time. What was known during that period of time?

The Big Brothers and Big Sisters, one of their straw men testified, a fine man. He's done a lot of good, but they have an entirely different program and an entirely different purpose. We have comparable organizations, clearly, and we have comparable approaches. And I'll talk to you about that a little bit later, but that's where it ends. They are not the same entities.

Ladies and gentlemen, for a hundred years, the Boy Scouts of America have been intrusted with the safety

2.

2.2.

of millions of boys and young men. And I would submit to you that from the first time that we hold our children in our arms, they are most precious asset that we have.

And to suggest that the Boy Scouts of America don't understand or don't appreciate that is not appropriate, folks. We haven't existed for a hundred years because that's how we treat young men and young women as well, some cavalier, uncaring attitude.

The claim that the Boy Scouts of America would deliberately, yes, even recklessly do anything beyond what's been claimed here or what has been claimed here is beyond my client's imagination truly. The Boy Scouts of America, folks, depend on parental involvement. And we believe and support the family, morality, God, country, you've heard that all before in this case.

If you think for one minute, ladies and gentlemen, and I mean, one minute that people like Bishop McEwen, Bishop French, Dr. Earl Wiest, Jim Bean, Grant Robinson, Jack Powell, Mr. Bybee, men who are dedicated in the LDS Church, men who are obviously involved with the Scouting program, men dedicated to success, men who support and subscribe to the Scout oath, and that is on my honor, I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country, and to obey the Scout law, to help other people at all times, to keep myself physically strong, mentally

1 awake and morally straight, if you think for one minute 2. that those men don't live by the Scout law and they are 3 going to sit still and tolerate any known pedophile, 4 predator or child, a person involved in child sexual 5 abuse, if you think for a minute they are going to sit 6 still for that, then you are not going to spend a lot of 7 time deliberating on this case, ladies and gentlemen. Ιt 8 won't take you long at all. 9 I would submit to you that the exact opposite 10 is the case. What about Bishop McEwen? In opening 11 statement, you'll recall that I called up or played a 12 portion of his testimony, questions that I had asked him 13 on his deposition, several depositions that had been 14 taken. 15 And again, I told you, I'm not going to replay 16 that, I wrote down essentially what he said. He very 17 candidly answered several questions in that deposition in one of those depositions. 18 19 He was asked -- I asked him: "Were you acting 20 on behalf of the Cascade Pacific Council when you met 21 with Timur Dykes? 2.2. "Answer: No. 23 "Question: Were you acting on behalf of the 24 Boy Scouts of America? 25 "Answer: No.

1 "Were you acting in your capacity as bishop of 2. the church? 3 "Answer: Yes." 4 He was not acting obviously within the course 5 and scope of any agency as alleged by the plaintiff when 6 he answered those questions and when he was doing what he 7 did. 8 And what again, about -- what did he do? 9 what did he do wrong in this case? He took action 10 immediately. He cooperated with the authorities. He met 11 with the families. He disfellowshipped Timur Dykes. 12 Counsel calls it a slap on the wrist. I think the 13 evidence is, a couple of years later, Timur Dykes was 14 excommunicated. 15 Granted, he did not report it to the local 16 Council, the Cascade Pacific Council. And he did not 17 report it to the Boy Scouts of America. He didn't find 18 that information. Didn't find the way to us. 19 But should he have done something else besides 20 disfellowship? Should he have stood up in the church? 21 What would the circumstances be then? Can you imagine 2.2. that, ladies and gentlemen? 23 Had he gone in before the congregation on a Sunday and talked about 17 youngsters having been 24 25 apparently abused by Timur Dykes? There's been a

2.

2.2.

discussion about whether they were 17 Scouts or 17 boys. I would submit to you that if they were only Scouts, somebody would have found where he testified to that before, but what's the difference?

Let's assume they were all Scouts, or if not that, certainly some of them were Scouts. They were all members of the LDS Church. And can you imagine calling out a situation with Timur Dykes and saying Timur Dykes has been disfellowshipped because he's been abusing young men, the members of our congregation?

He wouldn't have to name the boys. Everyone would know in that congregation who was in that Scout troop or who other people were in the church. And how do you think those kids would have felt going to school the next day?

There's got to be some common sense here, folks. I'll talk to you a little bit more about that. But again, how do you think those kids would have felt if that kind of information had been brought to the attention of the entire congregation?

So he handled it on a private basis as best he could under circumstances with law enforcement involved and law enforcement cooperating with him as well as he cooperating with them on an expeditious and expedient basis.

The bishop says — Bishop McEwen says that he told Dr. Wiest about this situation. Dr. Wiest doesn't recall that in so many words. He wondered about the situation. The evidence is he wondered about that, but he didn't know.

What about Dr. Wiest? Again, I ask you, does he impress you as the kind of individual that had he known, would he have recommended, as the evidence apparently is, that Timur Dykes assist Joe Severs with the Eagle Scout program, in pursuit of an Eagle Scout award? Did Dr. Wiest impress you as somebody that would do that had he known? I respectfully submit to you again, he would not.

This incident in the restaurant when Dr. Wiest candidly told you, and he kind of gulped, he struggles with that, and part of that might have something to do with the doctor's age and what he grew up being used to and what he saw that day. It was about a year ago. He hadn't seen Timur Dykes in a year, and he sees him across the room in a restaurant, and he doesn't know what to do.

How many of us would walk over to somebody having a meal, and Timur Dykes is there with a youngster and the youngster's maybe mother or aunt or grandmother, we don't know, what would you have him do?

Go over and confront them. Go over and

2.2.

```
tell -- do something to tell the lady something about
 1
 2.
      Timur Dykes? How does he know what's going on during the
 3
      year? How did he know who those people are? Again, I'm
 4
      asking you to use a little common sense when you stop and
 5
      think about that.
 6
                 Lastly, here before the noon hour, I quess
 7
      I'll try to wind up.
 8
                 THE COURT: I was going to ask you to find a
 9
      place that's good for you to stop, Mr. Smith.
10
                 MR. SMITH: I think I can do it here.
11
                 What about Jack Powell, just a couple of
12
      blocks away, a cycle policeman in the Portland Police
13
      Department, it was better than 20 years, what about Jack
14
      Powell?
15
                 Do you think for one minute when he was at
16
      Farragut, Idaho, at the LDS Encampment, do you think he
17
      was asked about, did he see Timur Dykes there? What if
18
      he had seen Timur Dykes there?
19
                 Again, do you think for one minute he would
20
      have tolerated that, as a Portland Police officer, as a
21
      member of the church and somebody actively involved in
2.2.
      Scouting? I would submit to you again, the answer is no.
      He would not have. Again, you've got to apply some
23
24
      common sense to what you've heard.
25
                 I quess that's the best place to stop.
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: A good time to stop. We're going
      to stop for lunch now. We'll resume at 1:30. So we'll
 2
 3
      see you then.
 4
                 (Luncheon recess, 12:00 p.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
                 AFTERNOON
                                     SESSION
 2.
                 THE COURT: Be seated, folks.
 3
                 Are we ready for the jury? Let's bring them
 4
      in.
 5
                     (Jury present, 1:30 p.m.)
 6
                 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Smith.
 7
                 MR. SMITH: Thank you, your Honor.
 8
                 Well, hello again, ladies and gentlemen, and
 9
      good afternoon.
10
                 I want to go back to the BSA structure just a
11
      little bit. You've heard a lot about it, so I don't want
12
      to belabor it, but the relationship between the CPC and
13
      the BSA and the charter organizations.
14
                 You've heard the court's instructions on the
15
      law in that regard. And I would just comment to you the
16
      instructions again on agency and control. I'm not going
17
      to detail that evidence.
18
                 I'll just simply say that you know that the
19
      evidence is that they are three distinct entities.
20
      charter organization's responsibility is to run the
21
      day-to-day activities of the troop. And it is
2.2.
     responsible for the operation of the troop with local
23
     volunteers, the CPC or the Cascade Pacific Council, in
24
      this instance was the Columbia Pacific Council then, is
25
      to provide local support, and the BSA has the
```

2.

2.2.

responsibility to provide the guidelines and the training materials and that type of thing.

Make no mistake about it, the Boy Scouts of America do require, make mandatory, two matters. And that is the uniform and the advancement protocol. And that's about it.

Do we retain the right to revoke a charter, a registration? Yes, we do. And we submit respectfully to you that that does not mean we have the right to control how the Council does its job or the local organization does its job.

It is designed to maintain the standards, and we do expect and do require and do want the adherence to the guidelines. And if it does not occur, the Boy Scouts of America do reserve the right to revoke, for instance, the local charter or in the particular instance of an individual, their registration. And that ties in with the I.V. Files.

In connection with the organizational — the organization and how it works, however, I would just commend to you your notes. And with respect to the witnesses, Mr. Marshall, Doug Smith, Bishop French and Grant Robinson, they all detailed and all talked about and testified about operational details.

With respect to the relationship of the Boy

2.

2.2.

Scouts of America and the LDS Church in this instance, I would commend to you Cascade Pacific Council's Exhibit No. 3041. You can take a look at the -- it is a 1977 publication by the Latter-Day Saints.

You can take a look at the table of contents. It talks about the working relationships between the Boy Scouts of America and the sponsoring units of the church. And it talks about church policies regarding chartering of units, of Scouting units.

And for more detail perhaps and some illustrations, you might want to take a look at the CPC Exhibit 3042. And that is the LDS's publication of its Scouting Handbook.

And page 1 of that handbook has an illustration of a special award that the LDS Church provides for Scouts that are members of the church. It is an On My Honor Award. And you can take a look at that if you like.

And it indicates to you, and I'm going to quote, "This handbook has been developed to help stake and ward advisers and other Scouting leaders understand how the Scouting program is used in the church. When properly carried out under strong priesthood leadership, Scouting effectively holds boys and young men close to their families and the church."

1 "It specifically provides that every phase of 2 the Scouting program should help young men and leaders 3 understand that Scouting activities are carried out to 4 accomplish priesthood purposes. Scouting is under the 5 direction of the priesthood and is itself a priesthood 6 activity." 7 That's page 1. Then if you are interested in 8 taking a look at this exhibit further, I would just 9 commend you to page 8. It talks about, and you've heard 10 about this, 11-year-olds are Blazer Scouts in the LDS 11 Church. 12 You've heard that explained to you. I don't 13 need to detail that, but it does go into some detail. 14 And surprise of all surprises, they have a special 15 position on the Sabbath. 16 What a surprise that the church would prefer 17 not to have campouts over the weekend if it is going to 18 invade Sunday. You've heard about that, that they do try 19 to curtail that except if they have an extended campout. 20 So there are special arrangements made. 21 would submit to you that there's been no evidence on it 2.2. and that is not particularly unique. It is still within 23 the guidelines of the Scouts.

Turning to the I.V. Files, it is true no youth organization in the country apparently at the time had a

24

25

2.

2.2.

program like that its in place. It is not that sophisticated, I believe you'll find, and I respectfully submit, you take a look at the files and you can make up your mind for yourself. It is not designed, this program is not designed for statistical purposes.

Dr. Warren testified for you that they do not

Dr. Warren testified for you that they do not have anywhere near the information needed to develop the scientific or analytical base, database for purposes claimed by the plaintiff in this case.

She specifically told you that no analysis or evaluation — or an analysis and evaluation, I should say, requires a skilled people to conduct the interviews. It has to be handled over a period of time.

And she gave an example, the McMartin situation that occurred years ago. And maybe people remember it, maybe you don't. She cited that, as where skilled people aren't involved interviewing children and doing the follow-up on it. And it just creates more problems than it solves.

No one has her statistical summary, or her statistical summary hasn't been challenged. And yes, we did have this done because in connection with this case, it was felt it was necessary.

She spent 220 hours herself looking at these files and cutting them down and trying to evaluate and

2.

2.2.

analyze them. You saw the four slides, and you'll have copies of them for you to review.

Significantly one of those charts shows that a good many — a good many of the years, I think almost every year showed that we had more people that we were keeping track of or finding out about than law enforcement did. And there's a graph of that. You can take a look at that.

There's really no convincing evidence, ladies and gentlemen, I would submit to you, that point out that the maintenance of these files and what information has been acquired here has any direct, causal relationship to the damages that are being claimed.

The Files are for one purpose. I told you in opening statement, and I'll say it again, they are to rid the BSA of problems and -- problems, undesirable people, and they are to prohibit them from returning.

It is not done to hide. It is not done to move them around. It is not done, if they are on probationary status, to move them around. It is designed for the exact opposite, to keep track of them and try to control the problem and/or keep them out initially.

If you choose to review the Files, and counsel has asked that you do so, I do the same, you'll find all kind of examples, ladies and gentlemen. Some, I believe

vou'll find were well-handled and others not so good. 1 2. There's some mistakes were made. There's no question 3 about it. We're not perfect. There's some questionable 4 judgments, and you've certainly heard about those. 5 There's some probation that hasn't always 6 worked, and there's probation that has. The plaintiffs 7 arque here, the plaintiff arques that you could have done 8 more. We should have done more. We made lots of 9 mistakes. You made lots of mistakes, but nevertheless, 10 the Files are invaluable. 11 Well, you can look at them for yourself and 12 see if that really makes common sense. Probation is not 13 the equivalent of the Catholic Church, for instance, and 14 moving priests around to hide something. I think it is 15 just the opposite, again, as I said. 16 There's a pile of Files here. And I thought 17 it would be a great idea -- you could see I have these --18 these are Files that I know I've tried to keep a note of 19 that were offered in evidence and that were discussed. 20 And I had thought about what a great idea it 21 would be to start going through these and point out what 2.2. I thought were pitfalls, pratfalls and what were good 23 about these Files. 24 But I found at the end of the morning this

morning, my voice is going out, and that's probably a

25

1 good thing because I'm not going to do this. I will just 2. point to you some numbers, though, some of Files, if you 3 want to take a look at them. 4 I would -- I'll give you those numbers. 5 There's about 15 of them, maybe a few more. But it will 6 give you a cross-section of these files: 5, 7, 11, 31, 7 40, 43, 49, 113, 520, 563, 692, I think that's it. 727, 8 I think I've got that one down, too, 735 and 1147. 9 And you may not find it interesting, I don't 10 know, but it is better to have than me reading them to 11 you and trying to point things out. There's one File, 12 though, that I thought is fairly recent, and I'm sure you 13 all remember it; I just want to touch on it. 14 Dr. Sebastian was asked, did you find any 15 evidence of satanic cult in these Files or any kind of 16 thing? She said no, I didn't. And she reviewed, I think 17 every other, seven or nine, files after they've been gone 18 through by her team. 19 And that file, it was Plaintiff's Exhibit 182, 20 was shown up on the screen. And you'll recall that the 21 cross-examination pointed out, and I would ask you to 2.2. look, it was that File that had the news alert on it, if 23 you recall. And the date of this report on this news

And the next day, you'll find -- I beg your

24

25

alert was November 17.

2.

2.2.

pardon. The date of the incident was the — the arrest was November 16. The date of this news report, the news alert internally down in Irving, Texas, was November 17, ladies and gentlemen, the day after this arrest was made, and it talks about the details.

The person that was arrested was not registered at the time. He was registered through October '92. So pretty close in point of time, but -- I beg your pardon, in 1982. So he hadn't been registered for a while.

And yet, he still put it in the I.V. File.

Unfortunately, in this incident, there was an Eagle Scout involved. And even without details involving the Eagle Scout, his — his name was put in the I.V. Files.

So there's an example of one they called up for one particular purpose, but the response was very quick. And that's a good thing, I would submit to you, because that's what this is designed for.

Now, if you want to look in these boxes, I'll take one out in the file, I don't care. I don't want to get it out of order. Here is one. I don't know what it is. I'm not going to take time to look through the file, folks, but it is one file.

And what is bad about this file? I'll tell you what's bad about it. One of these matters involving

2.

2.2.

sexual abuse is not good. The Boy Scouts would prefer that's not the case. One of them is not good.

It is too many. What's good about this File? Well, hopefully, the person is still not eligible to be in the Boy Scouts. What's good about all these Files? It is because they are out of Scouting, and that's what they are designed to do. Nothing more. Nothing less. And that's the whole purpose of these Files again.

How is the reporting to be done? You'll have four exhibits: Maintaining Standards of Leadership. You can go through those. I will commend to you the 1972 publication. It is CPC Exhibit 3022. And it talks about how to go about informing the BSA National about this kind of problem, how to secure the evidence and how you submit it and what you do with it.

I won't detail that again. You are welcomed to look at it if you like. That's how it is supposed to work. Has it always worked perfectly? No, it has not. But we've got it in place. And again, it is for a reason.

Now, these Files, ladies and gentlemen, are unredacted. We had to produce them. And I told you in opening statement, we don't produce these Files unless ordered to do so by the court. And there's a good reason for that. And so — because we feel a responsibility to

2.

2.2.

try to keep these Files confidential. But naturally, we have to obey a court order. So these Files were produced after a number of issues involving their production.

But I want to tell you they are unredacted. The concern of the BSA, and it should be the concern of anybody when you stop and think about it for four weeks now, these Files, portions of them, sometimes all of them have been flashed up on the screen.

You've got people sitting back here in the gallery, and we've had visitors throughout this four weeks of trial, and these names have been up on this board. And how would it be if somebody sitting here back in the gallery like today, and they see a name flash up, and they recognize it as a child, somebody they knew in their childhood or a family member, or a friend or a neighbor?

Not good. Not at all good. And that's why they are kept confidential. We go to great lengths, ladies and gentlemen, in this country to protect our children and their identities and their names when things like this are involved. And that carries into adulthood on many occasions. And this case is the perfect example.

It is filed as a Jack Doe. If you've had occasion when you've been walking around the hallways on breaks, if you've looked at the schedule out here, you'll

2.

2.2.

not see Kerry Lewis' name, ladies and gentlemen. He's an adult. His birthday was just this last Tuesday. And that's for a good reason, isn't it? These Files need, and we hope they are kept confidential.

The standard of care that existed 25 or 30 years ago was different than it is today. And in my opening statement, I tried to give you some examples of what was going on in that period of time, kind of see if we couldn't set the stage.

But you've heard witnesses talk about stranger danger and the man in the shadows in the trench coat. Or that was a long time ago, wasn't it, but some of us remember those days. The evidence was in this case insofar as the standard society was just waking up to this kind of problem.

We've been criticized. Apparently I guess it is criticism you folks are going to have a chance to see these two exhibits again, CPC Exhibit 3026 and 3025. I guess I should have reversed those numbers and given you the lowest one first.

I'll just hold them up. You'll remember seeing them. This is the pictures. These ads, if you want to call them that, they are a public service announcement appeared in the Scouting magazine, a magazine designed for adults.

2.

2.2.

And it has been kind of dismissed that hey, is this the best you can do? These public service announcements put up by the National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse. And that's what they were doing at the time. And they were running in Scout magazine as a public service.

And you'll recall one of the questions from counsel was well, this shows a little girl. Well, yes, it does. You can see that. And what was the thinking at the time? The girls were a target and young boys were not. And you heard some evidence along those lines.

And this is consistent with that. And the evidence about is rehabilitation working or not working, you've heard it is not particularly effective. But you'll see in these ads that most abusers could be helped in one of them. The other one says most child abusers can be helped.

That was the thinking at the time, and this is what was being produced at the time. That was the standard of care. And that's indicative of the standard of care, I should say.

Donald Wolff testified for you, and we know who he is. And he did an article in 1982. That was a part of his testimony, I believe you'll recall. He likewise confirmed that in the early '80s, we're finally

getting some traction on this issue.

2.

2.2.

But we had a copy of his article. I asked him about it and so did Mr. Xochihua asked him several things about it. But he wrote when an allegation is reported to us from whatever source, an accurate written report should be immediately prepared and filed.

I have recommended in every instance that the match, if still in existence, should be immediately suspended. He wrote that in 1982. And who was doing that for decades before that? Who was instituting immediate suspension? It was the Boy Scouts of America, ladies and gentlemen.

He also wrote — I believe we asked him about some of the problems involved. Organizations such as ours, meaning the Big Brothers and Sisters, should have the computerized ability to maintain a list of all employees and volunteers as well as those whose services have been terminated, so that member agencies can have access to information, which would at least dictate follow-up disclosure concerning said termination before re-employment and rematching with children.

Even this suggestion, he says, might violate privacy rights unless legislation is expanded to include the rights of such agencies for recordkeeping or the right to access the state and national recordkeeping.

2.2.

And you'll recall we talked to Dr. Warren and asked Dr. Warren about the Congressional record. And the National Child Protection Act of 1993, there was a discussion in that record going back into the early '80s and talking about the creation or Congress' efforts to create a controlled registry so that interchange of information could be accomplished.

She mentioned three organizations, didn't she?

The Civil Air Patrol, Big Brothers and Sisters, and the

Boy Scouts of America all interested in trying to get

that accomplished. And yet, it has not been

accomplished. It has not been done yet.

Taking it right up to current times. And again, not about the time frame, we know we're working up through July 1984, but Dr. Conte, when he brought in his file, had an article in it from the Journal of American Medical Association, March 27, 2010. And I had a tough time kind of examining about some of the findings in this article, simply because it is kind of cumbersome language.

It is a real mouthful. And at the risk of reading again to you and not putting it up on the screen, I do want to read to you what the final comment was, and perhaps you'll remember me reading it to him.

Karen M. Eichhorn, C.S.R.

And it was a review of sexual abuse of boys,

2.

2.2.

definition, prevalence, correlates, sequelae and management. And the comment in the conclusion of the article was, "The objectives of this review were to clarify the definition of sexual abuse of boys to update the prevalence estimates of this abuse and to explore its correlates, its sequella and management.

"The literature was small and methodology limited. Methods of eliciting abuse, histories frequently reported described or done subjectively, definitions of abuse, vary widely, sampling techniques were generally poor, and few studies controlled for effect, modifiers and confounders. Consequently, prevalence estimates were discrepant, associates confounded, and causal inferences not feasible."

A real mouthful. You'll see why I had difficulty probably examining him about it. But that was the state of affairs, ladies and gentlemen, a month ago in 2010.

We're asking the Boy Scouts of America to take care of that kind of a problem here with these Files. I would submit to you again, is that common sense?

Turning to this question of noneconomic damages. First, again, if Scouting was the problem, as it has been claimed to be, we would submit to you it is significant that when the family moved from the Portland

2.

2.2.

area to Klamath Falls, immediately the three boys were put back into the Scouting program, all brothers.

And what is the evidence about these damages?

Dr. Sebastian was retained to conduct a comprehensive

analysis. We had her report. And I asked her about the

18 points that are in that report.

They involved records that she received, informed consent that was taken, procedures utilized, parental status, and behavioral objectives — or observations, excuse me, family background, military history, criminal history, physical health, legal issues, sexual issues and so on, and the test that she conducted and her findings.

And she concluded after an 18-point exhaustive examination that sexual abuse did not cause the drug abuse issue, and that plaintiff has drug-related issues. She didn't blame it on Klamath Falls, ladies and gentlemen. Klamath Falls was in the discussion, no question. The plaintiff himself brought it up, you'll recall.

Dr. Conte, in his report, basically said and basically he testified, as you say, that the root of the problem now may not have been the sexual abuse, but it was this issue of betrayal.

Well, how do these experts characterize the

2.

2.2.

significance of the abuse? Neither of them really reported touching. And Dr. Conte's notes, he didn't report touching. And there was an indication that the plaintiff couldn't recall. Dr. Conte described the abuse as relatively low in order.

Dr. Sebastian said it was mild. What's the best evidence on this point? What's better than these two experts? You folks heard it. And I would submit to you, you saw it. It was the evidence about ten years in New York.

Mr. Lewis, to his credit, got off drugs. And look what happened. He became gainfully employed. He married. He started a family. He was earning a good living. Standing on his own two feet. I think I used those words.

He obviously was satisfying an employer who had confidence in him. He was supervising sometimes 25 to 30 men who were older, older than he was. Kind of used a slang phrase, I think, about how they felt about him, but he was emphatic about it and he meant it, and I don't blame him.

But I would submit to you that you not only heard that evidence, you had a chance to see him testify about it. And I would submit to you again, he was animated when he did it. It was a period in his life, it

2.

2.2.

was an accomplishment, and he was proud of it, and as well as he should be.

His pride radiated when he was discussing it. You could tell it in his voice and in his appearance. I would respectfully submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that without the drugs, the claimed damages that we're talking about here cannot be attributed to the Boy Scouts of America. He completely got himself straightened out for ten years. So when you think about the noneconomic damages, I would ask you to think about that evidence.

Turning to the question of punitive damages, again, the Boy Scouts of America are not infallible. No matter how hard we try and no matter how effective the program is, and despite the BSA's best efforts, you are being asked, never mind. Let's penalize him. Let's penalize them anyway, despite everything they've tried to do.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're not supposed to swear in court, but I'll tell you, with all due respect to his Honor and the lawyers and their parties and the gallery here, we are damned if we do and we're damned if we don't here. Please stop and think about that.

Was the Boy Scouts' conduct here as alleged amounted to reckless indifference or disregard? Has it been outrageous? I respectfully submit to you, ladies

1 and gentlemen, that it has not, and it doesn't warrant an 2. award of noneconomic damages or punitive damages. 3 aren't appropriate in this case, I submit to you. 4 In the early '80s, society was just waking up 5 to this problem. Congress was struggling with it, still 6 struggling with it, even as late as last month, and now 7 the Boy Scouts of America are being hauled before you and 8 being hauled before this court and criticized for not 9 doing a job. 10 Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for your 11 attention, and I am asking that you return a verdict for 12 the Boy Scouts of America. 13 Thanks again for your attention. 14 THE COURT: Whenever you are ready, Mr. 15 Xochihua. 16 MR. XOCHIHUA: Thank you, your Honor. 17 Counsel, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Devore, 18 members of the jury. 19 It is a rare privilege to be here talking to 20 you about this case that you've been so patient and 21 attentive to. It is a rare privilege to represent the 2.2. Cascade Pacific Council in this case. 23 My client appreciates the attention that 24 you've given and paid in this case, paying attention to 25 the evidence, stuff that you've seen on the screen, and

we appreciate the questions that you've asked.

2.

2.2.

I am usually going third, and I'm third again, it is 2:00, you've had lunch. I'm going to try to move around and keep you awake. I'm trying to ask you to pay attention.

You probably want me to be brief so you can hear from Mr. Clark or Mr. Mones, whoever is going to come up and talk after I sit down, but I have to talk. It is a \$4 million case right now, more to come maybe, and I have to get some points for my client.

But before that, I want to talk about some of the things that I thought I heard on Mr. Clark's closing. Sometimes you've probably seen me over there with my pen circling stuff, and that's what I did. What I think I heard him say, and again, as everybody has been saying, whatever we say isn't fact. We're advocates, right. So go on your memory.

But I think he said that the defendants here couldn't even stand up here and tell you there was a problem. Maybe you remember that. Maybe you don't. I think he said that none of the witnesses you heard from said there was a problem.

Then the very next thing he said was, what did Grant Robinson tell you? Well, Grant Robinson was the Scout Executive in 1984. Did he get up here and tell you

2.

2.2.

there was no problem? Mr. Clark referred to him because Mr. Grant told you he'd been aware of a problem since he started working as a professional Scouter in some council, didn't he?

Where is this "no one will admit a problem" coming from? What I think I heard was something about this just being the tip of the iceberg, just the tip of the iceberg. There was no system. These are here because of blind dumb luck.

What about the documents called Maintaining Standards of Leadership that started in 1972? I'm going to tell you what the exhibit numbers are. I think there are four different versions of them in evidence. They are our Exhibits 3022, '23, '24 and '25. I would ask you to take a look at those and see if that's blind dumb luck.

Mr. Clark stood up here and talked about 85 years. I'm going to remind you that most of what you've heard stopped in mid-1984. What he got up here and told you was that nothing has changed since then. That's what he was implying.

But we're limited in this phase of the case as to what we can say about what happened after July 1984. So I'll ask you to do the math from, I guess 1925 through 1984. It is not 85 years.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

What I heard I think Mr. Clark say was the Boy Scouts basically should have been better than everyone else because there are these files and they started keeping them early. Is that reasonable? Read your jury instructions. It talks about what a reasonable person, reasonable organization would have done. Is it reasonable to say you have to be the best? I think Mr. Clark suggested that because of worries about public image, the Boy Scouts of America did not talk about child sex abuse in their materials. was talking about the Tribune articles in 1974, the ghost troop issue. He said they were obsessed with membership. They were so obsessed with membership, that's why they didn't want to bring this horrible issue up. That's why. Where was the evidence to support that? He said, I think, that if Mr. Wolff had been in charge of the BSA program years ago, there would have been no more victims of child sex abuse in the Boy Scouts. Do you believe that? He said Dr. Warren insulted your intelligence. Did she? He said, children don't matter to the Boy Scouts of America. Don't they? He said, we're going to get up here and blame everyone else but ourselves. Mr. Smith said he wasn't going to blame anyone. I'm going to blame somebody, and it was Mr. Dykes. That's

2.

2.2.

who I'm going to blame. You heard Bishop McEwen refer to him as a snake. Do you remember that? He was asking him about a wolf in the garden. He said well, more like a snake. That's whom I'm blaming.

He suggested that Mr. Dykes was put on probation and he apparently wants to know what the explanation is for some of the documents. And I'm going to hit some of them for you to see if I can suggest an explanation that you consider reasonable in light of what you've heard.

He talked a lot about this statute of limitations defense. We have suggested that somehow if it is the law and it applies, it is unfair, that we're saying his client filed too late. I'm going to ask you to take the law and apply the facts to the law calmly and dispassionately and do what the judge has told you to do.

He suggested that Dr. Sebastian is a turncoat. He didn't use that phrase, but he said back when she wrote that letter when she supported victims. You read that letter. You read that letter. She was in support of extending the statute of limitations to sue the abuser who is not here, who has not been sued.

So now, back to what I planned to say. You might have guessed I get a little wound up every now and then. I've done it when I've asked questions. I try to

restrain myself, but I can't help it sometimes.

2.

2.2.

If I've done so and I've offended you, don't hold it against my client, please. You can tell other people that there was this crazy lawyer in the courtroom, or something like that, but try not to hold it against my client. You've seen the different styles. I told you at the outset, we're advocates. We want our clients to win. Absolutely we do.

Even though what we say isn't evidence, I am assuming that by paying attention, you've learned a lot about the strengths and weaknesses of our cases by how we ask questions, by what we ask questions about, whether we brought stuff out on direct or cross-examination.

At the outset of the case, I think I waved around a book. It was a different colored book because it was 2009. This is 2010. I think the judge has got one on his bench. I suggested that I was going to do everything that I could on behalf of my client to follow these rules. And if people thought I wasn't, well, the judge is the referee here, and you saw us jump up and down objecting. And the judge is making the calls just like the line judge in the tennis match does, except a lot more complicated than that.

What is plaintiff's claim? You have your jury instructions hand-out there. If you do, there's a

2.

2.2.

summary of the pleadings, page 3. You don't have to go through it. I'll just read parts I like and then someone else can read parts they like, but I encourage you to read it all.

In the first paragraph, plaintiff's summary of their complaint says Mr. Lewis was sexually abused as a child by his Boy Scout leader.

Now, just for a second, I want to digress. You heard their expert, Mr. Schoener, not Dr. Schoener, Mr. Schoener, you heard him agree that the rosters that you are going to get a chance to look at in detail never show Mr. Dykes as being a Scoutmaster or Scout leader in any pack or troop Kerry Lewis was in.

Same unit, no question. Same unit for a time, but he was never officially Mr. Lewis' Scout leader according to plaintiff's expert, according to the rosters.

In that first paragraph, they say at first,

Kerry Lewis alleged that defendants were negligent in

that before the abuse of Kerry Lewis, defendants had

direct knowledge through their agents that Dykes posed a

danger to Scouts. Direct knowledge through their agents.

Who were they talking about? Later in the instructions,

you may remember from yesterday, they are talking about

Bishop McEwen and Earl Wiest, Dr. Wiest.

2.2.

In the second paragraph, they talk about this institutional-wide problem that the Boy Scouts had with Scout leaders sexually abusing children. They say despite the knowledge and the knowledge that is in the Ineligible Volunteer Files, despite this knowledge, they didn't implement adequate policies to prevent sexual abuse of children. They say it was foreseeable to my client and BSA that if the policies remained unchanged, plaintiff, that's Mr. Lewis, plaintiff would be sexually abused by adult Scout leaders.

So because of what's in these Files, our clients should have known that he would be -- it was foreseeable that he would be abused. That's part of their claim.

Then they move on to the punitive damages.

This is the third paragraph where they scratched out the word "amounted." Do any of you remember? They say that Mr. Lewis has alleged that in failing to warn or protect him from the risk of sexual abuse by a Scout leader, defendants, that's my client, the BSA, acted with a reckless and outrageous indifference to a highly unreasonable risk of harm and with a conscious, conscious awareness, conscious indifference to the health, safety and welfare of plaintiff.

And if you believe that, that's the last

2.

2.2.

couple of questions on the verdict form. It has to do with punitive damages. That's what they are claiming. And the last two paragraphs deal with the answers that have been filed.

We said that we admitted on at least one occasion Timur Dykes illegally touched Kerry Lewis. We denied that we knowingly allowed, permitted or encouraged any acts of childhood sexual abuse of Kerry Lewis. And that affords us a defense under statute of limitations.

We also deny fault. We deny liability. I want to touch on just a couple other things in these instructions before I go away from them maybe.

What are their claims based on? We just read it. Direct knowledge, right, direct knowledge. That's why all of these agency claims, agency, the bishop, Dr. Wiest.

Now, you heard them both testify. They never talked to the CPC, Cascade Pacific Council or the BSA. I think one of the jurors may have asked a question in that regard. Did the CPC and the BSA know? Well, usually you don't ask a witness who is not with that organization did they know. You put on evidence that shows they knew. That's what plaintiffs are trying to do here with these I.V. Files.

They've used these and somebody asked for

2.

2.2.

limiting instructions. Remember the limiting instructions? You have to read those and figure out how you use these documents. But they are using these to prove notice and knowledge against my client and the BSA.

They are claiming apparently that when Bishop McEwen, in a privileged, religious privileged setting, learned about Mr. Dykes' problem with boys, as Mr. Smith said when he was acting as bishop, not on behalf of my client or the Boy Scouts, he was a dual agent.

I'm going to turn to page 6 of these instructions. And down at the bottom, it says knowledge of agent. It is the second instruction up. And I want to touch on this. It says a principal, that would be in this case either my client or the Boy Scouts of America, is not charged with the knowledge an agent acquires while not acting in the course of his agency.

Not charged with that knowledge, if the bishop was not acting in his role as an agent for either of our clients, or you are not charged with knowledge, or which relates to matters not within the scope of his authority unless the agent actually communicates the information to his principal.

I suggest this instruction, if you interpret it according to the facts that you've heard, means that if the bishop — if you believe the bishop when he said

2.

2.2.

he was doing it in a privileged setting, and he did not tell my client and did not tell the BSA, then that knowledge didn't come to us. You can't just pretend it did.

Let me turn to the next page. Again, near the bottom, there's an instruction called agency control. It says a person is considered an "agent," it is in quotes, of the principal. So, let's see, Bishop McEwen for a second.

Bishop McEwen is considered an agent of, I'll say, the Cascade Pacific Council, if the Cascade Pacific Council has the right to control the manner of the performance of the work, not only end result, but how that result is reached.

Do you think the Cascade Pacific Council had the right to control how Bishop McEwen took a confession? It says a mere furtherance of the purpose of the principal is not sufficient.

Well, the bishop did remove Dykes from his calling as an Assistant Scoutmaster. That sort of furthers the purpose of the Boy Scouts of America and my client by removing a bad egg. But that's not enough, according to this instruction.

This instruction goes on. A principal, Cascade Pacific Council, controls the conduct of a

2.

2.2.

nonemployee agent. Who would that be? Of course, the bishop, Bishop McEwen, maybe Dr. Wiest, if the principal, Cascade Pacific Council, controls the details of the manner of performance of the conduct which is alleged to have caused the injury.

So what was the bishop's conduct that caused the injury? It was in not contacting the parents of Kerry Lewis. That's the causal link here. He did not contact the parents of Kerry Lewis after he learned about Mr. Dykes' problem with young boys. That's what is really being complained about here. Did the Cascade Pacific Council control what the bishop did in that regard? It is for you to decide.

So I'll move on. I crossed out some things while Mr. Smith was talking because sometimes we tend to think along the same lines. But he did talk to you about bias. And you've been told that you are not supposed to let bias or sympathy or prejudice enter into your decision—making process. But I'm going to talk about a different kind of bias. And that's the bias of witnesses that you saw here or saw on video.

You get to evaluate other people's bias and how it affected their testimony and what they said. You get to think about their motives in seeing what they said. You get to evaluate them and their credibility.

And I would ask you to do that and take that job seriously.

2.

2.2.

Who were the least biased witnesses you've heard? Who were the least biased witnesses? I have some thoughts about that, but I'm not going to jump to my thoughts right now.

Let's talk about clients. Do you think clients are biased if they are part of a case? You better believe it. Why wouldn't they be? My client didn't even get to testify. My client representative? Why? Well, he wasn't in the Council back then. He's the current Scout Executive in the Council. Is he biased? You bet. He would like to get up here and tell you how biased he is. Isn't Nate Marshall biased? You bet. He wants to win, doesn't he?

Is Kerry Lewis bias? Do you think the other clients of Mr. Clark were biased when they testified here in support of a family member or another plaintiff in a case against the same parties? I'm going to suggest they are biased.

You can evaluate whether that affects their credibility. It is up to you. I'm not saying that it makes them not believable. I'm just saying you get to think about that. How did that affect their testimony? What are their motives for testifying?

1 Nate Marshall, we'll talk about him for a 2. minute. You know, he sat up there, I don't know how many 3 hours, being cross-examined. How did he do? Was he 4 given just one-sided answers? Always supporting 5 Scouting? Or did he exhibit ignorance about things? 6 he say, I really don't know? I don't remember? Or did 7 he flub up? Was he rehearsed? Do you think he was 8 rehearsed? 9 You get to evaluate those sorts of things. 10 When you all get back there and you get to talk about it, 11 I'm sure you'll have a little lively discussion about 12 that. 13 He didn't know the contents of each and every 14 one of these Files. Did you expect him to? When Mr. 15 Mones asked Mr. Marshall what he meant when he said he 16 thought parents had a vested interest in their children, 17 do you remember that? Mr. Marshall explained what he 18 meant. 19 Do you think he was trying to blame Mr. Lewis 20 or Kerry Lewis' mother, Helen Caldwell, or was he 21 explaining what he just told you? 2.2. Grant Robinson, we've talked about him. 23 biased did he come across? Does bias affect his 24 testimony? He out and out told you, hey, when I started, 25 I was told bad guys like boys, and we have an

2.

2.2.

organization that caters to boys and here is what we do about it.

Now, there may not have been a document called Maintaining Standards of Leadership in the '60s, we don't know. We can't find one. It looks like the 1972 one you'll see has a letter that says this is the first time we put it on paper.

Does that mean that because there wasn't a piece of paper or a little brochure saying here is how things are done, that it wasn't done? Well, the Files are evidence that it was before 1972 that something was happening. There was some process.

Gene Grant, current volunteer, president of the Cascade Pacific Council. He's a lawyer. He donates, too. He raises funds for the Cascade Pacific Council. He said he hadn't testified much. You might have been able to tell that as his testimony went on.

When he spoke his mind, about his opinion, about some of the facts and circumstances, was he showing his bias? You bet he was. He was showing his bias. But that is his opinion.

He tried to pull it back a little from the edge by calling it hyperbole when he said that it just seemed criminal. This group thing, he doesn't know what was going on. What parents would allow this to happen?

But that is not the position we are taking here officially before you.

2.

2.2.

You probably remember it was about 20 minutes to 5:00 when I started asking him questions. Maybe 25 minutes to 5:00 one evening. And I asked him maybe 15, 20 minutes of questions, turned him over to Mr. Smith, took about five minutes. Mr. Clark took just a little.

And there it is 5:00, and we left maybe 15 or 20 more minutes of questioning of that witness. We got interrupted because I got to cross-examine Mr. Schoener for a while. But then Gene Grant came back and spent hours on the stand on April Fools Day because I tried to be funny when it was my time to take over again and pretend that I was going to blow the next hour and a half of your day.

Neither Mr. Smith nor I asked Mr. Grant any questions about his personal opinions. What we asked him about, and this is the testimony I'd like you to think about, was Scouting in the LDS Church. What did it mean, camping by Cub, Webelos, Boy Scouts in the LDS Church?

Trying to do the math with trying to come up with 34 or 35 campouts, as Mr. Lewis has testified that he went on with Mr. Dykes. And if Mr. Grant is to be believed, and I'll suggest to you that some of the LDS exhibits Mr. Smith referenced talk specifically about how

2.

2.2.

many overnight camping events can be had by different levels of Scouts. If he is to be believed, there might have been six before Mr. Lewis moved out of the 10th Ward of the church with his family and his name shows up on Unit 815 rosters.

We asked him about Kerry Lewis. Hey, do you

We asked him about Kerry Lewis. Hey, do you recognize this old picture of him? Was he ever there in Unit 815 in the 15th Ward of the church? He said, I recognize him. Yeah, he was.

Do you believe that testimony? Or is he just making it up? Is his bias affecting that testimony? Or do you believe what he said then? Do you believe he believed what he said when he said parents, it is criminal? Bias, but maybe still believable.

You get to decide that. Let's talk a little bit about some people that plaintiffs chose not to bring here for you. Where was Counselor Alderson? She was the first therapist who ever treated plaintiff. Plaintiff was referred to her by his lawyer after getting involved in this church while the LDS Church was still a party. Remember, we went through her records a little bit.

Where was Dr. Natasha Velaas? Where was she, the second counselor to ever treat this plaintiff for \$4 million worth of noneconomic damages that are being sought here? Why wasn't she here?

2.

2.2.

What did Dr. Conte say about that, the expert who evaluated the plaintiff? Do you remember what he said? It sounded — again, my recollection isn't perfect, but it sounded to me like when we asked him, well, did you think about calling up his therapists, he basically said that wouldn't have mattered to me.

They don't, they don't know what I know. They don't know what I do or something to that effect. I can't remember. But it seemed he was sort of dismissive of the very people who had been hired to treat this plaintiff, one of whom at least we know was selected for this plaintiff.

Let's talk about Detective Shipley for a little bit. Do you think he might have been one of the least biased people here? He doesn't really take either side. He's law and order, former law and order. He's sort of law and order in his job at Safeway handling investigations. What about Judge Snouffer? Both sides wanted to call those witnesses, but plaintiff gets to go first, so I didn't have a problem.

Let's talk briefly about Mr. O'Connor, an interesting man from a class who had no axe to grind. Did it seem to you like he had no axe to grind? Did he seem eager, maybe a little bit, to label the Boy Scouts of America liars? That's what he said on the witness

1 stand.

2.

2.2.

I was Googling this trial and I saw in the press. They are liars. And then when he testified and he explained what he meant by that, what he meant was he had an unfortunate situation involving a former friend, Mr. Gould. He reported him to that Council.

Doesn't know if that information ever made it to the Boy Scouts of America, but because he saw him again 11 years later, he assumed it must not have or — he assumed it did and they didn't care.

That's what he was telling you. They are liars. They don't kick these people out. They get this information, they don't act on it. But he didn't have the knowledge to support that opinion, I suggest. It is up to you to decide if he did.

What could he know about this trial that you don't know in his Google session? You've been here.

This is more than 15 and a half days. You've been here.

Do you think he knows more about what's happened here than you do? Maybe. Maybe not. But he was sure willing to come in here and tell you about it.

He was willing to testify that the Boy Scouts of America falsifies records it submits to Congress every year. What was his support for that? Well, back in '69, or whenever he was actually a professional Scouter, he

2.

2.2.

became aware of some problems with registration. And he was aware of all these articles in '74 about Troopgate or whatever it is.

Mr. Smith read those while I was still sort of thinking about them. And while the witness was on the stand, he said, gee, you know, these articles, don't they show that once the national organization became aware of this, they implemented a five-step program?

They fired people. They took care of the problem once they knew. It was in all of the papers. Why not just try to cover it up? Because you can't cover stuff up that's in the papers. That's one reason. Maybe, maybe the Boy Scouts of America realized it had a problem and tried to deal with it. Maybe.

Plaintiffs don't want you to believe that.

They want you to believe the numbers that we were talking about with Mr. Schoener are all inflated and useless information. Is that what you believe? You get to choose to believe or not believe that.

I made a mistake in my numbers, and I put an extra zero in there. I hope you realize once I realized that, I took it back and said something about it. I think the numbers that I put up on the chart were like .0003. I had an extra zero that I had to remove, but .003 percent to .005 percent, not the .0001 percent that

Mr. Clark put up there.

2.

2.2.

Who else called -- was called? Ryan Johnston came in to talk to you. I couldn't believe this. How four boxes of documents can multiply into six. That was a pretty powerful witness there.

So plaintiff, his mother, his father, two of his brothers and three other plaintiffs with current claims against my client, current claims against the Boy Scouts of America, those three other plaintiffs who formerly had a claim against the LDS Church all were represented by Mr. Clark's office.

Did their bias affect their credibility at all? Did any of their testimony seem at all rehearsed to you? Do you remember the sort of parade of answers?

Well, it was in the Cub Scout Handbook, four or five questions pretty close together. How did you know? Well, it was in the Cub Scout Handbook. You heard it four or five times, three or four times. When did he last read it? That was kind of interesting. Maybe it is mean — maybe I was mean asking that question. Maybe it was unfair. But maybe I wanted you to know.

You heard in opening statement that the first time Mr. Lewis woke up lying on Mr. Dykes' abdomen and Mr. Dykes had an erection that he thought wrong, wrong, wrong. Do you remember that? I can't do it like

Mr. Clark does.

2.

2.2.

Is that what he testified to under oath when the LDS Church was still in the case? I think we played that for you as to what he testified. I think the testimony was, something to the effect of, I didn't know what to think. He didn't even know what an erection was at the time. Remember that testimony? I hope I am not mistaken.

Do you think the testimony from the various witnesses who gave deposition testimony while the LDS Church was still a party, do you think their testimony changed at all after the LDS Church was no longer a party?

Do you think the focus of attention went away from the church is at fault? We don't trust the church, the church betrayed us to well, now, it is the Boy Scouts who did it? I tried to bring out what I could in that regard. I hope you weren't offended by that.

I'm going to ask you to bring up Exhibit 3082, please, page 2. These are the records from Michelle Alderson, some of them. I'm not going to make you look at all of them. I'm going to blow up this letter of January 27, 2010.

Just down here. Remember, we showed you this before. Kerry had shared that he told his parents about

2.

2.2.

the abuse after it occurred and that his parents confronted the church. Church representatives reportedly told his parents that they knew about this sexual abuse and the priest had repented. There was apparently no consequences for this priest by the church, which continued to cause Kerry anger and frustration.

Let's go to page 12, same exhibit. This is his actual first visit record. He had one scheduled before, but it got rescheduled. What does this say?

March 4, 2008. An hour-long session. Worked on anger issues related to SA. I'm going to suggest that might mean sexual abuse by priest. LDS youth group and Boy Scout leader.

Client angry that told parents at time of abuse. Told parents at time of abuse. Parents confronted church, who advised they were aware of abuse and abuser had repented. Continue to work on anger issues.

Why do you think Counselor Alderson wasn't called as a witness here? You can drop that. I was going to bring up the, and I will — I'm going — let's bring up Exhibit 182. Mr. Smith talked about this, but I kind of like showing it to you. Top half of this.

Remember the questions about this little fireman putting out the fire? How significant was that

1 to you in the overall scheme of things in this case? 2. They were talking about this because of the satanic cult. 3 Mr. Smith pointed out that this person, 4 however you pronounce his name, John Sileo, was arrested 5 on November 16. They found drugs, alcohol, weapons and 6 other sexual material. He was an Assistant Cubmaster in 7 Pack 145 through October 1982. So a year before, not now 8 registered. And then there was somebody else. 9 This is the Eagle Scout currently registered. 10 Extent, details of his involvement not immediately known. 11 Council is processing standards of leadership, again, 12 those exhibits, removal papers today. 13 Down here: Action or recommendations. 14 procedures. Forward anything to National. Point out 15 that this guy is not registered with the BSA and that 16 this other guy whose involvement isn't really known is 17 being removed the next day. Counsel said if we wanted to 18 pull up good files, why, then we would. Well, we didn't 19 have to. They did it. 20 Let's talk for a minute about credibility of 21 some of the witnesses that you've heard. I won't hit 2.2. them hard, but Bishop Gordon McEwen, Robert French, 23 Bishop French, Jim Bean, I like saying his name, Jack

You know, we brought in -- I'm going to insult

Powell, Linnard Bybee, what did you think about them?

24

25

2.

2.2.

somebody here, I know it, we brought in some people who are mature. That's a good word. They had gray hair.

Most of them, if they had hair.

Why? Because they were around when this happened and it is getting harder to find them. It is getting harder to find witnesses who remember events back then and bring them in, but we did. It is up to you to evaluate their testimony.

Did Bishop McEwen come across as being biased?

Was he painting a rosy scenario for his benefit, for anyone's benefit? Do you think he spoke the truth about what he said he did when Colleen Lashbaugh came to him?

What did he do wrong?

There was some mention about the slap of the wrist and the disfellowshipment. Exhibit 3043 consists of about four or five pages of LDS documentation that explains both, about disfellowshipment and excommunication.

Was Bishop McEwen believable when he said he acted immediately that he removed Dykes from his calling? Told him to stay away from children when he said he cooperated with the authorities, legal authorities? Was he believable when he said, you know, I'm not really all that involved in Scouting? I don't really take the training. Other people do that.

2.2.

The people are more hands-on. So if he wasn't trained, that's the BSA's fault apparently, as it is my client's fault, because we didn't make people who weren't really directly involved take the training.

You heard Mr. Wolff, the attorney from St.

Louis. I think he ultimately admitted that back even in the mid '80s, you weren't really able to make people undergo this kind of training even in his organization.

Was the bishop credible when he said he had privileged conversations? I'm going to suggest, not just with Mr. Dykes, but when he went to talk to each of the parents and each of the children, do you think maybe it is possible that those were considered privileged conversations within the church? Do you think those conversations occurred at the direction or subject to the control of my client or the Boy Scouts of America?

Secrecy, you keep hearing secrecy. If you look at that summary of the plaintiff's case and the instructions, I don't think you'll find the word "secrecy" in there anywhere. It is a nice word. It sounds great in court. But was it wrong for the bishop to meet privately? Do you consider that secrecy to respect people's privacy rights and interests?

Did the bishop, Bishop McEwen, say he actually knew that these young boys were spending the night at

1 Timur Dykes' apartment? I think we read back the 2. testimony. While I forget, Gene Grant who actually -- he 3 was so biased, that he was the one willing to say that if 4 that's what the bishop said, he was wrong to say it, 5 didn't he? Wrong to allow it, if that's what he allowed. 6 If the bishop said it, and I suggest he did 7 not, I suggest he said that if he had known, he would 8 have put a stop to it or at least several of the 9 witnesses said that, was it with his approval? 10 Was it when he was acting on behalf of my 11 client or the Boy Scouts of America? You heard the 12 church frowned upon such things. I think it was Jack 13 Powell. Maybe I'm losing track of who said what. 14 Bishop French, he came across, I thought, 15 fairly well. Did he have an axe to grind against anybody 16 really? 17 Jim Bean, he said a lot. I tried to time him, 18 15 minutes or so, but he said a lot, didn't he, in his 19 soft-spoken way? Was he believable when he talked about 20 what the LDS Scouting publication would suggest and 21 recommend that training be taken by them from available 2.2. training resources? He talked about the round tables, 23 Council and so on. Was he believable when he said the 24 LDS Church promoted the training? Neither Mr. Smith nor 25 Mr. Clark cross-examined him.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

Jack Powell, did he really teach this Scout leader development course that Mr. Bybee came in to tell you about and brought his framed certificate? We made a color photocopy. I have to give this back to him, as you may recall. It is in evidence. I want to talk about Linnard Bybee for a few minutes. How did he come across to you? Did he have an axe to grind? Here is a guy who was a combat photographer in Vietnam. Was injured. Was awarded a Bronze Star. He comes back to Portland. Goes to school. Winds up in the electricians union. Moves up in the ranks. Becomes an electrician apparently with Portland Public Schools and now he is a supervisor at Portland Public Schools. Do you remember the cross-examination of Dr. Warren by Mr. Mones? Mr. Mones cross-examined him. she said, you know what, I think there was even some training back then. She referred to Mr. Bybee as Mr. Bypass. You all have been pretty stone-faced through this proceeding, jurors. I try to watch. I sneak glances, all of us do. Some of us are better at it than

others. You probably saw me.

What did Mr. Mones say? He said, oh, the bus driver. You remember that? Not all of you were

1 stone-faced when you heard that as if being just a bus 2. driver wasn't very impressive, as if someone who is just 3 a bus driver couldn't tell you the truth, as if a mere 4 bus driver shouldn't be believed. 5 Was Mr. Bybee believable? Was he trained when 6 he said he was? Did the red and white "train" badge on 7 his Scoutmaster shirt mean what he said it meant? Did 8 you believe him when he said he was kind of upset about 9 it because he lost overtime and there was a lot of 10 overtime available? 11 He remembers the training because it happened 12 when he and his wife apparently nearly lost their 13 daughter, for some reason that we didn't go into. 14 While I'm mentioning Mr. Mones, I'm going to 15 pick on him a little more just a little. Remember him 16 telling Dr. Warren to forget the Standards. Forget the 17 Standards. She kept wanting to talk about Standards. 18 Forget the Standards. Now, they are saying Standards, 19 apparently you didn't follow them. 20 Remember him telling Dr. Warren well, the only 21 thing they do is molest Scouts. Do you remember that? 2.2. That was kind of an interesting comment. My eyebrows

I'm going to talk to you about criminal acts. When you are in the jury room, I want you to look at page

23

24

25

went up.

2.

2.2.

6 of the instructions. Top of the page says unexpected criminal acts are not foreseeable.

That brings me to Mr. Dykes. He never testified. You saw him in opening. Some video was played, but he was never here before you as a witness. By all accounts, he had everyone convinced he was someone good. No one had a clue. Not Mr. and Mrs. Lewis at the time. Not Dr. Wiest. Not Bishop McEwen.

And Mr. Dykes unquestionably, I suggest, engaged in criminal acts with boys. Criminal acts which no one came here and testified before you that they expected at the time. In fact, everyone said that they couldn't believe it or at least words to their — shocked, stunned.

Unfortunately, even after Mr. Dykes confessed to the bishop, after he pled guilty and was investigated by a detective, after he was told to stay away from children, after he was told — charged with a crime or crimes by the Multnomah County District Attorney's Office, after he pled guilty and after he was sentenced by Judge Snouffer, he committed more criminal acts. Some of those involved Mr. Lewis. Were those expected criminal acts or unexpected criminal acts?

If my client didn't know through the bishop about the earlier problem, how could my client have

1 expected that the criminal acts directed toward Mr. 2. Lewis, how could they have expected that they happened --3 that they would happen? Unexpected criminal acts are not 4 foreseeable. 5 Dr. Wiest, let's bring up exhibit -- the 6 center-fold, I've been calling it. Dr. Wiest, why did I 7 bring this up when he was here? Because that's what he 8 looked like then. Here we are 25 or so years later. 9 That's what he looked like then. That's the guy who, if 10 he had known, would have taken action. 11 He understood that Dykes was removed from 12 Scouting, removed from his calling. He knew police had 13 been involved. But he wasn't -- he wasn't told by his 14 bishop the specifics of what the bishop knew. Why? He 15 had a son in the troop. Why was he not told? I suggest 16 it is because the bishop took his privilege seriously. 17 He didn't tell everyone because he felt he had to protect the privilege. He didn't tell anyone in the church. 18 19 But let's assume for the sake of discussion 20 that that privilege didn't exist. How far would you have 21 the bishop go to tell people? There's been a lot of talk 2.2. of about 30 people in the troop. 23 If you actually take the rosters for the years that Mr. Dykes was an Assistant Scoutmaster with the Unit 24

719 troop and you cross off duplicate names and then you

25

1 count them all up, and you merge those three years or two 2. years, I think you'll wind up with about 24. 3 Because some of the names are there that came 4 in after Mr. Dykes was already removed from Scouting for 5 this reason. There's a little notation that says so. 6 But even if the bishop had contacted everyone 7 in that troop, it wouldn't have hit Kerry Lewis' parents. 8 Even if he contacted every parent of every boy who was 9 still in that church, it still wouldn't have been to 10 Kerry Lewis' parents. 11 What he should have done apparently is see 12 Kerry Lewis' name. Find out where they were. Call them 13 up or go to visit him. Why stop there? Why stop there? 14 If Mr. Dykes is a known danger, gosh, shouldn't the 15 bishop have sent letters to like the school system? 16 Shouldn't he have sent letters to all of the LDS 17 Churches? Why limit it to the LDS Church? 18 That's kind of being preferential. You told 19 your own people. You didn't tell the Presbyterians down 20 Why not? You could be criticized for that. the road? 21 Where does it end? You have to decide whether 2.2. what he did was reasonable, whether what he did was at my client's direction or control or whether my client had 23 24 the right to control it. 25 Did Dr. Wiest try to slant his testimony?

2.

2.2.

said that after Bishop McEwen told him Mr. Dykes was released from his calling as an Assistant Scoutmaster, he does not remember Mr. Dykes being involved in any Scouting activities.

In fact, have you heard from one witness, one witness that any of these events involving Mr. Lewis occurred during a regular Scouting activity? The other plaintiffs who came in and testified, did they say any of this happened during regular Scouting activity? No.

Why not? Why not? Why didn't it happen during regular Scout activity? Well, it is not like the Big Brothers and Sisters where the whole goal is to get an adult alone with a child, one on one.

What the Scouts had was a structure that had a number of people involved; parents, troop committee, Scouting coordinator, Scoutmaster, Assistant Scoutmaster, more than one involved in most regular activities back then.

I'm going to talk briefly about the experts. Which experts came across as being less biased, more biased? Less informed, more informed? Mr. Dworin, the gentleman from LA, did he say he could have identified Mr. Dykes as a sexual predator on children before it was known to anybody else? No, he did not.

I don't think anybody came in here and told

2.

2.2.

you they could have identified Dykes as a predator beforehand regardless of all of these profile similarities that — I mean, if it had been, instead of Mr. Dykes, a married man who was in his 70s here that we were talking about having molested kids, I bet you could find files in here that said oh, married men in their 70s, got to keep an eye out for them. I think Mr. Dworin admitted there's no way to figure out who is going to prey on children before they do it.

Dr. Conte, he said 95 percent-plus of his evaluations are for plaintiffs; that regardless of the limits of information available to him, regardless of what Mr. Lewis told him who seems to minimize the effects on him of this sexual abuse, he had an opinion that nearly everything bad that has ever happened in plaintiff's life was probably somehow caused by this sexual abuse.

I remember in opening, Mr. Clark standing before you and saying his client wasn't going to make that claim. He was going to own up to some of the problems in his life. And maybe he did. And maybe I'm jaded and cynical. And maybe I just don't remember what he said completely in that regard. But what Mr. Clark said in closing, I suggest, was far different than what the picture was when he gave his opening.

2.2.

Dr. Conte didn't delve very deeply into Mr. Lewis' history in the Navy or perhaps he would have been told what Dr. Sebastian was told, that he was bored with his job in the Navy.

Do you remember Mr. Lewis' mother testifying about the notes she created about the circumstances involving the church and Mr. Dykes and the bishop that she was saving in case if there's some sort of an emotional crisis or need for them; that she never gave to her son and she can't find now?

Was he even aware that those existed? And was he? He interviewed people, but he thought what they were telling him was that there had been all these problems instead of not enough to give Mr. Lewis the thing that I wrote down shortly after Mr. Dykes was arrested in Tillamook.

Mr. Smith touched on this. If the abuse at the hands of Mr. Dykes caused Mr. Lewis' problems in high school after two years of good grades, with drugs, with women, with alcohol, what explains this stable period in New York?

How could the abuse not be a causal factor that made that impossible? How much did the abuse affect Mr. Lewis? How much did it affect him? He told Dr. Sebastian he really didn't think much about it until

```
1
      after he became involved in this lawsuit. I think he
 2.
      told you that in this courtroom.
 3
                 Let's pull up the testimony of Mr. Lewis which
 4
      I played in opening.
                 (Video deposition of Kerry Lewis played.)
 5
 6
                 "How was it that you came to -- well, why did
 7
      you end up suing the church and the Boy Scouts for this?
 8
                 "Answer: Because I was asked to be part of
 9
      this lawsuit.
10
                 "Question: Who asked you that?
11
                 "Answer: Mr. Clark.
12
                 "Question: Okay. Well, I don't want to --
13
      I'm not asking you about conversations that you had with
14
      Mr. Clark. What I'm trying to find out is how you ended
15
      up thinking that you might go see a lawyer about the
16
      situation, that's what I'm interested in.
17
                 "Answer: I didn't think about going to see a
18
      lawyer ever.
19
                 "Okay. How did you get contacted then?
20
                 "Answer: My mother started this whole thing.
21
      She asked me -- it is very difficult, a lot of
2.2.
      information. My mom started this whole ball rolling.
23
                 "Ouestion: How so?
24
                 "Answer: She read in the -- one of the
25
      newspapers here in Oregon about a case Mr. Clark was
```

involved with. 1 2. "Question: Had your mom not contacted you 3 about this, what would you have done? 4 "Answer: Nothing. 5 "Question: When did you first become angry 6 and frustrated at the church? 7 "Answer: When my mother called me back in '07." 8 9 I think that speaks volumes. When his mother 10 called him, apparently his marriage was not doing well. 11 There may have been some financial issues. He left his 12 wife and his daughter in New York to come here to be 13 involved in this lawsuit. 14 He did well after arriving for a while. 15 has a stable relationship. He has a house in Klamath 16 Falls. He has a truck. He has a trailer and a couple of 17 four-wheelers that he goes to the dunes on weekends. But 18 he also, once he learned this case was going to go to 19 trial, started having some problems. 20 And I'm going to suggest to you that before 21 that, he didn't really think he had any problems. What 2.2. Dr. Conte apparently is telling you is that despite what 23 his client believes, believed, thought, he disagrees 24 because the plaintiff is not, I can't remember the words 25 Dr. Conte used, but psychologically aware, mindful or

1 whatever it was, psychologically mindful.

2.

2.2.

You have to evaluate that, evaluate what you think, what the truth is. I'm going to talk a little bit about Mr. Schoener. He was a real interesting expert who testified to many opinions to a reasonable professional certainty. Do you remember that?

Even though he admitted he performed no independent research. Even though he only made it through one-third to one-half at least when he first testified, and when he was called back on rebuttal, maybe more than half of the I.V. Files.

Before he came in here and testified in front of you about vast majority and great majority and so on, even though he kept no count of the Files he actually viewed, even though he thought it would be irrelevant, irrelevant to try to learn how the Boy Scout's records compared to other records that may have been kept by other organizations at the same time. He wasn't even aware anyone else did.

What he said — when Mr. Clark repeated in opening, you don't have these kind of records unless you have a problem, so I guess if you don't keep them, you don't have a problem. And I think that's what Mr. Smith was saying when he cursed here in front of you. He used foul language.

2.

2.2.

Mr. Schoener, who believes all newspaper articles are true. Remember that testimony? Mr. Schoener, who I'm going to suggest tried to back out of his testimony when I got a hold of him 10 minutes or 15 minutes before 5:00 the first time he was here about how to measure, how to compare the known information, the known, I'm not talking about unknowns, we all know there are unknowns.

We all know that not all of these perverts get caught or reported, but comparing known information available from these Files to known information available to other youth-serving organizations, what other youth-serving organizations? Children's Protective Services? Law enforcement?

Mr. Schoener acknowledged that all he really had to do was run a newspaper search, have some news search engine go out and gather all of the newspaper articles that you are going to see in these Files when you go through them and that would have led him to the same type of information as the Boy Scouts was keeping.

You'll see them. You've seen some of them.

They talk about Scoutmaster and all kind of things in the newspaper articles. Do you think that was secret information? Do you think it was secret when it was on the front page of whatever New York paper it was, the old

1 one?

2.

2.2.

Do you think it was secret information when the Boy Scouts of America reported to Congress they kept these Files years ago? Mr. Schoener was surprised. He never heard of it before. You've been told here that you may be the first jury to look at it, but you certainly aren't the first people who have ever heard about these things. It has been in the papers. You'll see it when you go through these Files.

Mr. Schoener, who didn't ask for any additional information from the lawyers representing Mr. Lewis, who never tried to find out what training was available here in what was then called the Columbia Pacific Council. Never wanted to find out apparently, who was never provided with the trial testimony of Jack Powell or Linnard Bybee even before he came back.

Who could not, on rebuttal, do you remember this, he's on the telephone on rebuttal, Mr. Mones was talking about these statements Janet Warren made. I asked him, what page is that? What page are you talking about? And he couldn't come up with one. Why do you think that was? Was he an impartial, unbiased expert?

I'm getting near the end here, believe it or not. I could go on to talk about Mr. Schoener for quite a while. I have probably two more pages of things to say

2.

2.2.

about Mr. Schoener, but I'm going to skip to some of the ones that I think are probably more interesting.

I think he said he thought these early public service advertisements in Scouting magazine, first he said they aren't good enough, or words to that effect. You don't see anything about Scoutmaster or Scout abuse in that. That's not really even raising the awareness of people who are involved in Scouting about potential child sex abuse.

Then he also said, I think on the phone, he wasn't really intending to criticize those ads. He admitted he was not here to talk to you about the relevant standard of care for organizations like these two defendants back at the time, the relevant time. Why? Because he wasn't aware of one. He says you should have, you would have, you could have.

Did I go too fast?

She said he was unaware of any validating or commonly accepted training programs used by organizations like the defendants back at the time to prevent or train about child sexual abuse.

How did he stack up against Dr. Warren? Who do you think was more objective? Who do you think had their opinions more based on objective information? Who undertook any research at all? I suggest she did.

2.

2.2.

Mr. Schoener did say a couple of things that I think are potentially important, because what he finally said was the reason you want to tell parents that Scoutmasters could be abusing their kids in Scouting is because then they will be on notice, and they will be able to make a decision, a decision as to whether their children should continue on in Scouting.

Do you remember that testimony? And I asked him, would you agree that once Timur Dykes was arrested in July of 1984, that Mr. and Mrs. Lewis were on notice of the possibility that a Scoutmaster or Scout leader might abuse children since apparently they understood he was not supposed to be around young boys and they thought that might be a violation of some probation? He said yes.

And I asked him whether he was aware that after that, the children, including Mr. Lewis and his three younger brothers, continued on in Scouting? Why did I ask those questions?

Because at the time, even though they were on notice, Mr. Lewis' parents did not blame Scouting. They were mad at the church. There's no question. Mr. Lewis confronted the bishop in trying to find out where Timur Dykes was. He got no answers. I said in opening, they strayed from the church. But they continued on in

Scouting.

2.

2.2.

What does that matter to you? Because right here, right now, after they first sued the LDS Church and my client and the Boy Scouts of America, the church is out. It is not here anymore before you except in one place on the verdict form. And I think actions speak louder than words do now. Actions back then speak volumes. That's why we asked those questions.

Some might suggest I'm bringing this up because I'm blaming Mr. and Mrs. Lewis. And I want to be clear about it. Mr. Dykes' criminal acts against their son were not expected by them or anyone else at the time. I am not blaming them for being fooled by him. How could I? How could my client blame them for that?

Back to Detective Shipley. When he started testifying, it seemed like maybe he was suggesting that the bishop hadn't been forthright with him. And on cross-examination, did it come across to you that after we went slowly through his report, he realized some of his recollection wasn't all that great, as I think he came in and said, they only knew about two victims.

By the time we were done with cross-examination, it was up to six. Plus there were all those blacked-out names, you'll see, of other kids who were known to be around Timur Dykes.

2.

2.2.

How many does it take before at that time the investigative authority for this county to say, oh, gee, we might have a serial predator here? I don't know. Is two enough? Is six enough? Does it have to hit 17? It was a judgment call, and it was a judgment call by Detective Shipley, subject to the review of the Multnomah County District Attorney's Office.

I think he testified that at no time did he ever get any vibe that Bishop McEwen was in any way trying to hide any information from him. But remember, you are the ones who have to remember.

Did he ever ask for a roster? I think he said he did not. Did he ever suggest contacting the parents of other youth than the ones the bishop told him Mr. Dykes said he tried to touch while they were sleeping — or touch while they were sleeping? No. Did he think as a former Scout to contact the local Council or the National BSA? He didn't.

That's because he knew he was talking to a bishop in the 10th Ward of the LDS Church. Even though he knew there was Scouting involved, he didn't think to have anybody contact my client or the Boy Scouts of America.

The police reports shows Children's Protective Services was involved. I'm going to suggest that

2.

2.2.

Children's Protective Services is a youth-serving organization, and that it had lots of information about abused youth. Did Mr. Schoener seek to find out any of that here in Oregon, here in Portland?

Judge Snouffer told you about what happened back then. He said there was no Sex Offender Registry back then. He told you what he saw from the file made it look like it was a fairly routine and typical handling of a matter involving a first-time offender. He didn't require my client or the Boy Scouts of America to be notified.

Statute of limitations, it is on the top of page 5 in your instructions. It is one of our defenses. It is. I'm not shy about it. We have to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that our conduct did not knowingly allow, permit or encourage child abuse? That is for you to decide.

If you decide that the conduct of my client and the Boy Scouts of America or either of them was not knowingly allowing, permitting or encouraging child abuse, then Mr. Lewis' case is over. It is a tough call. It is a tough decision.

We are saying he doesn't get the benefit of the extension of the statute because that's the law. It will be a tough decision for you, I hope. I hope. But

1 maybe you won't get there because maybe you'll decide my 2. client and the Boy Scouts of America were not negligent 3 to begin with with respect to the abuse of Kerry Lewis by 4 Mr. Dykes. 5 I'm going to go back to those Maintaining 6 Standards of Leadership documents. Does that say we 7 knowingly allowed, permitted or encouraged child abuse? 8 Does the public service ad say that? 9 Do you remember the testimony of McEwen, 10 Bishop McEwen, Jack Powell, Linnard Bybee, Bishop French, 11 Detective Shipley, do you think that shows that my client 12 knowingly allowed, permitted or encouraged child abuse? 13 Do you recall the testimony about all of the 14 reasons for these Ineligible Files? Does that say that 15 we knowingly allowed, permitted, encouraged child abuse? 16 It is a serious question. And how you answer that, if 17 you get there on the verdict form, will have a tremendous 18 impact on one side or the other side in this case. 19 the law is what the law is. You get to calmly, 20 dispassionately decide the facts and apply the law. 21 I talk a little bit about numbers. 2.2. one document I want to bring up on screen. It is 3207, 23 please. 24 I'm getting there. I have two more pages, 25 judge, I think.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

You didn't hear anything about this. a document that was admitted by stipulation between counsel for the parties. Like the numbers Mr. Marshall had that are in evidence for the National organization, these are based on records at the Council level. And it gives you some idea during those four, five years how many units were in the Council, how many youth were registered through the Council, how many registered Adult Volunteers there were, and how many Professional Scouters there were for the Council. Should you choose to do any math, that's the only reason they are in there, but it also will give you an idea of the size of this Council back at the time. You can bring that down. I want to talk about the rosters for a minute. Please bring up 1409, Page 14, please. Do you remember all those questions to Dr. Wiest about rosters and such and how Mr. Clark was pointing out the scratch out and the dates and so on? One of you jurors wrote a question: Whose responsibility

was it to maintain the roster throughout the course of the year?

Remember, these are documents that were stipulated as having been produced by my client. that little CPC number in the corner. These came from my 2.

2.2.

client's records. Mr. Clark suggested that I was going to come up here and tell you there was a mistake; that that line for Timur Dykes wasn't crossed out, that that was a mistake.

I'm going to suggest to you that it is proof that my client was not notified that Mr. Dykes had been removed from his role as an Assistant Scoutmaster. This is the record that still existed at the Council when this lawsuit was filed, and it was requested and it was ultimately produced.

What does it show? It shows that he was, in fact, on this, according to this sheet, which was in their possession in 1987 when Mr. Dykes hit the Ineligible Volunteer Files, they went back and might have looked at this and said gosh, he might have been registered until January 31 of '84. 1 of '84, it says, on the face sheet of his Ineligible Volunteer Files.

You'll see on the face sheet that there's information there about excommunication in the LDS Church. Well, where did that information come from? We don't have a witness here who can tell you that.

Grant Robinson said, I signed it. I dated it, but that's not my handwriting. We had other people who would gather information. Well, how did he gather information? Is it possible that maybe it says resigned

2.

2.2.

simply because he never re-registered? There was no evidence he re-registered after this. And that's why it says resigned. That's for you to decide.

Mr. Clark said the conclusion you have to draw about this, I'm not going to tell you what conclusions you have to draw. You get to make up your own minds about what conclusions and decisions you reach. I'm just suggesting there's another way to look at this document. And I'm suggesting that it is proof of our position of lack of notification.

Mr. Lewis, he said two different things under oath at two different times on a number of occasions. We tried to bring that out to you. Why? Because maybe his biases have affected his testimony. Maybe his motives have effected his testimony. Just like you can consider bias and motives for any other witness, I'm going to ask you to consider them when you evaluate his testimony.

You've heard him say that Mr. Dykes pulled his hand up -- and pulled his hand up to his penis and they touched, but he told Dr. Conte he didn't think that happened, that it didn't touch.

He said he was asked to join the suit. He said he asked to join the suit. He said that it was wrong, wrong, wrong. He said, I didn't know what an erection was. I didn't know what to think about it.

2.

2.2.

Do you remember Dr. Sebastian testified that her examination of Mr. Lewis was recorded by somebody from Mr. Clark's office? Do you remember that? They sat in the interview room, and she had them move behind Mr. Lewis so that their presence wouldn't affect the communication going on.

She came in here and told you a number of things about what Mr. Lewis told her during that interview. If she was misrepresenting what he said when she came and testified in front of you, do you think maybe you would have heard excerpts from that audio tape proving her wrong? That didn't happen. I'm going to suggest that that's something significant.

Did she fail to support her opinions with information, knowledge? Was she reasonable in concluding that Mr. Lewis' drug issues were not primarily caused by the abuse at the hand of Timur Dykes? It is up to you to decide.

I want to bring up another document. Do you remember Mr. Clark saying he didn't come up with any kind of training documents, just this certificate is nice, but where are the training records? We don't have any.

But I found something interesting in one of the exhibits that's been received, Exhibit 1381, page 133, please. This, if I am not mistaken, is a Scoutmaster Handbook from 1981.

2.

2.2.

Remember the portions that were shown to you.

One of them was this sex curiosity. Why don't you roll it up here. It tells the Scoutmaster back in 1981, how do you handle these issues? You got to respect the privacy rights of parents to teach their own youth. How do you handle it?

Here is rule number one. Don't instruct the Scouts on the subject of sex and family life. It is not really Scouting's responsibility. I'm paraphrasing, not reading. Only give advice within your own competence. Why do they say that? Well, because it is based on volunteers who may have differing levels of knowledge and competence as to how to deal with issues like this that arise.

Rule number three, refer them to persons qualified to handle them. If they have a spiritual leader or doctor, go there. If they are not available, you might have to help the Scout meet one, but don't try to play a highly professional role and avoid passing the buck. So try to do something. But don't pretend you are something you are not.

It says publications that you judge unacceptable should be removed from the scene. Maybe that's where we got off on this point, issue, if you

remember that. Let's go to the next page.

2.

2.2.

This is evidence of what was thought at the time — what was being told to Scoutmasters at the time in 1981, about sex. Could run from the innocent to the scandalous. They call for a private and thorough investigation. Frank discussion with those involved.

Does that sound like secrecy to you? It is important to distinguish between youthful acts of innocence. And again, we're showing the age, the era, and the practices of a homosexual.

That's been waved around here like a red flag. But I talked to you before you were selected to sit on this jury and asked whether you can set that aside because it really doesn't have anything to do with this case. And I think most of you said that you were.

It does say, it is a greatest importance that such occasions be kept quiet, avoid accusations and any loose talk. Discuss these problems with the Scout's parents, religious leader and troop committee.

Does that sound like a campaign of secrecy to you, a failure to try to think ahead, a failure to try to do the right thing? It is not directly on point. It doesn't say child sexual abuse. But that's why we brought in people who researched the literature and had some idea of what the standard of care was at the time.

2.

2.2.

You heard Dr. Warren. She said that the Boy Scouts of America did not fall beneath the standard of care; that they exceeded it in some ways at that time.

I want to talk about the verdict form for a minute, damages, and then I'm done just in time maybe for a break.

The verdict form: The very first question is about the Boy Scouts of America. Was defendant, Boy Scouts of America, negligent in one or more of the ways plaintiff's claim -- plaintiff claims?

Again, it is your decision. I'm going to ask you to seriously consider putting a "no" in there. If that's the case, then the Boy Scouts win.

Then you get to my client, Question 2a: Was my client negligent? I'm going to ask you again to seriously question putting in a "no" as an answer. If you do that, you don't have to answer any more questions. But if you proceed, then you are going to be asked: Did that negligence cause harm to the plaintiff? If you say "no," again, the defendants win.

Then you get to the tough question, if you've gotten that far, what's the apportionment of fault?

You'll see that the LDS Church is listed there with a percentage. That's simply a function of the law. They are a former party. They are allowed to be considered by

you as to any fault they may have had.

2.

2.2.

I'm not here suggesting that you should find them at fault. I'm here suggesting you should find my client and the Boy Scouts of America not at fault and not reach that question. But you might, and you have to do what you consider to be the right thing.

What are the total damages? \$4 million is being claimed. You do not have to award \$4 million. You get to pick a number, if you get that far. I'm going to suggest to you that for what you heard here, this case is not worth millions of dollars. I'm going to suggest to you it is not worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. But that is not my decision. It is yours.

Then you get, after going through all of that, to the statute of limitations offenses. You may have gone through all of the prior questions and answered them all, and then you decide it was filed too late because you may decide that my client or the Boy Scouts proved they did not knowingly permit, allow or encourage child abuse in relation to plaintiff's claims that are here, then you go on to the punitive damages questions.

You heard Mr. Schoener testify. He gave his opinion. That was loud and clear. Oh, it was a highly -- what did he say, it was -- we'll use the magic language that relates to. You'll see it in the

2.

2.2.

instructions on the punitive damage instruction. Oh, yes, yes, they were. And his opinion is punish us. Punish us for what we did or didn't do. Again, you get to decide.

Given the length of the case, you got serious matters at issue. It is a natural human tendency to want to try to help people who look like they could use help. It is a natural human tendency to try to assume that organizations somehow don't have feelings or don't feel the results of a verdict.

I'll suggest to you that each and every registered volunteer in the Cascade Pacific Council will know about whatever verdict you do, whatever you decide, really quickly. And it could have an impact on them, just like the verdict could have an impact upon Mr. Lewis.

Okay. Mr. Lewis' lawyer, I don't know which, they have a chance to rebut what I've argued, rebut what Mr. Smith has argued again.

Again, I hope I didn't offend you. I hope when I sit down, if he comes up with an argument that I didn't think about, talking about, that you'll say what would the lawyers for the defendants have said in response to that argument when you deliberate, talk about that.

1 And I know when I sit down, I'm going to think 2. of a dozen more things to say or I should have said, and 3 I'm going to kick myself for not having done so. 4 I've gone an hour and a half, and that's plenty of time. 5 You've served the court system well, and I 6 appreciate it on behalf of my client. I thank you for 7 your time and attention. 8 THE COURT: Jurors, we're going to take a 9 15-minute break. 10 (Recess.) 11 (Jury not present). 12 THE COURT: Something we need to do before we 13 bring the jury in? 14 MR. JANCI: Your Honor, Peter Janci for the 15 plaintiffs. 16 We wanted to put on the record that we have 17 completed the redactions and the withdrawals of the I.V. 18 Files that were subject to the court's orders. And so 19 that set is now complete and ready for the jury. 20 working with Mr. Wiese. I think that he would agree with 21 these things. 2.2. THE COURT: With respect to all of the 23 exhibits that are going into the jury room, have all of 24 the lawyers had a chance to make sure that the right 25 documents go, nothing goes in that's not supposed to and

```
1
      before.
 2.
                 THE COURT: Yes.
                                   I have. I think it requires
      your stipulation, since Rule 47 F says to the contrary.
 3
 4
                 MR. SMITH: Yes.
 5
                 MR. XOCHIHUA: I think it is 57 F.
                 THE COURT: Did I say 47?
 6
 7
                 MR. XOCHIHUA:
                               Yes.
 8
                 THE COURT: Excuse me, I misspoke. I've got
 9
      it open here. It is 57 F. Thank you.
10
                 MR. XOCHIHUA: I concur in your suggestion.
11
                 MR. MONES: We would stipulate on the record,
12
      judge.
13
                 THE COURT: All right. Then what I'll do this
14
      afternoon, I'll identify the alternates. I'll thank them
15
      for their service. I'll send them home and tell them
16
      that we'll be in touch, and they are not discharged.
17
                        That's what we'll do. Thank you.
                 Okay.
18
      Bring them in.
19
                           (Jury present.)
20
                 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, Mr. Clark.
21
                 MR. CLARK: Thank you, your Honor.
2.2.
                 Good afternoon again, ladies and gentlemen.
23
                 Rebuttal is a very different kind of argument.
24
      And there are always decisions that one has to make about
25
      how to go about it. I'm going to try and blend a couple
```

2.

2.2.

of things. I'm going to try and keep our eye on the big picture and what is important, and at the same time respond to some of the specifics that have been brought up by the defense. There's no way to do both comprehensively. So you may find me jumping back and forth from the thematic to the specific.

And it will necessarily be jumbled. I will necessarily be jumping around, but I'll try and give you some headlines and some transitions so you know why I'm talking about what I'm talking about.

What is the defense to this case? The abuse didn't happen? Well, that's what it was for a long time. And then two weeks before trial when Timur Dykes admitted he molested Kerry Lewis, the Scout defendants took the word of the pedophile, after they spent two years calling Kerry Lewis a liar, and they said well, I guess some of it happened.

Mr. Xochihua said in his opening statement, maybe more times than one. So which is it? Did it not happen? Did it happen once or did it happen more than once? What we know is they still don't put any value on child sexual abuse. Not worth \$4 million. Not worth hundreds of thousands of dollars.

I waited. What is it worth? \$25,000? 75? 175? Not worth hundreds, that's all we know. That's

1 still the value they put on child sexual abuse. 2. So what is the defense? Did the abuse happen, 3 or did it not? Yes is the answer to that. Are we 4 blaming the parents or are we not? According to Mr. 5 Xochihua, no. According to the president of the Cascade 6 Pacific Council, they ought to be in jail. 7 Mr. Xochihua says, you know what, that's not 8 our official position. There are pleadings prior to a 9 week before trial that said blame of other parties, 10 including the parents, may be at fault. 11 So are the parents to blame, or are they not? 12 The answer is yes. This case has been defended exactly 13 the way a clever criminal defense lawyer defends a 14 pedophile. Death by a thousand cuts. Maybe I can get 15 this jury to reasonable doubt. The abuse didn't happen. 16 And when there's seemingly conclusive proof that it did, 17 well, then it wasn't me. 18 In this case it wasn't my people, it was 19 somebody else. That's what the anti-agency argument is 20 by definition. It is blaming somebody else. 21 And then it is what all pedophiles and 2.2. apologists for child abuse do at all times, which is you 23 blame the victim. They said they didn't do it. They 24 said they weren't blaming the victim. Really? Really?

They attack him seven ways from Sunday.

25

2.

2.2.

attacked his credibility. They attacked his motives. They called him a liar for two years, politely, of course. They didn't use that word. But what, what are you saying when you say somebody is not telling the truth about something that's profound as child abuse? You are saying he's lying. And they take words and they twist it out of context and they show short video clips.

Do you remember what he said? I was asked by Mr. Clark to get involved in this case as a witness.

Then he talks to his family and he decided what all child abuse survivors do, not all, but many child abuse survivors do is; it is time to stand up for myself.

He talked about the conversation with his dad in which he decided, I'm going to stand up for myself, because if I didn't do it, I would be running away from it. And then he became a plaintiff.

And I don't know how many times they played that darn video and how many times they have to hear it, they are going to use that as if the dangers of child abuse in this country are the responsibility — the abuse that happened to Kerry Lewis. And the real threat of society are two plaintiffs lawyers who try to stand up for a man who was abused. We're the threat. It is our fault. We're the ones that turned Timur Dykes loose. That's what they are saying.

2.

2.2.

Now, if Kerry Lewis is a liar, why doesn't he lie about the most important thing, the most potentially impactful thing on this case? It happened between 22 and 27 times. And it was anal penetration. And it was oral sex and it was masturbation. Nobody would know. You heard what the other boys said Timur Dykes did to them.

If he was going to lie to you knowingly and intentionally, if he's that kind of a character, if you can get into that kind of a mind-set and go there, then why doesn't he lie about the most important thing?

Because he's an honest guy. Yes, his process is developing. Of course, he's learning more about this.

He's learning the language to put concepts and these feelings into words.

But saying the same thing in a couple of different ways is not the same as saying different things. And to suggest otherwise is dishonorable and it is distasteful.

I was hoping we weren't going to have to spend time in closing argument talking about people's motives. We have challenged the motives of one group of people and one group of people only, the top-level corporate management of Boy Scouts of America for choosing membership, money and manpower over the safety of children.

2.

2.2.

We have not attacked -- we've attacked the judgment and the actions of Mr. McEwen, Mr. Wiest and a number of other people, but nobody is suggesting that they got up -- we haven't suggested they got up one morning and decided to hurt children, those men, that they got up and decided to hurt children. We judge actions, not motives.

And if the message isn't clear, our message about Bishop McEwen and Mr. Wiest and the others like him is they should have been trained, the Boy Scouts had the knowledge, and they didn't do it. So they made bad decisions.

But you know what, if you are Kerry Lewis, it doesn't really matter much why Mr. Wiest, Dr. Wiest or Gordon McEwen didn't pick up the phone and call his parents. It doesn't really matter much why, does it?

The fact is they didn't get the warnings that he was abused. We haven't attacked the motives of the lawyers. We haven't attacked the motives of their witnesses. And Mr. Xochihua stands up here for 45 minutes, all of the witnesses that we called are thieves and names. All of the witnesses that they called are noble and enlightened.

So the case is being defended the way a clever criminal defense lawyer defends somebody on trial for

2.

2.2.

child abuse. The abuse didn't happen. If it happened, it wasn't by me or by my people. The victim is changing his story. The family is stirring this up. Hoping death by a thousand cuts, that they can get you to reasonable doubt.

But this isn't a reasonable doubt case, as the instructions show. The burden of proof is on us to prove by a preponderance of the evidence, more likely than not, what happened. Then when it gets to the question of punitive damages, is it clear and convincing that the behavior was reckless and outrageous and so on and so forth.

So death by a thousand cuts doesn't get you there. I'm going to have some more things to say about the way this case has been litigated at the end. Since they opened the door and they want to talk about that, I'm going to talk about it, but I'm going to talk about it at the end.

Now, I'm going to do what I said I was going to do, which is I'm going to dig into some of the specifics. And the kind of cutoff place that I'm going to try to go to is the things that I think may be most likely get to be confusing to you.

Mr. Xochihua kept talking about standard of care. Standard of care is only relevant in this case to

2.

2.2.

the extent that the jury instructions say that it is.

And the jury instructions talk about foreseeability. The jury instructions talk about foreseeability based on specialized knowledge.

What's in the Files, what they knew about
Timur Dykes. Specialized knowledge affects
foreseeability. Standard of care in some abstract,
theoretical sense doesn't much matter. Specialized
knowledge, what Mr. Schoener said, I apologize for
calling him doctor earlier, too many doctors in this
case, for the standard of care is affected because if you
got this information, then according to what Mr. Schoener
says, your foreseeability shifts. You have an enormous
body of information. And you don't get to sit on it.

So standard of care is not the concept. The concept is foreseeability. And again, they come back to a couple of paragraphs in the Cubmaster Handbook, which talks pretty clearly, if you look at it, about young boys coming on to young boys.

They describe that as homosexual conduct. It doesn't say anything about Scout leaders. I come back to the same thing I said before, the reason that we — I suspect, I haven't asked him, but the reason I suspect that Mr. Mones referred to Mr. Bybee as the bus driver is to contrast that with what you would expect to see if

they are trying to put on evidence of comprehensive training.

2.

2.2.

You would expect to see a Boy Scout executive from Texas coming in and talking about oh, well, here are the 37 files that we had, and the way that we trained people back then in child abuse. Or a Cascade Pacific Council executive to come in and say, yeah, here is volume 1982, the way Mr. Wolff did with his early 1980's articles on child abuse for the Big Brothers and Sisters.

That's the reason that we used Mr. Bybee. Not out of any disrespect to him, I know Mr. Mones didn't intend it that way, because he's not that kind of man. But the fact is they didn't bring you anybody from leadership to talk about what they did.

They brought you a very nice person, obviously proud of his time in Scouting. And that's the only person they could find? And the two public service ads. That's the point of all of that.

Let's be real clear. Mr. Xochihua said there's no way to figure out who is going to prey on children before they abuse. We're not blaming McEwen and Wiest for not knowing before Colleen Lashbaugh's confession that Timur Dykes was a child molester.

We're blaming them and we're blaming the Boy Scouts for not training them to know that a guy that

1 molests 17 boys is likely to molest more, and that it is 2. foreseeable that he would go right to the same group of 3 kids, Troop 17, Pack 17, there's Kerry Lewis' name. 4 That's foreseeable. That's what we're blaming them for. And the suggestion that it was -- that we're 5 6 trying to blame them for not being able to pick Timur 7 Dykes out before the 17 were abused, that's irrelevant. 8 We've never said that. That's not part of this case. 9 We're suggesting that based upon what they 10 knew there, what they knew there, they could have put an 11 effective training program in place. 12 And I keep coming back to the Big Brothers and 13 Sisters for two reasons. One is it only took them a year 14 or two. Do you remember Mr. Wolff, he said when he got 15 the notice that NAMBLA, the Man/Boy Love Association, was 16 trying to infiltrate the Boy Scouts and the Big Brothers 17 and Sisters, he went into action. 18 He stared down his board and got some people 19 who agreed with him, and they ran it through, and within 20 a year or two they were doing seminars. He was writing 21 They were talking to other organizations. 2.2. happened quickly. 23 Now, yes, it was the 1980's. But you have to 24 remember, the Boy Scouts had a 40-year start on the Big

Brothers and Sisters. Boy Scouts were started in the

25

2.

2.2.

early 1900's. Big Brothers and Sisters weren't started until the 1940's. They didn't have this information. The Boy Scouts had it and sat on it. If they had one—tenth of what Big Brothers and Sisters had done a decade earlier, Kerry Lewis wouldn't have been abused. The causation is that clear.

And if McEwen and Wiest had been trained or had done the common sense thing and gone and found the rest of the kids on the roster, then the abuse wouldn't have happened.

I want to talk for a minute about this business of religious privilege. There's no jury instruction here that says a corporation can only act through its agents. And what an agent knows, a corporation knows, with an asterisk that says, unless the information was gained in a religious context, in which case it doesn't count.

That is not the law. They say they are not blaming the LDS Church. They spend a lot of time talking about LDS Churchy—things, including religious privilege. The suggestion is that because McEwen was listening to some of these people possibly in a privileged conversation, that he somehow was restricted from what he can do with that.

Well, a parent, not because he's talking to

2.

2.2.

the police officer about it, and if it is Timur Dykes' religious privilege, Timur Dykes is talking to a police officer about it, so it doesn't make any sense first off. Secondly, there's no jury instruction on it.

The question is, was he acting as an agent at the time? Now, if he wasn't acting as an agent for the Boy Scouts, and I mean, McEwen, if he wasn't acting as an agent for the Boy Scouts, then why does everything in Shipley's report talk about Scouting?

If he wasn't acting as an agent for the Boy Scouts, then why did Colleen Lashbaugh go to talk to him because he's the head of the troop in which all of the boys were abused? If he's not acting as the head of the troop, but he only acts a Mormon bishop, why did the Lewis family, the Lewis parents, Mr. Lewis go see McEwen a year later?

Why did he say that? Because I knew he was the head of a Scout troop. So he gets this information. He's wearing two hats. One of them is a Scouting hat. The fact that he may or may not have dispensed some religious absolution or some spiritual comfort to Timur Dykes is irrelevant.

And even if somehow it plays into the thing, you have to come back to what Eugene Grant said. I'm the guy. The buck stops with me. I'm the president.

2.

2.2.

Cascade Pacific Council and the Boy Scouts of America, charter organizations all over the country, Future

Farmers of America, rotaries, PTA's, Methodist churches, Episcopal churches, Catholic Church, if there's some problem that restricts people's ability to protect children because of the religious doctrines involved, then it is up to the Boy Scouts of America to say you can believe what you want to.

But as long as you are dealing with our program, here is the rules. You report this, this and this. Yes or no. You want a charter or not. You want a charter, you say yes. You don't want a charter, bye.

Unless maybe that particular religious institution owns 50 percent of your troops, in which case maybe you don't have the guts to say that. But either way, it comes back to the Boy Scouts of America and the Cascade Pacific Council.

Mr. Xochihua pointed you to the jury instruction that said that unexpected criminal acts are not foreseeable. I think everybody agrees with that. The question is these were not unexpected criminal acts by Timur Dykes after January of 1983. After January of 1983, it was absolutely expected. And after about 1965 or 1970, it was absolutely expected that this kind of abuse would happen in Scouting to boys like that.

2.2.

It is not an unexpected criminal activity. These are all full of criminal activity. The only difference between a freak accident and a foreseeable danger is frequency. And what you knew and when you knew it is a continuum. And at some point there's a tipping point. If you are the highway department and there's a dangerous curve, and you watch somebody go off the road, maybe that's a freak accident. And you make a note of it.

But a year later when ten people have gone off the road, and you've made ten notes of it, maybe you know you've got a dangerous curve. And 30 years later, when 200 people have gone off that road and died, and you've taken notes, at what point do you know you have a dangerous curve? At some point there you don't get to just say well, we never analyzed it.

The only difference between a foreseeable danger and a freak accident is frequency. I don't know. A thousand, the first 500, the first hundred, at what point does it tip when you say it is now foreseeable that if nothing changes, nothing changes?

We're not talking about unforeseeable criminal conduct. We are talking about absolutely foreseeable criminal conduct here. So the highway department has to put up a warning sign. They have to put up a guardrail.

2.

2.2.

Maybe they have to straighten the road. But they don't just get to keep sitting there and keep taking statistics and keep taking notes about the number of people that drive off the dangerous curve.

Now, as I can recall the main challenges to credibility or bias from the defense lawyers — interestingly, I waited for a challenge or bias or accusation against Mr. Wolff. And I didn't hear it.

But Mr. O'Connor from Alaska, the guy that's got the \$50,000 bequest in his will, he's been a Scouter for 60 years, the guy up there with the one Cub Scout in his troop, has an axe to grind. Apparently, that's why he came in here. He may have an axe to grind. If he has an axe to grind, it is that they didn't do the right thing in the '70s when it came to inflating membership and ghost units.

Mr. Smith said he is doesn't understand what that has to do with a child sexual abuse case. I suspect Mr. Smith is joshing you. What it has to do with is the motive to protect the organization's reputation.

If you are desperate to keep members, so desperate that you are pumping up the membership rolls and at the same time you don't want this thing to come out here, this secret. It is perfect. It is a perfect link; they call it circumstantial evidence.

2.

2.2.

The court instructed you yesterday that circumstantial evidence is just as powerful as direct evidence. Two facts laid side by side mean something. Footprints in the snow always mean somebody has been there. That's circumstantial evidence.

The motive is to keep membership numbers from dropping. That's the significance of the ghost units and what Mr. O'Connor had to say.

Very briefly, a couple of points. I suspect Dr. Conte didn't talk to Alderson or Velaas because at the time neither of them had seen Kerry Lewis more than about three times. But trust your judgment on what he said about that.

They attacked the credibility of Joe Severs,

Joel Drebert and Adrian Leech because they are

plaintiffs. Did they suggest one way in which their

testimony might have been effected? Are they suggesting

that any of those boys were lying? They have to be.

Why else do you bring that up unless — but you don't have the guts to say he's a liar, so you say he might be biased. If they are going to call him a liar, call him a liar. Don't pick around at it. Is he or isn't he?

It comes back from what I said in the beginning, what is the defense in this case? Who is the

2.

2.2.

first witness that the defense called? Who did they call to put on their theory of this case, what they stand for and what they want you to know about them? Do you remember who it was?

Was it a Boy Scout executive to tells you about the good things they do? Was it somebody from the top to talk to you about how they had done things right in terms of child abuse training?

The first witness that the Scout defendants called was a child abuse victim, Heath Lewis, Kerry's younger brother, the one who had gotten the tar beaten out of him by his stepdad.

And they put him up there for what reason?

What useful information did they get out of him? He had a drug problem. We would have stipulated to that.

That's what the Boy Scouts of America had stood for in this case. They call a child abuse victim up there to suggest that because his life is a mess and his life is a mess, it runs in the family.

I mean, think about it, what other possible explanation is it, is there for calling that young man who had ADD problems from very early on and has struggled with drugs, what possible reason is there for the Boy Scouts of America to call a child abuse victim as their first witness? To embarrass him in front of you people.

2.

2.2.

That's the way they have litigated this case. And they call these other abuse victims liars.

I can't let this one go. Dr. Sebastian's testimony before the legislature was in support, Mr. Xochihua said of bill, which would extend the statute of limitations to sue the perpetrators.

That somehow or other the laws in the State of Oregon and legislature or the courts or whoever is deciding that you can sue institutions of trust when they don't protect children; that somehow or another that law is a bad law, and we should just have — the law should just be that you can sue the perpetrators.

Yeah, that would solve the problem, wouldn't it? That would really solve the problem. The perpetrators, ladies and gentlemen, you don't -- Mr. Xochihua said that he blames, I think he said one person and one person only for this, or his client blames one person and one person only, and that is Timur Dykes, because Timur Dykes was a wolf and he fooled everybody.

Well, we know what wolves do to lambs and fowl and chickens. They chew them up. So when the wolf comes along and you leave the gate open, the wolf comes in and does what wolves do, the rancher doesn't get to blame the wolf.

Damn wolf. God, who would thought that wolf

2.

2.2.

got in and ate that lamb. Yeah, the door was open.

That's what wolves do. You don't get to come along and blame the wolf for doing what wolves do.

Of course, Timur Dykes was a tortured and demented man. Nobody is suggesting otherwise. That's not the point. They knew that those people were out there. In this case they knew that that's where he was. And the fact that this wolf, because nobody protected Kerry Lewis, got to Kerry Lewis, the rancher now blames the wolf.

They talk to you about the Procedures for Maintaining Standards of Leadership as an example of the kind of thing they were trying to do to respond to child abuse. I think the Exhibit No. is 3022, 23 and 24.

You'll want to look at the first page, I think, it is of the 1972 Procedures for Maintaining Standards of Leadership. What it says is, and I forget the exact order, but somewhere pretty clearly on the first couple of pages is, we've got to keep this quiet. When you put one of these people in the file, it has got to be quiet.

So I hope you do look at the Procedures for Maintaining Standards of Leadership in 1972. The other thing is there's no evidence in this case that anybody at the local level, the chartered organizations was trained

2.

2.2.

in how to put people in any of these files. Mr. Wiest wasn't. Gordon McEwen wasn't. They didn't know anything about the files, let alone how to get somebody in them.

I forget if it was Mr. Smith or Mr. Xochihua that said that Gordon McEwen was not acting on behalf of the BSA and not acting on behalf of the CPC when he removed Timur Dykes.

You may remember they asked that question in the deposition. And Bishop McEwen said no, I wasn't. I was acting in other than a capacity. And then later on, I asked him in the same deposition, well, if you weren't acting on behalf of the Boy Scouts in removing Timur Dykes, then he's still a member of Boy Scouts. He hasn't been officially removed. And Bishop McEwen said something like sadly, yes.

So he could go across town and register somewhere else? Sadly, yes. The fact is if he wasn't acting in an official capacity for the Boy Scouts of America, then how did he remove Timur Dykes as Scoutmaster?

I mean, the authority either flows down or it doesn't. They don't get to have it both ways. They don't get to say when it all goes well, these guys are our agents and then turn around and say, but when it goes badly, they are not our agents. If he removed him as

2.

2.2.

Assistant Scoutmaster, then he had to have authority to do that.

And on this agency question, it reminds me of one other thing I wanted to mention to you. When it all goes well and a Scout comes up you and does well and becomes an Eagle Scout, goes on and does great things in life, becomes a senator from any state, suppose the Boy Scouts of America give an equal share credit to the Third Street Baptist Church in Joplin, Missouri, where the guy was a Boy Scout, do you suppose they take the credit hook? Look at what our Boy Scouts do. But when it goes bad, all of a sudden, the Third Street Baptist Church in Joplin, Missouri, is on their own.

Again, they want it both ways. McEwen had to be acting in the course and scope of his agency or he wouldn't have the authority to remove Timur Dykes at all.

Now, they said — they've said that Timur

Dykes' I.V. File has to be a mistake. Where it says

'84-'85, it has to be a mistake. Do you remember hearing
them say that? I predicted they would say that. That's
what they said. Because Grant Robinson — because of the
things Grant Robinson testified to about how he opened
that file and how he got that information.

I think Mr. Robinson testified that he never had done one of these before. If you pull up Exhibit

1	504, face page. Pull up the signature on the bottom,
2	please.
3	This says Grant Robinson, when he was Scout
4	Executive of Lake Bonneville. Show the date, please.
5	1981. Before he came to Portland, before he opened Timur
6	Dykes' I.V. File in 1987.
7	Grant Robinson is no stranger to I.V. Files.
8	He knew how to open an I.V. File. He knew it was
9	important. He knew that the information is important.
LO	He had to get it out there.
11	Timur Dykes' file is a damming piece of
L2	evidence for the defense. And they don't know what to do
L3	with it, so they call it a mistake. I waited and waited
L4	and waited for an answer on where the official
L5	registrations for Timur Dykes are. I still don't think
L6	we know.
L7	But what that what Timur Dykes' I.V. File
L8	says is that he was active in Scouting in '84 and '85 and
L9	what the rosters say is that he was active in Scouting in
20	'83.
21	Just a couple other major points and then I'll
22	be finished.
23	One of the first things that Mr. Smith said
24	was that there's no comparison here with the Catholic
25	Church. They are both vertically integrated

1 organizations with a hierarchal structure. They are 2. family-based, community-based, youth-based organizations. 3 They have absolutely admittedly noble and lofty aims. 4 They had -- they rely on parents and 5 volunteers to carry out their mission. 6 knowledge at the top levels of serious problems with 7 child abuse decades ago. They gave no warnings about 8 that. They put people on probation and let them back in. 9 There was more abuse. When the lawsuits came, the first 10 reaction was to blame the victim. Other than that, 11 there's no similarities. It is exactly the same 12 situation playing out all over again. 13 I'm not going to comment again on the language 14 of the president of the Cascade Pacific Council, but he 15 did clearly say that the parents ought to be in jail. 16 And their pleadings clearly did say that the fault was in 17 part based on the parents' conduct up until two weeks 18 before trial. 19 Would you pull up the photographs? 20 You didn't hear much about this in closing 21 They spent a week telling you it was argument. 2.2. impossible for Kerry Lewis to hang around Troop 719. 23 Couldn't have been possible for Kerry Lewis to be in 24 Troop 719 in 1984. 25 This is July or August 1984, Farragut, Idaho,

2.

2.2.

LDS Encampment. And there he is. Look at the patches of all of the people around him. 719. Did they even ask any questions? Did they even — no, no, because they know — they knew that it was game over right here. Their impossibility theory is gone between that document and the Cub Scout roster. The defense of impossibility is gone.

Because Kerry Lewis was, in fact, hanging out with people in Troop 719, even if he was on the rolls in 815 and because they knew that Cub Scouts in Pack 719 had been abused.

Just to sort of show some other comparisons. Keep going. Keep going. Long, floppy, reddish blond hair, big overbite, small child. But it is impossible for him to have been involved in Troop 719. Pull it down.

I want to just recall the comments I made to you about the importance of this case. Whether you believe it is fate or luck or God, nobody is here by accident.

If a spunky guy in Alaska hadn't gotten on the phone or on the e-mail and contacted us and come down here to testify about what was happening to membership numbers in the 1970's, you would have never known the pressure that the Boy Scouts of America was putting on

its people to keep the membership numbers up.

2.

2.2.

You would have never known the motive, the driving motive for keeping these files secret if he hadn't contacted us. And they wanted it that way. They wanted you to go into that room ignorant of that fact.

If Mr. Mones hadn't been a good enough lawyer to find Mr. Wolff and interrupt his Easter weekend with his grandson, you would have gone into the deliberation room thinking that the Boy Scouts of America tried really hard to work with the Big Brothers and Sisters, but they just couldn't quite get it done because of some law in Congress, so there was nothing they could do.

But Mr. Wolff comes in here and tells you, no, it was feasible to do something. We did it. We didn't get any cooperation from the Boy Scouts, but we did it. But if we hadn't been able to contact Mr. Wolff based upon what we heard Dr. Warren say, you would have gone in there in the dark on that issue, and they wanted it that way.

They are still doing it. That kind of litigation, that kind of action has been going on for too long. That kind of response deserves a punitive damages verdict. That kind of attitude has been going on for decades. They are still doing it, ladies and gentlemen.

Thank you for your attention and your service.

On behalf of my client, we appreciate it.

2.

2.2.

THE COURT: Jurors, I have some housekeeping instructions for you.

First of all, there are no time limits on deliberations. This work will take you however long it takes you to accomplish.

It is a little past 4:30. It has been a long day for everyone. I am not going to require you to begin your deliberations today. I'm going to tell you you can go home as soon as we're done here to return tomorrow morning at 9:00 to begin your deliberations.

I want to remind you from now until I discharge you from further responsibility in this case, as I've said before, do not discuss this case with anyone at all. Do not read any news reports or watch any news reports or listen to any news reports about this case.

When you go to the jury room on your way out, leave your notes — first of all, take your notes with you for the first time. Take your copies of the jury instructions, your copies of the verdict form with you and leave them in the jury room.

They will be there for you tomorrow morning when you, when 12 of you come back to your deliberations. During your deliberations, you are to stay in the jury room at all times unless you leave with the clerk's