

The Maria Monologues - 1

“. . . having sex. It's pure to us, there's nothing wrong with it, so we let our kids be in on it, we let them get in on it if they want, we even play it with them because it's nice, it makes them feel good & they enjoy it.”

--Maria. December 12, 1990

Introduction

Maria, (aka Karen Zerby, Mama, Katherine R. Smith in the Family) is the spiritual leader of The Family International. On a typical workday, she spends hours attending to Family-related affairs. Because of her position of spiritual authority within the group, Maria's staff records her comments on a variety of issues.

***The Maria Monologues* contain excerpts from the transcripts of these tapes. They provide valuable insight into the inner workings of The Family International as well as Maria's character and leadership.**

WE CAN RENOUNCE LIT, BUT NOT DOCTRINES CONTAINED IN THE LIT

Someone suggested that we say, "These radical far out doctrines from the past, we no longer espouse them". Yes, well, I don't have any quarrel with that either. What I had even said was that we're going to drop these practices. You see, that could be interpreted several different ways. We can just drop them from our practice, but not from our heart. You may say that's a question of semantics also, but I don't think so. It can be, of course, to the hearer, but I want to speak the truth. And I know at the same time we have to give them something that they will be able to agree with or that will seem to clear us.

I could easily say, "We renounce our lit", & that's abandon, surrender, give up etc. You'll see that "renounce" means to abandon, surrender, give up, forsake. I can renounce the lit & I can say that we've renounced the lit, so I don't have any problem with that. And Dad [David Berg], I think, in the child abuse tract--which, by the way, was very good, it's tremendous, & it's still just as good as ever--I think he said he renounced the lit too. Well, we can easily renounce the lit, but renouncing the doctrine or renouncing our beliefs that are contained in the lit, we don't, & we can't. You could say that if you say you renounce your lit, the public figures you've renounced your doctrine, at least some of them might. Of course our enemies, I think they know us better than that.

Whatever they interpret it as, that's one thing, but I want to say the truth. I don't want to lie to them, especially in something as important as denying our beliefs, which aren't just Family or Children of God beliefs, as I discussed with Pipi [Sara Davidito] last night.--They're Godly, Scriptural, Biblical doctrines, & in denying them, we're denying the Lord. So I can easily say I renounce my literature, that's one thing, but to say, "I renounce these doctrines & these beliefs..." I can even say "I renounce these practices," but to say, "I renounce these doctrines, I

renounce these beliefs, I can't do that. And I think it's important. What's in a name? What's in words? I want to be truthful, & I think it's important to be truthful. Like Dad has said, we don't have to tell them the whole truth, we can let them interpret it any way they want, but we need to be truthful & we can't deny our faith.

DAVIDITO BOOK ETC., OUR ANSWERS--12/12/90

I see that our best answer in most cases is just that we've disposed of that material. I see that some of those were past explaining, ha! Quite a few of them! But you don't really need to convince me to get rid of the Dito Book, we've already gotten rid of it. There's no question, I wasn't thinking of digging it up again & bringing it back & putting it on our shelves; neither was I thinking of retaining Heaven's Girl. In spite of the fact that we've gotten rid of this material they bring them up to us in court or in investigations, what is the best answer we can give in these particular cases?

I think that has been definitely decided that all our questionable sex lit & "incriminating" lit, has got to go. And the only reason I'm asking these questions is I want to have the best answer for these things. I agree that in some cases there's not much of a best answer. We just say, "Well, sorry about that, we got rid of that." And the child abuse tract is very good at explaining away some of it, or as well as we can do. We just have to do the best we can & give the best answer. But in cases where there is an answer or people could understand it or at least begin to understand something from our viewpoint, at least where we could have some kind of answer, even if they didn't agree with, at least it's something that we can be convinced of & we can sound convinced of it & it can sound legitimate from our point of view, I think we should give that kind of answer.

OUR VIEWS ON KIDS & SEX--DIFFICULT FOR THE SYSTEM TO UNDERSTAND--12/12/90

Like Pipi says, what they don't understand, what they'll never understand & what we couldn't possibly explain to them--and they would laugh in your face at this & hoot & holler--but the thing is, & from our point of view, this is true, those little "playtimes" that Pipi had with Petie [Rick Rodriguez, *aka* Davidito] were just that. They were like little skits or how children play, creative play, fantasy play. They play doctor & patient or they play airline hostess. That's the kind of thing it is from our point of view. See, the system looks at it like, "You're preparing these kids! Look, as soon as they can fuck, you're going to have them fucking, you're going to have them into this sex thing & prostitution!" That's what they think it leads to.

They don't realise, & there's no way we could ever explain to them, that it's something that is part of our life, like eating, drinking, reading the Word, having sex. It's pure to us, there's nothing wrong with it, so we let our kids be in on it, we let them get in on it if they want, we even play it with them because it's nice, it makes them feel good & they enjoy it. But we're not "preparing" them that as soon as they get to be four or five years old & really can do it that we're going to make them do it, or that they're even going to want to do it!

Look at Petie! I'd say as far as our Family kids at least, he's probably one of the more conservative ones! It didn't make him a sex maniac because of being exposed to all this sex when he was a little boy. He's very conservative. He's not trying to jump on everybody that comes along, he's really not that interested in sex & he could do without it. He's very conservative for our Family & probably even a system team as far as his interest in sex. I mean, he likes it, but it

has a very low priority on his list of interests. So what they think & what it certainly looks like to them, & you certainly can understand it, because they have no experience with that, they don't know anything about it, it looks to them like that's what you're heading for, child prostitution & child sex & all the kids fucking here & there. But that really couldn't be further from the truth. And because our kids grow up so free, it's not that big a deal when they get older, when the real problems come in the System. But you would never ever be able to explain that, so all we can do is get rid of it & say, "We don't have that any more & we don't do those things & we don't practice that," & that's the end of it.

HOW TO ANSWER--IF THEY ASK YOU WHY YOU DON'T DO IT?--12/12/90

If you're going to say, "Well, we don't do those things." "Well, do you believe them?" "Yes, I believe them." "So you think they're OK?" "Yes, I think they're OK, I think they're fine." And then your accuser comes back & says, "If you think it's fine, why don't you do it with your children?" What are you going to say then? Then you're in trouble. Well, if you come to that, you just say the obvious, "Because it's illegal & we don't want to break the law. We believe in obeying the law & we don't break the law." I mean, if that's the kind of question you get, then that's the only possible answer, & that's a pretty good answer.

ANSWER TO CHILD ABUSE ACCUSATIONS--13/3/91

By the way, I think the best answer that we can give when our people are questioned about, "What about this lit, what about all of this child abuse you're into & all of this evidence of it in your pubs." I think we should say something like, "Well, in the last few years we've come out very strongly against child abuse & will excommunicate any members who would ever be found to be engaged in it." And I think the Lord could use that answer to help prevent any further questioning. Of course, our bitter enemies probably wouldn't want to stop there & would want to keep goading us, pushing us, "You did it, you've done it, see, it's right there, so how can we believe you?" etc. etc.

But my suggestion would be if they do this, just keep repeating our answer. "Well, in the last few years we have come out very strongly & publicly & privately against child abuse & we have excommunicated anyone who has ever been engaged in it. We definitely do not tolerate it & do not practice it" etc. You find that interviewers who keep goading & prodding interviewees on TV do that sometimes & keep repeating their questions, but often the one questioned, if he doesn't want to get any further into the subject will just stand his ground & keep repeating his answer, & pretty soon the interviewer almost has to go on to something else.

I think most of the public understands that a lot of people, probably many of them included, have engaged in some sort of what would be called at least child abuse today, & they don't want to be blamed for their past either. So there are quite a few people that are pretty tolerant & pretty merciful & forgiving if you've "turned over a new leaf". Maybe it wouldn't satisfy our very bitter enemies, but it's a good answer to give in public, I think, & then you don't get into all the nit-picky questions that the Devil would like to draw you into. There might be some occasions where we would have to go into it further, but I think those would be rare.