

Scott Rauscher and John Siems had supper with us Thursday night.

Here is a summary I wrote about the visit:

We have a long ways to go with Scott Rauscher. We visited after supper for about an hour. I mostly asked open ended questions to see where they were at on things.

-He is serious about forgiveness, and seems to see no difference in severity of sin.

-He is adamant that we do not need CSA policy, and feels he has the support of his staff in that. God's direction is enough for him.

-He feels that if we had policy, people would just ignore it, or go around it.

-He didn't have a good answer for the question: if Gods direction is sufficient, why did these things happen over and over and were covered up? He mostly just said some people weren't following Gods' direction.

-He feels people shouldn't talk about what perps have done- it is defamation of character in his book.

I am usually optimistic, but I dont see a lot of chance for his thoughts to evolve.

The real topper to tonight's discussion was John Siems.

He said "Dean wouldn't have been caught if he had been smarter about keeping his computer cleaned off"

John said this several times in a few different ways within the conversation about Dean. It was not a single statement that could be misunderstood.

For what it's worth.

Was John being dismissive? Or was he pointing out that none of the rest of this would have surfaced if Dean had kept his computer clean?

It was a little of both, and I think a desire that Dean had kept his computer clean so that this hard situation could have been neatly avoided.

John may have been awkwardly trying to say "You wouldn't be mad about this if you didn't know about it". Which is not any better really. It does clearly point to the willingness, even the desire of the ministry to cover things up. Remember- this is the statement of an older, senior worker sitting beside his overseer... who did not correct him or object in any way. This may as well be unwritten policy given the circumstance.

John didn't go out of his way to condemn Dean's sexual actions and other abuses. He focused on Dean being irresponsible by leaving evidence. At least that was the tenor of what

I (and my wife) heard. He really wants the last 6 months to just go away, so that things can go back to normal.

It was the most bizarre conversation I have heard in awhile.... And I wore a badge for over a decade.

My open ended questions worked... Scott and John told us what was on their minds.... For better or worse.

Scott demanded proof for my assertions of Corfield's allegations. It wasn't enough that Corfield admitted to two victims.

Both men cast doubts on the integrity of the investigators- Matt Smith in particular. The thing is... Matt has nothing to gain from what he (and others) are doing. None of the investigators do. Scott, and John and many others have everything to lose by acknowledging the facts. When you are guilty, attack the system and the accuser's integrity. When you are innocent, point to the facts, let the system work.

Matt has been very careful to follow the facts and only the facts. I trust him, and the process he has gone through.

John said: "I don't care if he was a Navy Commander, I don't trust him" I parse that to mean he doesn't trust Matt to listen to the workers, and be obedient. He doesn't trust Matt to overlook facts that are inconvenient to the prerogatives of the ministry.

This is the overview of the conversation we had, with my observations included.