

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE FAMILY DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice 23rd July, 1984

B & G (Wards)

Transcribed from the Official Tape Recording by a Deputy for Mrs. Beverley F. Nunnery, Official Tape Transcriber, 25 Dulverton Mansions, Grays Inn Road, London W.C.1.

MR. MICHAEL KENNEDY, Q.C. and MR. DAVID HART
(instructed by Messrs. Tweedie & Prideaux)
appeared on behalf of the Petitioner.

MR. ROBERT JOHNSON, Q.C. and MR. RUSSELL
(instructed by Messrs. Stephen M. Bird & Co.)
appeared on behalf of the Respondent.

JUDGMENT
(As approved by Judge)

MR. JUSTICE LATEY:

These proceedings concern 2 children, who are wards of Court:

A boy aged 10 who I will call B.

A girl aged 8 who I will call G.

The decision called for is whether they should remain in their father's care or be transferred into their mother's care.

The mother has been but no longer is a Scientologist. The father is a Scientologist.

At the heart of the mother's case is the contention that if the children remain in the care of the father they will be brought up as Scientologists and will be seriously damaged.

This the father denies: That is to say, he denies that with all its flaws Scientology will damage the children. And he says that he intends to bring the children up outside Scientology until they are old enough to make their own free choice.

This judgement is being given in open Court because it raises matters of some general public moment. In giving it I have tried to ensure that the children concerned and their family circles should not be identified. Inevitably, Scientologists in and around East Grinstead know who they are. So do Scientologists in other parts of the world, as has emerged in the evidence. But it could have serious and damaging effects on these children as they grow up if there were publicity in a wider circle identifying them. From experience over the years I know that the Press Association Reporters can be relied on to help in avoiding this where children are involved.

As in every case involving important decisions about children there is a plurality of factors to be weighed, and this is no exception. Scientology and its part in these children's lives now and in the future is one of the factors and an important one. But it is not the only one. It is important, indeed essential, to stress from the start that this is neither an action against Scientology nor a prosecution of it. But willy-nilly Scientology is at the centre of the dispute of what is best for the children. The father and his counsel have stressed that they are not here to defend Scientology. That is true in the strict sense that the "Church" of Scientology is not a party to the proceedings. But they have known from the start what the mother's case is. It is plainly set out in the Affidavits. If there remained any doubt it was dispelled by Mr. Kennedy for the mother at a hearing for directions in January, 1984. The father's solicitor is a Scientologist. He has been in communication with the solicitors who

act for Scientology.

There has been ample time and opportunity to assemble and adduce documents and evidence in refutation of the mother's allegations. None has been adduced. Why? Because the mother's case is based largely on Scientology's own documents and as the father's counsel, Mr. Johnson, candidly albeit plaintively said "what can we do to refute what is stated in Scientology's own documents?"

The hearing has occupied three weeks.

Most of it has been focused on Scientology, what it is and what are its methods and processes. Knowing virtually nothing about it before this hearing I was at first surprised at the ambit of the enquiry. I no longer am surprised. It is a very serious matter so far as these children are concerned and the time spent on it has not been excessive.

The parents were married in 1973 and late that year B was born. G was born in December, 1975.

The parents separated in November, 1978.

In December, 1978 and January, 1979, the parents signed agreements by virtue of which the father had custody of the children and the mother access. The mother lived with the step-father and the father lived with the step-mother. All four of them were Scientologists.

In March, 1979 the father filed a petition for divorce on the ground of the mother's admitted adultery with the stepfather.

In September 1979 a decree nisi was pronounced and, by agreement, custody was committed to the father. The divorce was made absolute in November, 1979. The father and step-mother married.

The mother and step-father also went through a ceremony of marriage believing that they were free to do so. In fact, the step-father's divorce had not gone through. Their union is a stable and happy one, they have a child, a little girl - 'A' I will call her - aged 4, and will marry when these proceedings are concluded and when the step-father's parents can be with them for the wedding.

The mother and step-father have made their home in a Commonwealth country and they ask that the children live with them there.

The father and step-mother's marriage is happy and stable. The step-mother has a child, 'J', by her previous marriage. He is close in age to B. They are very fond of each other. The father and step-mother have a child 'S' aged 3 and they are expecting another baby in

October.

In May, 1980 there began a hearing by the Scientology "Chaplains Court" concerning the custody of the Children. The decision, inaccurately described as an "Agreement", was that custody should remain with the father.

In the summer of 1982 when the children were staying with their mother and step-father the mother decided to keep them. She and the step-father had left Scientology and she instructed solicitors who wrote to the father.

The father went to the mother's country. The mother took children to the United States. An order was made for the return of the children to the father and the father went to the United States and recovered them in November, 1982.

In June, 1983 the mother issued her application for care and control. In January, 1984 the mother and step-father came to England, bought a house in East Grinstead and have been seeing the children regularly.

Those are the bare bones of the history. Some elaboration is called for.

After their marriage the father and mother lived in East Grinstead. This is where the Headquarters of Scientology in this country is situated at Saint Hill Manor. It was until recently the Headquarters world-wide. There are many Scientologists in the area, some working on the staff, others not on the staff but working for Scientology and all undergoing processing, that is to say, auditing and training courses if they can afford it.

As to the separation in 1978, the father said in his Affidavit that this was caused by the mother's relationship with the step-father. In his oral evidence the father accepted that he had drawn up what in Scientology language is described as a "Doubt Formula" in which he said that he considered himself the mother's intellectual superior, that he had doubts about the wisdom of the marriage and that separation had been discussed on a number of occasions. This, of course, puts a somewhat different complexion on the matter. It is scarcely surprising that with a husband who so regarded her, she became attached to a man who held her in full regard and affection.

As to the custody agreements in 1978 and 1979: The father naturally attaches much weight to them. The mother says that throughout she wanted the children and believed that it would be better for them to be with her. She was a committed Scientologist at the time. Scientology forbids recourse to the law courts of the country save in special circumstances with permission. The ordinary Courts are

described in the language of Scientology as the "wog courts", an expression invented by L. Ron Hubbard the founder of the cult. The mother says that she agreed to the father having custody because of the pressure brought to bear on her by the father and the Scientologists concerned. The father accepts that she agreed very reluctantly. He accepts that she is a good, loving mother and that the children love her.

At the time of the separation B was aged just 5 and G not quite 3. Had the dispute come to Court one cannot be sure, of course, what the decision would have been, but it is not unlikely that children so young would have been put in the care of a good and devoted mother as this one is and always has been. But the question today five and a half years later is what is better for the children in the circumstances as they are now and are likely to be.

The mother agrees that the father loves the children. The children love both their parents and are fond of both step-parents and get on well with them. As to the "Chaplains" decision: There were written submissions and some oral hearings. It is noteworthy that from start to finish the father's submission is couched in Scientology terminology and stresses all he and stepmother have done for Scientology, how correctly they have complied with Scientology "ethics" and how the mother has offended against those "ethics". The Chaplain of course was a Scientology official.

Both the mother and stepfather wanted to come to Court and in about May, 1980. She was given permission to do so by the "Assistant Guardian" - of Scientology - on condition that Scientology would not be involved. But the father intervened with the Guardian and the permission was withdrawn.

It is also to be observed that from March, 1979, the mother had been trying to get a hearing before the "Chaplains Court" in the United States. It was refused. It is plain that from first to last the mother wanted the children. She should have gone to the Court. As a Scientologist then she could not. As to what happened in the summer of 1982: The father immediately on arrival applied to the Courts of the country concerned. The mother's solicitor was instructed. This was on the Friday. On the Saturday the father saw the children at the mother's home. The step-father more than the mother was in touch with the solicitor. On the Sunday the mother took the children to the United States. She did so because she was in fear of losing them. She was cross-examined at some length about whether she did this knowing that an interim order had been made restraining her from removing the children. It does not affect the question I have to decide. It goes to credibility. On the balance of probabilities she was told. Whether and to what extent she grasped it is another matter. As the result of the father's arrival she was in a state of shock. She knew that he

had come to get the children if he could and was in great fear that he would succeed. It is understandable that she did not absorb the niceties. She impressed me throughout as a wholly honest person.

Nonetheless, she should not have done what she did do. It was done in panic. It was not in the better interest of the children. Nor was it right not to keep the father informed of the children's well-being. Apart from this one matter, so far as I can recall, her credibility has not been impugned.

So today the mother asks that the Children be committed to her care to live with her and the step-father and their small daughter in the country where they have settled. The children have stayed there happily for three lengthy periods. The mother and stepfather have bought the house in East Grinstead as a temporary measure to be near the children and see them pending this case.

The father asks that they continue to live with him and the step-mother and the other children in their home in East Grinstead where they are happy and well cared for and at the school where they have been for some time.

If those alone were the factors I think that the scales would probably come down in favour of not disturbing the status quo. Indeed were it not for the Scientology factor the mother painfully recognises that she would not now attempt to disturb the status quo and she herself and her counsel have made that plain from the start.

What then is the Scientology factor and what weight should be attached to it? "Horrendous." "Sinister." "A lot of rotten apples in it." Those words are not mine. They are the father's own words describing practices of the Cult and what it does to people inside it and outside it. "A lot of villains in it." "Dreadful things have been done in the name of Scientology." Those words are not mine. They are the words of the father's counsel.

The father at one stage said that he thought that these evils had largely been eradicated in 1980. In the light of the evidence, not surprisingly that suggestion was not pursued in counsel's final address.

What is Scientology?

It is a word invented by L. Ron Hubbard, the founder of the Cult. The concept, stated very briefly, is that from the beginning of time everyone is reincarnated. Inside each of us is a spiritual being whom Hubbard calls a "Thetan". This entity is there to help improve one through the millennia. But in each incarnation we are handicapped or the Thetan is handicapped by the existence in us of "engrams" as

Hubbard calls them - bad thoughts or past misdeeds in the present and previous incarnations. Those engrams have to be removed or "cleared" by certain processes invented by Hubbard. Until they are removed the Thetan cannot operate and the Scientologist is known as a "pre-clear". After they are removed the Scientologist is "clear" and becomes an "Operative [sic: "operating"] thetan" (OT). From there on he gets "case gain" improvement mentally physically and spiritually and begins his passage "up the Bridge". If he transgresses he goes back to the beginning and is re-processed.

Some might regard this as an extension of the entertaining science fiction which Hubbard used to write before he invented and founded the cult which now in this country and some others is called the "Church of Scientology" though in Australia for example it calls itself the "Church of the New Faith".

But in an open Society, such as ours, people can believe what they want to and band together and promulgate their beliefs. If people believe that the earth is flat there is nothing to stop them believing so, saying so and joining together to try to persuade others.

Some of the public proclamations of Scientology are unexceptional, such, for example, that Scientologists should obey the law of the land. When one looks at the reality behind the public facade the matter is very different as will appear.

What are "Dianetics"?

This is another Hubbard-invented word to describe the processes whereby the aims of Scientology are furthered. Those processes are "auditing" and training courses.

"Auditing"

"Auditing is a simple, thoroughly designed means, of concentrating the mind to the state of a controlled trance. The aim and result is progressively to enforce loyalty to and identification with Scientology to the detriment of one's natural awareness of divergent ways of thinking and outside cultural influences. Love and allegiance are more and more given exclusively to Scientology and L. Ron Hubbard." That is the description of it given by Dr. John Gordon Clark. Dr. Clark is a Doctor of Medicine of Harvard Medical School and a qualified psychiatrist and neurologist. He holds high appointments. Among others, he is Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School and Consultant in Psychiatry at Massachusetts General Hospital. He is a practising psychiatrist. He has made a study of various cults and taught and lectured in various countries on the medical-psychiatric aspects of forced conversions

and kindred topics.

He was cross-examined at considerable length. His evidence was wholly convincing. His description of the aims and effects of auditing is supported by a mass of other evidence and refuted by none (save the subjective but conditioned views of some of the Scientologists who have given evidence), and is supported by documents of Scientology, to some of which I shall refer later. His description is accurate.

In blunt language "auditing" is a process of conditioning, brainwashing and indoctrination.

Dr. Clark was asked about other Scientology cases on which he has given evidence to the same effect. I am not quite sure what the point was unless it was to show that he had become obsessive. If that was the point I can only say that he impressed me as objective, balanced, very careful and fair.

What is the fact is that it has called for very real courage to speak out as he has. I will come later to the vicious methods used by the Church of Scientology as a matter of deliberate settled policy to discredit Dr. Clark and any others who criticise it or indeed others who the Church thinks may in the future criticise it.

The mother complains about the cult and its practices and says that it is pernicious. Her principal complaints and my findings about them are these:

The Founder, L. Ron Hubbard

To promote himself and the cult he has made these among other false claims:

That he was a much decorated war hero. He was not.

That he commanded a corvette squadron. He did not.

That he was awarded the Purple Heart, a gallantry decoration for those wounded in action. He was not wounded and was not decorated.

That he was crippled and blinded in the war and cured himself with Dianetics techniques. He was not crippled and was not blinded.

That he was sent by U.S. Naval Intelligence to break up a black magic ring in California. He was not. He was himself a member of that occult group and practised ritual sexual magic in it.

That he was a graduate of George Washington University and an atomic physicist. The facts are that he completed only one year of college

and failed the one course in nuclear physics in which he enrolled.

There is no dispute about any of this. The evidence is unchallenged.

Hubbard in a course called Purification Rundown (a course which the father and step-mother recently attended, paying a high price for it) claims that it will increase the body's resistance to radio-activity. Shown this the psychologist who gave evidence on behalf of the father, described it as balderdash. Shown Hubbard's writings about psychiatry and psychologists he agreed that it was bunkum.

Hubbard has described himself as "Dr. Hubbard". The only doctorate he has held is a self-bestowed "doctorate" in Scientology.

The use of false, spurious descriptions extends downwards. The Deputy Principal of the school where the children are at present being educated is a Scientologist. At various times he has worn clerical garb and described himself as "Reverend". And at other times as "Professor". He did this, he accepts, for promotional reasons.

Mr. Hubbard went into hiding in 1980. Attempts have been made to secure his attendance at various hearings in the Courts of the United States. They have all failed because he cannot be found and served.

The evidence is clear and conclusive: Mr. Hubbard is a charlatan and worse as are his wife Mary Sue Hubbard (she has been convicted of criminal offences in the United States in connection with Scientology and imprisoned) and the clique at the top privy to the Cult's activities.

Recruiting

Various promotional campaigns are carried out. A favoured method is to offer a free "Personal Efficiency" test. When that has been carried out the subject is invariably advised that he or she is in need of Scientology and Dianetics. With the crude cynicism which informs the reality of Scientology in contrast to its cosmetic appearances potential recruits are described as "raw meat". The objective for adherents is to "get the meat off the street".

Locking them in

Once the fish is on the hook Scientologists must go to all and any lengths to stop it wriggling free.

L. Ron Hubbard writes this (HCO Bulletin 29 September 1959):

[HCO stands for Hubbard Communications Office]

"The whole dream of a PE (Personal Efficiency) Foundation is to get the people in fast, get them invoiced in a congress type assembly line, no waiting, give them hot, excited, positive service and boot them on through to their HAS [HAS is a Hubbard Apprentice Scientologist] and THEN worry about doing something else with them. And never let a student leave or quit - introvert him like a bullet and get him to get audited. If he gets no reality don't let him wander out. If he walks in that door for a free PE, that's it. He doesn't get out except into an individual auditor's hands in the real tough cases, until he's an HAS."

One of the most sinister aspects of auditing, one that shocked the father himself, is the corrupt, indeed criminal, use of the confessions made to the auditor. Hubbard has emphasised repeatedly that everything said during auditing is absolutely confidential. That assurance is given by the auditor to the person being audited.

What happens is that that person communicates to the auditor his innermost thoughts and relates any criminal offences or transgressions of any kind, any incidents from his life which are embarrassing or for which he could be blackmailed. These statements are written down by the auditor including time, place, and a detailed description of each incident as well as who were present and knew about the incident.

Contrary to the assurance of confidentiality, all "auditing" files are available to Scientology's intelligence and enforcement bureaux and are used, if necessary, to control and extort obedience from the person who was audited. If a person seeks to escape from Scientology his auditing files are taken by the intelligence bureau and used, if wished, to pressure him into silence. They are often so used and uncontroverted evidence of this has been given at this hearing.

Closely connected with this is the duty of Scientologists to inform on each other. This is done by means of "Knowledge Reports" to "Ethics", the department responsible for discipline. Very recently (this year, 1984) one such Report was sent to Ethics by the step-mother about one of her closest friends; and one such Report was sent by the Principal of the children's school about a part-time member of the staff and the parent of a child there.

Thus is built up a very complete dossier on every Scientologist for use if need be for the purposes I have mentioned.

Dated 22 December 1972 a top priority Internal Security project was circulated:

"This is a top priority Internal Security project.

The information I want is to be obtained from ethics files, pc files [pre-clear files], personnel files and interviews.

It may be that you will only have to, for example, look into a personnel file. If, however, you exhaust the file check, an interview will have to be done. This action can be done by your MAA [Master at Arms].

All persons on your staff who have ever been employed by a government agency; this would include a person working as an informer to any of these groups, are to be reported to me. Also, include city government, such as police departments. Add a description of the particular post said person held, with the time and connections.

This is to be done quickly and quietly."

It is no surprise that to escape from the clutches of Scientology calls for great courage and resolution. The stranglehold is tight and unrelenting and the discipline ruthless. And of course there is the anguish of conscience in the escaper after usually many years of commitment to Scientology. The mother and step-father have come through it as have others who have given evidence.

Recently some of the Scientologists in East Grinstead are half way to escaping. They describe themselves as Independent Scientologists. They still espouse the concepts of Scientology but they are in rebellion against the Church's practices and have left the Church. There are, it seems, a fair number of them and it may be that for them there is safety in numbers, I do not know. Apostasy is a "High Crime." High Crimes are the gravest in the Scientology calendar. I will come later to the punitive methods adopted to deal with apostates and others who incur the Church's displeasure.

Teaching Students to Lie

Scientology has its own Intelligence branch. One of its activities is to obtain information by falsehood and deception. Newly joined agents are trained in this and the method is described as follows. I quote verbatim:

"INTELLIGENCE SPECIALIST TRAINING ROUTINE - TR-1

Purpose: To train the student to give a false statement with good TR-1. To train the student to outflow false data effectively.

Position: Same as TR-1

Commands: Part 1 - "Tell me a lie". Command given by coach. Part 2 - interview type 2. WC by coach.

Training Stress: In Part 1 coach gives command, student originates a falsehood. Coach flunks for out TR 1 or TR 0. In Part 2 coach asks questions of the student on his background or a subject. "Student gives untrue data of a plausible sort that the student backs up with further explanatory data upon the coach further questions. The coach flunks for out TR 0 and TR 1, and for student fumbling on question answers. The student should be coached on a gradient until he/she can lie facily." [Meaning, I suppose, "facilely"]

Short example:

Coach: Where do you come from?

Student: I come from the Housewives Committee on Drug Abuse.

Coach: But you said earlier that you were single.

Student: Well, actually I was married but am divorced. I have 2 kids in the suburbs where I am a housewife, in fact I'm a member of the P.T.A.

Coach: What town is it that you live in?

Student: West Brighton.

Coach: But there is no public school in West Brighton.

Student: I know. I send my children to school in Brighton, and that's where I'm a P.T.A. member.

Coach: Oh, and who is the Chairman there? etc."

Intelligence gathering and its uses

Hubbard proclaims in his public writings that the law of the country must be obeyed and no illegal activities undertaken. The following Scientology directives and extracts show the hidden reality and show that what Hubbard professes is a cynical lie:

"Hubbard Communications Office
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead,
Sussex.

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 20 MAY 1970

Remimeo
Guardian WW
D/Guardian PR

Asst Guardians
Asst Guardians PR
Public Divisions

GUARDIAN PUBLIC RELATIONSHIPS

The Guardian's Office handles certain publics which are its sole responsibility. These publics are as follows:

Press relations
Government relations
Special Guardian group relations
Opposition group relations
Troublesome relations

In press relations are included relations with the press, radio, television and magazines. Although the Public Divisions may place news releases, appear on radio or television or write stories for magazines, all such is done in co-ordination with and approved by the Public Relations Bureau of the Guardian's Office. Any reporter calling the organization is routed to the Guardian Public Relations Bureau.

All relationships with governmental agencies and government officials are handled by the Guardian's Office or are cleared through the Guardian's Office. The Legal Bureau receives and then handles or approves all correspondence to and from Government officials acting in an official capacity; and whether such are local, county, district (state) or national, all are handled by the Legal Bureau.

The Public Relations Bureau handles visiting government officials all lobbying actions and carries out all public relations programmes involved with the government.

There are specialized groups which are either established by the Guardians Office or with which the Guardian's Office is co-acting toward mutual goals. These fall under the purview of the Public Relations Bureau.

Opposition group relations are in the sphere of Guardians Office. These opposition groups are those which are acting against Scientology or against the goals of Scientology.

Troublesome relations is a catchall to include all those relations which the organization has not handled with its various publics and which then wind up on Guardian lines. Into this category fall business firms which sue the organization, threatening former Scientologists expelled by the Church, non-authorized squirrel groups, hostile members of the immediate community and so on.

Mary Sue Hubbard, Controller
for
L. RON HUBBARD, Founder"

"HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 AUGUST 1960

In the face-of danger from Govts or courts there are only two errors one can make: (a) do nothing and (b) defend. The right things to do with any threat are to (1) Find out if we want to play the offered game or not, (2) If not, to derail the offered game with a feint or attack upon the most vulnerable point which can be disclosed in the enemy ranks, (3) Make enough threat or clamor to cause the enemy to quail, (4) Don't try to get any money out of it, (5) Make every attack by us also sell Scientology and (6) Win. If attacked on some vulnerable point by anyone or anything or any organization, always find or manufacture enough threat against them to cause them to sue for peace. Peace is bought with an exchange of advantage, so make the advantage and then settle. Don't ever defend. Always attack. Don't ever do nothing. Unexpected attacks in the rear of the enemy's front ranks work best.

The goal of the Department is to bring the government and hostile philosophies or societies into a state of complete compliance with the goals of Scientology. This is done by high level ability to control and in its absence by low level ability to overwhelm. Introvert [their word for infiltrate] such agencies. Control such agencies. Scientology is the only game on Earth where everybody wins. There is no overt in bringing good order."

["Overt" is a wrong-doing against Scientology.]

"9 March 1970

Guardian WW
D/G Int WW

Re: Successful and Unsuccessful Actions

Dear Jane,

The following is a list of the successful and unsuccessful actions used by intelligence.

Successful - Prosecuting Traitors - [that means traitors to

Scientology]

1) In the United States finding evidence of a crime and handing it over to the police or vice-squad. This is any crime.

2) In the United Kingdom - Finding evidence of a crime against the org [that means organisation], and having a representative of the Church press charges for a prosecution.

Regularly getting out files and reading through them. Especially any files or cases that were handled prior to your coming on post.

If reading through files brings up a connection you were not aware of, or had forgotten, chase it up and get out the other files pertinent to the area. [All these are the files which Hubbard says are absolutely confidential.]

Use the files regularly and continuously referring to them as often as possible. Crossfiling should not only be done under names of people but under groups and organizations as well. Also under subjects. In other words thorough crossfiling.

Use of telephoning to get simple information such as addresses etc., rather than a personal visit.

Contacting the secretary or aide of the person you are interested in and chatting them up. Note this is very successful in getting tricky information that is not available in other areas. Is Dr. so and so on his vacation now? Where is he? How long will he be gone?

Invent letterhead of some organization that is spurious, i.e. have it printed up and use it to make queries. Use some fairly safe address but don't be over cautious. if you have a letterhead nobody seems to bother checking it. Examples "Ford Foto Features" or "The Council for Human Relations in Industry". If you have a letterhead of any sort you will get answers to your questions most of the time. Of these using a phoney News Agency is the most successful.

Using 2D [that means Second Dynamic, and it means sexual relations or relationships or family relationships] on someone high in the government to seduce them over to our side. This particular action was not started as an intelligence action but was more personal. It did however move into 2D activity.

Infiltrating an enemy group with the end to getting documents. These can either be about their own plans or what they have on us.

Covert third partying with forged or phoney signatures. Anonymous third partying. Particularly the Internal Revenue service appears to

follow up every tip off they get. Getting information out of files. This is of course only vital files, not just any files.

Direct theft of documents ... " ["Third partying" is character assassination.]

"25 Mar 1977

RE: RED BOX

Dear All,

This is to introduce into B1US [Bureau 1, US - Ed.] the complete red box system. Most of you have heard of this earlier - I will now explain it in detail.

First of all, all data that is red box data, has to be pulled from your areas. The complete definition of Red Box material is attached.

Secondly, you must ensure that none of your juniors (for those of you who have them) have red box data in their areas. All the red box material from your areas must be centrally located, together and in a moveable container (ideally a briefcase, locked, and marked).

When this is done in each area, we will divide up the amounts and deputize persons in the area to be responsible for its removal from the premises in the case of a raid. This procedure will be drilled. This procedure will stay in at the new location.

Please have all this data sorted and located in proper container by Monday night Mar 28. I will then divide up removal duties, and we will drill it Tuesday night just before the all hands.

RED BOX DATA INFORMATION SHEET

1. What is Red Box data?

- a) Proof that a Scientologist is involved in criminal activities.
- b) Anything illegal that implicates MSH (Mary Sue Hubbard), LRH (L. Ron Hubbard).
- c) Large amounts of non-FOI [Freedom of Information Act] docs.
- d) Operations against any government group or persons.

- e) All operations that contain illegal activities.
- f) Evidence of incriminating activities.
- g) Names and details of confidential financial accounts."

These directives speak for themselves. Comment from me is unnecessary.

In 1983 those at Saint Hill, East Grinstead tried to improve the public reputation of Scientology and invited the Press to look round Saint Hill Manor. A short article appeared in The Times of 17th August 1983 by its religious correspondent. One wonders whether he was shown the Red Box data or told of its existence or indeed of any other of the material which I have been quoting. I doubt it.

Training Courses

Courses are held on a very large number of Scientology topics both in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America at "Flag" the headquarters of "Sea Org", which is the high command. They become more advanced as one advances "across or up the Bridge". These courses, or some of them, include auditing as part of them, as I understand it.

They can be very dangerous to the mental health of the trainee and evidence has been given of instances of mental breakdown during the course of them or as the result of them.

Discipline

Discipline is ruthless and obedience has to be unquestioning.

Scientologists working on the staff are required to work inordinately long hours for their keep and a pittance. The purpose, as Mr. Armstrong describes it, pursuant to L. Ron Hubbard's orders is to keep individuals impoverished so that they become completely dependent on the organization for their basic needs on a daily basis. Mr. Armstrong was a Scientologist for 13 years from 1969. For several of them he worked on Hubbard's personal staff and was privy to what went on in the innermost circles.

A catch phrase constantly recurring is "the greatest good for the greatest number of Dynamics". The step-father and his first wife were ordered to leave their little daughter full time with a baby-minder so as to put in maximum hours to "clear the planet", this being "for the greatest good for the greatest number of Dynamics". For several months they saw their daughter only on weekends. When he insisted on leaving earlier to bring the child home during the weekdays he was

threatened with "Ethics Condition", that is to say, disciplinary action. On another occasion in 1976 his wife received special permission to visit a doctor because of a recurring abdominal complaint. She telephoned to say she had to go to hospital immediately. He asked if he could leave to see her. He was told "get your stats up and you can leave at 4.30 not before". When he protested he was reminded of the policy "keep Scientology working". ["Get your stats up" means "meet your performance or productivity quota".]

Scientology must come first before family or friends. Much evidence has been given and not disputed of how it leads to alienation of one spouse from another, of alienation from children and from friends.

Another witness, Mrs. B, was a Scientologist from 1972 and rose quickly in the Organisation. She had a three-year-old daughter. Nonetheless, for a period of months she was required to work from 8.30 am to 1 am. She was allowed only 15 minutes daily to put her daughter to bed. On one occasion when the child broke her arm and she took her to the doctor she was directed to work all night as a penalty.

In January 1982, Mrs. B was made Commanding Officer of the Organisation, Saint Hill UK Foundation. At around this time the Commodore's Messenger's Org (Top Management) in the United States were originating an increasing number of international directives which seemed to her to be wrong and bad. She wrote a report addressing it to L. Ron Hubbard. Eight days later in November 1982, she was removed from her post and assigned to the "RPF" (Rehabilitation Project Force). She was refused counselling, required to do at least 12 hours physical work a day (shifting bricks, emptying bins etc.) and to communicate with no-one, except to receive orders. The work aggravated a chronic back condition. When she protested she was threatened with being declared a "Suppressive Person" (a High Crime - see below). Her time with her children was limited to one half hour per day.

Another witness worked at Flag and became an "L. Ron Hubbard Public Relations Officer", one of only three in the world and a high appointment. In 1977 she declined to undertake a mission that would cause her to leave her young daughter for at least 2 months. She was shouted at and abused because she put the care of her child first. She was subjected to a Committee of Evidence (disciplinary tribunal). She left Flag.

Those are a few of many illustrations, proved in evidence, of the ruthless and inhuman disciplinary measures.

Suppressive Acts (SA), Suppressive Persons (SP), Potential Trouble

Sources (PTS), and Disconnection

A 'suppressive act' is any act which seniors consider to be against the interests of Scientology. A 'suppressive person' is a Scientologist who does a suppressive act.

A 'potential trouble source' is anyone outside Scientology who is opposed to the Cult or anyone inside it who has been declared a suppressive person.

A Scientologist who is connected with a potential trouble source - spouse, fiancé, relative, friend or business associate - is ordered to disconnect from that person and, if that is not done, the Scientologist will himself or herself be declared a suppressive person.

Very many examples have been given and proved in evidence. Two will suffice as examples.

Mrs. F was a Scientologist and until recently a senior staff member of the "Church" of Scientology until, and I quote her own words: "I resigned because its practices were dishonest degrading and oppressive". She and the Deputy Principal (also a Scientologist as mentioned earlier) were in love and planned marriage when his divorce came through. She had been ordered to disconnect from a close woman friend. She discussed this and her disenchantment with Scientology with her fiancé. He was subjected to an "Ethics interview" at Saint Hill and the school. He wrote her a letter dated 16 January, 1984:

"16 January 1984

Dear

I have done conditions and decided that I am a Scientologist before all and do not wish to have any opposition to the church on my lines. I agree with the disconnection technology when a person commits a suppressive act, to assist them to confront and handle their behaviour. I believe that outnesses or disagreements can be handled on church lines. I believe there is no survival off these lines. I believe that I must not compromise my position and that your only hope lies in resolving your problems with the terminals here, at Saint Hill. I believe that you should take advantage of the help offered to get any false data corrected and any out-ethics handled.

I believe I have not been firm in cutting entheta lines and so have allowed a dwindling spiral for us both. I believe you are a remarkable being who I wanted to share an ethical future with.

Please listen to me, sweetheart. See the RTC Mission and hear

their data. Let's live within the church's protection If you will not do this for me and you, then I must disconnect, as I cannot believe you are acting for our survival. It's not a question of "your integrity", it's a question of survival along all dynamics ..."

The father had a business associate and close friend. He incurred the Church's disfavour - he was declared a Suppressive Person, I think - and he and the father fell apart and had a business dispute. The father wrote him this letter dated 6th April 1983 with copies to the "Justice Chief International" and the "Special Unit World Wide":

"6 April 1983

Dear

You have since your return in January behaved in a destructive and suppressive way toward me and my company.

In his recent Journal 37, LRH says that any suppressive person seeking to dissuade or invalidate one deals only in lies. And that truth blows the lies away.

You are dealing in lies. Your non confront, unwillingness to communicate, not-is-ness and lies have added complexity to the situation:

1. You proceeded contrary to our agreement to enter into a carpet supply business using the same comm lines as the cleaning company. This without any reference to me.

2. You have attempted to hold me to a "connection" with you as a declared S.P. knowing that such a connection would prevent me from progressing in Scientology. You have done this by refusing direct communication between us on the two outstanding matters of taxation and the valuation of the companies.

3. Rather than communication and confront of these subjects you have interjected a firm of solicitors two of whom are declared S.P.s again with the knowledge of the difficulty this would create. You have apparently instructed these solicitors to act against me based on lies.

4. You have been obstructive, suppressively so, in the matter of your vacating the premises and to my idea of the workable solution of the partition.

5. You have taken up with Ron Hopkins, a declared and expelled S.P. and thereby introduced another suppressive element into the premises and thus onto my lines. I have thought long and hard about

you of late. I have recently done a very thorough PTS C/S I course at AOSH. [that is, at Saint Hill]

Your actions, attitude and intentions are compatible with those of an S.P, In fact the only way to understand them is by reference to the LRH data on S.Ps. What you are now doing in setting yourself against the Church is not only very suppressive but also non-survival for you, your family and any group you are associated with.

My advice to you would be to stop your suppressive actions and drop all your S.P. connections and get yourself to I.J.C. [that is, International Justice Chief] and get this scene handled now.

I have regrettably, no illusions about your accepting this ..."

Punishment and Persecution

I have already mentioned some of the forms of punishment and examples of their use. There is more where the Church's enemies are concerned - suppressive persons and critics.

"Fair game policy"

In his HCO Policy letter of 18th October 1967 L. Ron Hubbard, Founder, directed:

"PENALTIES FOR LOWER CONDITIONS (Applies both Orgs and Sea Org)

LIABILITY - Suspension of Pay and a dirty grey rag on left arm and day and night confinement to org premises.

TREASON [that means to say, treason against Scientology] - Suspension of pay and deprivation of all uniforms and insignia, a black mark on left cheek and confinement on org premises or dismissal from post and debarment from premises.

DOUBT - Debarment from premises. Not to be employed. Payment of fine amounting to any sum may have cost org. Not to be trained or processed. Not to be communicated or argued with.

ENEMY - SP Order. Fair Game. May be deprived of property or injured by any means by any Scientologist without any discipline of the Scientologist. May be tricked, sued or lied to or destroyed.

L. RON HUBBARD Founder"

In his HCO Policy letter of 21 October 1968, Hubbard directed:

"CANCELLATION OF FAIR GAME

The practice of declaring people FAIR GAME will cease. FAIR GAME may not appear on any Ethics Order. It causes bad public relations. This PL [that is, policy letter] does not cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of an SP.

L. RON HUBBARD Founder"

It was suggested, but not pursued, that this did cancel the Fair Game treatment. It did nothing of the kind as the last sentence shows. It was cosmetic only for public consumption. Deprivation of property, injury by any means, trickery, suing, lying or destruction have been pursued throughout and to this day with the fullest possible vigour.

Two give two illustrations: Beginning in 1977 the Church of Scientology have conducted a campaign of persecution against Dr. Clark. They wrote letters to the Dean at the Harvard Medical School and to the Director of the Massachusetts General Hospital. But they refused to gag him. Their agents tracked down and telephoned several of his patients and interviewed his neighbours looking for evidence to impugn his private or personal actions. They submitted a critical report to a Committee of the Massachusetts State Senate. On three occasions during the last five years a Scientology "front" called the Citizens' Commission on Human Rights have brought complaints against him to the Massachusetts Medical Board of Registration alleging improper professional conduct. In 1980 he was declared a "Number One Enemy" and in 1981 they brought two law suits against him (summarily dismissed, but costly and worrying). They distributed leaflets at the Massachusetts General Hospital offering a \$25,000 reward to employees for evidence which would lead to his conviction on any charge of criminal activity. They stole his employment record from another Boston hospital. They convene press conferences calculated to ruin his professional reputation. It all failed, but that is of minor importance to Scientology. "Throw enough mud and some will stick." It has caused him heavy cost in time and money and anxiety. Mr. Armstrong points out that the claim that "Fair Game" has been cancelled is untrue. He was declared "Fair Game". They disseminated stories internationally falsely accusing him of theft, hired paid bullies to harass him and his wife day and night for over a month, threatened his life, assaulted him and hit him with a car.

Black Propaganda

By HCO Policy Letter of 11 May 1971, Hubbard directed:

"BLACK PR

"About the most involved employment of PR is its covert use in destroying the reputations of individuals and groups. More correctly this

is technically called Black Propaganda."

Use of the Courts

"Level "O" Checksheet by L. Ron Hubbard":

"The purpose of the suit is to harass and discourage rather than to win. The law can be used very easily to harass, and enough harassment on somebody who is simply on the thin edge anyway, well knowing that he is not authorised, will generally be sufficient to cause his professional decease. If possible, of course, ruin him utterly."

Some of the Scientology jargon in its own documents, which I have been citing may not be clear to someone who has not had to undergo the task of having them explained over the weeks. But their meaning is clear and they show out of the cult's own mouth the frightening, disgraceful and illegal lengths to which it is prepared to go and does go.

There has been harassment of the mother and step-father in this case. The father sent the documents in the case to the "Church", who in turn sent them with directions to the head of their Guardians' Office in the town where the mother and step-father lived. They tried to persuade them to discontinue the proceedings. If they did not they would be interfering with the "spiritual progress" of the children and would be expelled from the Church. They refused. Soon afterwards one of the step-father's company's employees, a Scientologist, resigned his job. He told the stepfather that this was because he was engaging in suppressive acts". He said that he had not wished to leave the company but had been ordered to do so by the "Church".

I was informed of this at the hearing for directions in January 1984. I warned that any continuance or repetition would be severely dealt with and it is right to say that there has been none.

Now at the end of this case I repeat publicly what I said then: The powers of this Court are wide and its arm is long. If there is any intimidation or harassment of any description of anyone connected with this case it will be dealt with the utmost severity.

Money

The cost of "Services"

The prices charged by Scientology for auditing or courses are very high, often running into many thousands of pounds. A Scientologist although "clear" is required to go on being audited and taking courses to advance up the Bridge for all of which he has to pay.

Over the period of 15 months before the Chaplain's Court in May 1980, the father and step-mother paid into Scientology £8,000 at Saint Hill and £6,500 at Flag, a total of £14,500. They have continued throughout the years to go on courses and being audited and have paid large sums of money. They plan to go on doing so and, indeed, will be subjected to harsh disciplinary methods if they do not. No recruit or Scientologist can have these services without paying for them. There is no tempering of the wind to a shorn lamb.

Scientology claimed recently that they would "clear the planet" within five years. Herein is a paradox. How can they clear all pre-clears when the majority cannot possibly hope to pay? But, I suppose, it is swallowed by the adherents just as everything else is. Their reasoning powers have been blocked out.

Apparatus and materials

There is a very long list of these and Scientologists are expected to buy at heavy costs.

An example is the "E-Meter". Hubbard in his book "Scientology. The Fundamentals of Thought" describes it as follows:

"The Hubbard Electrometer is a religious artifact used in the Church Confessional. It, in itself, does nothing and is used by ministers only, to assist parishioners in locating areas of spiritual distress or travail."

"Ministers" are Auditors. "Parishioners" are people being audited.

That is the description of it for public consumption. Privately it is used as a means of intimidation (see the U.S. Mission Holders Conference below).

Dr. Clark describes it as a crude lie-detector. The psychologist, already mentioned, describes it as a psycho-galvanometer, costing 28.50p. The father and step-mother have one in their house which they bought some years ago. It cost about £400.

"Regging"

This is the word used to describe extorting money.

Examples proved in evidence and not challenged are:

Two people were persuaded to sell their respective houses. Proceeds were used to pay for Scientology services. Both were left with virtually no assets.

A man was persuaded to pay the entirety of his worker's Compensation payment, approximately \$18,000 towards "Services".

A man was persuaded to pay \$52,000 out of a Settlement awarded to him for permanent injuries from a motorcycle accident.

A married couple were persuaded to pay \$105,000 by selling off a large part of the wife's inherited stocks and shares.

A man undergoing chemotherapy for terminal lymphatic cancer was persuaded to pay \$24,000.

These are examples only.

The US Mission Holders Conference San Francisco 1982

Missioners are those in charge of Scientology Missions, whose function it is to proselytize and get people into Scientology.

They were summoned to a "Conference" in San Francisco to be addressed by "top officials of the Sea Organisation". These persons are given the appellations of naval ranks. Hubbard is the "Commodore".

The top officials were a "Captain" and two "Commanders". They took it in turns to harangue the unfortunate missioners. Present were Scientology's own police and Masters at Arms" (MAAs). The whole burden of the harangue was "get more money in or else - "They had to double their quotas of recruits. They had to pay \$15,000 a day for investigators. They had to get rid of certain publications and buy others. Each one had to buy a projector for \$2,000: and so on.. If they did not comply they were going to be punished and "you'll be meter-tested" or "get the E. Meter".

For those of us old enough to remember it is grimly reminiscent of the ranting and bullying of Hitler and his henchmen.

It gives the flavour of the reality of what Scientology is and does. I include the transcript of the Mission Holders Conference as an appendix to this judgement. Counsel were agreed that the first 30 pages are irrelevant and these are not included.

"Make More Money"

In HCO Policy letter of 9 March 1972 Hubbard directed:

"GOVERNING POLICY

The governing policy of Finance is to:

A. MAKE MONEY.

B. Buy more money made with allocations for expense (bean theory).

C. Do not commit expense beyond future ability to pay.

D. Don't ever borrow.

E. Know different types of orgs and what they do.

F. Understand money flow lines not only in an org but org to org as customers flow upward. [I think customers flowing upwards means Scientologists advancing up the Bridge]

G. Understand EXCHANGE of valuables or service for money (P/L Exec Series 3 and 4).

H. Know the correct money pools for any given activity.

I. Police all lines constantly.

J. MAKE MONEY.

K. MAKE MORE MONEY.

L. MAKE OTHER PEOPLE PRODUCE SO AS TO MAKE MONEY."

What happens to the Money?

Mr. Armstrong is in a better position than most to know where the money goes. His evidence, together with other evidence, shows that much of it goes into the pocket of Hubbard and he has described how it is "laundered".

The Children's School

It is the mother's case that the school [Greenfields School - Ed.] is under the control of the Church of Scientology in East Grinstead.

The father's case is that it is entirely independent of Scientology.

It is not disputed that of 89 pupils all but 7 or 8 are the children of Scientologists; and save for 2 or 3 temporary or part-time staff, the Principal, Deputy Principal and all the staff are Scientologists. The governors or managers are the Board of Trustees. All of them are Scientologists, one of them being the father.

Scientology as such is not taught as a subject. But all the ambience [sic] is of Scientology, and it is plain that the Church exercises a

strong influence if not indeed control.

A pupil wrote a letter which the Principal circulated as a "Success Story". It reflects Scientology language and notions.

I have already mentioned the "Knowledge Report" sent to the Church by the Principal about a parent. Another Scientology parent who had fallen foul of the Church and was not "in good standing" was ordered to remove her children. The Principal was called to account by "Ethics" for allowing a Scientologist who had incurred the Church's displeasure, to attend the School Fair.

The School pays money annually to Scientology.

The facts speak for themselves.

Scientology's indoctrination of children

The objective of Scientology is to capture the child and its mind.

The auditing - the processing - begins at an early age. In "Child Dianetics", 1968 edition, Hubbard writes:

"It is possible to process a child at any age level beyond the point when he learns to speak. However, no serious processing should be undertaken until the child is at least five. Extensive dianetic processing is not encouraged, except in very unusual circumstances, until the child is at least eight years of age."

In "The Second Dynamic" 1982 edition under the heading "Children's Confessional Ages 6 - 12" is a "processing check for use on children". It is a very long and vigorous interrogation.

Dr. Clark says this:

"Among children's many development needs is the capacity to deal with strangers and diverse interests. A child brought up strictly within the closed system of Scientology would tend not to develop these capacities and instead look upon the non-'cleared' outside world as a totally alien culture.

The 'technical processes' used by Scientology to educate children are mind-focusing, hypnotic and anaesthetic. Such states of mind, which are induced in order to secure lifetime allegiance to Scientology, can mask real disease. Children need human nurturance from human - that is to say fallible - models in order to become autonomous and adaptive over a lifetime. The experience of stressful and manipulative Scientology training not only consumes a great deal of time unconstructively, but it favours identification with the

process rather than with human, parental authorities."

In "Booklet 2 of the Professional Course" (1982) Hubbard writes:

"A very effective thought control technique could also be worked out from Scientology which could be used to make individuals into willing slaves."

In my judgement that technique has been worked out and is operated. I agree with Dr. Clark that "Scientology training is training for slavery".

Dr. Clark adds:

"Children also become damaged pawns in family conflicts as the result of Scientology policy which teaches people how to manipulate others. One sees the untoward effects of this policy within the family home when the group works to alienate a child from a spouse who has incurred the 'church's' disapproval and who must be shunned by any means available. A prescribed tactic often used to this effect is called 'third-partying' by which a child can be subtly alienated from a parent who may not be acceptable to the 'church' of Scientology by blaming problems and conflicts on the non-conforming spouse or other close family members. Apart from direct psychic damage, a most significant result of this process is that the child loses half of his parental nurturance."

There is a large, a very large, body of evidence, most of it undisputed, in this case supporting Dr. Clark's analysis and I am left in no doubt that he is right.

A sad episode during the hearing was the evidence of a young man. He is greatly gifted and did exceptionally well at School and university. His parents are Scientologists as are his brother and sister. They are all totally committed. He did his first simple course at the age of six and a further basic course "The Hubbard Qualified Scientologist Course' two years later. Since then he has continued with course after course. He was cross-examined gently by Mr. Kennedy. It became apparent that he simply could not accept that there was or could be anything wrong with Scientology. The part of his mind which would otherwise have been capable of weighing objectively the criticisms of Scientology had been blocked out by the processing. He has indeed been enslaved. Mr Kennedy coined an accurate shorthand phrase to describe this: "Scientology blindness".

Is there a good side to Scientology?

Lifting the Ban

Some reliance is placed by the father on the lifting of "the ban". In July 1968 the then Government imposed immigration restrictions on non-British students of Scientology. In July 1980 the ban was lifted. The Home Secretary announced this in a written answer (No. 123) in these terms:

"Yes, this policy which applies to Scientology alone was announced in 1968 by the then Minister of Health who stated that Scientology was socially harmful and that its methods could be a serious danger to the health of those submitted to them. My Right Hon. Friend the Secretary of State of Social Services is not satisfied that there is clear and sufficient evidence for continuing the existing policy with regard to Scientologists on medical grounds alone. I have accordingly decided that the ban be lifted."

The inference it is suggested, is that Scientology is not harmful. Well, the Home Secretary's answer is in very guarded terms. I do not know what material the Department of Social Services had. It did not consult the views of Dr. Clark and his like-minded colleagues. I doubt whether it had the documents which have been proved in this case. I cannot properly attach any weight to it. It followed intensive propaganda by the "Church" and lobbying of MPs and others in which the father played a very active and time-consuming part.

Narconon

This is a campaign against drug abuse participated in by Scientology. It seems to have had some success and has been much publicised as such by Scientology. Credit for it is somewhat diminished by the evidence of Mrs. B, who was, in a position to know and who says that part of the funds raised for it were syphoned [sic] off to Hubbard.

"A religion"

Scientology approached a large number of theologians and other savants on the question whether Scientology is a religion. These have been put in evidence. The definitions vary. Some of them would embrace such cults as Satanism or devil-worship. Their purpose was to try to obtain acknowledgment that Scientology was a 'religion' within the meaning of certain fiscal enactments and so obtain tax immunity. They succeeded in Australia on appeal to the High Court of Australia from the decision of the Full Court of the Supreme Court of Victoria.

The question whether Scientology is or is not a "religion" for tax purposes seems to me to have nothing to do with the issues I have to decide. If all this material was put in evidence to suggest that the Courts of Australia have been satisfied as to the rectitude of Scientology no such suggestion is warranted. In the Courts of Victoria it was found to be a "sham". The High Court of Australia

neither affirmed or dissented from that description. Adopting the definition of "religion" that it did, it was not necessary to do so. The question, in the view of the High Court, was not whether Mr. Hubbard and the persons in ultimate command were charlatans, but whether the adherents believed in them and their ideas, observances and practices. The adherents accord "blind reverence", said the High Court of Australia, to the written works Mr. Hubbard and so there was a "religion" for the purposes of the legislation in question. I have searched and searched carefully for anything good, some redeeming feature, in Scientology. I can find nothing, unless it be such participation as there has been in the anti-drug abuse campaign.

Conclusion as to Scientology

In Re: T Minors (Transcript of judgments given on 10th December 1975) the Court of Appeal was concerned with children one of whose parents was a member of another and very different sect. In the course of his judgement Lord Justice Scarman (as he then was) stressed that "it is conceded that there is nothing immoral or socially obnoxious in the beliefs and practices of this sect". Scientology is both immoral and socially obnoxious. Mr. Kennedy did not exaggerate when he termed it "pernicious". In my judgement it is corrupt, sinister and dangerous. It is corrupt because it is based on lies and deceit and has as its real objective money and power for Mr. Hubbard, his wife and those close to him at the top. It is sinister because it indulges in infamous practices both to its adherents who do not toe the line unquestioningly and to those outside who criticise or oppose it. It is dangerous because it is out to capture people, especially children and impressionable young people, and indoctrinate and brainwash them so that they become the unquestioning captives and tools of the cult, withdrawn from ordinary thought, living and relationships with others.

The future of B and G

To summarise first what counsel have conveniently described as the conventional factors, B and G have been with their father and step-mother for five and a half years and with their step-brother J and half-brother. They are cherished by their paternal grandparents and by their step-mothers parents. It is a warm close family circle in which they are well cared for and thriving. They love them all and are loved by them all.

The mother loves them and has kept in close, regular contact with them in England and the country in which she has settled with the step-father and to which they wish to return. They love her and are fond of the step-father. She too has a close family circle waiting for them, sisters with children whom B and G already know. And there is their half-sister A. The mother impressed me as a very nice

sensible and honest young lady. The step-father too left an altogether favourable impression.

The father and step-mother also impressed me as a very nice couple save in those parts where they are poisoned by Scientology. A couple who are not Scientologists gave evidence. They are not close. They are more acquaintances than friends. The link is their daughter's friendship with G. They speak of the father and step-mother as a nice, normal couple with a happy family life with the children.

The family doctor gave evidence to the same effect. She did say that she had seen little of them and the children. She is not herself a Scientologist but has Scientologists among her patients in East Grinstead. She said that her Scientologist patients consult her less often than do the others. This is not surprising. Hubbard is opposed to orthodox medicine in general, proclaiming that his own methods are better and, strictly, a Scientologist has to obtain permission to seek orthodox medical treatment. Their previous doctor was a Scientologist in East Grinstead. But he has recently led a campaign against the "Church" methods and practices and especially its exorbitant charges for auditing and courses. He is no longer "in good standing" with the "Church" and is no longer the family doctor. But I am confident that the children's physical health is not neglected especially by the step-mother who appears to me, rightly or wrongly, to be less fanatically dedicated to Scientology than the father. It is, of course, the children's personalities and individualities and their freedom of choice and to grow up as normal young people which is the cause for concern.

If the children were to go into their mother's care they would not, of course, be going to strangers or to an institution. Nonetheless, they would be leaving what has been their real home and family circle. It would be an upheaval. It would certainly be confusing and, I think, probably seriously distressing for them for a time.

Although there are factors on both sides, if the matter rested there I would judge that it would be in the better interest of the children for there to be no upheaval while ensuring very ample access to their mother.

Does the Scientology factor tip the scales the other way?

Both the father and step-mother have been Scientologists for many years. They are totally committed, as they agree. They have continuously been audited and undergone courses. They have paid very large sums of money.

Mr Kennedy suggested that the father has lied when it has suited himself or Scientology. Mr Kennedy certainly cannot be criticised as

making that suggestion groundlessly.

Two examples out of several are these:

The father in the witness box professed respect for British justice as the best in the world. In his submission to the Chaplain's Court he said and I quote "there was no similarity between wog law and justice".

In his Affidavit sworn on the 14th June the father deposed "there is no effort or attempt on my part to indoctrinate the children with the beliefs of Scientology, although there must be a natural 'rubbing-off' on them of certain facets of my beliefs". And "it is my belief that all my children should be free to make up their own minds about Scientology and whether to pursue it, when they are old enough to make a decision. I have no intention of forcing any of my children to become Scientologists, to take Scientology courses or to be audited".

That is not true. There is more than one way of "forcing".

In his submission to the Chaplains Court he said "I really wanted to keep the children with me as a pro-survival urge for them and me to bring them up as worthwhile intelligent fulfilled beings using Scientology tech". [tech means technique {actually "technology" - Ed.}] And "it is our intention to raise the children as intelligent worthwhile people using Scientology Tech and Policy. This is being achieved". He has audited B and J. The children have been taught "Contact Assists" and "Touch Assists", two allegedly healing techniques. The two boys have had two sessions of a form of training or auditing which involves sitting facing each other for half-an-hour. They have been removed from their previous schools and put into the Scientology controlled school. They have been taken to Flag in the United States. With one or two exceptions all their friends are the children of Scientologists.

All this has begun to make its mark on the children.

Recently B asked his mother whether he could have a certain friend to stay for the week-end when with her "because he's the only one whose parents will let him come to your house".

Recently G asked her mother why she was not a Scientologist. Her mother pointed out that people could be good people without being Scientologists and observed that two widely respected personages in whom G is interested were not Scientologists. To this G replied they would be better if they were.

If they were to remain with the father and step-mother without conditions the process would go on with all the consequences to the

children earlier described, including inevitably and ultimately alienation from their mother. It would be nothing short of disastrous for them.

At the end of the hearing Mr. Johnson suggested that what is best of the status quo (that is to say, living with and being cared for by the father and step-mother with the other children) could be preserved while being cut off from Scientology until they are grown up and can make their own minds up. He acknowledged that this would mean that the father and step-mother would have to sever any connection with Scientology, the family would have to move from East Grinstead, and the children removed from their school. It was not mentioned but in fact it would mean a similar cutting off of J and S. And I was left wondering whether the full implications had been thought about and grasped by the father and step-mother.

Mr. Johnson told me that consideration had been given to seeking some appropriate dispensation from the "Church" but it was not thought that this would be forthcoming. That is not surprising. What is proposed is the ultimate heresy - a "High Crime".

Would what is now proposed be the most advantageous of the options for the children? I do not think so. The father and step-mother remain totally committed to Scientology. After much of the evidence had been given and they had read the written material (mainly consisting of Scientology's own documents) I hoped that their eyes might be opened and said that if that happened they should feel free to tell their advisers and the Court. They did not. They did say that they "might stand back" from Scientology while the children are growing up. I am afraid that that did not carry conviction. They remain afflicted by "Scientology blindness". The father said that he would seek to correct the evils disclosed during the hearing. But what could he do against the power of the "Church"? Nothing. The result would be that he would be declared a suppressive person with all that that would entail for him and his family. Apart from the upheaval, new environment, new home, new school, new friends, the pressures of the "Church" and of their own beliefs and consciences would be far too much for them. And to cut themselves and all the children off from Scientology would have traumatic emotional consequences on them and through them on the children.

The baleful influence of the "Church" would in reality still be there and the children would remain gravely at risk.

One cannot, alas attribute so many ounces or pounds to this factor and so much to that and so much to the other and then do the resulting adding and subtracting.

Weighing up all the factors, including the Scientology one, I have

reached the conclusion that in the interest of the children now and in the future the scales come down in favour of them making their home with their mother and come down that way decisively.

Accordingly, they will be committed to the care and control of their mother with leave to take them out of the jurisdiction to live in the country in which she and the step-father have settled and where, I should add, I am satisfied that the material and educational facilities are satisfactory.

This does not mean that they will be cut off from their father and the rest of his family. That would indeed seriously upset them. They love him as he does them. They will stay with him regularly. There will probably have to be conditions but they should be easy to observe and not interrupt his wife, himself and their other children in the practice of their beliefs.

This has been a very lengthy judgement mainly because of many verbatim recitals of Scientology's own documents whose authenticity is not disputed. I have taken that course deliberately. The "Church" resorts to lies and deceit whenever it thinks it will profit it to do so. It will, I think find it less easy to gull and dupe others in the face of its own documents and, so far as its practices methods and objectives are concerned, there will be less scope to counter this decision about these children on any factual basis.

[Adjourn into chambers.]