



**HUBBARD SCIENTOLOGY
ORGANISATION IN NEW ZEALAND**

**REPORT OF THE
COMMISSION OF INQUIRY**

JUNE 1969

A. R. Shearer, Government Printer
Wellington, New Zealand—1969

Hubbard Scientology
Organisation in New Zealand
and Any Associated Scientology
Organisation or Bodies in
New Zealand

Inquiry Pursuant to Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908

REPORT OF THE
COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

WELLINGTON, JUNE 1969

THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE
HUBBARD SCIENTOLOGY ORGANISATION IN
NEW ZEALAND

Chairman:

Sir GUY RICHARDSON POWLES, K.B.E., C.M.G.

Member:

E. V. DUMBLETON, Esquire

Counsel Assisting the Commission

G. S. ORR, LL.B.

Secretary:

R. BUIST, E.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Letter of Transmittal</i>	4
<i>Warrants</i>	5, 7

PART I

THE COURSE OF THE INQUIRY

A. Preliminary to the Inquiry	8
B. Public Sitings	10
C. Statements by Commission	11

PART II

THE DISCUSSION OF THE EVIDENCE

Introduction	13
Scientology in New Zealand	14
The Existing Law	27
The Evidence of the Witnesses	29
The O'Donnell Case	39
The Morris Case	43
Cases under Subclause (c)	45
Other Cases	50

PART III

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) Estrangements in Family Relationships	53
(b) Control of Persons Under 21	56
(c) Improper or Unreasonable Pressures	57
Conclusion	58

PART IV

Acknowledgments	59
-------------------------	----

APPENDICES

(i) List of Witnesses	60
(ii) List of Exhibits	61
(iii) Glossary of Scientology Terms and Abbreviations	66

Letter of Transmittal

To His Excellency Sir Arthur Espie Porritt, Baronet, Governor-General of New Zealand.

YOUR EXCELLENCY

By Warrant dated 3 February 1969, we the undersigned GUY RICHARDSON POWLES and ERIC VERNON DUMBLETON were appointed to report under the terms of reference stated in that Warrant.

We were originally required to present our report by 30 April 1969, but this date was later extended to 30 June 1969.

We now submit our report for consideration.

We have the honour to be

Your Excellency's most obedient servants,

GUY POWLES, Chairman.

E. V. DUMBLETON, Member.

Dated at Wellington this 30th day of June 1969.

WARRANTS

*Commission of Inquiry into Scientology*ARTHUR PORRITT, Governor-General
ORDER IN COUNCIL

To all unto whom these presents shall come, and to:

SIR GUY RICHARDSON POWLES, the Ombudsman; and

ERIC VERNON DUMBLETON, Retired Newspaper Editor:

GREETING:

WHEREAS it is considered expedient that inquiry should be made into the working of existing law and the necessity or expediency of any legislation in respect of certain activities, methods, and practices of the Hubbard Scientology Organisation in New Zealand or any associated Scientology organisations or bodies in New Zealand:

Now, therefore, pursuant to the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908, I, Sir Arthur Espie Porritt, Baronet, the Governor-General of New Zealand, acting by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, hereby appoint you, the said Sir Guy Richardson Powles and Eric Vernon Dumbleton to be a Commission to inquire into and report upon:

(1) The working of existing law and the necessity or expediency of any legislation in respect of the activities, methods, and practices of the Hubbard Scientology Organisation in New Zealand or any associated Scientology organisations or bodies in New Zealand in so far as those activities, methods and practices may—

(a) Cause or contribute to estrangements in family relationships;

(b) Affect the custody or control of children and persons under the age of 21 years;

(c) Result in persons who have severed their connection with Scientology or any Scientology organisation or body, or any other persons, being subjected to improper or unreasonable pressures of any kind by Scientologists or any Scientology organisation or body.

(2) Such other matters as may be brought to the notice of the Commission or initiated by it which the Commission considers relevant to its functions as defined in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of clause (1) hereof:

Provided that the foregoing terms of reference shall not extend to or include any inquiry into the philosophy, teachings, or beliefs of Scientology or Scientologists except in so far as those matters may in the opinion of the Commission be necessary to facilitate its inquiry into the matters referred to in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of clause (1) and clause (2) hereof:

And with the like advice and consent I do further appoint you, the said Sir Guy Richardson Powles, to be Chairman of the said Commission:

And for the better enabling you to carry these presents into effect you are hereby authorised and empowered to make and conduct any inquiry under these presents, in accordance with the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908, at such times and places as you consider expedient, with power to adjourn from time to time and place to place as you think fit, and so that these presents shall continue in force and the inquiry may at any time and place be resumed although not regularly adjourned from time to time or place to place:

And you are hereby strictly charged and directed that you shall not at any time publish or otherwise disclose, except to me in pursuance of these presents or by my direction, the contents or purport of any report so made or to be made by you or any evidence or information obtained by you in exercise of the powers conferred upon you except such evidence or information as is received in the course of a sitting open to the public:

And it is hereby declared that you have liberty to report your proceedings and recommendations under this commission from time to time if you shall judge it expedient so to do:

And, using all due diligence, you are required to report to me in writing under your hands not later than the 30th day of April 1969 your findings and opinions on the matter aforesaid, together with such recommendations as you think fit to make in respect thereof.

Given in Executive Council under the hand of His Excellency the Governor-General this 3rd day of February 1969.

P. J. BROOKS, Clerk of the Executive Council.

*Extending the Time Within Which the Commission of Inquiry Into
Scientology May Report*

ARTHUR PORRITT, Governor-General

ORDER IN COUNCIL

To all to whom these presents shall come, and to:

SIR GUY RICHARDSON POWLES, the Ombudsman; and
ERIC VERNON DUMBLETON, Retired Newspaper Editor:

GREETING:

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908, by Order in Council dated the 3rd day of February 1969* you were appointed to be a commission to inquire into and report upon certain matters relating to the Hubbard Scientology Organisation in New Zealand or any associated Scientology organisations or bodies in New Zealand and matters incidental thereto:

And whereas that commission was by the said Order in Council required to submit its report not later than the 30th day of April 1969:

And whereas it is expedient that the time for so reporting should be extended as hereinafter provided:

Now, therefore, I, Sir Arthur Espie Porritt, Baronet, the Governor-General of New Zealand, acting pursuant to the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908, and by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, hereby extend until the 30th day of June 1969 the time within which you are so required to report, without prejudice to the continuation of the liberty conferred upon you by the said Order in Council to report your proceedings and recommendations from time to time if you should judge it expedient so to do, and hereby confirm the said Order in Council and the commission thereby constituted, save as modified by these presents.

Given in Executive Council under the hand of His Excellency the Governor-General this 28th day of April 1969.

P. J. BROOKS, Clerk of the Executive Council.

**Gazette*, 3 February 1969, p. 159

PART I

THE COURSE OF THE INQUIRY

On 28 June 1968 a petition signed by F. P. O'Donnell and 715 others was presented to Parliament, and by it referred to the Select Committee on Social Services. The petitioners requested that a Board of Inquiry be set up to investigate the present activities, methods, and purposes of the Hubbard Association of Scientology in New Zealand. They also prayed certain courses of legislative action. After hearing a substantial volume of evidence the committee reported to the House on 7 November 1968 recommending that the prayer for a Board of Inquiry be referred to the Government for MOST FAVOURABLE CONSIDERATION, and added:

- (1) Not wishing to curtail freedom of association or to impede the free flow of ideas, the committee is reluctant to suggest that any movement be outlawed or that meetings of any groups of people be banned, but sufficient has been heard to indicate some action should be taken in connection with the activities and methods of Scientology.
- (2) Conscious of the need for being well informed before final decisions are taken, the committee finds that more detailed inquiry is needed; and that this be treated as a matter of urgency.
- (3) In response to the first prayer of the petition the committee emphasises that such further inquiry should not be restricted or confined to the "Hubbard Association of Scientology in New Zealand", but should be broad enough to include all aspects of the Scientology movement.

In view of the comprehensive nature of the inquiry it recommended, the committee considered that any action in respect of the other prayers of the petition would follow from and be consequential to the findings of that inquiry.

The committee's recommendation was agreed to by the House. The Government considered the report of the committee and by Order in Council of 3 February 1969 set up this commission.

*A. Preliminary to the Inquiry**(1) Public Notification*

The order of reference and the opening of the inquiry in Auckland on 18 March 1969 were publicly notified throughout New Zealand

in mid February, and persons wishing to give evidence or to make representations were requested to advise the secretary by no later than 28 February 1969, indicating the nature of their evidence or representations. In addition the resumption of the inquiry in Wellington on 30 April was similarly advertised.

(2) *Replies Received*

As a result of such advertisements, 51 persons wrote to the commission, and their replies fall into the following categories:

(a) *Offers to Give Evidence*

These totalled 24, of which 18 were accepted and 6 declined; 3 on the grounds that the proposed evidence was outside the order of reference and 3 because it was already being covered by other persons.

(b) *Order of Reference*

Where interested persons expressed a willingness to give evidence a copy of the order of reference was forwarded to them. It was pointed out that any evidence considered by the commission to be outside the scope of the inquiry would have to be excluded and that persons wishing to give evidence should satisfy themselves on this point. Some of those so informed did not proceed any further with their application to give evidence.

(c) *Forwarding Comments, Views, Literature, etc., but not offering to give evidence, 25.*

(d) *Subject matter outside order of reference, 2.*

(e) *Connections with Scientology and Attitudes thereof*

Of the 51 writers, 6 were ex-Scientologists, 37 had not been actively connected therewith, and in 8 cases it was not possible to classify accurately. Two of the writers were in favour of Scientology, 40 were against, and the attitudes of 9 were indeterminate.

(3) *Subpoenas*

Fifteen subpoenas requiring attendance and one requiring the production of documents were served on behalf of the commission.

In addition, seven subpoenas were prepared at the request of counsel for the O'Donnells and others, but he decided subsequently not to serve them.

(4) *Appointments*

After the issue of the warrant of 3 February 1969, the following appointments were made:

(a) *Counsel Assisting Commission*

Mr G. S. Orr of the Crown Law Office, Wellington, was appointed to assist the commission. His functions broadly were to advise and aid persons wishing to give evidence but who were not represented by counsel, to lead such witnesses as he thought fit, and generally to assist the commission.

(b) *Secretary*

Mr R. Buist of Wellington was appointed secretary.

(5) *Evidence in Camera*

Some requests were received to be allowed to give evidence *in camera*. The persons concerned were asked to say what was the special reason for this request, and were told that, if the commission was satisfied that the reason was valid, it would be prepared to exclude the public and press during the submission of the particular evidence. It was pointed out, however, that the representatives of the organisation and any other interested persons could not be excluded. The persons so informed either agreed to give evidence in public or decided not to give evidence at all, with the result that all evidence was given in public.

B. *Public Sitings*

(1) The commission commenced its sittings in Auckland, on 18 March 1969, adjourned on Wednesday, 26 March, and resumed in Wellington, on 30 April, on which day the public hearings finished. The commission sat for a total of 8 days.

All sittings were open to the public, representatives of the press, and the Broadcasting Corporation, and all the evidence was on oath.

(2) *Counsel*

In addition to Mr Orr, the following counsel appeared—

Mr F. H. Haigh assisted by Mr R. A. Adams-Smith, both of Auckland, for the Scientology organisation.

Mr K. Ryan of Auckland for Mr and Mrs O'Donnell and others.

(3) *Witnesses*

In all, 27 witnesses appeared (see appendix I), and of these 9 were called by counsel assisting the commission, 6 by counsel representing the Scientology organisation, and 12 by counsel representing Mr and Mrs O'Donnell and others. Six gave evidence in

favour of Scientology, 17 against, and 4 made depositions of a general nature.

(4) *Verbatim Record*

A verbatim record of proceedings totalling approximately 650 pages was taken, and the transcript was distributed progressively during the course of the hearings to the various counsel, the press, and the Broadcasting Corporation. In addition, the General Assembly Library has been provided with two complete sets.

(5) *Exhibits*

A quantity of material (see appendix II), comprising documents, books, publications, brochures, pamphlets, policy, and other letters, ethics orders, disconnecting notices, etc., totalling 191 separate items, was produced during the inquiry.

C. *Statements by Commission*

At the opening of the session in Auckland the chairman of the commission made the following statement:

At the outset of these hearings the commission wishes to declare its intention that they shall be confined to the order of reference which the secretary has just read. The commission is concerned only to hear about and examine cases where it is said that Scientology has in New Zealand led to the estrangement of families, affected the control of persons under 21, or put unreasonable pressure upon former Scientologists who have left it, or other persons.

The commission particularly wishes to emphasise two matters: First, the inquiry is not in general to extend to or include any inquiry into the "philosophy, teachings or beliefs" of Scientology. Secondly, it is to concern itself with the "activities, methods, and practices of the Hubbard Scientology Organisation in New Zealand". It follows from this that happenings overseas, or opinions formed after reading or hearing about them in general, have no relevance to the purposes of this inquiry. Some of the persons who signified their desire to give evidence to the commission were either unaware of or they misunderstood the advertised terms of reference, and for that reason it was necessary to notify them that they could not be called.

At the same time the commission states that although it was necessary for the purpose of organising this hearing to ask persons wishing to give evidence to notify the commission by 28 February, it is neither the desire nor the intention that anybody with relevant evidence to give should be excluded. Any such persons wishing to give evidence may still do so, provided only that the secretary is notified promptly, so that arrangements may be made for him or her to appear at these hearings or possibly at hearings elsewhere.

Finally the commission hopes it will be clearly understood that its findings will be based upon the evidence given in this inquiry, and not upon what the commission may or may not have read in the press,

or in the various Scientology and other publications available in New Zealand. For instance, the commission has not read the official record—a somewhat incomplete one, I am informed—of the evidence given before the parliamentary select committee last year, although the record is available to persons interested. If any of this material, whether select committee evidence or otherwise, is considered by any person interested to be relevant to this inquiry, then steps should be taken to bring it formally before the commission in the proper way.

At the resumed sitting in Wellington, the chairman said:

The inquiry is being resumed here, after having been adjourned from Auckland, for its concluding stages. The date and place of hearing was duly advertised so that there would be ample opportunity for any further witnesses to come forward should they so desire, but no witnesses able to give evidence within the terms of reference have made any such application. So we will proceed with the concluding matters left over from Auckland, which, as far as the commission understands, involves the production of certain documents by Lady Hort.

PART II—THE DISCUSSION OF THE EVIDENCE

INTRODUCTION

It is convenient to restate the commission's terms of reference. The commission was required to inquire into and report upon the working of existing law and the necessity or expediency of any legislation in respect of the activities, methods, and practices of the Hubbard Scientology Organisation in New Zealand or any associated Scientology organisations or bodies in New Zealand in so far as those activities, methods, and practices may—(a) cause or contribute to estrangements in family relationships; (b) affect the custody or control of children and persons under the age of 21 years; (c) result in persons who have severed their connection with Scientology or any Scientology organisation or body, or any other persons, being subjected to improper or unreasonable pressures of any kind by Scientologists or any Scientology organisation or body. In carrying out this inquiry the commission was enjoined to refrain from inquiring into the philosophy, teachings, or beliefs of Scientology or Scientologists except in so far as this might be necessary to facilitate the inquiry into the matters referred to in subclauses (a), (b), and (c).

Early in the hearing it was submitted by counsel for Scientology that subclause (1) (c) should be interpreted as being concerned only with improper or unreasonable pressures brought upon persons who have had something to do with any Scientology organisation or body. It was submitted that "or any other persons" implied any other person dealing with Scientology. After hearing argument, the commission concluded that the words "or any other persons" were to be understood in their broad and literal meaning; that is to say, subclause (c) referred to improper or unreasonable pressures by Scientologists either upon persons who had severed from Scientology or upon any other persons whatsoever.

The inquiry involved the commission in ascertaining the nature of the Hubbard Scientology Organisation in New Zealand or of any associated Scientology organisations or bodies in New Zealand; and in ascertaining what the activities, methods, and practices of these organisations were in fact, in so far as they might relate to the three specific classes of matters mentioned in the order of reference.

The commission had then to consider whether such activities, methods, and practices did in fact have any of the effects referred to in the terms of reference. If the commission came to the conclusion that they did have some such effect, then it was required to examine the application of existing laws to this situation and to consider whether any further legislation would be necessary or expedient.

All that follows in parts II and III of this report is based upon evidence publicly presented to the commission, either in documents or by witnesses appearing in person.

SCIENTOLOGY IN NEW ZEALAND

The following is the history of this organisation as shown in the official records:

- 28.1.1955 *The Church of American Science Inc.*
Objects (*inter alia*), to disseminate a religious faith known as Scientology.
This society was dissolved by declaration on 14 December 1960.
- 26.4.1957 *The Hubbard Association of Scientologists International Inc.*
Objects (*inter alia*), to establish a religious fellowship association for research into the spirit and human soul.
This society was dissolved by declaration on 30 March 1967.
- 23.2.1962 *The Hubbard Association of Scientologists International Ltd.* (previously known as the Hubbard Association of Scientologists Ltd.).
Objects (*inter alia*), to conduct scientific research, especially with reference to the human mind, spirit, and soul in mental psychosomatic fields, etc.
This company, incorporated in England, ceased to have a place of business in New Zealand as from January 1965.
- 13.9.1965 *The Hubbard Association of Scientologists International (HASI).*
Objects (*inter alia*), to establish a religious fellowship association for research into the spirit and human soul.
This society, originally incorporated in Arizona, U.S.A., ceased to have a place of business in New Zealand as from 1 October 1966.
(NOTE—HASI was claimed to be a non-political, non-religious, non-profitmaking organisation providing training and processing in Scientology.)

25.7.1966 *The Church of Scientology of California.*

This society was, on 18 February 1954, incorporated in California and registered as an overseas company in New Zealand.

Objects (*inter alia*), to accept and adopt the aims, purposes, principles, and creed of "the Church of American Science", as founded by L. R. Hubbard.

There appear to be no other Scientology organisations or associated Scientology organisations or bodies in New Zealand, and consequently the registration in New Zealand of the Church of Scientology of California provides the legal framework for the operation of Scientology in this country. It was said that there are about 2,000 adherents in New Zealand, who are mainly in the Auckland and Waikato areas.

Organisation and Control

While the legal organisation of Scientology in New Zealand is based upon the Church of Scientology of California, it is clear that in fact the organisation and control of Scientology in New Zealand are directed by and subject to another organisation, called in various terms the Church of Scientology World Wide or World Wide Headquarters. World Wide Headquarters is situated at Saint Hill Manor, England, and controls all Scientologists in the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth, including New Zealand. The individual organisations are asserted to be largely autonomous.

The founder of Scientology, the source of many prolific writings thereon, and its effective controller and guiding spirit is Lafayette Ronald Hubbard, an American who some 18 years ago established the organisation.

World Wide Headquarters is divided into four main branches: (1) the office of Guardian; (2) the Hubbard Communications Office; (3) the Organisation Office; and (4) the Public Division. The Guardian is an officer directly appointed by Hubbard, who has the task of safeguarding the church and its members. The other three divisions of the headquarters are under the control of an executive council of three, who are appointed by Hubbard.

The organisation in New Zealand follows similar lines. The Office of Guardian is in charge of an officer named Assistant Guardian, who is appointed by the Guardian for an unspecified term, the appointment being terminable at will by either party. The Assistant Guardian takes instructions from the Guardian and may, in certain circumstances, give directions to the Executive Council for the

purpose of safeguarding the church. There is an Executive Council of three, which is subject to direction from the World Wide Executive Council, by whom they are in effect appointed.

The three divisions—Hubbard Communications Office (known as HCO), Organisation, and the Public Division—comprise the main activities of the organisation in New Zealand. In so far as contact with the public is concerned, the organisations or divisions principally responsible are the Assistant Guardian, the HCO, and the Public Division. Lady Hort, who holds the office of Assistant Guardian in the organisation in New Zealand, was the principal witness for Scientology before the commission, and gave details of its organisation. Even she, however, was not quite clear about the actual connection between World Wide Headquarters and the Church of Scientology of California, although she did make it clear that the organisation in New Zealand gets all its directives, instructions, policy letters, and so on, from the Hubbard organisation in England and in many cases from Hubbard himself.

It appeared from the official Scientology publication called *The Auditor*, No. 42, that at the date of issue of this publication (presumably some time in 1968, but these publications are not dated) there were Scientology organisations in the following places: the United Kingdom, 3; Denmark, 1; Sweden, 1; France, 1; U.S.A., 12; Canada, 1; Australia, 3; New Zealand, 1; South Africa, 5; and Rhodesia, 1. Until recently there was an organisation known as ANZO, comprising an association of four Scientology organisations located at Auckland, Sydney, Adelaide, and Perth. The Auckland org (this abbreviation is frequently used by Scientologists to mean "organisation") was senior and was called "the Continental Org", the other three being area orgs. This association was temporarily abolished early in March 1969 at the request of the Assistant Guardian in New Zealand, who required its staff to serve in the Auckland org. In addition to all these various orgs, there is a sea-borne org, and in *The Auditor*, No. 44, Hubbard states that: (a) in 1967 he organised Sea Org in order to find and survey operating bases, and today it is the custodian and guarantor of pure technology standard training; (b) staff were highly disciplined and trained specialists who were on ships because of the necessity to be mobile in order to set up new bases, and man or correct old ones; (c) there were five ships in various parts of the world; (d) the target was for every Sea Org member to become an Operating Thetan.

Lines of Communication

It was stated that, although Hubbard was the founder of Scientology and the source of most of its writings, he was not the sole

controller; but most of the policy letters and directives with which the commission was concerned appear to have emanated from him. These policy letters and directives are apparently sent by him to the World Wide Communicator, who passes them on to the Communicator in each org, who in turn issues the letters to, and sees that they are carried out by, his particular org. Bulletins, information letters, technology data, and newsletters are used, and telex facilities are available to the various orgs. It was asserted, however, that there was a certain latitude in how directives were applied. It was said that they were merely a basic guide on which rules were formulated and might be applied provided that they complied with the laws of a particular country. The Assistant Guardian said that she did not agree with everything that Hubbard said; nor did she always follow his instructions.

Nature of Scientology

Although the commission was not concerned to inquire into the philosophy, teachings, or beliefs of Scientology, some discussion occurred at the hearing as to whether or not Scientology was a religion. On this point the actual submission made by counsel for Scientology was as follows:

If the commission please, the Order in Council which authorised the setting up of this commission made specific reference to the fact that this inquiry was not to extend into an inquiry into the philosophy, teachings, or beliefs of Scientology or Scientologists, except in so far as they affected the particular matters which the commission has to inquire into. If the commission please, I am instructed by my clients that they consider their beliefs over Scientology in the light of religious beliefs, and that they consider that they are members of a religion to which they are strong adherents. As I understand my instructions from my clients, it is a philosophy of life whereby the adherent gets to know himself better and relies upon improvement of his spiritual being or soul to lead a better life rather than relying upon assistance from a deity. Further, I am instructed that the church teaches the existence of an after life and it acknowledges a supreme being. I am instructed that it would be as close to the religion of Buddhism as any other religion.

Counsel for Scientology also produced a recent judgment (5/2/1969) of the United States District Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which held that for the purpose of the case before it the Founding Church of Scientology, has made out a prima facie case that it is a bona fide religion, though the Court also stated: "We do not hold that the Founding Church is for all legal purposes a religion."

On the other hand the commission's attention was drawn to what appeared to be a recent statement contained in a policy letter of 5 February 1969, signed by L. Ron Hubbard as founder and entitled "Code of a Scientologist". This is as follows:

CODE OF A SCIENTOLOGIST

1. To keep Scientologists, the public, and the press accurately informed concerning Scientology, the world of mental health, and society.
2. To use the best I know of Scientology to the best of my ability to help my family, friends, groups, and the world.
3. To refuse to accept for processing and to refuse to accept money from any preclear or group I feel I cannot honestly help.
4. To decry and do all I can to abolish any and all abuses against life and mankind.
5. To expose and help abolish any and all physically damaging practices in the field of mental health.
6. To help clean up and keep clean the field of mental health.
7. To bring about an atmosphere of safety and security in the field of mental health by eradicating its abuses and brutality.
8. To support true humanitarian endeavours in the fields of human rights.
9. To embrace the policy of equal justice for all.
10. To work for freedom of speech in the world.
11. To actively decry the suppression of knowledge, wisdom, philosophy, or data which would help mankind.
12. To support the freedom of religion.
13. To help Scientology orgs and groups ally themselves with public groups.
14. To teach Scientology at a level it can be understood and used by the recipients.
15. To stress the freedom to use Scientology as a philosophy in all its applications and variations in the humanities.
16. To insist upon standard and unvaried Scientology as an applied activity in ethics, processing, and administration in Scientology organisations.
17. To take my share of responsibility for the impact of Scientology upon the world.
18. To increase the numbers and strength of Scientology over the world.
19. To set an example of the effectiveness and wisdom of Scientology.
20. To make this world a saner, better place.

None of the points in this code seem to make any claim, or even give any implication, that Scientology activities are religious in purpose. However, the commission concluded that the question of whether Scientology is a religion or whether a Scientology organisation is a church was irrelevant to the purposes of its inquiry. Within our New Zealand constitutional framework a religion as such or a church has no specific liberty or immunity to indulge in practices or activities which are otherwise improper or contrary to law.

Activities, Methods, and Practices

According to the Assistant Guardian, the activities of Scientology are really the propagation of belief—the dissemination of Scientology: “It is our religion and we want to disseminate it.” The methods and practices are said to be simple, designed to increase a person’s ability and spiritual awareness: “The simple training is basic training in communication, and processing is simply intended to increase one’s communication with one’s own self as a spiritual being with one’s fellow people and with the physical universe.” “Auditing or processing consists of asking a person a question that the person can understand and answer, listening to his answer, and acknowledging it.” Progress in the organisation is by a series of steps, each one involving one or more auditing sessions, and designed to produce a “release”. The major object is to become a “clear”, which is beyond the state of “preclear”. Further advanced levels exist up to those of “Operating Thetans”.

In addition to advancing by being processed through these various steps, there are, of course, a number of Scientologists who actually do the auditing and who have to be trained as auditors. Consequently, as is gathered from *The Auditor*, No. 33, there are two main “routes to total freedom”. These are as follows:

1. Auditor's Route

- (1) Personal Efficiency Course (local org).
- (2) Hubbard Apprentice Scientology Course (local org).
- (3) Hubbard Dianetics Auditor Course (local org).
- (4) 0 to IV grade processing (local org).
- (5) Academy Training to Class IV (local org).
- (6) Power processing (Saint Hill).
- (7) Saint Hill Special Brief Course (Saint Hill) (includes solo audit training to grade VI).
- (8) Clearing Course (Saint Hill and advanced org).
- (9) Class VII—Internship (Saint Hill).
- (10) Operating Thetan Course, sections 1 and 2 (Saint Hill and advanced org).
- (11) Operating Thetan Course, sections 3 and above (advanced org only).

2. Preclear Route

- (1) Dianetics Auditor's Course (local or Saint Hill).
- (2) 0 to IV grade processing (local).
- (3) Power processing (Saint Hill).
- (4) Solo Audit Course to Grade VI (Saint Hill).
- (5) Clearing Course (Saint Hill and advanced org).

- (6) Operating Thetans Course, sections 1 and 2 (Saint Hill and advanced org).
- (7) Operating Thetans Course, sections 3 and above (advanced org only).

The revenue of the organisation, and the sole source of the income of its staff and the expenses of its operation, is derived from the sale of Hubbard's books and from the fees charged for the processing and training. These fees are substantial. For example, as at 23 March 1968 there was a set scale of fees applicable in Auckland which ranged from \$5 for the Hubbard Apprentice Scientologist Course to \$800 for "a dianetics course plus HAA package". The course for a preclear to grade IV could cost between \$600 and \$700. Discounts up to 50 percent were granted in certain circumstances, e.g., for contracted staff members. Auditing by students was free, as was counselling by the chaplain. A dianetics auditor's course of 4 weeks' duration and comprising five levels apparently costs \$320.

All courses up to grade IV processing were available at the local org in Auckland, but to advance further in the organisation it was necessary to go overseas to take the more advanced courses. A circular applicable from 1 January 1969 shows that the total cost of the eight advanced course sections in the O.T. range was \$3,800, but as a package, after 1 January 1969, all eight would be obtainable for \$3,400 but "if purchased now you need only pay \$2,850. Buy now in advance and save".

It is obvious that the greater the number of people who join the organisation and take these courses, the greater the income of the organisation. Evidence was given that the salaries of staff fluctuate in accordance with the income. The following is an extract from a policy letter signed by L. Ron Hubbard, which is designed to deal with the organisation of the Ethics Division, but which clearly delineates what must be an important motivation for Scientology staff:

The purpose of the org is to get the show on the road and keep it going. This means production. Every division is a production unit. It makes or does something that can have a statistic to see if it goes up or down. Example: a typist gets out 500 letters in one week. That's a statistic. If the next week the same typist gets out 600 letters that's an UP statistic. If the typist gets out 300 letters that's a DOWN statistic. Every post in an org can have a statistic. So does every portion of the org. The purpose is to keep production (statistics) up. This is the only thing that gives a good income for the staff member personally. When statistics go down or when things are so organised you can't get one for a post, the staff members' pay goes down as the org goes down in its

overall production. The production of an organisation is only the total of its individual staff members. When these have down statistics so does the org.

Ethics actions are often used to handle down individual statistics. A person who is not doing his job becomes an ethics target.

Conversely, if a person is doing his job (and his statistic will show that) ethics is considered to be in and the person is protected by ethics.

As an example of the proper application of ethics to the production of an org, let us say the Letter Registrar has a high statistic (gets out lots of effective mail). Somebody reports the Letter Registrar for rudeness, somebody else reports the Letter Registrar for irregular conduct with a student. Somebody else reports the Letter Registrar for leaving all the lights on. Proper Ethics Officer action—look up the general statistics of the Letter Registrar, and seeing that they average quite high, file the complaints with a yawn.

As the second example of ethics application to the production of an org, let us say that a Course Supervisor has a low statistic (very few students moved out of his course, course number growing, hardly anyone graduating, a bad academy statistic). Somebody reports this Course Supervisor for being late for work, somebody else reports him for no weekly adcomm report and bang! Ethics looks up the person, calls for an ethics hearing with trimmings.

We are not in the business of being good boys and girls. We're in the business of going free and getting the org production roaring. Nothing else is of any interest then to ethics but (a) getting tech in, getting run and getting run right and (b) getting production up and the org roaring along.

Attitude Towards the Public

Scientology undoubtedly inspires a degree of loyal enthusiasm amongst its adherents, who actively seek "converts", and who are quick to resent and oppose criticism. Scientology also seems to evoke passionate hostility amongst those whose personal experience of it has been unfavourable.

Scientology adopts an embattled position. Its supporters feel that it is girded up in self-defence and that it is necessary to take positive steps to combat antagonistic attitudes on the part of the public. On the other hand, among many non-scientologists—as exemplified by much of the evidence given to the commission—there is a strong feeling that it is Scientology itself which is the aggressor; that Scientology by its methods of high-pressure salesmanship deliberately forces itself upon unsuspecting members of the public, invades their privacy, and endeavours to persuade them to take certain actions. When unfortunate incidents occur, as they are shown to have, then these non-scientologists feel perfectly justified in themselves using strong measures to attack those who they conceive have originally attacked them.

This situation causes elements of strain and stress between Scientologists and others, and also within the Scientology organisation itself. So that we find an important series of letters and instructions by L. Ron Hubbard concerned with this question of discipline within the Scientology organisation and with the relations between Scientology and non-scientologists. The commission was presented with several directives of this nature, varying in date, but the most recent one appears to be HCO policy letter of 20 March 1969, and was one of the file of directives given in evidence at the resumed hearing in Wellington by Lady Hort, in reply to a request from the commission that she produce an up-to-date series of directives dealing with Scientology's relations with the public.

In this directive Hubbard explains that a Potential Trouble Source is a Scientologist who remains connected to a Suppressive Person or Group; a Suppressive Person or Group is one who actively seeks to suppress or damage Scientology or a Scientologist by Suppressive Acts; Suppressive Acts are acts calculated to impede or destroy Scientology or a Scientologist—and these are listed at length in this policy letter. They are generally defined as “those acts knowingly calculated to reduce or destroy the influence or activities of Scientology or to prevent case gains or continued Scientology success and activity on the part of a Scientologist”. There are 18 acts listed in this directive, and 17 of them clearly come within the overall description just given, but the other is “first degree murder, arson”. These latter, for some unexplained reason, are apparently the only major crimes constituting Suppressive Acts, whereas the other Suppressive Acts are such things as “public disavowal of Scientology”, or “Voting for legislation directed towards the suppression of Scientology”, or “reporting or threatening to report Scientology to civil authorities”, etc.

Formal steps are taken to declare persons as Suppressive Persons. The commission had presented to it many such “Ethics Orders”, an example of which is the one delivered to Mr and Mrs O'Donnell. This was as follows:

HCO ETHICS ORDER

No: 3056 AK

Date: 20.2.68

To: Those concerned
From: Ethics, Auckland
Subject: Mr Frank Patrick O'Donnell and
Mrs Stella Marjory O'Donnell—Condition of Enemy and
Declaration as a Suppressive Person

Mr and Mrs O'Donnell of 95 Clyde Street, Hamilton, are hereby Declared Suppressive People and Enemies of Scientology for the following reasons:

1. Attempting to suppress individuals from attaining total spiritual freedom.
2. Using the medium of *Truth* newspaper to achieve this knowing them to be an Enemy of Scientology.
3. Declaring their intention of joining a group known to be Enemies of Scientology.
4. Not to be communicated with in any way.
5. Not to be trained or processed.
6. Their associates are declared to be Potential Trouble Sources and are not to be trained or processed until they have handled or disconnected from Mr and Mrs O'Donnell.
7. The formula for a person in a condition of Enemy is "Find out who you really are".

When this formula has been followed evidence should be sent in writing to the Ethics Officer.

B. GIBSON
Ethics Officer, Auckland.

A more unusual Ethics Order is perhaps the one issued to M. J. Mahoney, the editor of *Truth*. This was as follows:

HCO ETHICS ORDER

No: 3055
Date: 28.2.68
Reissued at St Hill
2188 SH
18 March 1968

To: Those concerned
From: Ethics, Auckland
Subject: Declaration of Suppressive Person and Enemy to Scientology

The Editor of *N.Z. Truth*, J. Mahoney of Wellington, is hereby declared to be in a condition of Enemy and a Suppressive Person for condoning the printing of articles detrimental to mankind in the newspaper called *Truth*.

1. Which is seeking, by printing articles which are totally untrue, to turn people away from Scientology when this organisation provides at this time the only means man has to free himself from a cycle of warfare and insanity which has been prolonged for an insufferable amount of time.
2. Which perpetuates and has done so for years a policy that is suppressive to mankind.
3. Which perpetuates lies with loaded communication.
4. Which has used the lives of two teenagers to satisfy a personal opinion about something this newspaper knows nothing about—Scientology, and paying no regard for the fact that they have ruptured the lives of these two teenagers who sought to free themselves from an environment that they had found intolerable. (Reference article appearing in *Truth* dated 22 February 1968.)

5. Which is contributing to the destruction to the freedom of the press by constantly publishing one-sided detrimental, restimulating and hideous articles in relation to the electorate of New Zealand.
6. Which seeks to sell quantities of newspapers and makes money thereby abusing the privilege of a licence to communicate the existing condition to the electorate of New Zealand and choosing rather to write slanted stories on conditions of life that are aimed to restimulate the reactive minds of people and have them buy newspapers by compulsion rather than freedom of choice.
7. Which aims to make money from the people as a senior consideration to providing them with factual communication.
8. Which confuses the fact that having a licence to communicate to the people and for the people about the people is the freedom of the press, with a money making, truth destroying, lie perpetuating, power hungry policy, as freedom of the press. Thereby totally abusing and destroying the long-dead myth of freedom of the press.
9. Which seeks to destroy maliciously and with lies a philosophy like Scientology which is aimed to bring spiritual, mental, and physical freedom to man and seeks to free mankind from complete spiritual oblivion.
10. Which seeks maliciously to conceal from man the truth about the mind which has been available for years since the evolution of Einstein's theory of relativity which established conclusively that energy has mass and thereby provided further data directly related to the mind that thought created energy and therefore produces mass, mental mass, and has enabled further research to produce the exact structure of the subconscious or reactive mind.
11. Which has made a prolonged and chronic betrayal of the people of New Zealand who have placed their trust for guidance and communication through the medium of the press.
12. Which condones a policy which allows articles to be published without ever being willing to publish without distortion the other side of the story.
13. Which contributes by the nature of the articles printed in the newspaper called *Truth* to the grief of mankind and attempting to close the door on man's only way out—Scientology.
14. Which seeks through reporting frequently matters of sex and violence to restimulate its readers to such an extent that most decent people will not have this paper in their home.
15. Which by insistence on printing only one-sided reports on Scientology whilst knowing full well that there is also another side to the story and whilst knowing that Scientology is one of the fastest growing organisations in the world which fact obviously has only come about through the fantastic results obtained by hundreds of thousands of individuals throughout the world. Therefore because this newspaper considers it only worth while to print the opinion of a fractional minority to the exclusion of the majority a full public apology is required.

Because of the above reasons the editor of the newspaper called *Truth*, J. Mahoney is declared a Suppressive Person and an Enemy of Scientology. He is:

1. Not to be communicated with in any way.
2. Not to be trained or processed.
3. His associates and employees are declared Potential Trouble Sources and are not to be trained or processed until they have handled or disconnected from J. Mahoney.
4. Contributing in any way to the continuation of this publication by a Scientologist (this includes buying or selling) also constitutes a Suppressive Act and anyone so doing is hereby advised of this.
5. The formula for a person in the condition of Enemy is "Find out who you really are."

When this formula has been followed evidence of this should be sent in writing to the Ethics Officer.

PAT BLOOMBERG
HCO Secretary, Auckland

"If you find yourself critical of this—look for a misunderstood word."

A Scientologist who is a Potential Trouble Source may not be processed or further trained until he has taken appropriate action to cease to be a Potential Trouble Source. Until November 1963 the method usually adopted was for the Potential Trouble Source to "disconnect" from the Suppressive Person, but by the Code of Reform of 29 November 1963 the practice of disconnection is alleged to have been cancelled, and the Potential Trouble Source and Suppressive Person are now supposed to be dealt with by "handling", meaning persuasion. This practice of disconnection will be referred to more fully in a later stage of this report.

A further weapon in the Scientologist's armoury was the "Fair Game Law", under which a Suppressive Person became "fair game", meaning that he might not be further protected by the codes and disciplines of Scientology or the rights of a Scientologist, thus permitting aggressive behaviour by a Scientologist towards such a person. This practice has also been discontinued.

This question of the apparent change in the outlook and policies of Scientology, particularly concerning its dealings with the public, is of considerable importance. On 1 August 1963 an executive directive was issued by Hubbard, requiring all orgs widely to circulate a public questionnaire within their country. This questionnaire asked what reforms should be effected in Scientology organisations, what changes in the conduct of Scientologists, and what services could Scientology perform in the community. This questionnaire was distributed "World Wide" and, although the answers were not available to the commission, it is significant that

the Code of Reform, which has already been referred to, was published on 29 November 1968. This was as follows:

THE CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CALIFORNIA
THE HUBBARD SCIENTOLOGY ORGANISATION IN
AUCKLAND

Founder: L. Ron Hubbard
Cable: Scientology
Telephone: 362-921
(+ lines)

150 Hobson Street,
Auckland, 1.
New Zealand.

CODE OF REFORM

1. *Cancellation of disconnection as a relief to those suffering from familial suppression.*
2. *Cancellation of security checking as a form of confession.*
3. *Prohibition of any confessional materials being written down.*
4. *Cancellation of declaring people Fair Game.*

If you yourself have observed any further aspect of this Church's activities that you feel calls for reform, please let us know.

29 November 1968

THE ACADEMY OF SCIENTOLOGY

Board of Directors:

Lenka Marenkovich, President
Anthony John Dunleavy, Vice-President
Kenneth Eric Urquhart, Secretary

THE HUBBARD GUIDANCE CENTRE

Julia Lewis Salmen (U.S.A.),
President for U.S.A.
Kenneth Milton Salmen (U.S.A.),
Vice-President
Denny Louise Fields (U.S.A.),
Secretary

Resident Agent (N.Z.), Eunice Henley-Smith

(A non-profit corporation in U.S.A. Registered in New Zealand)

The commission also noted that Hubbard, in an HCO policy letter of 7 March 1969, states that the organisation is going "in the direction of mild ethics and involvement with the society". "After 19 years of attack by millions of vested interests, it seems that new policies evolved have ended in reform for severe internal disciplinary systems. The policy," he says, "which cancels the policy of disconnection, cancellation of the fair game law, the cancellation of security checks, and no records allowed on confessional materials, plus the new code of a Scientologist, have accomplished every reform suggested to us. Let's get the show on the road."

This changed outlook was apparent from the evidence of Lady Hort, the Assistant Guardian, who quite frankly stated that some of the cases which had created difficulty—such as the Morris and the O'Donnell cases—could not now occur under these revised rules.

Because of the hierarchical structure of Scientology and the extent to which policies and directions were issued from above, it seemed to the commission that, if practices which had been regarded as objectionable could be cancelled by fiat, they could also by the same fiat be reintroduced. This problem was put to Lady Hort, who undertook to communicate with L. Ron Hubbard and obtain some assurance as to the future course of Scientology in this respect.

At the adjourned hearing in Wellington, Lady Hort produced a letter which she said was signed by L. Ron Hubbard. This letter was as follows:

L. RON HUBBARD

Saint Hill Manor,
East Grinstead,
Sussex.
26th March, 1969.

The Commission of Enquiry into
Scientology in New Zealand.

Gentlemen,

With regard to the practice of disconnection, I have taken this up with the Board of Directors of the Church of Scientology, and they have no intention of re-introducing this policy, which was cancelled on the 15th November, 1968.

For my part, I can see no reason why this policy should ever be re-introduced, as an extensive survey in the English speaking countries found that this practice was not acceptable.

(Signed) L. Ron Hubbard
L. Ron Hubbard

LRH/iw

This letter will be discussed later in this report.

THE EXISTING LAW

In considering the working of existing law and the necessity or expediency of any legislation, the commission naturally had to have regard to what the existing law is. Counsel assisting the commission prepared three memoranda explaining New Zealand law under the three subheads (a), (b), and (c). These memoranda were accepted by other counsel as adequate and accurate.

As regards (a)—estrangements in family relationships—it appeared that this was an area in which the Courts have trod warily, and in recent times have become less rather than more willing to intervene. This proposition needs to be qualified in respect of the law relating to the custody or control of children, and this is discussed in the following paragraph.

The commission was advised that some vestigial remedies are still extant covering some cases of estrangements in family relationships, and comprise actions in tort for loss of services and enticement or harbouring. The commission was referred to the report of the Torts and General Law Reform Committee of New Zealand under the chairmanship of the Solicitor-General, Mr J. C. White, Q.C., which had been made public. This report stated that a New Zealand parent could rely on the inherent jurisdiction of the Court and obtain an order against a person who had threatened to entice, or had enticed, the child.

As far as concerns estrangement between husband and wife, the commission was advised that, in the absence of lawful justification, it is a tort actionable at the suit of a husband to induce his wife to leave him or to remain away from him against his will. This is known as the tort of enticement. A wife has a similar right of action for the enticement of her husband. In addition a husband may bring an action for damages against a person who harbours his wife after a request by the husband to deliver her up. The Courts have, however, declined to recognise a similar right of action at the suit of a wife against a person harbouring her husband against her will. Any tortious act committed against a wife is actionable at the suit of her husband if as a result he is deprived for any period of her society or service. A wife, however, has no corresponding right of action for the loss of her husband's society or services.

As to (b), the custody or control of children or persons under the age of 21 years, the commission was advised that the New Zealand law under this head has been revised and consolidated by the Guardianship Act 1968 which will come into force on 1 January 1970. This Act provides that as a general rule the father and mother are each the guardian of their child, and hence are entitled to its custody. The effect of the various provisions of the Act appears to be that, in the normal case, the parents of a child are each its guardians, and hence have the right to care and possession of the child until it reaches the age of 21. Guardianship includes the right of control over the upbringing of a child, and upbringing includes education and religion. But it is specifically provided that the Court shall not make an order contrary to the wishes of the child if he is 16 or over unless he is under the age of 18 and the Court is satisfied that his moral welfare so requires. Thus, while as a matter of law the parents of a child remain its guardians until it turns 21 or sooner marries, they cannot, save in exceptional circumstances and then only if the child is under 18, enforce their rights as guardians after it reaches the age of 16.

As regards (c), subjection to improper or unreasonable pressures of any kind, the commission was advised that this somewhat vague area appeared to encompass the law of defamation and that relating to blackmail. These comprised well known principles, but it was clear that what was improper or unreasonable in this respect would have to be a matter for the commission.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE WITNESSES

The evidence to the commission included a collection of the policy directions, letters, and instructions issued from the Hubbard Scientology organisation in England, together with a number of issues of their various publications and other documents, and articles covering various aspects of Scientology. Some of the documents were given in evidence by witnesses who had received them (for example, the suppressive person declarations and the disconnecting letters), and others were given in evidence or introduced to the commission by counsel or by Lady Hort on behalf of Scientology. The commission heard the oral evidence of witnesses against this background of written material, and was thus able to gain a clearer understanding of the circumstances surrounding each case.

The commission was concerned with evidence of specific acts coming under one of the subdivisions, (a), (b), or (c), in the order of reference. A number of persons had offered to give evidence generally against Scientology, but these were not heard, because the commission considered that the evidence had to relate specifically to its terms of reference.

The commission heard 27 witnesses. These fell into 5 well-defined groups, as follows:

1. Concerning the O'Donnell case, and related to subclauses (a), (b), and (c) of the terms of reference:

Mrs S. M. O'Donnell (mother)	Mrs M. E. Whiting (aunt)
Mr F. P. O'Donnell (father)	Mr G. H. Whiting (cousin)
Mr Kevin O'Donnell (son)	Mr C. F. Lawrence (neighbour)
Mr Noel E. O'Donnell (son)	Mr G. S. Partridge (neighbour)
Mr Patrick G. O'Donnell (son)	Miss M. A. Gibson (reporter)
Mrs K. E. Wright (daughter)	

2. Concerning the Morris case, and related to subclause (a) of the terms of reference:

Mr L. C. Morris (husband)	Mr H. W. Rickard
Mrs D. F. Morris (wife)	(wife's father)

3. Relating to subclause (c) of the terms of reference:

Mr F. J. P. Boric
Mr O. J. Church
Mr W. Brady

Mr R. J. Horsfall
Mr R. C. Gallagher
Mr P. A. Williams

4. On behalf of Scientology:

Sir James Hort

Lady Hort

(Mrs K. E. Wright and Mr N. E. O'Donnell also gave evidence on behalf of Scientology and against their parents.)

5. The remaining witnesses:

Mrs E. F. Lawson, alleging estrangement from her grandson,
Mr H. G. Bunn, who also gave evidence.

Mr J. H. W. Chamberlin, alleging estrangement from a son.

Mr G. F. Kenney, alleging estrangement from his wife.

Mr N. M. Levien, alleging threatened estrangement (which was averted) from a son.

The commission therefore proposes to discuss each of these groups in turn, considering them also in the light of any relevant evidence given in other groups.

The O'Donnell Case

Mr and Mrs O'Donnell live in Hamilton and they have six children. John, the oldest, is now married and living in Australia; Patrick, aged 22, is a university student in Auckland; Kathleen Erin, known as Erin, aged 20, is now married to Allen Wright and living in Australia; Noel, aged 19, is living with his sister and brother-in-law in Australia; Kevin, aged 15, and a younger boy aged 11 are still at school and living at home with their parents. Mr and Mrs O'Donnell allege that Scientology has caused or contributed to what appears to be an almost complete estrangement between them and their daughter Erin and their son Noel. They allege also that the influence of Scientology affected their proper custody and control over these two children, and that they (the parents) were subjected to improper and unreasonable pressures by the Scientology organisation.

Erin appears to have been a good student at school, according to a certificate from the Principal of Sacred Heart Girls' College at Hamilton, which reads as follows:

This is to certify that Miss Erin O'Donnell was a pupil of our college from the commencement of the 1962 school year till December of 1965.

She obtained her School Certificate in 1964, having presented English, French, German, history, and biology. She obtained a total of 315 marks.

In 1965 she was accredited with University Entrance in English, French, German, and biology, and in 1966 she obtained a credit pass in the University Entrance Scholarship examination, having presented music in addition to her previous four subjects. She also passed the Royal Schools of Music examination, grade VII, with distinction, in 1966.

Of upright character, Erin showed herself to be a good, all-round pupil; co-operative, very stable, and conscientious. In her last year at the college she held the office of School Prefect.

Erin first met Allen Wright, who was eventually to become her husband, on 9 May 1965, at a Catholic youth dance in St. Mary's parish in Hamilton. She was still at school, and he was living in Auckland. She next saw him in June 1965. Although she corresponded with him, she did not see him again until August of 1966 when she went to Auckland to take part in the competitions. By this time Allen Wright was interested in Scientology; he introduced Erin to it, and gave her a book about it to read. She went back to Hamilton and to school, and was successful in obtaining a credit pass in the University Scholarship examination.

Prior to this she had applied to Middlemore Hospital for a wardmaid's job, and she left home in December 1966 to take it. She found the hospital rather far out, and took a job at Woolworths until the university opened, when she commenced studying for a B.A. degree. After a few weeks she changed to a Bachelor of Music course and got a part-time job in the university cafeteria. In that year she passed in composition, keyboard, aural, and Music I, but she failed in her practical examination for the L.T.C.L. by, it is said, one mark. In October 1967 she became engaged to Allen Wright, and in November she started working with the New Zealand Insurance Company.

During this year, 1967, she was taken by Allen Wright to Scientology headquarters in April to undergo an I.Q. test and a personality test. After that she went on several occasions before actually being audited, which apparently took place in May. It appears that, without parental consent and being about 18 years old, she was fully processed to Grade IV, the course taking about an hour a week for 6 weeks.

At this stage there was no suggestion of a family estrangement, because Erin apparently spoke freely to her mother about Scientology, extolling its virtues. Mrs O'Donnell was convalescing after a major operation, and her daughter persuaded her to go to Auckland to have Scientology processing because, she said, "You will be all right and all your convalescence will be over." This Mrs O'Donnell did, but it proved for her a most unsatisfactory experience, particularly when she found her auditor was a girl aged only about 16 or 17. In the circumstances, Scientology's general reception and treatment of Mrs O'Donnell were, to say the least, tactless in the extreme. In the result, Mrs O'Donnell declined to go on with the course, which was to have cost £40. She said that she felt that by breaking away from Scientology she had made an enemy of her daughter; and she also felt that Erin and Allen were planning to "get hold" of the younger brother, Noel, who was then still at school.

Differences arose between Erin and her parents over her intending marriage. Her parents at first consented and then withdrew their consent. In February 1968 Erin and Allen Wright applied to a magistrate for permission to marry; the application was opposed by the parents and the magistrate refused to make an order. Erin then went to Australia, being followed very shortly by Allen Wright. They travelled together to England, with the object of going to the Scientology headquarters at Saint Hill Manor, and from there to Gretna Green, where they intended to get married; but they were refused entry into the United Kingdom. They then went to one of the Sea Orgs of Scientology, the *Royal Scotsman*, anchored in a harbour in Spanish Morocco, where, as Mr and Mrs Wright, they remained for some months. They then left and went to the Scientology office in Paris, where they worked for several months more, eventually returning to Australia via Las Vegas, where they were married, and arrived in Australia in early February 1969. In March 1969 they arrived in Hamilton to see her parents, and returned to Australia after a few days. Erin came to New Zealand from Australia to give evidence at the inquiry.

Noel also was a good student, and the certificate from St. John's College is as follows:

Noel O'Donnell was a student at the college from 1963 till 1967. During this time he made a generally good impression on the staff and seemed quite popular among his classmates. He took quite an adequate part in college affairs, participating in music contests—he had some talent for this—and playing football in some seasons. He passed School Certificate in 1965, and was accredited at University Entrance in 1967, after a second year in Lower Sixth Form. During this year, especially, he worked hard at his studies, and favourably impressed all by his demeanour.

Though quiet and perhaps a little intense, Noel was an asset to the college, and when he did not return to school as planned in 1968, this came as something of a surprise.

At the instance of Erin and Allen Wright, and before he left school, Noel was in June of 1967 audited by Scientology pursuant to arrangements made by Allen to have him processed "for free" up to Grade II. His father consented to this in a note written to the proposed auditor, reading as follows:

Noel wants to try the first stage of auditing to improve his concentration. I don't know anything about it, but Noel thinks it may do him good.

You have my permission to give him the first stage.

In January 1968, when his parents thought he was holidaying elsewhere, he went up to Auckland "to finish off his auditing". He said he was not particularly satisfied with school and was tired of studying. He went to Auckland to stay with a senior officer of Scientology, Mr Tom Morgan, who also had Allen Wright living with him at that time. He took employment on the staff of the Scientology headquarters. After the incidents of 13 February 1968, which will be referred to shortly, he did pay a short visit to his home but did not stay. An incident occurred in April which he felt was another attempt on the part of his relatives to restrain him by force. In June 1968 he left for Australia and worked mainly in the North-west Territory, returning only recently to Sydney and then visiting New Zealand for the purpose of giving evidence at this inquiry.

There is no doubt that Erin and Noel are estranged from their family—not only from their father and mother, but also from their brothers and their aunts, uncles, and cousins—and the question for determination is whether the activities, methods, and practices of Scientology have caused or contributed to this estrangement. In this, as in all the other cases, it is impossible to say that Scientology actually caused the estrangement. What has to be considered is whether it contributed to the estrangement in a degree significant enough to be worthy of comment. Furthermore, the question is not simply whether Scientology may have been responsible for a child or young person leaving home. The mere physical parting of a child from the family home to live elsewhere does not necessarily or even generally imply a family estrangement. Students who have been living at home and then in the normal course go on to a university centre in another town are not normally by that fact estranged from their family.

The relationship between Scientology and Erin and the O'Donnell home was complicated by the relationship between Erin and Allen

Wright. These two young people had met while in their teens and while Erin was still at school, had fallen in love, remained deeply attached to each other, and eventually, through a series of quite unusual adventures, were able to succeed in marrying without Erin's parents' consent even though she had not yet reached the age of 21. The opposition of the parents to the marriage was at least partly due to the fact that Allen was not a Roman Catholic. On the other hand, it appears that the older son, John O'Donnell, had married an Anglican girl with the approval—perhaps somewhat reluctant—of his parents, and the marriage had been fully accepted by the O'Donnell family. Mrs O'Donnell believes that it was the influence of Scientology on her daughter which changed her daughter and encouraged the girl in pursuing a course that was directly contrary to her parents' wishes. However, Mrs O'Donnell did, in her evidence, make no secret of the fact that she, from the very beginning, had conceived a personal dislike of Allen Wright, and this must have been one of the factors in what proved to be a complicated emotional situation.

The conclusion to be drawn from the evidence on this point is not clear, but what is clear is that the real and probably irrevocable breach between the daughter and her parents arose because of the parents' attitude to the marriage. After some discussion, Mr and Mrs O'Donnell reluctantly gave their consent to it, being, as they have said, under the impression that the wedding would take place in their church, and they went as far as making an appointment for the church ceremony in the following April. The O'Donnells appear to have thought that the young couple had given up Scientology at this stage, but concerning this there was some confusion and misunderstanding, which was at least apparent to Erin who, on 11 February 1968, wrote a letter to her mother and father as follows:

I am writing this letter to clear up the confusion about our wedding. First of all, I have not been a Catholic for the past year. This is a decision I reached by myself, one of the first I have ever made completely by myself. It is mine, so that is that. Hence, I refuse to let Allen take instructions even if he wanted to, and I refuse the hypocrisy of a wedding in a Catholic church.

This will come as a very hard blow to you at a time when your world is crumbling apart, I know that time will soften the blow.

Both Noel's and my awareness levels are now high enough to know exactly where we are going and what we are doing. I sure am not going to persuade you to see anything our way because you sure are not going to make it this time. In ten years time you may understand what I am saying but there is sure only one way to go—you can come with us if you like, you'd be most welcome if you reach for it, but if you don't that's tough.

It should be noted that Allen at this stage was also under 21, but that his parents had unconditionally consented to the marriage.

On 13 February 1968 occurred a series of incidents of which not entirely clear evidence has been given, and which perhaps in retrospect are not entirely clear to the participants. For some reason which was not definitely stated, the O'Donnells went from Hamilton to Auckland in the early morning with the object of bringing their children back home to Hamilton. In this enterprise they were assisted by Mrs O'Donnell's two brothers-in-law, the uncles of her children. Shortly after 6 in the morning they called at Morgan's flat and woke up Noel, who was asleep. After Noel had dressed and packed his bag he was taken out to the car and seated in the back between his two uncles. He said that he wanted to go to the police to see if he had a legal right to leave home at this stage, but they said that they would not allow him to do so.

The party then went round to where Erin was staying. She was also asleep, but got dressed and went outside and was told that she was to be taken home. She said that she was not going, and was told that she was coming home anyway. At this stage Allen Wright appeared down the road and the two uncles came forward out of the car. While Erin was arguing with her parents and her uncles, Noel got out of the car and ran off down the road. The party chased Noel in the car, going through a red light in the process and being stopped by a traffic officer. The traffic officer then came up to Noel and asked what was the trouble. Noel said that his parents were forcing him to go home and he wanted to go to a police station to find out if they could legally do this. "So we went," said Noel, "to the Manurewa Police Station," where, upon learning that Noel was 17, the sergeant in charge said that he was legally allowed to leave home and apparently made this clear to the parents.

The parents asked Noel to go down and see them the following weekend, which he did. Some point was made at the hearing about the fact that he was not met at the station and had to walk home. He said that he went in and was prepared to talk over differences, but once he got in his mother seemed rather antagonistic towards him so he decided he would leave. He packed up the remaining gear he had at home and left. His father was not at home.

When Erin was having her discussion with her parents outside her flat in Auckland on the morning of the thirteenth, it appears that they told her that they had found out that she and Allen were Scientologists, but Erin said she was surprised by this because she was under the impression that they had known. She referred specifically to the incident of her mother being audited in May

1967. However, it is clear that at the time of this particular incident, although Erin had written the letter quoted above, her parents had not received it. In this morning argument Erin says that her parents for the first time advanced Scientology as the reason for not approving of the marriage.

That afternoon Erin and Allen filed their respective parental consents to the marriage with the Registrar, and the wedding was arranged to take place in the Registrar's office on 16 February. On returning to Hamilton, however, Mr and Mrs O'Donnell decided to withdraw their consent to the marriage, which they did by notifying the Registrar, but they did not tell Erin. The result was that, when Erin and Allen and their friends arrived in the Registrar's office on 16 February, they found that the ceremony could not take place because the O'Donnell consent had been withdrawn.

These incidents prompted Mrs O'Donnell to tell the story to *Truth* newspaper, which on 20 February published an article under the banner headline of "Cult Clutch on Teens Forces Family Flight". In this article Mr and Mrs O'Donnell said that their teenage son and daughter were already members of the "pseudo-scientific cult" and they blamed Scientology for wrecking their daughter's future. They went on to say they feared that their two youngest boys would be influenced and that they were planning to leave New Zealand to move to Victoria, where Scientology is outlawed.

This action of the O'Donnells produced a strong reaction from Scientology. On the same day as the publication of the *Truth* article, the Ethics Order already quoted was issued, declaring the O'Donnells to be suppressive persons. Also on the same day a Mr V. Linklater, an official of Scientology (who it is understood had actually seen Mrs O'Donnell when she was in the Scientology office in May of 1967) wrote a letter to them in the following terms:

I hereby disconnect from you both as you are in a condition of Enemy and Suppressive persons.

(1) You attempted to suppress individuals from attaining total Spiritual Freedom.

That action I condemn and damn you both for it.

(2) You use the medium of Truth Newspaper to achieve this, knowing them to be an Enemy of Scientology.

In doing this you have associated and aided the lowest order of human behaviour, the criminal, and thus coloured yourself with the same brush.

I have nothing to do with criminals and I do so with you. You can flounder in your own darkness.

(3) You have declared your intention of joining a group known to be enemies of Scientology.

That's fine with me. You can go back to where you belong.

Both Erin and Noel wrote disconnecting letters to their parents, those written by Noel being in the following terms:

To my father, Mr F. P. O'Donnell, and all those concerned,

I hereby disconnect from him for his suppression of an individual's freedom of choice in the course he wishes to take in life, i.e., he is against an individual's search for total freedom and truth. He is suppressive to Scientology.

To my mother, Mrs O'Donnell, and to those concerned,

I hereby disconnect from my mother, Mrs Stella Marjory O'Donnell, for her suppressive acts against me, my sister and Scientology.

1. She declared publicly that she was against Scientology by way of the 'Truth' newspaper, and thereby against anyone who is on the road to total freedom.

2. She tried to suppress me, by first trying to make me come back to my old home in Hamilton, and when this didn't work she tried by letter.

And the many other times she has suppressed me in my search for truth.

She also suppressed my sister, Erin, also on the road to total freedom.

The letters written by Erin to her parents were not available to be produced to the commission, but were understood to be in similar terms, or stronger, than those of her letter to her aunt, Mrs Whiting, which was as follows:

I am disconnecting from you from now on. If you try to ring me I will not answer, I will not read any mail you send, and I refuse to have anything to do with you in any way whatsoever. All communication is cut completely.

During the following months Mr and Mrs O'Donnell received a series of "disconnecting letters". These were all presumably from Scientologists, and most of them seemed to follow a fairly standard form. They were untidily scrawled on little scraps of paper, and usually said something like: "To Mrs O'Donnell, I hereby disconnect from you. [Signed]———" Some 15 of these letters were produced in evidence to the commission, but it was stated that there had been a number more and that some of these had been produced in evidence to the parliamentary committee which heard Mrs O'Donnell's petition. Mrs O'Donnell stated that the great majority of the writers of these letters were unknown to her.

Then, in June 1968, as already recorded, Mr and Mrs O'Donnell presented their petition to the House of Representatives. The Select Committee heard the evidence, most of it in public, and the proceedings were extensively reported in the press. The commission was not concerned in any formal or legal sense with this hearing, or with the evidence presented, but it is recorded as a link in the chain of events

concerning the relationship between the O'Donnells and Scientology. As will appear later in this report, some of the evidence given on the hearing of this petition appeared to produce a strong adverse reaction from Scientology.

It was given in evidence before the commission that at the hearing of this petition it had been firmly and authoritatively stated on behalf of Scientology that the organisation had no knowledge at that time of the whereabouts of either Erin or Noel O'Donnell. Erin and Allen Wright had apparently spent a month or so in Sydney where she worked with the Scientology organisation there, before going abroad and joining the Sea Org as Mr and Mrs Allen Wright, as has been said. They had made an application to join the ship before they left Australia. This is where they were during the time of the hearing of the petition in New Zealand.

It is certainly a matter for comment that this World Wide Scientology organisation appeared to be unaware of the fact that Mrs Allen Wright was really Erin O'Donnell. However, they were eventually "found" and told that "because of the trouble in New Zealand" they must leave the ship, which they did. It is a further matter for comment that they then were given employment in the Scientology organisation in Paris, but their whereabouts were still not made known to their parents, who still did not know where they were. When they arrived in New Zealand, via Las Vegas and Australia, they went to Hamilton in an endeavour, so Erin said, to achieve a reconciliation with her parents. Unfortunately the parents had not received any word or letter of any kind from Erin, nor from Scientology, and had their first news of their daughter's arrival in New Zealand from the press. When Erin and Allen arrived at the O'Donnell home by car, they were accompanied by a public relations officer of Scientology, and their reception was understandably somewhat cool.

In the meantime, Noel had gone to Australia, and, after seeing his sister for a couple of days, went to Perth where he got a job as a construction labourer, later working on an oil rig in the Northern Territory, where he stayed for about 4 or 5 months. He said that, as well as his sister, several Scientologists in Perth knew where he was. It appears, from a file produced by Lady Hort, that Noel did in fact, but after the parliamentary hearing, communicate with Scientology in Auckland after he had been contacted by the local police close to his oil rig. He apparently told the police that he was doing fine and he did not want his parents to know where he was. Later Noel sent to Scientology in Auckland a Christmas present for his young brother, Kevin.

Two Affidavits

It is now convenient to refer to two documents which were much discussed during the inquiry, namely the so-called "affidavits" made respectively by Erin and Noel. Erin's affidavit was made before a Justice of the Peace in Sydney on 31 May 1968, and Noel's was made before a Justice of the Peace in Auckland in, strangely enough, the same month. The tenor of Erin's affidavit was that violence had been a part of the family life when she was home up to the age of 18. She spoke of several examples of what she called "great violence" and said that, because of the atmosphere in her home, she felt in despair and she disliked her parents to the point of hatred. This apparently was in 1966 during her last year at school. Noel's affidavit was to the effect that he had seen his brothers John and Pat get thrashings, and there were always some tension and barriers present because of the nagging and fighting that continually made life unpleasant, especially for children. He said that his mother was partly responsible for these hidings, and he could not remember a time when his father gave a hiding completely by himself; he was always nagged to do so by his mother. On the other hand, Erin appeared to blame her father directly. Various unpleasant incidents were recorded in these affidavits.

The question is, how did the affidavits come to be made and what value can be placed on them? The suggestion that there was any undue violence in the O'Donnell home was strongly denied by the two sons Patrick and Kevin and also by two independent witnesses, neighbours who have lived on friendly terms with the O'Donnells for many years. Incidentally, neither of these neighbours, who both spoke in high terms of the O'Donnell family, was a Roman Catholic. However, the neighbour who Erin said used to be called in by her mother to "stop the fights" was not called.

The affidavits also assumed importance because the Scientology organisation, which had possession of them, made deliberate use of them in releasing them to the press at the time of the parliamentary hearing. This action naturally increased the distress of Mr and Mrs O'Donnell.

Both Erin and Noel were closely examined and cross-examined about the circumstances surrounding the making of these affidavits. The tenor of the evidence of both of them was that they were entirely their own idea. However, it appears that a Mr Ron Broadbent, who was described as the Scientology organisation's legal adviser, played some part in the making of these affidavits. Noel had made some notes, and apparently Broadbent told him that he wanted the notes in legal form—and this is what Noel said he did. Broadbent was apparently also in Sydney, where Erin completed

her affidavit. Noel had given his notes to Morgan, with whom he was sharing a flat at the time, but says in his evidence that they did not discuss them. This seems hardly credible. The commission concludes that these circumstances, together with the form and wording of the affidavits throw grave doubt on the assertion that only those who signed them had a hand in them.

In this connection there is a significant passage in a policy letter of 23 December 1965 issued by L. Ron Hubbard, which reads as follows:

It is wise for any Scientologist, HCO secretary, or committee of evidence, in matters concerning suppressive acts, to obtain valid documents, letters, testimonies duly signed and witnessed, affidavits duly sworn to, and other matters and evidences which would have weight in a court of law. Momentary spite, slander suits, charges of Scientology separating families, etc., are then guarded against.

Lady Hort said that this directive had been cancelled, but it was not clear when this was done and it may well be assumed that either the directive or the ideas behind it were influential in Scientology at the relevant time. Lady Hort was not then in the country, and no other evidence was offered on behalf of Scientology which could throw any light on this affidavit question.

The commission considers, therefore, that the affidavits are of doubtful value as evidence of the truth of the facts stated in them, but the affidavit incidents are useful in throwing some light on the activities, methods, and practices of Scientology, and their public use by Scientology was clearly a form of pressure upon Mr and Mrs O'Donnell and, as such, was in the commission's view improper and unreasonable.

The commission therefore proceeded to determine, on the basis of evidence actually given by the witnesses who appeared before it, whether or not Scientology contributed to the estrangement of Erin and Noel O'Donnell from the rest of their family. None of the main allegations made in the affidavits were given in evidence-in-chief before the inquiry, and were not put to these two witnesses until they were under cross-examination.

The tenor of the affidavits and of the evidence given by Erin and Noel is that there was, and had been for many years, considerable violence in the O'Donnell home, consisting of severe corporal punishment of all the children, including Erin, and of fights between the father and the bigger boys.

Having seen all the important participants and heard their evidence, the commission is not prepared to accept the view that violence was an established feature of the O'Donnell home life. It was undoubtedly a strong and vigorous family and, of course, with

five boys and a girl, it would not be reasonable to expect peace and calm at all times. The commission believes that the home life in the O'Donnell family and the atmosphere in the home had nothing to do with any estrangement which later took place between Erin and Noel on the one hand and the rest of the family on the other.

As to Erin, it is clear that she left home to go to Auckland to attend university with her parents' consent, and she did attend the university for a year, during which time she certainly came under the influence of Scientology—so much so that she, on her own admission, ceased to be a Roman Catholic. While the initial cause of the estrangement from her parents was undoubtedly her association with Allen Wright, the commission thinks it must be clear that her association with Scientology sharpened this estrangement. The commission was told in evidence by Lady Hort that it was a rule of Scientology that no person under the age of 21 could be audited or processed without parental consent, and a form was produced which, it was said, one of the parents was asked to sign in such a case. Erin, however, was audited and processed to Grade IV without the consent of either of her parents. Lady Hort says this was a mistake. It was indeed, and one with possibly irreparable and tragic consequences.

Furthermore, there is no evidence whatever that Scientology, or Scientologists, at any reasonable and appropriate time took any steps to attempt some reconciliation between Erin and her parents. Indeed, the contrary was the case. By the issue of the suppressive order against the parents and by the adoption of the practice of sending disconnecting letters, including specific disconnections by the two children concerned, Scientology went far to make irrevocable a separation and estrangement which, while initially distressing, would not necessarily be regarded as incapable of being repaired. The further action in connection with the affidavits widened an existing gulf between the parents and children.

As to Noel, the circumstances surrounding his quite sudden and—to his parents—quite unexpected departure to Auckland early in February lead the commission to conclude that he was substantially influenced in so doing by the Scientology organisation. In January he had come up to Auckland to “finish off his auditing”, and did not tell his parents this. They thought he was on holiday with some friends at a beach. This “finishing off” was clearly beyond the authority of the quite limited consent already given by Mr O'Donnell and quoted earlier in this report. This must have been another “mistake” on the part of Scientology. After this Noel returned home only for a day or two and “didn't like it any more. I just wanted to get out. I was just tired of it.” Mrs O'Donnell says. “He looked ghastly.

... I knew something terrible had happened to him. ... The next morning we thought he was going to school ... and at 11 in the morning the phone went and Noel said, 'I am just ringing to tell you I am going to Auckland to lead my own life. I am at the Road Services.' And he put down the receiver and away he went."

In Auckland he went to stay with Morgan, with whom he had stayed before, and who was a leading officer in the Scientology organisation, and he obtained a job on the staff there. He was not in Auckland very long before the difficulties arose which have already been referred to. The *Truth* article appeared, and he, as did his sister, issued disconnecting notices to his parents. In his case, too, there is no record whatever of Scientology or Scientologists endeavouring to seek some reconciliation between him and his parents, and he shortly left for Australia. Here he made contact with Scientology, indicating that it was an element of some importance in his life.

It is significant that Lady Hort said in evidence that, in view of the changes in the practices of Scientology, the O'Donnell case (and the Morris case, which will be referred to later) could not occur today; there would be the most strenuous efforts made to prevent such occurrence. This, of course, is cold comfort to Mr and Mrs O'Donnell and the rest of the family.

The commission therefore concludes that the activities, methods, and practices of the Scientology organisation in New Zealand did contribute to the estrangement of Erin and Noel O'Donnell from the rest of their family, and did result in Mr and Mrs O'Donnell being subjected to unreasonable pressure.

As far as concerns the custody and control of children or persons under the age of 21, the commission finds that Noel was introduced to Scientology when he was 17, at which age he was in law entitled to remove himself from his parents' control if he so wished. It appears that at all material times Erin was 17 or over.

It does not seem to the commission that this quite disposes of the point under subclause (b) of the terms of reference, because, although the parents had no legal control, they would expect and indeed be entitled to exercise moral influence and persuasion to guide and help their children who, though 17 and over, were still inexperienced in the ways of the world. The subclause in the order of reference specifically mentions affecting the control of persons under the age of 21 and is understood by the commission to mean the normal parental influence of a non-legal character. The influence of Scientology on both Erin and Noel was clearly contra-parental, and dubious in its effect on their lives. It is worthy of note that these two intelligent, well-educated, courageous, and decent young people have, up to date

at any rate, failed to fulfil their earlier promise. Whatever the reasons may be, Erin, who is clearly capable of completing her university degree and who has considerable musical talent, has apparently abandoned all intention of progressing further in these fields, and when recalled she stated quite specifically that she sees her future as working in the Scientology organisation. Noel apparently lost his former ambition to become an engineer, and he is now a labourer. The commission considers that Scientology bears some responsibility for these changes in the probable course of their lives.

The Morris Case

Mr and Mrs Morris were married in 1951. After a long history of matrimonial disagreements and differences, which were related to the commission, they separated in September 1967. Mr Morris says that the basic reason for the marriage breaking up was his wife's involvement in Scientology. Mrs Morris, while admitting that her interest in Scientology did give rise to very real differences with her husband, says that she left home for reasons that were connected with his ill temper and other personal characteristics which eventually she could not bear to live with any longer. Mr Rickard, Mrs Morris's father, gave evidence which was basically in support of the point of view, not of his daughter, but of his son-in-law. The commission does not propose to traverse the evidence in its detail, but rather to summarise its general impressions of what could be said to be the effect of Scientology on the relations between Mr and Mrs Morris.

Mrs Morris became interested in Scientology in the early years of her married life, and even at that stage it seems that this interest was a source of worry and concern, not only to her husband, but also to her father. They moved away from Takapuna, where a neighbouring couple had introduced Mrs Morris to Scientology, and went to Titirangi where, unfortunately, according to Mr Morris, it was found that there were also some Scientologist neighbours. During this period Mr Morris says that his wife's interest in Scientology continued against his wishes. She went out on many evenings and Saturday afternoons, spent more money than could be afforded, and neglected her household and maternal duties. This is to some extent supported by Mr Rickard's evidence. In 1959, with substantial assistance from Mr Rickard, Mr and Mrs Morris moved on to a farm at Whakapirau. It was said by Mr Rickard and Mr Morris that this move was arranged in order to get Mrs Morris away from Scientology, but she says that she did not hear about this alleged reason until some time much later. However, Mrs Morris seems to have made some attempt to give up Scientology at that stage, but the literature continued to arrive and

eventually she seems to have resumed her interest. Allegations are made that she left the farm and went to Auckland on several occasions for the purpose of continuing with her Scientology. On one occasion it is stated that she stayed away for 3 days, leaving behind three children, including a 10 months' old baby. On this occasion Mrs Rickard looked after the children. Mrs Morris does not deny this occasion, but says she stayed away for only 1½ days.

Relations between husband and wife seemed to get steadily worse, and in addition to that the farming venture was not proving a success. Partly to help in the family finances, Mrs Morris obtained a teaching position in the Birkenhead School, and she moved to Auckland, taking two of the children with her, but the husband and wife apparently visited each other at weekends. The final separation occurred a little later.

It seems clear that Mrs Morris's interest in Scientology was a constant cause of bitterness and strife and differences of opinion between her and her husband. During the latter part of their married life Mrs Morris was apparently in correspondence with some office bearers of the organisation at World Wide Headquarters at Saint Hill Manor in England; some of these letters were produced to the commission. From these letters it seems that the World Wide organisation gave Mrs Morris fairly definite encouragement to adopt the course which apparently she had settled on in her own mind—that is, to leave her husband—and this encouragement seems to have been offered some 6 or 8 months before Mrs Morris told her husband or gave any intimation to him that she proposed to leave him. Mrs Morris said she did not think these letters had much influence on her—it was just nice to correspond with someone about her troubles. In evidence, Mr Morris gave what the commission concluded was an exaggerated estimate of the cost of Scientology to the Morris household, giving figures which ran into thousands of pounds. Mrs Morris's own evidence in this respect is more credible, and it seems that she actually spent on Scientology courses some \$600 over a period of 15 years, and she maintains that this was spent out of her own earnings.

Having seen both husband and wife, and having heard their evidence, the commission does not believe that there were in this marriage basic elements of permanence. There appears to have been a substantial incompatibility of temperament and outlook which might well, having regard to the stresses and vicissitudes of living together and raising a family in circumstances that required a constant struggle to make ends meet—a struggle which eventually seems to have been unsuccessful—have led to a separation without the influence of some extraneous factor such as Scientology.

In order to warrant a finding that Scientology contributed to the estrangement between Mr and Mrs Morris, it is necessary to show that there was some action of the organisation itself which had this effect. The evidence on this point is perhaps inconclusive, except that again one finds the pattern of endeavouring to persuade a Scientologist to "handle or disconnect" from a suppressive person. Mrs Morris's involvement in Scientology eventually led to her "disconnecting" from her husband and also, becoming estranged, from her own parents, to such an extent that in January 1968 she returned a birthday present her mother had sent her, and her parents had not seen her since.

Another significant episode in the Morris case is the fact that Mrs Morris took her son, then aged 13, to be audited at the Scientology headquarters in Auckland. The commission asked Sir James Hort whether in this case, where a child's parents violently differed on the subject of Scientology, to audit him at the request of one parent only was, in effect, using Scientology to help to contribute to the estrangement of family relations. Sir James Hort said that if that was what happened it would be against policy; they should not have done that, if in fact they did do it. Scientology's contribution towards family estrangements in this case can, therefore, in the commission's view, be said to be more in the direction of exacerbating and perhaps crystallising a situation which already existed rather than causing the situation itself.

Cases Under Subclause (c) of the Terms of Reference

The principal case under subclause (c) is that of Mr Boric, who since 1961 has carried on a small independent business as a stamp dealer and manufacturing stationer in Queens Arcade in Auckland. Some years after 1961 Scientology opened an office in the arcade. No clear evidence was given to the commission as to the nature of this office, but definite evidence was given to the effect that its operations caused annoyance and trouble to the other tenants in the arcade. According to Mr Church, the chairman of the Queens Arcade Businessmen's Association, the relations with Scientology in the Queens Arcade were at first normal and friendly. Later, however, his attention was drawn to their activities when they descended to the ground floor of the arcade and accosted people walking through, giving them pamphlets and asking them to go up and have a personality test. After this had been going on for a little while, Mr Church says that customers started to complain to many of the proprietors of the various shops in the arcade, inquiring why they had to be subjected to this accosting when they came into the arcade.

The businessmen's association apparently then made official representations to the Police and to the Traffic Department. This resulted in the practice of giving out pamphlets ceasing, but instead of that a printed card was held up in front of people at both entrances to the arcade. As none of these cards made any reference to the organisation being connected with Scientology, Mr Church went out one Friday evening and held up an opposing card which warned people not to have anything to do with Scientology. The next day he had a telephone call from Mr Frank Turnbull, whom he knew as having appeared to be in charge of the Scientology establishment in Queens Arcade. Mr Church said that after using some fairly colourful language Mr Turnbull said that he (Mr Church) was due for a terrible disaster, and a little later he said, "Something terrible will happen to you." Mr Church said his wife was very upset by this incident.

No satisfactory explanation was given to the commission of the violent reaction against Mr Boric by Scientology. Towards the end of February 1968 he appears to have had some differences with a man by the name of Rufus Fraser, who, according to Boric, went round the tenants in Queens Arcade asking them if they wanted to have an I.Q. test. In answer to a question, he told Boric that he did not have any connection with Scientologists. Boric says that he was then approached by a man by the name of Gibson and handed a circular stating that they had disconnected him. This was an "Ethics Order" in the following terms:

ACO ETHICS ORDER

To: Those Concerned
From: Ethics AK
Subject: Mr BORIC—Declaration of Enemy to and Suppressive Person to Scientology.

Mr BORIC of Aotearoa Stamp Shop is hereby declared in a Condition of Enemy to and a Suppressive Person to Scientology for the following reasons:

1. Making public statements detrimental and unfounded against Scientology based on unfounded information.
2. Attempting to suppress a philosophy that exists to offer man total spiritual freedom.
3. Attempting to stop people from entering or advancing on their way to total freedom.

All concerned are asked to report any libellous or slanderous statements made which will be placed in the hands of the solicitors for legal action.

The formula which must be applied in order for a person to get out of a Condition of Enemy is "Find out who you really are".

When the formula has been followed, notify the Ethics Dept in writing so that you can be upgraded out of the Condition of Enemy.

"B. GIBSON
Ethics Officer Ak."

Mr Boric says he does not know exactly why this Ethics Order was issued, but thinks that probably it was because Fraser did not like his attitude and because of his attitude towards the way things were being run in the Queens Arcade. Mr Boric seems to have regarded this notice as a declaration of war on the part of Scientology, and he took strong counter-measures. He told the story to *Truth*, he wrote to a number of important people not only in New Zealand but also in England, and eventually he gave evidence before the Select Committee of the House on the hearing of the O'Donnell petition. Before that hearing Scientology had already replied, because he received some 60 or 70 of these so-called "disconnecting letters". After the inquiry he was visited one day in his shop by two men, one of whom said that he was a reporter from a West Australian newspaper called *Freedom*. Later he discovered that this paper was a Scientology publication and that the two men were apparently members of the Scientology organisation in Auckland.

Some time in December of 1968 and January 1969 Scientology issued two brochures or circulars entitled *Freedom—Scientology, No. 1* and *Freedom—Scientology, No. 2*. A large number of copies were printed, and it was stated that they were widely distributed free throughout New Zealand by being put in letterboxes, and so on. They were also sent by post to a number of important people. They were described by Lady Hort as "broadsheets". They could equally well have been described as "broadsides", because they contained not only a vehement defence of Scientology but also a strong, and in some cases violent, attack on behalf of Scientology against some of those whom Scientology deemed to be its enemies. No. 2 of this publication contained an article mentioning Boric by name, which obviously had been written by the man who had interviewed him under the guise of being an Australian reporter.

Boric said that a number of the statements attributed to him in this article were inaccurate and misleading, and extremely damaging to his personal integrity and his business. One effect of the article was that a prominent trade supplier indicated that he had doubts about extending further credit to Boric. This article must be taken as an example of the practice of Scientology in endeavouring to meet opposition by discrediting the opponent and damaging his personal character and reputation.

Lady Hort said that the sending of 60 or 70 disconnection letters would not have been ordered by the church, and she agreed that it was silly. On the commission putting to her that Boric's reaction stemmed directly from what Scientologists had done to him, she agreed that it stemmed from what he thought they had done to him. In further questioning, as to whether or not Boric had been subjected

to improper or unreasonable pressure, she said: "I think it went a little too far, that one—I do agree." This was in reference to the article in *Freedom—Scientology*.

It is significant that no witness was called for Scientology to give any evidence at all from the Scientologists' point of view of the Boric and Church cases and of the whole story of the Queens Arcade. The commission is therefore entitled to accept the accounts given by Boric and Church, which stood up to cross-examination, as being uncontested.

The commission concludes, therefore, that in the Boric case the pressures exerted by Scientology were in fact improper and unreasonable. As to the Church case, perhaps the mere communicating of a threat by word of mouth over the telephone is not exactly pressure; yet it comes very close to it, and is equally as reprehensible as the more important and extensive series of incidents that occurred in the case of Boric.

Mr Brady was a man who alleged that he had received an Ethics Order declaring him to be a suppressive person, and he had also received disconnecting letters from persons of whom he had no knowledge. He is the secretary of an organisation known as "The Christian Propaganda Society of New Zealand", and in that sense can be said to be a committed member of an active opposition to Scientology, not like the purely disinterested outsiders and by-standers such as were Messrs Boric and Church. Mr Brady's activity, for which he was adjudged to be an enemy and a suppressive person, consisted of making criticism of Scientology at a public meeting and of writing anti-Scientology material to the press. The commission feels that the actions of Scientology in Mr Brady's case were not as reprehensible as those in the cases of Boric and Church.

Mr P. A. Williams is an Auckland lawyer who had been engaged by persons who were against Scientology, and he had carried out some investigations on their behalf. He had been to Melbourne and he had also given evidence before the Select Committee. His complaint was that in *Freedom Scientology, No. 1*, there was an article which was brutally and deliberately libellous of him, attacking his professional integrity as well as his marital circumstances. The article concludes: "Anybody care to sue us!!!"

The fact that the article may well be actionable does not, in the commission's view, remove it from being considered as an "improper and unreasonable pressure". It again indicates the propensity of Scientology to attack, and to attack viciously, those whom it conceives to have attacked it. This is in accordance with the established attitude of Scientology towards its critics, as explained by L. Ron Hubbard

himself in an article in the journal *Affinity* in 1967, Volume 8, No. 3. There is a long article under the heading "Critics of Scientology", which contains the following statements:

Those who criticise one for being a Scientologist or make snide remarks cannot stand a personal survey of past actions or motive. This happens to be a fortunate fact for us. The criminal abhors daylight. And we are the daylight.

Now get this as a technical *fact*, not a hopeful idea. Every time we have investigated the background of a critic of Scientology we have found *crimes* for which that person or group could be imprisoned under existing law. We do *not* find critics of Scientology who do not have criminal pasts. Over and over we prove this.

Politician A stands up on his hind legs in a Parliament and brays for a condemnation of Scientology. When we look him over we find crimes—embezzled funds, moral lapses, a thirst for young boys—sordid stuff.

Wife B howls at her husband for attending a Scientology group. We look her up and find she had a baby *he* didn't know about.

Two things operate here. Criminals hate anything that helps anyone instinctively. And just as instinctively a criminal fights anything that may disclose his past. Now as criminals compose about 20 percent of the race, we are on the side of the majority. This is quite true. In one country we have almost exactly 100 Scientologists for every member and supporter of psychiatry. They make the noise because they are afraid. But *we* have more general influence and more votes.

The way we handle the situation now is simplicity itself and we are winning. We are slowly and carefully teaching the unholy a lesson. It is as follows: "We are not a law enforcement agency. BUT we will become interested in the crimes of people who seek to stop us. If you oppose Scientology we promptly look up—and will find and expose—your crimes. If you leave us alone we will leave you alone." It's very simple. Even a fool can grasp that. And don't under-rate our ability to carry it out. . . .

Never discuss Scientology with the critic. Just discuss his or her crimes, known or unknown. And act completely confident that those crimes exist. Because they do.

Life will suddenly become much more interesting—and you'll become much less suppressed:

The evidence of Mr Horsfall in this respect suggests that Hubbard's injunction on how to deal with critics was not overlooked by Scientology in New Zealand. A private inquiry agent by occupation, he answered an advertisement for an investigator to carry out investigations in New Zealand and Australia. He attended an interview and saw two men, one of whom was John Dahloff. He later believed that John Dahloff was an office bearer in Scientology. He was told at this interview that they needed somebody to travel in New Zealand and Australia checking on a list of people that they would give to the investigator. The job would be to find out anything about them, such as criminal convictions, whether they

had been in debt, or whether they had ever been in trouble of any kind. He was also asked whether he had any objection at all to investigating lawyers, medical men, or anybody in Government circles. He was then asked whether he would be prepared to take on this job. He said he would like to think about it. They then asked him whether he had any idea of what kind of organisation he would be working for, and he replied that he thought he would be working for Scientology. When they asked how he knew that, he said that he had been doing some checking and had found that the man to whom he was speaking was named John Dahloff. They said, "All right, you will hear from us later." Here again, there was no denial of this by Scientology.

Mr R. C. Gallagher became opposed to Scientology because of what he thought it had done to a friend of his in the way of change of disposition. He said that he was apparently adjudged by Scientology in Auckland, after his friend had gone there for processing, as a suppressive person, and his friend was ordered to disconnect from him. This was done by the usual brief letter sent through the post. A little later he received the usual order declaring him to be a suppressive person. Mr Gallagher carried the attack into the enemy's territory by writing to World Wide Headquarters at Saint Hill Manor, using assumed names and inventing facts. Scientology replied in a letter from a Mr Arthur Jackson, Ethics Officer, dated 10 August 1966, which is as follows:

I am aware that you have been writing to Saint Hill, England, under the guise of various persons in Tokoroa who would not feel kindly towards receiving unsolicited mail from Scientological sources. I am also aware that this is a direct attempt to enturbulate persons in and around the environment of one of our Field Staff Members, so that then enturbulation may be directed toward him. I want you to be aware of the fact that I am having you investigated. Also, that I am making enquiries to England for the names of the persons under who's guise you have written, if any, and will bring this to their attention. Then if they wish to sue you they can go ahead. (Sgd.) Arthur Jackson, Ethics Officer.

The reference in this letter to "have you investigated" seems to conform to a pattern.

Other Cases

Mrs E. F. Lawson alleged that it was because of Scientology that her grandson Graham Bunn gave up his university course in Dunedin and came to Auckland to work for Scientology. She also alleged that it was because of Scientology that Graham Bunn had become estranged from her husband and herself and would not speak to

her. Graham Bunn's own evidence established fairly clearly that his grandmother had, in fact misunderstood the situation, because he had not known of Scientology until after he had given up his university course. The commission felt that it could not draw any definite conclusions from this case.

Mr J. H. W. Chamberlin alleged estrangement from his son because of his son's attachment to Scientology. He was disturbed at what he thought was the influence of Scientology on his son; it seemed to have induced him to break off an engagement, and he did not seem to be able to remain long in any particular employment. In about 3 years prior to attaining the age of 21, which he did in 1968, he had some five different jobs. The difficulties in this case, however, came to a head in a "disconnection", not on the part of the son against the parents, but by the parents against the son. It was established to the commission's satisfaction that the very strong and sweeping disconnecting and disinheriting letter signed by both parents was written to the son before the son himself wrote the Scientological disconnecting letter to his parents. The commission does not find that any useful conclusion can be drawn from this case.

Mr N. M. Levien alleged that after attending Scientology lectures his son then about 20 or 21, underwent a change of disposition, becoming uncommunicative, unfriendly, and aggressive. The witness described the efforts made, in the end successfully, to dissuade his son from following Scientology, and said that the aftermath was a flood of Scientology literature through the post, from Auckland and also from England and Greece.

Others besides Mr Levien spoke of annoyance caused them by the volume of Scientology literature which arrived through the post, and continued in some cases despite direct requests that it be discontinued. Though it cannot be said that persistence in sending "promotion" material through the post is peculiar to Scientology, it was in some instances carried to excess.

PART III

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In coming to its conclusions on the evidence, the commission has been conscious of the fact that the only oral evidence given to it by or on behalf of Scientology was that of Sir James Hort and Lady Hort. Sir James Hort's evidence covered quite a narrow field, and he did not attempt to speak with authority as one familiar with all aspects of the organisation. Lady Hort was Scientology's main and more important witness, and it was through her that all the various Scientology documents were produced. From the commission's point of view, there were lamentable gaps in her knowledge. She had become a member of the Scientology staff only in November 1966, and then presumably in a comparatively junior position, for she worked in the evenings only. In November 1967 she left for England for training at Saint Hill Manor, and did not return to Auckland until July of 1968. She was appointed Assistant Guardian in November 1968, and this position she held when she was giving evidence to the Commission.

Lady Hort's knowledge of the activities and operations of the organisation in Auckland was not nearly as extensive as the commission would have liked. She was unable to throw any light, from the point of view of Scientology, on the events associated with any of the specific cases which came up for consideration by the commission. Nor was evidence offered on behalf of Scientology from any of the persons who were in senior positions in her absence abroad or were in charge of the organisation in Auckland at the relevant and material times for the purpose of considering these various cases. It was indeed said that some of these officials were no longer in New Zealand. However that may be, the Commission decided that it must seek to reach conclusions on the evidence before it, and if this evidence led it to conclusions unfavourable to Scientology, which Scientology might assert were not in accordance with the facts, then Scientology had only itself to blame, because it did not give to the Commission its evidence on these facts.

It may be thought that the number of cases coming specifically under the terms of reference and concerning which evidence was given before the commission was surprisingly small. It is true that there were only three cases of substantive value from which clear conclusions could be drawn, and it has been suggested on behalf of Scientology that these were exceptional, that they were the outcome of mistakes, and that they could not happen again. The commission, however, felt that it was entitled to consider not only the specific evidence concerning these cases, but also all the relevant evidence,

documentary and otherwise, and to draw from this evidence the conclusion that the specific cases were examples of definite trends, patterns, and attitudes in the activities, methods, and practices of the organisation of Scientology.

(a) *Estrangements in Family Relationships*

From the discussion of the evidence it will be seen that the commission has concluded that there was clear proof of the activities, methods, and practices of Scientology in New Zealand contributing to estrangements in family relationships. In the O'Donnell case it could almost be said that Scientology "caused" the estrangement between Noel and his parents; it certainly contributed to it in a substantial manner. It also contributed substantially to the estrangement between Erin and her parents. This contribution was made not only in the production of anti-parental attitudes but also by the official act of the organisation in declaring the parents to be suppressive persons. This declaration was followed by the sending of disconnecting letters to Mr and Mrs O'Donnell by a large number of Scientologists, of most of whom they had no previous knowledge. It was also followed by the particularly vicious disconnecting letter written by Linklater and already quoted. There were also a suppressive person declaration and disconnecting letters in the Morris case.

It seems clear that at some stage in the course of its operations in New Zealand Scientology did actively contemplate interfering with familial relations in such a way as to induce trainee Scientologists to disconnect from close relatives who were considered by Scientology to be acting in the role of suppressive persons. HCO policy letter of 23 December 1965 on "Suppressive Acts" has, the commission was informed, been cancelled, but the date of cancellation was not given. This policy letter may or may not have been actually in force at the time of the O'Donnell and Morris cases, but in any case its spirit seems to have been applied to them. In a significant passage it says:

A Scientologist connected by familial or other ties to a person who is guilty of Suppressive Acts is known as a Potential Trouble Source or Trouble Source. The history of Dianetics and Scientology is strewn with these. Confused by emotional ties, dogged in refusing to give up Scientology, yet invalidated by a Suppressive Person at every turn they cannot, having a PTP, make case gains. If they would act with determination one way or the other—reform the Suppressive Person or disconnect—they could then make gains and recover their potential. If they make no determined move, they eventually succumb.

Therefore this Policy Letter extends to suppressive non-Scientology wives and husbands and parents, or other family members or hostile groups or even close friends. So long as a wife or husband, father or mother or other family connection, who is attempting to suppress the

Scientology spouse or child, or hostile group remains continuingly acknowledged or in communication with the Scientology spouse or child or member, then that Scientologist or preclear comes under the family or adherent clause and may not be processed or further trained until he or she has taken appropriate action to cease to be a Potential Trouble Source.

The validity of this policy is borne out by the fact that the US Government raids and other troubles were instigated by wives, husbands or parents who were actively suppressing a Scientologist, or Scientology. The suppressed Scientologist did not act in good time to avert the trouble by handling the antagonistic family member as a suppressive source or disconnect fully.

Disconnection from a family member or cessation of adherence to a Suppressive Person or Group is done by the Potential Trouble Source publicly publishing the fact, as in the legal notices of 'The Auditor' and public announcements and taking any required civil action such as disavowal, separation or divorce and thereafter cutting all further communication and disassociating from the person or group.

From this passage alone it could well be argued that Scientology did in fact contribute to family estrangements because it actively posed a choice between Scientology and familial ties, if the latter were adverse to Scientology. Given the active tactics employed by Scientology "to get the show on the road and keep it going", it is obvious that cases could arise where persons were under active pressure to break completely from their spouses or parents—whether rightly or wrongly is another matter. The commission is satisfied that such cases did occur in New Zealand, and concludes without hesitation that the activities, methods, and practices of Scientology have contributed to estrangements in family relationships.

It appeared to the commission that the attitude of Scientology towards family relationships was cold, distant, and somewhat uninterested. In a number of the cases of which the commission was informed it must have been apparent to the Scientology organisation, or at least to some of the officers concerned, that family relationships were being subjected to strain and could possibly be damaged by a continuation of a course in Scientology. There is no evidence in any of these cases that Scientology or any of its officers took any steps to remedy or alleviate this situation. It was particularly noticeable to the commission that the Scientology organisation, at any rate during the times material to this inquiry, took no steps whatever to prevent any estrangement occurring between the O'Donnell children and the rest of the family.

Lady Hort, as the principal witness for Scientology, had no personal knowledge of the O'Donnell case until very late in its history, when Erin and Noel had already left New Zealand, but it is obvious that Morgan, with whom Noel had been staying in

Auckland, must have known all about it. Morgan later left for England, and it is believed that it was because he was at Saint Hill Manor that Erin and Allen proposed to go there and make contact with him. In any event, it now appears that Morgan at that stage must have been important in the organisation, and is now apparently very much more so, being one of the three members of the Executive Council, World Wide, and one of the members of the Board of Directors of the Church of Scientology. No evidence was called before the Commission to rebut the obvious presumption that must be made in such circumstances.

The commission was informed that the practice of disconnection was cancelled by directive of 15 November 1968, and the commission received, as has already been mentioned, a letter from L. Ron Hubbard stating that the Board of Directors of the Church of Scientology had no intention of reintroducing the policy. He also added that, for his part, he could see no reason why the policy should ever be reintroduced. The letter is on page 27.

This undertaking does not, in its terms, go as far as the commission had hoped. It had hoped that there would be a direct undertaking by L. Ron Hubbard that the practice of disconnection would never be reintroduced. However, the intention appears to be there, although it is stated in somewhat guarded language. The commission naturally welcomes this undertaking, and believes that if it is fully observed in its intent and spirit it may have an important effect on the relations between Scientology and the public in New Zealand, and particularly by removing one of the important practices which contributed to family estrangement.

There still remains the issue of Suppressive Person orders. The commission believes that when these orders are issued against one member of the family in respect of the scientological connections of another member, they cannot do other than contribute to family estrangements. If the changed attitude of Scientology means that such suppressive orders will not be issued in future, but that these cases will be dealt with by "handling", then again the commission feels that much good may result.

The attitude of Scientology towards young people under the age of 21 and with reference to their parents necessarily bears upon family relations. This will be discussed under the heading associated with subclause (b) of the terms of reference, and the question of disconnecting letters will be discussed further under subclause (c).

However, as far as concerns subclause (a) the commission concludes that it is not necessary or expedient at present for existing

legislation to be amended. It has come to this conclusion for two reasons:

- (1) It dislikes adding to the body of statute law which restricts personal activities for social reasons.
- (2) It has been markedly influenced by what it believes to be a distinct change not only in the activities, methods, and practices of Scientology but also in the outlook of the organisation. Its founder and head, in his HCO policy direction of 7 March 1969, has this to say:

We are going in the direction of mild ethics and involvement with the Society. . . . The policy which cancels the condition of disconnection, the cancellation of the fair game law, cancellation of Sec. checks and no records allowed of confessional materials plus the new Code of a Scientologist have accomplished every reform suggested to us.

Let's get the show on the road.

If at any time it were to appear that this change had been reversed or that some of the old and objectionable practices had been revived, then the Government should, if an important social evil were found to be occurring, take note and consider what steps might be necessary.

(b) Control of Persons under 21

As to subclause (b) of the terms of reference, the commission first wishes to draw attention to the existing law relating to the custody or control of children or persons under the age of 21 years. In the summary quoted earlier in this Report it is stated: ". . . thus, while as a matter of law the parents of a child remain its guardians until it turns 21 or sooner marries, they cannot, save in exceptional circumstances and then only if the child is under 18, enforce their rights as guardians after it reaches the age of 16 . . ."

It will be seen that "as a matter of law" parents of a child who has attained the age of 16 years have very few rights. Nevertheless the commission is again definitely of the opinion that Scientology has affected the custody or control of children or persons under the age of 21 years, and it has done so in the sense and in the respects mentioned when discussing the evidence above. It has done so possibly because of what was admitted to be a mistake in the application of the rules of the organisation, which, the commission was told, provide that no person under the age of 21 may be audited or processed without the consent of a parent or a guardian.

The commission regards this rule as insufficient because the legal guardians of a person under the age of 21 are normally both parents. It therefore considers that no auditing or processing of a person under

the age of 21 should be undertaken without the express written consent of both parents, which consent should in terms refer specifically to the courses to be undertaken and approve the payment of the appropriate fees therefor. To process a young person with the consent of only one parent, when the issue of Scientology is a divisive influence in the family home, is only to contribute further to family estrangement.

Furthermore, the commission was disturbed by the evidence given of the auditing and processing of comparatively young children, even with their parents' consent. This must be a practice to be used with extreme caution and to be consented to only by parents who know full well what they are doing—for example, Sir James and Lady Hort when they consented to the auditing of one of their young children.

The commission was also disturbed at what appeared to be the practice of trainee auditing. In order to learn how to be an auditor the trainee had to practise auditing, and this practising was sometimes carried out on student Scientologists without fee. It seemed that a certain air of irresponsibility had crept into this practice of trainee auditing, and might have been the cause of the so-called "mistakes" which occurred in the O'Donnell case. The commission was informed by Sir James Hort that a person under the age of 21 (or even in one case, 16 or 17), could be fully trained to become an auditor and, if properly trained, could be a very good one. This may be so, but if it involves the young person practising upon other young persons, then the commission feels that persons under the age of 21 should not be trained to be auditors.

Influenced again by what has been said about the change in the practices of Scientology, and by the admission that mistakes have been made, the commission is not prepared to recommend that changes in the existing law are necessary or expedient.

It will be understood that the commission's reference to the age of 21 years is derived from its terms of reference, but in substance and for the future it must be understood to refer to the particular age that is adopted by the Legislature as being the age of majority.

(c) Improper or Unreasonable Pressures

The discussion of the evidence has already indicated the commission's clear opinion that the activities, methods, and practices of Scientology did result in persons being subjected to improper or unreasonable pressures. Here again the question is whether official assurance of the abandonment of the practice of disconnection, and the philosophy associated with it, will lead to a substantial improvement in the practices of Scientology in this respect. If this is not so,

then again the Government may have to consider whether, for example, it might be expedient to make it an offence to send through the post letters of the deliberately offensive and insulting nature of some of the disconnecting letters that have been referred to in this report. The general protection offered by the law of defamation and the law of blackmail is, the commission feels, adequate to deal with most situations under this head; but here again, if some of these former practices are reverted to, it may be necessary to consider legislation requiring a more substantial legal entity than is now in evidence in the case of Scientology.

Conclusion

It will be seen, therefore, that while the commission has in effect found against Scientology on all three heads of the terms of reference, yet it is prepared, relying on Lady Hort's candour and co-operation and upon the evidence of the changed outlook on the part of Scientology, to make no recommendations about the necessity or expediency of legislation change at this stage. The commission feels that for the future Scientology should regard as indispensable certain rules of practice. These are:

- (1) No reintroduction of the practice of disconnection.
- (2) No issue of Suppressive Person or Declaration of Enemy orders by any member to any other member of a family.
- (3) No auditing or processing or training of anyone under the age of 21 without the specific written consent of both parents; such consent to include approval of the fees (which shall be specified) to be charged for the course or courses to which the consent is applicable.
- (4) A reduction to reasonable dimensions of "promotion" literature sent through the post to individuals, and prompt discontinuance of it when this is requested.

If Scientology in New Zealand has regard to these rules of practice no further occasion for Government or public alarm should arise in respect of those of its manifestations with which this inquiry was concerned.


PART IV

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The commission acknowledges with gratitude the work done by Mr G. S. Orr, Crown Counsel, as counsel assisting the commission. His task of preparing the brief on a subject with which members of the commission were initially quite unfamiliar was complex and exacting. His painstaking preparation of the evidence and his urbane impartiality in presenting it and examining the witnesses contributed substantially in lightening the work of the commission.

The commission has good reason also to record its appreciation of the work done, with comprehensive thoroughness, before, during, and after the public hearings by its secretary, Mr R. Buist. In particular his summaries of the evidence, his orderly marshalling of documentary exhibits and his checking of references for this report were of invaluable assistance.

The commission is also grateful to the many persons who, from a sense of public duty, came forward voluntarily and assisted it by giving evidence, though this in some cases caused them to be subjected to considerable stress.



Chairman.



Member.

Dated at Wellington this 30th day of June 1969.

APPENDIX I
SCIENTOLOGY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY 1969
LIST OF WITNESSES

Witness		Called By
Name	Address	
Boric, F. J. P.	Auckland ..	Mr G. S. Orr
Brady, W.	Auckland ..	Mr G. S. Orr
Bunn, H. G.	Auckland ..	Mr Adams-Smith
Chamberlin, J. H. W. ..	Clevedon ..	Mr G. S. Orr
Church, O. J.	Auckland ..	Mr G. S. Orr
Gallagher, R. C.	Auckland ..	Mr G. S. Orr
Gibson, M. A. (Miss) ..	Hamilton ..	Mr G. S. Orr
Horsfall, R. J.	Auckland ..	Mr K. Ryan
Hort, Sir James F. ..	Auckland ..	Mr Haigh
Hort, Lady Joan Mary ..	Auckland ..	Mr Haigh
Kennedy, G. F.	Hamilton ..	Mr K. Ryan
Lawrence, C. F.	Hamilton ..	Mr K. Ryan
Lawson, E. F. (Mrs) ..	Morrinsville ..	Mr K. Ryan
Levien, N. M.	Auckland ..	Mr G. S. Orr
Morris, D. F. (Mrs) ..	Auckland ..	Mr Adams-Smith
Morris, L. C.	Auckland ..	Mr G. S. Orr
O'Donnell, F. P.	Hamilton ..	Mr K. Ryan
O'Donnell, K.	Hamilton ..	Mr K. Ryan
O'Donnell, N. E.	Sydney, Australia	Mr Adams-Smith
O'Donnell, P. G.	Auckland ..	Mr K. Ryan
O'Donnell, S. M. (Mrs) ..	Hamilton ..	Mr K. Ryan
Partridge, G. S.	Hamilton ..	Mr K. Ryan
Rickard, H. W.	Auckland ..	Mr G. S. Orr
Whiting, G. H.	Auckland ..	Mr K. Ryan
Whiting, M. E. (Mrs) ..	Auckland ..	Mr K. Ryan
Williams, P. A.	Auckland ..	Mr K. Ryan
Wright, K. E. (Mrs) ..	Sydney, Australia	Mr Adams-Smith

APPENDIX II

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Details
A	Church of American Science Incorporated: Rules of.
B	Hubbard Association of Scientologists International Incorporated: Rules of.
C	Hubbard Association of Scientologists Ltd: Memo. and Articles of Association.
D	Certificate of Assistant Registrar of Companies, Wellington of 14/3/69 relative to: (1) Hubbard Association of Scientologists International Ltd. (2) The Church of American Science Incorporated.
E	Hubbard Association of Scientologists International: Articles of Incorporation.
F	Church of Scientology of California: Articles of Incorporation.
G	Brochure: To the Householder: <i>Scientology and your Children</i> .
H	<i>Affinity</i> —Psychosis, Vol. 7, No. 6.
I	<i>Affinity</i> —Marriage, Vol. 8, No. 1.
J	<i>Affinity</i> —minor: Dianetics.
K	<i>Affinity</i> —minor issue, Vol. 8, No. 9: Myths of the mind.
L	<i>Affinity</i> —major issue, Vol. 8, No. 10: The Hope of Man.
M1, M2	<i>Affinity</i> —major issue, Vol. 8, No. 12: Advanced Courses at A.C. Greece.
N	<i>Affinity</i> —minor issue, Vol. 9, No. 11: Security Checks Abolished.
O	Agreement and Release, Church of Scientology, California.
P	<i>The Auditor</i> —33.
Q	"The Bridge from Chaos to Total Freedom"—(diagram).
R	<i>The Auditor</i> (extra) Scientology Expansion.
S	<i>Affinity</i> —Vol. 8, No. 3: Critics of Scientology.
T	H C O Ethics Order No. 3055—28/2/68. Reissued at St. Hill 18/3/63, to Editor, <i>Truth</i> .
U1	<i>Dianetics and Scientology</i> —(short history and impinging document.)
U2	"Dear Citizen"—Brochure and questionnaire from organisation secretary.
U3	Envelope—Prepaid (for return).
V	<i>Cede of Reform</i> —29/11/68.
W	<i>Miscellaneous Actions</i> —Report of Torts and General Reform Committee of New Zealand, February 1968.
X1	Affidavit—K. E. O'Donnell, 31/5/68.
X2	Affidavit—N. E. O'Donnell, (?) 1968.
Y	<i>Freedom Scientology</i> —No. 1, New Zealand.
Z	<i>Freedom Scientology</i> —No. 2, New Zealand.
AA	Letter (undated) Wednesday—A. Wright to Noel.
AB	Certificate, 11/3/69—St. John's College, Hamilton, re N. O'Donnell.

LIST OF EXHIBITS—continued

Exhibit	Details
AC	Certificate, 12/3/69—Sacred Heart Girls' College, Hamilton, <i>re</i> Erin O'Donnell.
AD	Certificate, 12/3/69—St. Mary's Convent, Hamilton, <i>re</i> K. E. O'Donnell.
AE	Letter, 20/2/68—V. Linklater - Mr and Mrs O'Donnell.
AF	H C O Ethics Order—3056 Auckland, 20/2/68, <i>re</i> F. P. and S. M. O'Donnell.
Disconnecting Letters	
AG	30/5/68—D. Oostenberg - Mrs O'Donnell.
AH 1	(Undated)—D. Compton - Mrs O'Donnell.
2	27/7/68—D. Kirkby - Mrs O'Donnell.
3	24/7/68—H. Alack - Mrs O'Donnell.
4	30/5/68—D. Oostenberg - Mr O'Donnell.
5	10/5/68—J. Bath - Mrs O'Donnell.
6	22/5/68—Al. Morgan - Mrs O'Donnell.
7	3/5/68—Eva Breska - Mrs O'Donnell.
8	22/5/68—Al. Morgan - Mrs O'Donnell.
9	11/6/68—Pat Bloomberg - Mrs O'Donnell.
10	6/6/68—Pat Brice - Mrs O'Donnell.
11	22/2/68—G. Stevens - Mr & Mrs O'Donnell.
12	22/2/68—D. Schoall - Mrs O'Donnell.
13	22/2/68—S. Stevens - M. O'Donnell.
14	14/3/68—R. F. Mitcheson - Mr and Mrs O'Donnell.
15	"5" N. E. O'Donnell to my father and all those concerned.
16	Undated N. E. O'Donnell to my mother and all those concerned.
AI	<i>Freedom Scientology</i> —No. 1 New Zealand.
AJ	<i>Freedom Scientology</i> —No. 2 New Zealand.
AK	<i>The Times</i> , Hamilton—8/11/68, extract.
AL	Scientology Press Release—8/11/68, <i>re</i> P. Williams.
AM	Disconnecting Letters to P. Williams from R. Compton, A. L. Morgan, and V. Linklater.
AN	H C O Ethics Order 707—22/8/66, <i>re</i> P. A. Williams.
AO	Letter, 11/2/68—Erin to Mum and Dad.
AP	Disconnecting Letter "3" undated—E. O'Donnell to Mrs Whiting.
AQ	H C O Ethics Order—3054 Auckland 19/2/68, <i>re</i> Mrs Whiting.
AR	Letter, 20/2/68—V. Linklater - Mrs Whiting.
Disconnecting Letters to Mrs Whiting	
From—	
AS	23/2/68—G. Schoall.
AT	22/2/68—S. Stevens.
AU	14/3/68—R. Mitcheson.
AV	21/3/68—O. Kirkby.
AW	23/4/68—K. J. and K. Geddes.
AX	"2" (undated)—C. Stevens.
AY	Oxford Capacity Analysis, 10/3/69—G. H. Shanely.

LIST OF EXHIBITS—*continued*

Exhibit	Details
Letters—	
AZ	1/11/60—L. Mooring (Scientologist) - Del.
BA	24/10/62—L. Polaschek (Scientologist) - Del.
BB	25/2/65—T. Morgan (Scientologist) - Mrs D. Morris.
BC	1/7/66—M. Parsons (Scientologist) - Mrs D. Morris.
BD	6/7/66—St. Hill (P. Hill - Murray) - Mrs D. F. Morris.
BE	11/4/67—C. Scheuerman (Letter Registrar) - Del Morris.
BF	12/5/67—J. Watson (Letter Registrar) - Mrs D.
BG	22/5/67—E. Horley-Smith (Scientologist) - Del.
BH	Costs of Scientology Treatment for Del Morris—Copy of Statement, Sheet 8.
BI	Letter, 8/8/67—Del - Dad.
BJ	Disconnecting Letter (undated)—A. P. Sateford - R. Gallagher.
BK	H C O Ethics Order 702—22/8/66.
BL	Letter, 10/8/66—A. Jackson (Ethics Officer) - Mr Gallagher.
BM	Disconnecting Letter, 18/5/?—Barry to Mum and Dad.
BN	Disconnecting Letter, 15/5/68—Barry to Gail.
Letters—	
BO	30/7/68—H. Clark (Public Ethics Officer) - Barry.
BP	21/7/68—B. Robertson (for letter Registrar A.O.) - Barry Chamberlin.
BQ	29/7/68—J. Lawrie - Barry Chamberlin.
BR	12/5/?—J. H. W. and B. M. Chamberlin - Barry.
BS	A C O Ethics Order (copy)— <i>re</i> - Mr Boric.
BT	<i>Freedom Scientology</i> , No. 2, New Zealand—"Rough Deal".
BU	Directors and Secretaries (Scientology)—Extract from particulars of (by Assistant Registrar of Companies, Wellington).
BV	"Staff Photos", New addresses and notices—July 1964, Vol. 5, No. 7.
BW	Press Release—Scientology, 8/11/68, <i>re</i> , P. Williams.
BX	Press Release, 12/11/68—Scientology, <i>re</i> - P. A. Williams.
BY	H C O Ethics Order (copy)—No. 4012, Auckland, 13/3/68.
BZ	Disconnecting Letter, 26/2/?—E. Martin - W. Brady.
CA	Disconnecting Letter, 2/4/68—R. Mitcheson - W. Brady.
CB	<i>Truth</i> 20/2/68—"Cult Clutch on Teens Forces Family Flight".
CC	Letter 1/10/65—Erin - Jocelyn (a cousin).
CD	Letter, 6/11/65—Erin - Jo.
CE	Letter (undated), (copy)—F. O'Donnell - Morris (permission for first stage).
CF	Affidavit 28/2/69—F. P. and S. M. O'Donnell (lodged Magistrate's Court Hamilton).
CG	<i>New Zealand Herald</i> , 4/4/68—Extract "Children now like Hitler Youth".

LIST OF EXHIBITS—continued

Exhibit	Details
CH	<i>Affinity</i> —(major), Vol. 9, No. 2: "The Mission of Scientology".
CI	Undated letter (copy): G. Bunn (Director of Clearing) - "Dear Scientologist"—Appointing Field Staff members.
CJ	Circular: H. Alachi (Chaplain) - "Dear Scientologist"—Advising speakers for coming services.
CK	Organisation Chart: World Wide Headquarters—Church of Scientology, England.
CL	Charges Scientology—List of 28/3/68 (2 pages).
CM	H C O Policy Letter, 23/4/68—Issue III. Assent forms to processing from parent or guardian.
CN	<i>H C O Bulletin</i> , 30/6/62—ARC Process.
CO	<i>Affinity</i> —
	Vol. 8, No. 1—Marriage.
CP	Vol. 9, No. 2—"The Credo of a Good and Skilled Manager."
CQ	Vol. 9, No. 3—
	(1) Amnesty.
	(2) Bridge from Chaos to Total Freedom.
CR	Vol. 9, No. 4—Leadership.
CS	Vol. 8, No. 5—The Five Conditions.
CT	Vol. 9, No. 6—(Various).
CU	Vol. 10, No. 7—The Scope of Scientology.
CV	Vol. 8, No. 8—
	The Ethics of Scientology.
	Being a Scientologist.
CW	Vol. 8, No. 9—The Myths of the Mind.
CX	Vol. 8, No. 10—The Hope of Man.
CY	Vol. 9, No. 11—Security Checks Abolished.
CZ	Vol. 8, No. 12—Scientology Technology.
DA	Vol. 7, No. 3—What is Greatness.
DB	Vol. 8, No. 10—Contests and Prizes.
DC	Vol. 8, No. 11—Artistic Presentation.
DD	Vol. 8, No. 12—Petition.
DE	Bunn, H. G.—Scientology file of.
DF	Morris (Mrs D) —Scientology file of.
DG	O'Donnell, N. E.—Scientology file of.
DH	(1-28) H C O Ethics Orders.
	(29) H C O Policy Letter, 25/9/65.
	(30) H C O Policy Letter, 29/12/66.
	(31) H C O Policy Letter (vi), 18/10/67.
	(32) H C O Policy Letter (iv), 18/10/67.
	(33) Letter 18/2/69—Hunter - W. McNeil.
	(34) H C O Bulletin, 30/6/62.
DI	H C O Ethic Orders—
	(1) 6456 A. Jackson, 19/3/69.
	(2) 4453 A. Jackson, 18/3/69.
	4454 A. Jackson, 19/3/69.
DJ	H C O Policy Letter, 15/11/68 (UK)—Disconnecting Cancelled.

LIST OF EXHIBITS—*continued*

Exhibit	Details
DK	H C O Ethic Orders— (1) 4424 AK, 6/11/68—Charles Brodie. (2) 4419, 28/2/69—Court of Ethics convened. (3) 4409 AK, 15/10/68—Executive Ethics Hearing convened. (4) 4410 AK, 15/10/68—Ethics Hearing.
DL	H C O Policy Letter (UK). 1.9.Ad15—Ethics Protection.
DM	H C O Policy Letters, 7/6/65—Entheta letters and Dead File: Handling of.
DN	H C O Policy Letter, 23/12/65—Suppressive Acts: Suppression of Scientology and Scientologists: The Fair Game Law. <i>The Auditor</i> —
DO	No. 14.
DP	No. 42.
DQ	<i>Evening Post</i> 16/10/68: (Extract)—Scientologists have right to investigate critics.
DR	Notice—Reward: \$10,000 for information <i>re</i> libel and conspiracy. H C O Policy Letters:
DS	27/10/64—Policies on Physical Healing, Insanity, and "Troublesome Sources".
DT	17/3/65—Justice, Fair Game Law, Organisation of Suppressive Acts, and the Source of the Fair Game Law.
DU	18/10/67—Penalties for Lower conditions (Orgs and Sea Org).
DV	23/10/67: Enemy Formula.
DW	21/7/68: Penalties for Lower Conditions (Orgs and Sea Org).
DX	<i>The Auditor</i> , No. 44 (1969)—The Value of Scientology.
DY	H C O Policy Letters (UK) 16/10/68—Condition of treason.
DZ	Newspaper (Unknown), 15/11/68—Scientology talks about "killings".
EA	26/3/69 Letter—Hubbard - Commission <i>re</i> Cancellation of Disconnection.
EB	File of Scientology (34 documents).
EC	Booklet— <i>Introduction to Scientology Ethics</i> .
ED	<i>Affinity</i> —minor: Dianetics
EE	United States Court of Appeal— <i>Scientology v. U.S.A.</i> : Decision of, 5/2/69.

APPENDIX III

GLOSSARY OF CERTAIN SCIENTOLOGY TERMS AND
ABBREVIATIONS:

(COMPILED FROM DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED IN EVIDENCE,
PARTICULARLY "INTRODUCTION TO SCIENTOLOGY
ETHICS" by L. RON. HUBBARD)

- Auditor** A listener or one who listens carefully to what people have to say. The person trained and qualified in applying Scientology processes to others for their betterment.
- Auditing (Processing)** The application of Scientology procedures to a person by a trained Scientologist. That action or actions governed by the technical disciplines and codes of Scientology, of administering a process of a preclear in order to release or free him. The means by which a person progressively emerges as his essential self.
- ARC** Affinity, Reality, Communication.
- Clear** An unaberrated state of mind; a person who is clear of aberrations. One who through the technology of Scientology has achieved the state of being able to be at cause knowingly and at will over mental matter, energy, space and time as regards the first dynamics (survival of self).
- Committee of Evidence** A fact-finding group appointed and empowered to impartially investigate and recommend upon Scientology matters of a fairly severe ethical nature.
- Dianetics** The modern science of mental health. Man's most advanced school of the mind. A way up to a capable human being.
- Ethics Report** A report to Ethics concerning the misuse or abuse of technology or the misconduct of a Scientologist.
- Entheta Letter** A letter containing insult, discourtesy, "chop" or nastiness about an organisation, its personnel, Scientology or the principal figures in Scientology (EN=Enthurbulated; Theta=Greek for thought or life).
- Files Dead** A file held by Ethics Division which includes all persons who write nasty or choppy letters to an organisation or its personnel.
- Grade** A level of release or auditing.
- HAS** Hubbard Apprentice Scientologist.
- HCO** Hubbard Communications Office.
- HCS** Hubbard Certified Scientologist.
- HPA** Hubbard Professional Auditor.
- Hubbard** Lafayette Ronald Hubbard.
- Overt Acts** The administration of pain or destruction to another.
- Potential Trouble Source** Any person who while active in Scientology or a preclear remains connected to a suppressive person or group.
- Preclear** A person who has not reached the state of clear. One who through Scientology processing is finding out more about himself.
- Security Checks** A check made to see whether a person has any counter intentions towards Scientology or Scientology organisations.

Suppressive Person One who is battling constantly in covert ways to make others less powerful and less able because of imagined danger to himself.

Sea Org The organisation which sends out missions to put ethics in on the planet.

Scientology The route from human being to total freedom or total beingness.

Standard Technology The exact processes and auditing actions laid down and used for the invariable resolution of cases; taught and used without variation by all Scientology auditors.

Statistic A number or amount compared to an earlier number or amount of the same thing. Statistics refer to the quantity of work done or the value of it in money.

Sub-zeros The grades of release below Grade O.

Thetan Akin to the soul or spirit. The person himself—not his body or name, the physical universe, his mind or anything else—that which is aware of being aware; the identity that is the individual. (From Theta=Greek for thought or spirit).

Operating Thetan Operating is being able to act and handle things; Thetan the spiritual being that is a basic self. The operating thetan is one who can handle things without having to use a body or physical means.

BY AUTHORITY:

A. R. SHEARER, GOVERNMENT PRINTER, WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND—1969

63802—69 G