

September 29, 2009

To: Reports Off RTC Int, Keeper of the Tech FSSO, Keeper of the Tech FSO, CO CMO Int, CO CMO FSSO, Data Files FSO, ED Int, CO OSA Int, PR Aide OSA Int, Legal Aide OSA Int, Int Justice Chf, I & R Chf HCO Int, President CSI

From: Mary Jo Leavitt, New OT VIII

Copy: HCO FSSO, CMO FSSO

**KNOWLEDGE REPORT
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY - HATS NOT WEARING – CONDITION OF TREASON**

A serious situation exists which threatens the survival of the Church internationally. Yet it continues despite a mounting count of outpoints by parishioners and others in various positions within the Church. It is neither acknowledged as recognized by Management nor addressed from anyone in any position able to resolve the conflicts being created and evidenced through this report. This report, then, is an effort to bring light to the threat so that a resolution can be, at a minimum, confronted and considered, if not met and resolved. This report is submitted in accordance with **HCO PL 22 July 1982 “Knowledge Reports”** and each and all of the references listed upon that policy letter.

The areas below are those I have personally observed where SO and staff members are not wearing their hat(s) and this is often justified as “*Command Intention*.” Individuals concerned are each specifically named, where known.

Command Intention is a squirrel “catch all” term that really means “David Miscavige’s orders.” But this direction is often the opposite of the original definition as I learned it, i.e. “Source”/LRH intention.

Definition of Source per **HCO PL 16 April 65, Issue I, KSW series 22 “The ‘Hidden Data Line’ ”**: “If it isn’t in an HCOB or in a HCO PL or recorded in a tape in my voice, it isn’t tech or policy.” LRH

The Management of the Church of Scientology was created to implement LRH tech and policy in the areas of Ethics, Tech and Admin. It is their hat to do this in order to create the correct environment so Scientology as a movement can expand and help the peoples of Earth.

Any action against that, as an overt of omission or commission, is a treasonous act, as in **HCO PL 20 April, 1969 “Hats Not Wearing”**. See also **HCO PL 22 September 1970 “Hats”**.

HCO PL 27 April 1969 “Death Wish” – “Anyone who doesn’t wear his hat in a group and doesn’t do his job is obviously dramatizing a death wish for the group...Only this phenomenon prevents a group from becoming a true group.” LRH

HCO PL 20 October 1967 Issue I, Admin Know-How Series 17 “Conditions, How to Assign” “It is more than policy that one gets the condition he fails to correctly and promptly assign *and* enforce. It’s a sort of natural law.” LRH

(Note, any reference below may apply to multiple points but, for the most part, will only be listed once on the list).

LIST OF SPECIFIC HATS, NOT WEARING:

- 1) EDs and D/EDs of Orgs are not doing their job but are rather run by the CLOs pushing fund raising for buildings/renovations/library campaigns/Basics/IAS (throughout LATAM, and at LAF and LAD, that I can attest to personally); in addition, the current OTA Program requires all OTCs worldwide to send their qualifying public to Flag for Grades, get everyone onto and through their Basics, and complete the projects for an Ideal Organization, all which distract or impede the org from delivering its key services- Academy training and HGC auditing. (See copy of the OTA Program for this year, and the KR to COB [Nov 2008] about the disappearance of the OTC network in LATAM).

This violates the following policies:

Hat of an ED - **HCO PL 22 February 1965 Issue III “Executive Director Commlines”** (sections “Reports” and “Comm Stress”);

Hat of a D/ED for D&E – **HCO PL 30 November 1982 “The Deputy CO or Deputy ED for Delivery and Exchange”**;

HCO PL 13 January 1983 “The Business of Orgs”;

HCO PL 31 January 1983 “The Reason for Orgs”;

HCO PL 1 October 1967 “Uses of Orgs”;

HCO PL 26 May 1961 Issue II “Quality Counts”.

- 2) Every staff member, apparently, has been recruited to work for the IAS to “reg” or raise funds through activities that fit the policy definition of Exchange Type 1 per **HCO PL 10 September 1982 “Exchange, Org Income and Staff Pay”** on the four types of exchange, i.e. criminal/ripoff. (This is as evidenced by the proud, almost boastful statements from the Snr. MAA CLO WUS and the CO ASHO that they spend 90% of their post time on IAS cycles [please see my KR of 20 Sep 09]). Moreover, everyone I have been in touch with while on course, from the lady at the canteen at PAC to the receptionist to the supervisors to the D/ED LAD, have all asked me for donations or directed me to briefings either for the IAS or other campaigns. Staff members are also given stiff quotas for “Library donations,” sales of Basics packages and even building purchases or renovations (see email from D/OTA IC Int [M.B.] about Basics; also this phenomena is further evidenced by emails from the FCS LAF, C.T., sending numerous requests for donations; see the Emails from C.T.). This also takes the staff member off-hat and while engaged in wearing such Donations Collections hats,

policies they should be implementing defining the purpose of their individual post hats (as per HCO PLs The Business of Orgs, Reasons for Orgs, etc.) are not being carried out.

This violates the following policies, in addition to those mentioned in the above text:
HCO PL 2 November 1970 Issue II “The Theory of Scientology Organizations”;
HCO PL 31 July 1971 “The Usual”;
HCO PL 28 May 1971 Issue II “Service and Workload” (Section on Hat Knock-off);
HCO PL 25 April 1963R Revised 29 August 1990 “Duties of a Staff Member”;
HCO PL 3 December 1971 “Exchange”;
HCO PL 10 September 1982 “Exchange, Org Income and Staff Pay”;
Third Dynamic Triangle – Admin Dictionary page 523 – “People, Service, Funds”.

- 3) The environment of the Org is hostile and aggressive, continuously asking the students/members to GIVE money, for no exchange. The org is not wearing its hat of being a friendly environment. The org is not wearing its hat of being a safe space where Dianetics and Scientology services are delivered. It has other fish to fry: getting money from public at level 1 of Exchange (“Criminal exchange”). That is its current business (as evidenced from the HCO Summons I received, based on a false KR which I was only given a copy after several requests [I received it 7 weeks after it was written; a violation of Knowledge Reports]; also based on numerous reports I received from LATAM, emails from terminals in LATAM since I have left the post of OTA IC LATAM, assisting the OT Committees; Sec ED making it mandatory to donate; false Ethics Chits for not attending a “mandatory” meeting. See attached evidence.)

This violates the following policies:

SOLVE IT WITH SCIENTOLOGY [Excerpt from **HCO PL 24 February 1964 Issue II, Org Programing**]:

“If the org slumps during this transition period, don’t engage in ‘fund raising’ or ‘selling postcards’ or borrowing money.

“Just make more income with Scientology.

“It’s a sign of very poor management to seek extraordinary solutions for finance outside Scientology. It has always failed.

“For orgs as for pcs ‘Solve It With Scientology’.

“Every time I myself have sought to solve finance or personnel in other ways than Scientology I have lost out. So I can tell you from experience that org solvency lies in More Scientology, not patented combs or fund raising barbecues.” –LRH;

HCO PL 30 May 1971 “Manners”;

HCO PL 2 September 1970 Issue II “First Policy” (“Maintain friendly relations with the environment and the public.” -LRH);

HCO PL 5 April 1965 Issue III “Scientology Makes a Safe Environment”;

LRH ED 102 Int 20 May 1970 “The Ideal Org”;

HCO PL 14 January 1969 Issue I “OT Orgs,” and many other LRH policies including the PR Series, Div 6 OEC Vol, Finance Series and others.

- 4) Staff and SO members are accepting “orders illegal and cross” from Int. management (as evidenced by previous issues; public encouraged to be routed off org lines to Flag, heavy-handed ethics actions in violation of the Justice Codes and ethics gradients, illegal campaigns [such as the IAS] not based on policy and not related to their post that are nevertheless forwarded by staff and Sea Org terminals).

This violates the following policy:

HCO PL 13 January 1979 “Orders, Illegal and Cross – How to keep out of trouble”
Also, refer to LRH references on Dev-T.

- 5) Staff and SO members are accepting a bypass and allowing middle management to be dealing directly with running the orgs and the public, particularly the OTCs and OTs in the field. Evidence: Current strategy that creates camouflaged holes by double-hatting staff as IAS regges; the implementation of a strategy to push Basics before Academy training and route people to Flag for “faster and cheaper” grades; amidst a campaign to black PR against other Class V organizations for their Basics and Grades; see FLAG magazine and Freewinds magazine, OTA Program, MV4 and the Sec ED; all these actions are in direct violation of policy and do not have any other policy (per **HCO PL 16 April 65, Issue I, KSW series 22 “The ‘Hidden Data Line’ ”** and **HCO PL/HCOB 9 February 1979R Iss II Rev 23 August 1984 “How to Defeat Verbal Tech Checklist”**) to back them up, effectively blocking staff and SO members from doing their factual, assigned per policy jobs; it also blunts and negates the actual contributions required by OTs and OTCs, to fulfill their hats as Scientologists and improve conditions.

This violates the following policies:

HCO PL 28 February 1966 “Danger Condition Data Why Organizations Stay Small”;
HCO PL 19 January 1966 III “Danger Condition Responsibilities of Declaring”;
HCO PL 30 November 1968 “OT Central Committee”.

- 6) Events to disseminate to public are being canceled or “taken over” to do “fundraising events”. The FCSs and Public Secs in the Orgs are completely off hat. The focus is fundraising events to collect money for nothing in exchange, other than for the promise of a building for which the org does not even currently qualify as it is not solvent (at least this is the case in Latam, that I have personally observed; other issues of non-qualification exist as well, see KR to COB, Nov 2008 for details).

This violates the following policies:

HCO PL 21 January 1965R “Vital Data on Promotion”;
HCO PL 10 September 1990 Issue I “The Quality of Division 6A – A Division 6A checklist for Quality” (Section “Treason Quality” Point 12);
HCO PL 10 September 1990 Issue II “The Quality of Division 6B – A Division 6B checklist for Quality” (Section “Treason Quality” Point 21);
HCO PL 21 November 1968 Issue I “Senior Policy” (“We always deliver what we promise.” -LRH);

HCO PL 23 September 1970 “Quarters, Policy Regarding Historical”.

- 7) Div 3 terminals have ceased to demand income from the org services and often staff are not paid and the orgs are often PTP'd with the usual payment of bills to keep the orgs going. The Building Fund designed by LRH is not in, and instead the money is continuously solicited from the parishioners. (See Emails from FCS LAF [C.T.], wherein she requests money from the public to pay for file folders and other materials on several occasions, implying the org cannot pay for these things itself, despite its being a “Model Ideal Org”).

This can also be deduced from the MV2 2007 event and the OTA Program this year, between the push for Basics and the re-routing of Grades public; and the block of public moving up their Academy levels through the creation of a longer runway with Basics push, has resulted in the disruption of the org's regular means of income; concurrent rise in regging for IAS, Basics, Libraries, etc. is corollary evidence that the orgs have been forced into unusual solutions, otherwise they would be doing their business as laid out by Ron.

This violates the following policies:

HCO PL 18 January 1965 “Financial Management Building Fund Account”;
HCO PL 28 May 1964 “Reorganization” (“...Solvency depends upon maximum effort by production departments and minimum wastage by any department or unit.” -LRH).

- 8) Qual Division, at a Local, Middle and Upper Management level is off-hat. As far as can be observed, it is not doing corrections as otherwise that would revert the low income, ARC broken public, earned Certs and Awards, etc. One thing we have in Scientology that is missing in most other organizations, is the element of Qual. Yet per this reference, **HCO PL 7 December 1971 Issue IV “Correction Division – Purposes, Ideal scenes, Products, Statistics”** this area is not wearing its vital hat.
- 9) OSA is not fully on post protecting the Church; bad PR (our own CLO terminals publicly promoting that “the field is disaffected” which in itself leads to disaffection, and the incorrect use of ethics); “Anonymous” groups picketing once a month or more in front of orgs, becoming a “normal” part of the scene. These are all due to the mishandlings of flaps in the orgs/field and a not-is of the actual flaps the Church is responsible for generating.

This violates the following policies:

HCO PL 13 March 1961 Iss I and Iss II “Department of Official Affairs”;
The PR Series (Mgmt Series Vol 3) including **HCO PL 21 November 1972 “How To Handle Black Propaganda”** and numerous others;
HCO PL 24 December 1966 Iss I AKH Series 10 “How to Program an Org, Saint Hill Programs.”

- 10) RTC is responsible for the safety and proper use of the trademarks of Dianetics and Scientology. This hat has not been effectively worn and has resulted in all the

confidential materials posted all over the Internet. In addition, under RTC, the trademarks and service marks of Dianetics and Scientology have been embellished to form new marks and symbols, such as the OTA program (see OTA symbol and fine print), the Basics Campaign (a combination of the Dianetics and Scientology symbols out of context), etc. This is in violation of the trust placed in RTC to keep the Tech pure. Also RTC is responsible for the correct application of the tech within Scientology and it is not doing this – As evidenced by this report there is out-tech going on and the line to correct this is broken. Given the information available to me, I can only pose the question if this could be because the “Command Intention” (COB RTC), at the top of the entire Org Board and overall responsible for the on-policy administration of the Church in its entirety, is giving orders and direction in the areas of Ethics, Tech and Admin which are in direct conflict with LRH Standard Tech as referenced in this write-up. See below for the RTC purpose, from their website rtc.org:

THE GUARANTOR OF SCIENTOLOGY'S FUTURE

The powerful technologies of Dianetics and Scientology provide nothing less than the means to attain true spiritual freedom and immortality for everyone who begins the journey toward that goal. Technology like this never existed before, and millions around the world personally regard it as valuable beyond comparison. They know that when this technology is applied precisely as written by L. Ron Hubbard — and with their honest and ethical participation — they will achieve the spiritual benefit they seek through Scientology one hundred percent of the time.

Religious Technology Center (RTC) exists to ensure that this can occur. Its purpose is to protect the public from misapplication of the technology and to see that the religious technologies of Dianetics and Scientology remain in proper hands and are properly ministered.

Monitoring and enforcing the purity of technical application, and guaranteeing standard administration is no small task. Historically, every religion has experienced periods during which growth has met with alterations of religious doctrine and practice and even outright derailment from the initial mission. Spiritual movements and religious denominations throughout the ages have suffered the destructive influences of infighting and struggles for power."

In light of the incidents in this report, this purpose above is in violation and additionally, RTC has violated the following policies:

HCO PL 12 March 1971 II “Command Intention and Your Post”;

HCO PL 18 Oct 1967 III "Policy and HCOB Alterations High Crime";

HCO PL 7 Feb 1965 "Keeping Scientology Working";

HCO PL 19 Nov 1958 "Organization" ("...no single board member or unauthorized person can alter existing policy or create new policy by the issuance of directives or instructions over his own signature."- LRH).

- 11) ED Int. is apparently not running the Church internationally, as appointed by LRH. This is evidenced by COB running the “Ideal Org” campaign. In addition, the SO1 line is cut. The replies coming back are not even signed by ED Int [G.L.] and he has no

power to correct any outpoints written up on this line. He is not wearing LRH's hat in this area, as he was entrusted by LRH to do. (See my letter to ED Int. dated 7 August 2008, and also his response, enclosed.)

This violates numerous policies including:

Admin Dictionary definition of "**SO 1 Quarterly Summary**" page 484;

Policies on the SO 1 line and on the post of ED Int including **HCO PL 20 Nov 1965RA Iss I Revised 4 May 1985 The Promotional Actions of an Organization** ("The Executive Director . . . on post and functioning to get the stats of individuals in the org up...").

- 12) The appearance is that COB RTC is running EVERY aspect of Scientology, as evidenced by staff referring to his orders as "Command Intention," his majority presence at all Int events, his spearheading all major campaigns, from "Arbitraries removed" to the "Golden Age of Tech," etc. LRH references, orders or issues defining the post are not available to parishioners, if such exist, but in the Scientology.org web site his duties are described as: "The Chairman of the Board is the most senior office in RTC and one for which David Miscavige is uniquely qualified". "RTC holds the ultimate ecclesiastical authority regarding the standard and pure application of L. Ron Hubbard's religious technologies. Religious Technology Center is not part of the management structure of the Church, nor is it involved in the Church's day-to-day affairs." This is clearly false, and is an outpoint.
- 13) The Scientology web site does not have any stats listed (per the definitions of a statistic, Hubbard Management Dictionary "1. The relative rise or fall of a quantity compared to an earlier moment in time. If a section moved ten tons last week and 12 tons this week the statistic is rising. If a section moved ten tons last week and only eight tons this week the statistic is falling. (HCO PL 30 Jan 66). 2. 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." This organization is run on stats and yet none are available for the public to view. So any claims of expansion, any actual records, any verifiable statistics or comparisons to the expansion momentum created by LRH prior to his departure, do not exist or are publicly not available for verification and are apparently based upon no actual data to back up such claims.
- 14) Public international events show PR stats, which are actually cumulative yet give the impression that the graph is going up and up. These are also mentioned so quickly one can't make out too well what is being said. There are lies (false reports) in events such as in the New Year's event 2008 the number of businesses using LRH tech was false (I was told by [public] E.T. this was the case, as they were his clients).

This violates the following policies:

HCO PL 13 August 1970 Issue II "The Missing Ingredient":

("...The more lies you use in PR the more likely it is that PR will recoil.

“Thus the law: NEVER USE LIES IN PR.

“The trouble with PR then was its lack of *reality*. A lie of course is a false reality.” -LRH);
HCO PL 2 March 1984 Rev “OW WRITE-UPS” (“...Lying is an alteration of time, place, event or form. Lying becomes alter-isness, becomes stupidity.” -LRH);

HCO PL 1 May 1965 Iss I “Staff Member Reports”.

- 15) The IAS was created for a particular reason and a particular time (I am a Founding member) according to the situation facing the Church at the time. We achieved tax exemption in 1993 in the United States thus fulfilling an original purpose. Yet the IAS continues to accumulate funds that are unaccounted for and are non-refundable and for which no new target has been established to replace the original, at least not as publicly available for all to see, apart from individual "campaigns" which are not traceable to LRH policies about the administration of the Scientology network. The IAS has placed itself ahead of Scientology by enforcing increase in membership status and demanding, for its own purposes, funds that the parishioners need to be spending instead on their own services (See Executive Directive CO CLO WUS where that was given as an order). This has cut into org income (as evidenced by empty course rooms). LRH policies from which the IAS was created or is sustained are either non-existent or not publicly available (in violation of **HCO PL 16 April 65, Issue I, KSW series 22 “The ‘Hidden Data Line’ ”**).
- 16) Library campaigns and other campaigns that the *public* has to fund are being given an importance that neither stems from nor is supported by LRH policy. Again, the Church is not wearing its hat of generating dissem lines funds using money that has come in for services, as LRH intended and set up. This violates the article, **The Auditor No. 51 1970, “What Your Donations Buy”**, which specifically refers to donations for services and which notes how portions of those funds are to handle the various needs of the organization, including legal, dissemination, and special project funds. LRH never intended for public to pay directly for any of this, nor is it justifiable by reference to any (publicly available) LRH issue. In addition there are false reports regarding these library campaigns: the books are not in every library. This is easy to verify.
- 17) Re: Super Power. Int. Management and personnel of this unit are not wearing the hat to use donations given for Super Power to set up and deliver this service. Instead those funds are being diverted and used as Int. management sees fit (one that I know of is the purchase and renovation of the Oak Cove building, as told to a public friend of mine at Flag). This is not what the money was raised for. I have been told numerous times that they will start with the service “next year” and it does not happen. I don’t believe them anymore and after donating since 2001 a total of 105+K, I feel betrayed.
- 18) The CMO (Commodore's Messenger Org) is similarly collecting funds – e.g. SuperPower and IAS regges [names omitted] are CMO staff. Policies originated

by LRH establishing the hats and functions of the CMO are not available for review and if such exist naming the collection of donations as one of those functions, this should be made clear and available to Scientology parishioners who are the target of these efforts, so long as CMO staff are going to directly interact with Scientology publics. To attempt to avoid such creates a "hidden data line" contrary to LRH policy (**HCO PL 16 April 65, Issue I, KSW series 22 "The 'Hidden Data Line' "**).

- 19) The entire Tech Division of an Org (e.g. LA org) is heavily involved in delivering "Basics". This is off hat. The "Basics" are in Div 6. Div 4 (auditing and training) is mostly unmocked while "everyone gets through their Basics". (Also reference the OTA Program 2009-2010, Major Target #2, "Work with your org to help all Scientologists through the Basics and then right onto further training and processing to move your field up The Bridge to Clear and OT." Whereas previous OT Programs separated the targets of getting people onto their Basics and getting people up The Bridge to Clear and OT.)
- 20) MAAs' requesting and demanding donations for the various campaigns; MAAs demanding these as part of eligibility checks for OT VII auditors. This is off hat and results in donations being given under duress. I experienced this during my time on OT VII and OT VIII and have heard it from others whom I encouraged to write KR's. What are the LRH policies that are being relied upon for the justification of using MAAs to enforce donations with threats and duress?

This violates the following policies:

HCO PL 7 December 1969 I "Ethics, the Design Of";
HCO PL 7 December 1969 II "The Ethics Officer, His Character"

- 21) Security guards are demanding money for the IAS while using their beingness and position to reg for the IAS. If any LRH policy exists that states this to be one of the functions of a security guard, it needs to be made public and made known to the public who have become or will become the targets of this activity. This happened to me at Flag (where I was approached by three Security guards late at night, as I was going into my room; their tone and demeanor were intimidating) and I protested it at the time. The function of the Security force ought to be, by simple observation and deduction, to protect the public and ensure the environment of the org is safe. If it is not this function, or if it also includes other purposes in interacting with the public, make the LRH reference visible to all.
- 22) The SO has the hat of putting ethics in on the planet. They are themselves largely out-ethics as they have allowed hat knock-off, violation of **HCO PL 31 July 1971 "The Usual"**, **HCO PL 7 February 1965 Keeping Scientology Working 1** and numerous references as mentioned above plus many more, policies that are the very foundation of Scientology. The responsibilities of HCO are very clear and easily available to anyone with access to OEC Vol 1 or to a course room; or just about any org staff and public, and these duties are long-standing successful actions on which the very foundation of orgs exist. As such, with the Sea Org itself in treason to its purpose, the group as a

whole cannot deliver the tech, create a safe environment for the existing public (and much less for the many more that we need to disseminate to.)

- 23) The public is also off-hat, as a result of the direction and demands of Management. For example, Scientologists with whom I am familiar, are, for the most part, broke and/or in debt. They are confused, disappointed and very unhappy. We as Scientology public are not fully wearing our hat of applying Standard Ethics, Tech and Admin across the boards so we can improve our own conditions and help others improve theirs (I am speaking for myself and for those I know and observe).
- 24) Moreover, anyone on OT VII is trapped in this vicious cycle of “Refreshers” with very tight ethics “leashes” where they have to donate way beyond what they can borrow in order to “qualify” and be allowed to stay on the level. I see this happening to friends and selectees and it is the norm for the public on this level. Additionally, a Solo NOTS auditor is never treated with the respect that an auditor deserves; what the level is doing seems to be irrelevant to staff, except for the C/S, Sups, D of Ps. Yet a Solo NOTS Auditor is doing a very important job. They often have to go off-hat by missing sessions because they have to attend numerous “mandatory meetings for OTs” or OTC demands or they are very PTP'd and have to work extra to pay off debts and this keeps them out of session. See "Executive Directive Pacifica Base ED 275 14 August 2009" Issued by CO CLO WUS as an example of this direction.
- 25) There is no Financial Tech being applied by the public; there are double standards rampant. Example: The Church wants to buy buildings 100% cash yet parishioners are expected to borrow to the max, mortgage their homes and completely violate ALL LRH financial references. This is squirrel tech. I myself have been guilty of this, as a public, violating Finance Tech numerous times while encouraged/required to do so.

This violates the following policies:

HCO PL 29 January 1965 “How to maintain Credit Standing and Solvency”;
(Attached is evidence of a senior SO member giving advice on finance/acquiring credit/debt [“Finance notes by EUS Staff B.S”] that is in direct violation of Finance Policy.)

HCO PL 2 June 1959 “A Comment on Finance”;

See also KR's on IAS Reg interviews, enclosed.

- 26) Publics J.P. and M.P. and family (KR's enclosed in this packet) have been the effect of a criminal exchange sit with the Caracas Org for non-payment of rent of their property for over 8 years. This continues despite numerous reports by them and me to Int. terminals, including FBO Int. and IJC, who have not been wearing their hats by not resolving this cycle.

This violates the following policies:

HCO PL 12 October 1982 “Corrupt Activities”;

HCO PL 23 December 1965RB “Suppressive Acts, Suppression of Scientology and Scientologists”.

27) LRH quotes are taken out of context completely, to make it look like LRH needs every parishioner to pay for everything the org needs, specifically buildings. This is a fraudulent use of Source and it is done with the intention to manipulate. It is actually twisted to give a message that in most cases is the exact opposite of what LRH intended.

As an example, below is a quote that was emailed to me by Pasadena Org to collect money for their building/“Ideal Org” (It was also sent out by Bridge in this abbreviated form):

"What is important is how much service you can give the world and how much you can get done and how much better you can make things. These are important things. These are all that are important. A bank account never measured the worth of a man. His ability to help measured his worth and that's all. A bank account can assist one to help but where it ceases to do that it becomes useless."

-L. Ron Hubbard, Anatomy of the Human Mind Congress, The Genus of Dianetics and Scientology

Here is the quote with the paragraph above it included, with the point of the actual message which was to *not* focus on purchasing buildings!

"We own a tremendous amount of property. We own a tremendous amount of material, and so forth. And it keeps growing. But that's not important. When buildings get important to us, for God's sake, some of you born revolutionists, will you please blow up central headquarters. If someone had put some HE [High Explosive] under the Vatican long ago, Catholicism might still be going. Don't get interested in real estate. Don't get interested in the masses of buildings, because that's not important."

"What is important is how much service you can give the world and how much you can get done and how much better you can make things. These are important things. These are all that are important. A bank account never measured the worth of a man. His ability to help measured his worth and that is all. A bank account can assist one to help but where it ceases to do that it becomes useless."

-L. Ron Hubbard, Anatomy of the Human Mind Congress, The Genus of Dianetics and Scientology

This is a blatant alteration and it is RTC's job to ensure the tech is not altered or misused. They are not wearing their hat. It is also a Tech Degrade to take LRH materials out of context. (**HCO PL 17 June 1970RB1 “Technical Degrades” Point #10**). (It is also an outpoint from the **Data Series**, i.e. FALSEHOOD, which, if one were counting outpoints, has been a very prevalent outpoint in the count thus far.). And of course, per the LRH reference above, it is a major outpoint to allow this illegal real estate acquisition campaign the Church management is engaged in, especially with parishioner funds. This is RTC and ED Int off-hat and out-KSW.

28) FSO is taking public from Class V Orgs to deliver grades. This is not Flag's hat and bypasses and puts in Danger Class V Orgs. (Additionally, it is the third Major Target of the current OTA Program to reroute public worldwide from their local Org to Flag: "3. Send Scientologists in your field who need their grades to Flag and take full advantage of the 50 newly trained auditors [my emphasis] who will get the public in your field through their Grades at lightning speed." It is also a Tech Degrade to refer to the grades being done "at lightning speed" (Point #8 **HCO PL 17 June 1970RB1 "Technical Degrades"**) and creates a PR flap that Flag-trained auditors worldwide have been somehow delivering "substandard" Grades processes in their local orgs.

HCO PL 10 September 1990 Issue I "The Quality of Division 6A – A Division 6A checklist for Quality" – Section "Treason Quality". "A Division 6A of this type will strangle the Org due to lack of new public inflow. Unusual solutions will be used to get new public onto services such as attempts to sign up raw public for out-gradient training or processing or taking public from lower orgs who have not completed their services". **See also point # 32.**

In conclusion, **HCO PL 23 December 1965RB "Suppressive Acts, Suppression of Scientology and Scientologists"** states: "Additionally, a crime, if severe and of magnitude, harmful to many and committed repeatedly, can be reclassified as a High Crime."

Then, **HCO PL 7 March 1965RA Issue II "Offenses and Penalties"** has as a crime "**Treasonable neglect**" which is a crime that can be reclassified as a suppressive act.

While the above information can be ignored by some and dismissed by others who will say it is information from personnel who hold a viewpoint labeled "disaffected", there are honest people in Scientology too, people who will recognize that something is direly wrong, that too many things don't add up. My information is miniscule compared to all the data there is. Yet my comm lines are wide and open and there are no hidden influences in the observations made above or to the LRH policy references cited for comparison to the current scene. There are valid concerns communicated herein and these concerns are neither insignificant nor will they "go away" just because someone may see fit to trash this report. Things are not right nor am I the only one to see it.

It is my sincere hope that the above information is used for the purposes of improving the scene in the Church of Scientology.

This is true,
Mary Jo Leavitt