

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 2 JUNE 1965

Gen Non-Remimeo

HCO DIV 1
ETHICS SECTION

WRITING OF AN ETHICS ORDER

When writing an Ethics Order, don't ARC Break its *readers* by leaving out the data.

Don't create a mystery. Example of Wrong phrasing: "Woody McPheeters is declared a Suppressive Person. He stopped a student from coming on course." That leaves out all the data. Leaves questions – *Where* did it happen? Is it in our area? What did he do? Who did he do it to? What's the evidence? Correct Example: "WOODY McPHEETERS in Baltimore, U.S.A. is declared a Suppressive Person. On (date) he discouraged Fred Fairchild from taking the Saint Hill Course by writing to him lies about the course, well known by said McPheeters to be false statements. Evidence: Letter from McPheeters dated --- to --- now available in Ethics Files. Charge: Suppression of a Scientologist and barring his way to Release and Clear. Findings by former evidence of course record and this: Suppressive Person. All Certs etc."

Don't be unspecific or you leave people in a huge mystery.

Ethics Orders are supposed to run group engrams out, not in!

Always put in what you know, nothing you don't know, and only what you have evidence or witnesses for. Ethics Orders are issued on real data, not opinion.

WHAT THEY DID

Don't issue orders saying "made derogatory statements about Ron," or "suppressed Scientology." Obviously that's quite impossible as a charge.

1. No statement could possibly injure Ron. It's quite impossible to "spoil Ron's reputation" or "upset Ron" by some suppressive utterance. Ethics weren't made to defend Ron. Statements "about Ron" are just indications of suppression. This is never used in an Ethics Order. Just omit statements or charges about Ron.

2. Suppressives can only restim people's banks. They have no power at all. To infer one could do much to Scientology is silly.

All such charges are based on a Suppressive's actions against other persons and Scientologists or groups. These can be restimulated and can be made to wobble about. Some man forbidding his wife auditing is pronounced Suppressive "for forbidding his wife auditing on date ---- by ----."

PTS

The Potential Trouble Source is also named as to why and with what Suppressive Person he or she is connected.

Often no Ethics Order is issued on a PTS. They disconnect at once when the Suppressive is named.

THE RIGHT SUPPRESSIVE

Always find the right Suppressive or *all* the Suppressives in examining and declaring a PTS.

If you name the wrong one or err in that it's a group not a person the PTS won't disconnect.

If you name the real person or group the PTS gets a meter blow down, sighs with relief and disconnects.

Suppressive Persons or groups deal in such generalities, the PTS is often quite blind to the real one.

Be very careful here. It's the only way to goof handling a PTS.

LABELLING

Never be afraid to issue orders that label somebody an SP if you have the real evidence.

If you label them you get them back in some day. If you don't label them, they are *far* more likely to vanish forever.

Labelling them is a kind action.

If you are frightened of civil suits because of an Ethics Order, just remember to issue them only when you have the evidence.

CIVIL ACTIONS

Ethics *can* handle any Civil Action amongst Scientologists.

Two data are the Biggest Senior data in Law:

1. IF YOU DON'T PROVIDE *FAST, CHEAP* JUSTICE, PEOPLE WILL TAKE IT INTO THEIR OWN HANDS AND WRECK ONE ANOTHER;
2. LAWS CAN ONLY BE ENFORCED, IF THEY SPRING FROM THE CUSTOMS AND HABITS OF A PEOPLE.

Good Scientologists swarm in under Ethics. Bad ones howl. The good ones comprise 80%. The bad ones comprise 20%. The majority rules. We have Ethics.

Civil Actions are what the group demands. By *Civil* is meant disputes—marriages, separations, settlements, child care, money owed, that sort of thing.

We must handle these. Fairly. It's done by an Ethics Order Convening an Ethics Hearing naming the parties and purpose. It summons them to a person appointed to Hear it, a time and a place. The hearer decides what's to be done between or amongst them.

But this *firm policy exists*:

NO CIVIL MATTER IN AN ETHICS HEARING MAY BE DECIDED BY RECOURSE TO TECHNOLOGY.

There is no "get processed" finding in a Civil Ethics Hearing. Or an "until processed." The decision is made *there* and *then* on its own merits and no dependency on tech.

All Civil matters in writing an Ethics Order are headed CIVIL HEARING.

This removes the idea the disputants are in trouble with Ethics. They aren't. They're in trouble with each other. Say so. And what kind of trouble and how much and who is suing who.

Write a nice informative Ethics Order. Don't leave anyone in mystery. Mysteries cause trouble and the purpose of Ethics is PEACE IN WHICH WE CAN GET IN TECHNOLOGY.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mh.cden
Copyright © 1965
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED