HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF MARCH 17, 1965
ISSUE II

HCO (DIVISION 1)

ETHIC

FAIR GAME LAW

ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPRESSIVE ACTS

THE SOURCE OF THE FAIR GAME LAW

The reason a democracy or any wide open group caves in lies in its extending its privileges of membership to those who seek to destroy it.

The idiocy of doing so is plain. When a person announces he is no longer part of a group, he has rejected the group. He has also rejected its codes and rules. Of course he has also rejected the protection to which he was entitled as a group member.

Democracy always faces this problem and so far never solved it. The constitution of the US permits people to refuse to testify if it would incriminate them (5th Amendment). Yet it sits by in courts letting people who are pledged to overthrow the government yet use their privilege to invoke the 5th Amendment. Idiocy is the right word for it. It does not make sense to extend the protection of the group to the person seeking to destroy the group. That's like encouraging a disease.

Hence we have a Fair Game Law.

If a group member rejects the group, he rejects everything about the group and no further question about that. Certainly there is no question in his or her mind of salvaging or helping the group. Why should the group then seek to extend its protection over him unless it wants to defy its first right: that of survival.

So, in Scientology, anyone who rejects Scientology also rejects, knowingly or unknowingly the protection and benefits of Scientology and the companionship of Scientologists. If the person never was a member of the group or if the person had been a member of it, the result is the same.

A suppressive person, wishing to work more damage, is the first one to cry for the protection of Ethics.

We have the weird humanoid situation of the ex prime minister of England having to go to court to defend his election against a Communist whose first principle is the destruction of the British Government and Courts.

We have many modern instances of this.

At last dismayed at the havoc made, a government goes savage and wipes out the rights of its citizens in order to get at a few criminals. Thus even the government betrays its people at last if it has not mastered the principle that he who rejects the group also rejects everything about the group.

Scientologists deserve protection from psychotics and criminals, from suppressive persons and covert or overt acts. Scientology protection is getting more and more real and within a year or two will be quite adequate for anyone.

Now if we carry forward the deadly disease of stupidly refusing to recognize, when somebody wants to do us in, that we must at least refuse to help him do it, someday Scientology Orgs will start reducing various rights of Scientologists to decent treatment and fair play.

Any reduction we may have experienced already stems from efforts to bring order when faced with suppressive conduct. Lacking methods and limits everyone becomes fair game. Thus let us fix the matter up before it upsets our forward progress.

A person who publicly rejects the group is no longer a member of the group.

ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPRESSIVE ACTS

Students or pcs who seek to resign or leave courses or sessions and refuse to return despite normal efforts, become suppressive of that course or organization and cease to have the rights of its protection or assistance. If they can be brought to recant after causing public commotion the procedure given in HCO Pol Ltr. Mar. 7 1965 Issue II A to E is applicable.

HCO is at once called in on the matter. And although HCO, as in any case where physical disturbance is possible, may deputize any staff member or members temporarily to assist, no Division 2 staff may assist further than following the instructions of the HCO personnel to restrain or fetch the person or persons and stand by while HCO carries out the required steps.

It should be remembered however that course and session blows result from technical failures and the more ordinary action is to catch the ARC Break early and to handle the ARC Break.

Where a staff member or executive publicly resigns in protest or with intent to suppress HCO may act at once with steps A T E, HCO Pol. Ltr. Mar. 7, 1965 Issue II.

In neither case may certificate cancellation or the Fair Game Law be invoked unless the student or pc blow or the public resignation also includes a threat to leave Scientology.

No publication as per B where no threat to leave Scientology is included may go further than the group which witnessed the matter, but in this case it must be published on their public bulletin board for three days and no longer.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw:et.mek

(Re-copied as per Sec Ed #68)