

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Remimeo HCO POLICY LETTER OF 10 MARCH 1982
All Staff REISSUED 20 JUNE 1986
Ethics
Officers (Also issued as an
Auditors HCOB, same date)
Case Supervisors

(Reissued 20 June 1986 to correct
a typographical error in the signatory)

CONFESSIONALS - ETHICS REPORTS REQUIRED

Ref: HCO PL 2 Apr 65 URGENT URGENT URGENT,
FALSE REPORTS
HCO PL 1 May 65 STAFF MEMBER REPORTS
HCO PL 17 Jun 65 STAFF AUDITOR ADVICES
HCO PL 7 Mar 65R III OFFENSES & PENALTIES
Rev. 24.10.75
HCO PL 16 May 80 II ETHICS, SUPPRESSIVE ACTS,
SUPPRESSION OF SCIENTOLOGY
& SCIENTOLOGISTS
HCO PL 5 Mar 68 JOB ENDANGERMENT CHITS
HCO PL 24 Feb 69 JUSTICE

It has recently been noticed that there was an omission on the part of ministers doing Confessionals: they were not writing reports to Ethics on matters relating to the offenses of others that were revealed during a Confessional. Doing so, is required per HCO PL 17 Jun 65 STAFF AUDITOR ADVICES and is implicit in HCO PL 2 Apr 65 URGENT URGENT URGENT, FALSE REPORTS and in HCO PL 1 May 65 STAFF MEMBER REPORTS.

Apparently this was due to a failure to differentiate between a pc "getting off" only other people's withholds and a pc revealing knowledge of another's overt or crime against Scientology, its organizations or Scientologists.

A person who only talks about others' overts or withholds is often withholding an overt of his own or engaging in a black PR campaign.

But a person who has knowledge of another's overts or crimes against Scientology should have made out an ethics report himself and having failed to do so, would have a withhold of knowing about another's offense and not having reported it, even if it were only suspected.

There are various reasons why a person might withhold from reporting the offenses of another: similar overts or withholds of one's own; fear of consequences or retaliation from the person being reported on; not having all the facts and so only suspecting the offense and not being certain enough, are among more common reasons.

None of these are valid because a staff member can only be disciplined for making a knowing false report or for a no report. And if the matter is only suspected, the report should say so and it is the Ethics Officer's hat to investigate and determine the facts.

Thus, when a minister discovers that a pc has knowledge of an overt or crime against Scientology or against the codes of the Church but has not reported the matter to Ethics, this should be handled as a withhold and must be the subject of an ethics report. This applies both to HCO Confessionals and to any other session.

OFFENSES AGAINST SCIENTOLOGY OR ITS CODES BY ANOTHER PERSON THAN THE PC, MUST BE REPORTED TO ETHICS FOR INVESTIGATION (EVEN IF ONLY SUSPECTED OR WHEN FULL FACTS ARE NOT KNOWN).

This is important because persons who get off their own overts have a higher responsibility level than those who don't and these last, who don't get off their overts, are sometimes only detectable and handleable by the reports of others.

The more serious the ethics offense, the more necessary and vital it is that such reports be made. Failure to make such a report can result in the pc (or staff member) being named as an accessory or at least being charged with condoning the offense.

There is another side to this. Some pcs, viciously, can begin a black PR campaign against another by "getting off the other's withholds" which are false.

Some people unfortunately, can be very wily and spread all sorts of rumours or trouble in this way. Doing so is the very lifeblood of such criminal organizations as the FBI and Interpol.

So the minister reporting all overts reported by the pc serves a triple purpose.

- A. It catches actual crimes by others which might otherwise remain undetected.
- B. It gets rid of withholds from the pc which he knows he should have reported and
- C. It gives evidence of a black PR campaign in progress against principal people of Scientology and executives.

The use that the Ethics Officer puts these reports to is very precise.

They are:

In case of (A) he can at once investigate and sec check the others named and get Ethics in.

In the case of (C) he can order a full rollback of the rumour or report and usually catch a real tiger operating in an org or area with black PR designed to paralyze the place.

So the reports are VERY valuable.

An honest executive would be very foolish to discourage these from being filed and even more foolish not to make sure they get fully followed up and investigated.

Doing this is a heavy blow to criminals and to the enemy who seek to stop Scientology.

For instance, finance crimes cannot occur without collaboration or someone noticing.

Black PR with its false reports is covering up real withholds and overts, which, remaining undetected, can cave the whole place in.

A person can be helped by Scientology only when he has clean hands with it. One cannot be helped by it when he has overts against it, its principal names or organizations.

So this policy assists greatly, not only in protecting execs but in saving people. It must NOT be looked on as a way to victimize anyone. It is an instrument of salvage.

And on an organizational strata, no org can prosper when its staff has overts. Recent investigation has shown that below EVERY outness in an org or down stat there lay heavy withholds and overts. The many should not be penalized by the criminal few.

By following these policies, ethics investigations will be speeded, statistics raised and a much cleaner, happier and more productive environment will be achieved. Only the guilty will ever protest such reports and that, too, is an indicator for urgent action.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Adopted as Official
Church Policy by
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL