

## Declaration of independence from the Church of Scientology

My name is Stefan Tunedal. English is not my first language so there might be some incorrect use of english. This declaration is available in swedish.

In 1979 I was introduced to L Ron Hubbard's philosophy Scientology. I have nothing but good words to say about this philosophy. The philosophy is one thing. This declaration concerns the church only.

I can not claim that I have nothing to do with the acts of this church for as long as I remain a member. My membership shows that I accept what is going on. But I don't accept it! So I leave.

The church has been changing into something that I can not support. These are the main things for now:

### *1) The Sea Org offloads parents, resulting in abortions*

I really digged what I was reading, texts written by Hubbard about children, parenting and family. These questions were important to me, always wanting a big family myself and I still consider mothers to be true heroes of our time. Hubbard always showed a special care towards children.

The Sea Org is the organisation withing the church which has the responsibility for the philosophy and the establishment of the organisation with all its parts.

Then in 1986 there was this order saying that Sea Org staff could not remain in the organisation if they became with a child.

Somebody told me about this order back in that time and I was not feeling comfortable with it, not at all - it was like something hit me in the chest. I realized that Hubbard had nothing to do with it but the fact that somebody, some people, brought this idea forward, making it a rule, this was a blow against my respect for the organisation.

I talked to someone about this, about my perception of it, and this person suggested I should find out more about the order. I did want to understand so I contacted a higher staff in personnel at the Clearwater base, arranging for a meeting in his office. It was hard to talk to him and I found it even hard to look at him. We did talk but he was quiet and seemed suspicious towards me and my questions, he was moving his head to one side as he talked. He also refused to show me the order, saying that it was only for staff. That's where I stopped asking questions about this. I closed my eyes on it, but through the years I have been reminded of this order, each time reacting as if I was touching an electric fence.

Recently I studied testimonies saying that this order was responsible for abortions with staff in the Sea Org (reference 1a + 1b.)

Considering these testimonies I feel bad, bad because I didn't follow through back there in 1986. I had a bad taste in my mouth and I didn't do more, should have done more with my distaste against this destructive order against children, should have made a scene and probably I would have been kicked out because of it. This would have made me feel more proud today. Now, 24 years later, I am facing this. Better late than never.

When I first heard of the order I couldn't imagine this would cause women to do abortions. Now, today, I realize that this was to be expected, as it sure did.

Certainly there are different views on this parent offload order. Myself I cannot accept it, find *no* excuses for it.

Just recently I received an email from the Clearwater base, asking me when I was going back there for study. I replied saying that I may consider returning when staff again are allowed to become parents and still keep their jobs.

### *A woman in Copenhagen*

An example of how this offload order strikes against life is about a young woman who is sent to Clearwater from Copenhagen for training. The plan was that she should return to work in the Copenhagen church when the training was completed. She was on training for a very long time, years, and when she returned to Copenhagen she started working, fell in love with a man, married him and became pregnant. She decided that she wanted to keep the baby and the father supported this. Because of this they both had to leave staff, which they did.

I overheard some vulgar criticism against this woman's act, basically saying that she was irresponsible and even clumsy as she received all this training and then got pregnant, and it was even suggested that she got pregnant on purpose to get away from working. (After listening to this critique I told the person to get lost, as I couldn't take it listening to this talk.)

The offload rule was not created by Hubbard. I am certain Hubbard would, if he was alive, throw out those responsible for implementing it. Hubbard had kids of his own and he would *never* ask others working for him to give up children. It is no surprise then that those people behind this order waited for Hubbard to leave before they posted it. This is my view, based on what I know of Hubbard and the things he wrote to improve the lives of babies, children and parents.

The future will probably show us just how destructive that order is. I believe it has devastating consequences. You hear about bad karma - this is bad karma, I think.

### *The offloading parents-rule still exists*

I checked and it was confirmed just a week ago that this rule still exists. This situation alone is sufficient for my decision about independence.

Rhetorical question: Considering that Scientology is so clearly positive towards children, parenting and survival, how is the individual staffmember convinced about living life without children?

## **2) *The "rehabilitation of staffmembers"***

In the mid 80:ies, at the Clearwater base, I saw staffmembers running around wearing blue t-shirts. I was wondering who they were and what they were doing. I ran into a few of them on the base and noticed that they didn't look directly at me - looking down into the ground - very unusual.

They were part of a "Rehabilitation Project Force" (RPF) And the information about them was told, this was no secret.

They were staffmembers who did some mistakes on post and was assigned to this project to get rehabilitated. While being on the RPF they couldn't talk to others but only to those who were themselves on the same project. They did manual work on the grounds

and part of the time they did study. And they could not look at you directly.

With this information alone I found it hard to accept this but it got worse: Some of them spent years on this project! Further so; those who were married was not allowed to meet their spouse for the duration of the project.

I remember a man in his fifties, I saw him a few times around the base and I was impressed by him, his proud posture, the way he was working. He was forced to labor and study things others told him to, from the time he got up in the morning until he went to bed, with very short breaks. He was not permitted to speak to others, was not permitted to experience romance or sex, not to meet with his wife, if he had one, not to eat dinner with some good friends. And this was going on for years, maybe! This was a man who already gave up having children and luxury so that he could make a difference somehow, I mean he was not planning robberies. Life in the Sea Org was tough as it was and he was choosing this life. Why treat him like a criminal? Are we back in the 18<sup>th</sup> century? I was figuring this guy should easily be capable of being responsible for any mistake he made in the past and get back to his work with pride. I was absolutely seeing this RPF as punishment and nothing but punishment. This is limited free time, supervision, bad food, limited meeting of others etc. (ref #2.)

Is this Scientology? No, I found out later, this project existed by name when Hubbard was around *but* it had none of this sadistic treatment of people, and it was a short program of 2-5 weeks. As far as I can see, the old RPF was aimed for rehabilitation with respect for the person.

RPF was redesigned – it is new, unwanted and mentally brutal treatment of people.

I am incapable of supporting a group dealing in this treatment of people.

Rhetorical question: A rehabilitation program that looks like a punishment, designed for staffmembers who are not criminal, is this about obedience at all?

### 3) Fundraising

I saw more and more of fundraising, starting in the early 90:ies. Instinctively this turned my stomach. I also knew there was no such recommendation in texts, but to make sure I did as I normally do; I wrote a letter to management. Got a reply saying this was ok, fundraising is ok, giving no actual reference on why they did what they did.

Personally I had stayed away from fundraisers as if they were dogs with rabies. The only one I attended, not knowing what to expect, lasted until after 3 in the night (I left at 1, I think.) This meeting was disturbing; there was a guy standing by a board, writing down the donations on it, while the speaker told us how badly they were treating us in Germany, how he started to cry when he understood how evil it was (I believe he actually cried on stage.) He also told us, the audience, that we were there because we got it, and that those who were not there were the ones who didn't get it – or they would be there, right? (Is this making any sense at all?)

As much as I was frustrated about what was going on in Germany, I still couldn't make myself to donate – there was something very wrong here and I just couldn't do it.

I looked around the room and I could see there were others who was looking weird, as if their faces had been bashed in. They were looking the way I was feeling. I wanted to get out and eventually I did. As I walked to the exit I was *not* feeling guilty – only strange and shaken, as if I had just seen the movie *Shining*.

From what I could observe, these events became quite unpopular with time. The church searched for new ways to get a crowded house and I remember me and my wife

being invited to a wedding. The couple are good friends so of course we wanted to attend.

The wedding was beautiful but when it was done we could see the organizers making a shift on stage and it turned into a fundraiser. (Is this taste?) We left before they got started. A few days later a report arrived complaining about us leaving before the event was finished. The report was written by a church executive.

#### 4) *The files*

The organisation is gathering documents about each member, putting them in folders. One of these folders deal with your behaviour - you will find commendations and complaints about the person. This folder is called the ethics file.

When I first heard about these files I wasn't thinking much about it. The purpose was, as I understood it, to reveal members who spread bad rumors, did criminal acts etc.

Lately I see things differently, as this system with ethics files, I think, became a weapon in the hands of management. So what will happen if you find yourself with a bad management? And another thing: It seemed to me that the file will be used differently depending on who you are in the organisation. Of course I can be wrong.

What if management uses the file contents to trash those who leave? (ref #3) This *would* be a weapon, I think.

Anybody can write a complaint on another member and there is no real need for a copy to be sent to the person in question. The church will put the complaint in the file. I haven't checked but I am quite certain that the complaint that me and my wife received on the wedding matter is there in my ethics file.

My ex-wife wrote a report on me just after our divorce in 1992. She was not happy with me and this complaint was quite something to read - she didn't like me. But it wasn't until many years later that I found out about the report. It had been sent to I'm not sure how many terminals and when I finally got hold of a copy then I got quite upset. I tried for a long time to get some redemption and correction to her letter but I gave it up. It seemed impossible to get some justice and I actually never saw any proof that church people ever read my letters asking for some investigation or withdrawal. There was practically *no* reaction. My ex-wife's past ideas about me is there to see and it will not matter if she changes her mind about me, as may well happen after some time passing - that letter will probably still be there when I drop my body. Who likes this? Who wants to be remembered by your ex-wife's opinion about you?

If there is such a system with ethics files, I think this calls for extraordinary high level of responsibility with those controlling and handling them. *And* we need God-like leaders.

#### 5) *Lies*

Looking at reports from management I get an impression of extraordinary expansion. See for instance a recent issue of the Freedom magazine (reference 4). Being involved in this, listening to the news, I became puzzled because I was seeing a shrinking church. I tried to explain this to myself saying that the expansion was happening elsewhere, maybe in the eastern Europe and I was quite certain this was the case, so I stopped looking for some time. The thought of having a management who made it up, this idea was absurd. But something didn't fit the picture and I started to research to find this expansion. Not that I spent much effort on this, still I am convinced there is no real expansion going on.

So management is lying? I believe so.

## *Summary*

By facing these acts committed by the Church of Scientology, writing about them, I show to everybody that I don't accept it. In spirit I removed my support back in the early 90:ies but it had to come to this; a physical door shut and a clearly stated ending of membership.

Stefan Tunedal  
Skogås, 12 jan 2010

## References

#1a (abortions) <http://markrathbun.wordpress.com/2010/01/07/samantha-sam-domingo-uk-independent/>

#1b (abortions) <http://www.scientology-cult.com/videos/steve-hall-videos.html>

#2 (RPF) <http://www.scientology-cult.com/the-rpfs-rpf.html>

#3 (file contents to media) <http://www.scientology-cult.com/paul-haggis.html>

#4 (lies?) [http://www.freedommag.org/sites/default/files/special-edition/freedom\\_magazine.pdf](http://www.freedommag.org/sites/default/files/special-edition/freedom_magazine.pdf)

#5 (about numbers) <http://www.robertdam-cos.dk/Letter%20to%20ED%20Int.PDF>