

## York students join Scientology protest



By [Henry James Foy](#), Editor (2008/09)  
Wednesday 20 February 2008

University of York students joined an international protest against the Church of Scientology last weekend. The protest, which was organised by the internet campaign group Anonymous, took place outside the York branch of the Church on Sunday.

"Today's protest is to raise awareness in the public mind and, indeed, inside scientology itself as to what the organisation is doing," said a protesting student, who wished to remain anonymous. He referenced practices such as "child labour, the use of copyright laws in a religious context, and the aggressive tactics they use to suppress free speech of their members" as reasons for his participation.

"This is not a protest against the religion, anyone can practice that if they wish, this protest is against the Church of Scientology - the large corporate entity which is not about religion, but which takes millions and millions of their followers' money every year to bring them salvation," the protestor added.

The peaceful protest, which took place opposite the Scientology building in Mather House, on Hull Road, attracted around 30 protesters. Many were holding placards with messages for passing motorists such as "Britons against the 'church' of Scientology" and "Scientology is a CULT".

Graeme Wilson, Church of Scientology Public Affairs Director, labelled the protestors as "terrorists". "‘Anonymous’ is perpetrating religious hate crimes against Churches of Scientology and individual Scientologists for no reason other than religious bigotry. Religious bigotry of any nature is deplorable and profoundly affects the entire community. The terrorist crimes of ‘Anonymous’ should be condemned," he said.

The official Anonymous video, posted on YouTube, states: "[Anonymous] has decided that your organisation should be destroyed. For the good of your followers, for the good of mankind, we shall expel you from the Internet and systematically dismantle the Church of Scientology."

The video goes on to call the Church "a serious opponent," and states that they are "prepared for a long, long campaign." "Your methods, hypocrisy, and the artlessness of your organisation have sounded its death knell," it continues.

However, a member of the group posted on an internet forum: "Anonymous bears no ill-will to the followers of Scientology, nor do we have any nefarious plans to go against their beliefs. Anonymous simply opposes the practices of the Church of Scientology - not the establishment itself."

The York student agreed with these aims, saying "[Anonymous] saw that the most effective way of doing that was to come out here, get away from the internet, and spread information, because that is what the Church of Scientology fears the most."

Wilson was unfazed by the protesters: "The actions of ‘Anonymous’ will not interrupt the Church's normal activities of serving its parishioners and the community, and the Church is working in coordination with the police to minimize the negative impact of this terrorist group."



The York branch of the Church, the 14th in Britain, opened last summer. Its website boasts “a full array of Life Improvement Courses, Dianetics stress testing, workshops and counselling.”

The date of the protest was chosen by Anonymous to mark the death of Lisa McPherson, an American scientologist who, it is alleged by Anonymous, died at the hands of the Church following a car accident.

While the protest in York attracted only a small number of Anonymous members, protests took place outside Scientology locations all over the world.

An estimated 200 people assembled at the Church’s headquarters in Blackfriars in London, while around 150 gathered in a protest in Edinburgh. Protests took place around the world including larger demonstrations in Sydney and New York. Most protests went ahead peacefully and without incident.



---

## 37 comments

Anonymous

20 Feb '08 at 5:15 pm

“The official Anonymous video, posted on YouTube”

There is no ‘official’ anything with anonymous. You have misunderstood the concept.

[▲ Report](#)

---

ANON4Ever

20 Feb '08 at 6:30 pm

WOW excellent and very fair coverage by a journalist who did his homework. You sir will go far in your profession!

[▲ Report](#)

---

banonymous

20 Feb '08 at 6:39 pm

It seems to me that Mr. Wilson is doggedly throwing the terms “religious bigotry” and “terrorist” around without hearing what Anonymous is saying. We had peaceful protests in 93 cities across the world, and nearly 10,000 participants.

If there is any doubt that Scientology brainwashes its members, one need look no further than Mr. Wilson’s statements.

We have clearly stated that we do not object to Scientology’s beliefs, but rather its abusive and destructive acts against members and critics. However, Scientology representatives worldwide have regurgitated the same, identical non-sequitur garbage about “religious persecution.”

The only incidents which occurred were perpetrated by Scientology members against Anonymous participants. And they call us “terrorists?”

Terrorists fly airplanes into crowded buildings and bomb subways. They have no qualms about wasting human life to further their goals. Scientology’s use of that term minimizes real terroristic acts, and I find it offensive.

Anonymous is not a terrorist group. Anonymous wishes to improve the world by halting the abuse, the menacing, the fraud perpetrated by this criminal organisation posing as a religion.

[▲ Report](#)

---

David Miscarriage

20 Feb '08 at 7:43 pm

To Anonymous-san #1, Anonymous doesn't have any official anything, but we are mostly gathering behind that video as a flag of sorts.

While there are no official videos, the "most official" videos are  
Message to Scientology - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JCbKv9yiLiQ>

Code of Conduct for any planning the next protest, on March 15th:  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-063clxiB8I>

And the project for April, Operation Reconnect  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4Dj67TXxrmM>

March 15th is the date of the next worldwide protest.

 Report

---

bgodley

20 Feb '08 at 8:20 pm

Recently I have posted several comments regarding a few reports such as these discussing the merits of Anonymous and the claims of Scientology being an "evil cult". There are so many lies, alterations, insinuations and antagonisms that I find it hard to choose which to address. I could easily write a mini-novel addressing both the actual facts of the case and the philosophy, intention and results of the various activities discussed here.

By the very level of rumour and sometimes vicious claims asserted by Anonymous and like minded critics one must climb over a mountain of prejudism and bias to establish any degree of fair assesment. Unfortunately, and more as a comment on human nature, there are those who get swept up in a propoganda campaign lacking certain tools of evaluation so as to inspect the truth of a claim.

When one is truly trying to decide the merit of two opposing groups, you must first brush aside all bias and rumor as this goes along way into affecting the outcome of a decision. You then have to ascertain what the actual intentions of the group are followed by the statistics or real world effect that is being created.

In the case of groups like Anonymous and other anti-Scientology proponents you must first determine the intention. Well the intention is clear by the vidoes they produce and the sites they refer to ... the wholesale destruction of Scientology. Some claims of "we're against the Church not the doctrine" is all pretense. There are numerous comments and sites that not only attack the church but the validity of anything Hubbard authored or anyone connected to it - Tom Cruise being the biggest example. Their intention is thus to destroy a thing and not create a thing. No endeavor in history, no matter how loudly professed, has ever forwarded mankind by only destroying and not creating. There are those who build and those who criticize those who build for building wrong. There are many reasons one could suppose for a destruction only message. Easily it is the safest route for you don't have to defend any creation of your won you only have to destroy or allude to the unworkability of someone else's.

Now let's examine the real world results of their actions. They have illegally hacked Church websites, made violent threats against Scientologists and other more ill guided actions. Their message or "awareness" campaign is to supposedly draw attention to the multitude of heinous activities of the Church and destroy it while magically safeguarding the Scientologist's right to have a Church to practice their philosophy. The hypocrisy is flagrant if one wishes to really examine.

What is lost on them in their effort to "help" Scientologists from the "evil church" is that their brand of help is not needed or desired by the actual Scientologists themselves. What their actions do result in for the parishoners is annoyance, upset, inflaming trouble in their personal lives among friends and family,

and the need to overcome a stigma as an adherent to a “dangerous cult”. There is no beneficial result here. So it would be wise for any reading this to do follow the same examination.

- 1) Inspect by brushing aside all bias and rumor.
- 2) What are the intentions and activities of that group?
- 3) What are the results and real world accomplishments?
- 4) Decide if it should be helped or harmed.

[▲ Report](#)

---

Anonymous

20 Feb '08 at 8:49 pm

There is a misquote in this article

“we shall expel you from the Internet and systematically dismantle the Church of Scientology in its present form.”

You left out the most important part; [we will] dismantle the Church of Scientology **in its present form .**” As a corrupt, money-grubbing corporation, the Church will be dismantled. As a faithful religious practice, we want it to continue.

[▲ Report](#)

---

Alizon

20 Feb '08 at 11:46 pm

You know I've been reading these “we're not prejudiced” comments about people who are saying they don't mind if Scientologists do their thing, it's just their church they want to destroy. Hello? Let's translate this: “I don't have anything about Catholics, I just want to bomb the Vatican.” Sorry.

[▲ Report](#)

---

Joxe Arkaitz

21 Feb '08 at 12:48 am

Scientology helped me overcome a depression more than 20 years ago and since then, they have helped me improve my life in every aspect I wanted. Everytime I went to the Church I got help. They have also helped my mother and many of my friends. They have a technology that works, based in solid wise principles about life, the mind and the spirit. I find it very sad that some people attack a movement that makes so much good in the world instead of helping it expand and help more people. Really sad...

[▲ Report](#)

---

anon

21 Feb '08 at 2:53 am

well written and fair. But the London protest had somewhere between 500-600 people =F us Brits have been boasting about it.

[▲ Report](#)

---

Chris Northwood

21 Feb '08 at 10:18 am

bgodly: “No endeavor in history, no matter how loudly professed, has ever forwarded mankind by only destroying and not creating.”

I would say that the destruction of the Berlin Wall forwarded mankind.

Joxe and all the other Scientology proponents: You're missing the crux of this article and many of the points the critics are making here, which is why should the CoS be run like a business, to make money, and why does it force its parishioners to pay for the help they receive? No other church (to my

knowledge) does the same.

[▲ Report](#)

---

Stewart

21 Feb '08 at 5:16 pm

I am a graduate of York University (BA Hons 2.1 in PPE) and have been a Scientologist nearly ten years.

Anonymous also said of itself:

“We ruin people’s lives because we can ... Hundreds die in a plane crash – We laugh.” It also claimed that its members are cruel and without morality or pity.

Why does Nouse not quote this?

The fact is that all Scientology organisations are non-profit, without shareholders.

[▲ Report](#)

---

Chris Northwood

21 Feb '08 at 6:06 pm

Stewart: Not in the eyes of the German law and the State of Washington, which counts Scientology as a business. L. Ron Hubbard was also quoted as saying “You don’t get rich writing science fiction. If you want to get rich, you start a religion” and pays commission based earnings to the CoS franchises.

You also appear to misunderstand the point of Anonymous. Anonymous is collection of people using a pseudonym, there is no way it can speak “of itself” because it isn’t an organisation.

[▲ Report](#)

---

bgodley

21 Feb '08 at 7:11 pm

Chris,

You mentioned the Church being run like a buisness. First off, any claim or assertion that it is a business or deals in profits is wholly untrue. The church has either been granted tax exempt status or is pending approval in several countries around the world. In all cases all incomes, expenses, assets are fully accounted for to the penny. The IRS in the US did the most comprehensive audit of Church books of any group applying for non-profit status and it was shown that it fully conforms to highest standards. No individual including Hubbard ever attained personal gain from Church incomes no matter how small or large.

The fact that some parishoners donate a lot of money is what may lead someone to think it runs as a business but again this is only an assumption. Some Scientologists donate a lot while some donate a little. I myself have donated a fair amount but when I started in Scientology I had little to no money, I actually didn’t even have a job. With the help of the business tools and the increase of my own well being through the practical application of Scientology I eventually became a business owner and have had businesses make well over a million dollars per year. This seems to be a common “side effect” of being a Scientologist. Doing well in life so as to be able donate more and have more.

Secondly, in reference to the way the Church collects donations. The Church collects donations in a variety of ways. The Church collects from direct donations, donations for philosophical services and in some cases government grants for social betterment activities. In the case of the donations for philisophic services, this is simply one method that is agreed upon by all the members of the Church itself. A large part of Catholic donations were obtained by estate transfers. The Mormans and other churches tithe a percent of their income. This is just the way Scientologists decided to do it.

What seems to be lost on these critics is that the people actually doing the donations don’t really care. The individuals who have no desire to use the philosophy or assist the Church or any of it’s activities are

the ones complaining.

You can actually pick up a Dianetics book that contains the basic technology used in some form throughout all levels of Scientology and work with a friend or someone else for the cost of a book. However, I don't think we will find these critics taking that path. By their actions we can see their intention is to not improve the condition of the church or better the life of any adherent. It is to mock, defame and destroy.

[▲ Report](#)

---

sigh.

21 Feb '08 at 7:22 pm

"Let's translate this: "I don't have anything about Catholics, I just want to bomb the Vatican.""

Let's translate THAT:

"I don't know anything about the movement, but I would like to divert attention away from the issues and assert that anonymous has violent intentions, contrary to everything that has been said and done thus far."

not sorry.

[▲ Report](#)

---

MrChillyAnon

21 Feb '08 at 8:24 pm

Not run as a business? There's numerous articles about the church pegging e-bay, having it remove e-meters that are for sale. That, albeit illegal, is done so that the e-meters are bought from the church. They lose money when someone sells a used one on e-bay to a new member who wants to save a few hundred dollars, but the CoS just won't stand for that. Why do you think they attack freezone like they do? The CoS stands to lose money from an offshoot that doesn't share it's money hungry ways. You talk of the irs granting them tax exemption. You don't talk of the CoS blackmailing several irs backed buildings with threats of various code violations. They continually employ their fair game tactics to keep any and all negative information from people, companies, countries ever reaching the public. Attack Attack Attack. They are a business. They do everything the can to put themselves in the best possible situation to make the most money possible. If it's all about the religion, why can't I get their church teachings? Why can't I go to ebay for an e-meter? What does my soul and ridding myself of thetans have to do with the hundreds of thousands of dollars I'd have to spend to rid myself of them?

[▲ Report](#)

---

MrChillyAnon

21 Feb '08 at 8:48 pm

Not run as a business? Why, then, are they pulling e-meters off of ebay? If not for loss of income, why would they care? They're ohmmeters...nothing more. There's no patent infringement, nothing. Yet they pushed ebay into pulling all emeter sales off. Could it be b/c they don't want new scientologists getting their stuff from anywhere but the church? Could it be the church needs to get as much cash as it possibly can? It's a business period. Do you realize how many hundreds of thousands of dollars you have to pay just to get to the part in the story about xenu? The boats, planes, retreats, etc all need the steady influx of "religious donations" to keep running. John Doe needs to get his e-meter from the CoS and not from ebay for that very reason.

And yes, we can attack your church's practices and not your beliefs at the same time. You find that scientology has made you a better person, and that's great. We're really not worried about that. We're worried about the woman who was kidnapped in Italy, Lisa, the people who have felt the wrath of "fair game" and the bogus tax emption status that the CoS blackmailed it's way into.

[Report](#)

---

**MrChillyAnon**

21 Feb '08 at 8:48 pm

Sorry for the double post...not very hackerish of me

[Report](#)

---

**Chris Northwood**

22 Feb '08 at 1:10 am

bgodly: L. Ron Hubbard received over \$100,000 over the course of 4 years in the 1960's (and that was a lot of money at the time), as well as the house and car he was bought by the Church, in addition to paying his wife a salary, despite the fact an audit by the State of Washington (which lead to its non-profit status being rescinded in that state) finding that she had never done any work for the organisation?

Any analogies you try to draw between Scientology and Catholicism are fallcies by default. Catholicism is a religion. The CoS is not.

I do like how you completely ignored the fact that Germany have branded the Church a business (and tax them as such) and a cult, with discussions at one point to ban the organisation operating within the country.

I also assume that you're not a UoY student, and certainly not in this country if you're discussing dollars, so one must ask exactly why you're trolling a thread on a website aimed at York students?

[Report](#)

---

**Matthias**

22 Feb '08 at 7:23 pm

Probably he is trolling for the same reason as a number of the anons who never had really cared about the Church of Scientology, just attending the demo "for the lulz".

But seriously, probably because the article at the top appears on the internet and hopefully is open for anyone to comment, or is the University of York some sort of a sectarian movement????

Besides, I also find it difficult to believe that the kind of "blanket bombing" (I do NOT mean that literally) done against a Church will only affect the leadership of it, it will also increase discrimination against ordinary members.

Also a number of anons did despite of earlier claims also target religious concepts of Scientology, this again contradicts the claim it is only the current structure one wants to tear down.

Lastly: What guarantee does one have for that extremists are not being attracted to anon and under the guise of this name commit actual crimes? Sorry to say these will be attributed to anon no matter what their intentions might be.

[Report](#)

---

**Matthias**

22 Feb '08 at 8:01 pm

To Chris:

Yes, the Germans, the Germans. In the US the Church of Scientology is recognized as a religion, also in Sweden, South Africa, Spain and Portugal. But that is beside the point, it should not be that a government sanctions religious beliefs at all, therein lies discrimination against those religions one does not sanction. But that is why it is sooo convenient to call it a business. Then we are not discriminating against a

religion, right?

You say: I would say that the destruction of the Berlin Wall forwarded mankind.(Yes, but you are here missing the point of creating which was in the same sentence, if you only destroy it does no good, there was a lot of creating going on in Berlin, I visited the city last year and it has changed immensely i just a few years.

This last one goes for Mr ChillyAnon:

I am an electronics engineer. From a technical viewpoint alone I am surprised (Not really)of the lack of knowledge about what an e-meter is. It is not "They're ohmmeters...nothing more". It is a Wheatstone Bridge, which is a fairly sophisticated apparatus to measure resistance where small changes in resistance can be displayed, something that is not possible with an ohmmeter (which can purchased for as little as 10 pound).

The rest of what is being claimed does not make sense, do you really believe the IRS would be "tamed" just like that? Could it simply be that one feels it is hard to accept that the Church of Scientology actually deserves its status as non-profit organization? Funny how anyone critical of Scientology automatically gets a ton of added credibility (without inspection) while anything in favor of Scientology is being scrutinized in the extreme. The hard fact is that there is discrimination and the Church of Scientology even won a case last year in the European court of human rights, google it if you do not believe it.

[▲ Report](#)

---

bgodley

22 Feb '08 at 8:33 pm

Chris,

I am not sure where you got this information about Hubbard making money off the Church and alluding to the fact that the State of Washington recinded tax exempt status. But in the United State tax exemption of income tax is decided federally and states uphold 501 c(3) filings. States have their own income tax but every state in the union allows deductions of Scientology donations. If you are referring to historical data only I can state that Hubbard actually donated a bulk of his personal income and almost his entire estate to the church. The income he donated was from royalties for several books and screenplays, many were non-scientology best sellers. This is all documented.

You and MrChilly as critics contradict yourselves. MrChilly states that you don't attack the philosophy of the church yet you boldy state that Sceintology is not a religion. How do I practice the religion of Scientology without it being a religion?

[▲ Report](#)

---

Chris Northwood

22 Feb '08 at 9:19 pm

Matthias: I suggest you read L. Ron Hubbard's "The Creation of Human Ability: A Handbook for Scientologists", which states "Scientology is not a religion."

That is why you and others do not practice the religion of Scientology, because Scientology is not a religion.

bgodly: The information about tax status in the State of Washington was obtained from Sir John Foster, KBE QC MP's 1971 report "Enquiry into the Practice and Effects of Scientology", which is available from Her Majesty's Stationary Office, and reproduced on multiple websites online.

[▲ Report](#)

---

MrChillyAnon

22 Feb '08 at 10:47 pm

Never said it wasn't a religion...what I said was the CoS is run as a business...I will say once again..this is not about their beliefs...and Mr Electrical Engineer..sure thing..I did over simplify the e-meter...but it's not quite as advanced as portrayed...in your reply on my statement about the IRS...it's common knowledge the CoS legal dept is top notch and it's wallets are deep...given enough money and research anyone can work a deal..here...read this... <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~dst/Cowen/essays/nytimes.html> there's other places we can nab quotes from too if you'd like...of course I'm sure you'll spin this as "being written by a religious bigot" or "this is just plain anti-scientology prop"

 Report

---

bgodley

22 Feb '08 at 11:15 pm

Chris,

At the risk of sounding unduly unkind your statements are one of the reasons I posted this commentary.

In reference to this concept that Hubbard made money on the internet, I wasn't asking where you got the data regarding Washington State, I was asking where you got the information that Hubbard or anyone in the Church received undue personal gain from it's activities. Where is the proof of this?

I know you got that statement re Washington state from that xenu site. That site lists a handful age old court cases (this one being almost 37 years old) where judges offered opinions regarding Scientology. Some of those cases were even custody battles where attorneys tried to defame Scientology as an issue for custody all with very hazardous results for the children. Many of those very same statements were also refuted or contradicted by superior courts. In either case that statement is irrelevant. Scientology is a non-profit organization, that submits complete financial records every year and is afforded tax exemption in all states of America including Washington.

In reference to the quote you state where L. Ron Hubbard supposedly displaces Scientology as a religion in one of his books, you are woefully incorrect. Did you even read that book? Please state which chapter and page you got that from, I am curious to see your response.

 Report

---

bgodley

22 Feb '08 at 11:31 pm

I made an error in my last message the second paragraph opening statement should have read ...church and not internet. My apologies.

To hopefully put a nail in the coffin of the issue regarding Scientology being a religion, please see the unsolicited comment made by a professor of religious studies at UCLA that just came out today.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-ow-rosenfeld22feb22,0,2442274.story>

 Report

---

Upnorth

23 Feb '08 at 7:44 am

I'm not involved in this issue, just reading a few articles on the protests, and I couldn't help but notice that Miss Bgodley is posting pro CoS comments wherever an article can be found, which means you either have a lot of time on your hands or you're being paid.

In either case, you defend the fact that the church isn't about profits and that all monies are accounted for to the dime. Well, Hubbard was convicted of fraud in a french court and sentenced to four years, though he never served, he didn't show up for his hearing. And there are other cases. Though later, one of his wives would later be imprisoned on 'company business.

If you are going to be a CoS defender or apologist, you might want to do a bit more fact checking.

 Report

---

[Chris Northwood](#)

23 Feb '08 at 2:32 pm

bgodly: "In reference to this concept that Hubbard made money on the internet, I wasn't asking where you got the data regarding Washington State, I was asking where you got the information that Hubbard or anyone in the Church received undue personal gain from it's activities. Where is the proof of this?"

I suggest you read my comment more carefully: the second paragraph is "The information about tax status in the State of Washington was obtained from Sir John Foster, KBE QC MP's 1971 report "Enquiry into the Practice and Effects of Scientology", which is available from Her Majesty's Stationary Office, and reproduced on multiple websites online." I didn't get the statement from the Xenu.net site, I've never been on that website - in fact the Foster report is published on the website of Carnegie-Mellon University, and I found this via the online encyclopaedia Wikipedia.

"Please state which chapter and page you got that from, I am curious to see your response." - on the pre-1971 printings, you'll find it on page 251.

 Report

---

[Chris Northwood](#)

23 Feb '08 at 2:39 pm

After reading Upnorth's comment, I've decided I'm not going to pursue this line of discussion any more, as it's fairly obvious that you're this person: <http://www.xkcd.com/386/>, and you're not going to listen to reason or fact.

In conclusion, I feel that Scientology is at worst a dangerous cult, and at best an alternative method of psychotherapy.

 Report

---

[Chris Northwood](#)

23 Feb '08 at 2:39 pm

That link above should be: <http://www.xkcd.com/386/>

 Report

---

[Anonymous](#)

23 Feb '08 at 3:43 pm

The recent protests are not against the core beliefs of Scientology. Protesters are speaking out against the criminal actions of the Church's administrative architecture and practices.

The Church of Scientology stalks, harasses, and intimidates any critical voice whether it be inside or outside the religion. The Church charges parishioners large amounts of money per service and requires the purchase of commercial literature in order to obtain higher levels of spirituality.

The Church's malicious Disconnect Policy forces its members to completely separate themselves from family and friends that do not support Scientology.

The Church of Scientology does not allow "splinter sects". There is no Methodist or Lutheran-esque style of Scientology. The Church aggressively pursues legal action, via copyright claims, against anyone attempting to freely practice the "religion" without paying large amounts of money for it.

Does that fit your idea of what a Church should be? Or is it closer to the actions of a criminal syndicate?

[▲ Report](#)

bgodley

24 Feb '08 at 5:47 am

Chris, to address your and Upnorth's concern, I definitely have been posting a lot of commentary on this issue, this is very true. I do not get paid and no I don't have a lot of time on my hands, I run a business, I am a father, I am a cub scout leader and work on other social programs.

Much of my freetime recently, I have used to review opinion pieces and commentary on Scientology. My reason? Because my life has been very positively impacted by Scientology and this group to me is of very high value. To stand by and watch as very decent, honest individuals with decent, honest standards be mocked, defamed and vilified and do nothing is not in my nature. This to you may seem unusual or somehow misguided but those are the facts be as they may.

My purpose is to only ensure that others have the opportunity to view more than one side of this issue and offer other points for reflection.

You say that I have an inability to look at or take criticism from others or I am too fixed in my support of Scientology. Well, those who know me may beg to differ. I try and pride myself on being able to look at something from all angles and, believe you me, I have spent time contemplating how some of these views were arrived at.

I have openly acknowledged that many Scientologists including church staff and have made mistakes. Someone has probably been mishandled or antagonized. There probably have been Scientologists that inflamed upset in someone else or incorrectly shut out a family member. The church may have sent too much mail or had staff member that tried to get someone on a course they didn't want; a host of errors could be catalogued. L.Ron Hubbard in Church policies has acknowledged his own brand of human error.

However...

This does not make an evil cult that preys on the weak or fleeces them of their money. It does not make an ill intentioned founder in L. Ron Hubbard.

I am not sure if it is outside of someone's reality that in those cases sited such as the fraud charge in France that there might exist the possibility of vested interests or those that somehow saw a threat in L. Ron Hubbard.

I don't know if you have ever pondered what might befall someone who actually held as a goal a world without war, crime and insanity and took bold measures in that direction.

What would that truly be like?

Would everyone share this goal? Would all persons in the various governments and organizations do all they could to support it or does there lie the possibility that some may not only not support this goal but actively resist it?

If there exists not truly evil men, do evil concepts and deeds not exist? Do some people on the surface pretend help when actually engaging in evil actions? Have we all not fallen victim to the grape vine effect and engaged in gossip without knowing for sure the accuracy of what we heard?

Maybe you see my position or maybe you don't. I don't mind that you communicate. I do not mind that you may hold an opposing view. I only mind that you may hurt another in your cause.

[▲ Report](#)

Upnorth

26 Feb '08 at 6:50 am

bgodly -

To imply that the charges laid against CoS and Hubbard were concocted in an attempt to sabotage the 'religion' or his reputation is so absurd and bizarre that it's hardly worth acknowledging.

CoS members (one was Hubbard's wife) was charged with infiltrating the federal government with wire taps; documents were stolen from the Canadian government and CoS attempted to bribe Canadian's with 1.5 million to drop the charges; France fraud charges, fraud charges against Hubbard in Florida, and Germany. I could go on but it seems pointless.

I find it difficult to believe the world is sufficiently organized to unanimously target what was for a very long time, a small group of Dianetic fanatics.

And by the way - cult: a religion or sect considered to be extremist with many members living under the direction of a charismatic leader; a group of individuals bound together by the veneration of one person or thing; where information is controlled and disseminated based on an internal hierarchy; and where individuals are separated from family members and friends who do not share belief systems...

 Report

---

Lacelotte

1 Mar '08 at 12:45 am

I attended the last protest in York and held the "Britons Against The 'Church' of Scientology" sign. For the sake of the readers of dianetics amongst you I would like to explain EXACTLY why I was there.

In the UK this company trades under the name of the Church of Scientology (England & Wales).

Lets break this name down a little. Starting with the word "Church". Derived from the Greek word kuriakon (The Lords House), the Cambridge Dictionary defines a church as "a building for Christian religious activities" or "an official Christian religious organisation". We all know that this company is not a Christian organisation and it's offices are not used as a Christian place, so why is it allowed to mislead the public into thinking otherwise?

As a Christian I find this very offensive as a company is using words, phrases and symbols of a well know and trusted RELIGION to try and gain a more credibility.

I would ask any members of other faiths here, Muslims/Jews for example to comment on how you would feel if this company called its offices Mosques or Synagoges?

It is my aim to have the Secretary of State for Trade & Industry or the Prime Minister, rename the so-called 'Church' of Scientology legally under section 32 of the Companies Act, for misleading the public about the main nature of it's tradings.

As a proud Englishman it pains me to admit that yet again the Scottish Parliament has got it right by banning the company from using the word "church" in it's name. It is known as the Hubbard Institute of Dianetics. (correct me please if I am incorrect)

**THIS IS A TRADING NAME WHICH IS MORE FITTING TO ITS MAIN NATURE OF BUSINESS!**

THIS is why I was protesting in February and this is why I will be there again In March raising this issue to as many members of the public as possible.

On a personal note. I feel that Dianetics is nothing more than a self help method (many claim a very successful one) and as a method of self help should not be regarded as any different than Paul McKenna's latest one "Change your life in seven days". Or should we give Paul tax exempt status and claim him a saviour?

Sign petition via <http://www.againstscientology.co.uk>

 Report

---

Mark

16 Apr '08 at 10:52 pm

I'm surprised students of York University have time to go protesting against Scientology with all their studies. Pity they dont spend their time doing something effective for their city...like getting a job like the rest of us. Go back 2000 years and you would have been cheering on the crucifixion of Christ! There will always be those who oppose religion, most of them are slackers and criminals...never did a hard days graft in their lives!

[▲ Report](#)

---

David

17 Apr '08 at 4:55 pm

And I'm surprised that someone who obviously sees himself as a grafter has the time to go trawling through the website of a student newspaper looking for things to complain about.

[▲ Report](#)

---

Mick the puzzled ex-yorkie

18 Feb '09 at 9:33 pm

To all of you,

Effort= 10/10

Content= Debatable

Discussion= Should you all up your game or is the internet just a forum for slagging people off?

Submission Date= 20th February

Tick tick tick.....

[▲ Report](#)

---

Asley Thaler

15 Jun '17 at 10:49 pm

Attractive component of content. I simply stumbled upon your blog and in accession capital to claim that I acquire actually loved account your blog posts. Anyway I'll be subscribing to your feeds and even I achievement you access persistently fast.

<http://buyessay.rocks/>

[▲ Report](#)

---

Most Read Discussed

1. [What is the difference between tax evasion and tax avoidance?](#)
2. [Penalty for submitting work up to an hour late halved](#)
3. [Study reveals spending habits of students](#)
4. [Massive power cut hits homes and train station](#)
5. [Academic censorship at Reading University](#)
6. [YUSU to hold referendum on policy of supporting second EU referendum](#)

### Write for Nouse News

[Get in touch with the editors](#)

[Join the Facebook group](#)

### More in News

[Penalty for submitting work up to an hour late halved](#)

[Massive power cut hits homes and train station](#)

[YUSU to hold referendum on policy of supporting second EU referendum](#)

[A Viking Theatre for York](#)

[Annual Student Housing survey to close soon](#)

[Volunteering Week](#)

- [About Nouse](#)
- [Who's Nouse](#)
- [Website Credits](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Advertising](#)
- [Archives](#)
- [Student Discounts](#)
- [Print Editions](#)
- [Mini-Sites](#)
- [Nouse on Twitter](#)
- [Nouse on Facebook](#)
- [Nouse on Google+](#)

