

January 30, 2008

MALIGNANT NARCISSISM, L. RON HUBBARD, AND SCIENTOLOGY'S
POLICIES OF NARCISSISTIC RAGE

Jodi M. Lane, M.A.
Addictions Researcher
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada

Stephen A. Kent, PhD*
Department of Sociology
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2H4

Translated French version published as "Politiques de rage et narcissisme malin,"
Criminologie 41 No. 2 (2008): 117-155. Please note that the published French version
altered the title and the abstract from the original English version.

The authors thank numerous former members of Scientology, whose generosity
with documents and insights made this article possible.

*Please direct e-mail correspondence to co-author Stephen Kent at:
<steve.kent@ualberta.ca>

MALIGNANT NARCISSISM, L. RON HUBBARD, AND SCIENTOLOGY'S
POLICIES OF NARCISSISTIC RAGE

ABSTRACT

In this article, we argue that Scientology's founder, L. Ron Hubbard, likely presented a personality disorder known as malignant narcissism, and then we establish that this disorder probably contributed to his creation of organizational policies against perceived enemies that reflected his narcissistic rage. We illustrate our argument by discussing Hubbard's creation of an internal Scientology organization called the Guardian's Office, which carried out a sustained and covert attack against a Scientology critic, Paulette Cooper. This attack, and the Scientology policies that Hubbard created to 'handle' critics like her, demonstrate how Hubbard translated narcissistic rage into organizational policies that loyal members enacted on his behalf. By using psychological insights about the leader's personality, and then showing how that personality translated into socially deviant and sometimes criminal policies and actions by his organization, we hope to encourage criminologists to examine other groups by applying similar theories.

MALIGNANT NARCISSISM, L. RON HUBBARD, AND SCIENTOLOGY'S
POLICIES OF NARCISSISTIC RAGE

Grandiosity,¹ elitism (Wilson, 1970: 26-27; see Atack, 1990: 181), transformative visions,² and expectations of loyalty (Storr, 1996: 209 see Lalich, 2004: 52, 90, 142, 241) are commonplace among many new religious leaders (Singer with Lalich, 1995: 8-10, 39-40),³ and these characteristics are sources of inspiration for acolytes who internalize them. Often these leaders arise and gain followers during periods of societal and cultural disruption (Cohn, 1970: 52; see Kent, 1987c; 1989; 2001) and “in moments of distress—whether psychic, physical, economic, ethical, religious, or political” (Weber, 1922 [1968]: 1112; see Glock, 1964). Amidst, however, these and other social factors (such as “secularization, pluralism and privatization”) that may give rise to these sects (Clarke,

¹ On the grandiosity of Guru Maharaj Ji (leader of the Divine Light Mission) in the early 1970s, whose plans to construct a divine city supposedly were so important that they were to attract the attention of space aliens, see Kent, 2001: 156. On the dream and plans of Scientology's founder, L. Ron Hubbard, to create an international city in which Scientologists would monopolize mental health, see Kent, 1999: 154. On Rajneesh's grandiose plans to create “‘Homo Novus’—the new human who would be beyond good and evil, unrestrained by norms and rules of culture, but who would somehow manage to live in peace and love,” see Carter, 1990: 66. On the self-assertion from Dwight York, leader of the United Nuwaubian Nation of Moors (in Putnam County, Georgia) that he was “‘the incarnation of God for this age’” (before his sentencing to 135 years in prison for child sexual abuse), see Osinski, 2007: 68-69. Many other examples exist of grandiose claims made by leaders of new religions and related groups.

² For instance, “A revelation from the Hindu deity Shiva, which became the primary deity in Aum [Shinrikyo] led [founder Shoko] Asahara to regard himself as a messianic figure who was to lead his followers in the establishment of an ideal society referred to as the Kingdom of Shambala” (Mullins, 1997: 316). Similarly, Reverend Sun Myung Moon of the Unification Church reported “that on Easter Day 1936 Jesus appeared to him and revealed that God had chosen him for the mission of establishing His Kingdom of Heaven on earth” (Barker, 1984: 28). While on Mt. Zion in Israel, Branch Davidian leader, David Koresh, claimed “that he was visited by seven angelic beings who explained to him the secrets of the seven seals [in the Book of Revelations]” (Newport, 2006: 183). On a general level, “Many cult leaders report miraculous mystical and conversion experiences which start them on their road to religious leadership” (Deutsch, 1989: 148).

³ We do not want to become entangled in the terminological debates over the terms, *sect*, *cult*, or *new religion*, and in this study we use them more-or-less interchangeably to indicate non-mainstream groups with non-traditional messages that contain various degrees of supernatural claims. Nor do we wish here to debate which of these terms best describes Scientology according to more formal, academic definitions.

2006: 16-21) stand the unusual personalities of the groups' founders.⁴ Sectarian founders likely hold strong convictions--a focused certainty and assuredness that conveys power and draws disciples. The towering figure in the early sociology of religion, Max Weber, called these qualities charisma, but contemporary social scientists also label some of these same figures as being mentally ill or personality imbalanced (Deutsch, 1983: 122-128; 1989: 156-257; Lys, 2005; Numbers and Numbers, 1992; Raine, 2005; Storr, 1996: 152-158).

No better example of this dual label exists than the scholarship that examines the life and activities of Mormonism's founder, Joseph Smith. When developing his concept of charisma, Weber specifically mentioned Smith, albeit in a far-from-complimentary manner. In his classic definition of the concept (written some time between 1918 and his death in 1920), Weber offered:

The term 'charisma' will be applied to a certain quality of individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities.

These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of

⁴ Certainly academic discussions have taken place since the early twentieth century about the relationship between mental health and the founding of new religions. William James's *Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902) remains the most famous of numerous of these studies, but the debate around (for example) George Fox's mental health and its relationship to Quaker origins engaged numerous additional authors (see Kent, 1987a; 1987b). One recent attempt by sociologists to interweave the psychiatric conditions of (what these researchers called) cult founders and the groups they created was the *psychopathological* model presented by William Sims Bainbridge and Rodney Stark. This model saw some "cult innovation as the result of individual psychopathology that finds successful social expression" (1979: 173). While in some ways the biopsychosocial model that is behind our work (Kent, 2006) shares similarities with the Stark and Bainbridge position, we consider their psychological/psychiatric language and concepts to be far too imprecise if not inaccurate. For example, they discuss L. Ron Hubbard in a paragraph on "classical paranoia and paranoid schizophrenia" (Bainbridge and Stark, 1979: 175). While Hubbard demonstrated paranoid characteristics, he almost certainly was not schizophrenic.

divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a 'leader' (Weber, 1922 [1968]: 241).

Several sentences later he added, "For present purposes it will be necessary to treat a variety of different types as being endowed with charisma in this sense.... Another type is represented by Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism, who may have been a very sophisticated swindler (although this cannot be definitely established)" (Weber, 1922 [1968]: 242, see 1112).

The author, however, of a recent book about Smith takes a very different approach. While never doubting Smith's charisma (see Anderson, 1999: 236), ex-Mormon psychiatrist, Robert D. Anderson, developed the compelling argument that Smith presented in fact a disorder called malignant narcissism. Viewing malignant narcissism as combining features of both the antisocial and narcissistic personality, Anderson indicated:

Less severe forms might manifest moral behavior in some areas and exploitative behavior in others. Some individuals may experience some forms of guilt, concern, and loyalty to others. They may be able to plan for the future. These lesser forms of malignant narcissism may be characterized by sexual promiscuity and/or financial exploitation of followers, yet be honest and consistent in other dealings. They may blame others for their problems and offer rationalization for troubles.

In the case of Joseph Smith, the theme of deceiving self and others is not a thread, but a steel cable. Seldom has such a characteristic been so well documented (Anderson, 1999: 230).

In support of his diagnosis of Smith, Anderson discussed the prophet's "sexual conquests under the guise of religious practice," "his deceit," his willingness "to blame imaginary enemies" for interfering with his work, his "blaming the sufferers" who contracted a disease, and his pattern of blaming "others for the collapse of his banking venture" (Anderson, 1999: 231).⁵ The "malignant" dimension of this personality disorder is a person's willingness to hurt or destroy others whom he or she perceives as hindrances or opponents. When criticized, this type of narcissist "may react with disdain, rage, or defiant counterattack" (American Psychiatric Association, 2000b). These narcissistic and malignant narcissistic characteristics appear in other charismatic leaders,⁶ one of whom is the subject of this study.⁷

The sectarian founder of particular interest to us is another leader who presented numerous indicators of malignant narcissism, L. Ron Hubbard (1911-1986), founder of,

⁵ Even Smith's best-known biographer, Fawn Brodie, realized that something was not right about the prophet. She wrote, for example, that "The casual reader will be shocked by [Smith's] deceptions—sometimes clumsy, but even more shocking when they were deft—because Joseph was practicing in the field of religion, where honesty and integrity presumably would count for something" (Brodie, 1963: 84). Soon she added, "And at an early period he seems to have reached an inner equilibrium that permitted him to pursue his career with a highly compensated but nevertheless very real sincerity. Certainly a persisting consciousness of guilt over the cunning and deception with which his prophetic career was launched would eventually have destroyed him" (Brodie, 1963: 85). Viewing Smith as a narcissist gives new meaning to these and many other observations about Mormonism's founder.

⁶ For discussions of charismatic sect, cult, and new religious leaders as narcissists and/or malignant narcissists, see: Clark, 1988 (about Rajneesh); Kent, 2007 (about Alexander of Abonuteichos in the ancient world); Krakauer, 2003:162, 303-307 (about the homicidal Mormon fundamentalist, Ronald Lafferty); Mascareñas de los Santos and Ruiz, 1997: 102-105 (about the current leader of La Luz del Mundo, Samuel Joaquin Flores); National Parole Board, 2003: 3 (about the convicted felon, Ivon Shearing, head of a British Columbia sect called the Kabalarians); and Sil, 1991 (about the famous Indian guru, Rāmakrsna Paramahansa). For general comments about gurus and sect leaders as narcissists, see Storr, 1996: 208-211.

⁷ We must point out that we are not the first researchers to draw parallels between the lives of Smith and Hubbard. In the article on "religious fraud" in the *Encyclopedia of White Collar and Corporate Crime* (2005), the first sentence reads, "From Joseph Smith, who founded Mormonism after a revelation that still brings charges of a hoax to L. Ron Hubbard and the lawsuit-prone Scientologists, religion and fraud have been inextricably mixed, either as fact or in the perception of non-believers and skeptics" (Barnhill, 2005: 679). Our article points to the conclusion that perceptions by others of fraud likely stem from the probability that both leaders demonstrated behaviours related to narcissism.

and singular ‘theologian’ for, the ideological organization known as Scientology. We certainly are not the first analysts of Hubbard to mention that he might have suffered from narcissistic personality disorder (see Atack, 1990: 372; Kent, 2006: 347),⁸ but this article is the first attempt to locate Hubbard’s personality structure within the existing academic literature on that condition. Moreover, we will show that Hubbard displayed traits of a particular form of the condition, malignant narcissism, in his reactions to perceived opponents, and that his personal reactions provided the impetus for Scientology’s organizational policies of retaliation and vengeance. In essence, the corporate climate within Scientology largely is a reflection of Hubbard’s narcissism and malignant narcissistic rage. We support this claim by using biographical information about the man himself, along with numerous primary documents that outline the policies for Scientology that he devised to suppress or silence perceived critics and enemies.

Narcissism

The term, narcissism, traces back to Greek mythology and the poet Ovid (43 BCE to ?17 CE). Representations of the concept appeared in art and prose throughout the centuries and, by the very end of the 19th century, entered into the psychiatric literature (Ronningstram, 2005: 4-5; see Kernberg, 1998: 31). A psychoanalytically trained psychiatrist, Otto Kernberg, introduced the concept of malignant narcissism in the early 1980s, which included persons who “experience increased self-esteem and confirmation of their grandiosity when they can express aggression toward themselves and others” (Kernberg, 1984: 257, see 290-297; 1998: 44). This and other psychoanalytic insights carried over into the more externally descriptive and empirical (as opposed to

⁸ In an earlier study, one of the authors (Kent) stated that “by my reading [Hubbard] was most likely an individual with a combination of paranoia and narcissism” (Kent, 2006: 347). The narcissistic model that we follow here, however, discusses paranoia as an aspect of narcissism.

intrapsychically analytical) approach that the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual* took after its 1980 edition (Ronningstram, 2005: 11-16-19, 22-25; Ronningstram and Gunderson, 1990; see Wilson, 1993). A psychoanalytic contribution, however, to the current understanding about narcissism appears in a recent summary of research findings about the disorder made by one of the leading researchers in the field:

Beyond the [*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual*], there is by now both clinical and empirical support for identifying the core of narcissistic pathology as centering on four major areas of functioning: self esteem regulation; affect regulation; interpersonal relationships; and superego [i.e., internalized morality systems] functioning. In addition, several accounts support the existence of three subtypes of [Narcissistic Personality Disorder]: (1) the arrogant, oblivious, overt type; (2) the shy, hypervigilant, covert type; and (3) the psychopathic narcissistic type (Ronningstram, 2005: 76).

“Malignant narcissism” is a variant on the psychopathic type (see also Kernberg, 1992: 67), and it is the specific form of the disorder that, we argue, afflicted L. Ron Hubbard. If it is indeed applicable to Hubbard, then it certainly would explain his formulation and implementation of policies against perceived opponents.⁹

Self Esteem Dysregulation

⁹ Perhaps worth mentioning is that Kernberg indicated some malignant narcissists “may present rationalized antisocial behavior—for example, as leaders of sadistic gangs or terrorist groups” (Kernberg, 1992: 78). Without wanting to push the analogies of “sadistic gangs” and “terrorist groups” too far in their possible applicability to Scientology, some of the punishments that Hubbard inflicted upon his loyal followers certainly had sadistic overtones. Punishments that immediately come to mind are from the period in which Hubbard commanded a small fleet of Scientology ships in the late 1960s and early 1970s. During this period, Hubbard repeatedly ordered, as punishment, that people were to be thrown overboard from considerable heights (sometimes blindfolded with their hands and/or feet loosely bound). As one critic of Scientology concluded about these punishments, “Being hurled such a distance [between fifteen and forty feet], blindfolded and restrained, into cold sea water, must have been terrifying” (Atack, 1990: 187). Moreover, Hubbard sent children to a ship’s chain-locker for several days as punishment (Atack, 1990: 180). Likewise (as we will discuss below), persons like Paulette Cooper who became targets of Scientology’s “fair game” policy certainly felt terrorized by the organization.

Self esteem dysregulation issues involve “a sense of superiority and uniqueness . . .; exaggeration of talents and achievements . . . [;] grandiose fantasies . . . [;] self-centered and self-referential behavior . . . [;] boastful and pretentious attitude . . . [; the] need for admiring attention . . . [; and] strong reactions to criticism and defeat” (Ronningstam, 2005: 83; see Diagnostic Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 9 in American Psychiatric Association, 2000b; Lieberman, 2004: 75). Scientology’s founder had significant issues with all these aspects of self esteem dysregulation.

No single statement captures Hubbard’s sense of superiority and boastful pretentiousness as does a series of comments that he made in a letter to his first wife in 1938:

‘Foolishly perhaps, but determined none the less, I have high hopes of smashing my name into history so violently that it will take a legendary form even if all books are destroyed. That goal is the real goal as far as I am concerned’
(Hubbard, quoted in Miller, 1987: 81).

Consequently, in his own eyes his achievements were grandiose and legendary. In, for example, the first printing of his best-selling book of 1950, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, he proclaimed that “The creation of dianetics is a milestone for Man comparable to his discovery of fire and superior to his inventions of the wheel and arch” (Hubbard, 1950: ix). Likewise, in 1974, he introduced his reputed cure for psychosis with the pronouncement that “I have made a technical breakthrough which possibly ranks with the major discoveries of the Twentieth Century. It is certainly the greatest advancement of 1973....” (Hubbard, 1974b, in Hubbard, 1976d: 239).

For at least two books that he wrote, Hubbard more-than-exaggerated his credentials when he identified himself as “L. Ron Hubbard, C. E. [Civil Engineer], PhD.” (Hubbard, 1956a; 1956b), even though he had dropped out of college and never finished his Bachelor’s degree or received a degree in any form of engineering (Miller, 1987: 57). Despite these and many other deceptions about his credentials, he was completely self-referential when instructing his followers about how to do their job assignments or posts. In an Executive Directive that he wrote in 1969, he used an imaginary speaker to make the point that if one were encountering difficulties, then the best thing to do was to “Remember the old maxim? When all else fails, do What Ron Said” (Hubbard, 1969: 260 [capitals in original]). Indeed, for a person holding any Scientology position (what Hubbard called a “post”), “IN ESSENCE, YOU ARE WEARING *MY* ADMINISTRATIVE HAT FOR THAT POST.... As it is *my* hat really, no matter how small the post is, it has to be worn as I would wear it” (Hubbard, 1967b: 238 [capitals and italics in original]).

Hubbard craved attention and adulation. As revealed in a 1984 court case, in the late 1930s Hubbard used to rehearse what he called his “Affirmations,” which included the statement, “All men shall be my slaves! All women shall succumb to my charms! All mankind shall grovel at my feet and not know why!” (Hubbard, quoted in Corydon, 1996: 58). A clearer narcissistic example is hard to imagine. We shall return to Hubbard’s “strong reactions to criticism and defeat” when we discuss the malignant dimensions of his narcissism.

Affect Dysregulation

According to Ronningstam, “People with [narcissistic personality disorder] are challenged both by the presence of strong affects [i.e., emotions], especially rage, shame, and envy, and by the low tolerance of the nature and intensity of such feelings” (Ronningstam, 2005: 83). Specifically, they have “strong feelings of shame and envy . . . [,] intense aggressive reactions to threats to self-esteem . . . [,] sharp mood variations . . . [, and] intense reactions to the perception of others’ envy” (Ronningstam, 2005: 92; see Diagnostic Criteria 8 in American Psychiatric Association, 2000b; Lieberman, 2004: 75, 76, 80). In Hubbard’s case, glimpses into what seem to have been feelings of shame about his mother appear in comments by Barbara Kaye (a pseudonym), who was Hubbard’s secretary and lover in 1950 and 1951. She recalled that, as he “drank excessively,” he related:

‘[g]rotesque tales about his family mostly and his hatred of his mother, who was a lesbian and a whore.... He is a deeply unhappy man. He said the only thing to show him affection for the last few years, before he met me, was Calico, his cat’ (Kaye, quoted in Miller, 1987: 169).

He also claimed that he found his mother “in bed with another woman, and that he had been born as the result of an attempted abortion” (Kaye, quoted in Miller, 1987: 168). Kaye’s recollection of Hubbard’s shame concerning the circumstances surrounding his own birth likely has bearing on the fact that in his 1950 *Dianetics* book, he gave numerous examples of negative mental energy (what Hubbard called “engrams”) having been created due to failed abortions (Hubbard, 1950: 132-133, 156, 286).

Narcissistic dysregulation around envy “has been especially difficult to clarify” (Ronningstam, 2005: 89), in part because:

Envy is always disguised, hardly ever appearing in a straightforward manner

The expressions of envy in social and interpersonal contexts can be extremely subtle and undermining, ranging from discrete spoiling behavior and withholding what a person needs . . . , to actively spoiling or destroying the object . . .

(Ronningstam, 2005: 90; see Diagnostic Criteria 8 in American Psychiatric Association, 2000b).

Despite the difficulties associated with identifying envy in persons suffering from a narcissistic disorder, an incident that took place between Hubbard and one of his ship's captains, Hana Eltringham, almost certainly is a dramatic example of narcissistic spoiling behavior.

Eltringham joined Scientology in South Africa, and in August 1967 she became part of Hubbard's crew on his first ship (Miller, 1987: 269). Quickly she moved up the ranks, and eventually Hubbard appointed her as ship's captain (Miller, 1987: 282). Often working closely with Hubbard, she developed deep admiration for him. "He was my everything. I loved him like a father or a brother, he was part of my family. I really loved him that much[.] I would have done anything for him . . ." (Eltringham, quoted in Miller, 1987: 287). On a romantic level, however, she also was "deeply in love" with another member, John O'Keefe, "and had been for some time" (Corydon, 1996: 65). In essence, she had a deep emotional attachment for someone other than Hubbard (who knew about Eltringham's and O'Keefe's relationship [Corydon, 1996: 68]), and--in a manner consistent with envious narcissistic spoiling--he set out to destroy it.

Hubbard appointed O'Keefe captain of one of his ships, and gave him sailing orders—the contents of which were to become an issue of contention. O'Keefe followed

the instructions that, later, he insisted Hubbard had given him, but they led the ship directly into a ferocious hurricane that came perilously close to destroying the vessel. With great effort, however, O’Keefe came through the ordeal, but the ship was not at the port where Hubbard expected it to be. Enraged, Hubbard created a ‘committee of evidence’ (i.e., an internal Scientology trial)¹⁰ to rule on O’Keefe’s fitness, competence, and loyalty, showing no regard for the ordeal O’Keefe had been through. Eltringham happened to be standing next to Hubbard when one of his messengers delivered an instruction from Hubbard himself, telling her that she was to chair the committee of evidence on her lover. “‘He turned around with this half smile on his face and he said, ‘Poetic justice, isn’t it’” (Eltringham quoting Hubbard in Corydon, 1996: 68).

As we interpret this action, Hubbard was envious of Eltringham’s other strong emotional relationship, and he spoiled their relationship by deliberately placing Eltringham in a position where she would have to sit in judgment of her lover. As she indicated, the absolute power that Hubbard held over the organization meant that, “‘I knew I had to find John guilty. Absolutely! There was no way out....’” (Eltringham, quoted in Corydon, 1996: 69). The strategy worked: the committee that Eltringham chaired found O’Keefe guilty, even though she privately thought that he was innocent. As a result, O’Keefe left Scientology and Eltringham, while Eltringham remained a loyal Hubbard devotee for several more years. Hubbard had successfully spoiled their relationship. Only later did Eltringham realize that Hubbard probably was incorrect about the sailing orders that he had given to O’Keefe.

¹⁰ While to non-Scientologists, a committee of evidence probably resembles a hearing or trial, Hubbard insisted that “a **committee of evidence** is not a court. It is simply a fact-finding body with legal powers . . .” (Hubbard, 1976a: 91 [boldface in original]). He also said that it was “the most severe form of ethics action” (Hubbard, 1976a: 91). Of course, the ‘legal powers’ that it had only were within Scientology’s internal ‘justice’ system.

People like Eltringham who worked closely with Hubbard saw (and experienced) his remarkable mood variations (Corydon, 1996: 104; Miller, 1987: 269-270). Ronningstam specified that these “sharp mood variations” among people who have narcissistic personality disorder included such items as having “brief reactive depressions,” hypomania,¹¹ “periodic substance abuse,” hypochondria, and “preoccupation with the body” (Ronningstam, 2005: 91). These traits described Hubbard almost perfectly. In the early 1950s, his mood swings were at times so severe that Barbara Kaye became convinced that “he was a manic depressive with paranoid tendencies” (Miller, 1987: 175). Eltringham reflected back on his explosive temper—“the furious screaming—just an amazing outrage that would pour out of him at something that was going wrong” (Eltringham, quoted in Corydon, 1996: 64, see 65, 68-69, 74; Atack, 1990: 250-251).

Issues related to hypochondria and body preoccupation appear in Hubbard’s medical records immediately after WWII. As biographer, Russell Miller, discovered: Hubbard was a patient at Oak Knoll Naval Hospital for three months after the war, although doctors were undecided as to precisely what was wrong with him. He was certainly neither blind nor crippled, but seemed to be suffering from endless minor aches and pains. His medical record shows that he was examined exhaustively, almost every week, complaining of headaches, rheumatism, conjunctivitis, pains in his side, stomach aches, pains in his shoulder, arthritis,

¹¹ Hypomanic episodes involve mood elevation for at least four days, along with at least three of the following: grandiosity, reduced sleep, talkativeness, the steady rush or flight of thoughts, “distractibility,” and/or an “increase in goal-directed activity” (American Psychiatric Association, 2000a).

haemorrhoids . . . there seemed to be no end to his suffering. Sometimes the doctors could find symptoms, sometimes they could not (Miller, 1987: 112).¹² It seems likely that at least some—or more likely many—of these supposed afflictions had little if any serious physical bases (see Corydon, 1996: 309).

At another stage in his life, Hubbard seemed to have phobias about germs and smells. A young woman, Tonya Burden, offered important observations about these phobias in a 1980 affidavit. As a thirteen-year-old member of Hubbard’s management staff, the Sea Organization (or Sea Org) in the early 1970s, Burden first had to go through a teen ‘training and labour’ program called the Estates Project Force (EPF). One of her onerous chores in the program was scrubbing clothes for six hours a day. “The clothes were scrubbed by hand in a bucket, and I was directed to rinse each article in 13 separate buckets.” Later she added that Hubbard “frequently exploded if he found dust or dirt or smelled soap in his clothes. That is why we used 13 buckets to rinse” (Burden, 1980: 4, 6 [underline in original]). Hubbard, it seems, was afraid of dirt and repelled by scents.

The affect dysregulated narcissistic trait, however, most striking about Hubbard was his “intensive aggressive reactions to threats to self-esteem” (Ronningstam, 2005: 92; see Phillips, Yen, and Gunderson, 2008). These reactions were so dramatic that we will discuss them as part of our analysis of the malignant aspects to Hubbard’s narcissistic disorder.

Dysregulated Interpersonal Relationships

Again based upon current research on narcissistic personality disorder, Ronningstam indicated that “Narcissistic individuals are usually identified by their

¹² See, for example the “Special Orthopedic Examination” of Hubbard, conducted on 8/1/51 (presumably August 1, 1951) by C. L. Williams, M.D., which failed to find either his alleged “bursitis with calcification,” “multiple arthritis,” or “duodenal ulcer,” all of which Hubbard claimed to have had.

specific interpersonal pattern with a more or less overtly arrogant and haughty attitude, and entitled and controlling behavior” (Ronningstam, 2005: 99; see Diagnostic Criteria 5 and 9 in American Psychiatric Association, 2000b; Kernberg, 1975: 228). Elaborating later, she specified that these traits include “arrogant and haughty behavior . . . , entitlement . . . [, an] impaired empathic capacity . . . , interpersonal control and hostility . . . , [and] lack of sustained commitment to others” (Ronningstam, 2005: 99-100; see diagnostic Criteria 5, 6, and 7 in American Psychiatric Association, 2000b). As with other narcissistic qualities, Hubbard demonstrated all of these, often quite dramatically.

Regarding his own supposed achievements, Hubbard believed them worthy of the highest praise. In essence, he felt entitled to a Nobel Prize “for his discovery or creation of the Purification Rundown,” according to Armstrong (1984a: 1503; see Atack, 1990: 260), which was a program supposedly able to purge the body of drug and radiation residues. During the end of 1979, Hubbard allocated “unlimited funds” for this ultimately unsuccessful project (Armstrong, 1984b: 1790).

While feeling enormous entitlement for accolades regarding his own projects, he haughtily and arrogantly demeaned perceived enemies, especially psychiatrists, for their opposition. In 1982, he wrote about “the vested interests which pretend to run the world (for their own appetites and profit)” (Hubbard, 1982: 1), and which, he claimed, “have mounted full-scale attacks” against his organization (Hubbard, 1982: 1):

Honestly, my friends, a review of these battles over the past thirty-two years moves one to contemptuous laughter. The enemy, perched in their trees or swinging by their tails, have been about as effective as one of their psychologist’s

monkeys peeling a policeman's club thinking it is a banana and then throwing it only to hit the chief ape in the face (Hubbard, 1982: 2).

In directing his staff to undertake the Nobel Prize project and others, he attempted to maintain tight control over it and the people working under him, often expressing his orders to them in extremely hostile ways.

For example, while on the ship, *Apollo*, in the early 1970s, Hubbard created the Commodore's Messenger Organization (CMO), which he staffed with teenage girls who "dressed in cute little dark blue uniforms and gold lanyards" (Miller, 1987: 301). The CMO girls:

were trained to deliver Hubbard's orders using his exact words and tone of voice: if he was in a temper and bellowing abuse, the messenger would scuttle off and pipe the same abuse at the offender. No one dared take issue with whatever a messenger said; no one dared disobey her orders (Miller, 1987: 301-302).

In addition to relaying orders to the crew, another function of the CMO was to serve Hubbard—to wait on him (literally) hand and foot. A former Messenger, for example, swore in an affidavit:

As his servant I would sit outside his room and help him out of bed when he called 'messenger.' I responded by assisting him out of bed, lighting his cigarette, running his shower, preparing his toiletries and helping him dress. After that I ran to his office to check it, hoping it passed white glove inspection [i.e., was completely dust-free] (Burden 1980: 6).

These interactions with the CMO girls demonstrate Hubbard's extraordinary sense of entitlement, and his use of them to shout orders to his shipmates suggests how difficult Hubbard was in interpersonal relations.

These difficulties revealed themselves most especially in interactions with his family. He completely lacked the ability to empathize with any of them, so when, in November 1976, he learned of son Quentin's suicide, a CMO girl subsequently reported hearing Hubbard "shouting at the top of his voice: 'That stupid fucking kid! That stupid fucking kid! Look what he's done to me! Stupid fucking . . .'" (quoted in Miller, 1987: 344).¹³ As one might suspect from this incident, Hubbard lacked the ability to maintain sustained interpersonal commitments, even with many members of his family. He married three times (one bigamously); his son Quentin killed himself; his eldest son denounced his father and spent years speaking against him (and sometimes retracting his criticisms [Corydon, 1996: 11-13, 55-58]); and estranged daughter Alexis refused to sign "a bizarre claim that L. Ron Hubbard JUNIOR [was] her real father" (Corydon, 1996: 13 [capitals in original]). In 1984, a judge wrote about Hubbard's third wife, Mary Sue, that she "'certainly appeared to be a pathetic individual. She was forced from her post as Controller [of the Guardian's Office], convicted and imprisoned as a felon [for her role in Scientology's illegal operations against the U.S. government in the 1970s], and deserted by her husband'" (Judge Brekenridge, quoted in Corydon, 1996: 255). In addition to these tragic family dysfunctions, numerous people who at various times worked closely with Hubbard (such as Laurel Sullivan, Hana Eltringham, John McMaster, Richard

¹³ Kernberg notes, for example, that narcissists "are especially deficient in genuine feelings of sadness and mournful longing; their incapacity for experiencing depressive reactions is a basic feature of their personalities. When abandoned or disappointed by other people they may show what on the surface looks like depression, but which on further examination emerges as anger and resentment, loaded with revengeful wishes, rather than real sadness for the loss of a person whom they appreciated" (Kernberg, 1975: 229).

DeMille, etc.) broke ties with him and spoke publicly about his abuses (see, for example, Corydon, 1996: 37-40, 206-207, 350-352; Miller, 1987: 214-215). Apparently his pathological narcissistic traits damaged his ability to relate meaningfully to others over long periods of time.

Malignant Narcissism

Put simply, those persons who are willing to harm others as they act out their narcissistic traits have earned the label, *malignant*. This form of narcissism is characterized by “overt passive or active antisocial behavior, paranoid traits, and ego-syntonic aggression and sadism that can be directed toward others as well as toward the self” (Ronningstam, 2005: 106). Some research suggests “that malignant narcissism can be expressed in seemingly self-justifiable violence, sadistic cruelty, or self-destructiveness, where aggression and sadism is combined with elation and increased self-esteem” (Ronningstam, 2005: 106). In extreme cases, persons suffering from malignant narcissism can be murderers, viewing “killing as a righteous act of retaliation, a desperate effort to gain control, and to protect and raise self-esteem” (Ronningstam, 2005: 107).

Because many malignant narcissistic traits manifest in social relations, we postponed discussion of certain narcissistic traits until now. Specifically, we now return to one trait involving self esteem regulation (i.e., “strong reactions to criticism and defeat” [Ronningstam, 2005: 83]) and one affect regulation trait (i.e., “intense aggressive reactions to threats to self-esteem” [Ronningstam, 2005: 92]). It seems to us that these general traits are likely to have violent manifestations in the lives of malignant narcissists (Kernberg, 1984: 257; 1992: 67), as they did in the life of L. Ron Hubbard. A special

characteristic, however, about Hubbard was that he had an entire organization of followers--tens of thousands at least--beneath him, including a dedicated cadre of full time Sea Org members, who were primed and willing to act on his commands. We contend that Hubbard clearly demonstrated his malignant narcissism in various organizational doctrines that he developed and the structures and policies created to implement them.¹⁴

The Formation of the Guardian's Office

From the publication of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* (1950) to his death in 1986, Hubbard's evolving ideology drew considerable criticism from outside organizations. In the media, initial reviews of the book (often written by psychiatrists and other medical doctors) denounced Dianetics as ineffectual and a dangerous substitution for legitimate psychiatric treatment (Atack, 1990: 160-161). For example, soon after the publication of *Dianetics*, a past president of the American Psychiatric Association and renowned psychiatrist, William Menninger, concluded about it that "It can potentially do a great deal of harm. It is obvious that [Hubbard] has oversimplified the human personality both as to its structure and function and my impression is that he has made inordinate and very exaggerated claims in his results" (quoted in Clarke, 1950: 3). Likewise, a Beverley Hills, California psychiatrist, Frederick J. Hacker, dismissed Hubbard's creation by saying, "If it were not for sympathy for mental suffering of disturbed people, the so-called [sic] science of *Dianetics* could be

¹⁴ An observation by Kernberg is worth mentioning here. "When narcissistic personalities are themselves in a position of objective importance—for example, heading a political institution or a social group—they love to surround themselves with admirers in whom they are interested as long as the admiration is new. Once they feel they have extracted all the admiration they need, they perceive their admirers as 'shadows' once more and mercilessly exploit and mistreat them. At the same time these [narcissists] are extremely offended when one of their 'slaves' wants to free himself" (Kernberg, 1975: 236).

dismissed for what it is—a clever scheme to dip into the pockets of the gullible with impunity” (quoted in Clarke, 1950: 3, 16). While initially the Dianetics movement was popular, interest in it quickly declined due to public debates about the merits and effectiveness of the Dianetics practices (see Wallis, 1977: 87).

After expanding Dianetics theory by creating Scientology in 1952,¹⁵ Hubbard faced continued criticism on a number of fronts. The psychiatric profession resumed its disparagement of Hubbard’s ideology (for examples, see Atack, 1990: 219, 392) and his organization suffered attacks from governments around the world (for examples, see Atack, 1990: 142; Miller, 1987: 247, 252-253). As the creator, sole theologian, and corporate leader of Scientology, Hubbard construed attacks against his ideology and organization as attacks against himself. As Hubbard revealed in a confidential publication on justice, “People attack Scientology; I never forget it, [and] always even the score” (Hubbard, 1959: [1]).

Demonstrating the paranoid disorder associated with malignant narcissism that may accompany “experiences of serious failure, betrayal, or humiliation,” (Ronningstam, 2005: 131), Hubbard reacted to the external criticisms by alleging that he was the victim of an international conspiracy. He claimed that the World Federation of Mental Health and members of its national counterparts were entrenched in government and private agencies that were opposed to Scientology (Hubbard, 1968e; LRH Aides, 1969: 3-7). Although Hubbard made repeated references to psychiatry’s conspiracy against him throughout the duration of his leadership of Scientology, he never substantiated his claims.

¹⁵ Hubbard’s first lecture on Scientology took place on March 3, 1952 (Hubbard, 1976b: 218), although he alerted readers in a December 1951 publication that the new science of Scientology soon would appear (Hubbard, 1951: 41).

By August 1965, a Board of Inquiry into Scientology convened in Australia to investigate “allegations of blackmail and extortion, and accusations that [it] was affecting the ‘mental well-being’ of undergraduates at Melbourne University” (Miller, 1987: 25). As the resulting public scrutiny increased, Hubbard responded by formulating policy that reflected the self-esteem and affect dysregulation traits of malignant narcissism.

Demonstrating both his “strong reactions to criticism and defeat” (Ronningstam, 2005: 83) and “intense aggressive reactions to threats of self-esteem” (Ronningstam, 2005: 92), Hubbard became preoccupied with his external critics to the point that he created policy letters concerning the identification of reputed enemies. These policies centered around what he called a ‘Suppressive Person’ or ‘Suppressive Group,’ which “actively seeks to suppress or damage Scientology or a Scientologist by ‘Suppressive Acts’” (Hubbard, 1965a: 1). He described ‘Suppressive Acts’ as “actions or omissions undertaken to knowingly suppress, reduce or impede Scientology or Scientologists” (Hubbard, 1965a: 553). In a supplementary policy letter, Hubbard provided an extensive commentary on the characteristics, motives, and actions of ‘Suppressive Persons’ (Hubbard, 1965b). Hubbard’s fixation with critics is also reflective of the “extreme sensitivity and tendency to overinterpret rejections or disappointments” (Malmquist, 1996: 169) associated with malignant narcissism.

Soon after Hubbard began integrating his discourse on Scientology enemies into corporate policy, Scientology experienced a noteworthy failure when the Australian Board of Inquiry into Scientology published its report on the organization. After releasing the report, “the State of Victoria passed the Psychological Practices Act which effectively outlawed Scientology and empowered the Attorney General to seize and destroy all

Scientology documents and recordings” (Miller, 1987: 254). Within the next year, Great Britain, which was Hubbard’s place of residence, also began an inquiry into Scientology.

As international scrutiny of Scientology grew, Hubbard reacted by launching the ‘Public Investigation Section,’ a corporate division intended to amass intelligence and investigate critics (Atack, 1990: 160). Within the following month, he changed the name of the Public Investigation Section to the Guardian’s Office (GO) (Atack, 1990: 161) and he announced that his wife, Mary Sue, would oversee the division.

The primary assignment of the Guardian’s Office was “to help LRH [Hubbard] enforce and issue policy, to safeguard Scientology Orgs, Scientologists and Scientology and to engage in long term promotion” (Hubbard, 1966b: 1). The GO adhered to Hubbard’s policies, and Hubbard permitted other GO staff members to draft new policies only if they were consistent with existing ones that, of course, he already had formulated (Hubbard, 1966b: 1). Hubbard’s refusal to relinquish his absolute control over Scientology ideology and corporate guidelines reveal the presence of self-esteem regulation issues that accompany malignant narcissism, including his sense of superiority, uniqueness, and self-centered and self-referential behaviour (Ronningstam, 2005: 83).

To best maintain Hubbard’s authority and directives, the GO operated internationally. With headquarters in Great Britain and eight satellite offices throughout the world, each GO comprised six bureaus to carry out Hubbard’s policies: Information (initially named Intelligence), Service, Public Relations, Legal, Finance, and Social Coordination. The Information and Legal Bureaus operated concurrently to identify and manage Scientology critics.

The Information Bureau functioned as Scientology's intelligence agency. The division collected information internally and externally in its effort to identify and amass data on critics. The bureau also included an Operations Section, which prepared and executed campaigns against Scientology enemies (Atack, 1990: 219).

The Legal Bureau managed Scientology's legal matters. In its operations, the Legal Bureau carried out actions against enemies consistently with Hubbard's proclamation:

The purpose of the suit is to harass and discourage rather than to win. The law can be used easily to harass, and enough harassment on somebody who is simply on the thin edge anyway, well knowing that he is not authorized, will generally be sufficient to cause his professional decease.

If possible, of course, ruin him utterly (Hubbard, 1955: 157).

Throughout the tenure of the GO, the Legal Bureau utilized the legal system extensively to intimidate and harass Scientology's reputed opponents (Kumar, 1997).

Together, the Information and Legal Bureaus served as permanent corporate divisions mandated to identify Scientology's enemies and carry out long-term, organized campaigns of harassment in order to achieve their silence. The very existence of corporate structures sanctioned to detect and attack enemies under Hubbard's directives is indicative of a narcissist's "intense aggressive reactions to threats to self-esteem" (Ronningstam, 2005: 92), and "aggressive, sadistic, revengeful behaviors" (Ronningstam, 2005: 110). The creation and operation of the bureaus also reflects malignant narcissists' propensity to "initiate schemes to destroy another person, often one whom they see standing in their way of gaining even greater glory" (Malmquist, 1996: 165).

Guardian's Office Policies on Managing Enemies

In order to execute Hubbard's directives on silencing Scientology critics, the GO adhered to several key policies that outlined the management of enemies. The policies are also reflective of Hubbard's malignant narcissism, in that they are "aggressive reactions" to outside threats (Ronningstam, 2005: 92) and inform continuing operations against critics. He outlined the guiding principle determining the treatment of Scientology enemies in the 'Fair Game' policy. In the "Penalties for Lower Conditions" policy (Hubbard, 1967a), Hubbard stated that persons declared 'Suppressive' were 'Fair Game' and "[m]ay be deprived of property or injured by any means by any Scientologist without any discipline of the Scientologist... [and] [m]ay be tricked, sued or lied to or destroyed" (Hubbard, 1967a).

After the 'Fair Game' policy received wide but critical publicity, Hubbard issued another policy as a result of the public backlash. In "Cancellation of Fair Game," he stated that "[t]he practice of declaring people Fair Game will cease" (Hubbard, 1968a). In the same policy document, however, he continued by asserting that "[t]his P/L [Policy Letter] does not cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of an SP [Suppressive Person]" (Hubbard, 1968a). Clearly, Hubbard's cancellation of the policy was to placate critics, while, in actuality, the practices described in the 'Fair Game' policy were to continue.

After the Intelligence Bureau identified enemies through intelligence-gathering, they became 'Suppressive Persons' and subject to the ramifications of being declared 'Fair Game.' The policy demonstrates Hubbard's narcissistic rage and the associated "need for revenge, for righting a wrong, for undoing a hurt by whatever means, and a

deeply anchored, unrelenting compulsion in the pursuit of these aims . . .” (Kohut, 1972: 380; see Ronningstam, 2005: 86).

Under the ‘Fair Game’ policy, the GO manufactured campaigns against ‘Suppressive Persons’ in order to actualize Hubbard’s narcissistic rage. As the policy clearly stated, ‘Suppressive Persons’ could be “injured by any means” (Hubbard, 1967a: 1), and members of the GO acted fervently on Hubbard’s orders. GO documentation demonstrated that illegal activities were acceptable tactics that its Scientology agents used against critics and perceived enemies. Indeed, illegal, covert operations that the GO conducted against the United States government in the mid-1970s led to the conviction and imprisonment of eleven high-ranking Scientologists. In sentencing nine of the eleven GO agents, the presiding judge summarized:

the incredible and sweeping nature of the criminal conduct of the defendants and of the organization which they led. These crimes include the infiltration and theft of documents from a number of prominent private national and world organizations, law firms and newspapers; the execution of smear campaigns and baseless law suits to destroy private individuals who had attempted to exercise their First Amendment rights to freedom of expression; the framing of private citizens who had been critical of Scientology, including the forging of documents which led to the indictment of at least one innocent person; [and] violation of the civil rights of prominent private figures and public officials (United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 1979a: 2-3).

Hubbard was an unindicted co-conspirator for these crimes (United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 1979b:69), since “L. Ron Hubbard was, by virtue of his role

as the founder and leader of Scientology, overall supervisor of the Guardian's Office" (United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 1979a: 7). The judge's mention of "the forging of documents which led to the indictment of at least one innocent person" is an allusion to the GO's campaign against New York journalist, Paulette Cooper, and the operation against her demonstrates dramatically how Scientology put into practice policies that reflected Hubbard's malignant narcissism.

'Operation Freakout' Against Author Paulette Cooper

In 1969, Cooper published an article entitled "The Tragi-Farce of Scientology," which she expanded into her 1971 book, *The Scandal of Scientology*. In response, Scientology initiated a 'Fair Game' operation against her. Tactics included four lawsuits and the forgery of bomb threats that led to her criminal indictment (City of Clearwater, 1982; *New York Times*, 1979). She received her first death threat in the same month that her first article appeared in print about Scientology, and subsequently she discovered evidence that her phone was tapped (City of Clearwater, 1982: 8; see *New York Times*, 1979). Her neighbors received character-assassination letters about her; she began receiving "very, very disturbing" telephone calls; her parents were harassed; and someone started mailing her copies of pages from a private diary that she had kept when she was younger (City of Clearwater, 1982: 9, 11, 18). When Cooper retaliated by becoming the first person to file a lawsuit against Scientology, the organization escalated its campaign against her. Scientology's campaign, which was a prolonged and aggressive response to Cooper's publications and legal action, demonstrates the extent of Hubbard's "narcissistic rage" and "need for revenge" (Kohut, 1972: 380). By applying multiple

methods aimed at harassing and intimidating her into silence, members of the GO effectively actualized Hubbard's malignant narcissism.

Several detailed instructions outlined how Scientologists were to implement the 'Fair Game' policy, and agents seemed to have followed all of them in their operation against Cooper. Hubbard recommended 'Noisy Investigations' as an effective method of casting suspicion on critics and disrupting their personal and professional lives (Hubbard, 1966a). Scientologists carrying out such investigations were to contact all associates of a corporate enemy and claim that the target was under investigation for violating religious liberties (Atack, 1990: 167-168). Ultimately, the tactic's purpose was to spread suspicion about enemies, rather than serve as an investigation method.

When Cooper sued Scientology for harassment, agents within the organization began a 'Noisy Investigation' as part of their operation to silence her. Cooper claimed that, during their investigation of her, Scientology proffered falsehoods to misrepresent the truth in their attempt to intimidate and silence her (Supreme Court of the State of New York, 1972: 1-5). These falsehoods included "a terrible smear letter [that] arrived to all of my neighbors. There wasn't anything true in it" (Cooper, quoted in *New York Times*, 1979), including the false allegation that "Her tongue is noticeably swollen from an attack of venereal disease in the past" (quoted in *New York Times*, 1979).¹⁶

'Noisy Investigations' of Cooper and others effectuated Hubbard's desire to discredit, harass, and disrupt the lives of his critics, as also was the 'Dead Agenting' policy. In a publicly available policy letter, Hubbard stated, "The technique of proving utterances false is called 'DEAD AGENTING' When the enemy agent gives false

¹⁶ A copy of this smear letter is on file in the Stephen A. Kent Collection of Alternative Religions, housed at the University of Alberta Library. It is a single undated sheet, all typed in capital letters, from "A Concerned Neighbor" to "Dear Fellow Tenant."

data, those who believed him but now find it false kill him—or at least cease to believe him” (Hubbard, 1972: 422 [capitals in original]). As portrayed there, the policy appears to be little more than correcting falsehoods, which lead to discrediting those persons who propagated them. In, however, a “Confidential” policy letter on dead agenting eighteen months later, Hubbard stated that ‘Dead Agenting’ involved “feeding lurid, blood, sex crime actual evidence on attackers to the press” (Hubbard, 1974a: 4). By attacking enemies publicly, therefore, Hubbard endeavored to discredit the legitimacy of critics and reduce if not eliminate the impact of their criticisms on him and his group. Scientology’s policies and tactics, therefore, represent the actualization of Hubbard’s narcissistic rage and subsequent “schemes to destroy another person, often one whom they see standing in their way of gaining even greater glory” (Malmquist, 1996: 165).

After Cooper escalated the conflict by suing the corporation for harassment, Scientology applied its ‘Dead Agenting’ policy to her. Cooper claimed, for example, that Scientology published untruths about her in the media in an attempt to ruin her career by destroying her credibility as a writer (Supreme Court of the State of New York, 1972: 6). Around 1974, the Church of Scientology of California’s U.S. Ministry of Public Relations circulated what it called a “False Report Correction” on her *Scandal of Scientology* book, alleging in it (sometimes correctly, often not) that she made numerous factual errors.¹⁷ It also reproduced a statement that a barrister for the British publishers

¹⁷ This document consists of thirty-two pages of brief statements by Cooper (or summaries of particular statements), each countered by Scientology. Following these exchanges are fifty-six documents that unnamed Scientologists in the organization’s U. S. Ministry of Public Relations. believed supported their refutations. For example, on 11, the following exchange took place:

ITEM: (p. 71) *One type of investigation Hubbard suggested was what he called ‘noisy investigations.’*

FACT: This suggestion did not originate from Mr. Hubbard nor has anyone been noisily investigated as per that policy. Which [sic] has been in force for over six years” (U.S. Ministry of Public Relations, n.d.: 11).

of Cooper's "Tragi-Farce of Scientolgy" read in open court, apologizing and withdrawing allegations in it that were untrue (U.S. Ministry of Public Relations, n.d.). By purportedly showing Cooper's faulty research, this correction was part of a dead agent program against her.

Around 1980, a less sophisticated dead agent article circulated among Scientologists, which had all the indications of having been produced by the Guardian's Office. It stated that in 1976 she signed a statement with Scientology, acknowledging errors in her book and retracting it (Anonymous, 1980?: 13). While that retraction did in fact occur, it did so amidst repeated harassments and legal proceedings that wore down Cooper financially and emotionally (City of Clearwater, 1982: 19-20). The less sophisticated dead agenting article also relayed 'facts' such as "Cooper was indicted for making [bomb] threats through the mail and perjury" (Anonymous, 1980?: 10) without indicating that Scientology itself had framed her for those threats as part of Operation Freakout.

Tactics such as these, involving public humiliation and character assassination, reflected Hubbard's narcissistic rage, which he had outlined in numerous policies and which GO members ruthlessly applied in their covert attack on her. The employment of the 'Dead Agenting' policy also reflected Hubbard's narcissistic desire to derogate Cooper in order to discredit her claims against Scientology and remove the public

In fact, however, Hubbard wrote a 1966 Policy Letter about "Attacks on Scientology," and in a section discussing a "Third Group of Actions [that] have been positive in stopping attacks," Hubbard identified "Investigating noisily the attackers" (Hubbard, 1966a: 491). On this point, Cooper seems to have been correct about Hubbard having suggested noisy investigations against opponents. On p. 31, however, the Scientology publication corrects Cooper's reference (Cooper, 1971: 182) to a publication, which she referred to as "*PABS (Preclear Auditor's Book)*" but whose correct title is, *Professional Auditor's Bullentin* (United States Ministry of Public Relations, n.d.: 31). This point/counterpoint exchange goes on for roughly two hundred items.

accusations that she had written about him and his organization, all of which threatened Hubbard's self-esteem.

When Scientology identified enemies as long-term threats, the organization intensified 'Dead Agenting' policy tactics and implemented 'Black PR [Public Relations]' campaigns. Scientology employed the confidential 'Black PR' policy in attempts ultimately to destroy the reputations of enemies and "to discredit them so thoroughly that they will be ostracized" (Hubbard, 1974a: 8). 'Black PR' campaigns comprised detailed, multi-faceted operations aimed at destroying and conclusively silencing critics.

Throughout the decade after Cooper first published "The Tragi-Farce of Scientology," (1969) Scientology's retaliation escalated into the employment of a 'Black PR' campaign against her. The organization's plot against Cooper eventually came to light in documents contained in a file entitled 'P.C. OP. FREAKOUT,'¹⁸ which the FBI discovered in raids of the Washington and Los Angeles Scientology offices in 1977 (*New York Times*, 1979).¹⁹ This file documented the GO's multi-dimensional operation to get Cooper "incarcerated in a mental institution or jail, or at least hit her so hard that she drops her attacks" ([Guardian's Office], 1976).

In addition to the actions consistent with 'Noisy Investigation' and 'Dead Agenting' policies, Scientology employed increasingly creative and illegal methods designed to destroy and conclusively silence her. These creative and illegal methods also were applications of Hubbard's instructions to followers in 1960: "If attacked on some

¹⁸ Just so no misunderstanding exists on this point, "P.C." stands for "Paulette Cooper" and "OP" for "operation."

¹⁹ See: United States District Court for the Central District of California, 1978: 170, "Cedars Inventory, 11972-74, Item 46 - Letter-sized manila folder captioned, 'Op. Freakout' containing three documents."

vulnerable point by anyone or anything or any organization, always find or manufacture enough threat against them to cause them to sue for peace” (Hubbard, 1960: 484). In Cooper’s case, one of the most serious manufactured threats was the GO’s frame-up of her as a potential bomber. After Cooper filed a lawsuit against Scientology, the organization obtained Cooper’s fingerprints surreptitiously and placed them on bomb threats mailed to the New York Church of Scientology. Scientology immediately relayed its fabricated evidence to the FBI, which in turn placed Cooper under investigation. Cooper cooperated with the investigation and was shocked to discover that the bomb threats contained her fingerprints (City of Clearwater, 1982: 11-13; *New York Times*, 1979). She was indicted under two felony counts of sending bomb threats through the mail and one count of perjury for her denials while under oath (Cooper, 1997: Part 9, Page 1). After passing a sodium pentothal examination, a judge postponed her trial and ordered her to visit a psychiatrist (City of Clearwater, 1982: 17-18). Two years later, a court dismissed the charges against her.

Another ‘dead agenting’ tactic included efforts at devastating Cooper emotionally and disrupting her relationships with family and friends. Scientologists from Boston burglarized her former psychiatrist’s office and removed and copied her file before surreptitiously replacing it (Bradlee, 1983: 4). Members of Scientology then mailed copies of her file to her relatives and friends and, as a result, “she underwent severe emotional trauma, lost weight, was unable to work and suffered from paranoia” (United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, 1981: 3).

Scientology’s tactics against Cooper followed policies that Hubbard devised, which embodied the “aggressive, sadistic, revengeful behaviors” (Ronningstam, 2005:

110) associated with people afflicted with the malignant form of Narcissitic Personality Disorder. Scientology's capacity to "become involved in criminal activity" (Malmquist, 1996: 165) also shows the extent to which corporate members were willing to actualize Hubbard's narcissistic rage. Ultimately, the 'Black PR' campaign against Cooper exemplified Hubbard's propensity to "initiate schemes to destroy another person, often one whom they see standing in their way of gaining even greater glory" (Malmquist, 1996: 165).

While the aforementioned GO policies demonstrate the actualization of Hubbard's malignant narcissism, 'Auditing Process R2-45' is the ultimate manifestation of narcissistic rage. First revealed in *The Creation of Human Ability* in 1954, 'Auditing Process R2-45' was described as "an enormously effective process for exteriorization,²⁰ but its use is frowned upon by society at this time" (Hubbard, 1954: 120). "A number of former Scientologists who are now critics of the organization assert that R2-45 is meant to authorize killing its antagonists with a .45-calibre pistol" (Rawitch and Gillette, 1978: 2).

Scientologists discount the legitimacy of the policy, but the organization's internal documentation substantiates the authenticity of 'Auditing Process R2-45.' In an ethics order entitled "Racket Exposed," Hubbard listed the names of twelve "suppressive persons" whom he declared to be "Enemies of mankind, the planet, and all life." He also identified them as "fair game," and instructed that "[a]ny Sea Org member contacting any of them is to use Auditing Process R2-45" (Hubbard, 1968b: 1). He reproduced the ethics order (and added another name to the list) in an organizational newspaper entitled,

²⁰ "Exteriorization, in Scientology terminology, is the ability of the mind, or 'thetan' to physically leave the body" (Rawitch and Gillette, 1978: 2).

The Auditor, which Scientologists received around the world (Hubbard, 1968c), Later that same year (1968), Hubbard printed another R2-45 order in *The Auditor*, this time against four more people (Hubbard, 1968d). No definite evidence exists that any Sea Org member followed Hubbard's murderous instructions, but one incident involving a relative of Paulette Cooper is worth retelling.

When Cooper testified at the City of Clearwater Commission Hearings Regarding the Church of Scientology in 1982, she claimed that Scientology included 'Auditing Process R2-45' in its tactics against her. She disclosed that she moved to a more secure apartment in 1972 and her cousin, Joy, who physically resembled Cooper, assumed her prior residence. Four days after the move, Joy answered the door to discover a man holding a bouquet of flowers that concealed a gun. He uncovered the weapon, pointed it at her head, and pulled the trigger. When the gun didn't fire, he began strangling her until she screamed and he ran away. Cooper later testified under oath that she believed she was the intended victim of the attack, which she viewed as a failed attempt to kill her, and that the incident was the application of 'Auditing Process R2-45' (City of Clearwater, 1982: 10; see Cooper, 1997: Part 3: 2).²¹

'Auditing Process R2-45' dramatically demonstrates the manifestation of Hubbard's malignant narcissism and, more specifically, his narcissistic rage. His conceptualization and authorization of the policy reflect "the dynamics of narcissistic

²¹ Another allegation of a failed 'R2-45' operation appeared in 1994 declaration by former member Hana Whitfield (formerly Eltringham), whom we have mentioned earlier. Under penalty of perjury, she declared that in while in Bizerte, Tunisia (North Africa), "Two Sea Org Officers and I spoke on the dock one evening. They were both flying out the next day to Los Angeles, on a Hubbard assignment. They told me that Hubbard ordered them to shoot up Jack Horner, who lived in Los Angeles, a suppressive person whom Hubbard had personally declared some years earlier. Both men had hand guns and would travel with them. They left . . . and then returned some weeks later. After their debrief they told me that Horner had indeed been shot at multiple times, while he and his family were in their home one evening. Fortunately, no one had been hurt" (Whitfield, 1994: 19).

killing as a righteous act of retaliation, a desperate effort to gain control, and to protect and raise self-esteem” (Rommingstam, 2005: 107; see Malmquist, 1996). The probable implementation of the policy against Cooper exemplifies narcissistic rage at homicidal proportions (Malmquist, 1996: 168), and sits near the extreme end of a continuum of potential reactions to threats against Hubbard’s self-esteem. Moreover, the ruthlessness and scope of Scientology’s campaigns against enemies are indicative of the willingness of some of Hubbard’s followers to silence persons whose statements and actions Hubbard found threatening.

Conclusion

Criminological theory has yet to avail itself of a wealth of material that exists within sects, cults, and new religions—all of which are terms that researchers have applied to Scientology over the years. Within these groups exists wide ranges of behaviour that often involve deviance and criminality (Robbins, 1988), differing little from similar behaviours in government and industry that criminologists have analyzed at length. Criminological behaviours in some of these sects range from massive international corporate malfeasance to global movements of personnel and resources in efforts to commit or cover corporate crime. In fact, religious and/or sectarian crimes, which are illegal actions “perpetrated in accordance with groups’ operational goals,” cover every type of malfeasance found in traditional criminological analyses (Kent, 1998) yet rarely receive mention in, for example, discussions of white collar crime (Lane, 2005; cf. Barnhill, 2005).

As criminologists discover this abundance of under-analyzed information, they will benefit from attentiveness to the crucial role that founders and leaders play in much

of the malfeasance in which many sects engage. Moreover, they will be in line with colleagues in the business community who have known about the dysfunctional and sometimes criminal implications of narcissistic leaders for at least two decades (see, for example, Lubit, 2002; Maccoby, 2000; Sankowsky, 1995; Schwartz, 1987). In all likelihood, scholarship on narcissistic harm within businesses will have direct applicability to the criminological study of sects, since many sects operate business ventures of considerable complexity. Similar relevant research has gone on within the community of political analysts who have examined such topics as malignant narcissism and narcissistic rage among political tyrants (Glad, 2002: 2-25; Post, 1993: 109, 113-114) and the dysfunctional relationship between narcissistic charismatics and their followers (Post, 1986).

Surprisingly, however, sociologists of religion have been resistant to the enrichment of their own approaches with psychological and psychiatric insights. Longstanding hegemonic struggles between sociology and psychology over designations of expertise probably explains some of the resistance, as does a deeply rooted sociological aversion to interpreting social phenomena through psychological concepts. In addition, some sociological researchers have been loathe to address criminality within sects and new religions, fearing that critical information about these groups would provide fodder for 'anti-cult' efforts.

For example, sociologist David Bromley and religious historian Gordon Melton diminished the impact that dysfunctional leaders have on sectarian groups by concluding, "Attributing organizational outcomes to the personality of a single individual, even a powerful charismatic leader, usually camouflages much more complex social dynamics"

(Melton and Bromley, 2002: 47). In our analysis of Hubbard, however, the identification of his malignant narcissism uncovers, rather than camouflages, the underlying psychological condition that provided the context for the “complex social dynamics” of members’ retaliation against critics and perceived enemies. Out of our analysis emerges crucial social questions involving the socialization of members into Hubbard’s worldview—a topic that demands its own full-length study.

Another prominent sociologist who diminishes the importance of psychological (or as we prefer to say, biopsychosocial) interpretations of sect leaders is Lorne Dawson. In an article analyzing whether psychopathologies play roles in charisma and violence associated with new religions, he concluded, “there is insufficient evidence to argue that charismatic leaders are any more prone to violent behavior, or policy initiatives that lead to violence, than other people” (Dawson, 2006: 21). He added:

I am disinclined to follow the assumption of almost all psychological analyses of charismatic leaders that they are suffering from some kind of identifiable form of neurosis or even psychosis. We simply lack the kind of data require [sic] to come reliably to such a judgement (Dawson, 2006: 21).

At least regarding L. Ron Hubbard, however, it is abundantly clear that “the personality of a single individual” is the central variable needed to explain Scientology’s deviant and sometimes criminogenic policies, and that the evidence for Hubbard’s malignant narcissism is overwhelming.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Psychiatric Association. 2000a. "Hypomanic Episode." *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. Fourth Edition, Text Revision. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association; On-line Download.

----- . 2000b. "301.81 Narcissistic Personality Disorder." *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. Fourth Edition, Text Revision. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association; On-line Download.

Anderson, Robert D. 1999. *Inside the Mind of Joseph Smith: Psychobiography and the Book of Mormon*. Salt Lake City: Signature Books.

Anonymous. 1980? "Paulette Cooper." [Probable Guardian's Office Dead Agent Pack]. Unpublished Manuscript: 18pp.; On File in the Stephen A. Kent Collection on Alternative Religions, Housed in the University of Alberta Library.

Armstrong, Gerald. 1984a. "Reporters' Transcript of Proceedings." Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles. *Church of Scientology of California vs. Gerald Armstrong, Mary Sue Hubbard, Intervenor*. No. C 420153. (May 10): 1289-1563.

----- . 1984b. "Reporters' Transcript of Proceedings." Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles. *Church of Scientology of California vs. Gerald Armstrong, Mary Sue Hubbard, Intervenor*. No. C 420153. (May 14): 1740-1895.

Atack, Jon. 1990. *A Piece of Blue Sky: Scientology, Dianetics, and L. Ron Hubbard Exposed*. Secaucus, New Jersey: Lyle Stuart.

Bainbridge, William Sims; and Rodney Stark. 1979. "Cult Formation: Three Compatible Models." *Sociological Analysis*: 40 No. : 283-295; Reprinted in Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge. 1985. *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation*. Berkeley: University of California Press: 171-188.

Barker, Eileen. 1984. *The Making of a Moonie: Choice or Brainwashing?* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Barnhill, John. 2005. "Religious Fraud." *Encyclopedia of White-Collar & Corporate Crime*, Volume 2, edited by Lawrence M. Salinger. London: Sage: 679-685.

Bradlee Jr., Ben. 1983. "Scientology Defectors Charge 'Dirty Tricks' in Boston." *Boston Globe* (May 31); Downloaded from: <http://www.xenu.net/archive/go/media/bg310583.htm> on June 1, 2007: 7pp.

Brodie, Fawn M. 1963. *No Man Knows My History: The Life of Jospeh Smith*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Burden, Tonya. 1980. "Affidavit." Las Vegas, Nevada (January 25): 12pp.

Carter, Lewis F. 1990. *Charisma and Control in Rajneeshpuram: The Role of Shared Values in the Creation of a Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

City of Clearwater. 1982. "Commission Hearing: The Church of Scientology." Day 4, Paulette Cooper. May 8; Downloaded from: www.xenu-directory.net/documents/cw1982/cw4_314-348.htm on May 31, 2007: 30pp.

Clark, Ronald O. 1988. "The Narcissistic Guru: A Profile of Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh." *Free Inquiry* (Spring): 33-45.

Clarke, John. 1950. "Noted Doctors Attack New Treatment." *Daily News* [Los Angeles, California], (September 9): 3, 16.

Clarke, Peter. 2006. *New Religions in Global Perspective: A Study of Religious Change in the Modern World*. London: Routledge.

Cohn, Norman. 1970. *The Pursuit of the Millennium*. 1957, Revised and Expanded Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cooper, Paulette. 1969. "The Tragi-Farce of Scieintology." *Queen Magazine*. London; Downloaded from: <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~dst/Library/Shelf/cooper/sos-que.html> on January 29, 2008.

----- . 1971. *The Scandal of Scientology*. New York: Tower Books.

----- . 1997. "Paulette Cooper's Harassment Diary." Downloaded from <http://www.holysmoke.org/pc/pc.htm>.

Corydon, Bent. 1996. *L. Ron Hubbard: Messiah or Madman?* 1992, Newly Revised and Updated. Fort Lee, New Jersey: Barricade Books.

Dawson, Lorne. 2006. "Psychopathologies and the Attribution of Charisma: A Critical Introduction to the Psychology of Charisma and the Explanation of Violence in New Religious Movements." *Nova Religio* 10 No. 2: 2-28.

Deutsch, Alexander. 1983. "Psychiatric Perspectives on an Eastern-Style Cult." In *Psychodynamic Perspectives on Religion Sect and Cult*, edited by David A. Halperin. Boston: John Wright: 113-129.

----- . 1989. "Psychological Perspectives on Cult Leadership." in *Cults and New Religious Movements: A Report of the American Psychiatric Association*, edited by Marc Galanter. Washinton, d.C.: American Psychiatric Association: 147-163.

Glad, Betty. 2002. "Why Tyrants Go Too Far: Malignant Narcissism and Absolute Power." *Political Psychology* 23 No. 1 (March): 1-37.

Glock, Charles. 1964. "The Role of Deprivation in the Origin and Evolution of Religious Groups," in *Religion and Social Conflict*, edited by Robert Lee and Martin E. Marty. New York: Oxford: 24-36.

[Guardian's Office]. 1976. "Operation Freakout." (April 1). Document Obtained During the FBI's July 8-9, 1977 Raid on Scientology Offices in Washington, D.C. and Los Angeles.

Hubbard, L. Ron. 1950. *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. 1st Printing. New York: Hermitage House.

----- . 1951. *Handbook for Preclears*. [No Location]: Scientific Press..

----- . 1954. *The Creation of Human Ability*. Sussex, England: Department of Publications Worldwide.

----- . 1955. "The Scientologist: A Manual on the Dissemination of Material," in Hubbard, 1976c: 151-171.

----- . 1956a. *The Problems of Work*. Washington, D.C.: Scientology Consultants to Industrial Efficiency.

----- . 1956b. *Scientology: the Fundamentals of Thought*. London: Hubbard Association of Scientologists International.

----- . 1959. "Manual of Justice." Confidential—for HCO Personnel Only. London: Hubbard Communications Office.

----- . 1960. "Dept of Govt Affairs." *Hubbard Communications Policy Letter* (August 15); in Hubbard, 1974c: 483-485.

----- . 1965a. "Ethics. Suppressive Acts. Suppression of Scientology and Scientologists. The Fair Game Law." *Hubbard Communications Office Policy Letter*

(December 23); in L. Ron Hubbard, *The Organization Executive Course*, Volume 1. Copenhagen: Scientology Publications Organization, 1970: 552-557.

----- 1965b. "Suppressive Persons, Main Characteristics Of." *Hubbard Communications Office Policy Letter* (August 7); in L. Ron Hubbard, *The Organization Executive Course*, Volume 1. Copenhagen: Scientology Publications Organization, 1970: 428-430.

----- 1966a. "Attacks on Scientology." *Hubbard Communications Office Policy Letter* (February 18); in L. Ron Hubbard, 1974c: 491-493.

----- 1966b. "The Guardian." *Hubbard Communications Office Policy Letter* (March 1): 6 pp.

----- 1967a. "Penalties for Lower Conditions." *Hubbard Communications Office Policy Letter* (October 18): 1p.

----- 1967b. "Post, Handling Of." *Hubbard Communication Office Policy Letter* (September 12); in L. Ron Hubbard, *The Organization Executive Course, Basic Staff Hat*, Volume 0. Los Angeles: Bridge Publications, 1991: 238-239.

----- 1968a. "Cancellation of Fair Game." *Hubbard Communications Office Policy Letter* (October 21); in L. Ron Hubbard, *The Organization Executive Course*, HCO Division 1. First Edition. Copenhagen: Scientology Publications Organization (1970): 489.

----- 1968b. "Racket Exposed." *Hubbard Communications Office Ethics Order*, No. 30 INT (March 6): 1p.

----- 1968c "Racket Exposed." *The Auditor* 35. East Grinstead: Saint Hill Manor.

- 1968d “Racket Exposed.” *The Auditor* 37. East Grinstead: Saint Hill Manor.
- 1968e. “The War.” *Executive Directive from L. Ron Hubbard* 55 INT (November 29): 2pp.
- 1969. “Organization Program No.1.” *LRH Executive Directive* 49 INT (9 December); in L. Ron Hubbard, *The Organization Executive Course, Basic Staff*, Volume 0. Copenhagen: Scientology Publications Organization, 1970: 256-260.
- 1972. “How to Handle Black Propaganda.” *Hubbard Communications Office Policy Letter* (November 21); in L. Ron Hubbard, *The Management Series*, Volume 2 (Los Angeles: Bridge Publications, 1982): 418-427.
- 1974a. “Handling Hostile Contacts/Dead Agenting.” *Board Policy Letter*, Confidential PR Series 24 (May 30): 9pp.
- 1974b. “The Technical Breakthrough of 1973! The Introspection RD.” *Hubbard Communications Office Bulletin* (January 23); in Hubbard , 1976c: 239-242).
- 1974c. *The Organization Executive Course* Volume 7. Second Printing, 1976. Los Angeles: Church of Scientology of California.
- 1976a. *Modern Management Technology Defined*. Copenhagen: New Era Publications.
- 1976b. *The Technical Bulletins of Dianetics and Scientology*, Volume I (1950-1953). Copenhagen: Scientology Publications.
- 1976c. *The Technical Bulletins of Dianetics and Scientology*, Volume II (1972-1975). Copenhagen: Scientology Publications.

-----, 1976d. *The Technical Bulletins of Dianetics and Scientology*, Volume VIII (1972-1975). Copenhagen: Scientology Publications.

-----, 1982. "The Future of Scientology." *Ron's Journal* 34 (March 13): 3pp.

James, William. 1902. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: The Modern Library/Random House..

Kent, Stephen A. 1987a. "Psychological and Mystical Interpretations of Early Quakerism: William James and Rufus Jones." *Religion* 17: 251-274.

-----, 1987b. "Psychology and Quaker Mysticism: the Legacy of William James and Rufus Jones." *Quaker History* 76 No. 1 (Spring): 1-17.

-----, 1987c. "Puritan Radicalism and the New Religious Organizations: Seventeenth Century England and Contemporary America." *Comparative Social Research* 10. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press: 3-46.

-----, 1989. "Mysticism, Quakerism, and Relative Deprivation: A Sociological Reply to R.A. Naulty." *Religion* 19: 157-178.

1998. "Crimes." *Encyclopedia of Religion and Society*, edited by William H. Swatos. London: Altamira Press: 121-122.

1999. "The Globalization of Scientology: Influence, Control and Opposition in Transnational Markets." *Religion* 29: 147-169.

-----, 2001. *From Slogans to Mantras: Social Protest and Religious Conversion in the Late Vietnam War Era*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

-----, 2006. "Scientific Evaluation of the Dangers Posed by Religious Groups: A Partial Model." in *The New Religious Question: State Regulation or State Interference?*

edited by Pauline Côté and T. Jeremy Gunn. Bruxelles: Peter Lang: 343-370; Revised Version Previously Published in *Cultic Studies Review* 3 Nos 2 & 3 (2004): 101-134.

-----, 2007. "Narcissistic Fraud in the Ancient World: Lucian's Account of Alexander of Abonuteichos and the Cult of Glycon." *Ancient Narrative* 6: 77-99..

Kernberg, Otto F. 1975. *Borderline Conditions and Pathological Narcissism*. 2nd Printing, 1976. New York: Jason Aronson.

-----, 1984. *Severe Personality Disorders: Psychotherapeutic Strategies*. 1986 Edition. New Haven: Yale University Press.

-----, 1992. *Aggression in Personality Disorders and Perversions*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

-----, 1998. "Pathological Narcissism and Narcissistic Personality Disorder: Theoretical Background and Diagnostic Classification." in *Disorders of Narcissism: Diagnostic, Clinical, and Empirical Implications*, edited by Elisa F. Ronningstam. Washington, American Psychiatric Press: 29-51.

Kohut, Heinz. 1972. "Thoughts on Narcissism and Narcissistic Rage." *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 27. New York: Quadrangle Books: 360-400.

Krakauer, Jon. 2003. *Under the Banner of Heaven: A Story of Violent Faith*. New York: Doubleday.

Kumar, J. P. 1997. "'Fair Game': Leveling the Playing Field in Scientology Litigation." *Review of Litigation* 16 No. 3: 747-772.

Lalich, Janja. 2004. *Bounded Choice: True Believers and Charismatic Cults*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Lane, Jodi M. 2005. "The Guardian's Office of Scientology: A Test of James Coleman's Theory of Elite Deviance." M.A. Thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Alberta [Canada].

Lieberman, Anne R. 2004. "The Narcissistic Personality Disorder," in *A Therapist's Guide to the Personality Disorders: The Masterson Approach*, edited by James F. Masterson and Anne R. Lieberman. Phoenix, Arizona: Zeig, Tucker & Theisen: 73-90.

LRH Aides. 1969. "Covert Operations." LRH Aides' Conference. (November 2): 31 pp.

Lubit, Roy. 2002. "The Long-Term Organizational Impact of Destructively Narcissistic Managers." *Academy of Management Executive* 16 No. 1: 127-138.

Lys, Candice. 2005. "The Violence of Jim Jones: A Biopsychosocial Explanation." *Cultic Studies Review* 4 No. 3: 267-294.

Maccoby, Michael. 2000. "Narcissistic Leaders: The Incredible Pros, the Inevitable Cons." *Harvard Business Review* (January-February): 69-77.

Malmquist, Carl P. 1996. *Homicide: A Psychiatric Perspective*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Mascareñas de los Santos, César; and Jorge Mascareñas Ruiz. 1997. "Un Estudio Psicoanalítico Sobre la Relación Líder-Feligresía en la Iglesia 'La Luz del Mundo,'" in *La Luz Del Mundo" Un Análisis Multidisciplinario de la Controversia Religiosa Que Ha Impacctado A Nuestro País*, edited by Revista Académica Para El Estudio de las Religiones. Mexico City: Estudia Científico de las Religiones: 85-116.

Melton, J. Gordon; and David Bromley. 2002. "Challenging the Misconceptions About the New Religions—Violence Connection," in *Cults, Religion and Violence*, edited by David G. Bromley and J. Gordon Melton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 42-56.

Miller, Russell. 1987. *Bare-Faced Messiah: The True Story of L. Ron Hubbard*. Toronto: Key Porter Books.

Mullins, Mark R. 1997. "Aum Shinrikyō as an Apocalyptic Movement," in *Millennium, Messiahs, and Mayhem: Contemporary Apocalyptic Movements*, edited by Thomas Robbins and Susan J. Palmer. London: Routledge: 313-324.

National Parole Board. 2003. "NPB Pre-Release Decision Sheet' [on Ivon Shearing]. (April 15): 5pp.

Newport, Kenneth G. C. 2006. *The Branch Davidians of Waco: The History and Beliefs of an Apocalyptic Sect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

New York Times. 1979. "Author of a Book on Scientology Tells of Her 8 Years of Torment." (January 22): A14.

Numbers, Ronald L.; and Janet S. 1992. "Afterward: Ellen White on the Mind and the Mind of Ellen White," in Ronald L. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health: Ellen G. white and the Origins of Seventh-day Adventist Health Reform*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press (1992): 202-227.

Osinski, Bill. 2007. *Ungodly: A True Story of Unprecedented Evil*. Macon, Georgia: Indigo Publishing Group.

Phillips, Katharine A; Shirley Yen; and John G. Gunderson. 2008. "Personality Disorders," in *Textbook of Clinical Psychiatry*, 4th Edition, edited by Robert E. Hales and

Stuart C. Yudofsky. Arlington, Virginia: American Psychiatric Publishing; On-line Download.

Post, Jerrold M. 1986. "Narcissism and the Charismatic Leader-Follower Relationship." *Political Psychology* 7 No. 4 (December): 675-688.

-----, 1993. "Current Concepts of the Narcissistic Personality: Implications for Political Psychology." *Political Psychology* 14 No. 1 (March): 99-121.

Raine, Susan. 2005. "Reconceptualizing the Human Body: Heaven's Gate and the Quest for Divine Transformation." *Religion* 35: 98-117.

Rawitch, Robert and Robert Gillette. 1978. "Scientology Critics Assail Aggressiveness of Church." *Los Angeles Times*, August 28: 11pp. Downloaded from <http://www.xenu.net/archive/go/media/la280878.htm>.

Robbins, Thomas. 1988. "Profit for Prophets: Legitimate and Illegitimate Economic Practices in New Religious Movements," in *Money and Power in the New Religions*, edited by James T. Richardson. Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press: 69-116.

Ronningstam, Elsa F. 2005. *Identifying and Understanding the Narcissistic Personality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ronningstam, Elsa; and John Gunderson. 1990. "Identifying Criteria for Narcissistic Personality Disorder." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 147 No. 7 (July): 918-922.

Sankowsky, Daniel. 1995. "The Charismatic Leader as Narcissist: Understanding the Abuse of Power." *Organizational Dynamics* 23 (Spring): 57-71.

Schwartz, Howard S. 1987. "On the Psychodynamics of Organizational Totalitarianism." *Journal of Management* 13 No. 1: 41-54.

Sil, Narasingha P. 1991. *Rāmākṛṣṇa Paramahansa: A Psychological Profile*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Singer, Margaret Thaler; with Janja Lalich. 1995. *Cults in Our Midst*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Storr, Anthony. 1996. *Feet of Clay: Saints, Sinners, and Madmen: A Study of Gurus*. Toronto: The Free Press.

Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York. 1972. "Paulette Cooper, Plaintiff, against Church of Scientology of New York, Inc.; Church of Scientology of California; and U.S. Churches of Scientology, Defendants." Verified Amended Complaint., Index # 6732/72 (June 21); Downloaded from: <http://groups.google.com/groups?q=%22Church+of+Scientology+of+California%22+%22Queen%22+%22Paulette+Cooper%22&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&edition=us&selm=58c6co%24d74%40clark.zippo.com&rnum=2> on June 1, 2007: 8pp.

United States District Court for the Central District of California. 1978. "Church of Scientology of California v United States of America." Respondent's Submission of Search Warrants Inventories Marked with Documents to be Returned to Petitioner." No. CV 77-2565-MML (April 4).

United States District Court For the District of Columbia. 1979a. "Stipulation of Evidence." United States of America v. Mary Sue Hubbard, et. al. Criminal No. 78-401 (October 26): 284pp.

United States District Court For the District of Columbia. 1979b. "Sentencing Memorandum of the United States of America" United States of America v. Mary Sue Hubbard, et. al. Criminal No. 78-401 (December 3): 72pp

United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts. 1981. "Paulette Cooper, Plaintiff, vs. Church of Scientology of Boston, Inc., L. Ron Hubbard and Mary Sue Hubbard, Defendants. Complaint." (March 9): 10pp.

U.S. Ministry of Public Relations. N. D. [circa 1974]. "False Report Correction: *The Scandal of Scientology* by Paulette Cooper." [Los Angeles?]: Church of Scientology of California.

Wallis, Roy. 1977. *The Road to Total Freedom: A Sociological Analysis of Scientology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Weber, Max. 1922 [1968]. *Economy and Society*. 2 Vols., edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich; Translated by Ephraim Fischhoff, et. al.. 1978 Reprint. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Whitfield, Hana. 1994. "Revised Declaration of Hana Whitfield Re Motion for Costs." United States District Court, Central District of California, "Church of Scientology International vs. Steven Fishman and Uwe Geertz." No. CV 91-6426 HLH (Tx). (March 8): 79pp.

Williams, C. L. 1951. "Special Orthopedic Examination [of Lafayette R. Hubbard]." (8/1 [August 1?]): 2pp.

Wilson, Bryan. 1970. *Religious Sects: A Sociological Study*. Toronto: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Wilson, Mitchell. 1993. "DSM III and the Transformation of American Psychiatry: A History." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 150 No. 3 (March): 399-410.

BIOGRAPHIES

Jodi M. Lane, M.A., is an addictions researcher in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, specializing in alcohol, tobacco, illicit drug use, and gambling behaviour among youth.

Stephen A. Kent, PhD, is a Professor of Sociology and Adjunct Professor of Religious Studies, University of Alberta (Canada), specializing in the study of ‘cults’ and alternative religions. He has published articles in numerous sociology and religious studies journals on a variety of topics, including Gnosticism, ancient Hindu philosophy, Mahayana Buddhism, Puritanism, fundamentalist Mormon polygamy, deviance, and new religions.