The Dangerous Discourse of Dianetics: Linguistic Manifestations of Violence Toward Queerness in the Canonical Religious Philosophy of Scientology

Francesca Retana

University of Puget Sound, fretana@pugetsound.edu
The Dangerous Discourse of Dianetics: 
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of Scientology

I. Uncovering the Anti-Queer Sentiment in the Dianetic Perspective

At present, there is a groundswell of public sensational interest in the subject of Scientology; and, in fact, in the time since I began this research paper, a nine-episode documentary series has premiered and reached finale on A&E titled “Scientology and the Aftermath”— a personal project hosted by sitcom celebrity, ex-Scientologist, and author of Troublemaker: Surviving Hollywood and Scientology, Leah Remini.¹ I could not begin to enumerate the myriad exposés/memoirs of ex-Scientologists that have been published in recent years nor could I emphasize enough the rampant conspiracy theories that are at the disposal of any curious mind on what many have termed “the cult” of Scientology. Be forewarned that a simple internet search of “Scientology” plus “Violence” will surely coax one down the rabbit hole of research. I anticipate, however, that a conjunction of the terms “Scientology” and “Homophobia” might prove exceedingly enlightening.

It is beyond the scope of this research paper to analyze the multiple accounts that have emerged across numerous platforms (both digital and print via formal and informal channels of publication) that detail instances of personal and physical violence committed at the behest of Scientology. Rather, what I set out to do in the limited space granted is to interrogate a very distinct and incisive form of violence perpetrated against a particular category of marginalized identities. By utilizing passages from trademarked canonical texts of Scientology as primary source material, I will investigate how this form of violence is authenticated and realized. I am

only capable of providing a contextual glimpse into a pervasive violent reality as it intersects specifically with queerness—in a way that has been consistently invisible to the outsider, and more often than not, the insider as well.

Typical interpretations and expressions of violence can be understood as physical harm accomplished through brute force that define a clear perpetrator and victim.\(^2\) To be sure, such instances are rampant and well-evidenced within the formal institution of Scientology. I would like to emphasize that I fully recognize the existence of such occurrences and have become well-versed in the structures that carry them out through research and presentation. If traditional acts of violence as demonstrations of physical force in Scientology are of greater interest to the reader than the more subtle or covert forms of violence that this paper will explore, I would invite the inquirer to review the glossary attached to this paper.

With the intention of preciseness in the following investigation, I have limited my discussion to the realm of verbal violence as it exists on the documented linguistic level. Such verbal violence is perpetually deployed in the copying and consumption of L. Ron Hubbard’s (the founder of Dianetics and Scientology) writings—remaining remarkably static over the past sixty-seven years. To reiterate, I understand that by concentrating in linguistic properties of violence as they manifest through rhetorical devices, millions of forms of atrocious and visible instances of violence are going without mention.\(^3\) I do not wish to diminish the value of current discussion surrounding corporeal and visible forms of violence, however it seems crucial that a scholarly discussion—as opposed to scandalized and sensationalized—be prompted to validate the physiological after-effects that frequently accompany linguistic violence for those whom are

\(^2\) Class notes, REL 410, Professor Greta Austin. Sep 1, 2016.
victims. While I am aware of the preponderance and consequences of physical injury that have attracted media attention as of late, I set out to demonstrate that the psychological harm incurred through overt and covert levels of language are equally as devastating and deleterious to the targeted sufferer. Then, the objective of the following paper is to analyze the ways in which linguistic violence is erected to target the queer community through rabid homophobic rhetoric encountered in the foundational, or canonical, texts of Scientology as an applied religious philosophy.

I will argue that the expression of sexuality is violently repressed by the deployment and manipulation of discriminatory language included in Scientology’s canonical texts that introduced the technological philosophy of Dianetics. L. Ron Hubbard’s outlined path to spiritual superiority in his invented, new and alternative religious movement is enduringly plagued by prejudice. The narratives and testimonies of queer and ally defectors/apostates from the institutionalized Church of Scientology include their understanding of the Second Dynamic (or Sex Dynamic) and the ways in which a Dianetic framework of human existence is brimming with unbridled bigotry with the intent to indoctrinate.⁴ I will seek to prove that L. Ron Hubbard has equipped Scientology with normalized master tools of manipulation that champion compulsive heteronormativity and in turn diminish, if not erase, autonomy and agency as they relate to the expression of sexuality and gender nonconformity.

The emergence of individuality is seriously crippled by the distortion of identity development as presented in L. Ron Hubbard’s *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* (*A Handbook of Dianetic Therapy*), the foundational text of Scientology, as well as in his follow-up books *Science of Survival: Prediction of Human Behavior* and *Handbook for Preclears.*

---

Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health was originally published in 1950 and spawned the religious movement that would soon materialize as the Church of Scientology in 1954. The application of Dianetics, as a technological philosophy, was extended upon in Hubbard’s 1951 Science of Survival: Prediction of Human Behavior and Handbook for Preclears. I selected these texts in particular because they make explicit reference to homosexuality and, in a more modern comprehension, this would include non-normative sexual identities or expressions. In my research, I scoured through three different print editions of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, and my findings were as remarkable in their consistency as they were alarming.

In the last two decades, the Church has pushed a flimsy agenda of acceptance and inclusivity. While currently disseminated material by the Church is guised as more inclusive of the queer community, the posthumous versions of the above mentioned Hubbard texts remain unchanged regarding the topics of sexual deviancy and/or perversion. It is clear that the precedent was set in 1950 and the Church has not rid itself of a violent anti-queer sentiment. In actuality, there is nothing subtle or covert about this position as can be demonstrated by flagrantly homophobic rhetoric and conscious components of Scientology configured by Hubbard’s wish to eradicate what he perceived to be a psychosomatic illness of “sexual perversion.” This is further exacerbated by the unwillingness of any devout Scientologist to challenge, denounce, or amend the conclusions of their glorified charismatic founder.

It seems only fair that I acknowledge and differentiate between variant manifestations of Scientology. Scientology as a formal and official institution is referred to as the Church of

---

Scientology (in previous pages, I have referred to it simply as “The Church”). The Church (currently fronted by David Miscavige) is the most dominant embodiment of Scientology and seeks to keep strict regulation on the dissemination of Dianetic materials and track global membership. However, Scientology as an applied religious philosophy does not occur solely in this context. Independent Scientologists operating in what is commonly referred to as the “Free Zone” still prescribe to the techniques and doctrine of Scientology outside of the conventional establishment. Regardless of the context of application, the unifying component of all Scientology practitioners is the glorification of L. Ron Hubbard (occasionally abbreviated as “LRH” from here forth) and the reliance on his book *Dianetics*. The acceptance and application of *Dianetics* as the authoritative origin of behavior will serve as the focus of the paper. As an aside, there is great contention in how many self-identified Scientologists there are today—the institution claims upwards of eight million while various polls have offered a generous estimation of just forty-thousand worldwide. This confusion may arise in that the organization inflates these numbers with the sales of the *hundreds* of books, seminars, lectures, and courses authored or created by LRH that it pitches to the curious inquirer. Essentially, anyone who has had any initial contact with the Church is subject to getting factored in to this number.

I am not making an attack on the institutionalized Church of Scientology nor on those who identify as Scientologists but do not claim direct affiliation with the Church. To extend this idea even further, I am not passing direct judgment on the many who adhere to the philosophy

---

and approaches presented in *Dianetics* as a way of life, but wouldn’t call themselves “Scientologists.”  

Membership not withstanding, I am scrutinizing L. Ron Hubbard’s authoritative fundamental Dianetics *Handbook* as well as his postliminary literature that have surely been influential to all factions listed above. These texts are likely to frame the perceptions of LRH’s most ardent supporters today, as they have operated to covertly yet coercively inform their understanding of humanity. I have not conducted any ethnographic research nor have I spoken first-hand to any Scientologists or ex-Scientologists to confirm this hypothesis; for this, I rely solely upon critical memoir. Thus, my paper is exploratory, interpretive, and comparative in approach. I do not wish to further engage in debate, speculation or conjecture on the nature of this particular new religious movement as either an authentic religion or an illegitimate cult— I only wish to reveal the inherent homophobic and anti-queer rhetoric in the writings of its founder. The following section is dedicated to the linguistic violence inherent in my primary sources.

**II. Dangerous Declarations of Inferiority Substantiated in the Source**

**A. Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health**

*Dianetics* is confusingly referred to as “Book One” by Scientologists and Dianeticists, although technically it was the third book in the chronological sequence of publishing (May 1950) according to Scientology’s Materials Guide Chart. To be clear, *Dianetics* is recognized as the most formal compilation of Hubbard’s interpretation of human behavior, marking the end of his career as a prolific writer for pulp magazines predominantly of the science fiction genre.

---


Dianetics, as Hubbard intended, is "the study of human behavior for the purpose of discovering and removing the sources of aberration" and, once in print form, Dianetics launched the movement that would soon define itself as a religion four years later. Supposedly, this book presented Hubbard’s twelve years of laborious research and introduced his principles regarding the "reactive mind" and the "dynamic principle of existence." Dianetics alleges that the application of its technologies will bring about unprecedented therapeutic benefit; naturally, its advent alarmed the professional medical community because it employed superficially scientific language.

A distinguishing feature of this book is that it was typed by L. Ron Hubbard, the prophet, himself and therefore could not possibly be subject to content error or extensive typographical mistakes. In fact, Hubbard is claimed to have written the lengthy Dianetics (over five-hundred pages in most editions) in somewhere between three to six weeks. Although accounts vary, this general conception of Hubbard’s numinous and prodigious composition is widely accepted by Scientologists. All other Beginning and Basic books that form the Scientology canon were dictated by a transcriptionist; therefore, it has been a common claim of the Church that Hubbard’s original concepts were misconstrued in this process. Conspiracy theory has made the whole subject particularly challenging to navigate because some argue that Dianetics “has been subject to continuous editing since its inception so that at present it hardly resembles the

17 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
original 1950 edition.” However, my own research into the rhetoric erected toward queerness in “Book One” could not attest to this charge.

In 2007, it was verified by David Miscavige himself that not a single word had been changed in the new edition of *Dianetics* as it required extremely minimal editing (mostly in the interest of aesthetics). I present to you a dismaying passage found completely unmodified in the 1950, 1967, and 2007 editions of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*:

> The sexual pervert (and by this term dianetics, to be brief, includes any and all forms of deviation in Dynamic II such as homosexuality, lesbianism, sexual sadism, etc. and all down the catalogue of Ellis and Krafft-Ebing) is actually quite physically ill. Perversion as an illness has so many manifestations that it must be spread through the entire gamut of classes from (1) to (5) above. Over-development of sexual organs, underdevelopment, seminal inhibition or magnification, etc. are found some in one pervert, some in another. And the sum of it is that the pervert is always a very ill person in one way or another, whether he is conscious of it or not. He is very far from culpable for his condition, but he is also so far from normal and so extremely dangerous to society that the tolerance of perversion is as thoroughly bad for society as punishment for it. Lacking proper means prior to this time, society has been caught between tolerance and punishment, and the problem of perversion has, of course, not been resolved.

> For context, Richard von Krafft-Ebing published works on a variety of sexual practices and inclinations in the latter half of the nineteenth century. His conviction was such that sexual engagement not designated to accomplish procreation was undeniably perverse; further noting that homosexuals suffered from an extreme degree of perversion because their sexual practices

---

were veritably unproductive of offspring.\(^{22}\) In a similar vein, Hubbard certifies the perverse nature of homosexuality but takes Krafft-Ebing’s conclusion one step further by detailing the experiential antecedents that construct said nature. Hubbard’s essential premise is that the mind is more than capable of adversely affecting the body, and when it does so, it is described as a psychosomatic condition.\(^{23}\) Thus, psychosomatic illnesses are physical illnesses caused by the internal spirit—which will later be termed by Hubbard as “theta(n)”. Logically following, queer acts, inclinations, innuendo, and identities are construed as the symptoms of psychosomatic illness. To leave you with an unsettling depiction that easily surpasses Freud’s absurd rationale in his psychosexual theory, Hubbard writes:

A bit off the subject here, but it can be remarked about perversion that the best previous explanation for it was something about girls becoming envious of Papa's penis or boys becoming upset about that terrible thing, the vulva, which Mama was incautious enough to show one day. It takes a great deal more than this utter tripe to make a pervert. It is, rather, something on the order of kicking a baby's head in, running over him with a steam roller, cutting him in half with a rusty knife, boiling him in lysol and all the while with crazy people screaming the most horrifying and unprintable things at him...When it comes to throwing his second dynamic out of balance, what that takes is straight out of Dante and Sax Rohmer combined. Hence the pervert, containing hundreds and hundreds of vicious engrams, has had little choice between being dead and being a pervert. But with an effective science to handle the problem, a society which would continue to endure perversion and all its sad and sordid effects doesn't deserve to survive.\(^{24}\)

B. Science of Survival


Science of Survival was first printed in June of 1951 and is considered the follow-up to Hubbard's very popular Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health. It is considered standard reference work of the Church of Scientology and is listed as fourth in publication on the Materials Guide Chart. In original editions, Science of Survival featured the subtitle “Simplified, Faster Dianetic Techniques,” while more recent editions include the subtitle “Prediction of Human Behavior.”25 In the preceding historical moment, Dianetics was lauded as a scientific subject with techniques aimed toward therapeutic results. However, in Science of Survival, Hubbard’s description of “theta” makes its first appearance; for clarity’s sake, this can be understood as the “life energy” or source of the “thetan”—the divine spark in each individual human (often interpreted as self, spirit or soul).26 This rhetoric presents an initial shift toward religiosity and spirituality that is more or less representative of a Gnostic worldview.

Hubbard authored Science of Survival during a highly suspect sojourn in pre-communist Cuba.27 Science of Survival is a cumulative text filled with Dianetics terminology, and it serves a key purpose in elaborating upon and advancing Hubbard’s “discovery” (or contrivance) of the Tone Scale—his first attempt at a characterization of human behavior in a numerical graphic. Hubbard also introduces concepts that would later become key elements (or tools) of Scientology, like the formalized Hubbard Chart of Human Evaluation. This defining revelation is the key feature of Science of Survival and effectively codifies a complete description of the Tone Scale and the components of emotion.28 As depicted below, Hubbard locates homosexuality (as a manifestation of sexual perversion and deviation) on his Tone Scale at 1.1—“Covert Hostility.”

According to Hubbard’s Chart of Human Evaluation, other behavioral descriptors of Covert Hostility (1.1) include: promiscuity, perversion, sadism, use of children for sadistic purposes, neurological illness, unexpressed resentment, no control of reason or emotion, uses sly means of controlling others, active liability, vicious hidden intents, sex criminal, deviously dishonest without reason, listens little; mostly to cabal, gossip or lies, incapable, capricious, irresponsible, generally always despised, and nearly always fails (among other charges).29 Below you will find an excerpt from Science of Survival detailing Hubbard’s stance on those individuals placed at 2.0 or below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40.0 Serenity of Beingness</th>
<th>2.0 Antagonism</th>
<th>0.8 Propitiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.0 Postulates</td>
<td>1.9 Hostility</td>
<td>0.5 Grief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.0 Games</td>
<td>1.8 Pain</td>
<td>0.375 Making Amends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0 Action</td>
<td>1.5 Anger</td>
<td>0.3 Undeserving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Exhilaration</td>
<td>1.4 Hate</td>
<td>0.2 Self-abasement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Aesthetic</td>
<td>1.3 Resentment</td>
<td>0.1 Victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Enthusiasm</td>
<td>1.2 No-sympathy</td>
<td>0.07 Hopeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Cheerfulness</td>
<td>1.15 Unexpressed Resentment</td>
<td>0.05 Apathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Strong Interest</td>
<td>1.1 COVERT HOSTILITY***</td>
<td>0.03 Useless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Conservatism</td>
<td>1.0 Fear</td>
<td>0.01 Dying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Mild Interest</td>
<td>0.98 Despair</td>
<td>0.0 Body Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Contented</td>
<td>0.96 Terror</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Disinterested</td>
<td>0.94 Numb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Boredom</td>
<td>0.9 Sympathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Monotony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are only two answers for the handling of people from 2.0 down on the tone scale, neither one of which has anything to do with reasoning with them or listening to their justification of their acts. The first is to raise them on the tone scale by un-enturbulating some of their theta(n) by any one of the three valid processes. The other is to dispose of them quietly and without sorrow. Adders are safe bedmates compared to people on the lower bands of the tone scale. Not all the beauty nor the handsomeness nor artificial social value nor property can atone for the vicious damage such people do to sane men and women. The sudden and abrupt deletion of all individuals occupying the lower bands of the tone scale from the social order would result in an almost instant rise in the cultural tone and would interrupt the dwindling spiral into which any society

may have entered. It is not necessary to produce a world of clears in order to have a reasonable and worthwhile social order; it is only necessary to delete those individuals who range from 2.0 down, either by processing them enough to get their tone level above the 2.0 line — a task which, indeed, is not very great, since the amount of processing in many cases might be under fifty hours, although it might also in others be in excess of two hundred — or simply quarantining them from the society. A Venezuelan dictator once decided to stop leprosy. He saw that most lepers in his country were also beggars. By the simple expedient of collecting and destroying all the beggars in Venezuela an end was put to leprosy in that country.  

The sentiment in this passage is nothing less than an overt suggestion of total extermination by deeming a particular population absolutely futile and incurable — a genocidal and rhetorical justification not unlike that employed by Adolf Hitler in Nazi Germany. While Hubbard delineates processing as a route to deliverance, he considers the human possessing a “thetan” in a critically confused or dysfunctional state (like that of the homosexual according to Hubbard) better off eliminated. Made possible by Hubbard’s newly invented construction of “theta(n),” *Science of Survival* now initiates a discussion on the incorrigible condition of existence at low levels of The Tone Scale and the consequential implausibility of salvation. At such low levels, the internal theta(n) is so agitated, disturbed, and overloaded, that corporeal death becomes the singular and inevitable outcome for the host. While the process of rehabilitating the theta(n) is a key feature of Dianetics, it has been made markedly obvious in the above passage that this course of action is almost entirely unattainable for certain human classifications — making queer identities (1.1) ostensibly ineligible.

*C. Handbook for Preclears*

*Handbook for Preclears*, published in December 1951, is the sixth charted book in the Scientology canon and has often been considered the second most overlooked and undervalued
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in the vast L. Ron Hubbard aggregate.\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Handbook for Preclears} is best described as a self-processing manual geared toward personal advancement. Similarly to \textit{Science of Survival}, \textit{Handbook for Preclears} is considered a companion guide to the seventh book referenced on the Materials Guide Chart.\textsuperscript{32} Interestingly, \textit{Handbook for Preclears} contains the first use of the word “Scientology” and it certifies the transition from Dianetics as a scientific system to be \textit{implemented}, to Scientology as a religious creed to be \textit{embodied}.\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{Handbook for Preclears} is a collection of several short didactic essays accompanied by “Fifteen Acts” of instruction. Although brief, it offers a considerable number of exercises intended to aid an individual seeking to excel both physically and mentally. Amidst expansive description, Hubbard introduces a self-evaluation map called the “Chart of Attitudes,” specifically prepared for this short volume. It was designed to complement the “Hubbard Chart of Human Evaluation” by not only explaining one’s reactions to life but also extending the uppermost and lowest tiers of the “Attitudes of Beingness.”\textsuperscript{34}

Since 2007, the Church has officially marketed it as “the book of miracles” because Hubbard purportedly provides extremely powerful and impressive processes toward “a new codified understanding of such things as interpersonal relations and constructive action.”\textsuperscript{35} The publishers note (1951) makes the tall claim, “tests so far conducted demonstrate that this volume

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{31} Official Church of Scientology. “GOLDEN AGE OF KNOWLEDGE FOR ETERNITY: THE BASICS.” Video, 2:49:40. \url{http://www.scientology.org/david-miscavige/renaissance-for-scientology/basic-books-and-lectures.html}
\item\textsuperscript{32} Official Church of Scientology. “GOLDEN AGE OF KNOWLEDGE FOR ETERNITY: THE BASICS.” Video, 2:49:40. \url{http://www.scientology.org/david-miscavige/renaissance-for-scientology/basic-books-and-lectures.html}
\item\textsuperscript{34} Hubbard, L. Ron. \textit{Handbook for Preclears}. 8th ed. Los Angeles: Church of Scientology of California, Publications Organization, United Stateses, 1974.
\end{itemize}
is capable of producing complete and lasting results in 88 per cent of the cases to which it is applied as compared to the temporary results now being obtained by mental practitioners in 22 per cent of their cases.”\(^{36}\) Championed with the capability to allow self-processing, Hubbard describes it as a popularized and personal application of certain discoveries that allow someone to independently “improve [themselves] considerably above [their] fellows” by “increas[ing] [their] skills” and “rehabilitat[ing] [their] goals.”\(^{37}\)

In Hubbard’s thirteenth act, he presents a strange explanation and exercise for “the homosexual” by assuming that they intentionally summon the effects of aberrations through wrongly positioned desires in the sexual sphere or second dynamic:

Homosexuality comes from this manifestation and from the manifestation of life continuation for others. A boy whose mother is dominant will try to continue her life from any failure she has. A girl whose father is dominant will try to continue his life from any failure he has. The mother or the father were cause in the child’s eyes. The child elected himself successor to cause. Break this life continuum concept by running sympathy and grief for the dominant parent and then run off the desires to be an effect and their failures and the homosexual is rehabilitated. Homosexuality is about 1.1 on the tone scale. So is general promiscuity.\(^{38}\)

Hubbard makes the astounding claim that Dianetics can resolve “the problems of mental and psychosomatic disorder in a percentage of cases not previously attained.”\(^{39}\) However, Hubbard writes, “this small self-help volume is offered to the intelligent layman for his use and to qualified practitioners in the field of the human mind.”\(^{40}\) He is quite clear by including on page 1, “this book was written to improve the ability of the able” and not intended for “the lame, the halt, and the aberrated.”\(^{41}\) Once again, these materials are not meant to be accessed directly


\(^{38}\) Ibid.

\(^{39}\) Ibid.

\(^{40}\) Ibid.

\(^{41}\) Ibid.
by anyone registering notably low on Hubbard’s Tone Scale, and certainly not at 1.1. The techniques set forth in *Handbook for Preclears* have been applauded as a formal procedure of self-processing, therefore making direct auditor oversight trivial in certain cases. However, in actuality, this “breakthrough” is not uniformly applied because Hubbard clearly requires that these therapeutic techniques or procedures of “auditing” be *enacted* upon “the homosexual”—no more and no less than a sort of gay conversion therapy.

### III. Narrative Exposure of Hostility Toward Queerness Within Scientology

The following section of this research paper serves to briefly introduce the authentic accounts of three ex-Scientologists. The included narratives allude to the many ways individual livelihoods have been disturbed and harassed by the active anti-queer sentiment present in Dianetics and Scientology. I would encourage the reader to delve further into their stories which are available across an array of mediums:

#### A. Kate Bornstein

Kate Bornstein is an accomplished author, playwright, performance author, gender theorist, and Trans activist. Assigned male at birth, Bornstein is now gender non-conforming. Ze [preferred pronoun] is currently 68 years old, suffers from a slow-growing form of chronic leukemia, and in 2012 was diagnosed with lung cancer. Ze is also Jewish and has made appearances on the pilot season of “I am Cait” on E! News. Bornstein was a member of the Church of Scientology for twelve years and became a high-ranking lieutenant in the Sea Org. Following a charge of conduct violation requiring extreme punitive measures, ze formally left the movement in 1981. Hir [preferred pronoun] daughter, ex-wife, and grandkids all remain members of the institutionalized Church of Scientology. Bornstein’s “antagonism toward Scientology and public split from the church
have had personal consequences”—by canonical law, Bornstein is deemed an evil “Suppressive Person” and a cryptic policy of “Disconnection” has been instituted against hir. Bornstein’s autobiography A Queer and Pleasant Danger is dedicated to hir daughter that remains enraptured in Scientology. It is a fascinating memoir that speaks frankly of gender identity against a Dianetic backdrop. Bornstein also has an illuminating feature interview with Kristin Rawls entitled: “No Longer At Sea: Kate Bornstein Talks Scientology” that can be found online.42

B. Nora Crest

Nora Crest identifies as lesbian and runs her own blog, “Raging Buddha.” She has also posted several vlogs (video blogs) on Youtube, specifically in a series called “Growing Up in Scientology: From Cradle to Slave.” She is a celebrated public speaker and self-proclaimed “survivor of the Cult of Scientology” who speaks frankly about the way the religious doctrine entered her life at an extremely young age. Her video “Why You Can't Be Gay In Scientology” presents a clear analysis of how Dianetic theory projects onto and invades into the lives of queer individuals. Nora joined the Sea Org at eighteen and worked at the Celebrity Centre International in Hollywood as a member of the clergy for 5 years. The institutionalized Church of Scientology found her guilty of a homosexual indiscretion and sent her to the Rehabilitation Project Force (RPF)—a hard-labor reform camp. She was jailed there for almost three years before escaping in an uncompleted suicide attempt.43

C. Paul Haggis


The account of Oscar-winning film director Paul Haggis may very well represent the most sensationalized break of a public figure with the Church of Scientology in recent years (besides that of Tom Cruise’s ex-wife, Katie Holmes, departure from The Church after a seven year relationship). His experience secured media attention in an infamous article spanning multiple pages in a February 2011 issue of The New Yorker, “The Apostate: Paul Haggis vs. The Church of Scientology.”44 Together with author Lawrence Wright, they exposed a plethora of Scientology related atrocities. Central to the article’s focus was the Church of Scientology of San Diego’s sponsorship of Proposition 8 (2008) “which succeeded in taking away the civil rights of gay and lesbian citizens of California.”45 While Haggis is not gay himself, he has two lesbian daughters and considers himself an ally. The article was thoroughly informative and presented a comprehensive chronological timeline that detailed the suspicious and unsavory legal history of the institutionalized Church of Scientology. It was a solid compilation of research that set the foundation for Wright’s 2013 book-length exposé: “Going Clear: Scientology, Hollywood, and the Prison of Belief” and the subsequent 2015 HBO documentary by the same title.46

**IV. Language as a Vernacular Vehicle of Violence**

It seems paramount that I now prove that the concept of violence is undeniably applicable to language. I have designated the subsequent section to elaborate on my operating definition of

---

44 Wright, Lawrence. "The Apostate: Paul Haggis vs. the Church of Scientology." The New Yorker 14 (February 2011)
45 Ibid.
linguistic violence that has served as the theoretical framework in critiquing Hubbard’s

*Dianetics.* Slavoj Žižek is a psychoanalytic philosopher, cultural critic, and Hegelian Marxist

who has presented and repeatedly revisited a paradigm of violence in much of his work and

which I am adapting to the present conversation; more specifically, through his construction of

“symbolic violence embodied in language and its forms.”[^47] My analysis is further augmented by

the intellectual and philosophical contributions of Dr. William C. Gay that have served to

advance linguistic violence as a legitimate category.[^48] I will not neglect a discussion of Max

Weber’s construct and category of charismatic authority as a defined type of leadership that is

easily recognizable in prophet figures such as L. Ron Hubbard.[^49]

Violence as it manifests in language— or *linguistic violence*— is not an intellection that

is exercised without great philosophical effort. In his book “Violence: Six Sideways

Reflections,” Slavoj Žižek offers a theoretical structure that lends itself to the concept of

language *as* violence. As a subcategory or variety of objective violence, symbolic violence is

achieved in the vernacular structure and incorporates the violence that is lurking yet solidly

embedded in colloquial or quotidian discourses.[^50] This lexico-semantic level of violence is at

work in the stage of incitement that is often the root source of palpable displays of *subjective*

violence. As Žižek says, symbolic violence is at play within “relations of social domination

reproduced in our habitual speech and the various hierarchies inscribed into our daily


[^49]: “Class notes,” REL 410, Professor Greta Austin. Sep 13, 2016.

language.”  

Socially imposed violence—that is, “of sustaining relations of forced domination”—is wholly intertwined with symbolic violence.  

In a deliberate tapering of ideas originally presented by sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, Žižek locates symbolic violence in the “social reality” that is mapped through language and systemically or routinely reproduced in cursory conventional expression. Hence, symbolic violence is often intrinsic and covert, but is revealed both in the connotation and denotation of words. Examples of contemporary subtle forms of coercion that sustain relations of domination and exploitation consist of commonplace racial micro-aggressions, the default to generic masculine, political immigration rhetoric and phraseology, and exclusionary constitutional protections. In context, let us examine the first lines of the purported “Aims of Scientology”:

A civilization without insanity, without criminals and without war, where the able can prosper and honest beings can have rights, and where Man is free to rise to greater heights, are the aims of Scientology.  

To be clear, we are immediately presented with rhetoric indicating a prejudicial attitude towards people with mental health conditions (mentalism/sanism), a stigma carried toward convicted criminals (ever so relevant in present today with a direct and inherent link to racial bias), ableism, and of course, androcentrism through the generic masculine pronoun. This is a prime example of linguistic violence—seemingly covert, but easily deconstructed. Whether the product of malicious intention or obliviously perpetuated by the inveigled majority, violence
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actuated through language has devastating and reverberating repercussions. Language, as a 
technological construction, violently forces “ideological vision goggles” of interpretation upon 
humans (as absorbers of information) and creates for them a distorted perception of reality. Žižek 
indicates that humans, particularly those contaminated by Western Enlightenment aspirations, 
are morally pliable and sensitive to language that validates personal superiority—generating 
blind “victims of an ethical illusion.”

The construction of language as a tool of reason and mediation is often academically 
discussed relative to the reduction of the aggressive, carnal, and less-civilized approaches to 
conflict exhibited by earlier ancestors. Žižek, however, asks us: “What if, however, humans 
exceed animals in their capacity for violence precisely because they speak?” I concur with his 
position in that although language presents opportunities for debate, negotiation, and 
compromise, it is easily transformed into “a violent medium of immediate and raw 
confrontation.” Communication cannot be freed from human subjectivity because of our 
tendency to manipulate language based on personal perception and experience. This concept is 
precisely what Linda Alcoff aims to convey in her popular essay, “The Problem of Speaking for 
Others.” She claims that truth is not fixed in any authentic sense and that meaning is always 
effected through the subjective positioning of the communicator. Language is much more 
complex than the threading together of uncharged words, and there are a multiple layers that bear 
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upon the overall perceived meaning—like context, for example. To develop this assertion, Alcoff continues, “rituals of speaking are constitutive of the meaning of the words spoken as well as the meaning of the event…this claim requires us to shift the ontology of meaning from its location in a text or utterance to a larger space that includes the text or utterance as well as the discursive context.” It is impossible to assume an ability to transcend our internal reality and therefore prevent it from seeping into all levels of our communication. To make the direct correlation between Alcoff’s essay and the construct of symbolic violence, Žižek clarifies, “human communication in its most basic, constitutive dimension does not involve a space of egalitarian intersubjectivity. It is not ‘balanced.’ It does not put the participants in symmetric mutually responsive positions where they all have to follow the same rules and justify their claims with reason.”

Beyond obvious hate speech as a fundamental form of symbolic violence, discursive practices that attempt to appropriate or commandeer human individuality through linguistic description are equally as malignant. Žižek writes, “language simplifies the designated thing, reducing it to a single feature…It dismembers the thing, destroying its organic unity, treating its parts and properties as autonomous. It inserts the thing into a field of meaning which is ultimately external to it.” He then further proposes, “this is why language itself, the very medium of nonviolence, of mutual recognition, involves unconditional violence.” The ability to negotiate, reason, and locate common ground as humans capable of linguistic communication is all stripped away through Scientology’s established canonical texts that restrict debate—
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substantially reinforced and legitimized through the religious fixture of a founding prophet (L. Ron Hubbard).

Words themselves do not hold within them an invaluable quintessence, or in other terms, “a stable core that guarantees the identity of a thing.”65 Rather, essence is created and recreated through an active rhetorical process—“essencing”—that occurs within a specific historical context and is dependent upon an established ideology.66 Because language is not imbued with an inherent truth, this task is undertaken by way of specialized intention on behalf of the author; which, in turn, affects the way a human (as an absorber of information) interacts with the presented literature. I surmise that the notions constructed in Dianetics by author L. Ron Hubbard, predetermine as well as “overdetermine” the ways in which his readers and Dianetics practitioners experience queer bodies in authentic encounters.67 Thus, their “change in sensitivity is sustained by language; it hinges on the shift in [their] symbolic universe. A fundamental violence exists in this ‘essencing’ ability of language: [their] world is given a partial twist, it loses its balanced innocence, one partial color gives the tone of the whole.”68

It logically follows that ideology exerts upon performative agency. The influential origin is often detectable in customary language and accepted norms, especially within religious contexts. In Scientology, homosexuals are ascribed a “socio-symbolic identity” sprouted in 1950’s perceptions and forged on the heels of Freudian psychoanalytic theory; however, because Hubbard’s beliefs have now been elevated to the revelations of a prophet, they remain rigid and
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invariable. It is the identity of homosexuals erected through Hubbard’s insolent language—the constructed “fantasmatic dimension” or falsely informing narrative—that persuades adherents to relegate homosexuals as perverts, and queers as deviants. It is this perceived “fantasmatic dimension” that always steers violence, never an essential awareness of the foreign subject. Hubbard cements “an interpretation that determines the very being and social existence of the interpreted subjects,” and has secured this particularly oppressive point of view for future generations. Queer bodies are “not inferior but merely inferiorised” by the violence imposed on them by the discourse of Dianetics, “that is, they are affected by an imposition which does not affect them in the very core of their being…” Homosexuality as an extreme sexual perversion “which circulates and has been constructed in their tradition” is an egregious delusion; however, we should acknowledge and make some allowance for intellectual isolation as it powerfully encourages a mentality of “group think.” Such dynamics of power and control have been common in the new religious cult structures of the twentieth century (e.g. People’s Temple, Branch Davidians, Heaven’s Gate). For LRH, the pre-Civil Rights era was fertile ground for forming a new religious movement that was hostile toward alternative identities and emboldened through tactics of “othering.” As we are still in the early phase of the 21st century, Žižek
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encouragingly remarks that those who have been subjugated, “can (and do) resist as free autonomous agents through their acts, dreams, and projects.”

The biggest hurdle Scientology faces in becoming linguistically inclusive is that the controversial positions of their charismatic leader, L. Ron Hubbard, are not foreseeably subject to any sort of amending. However seemingly antiquated Hubbard’s understanding of human nature may be (according to modern science), his devised nomenclature in Dianetics informs the esoteric religious doctrine to a supreme degree, and Scientology is therefore uniquely contingent upon it. While “the evaluation of [his] merits and faults ha[ve] constantly shifted over historical time” from the outside, his words are, in theory, not to be adapted to the changing global context on the inside. This resolution is reinforced by the charismatic forces that are highly discernible in the political beliefs and ethical conduct advanced by L. Ron Hubbard to be discussed in Section V where I explore, in extreme brevity, the contributions of Max Weber— specifically his notions of charismatic leadership in his tripartite classification of authority.

Dr. William C. Gay has published an abundance of literature with exclusive attention to linguistic violence and his insight strongly informs the discoveries of my research. I am working off three basic premises located across his works: 1) Language is frequently an instrument of covert institutional violence, 2) Language, as an institution, can do violence against individuals that is psychological rather than physical, and 3) Language shapes, but does not determine human consciousness and behavior.
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I would first like to clarify and then elaborate upon an understanding of oppressive and covert institutional violence. I am operating from the position that violence does not require the exercise of physical force. According to Gay, “a language of oppression not only inflicts covert violence, but also it sometimes does so without detection,” and while “overt physical injury causes visible hurt, we are usually immediately unaware when we have suffered psychological harm.” In light of this, Dr. Gay “argue[s] for the extension of the term violence to cover more than a physical harm and against a strictly institutional view of language.” I am making the claim that covert violence is no less significant or injurious than overt violence; rather, covert violence is camouflaged and obscured in a way that arguably makes it more difficult to dismantle. Furthermore, because it is institutional as opposed to personal, it is generated in organized established conventions that further buttress its foundation and infrastructure. Dr. Gay proposes several considerations on the topic of linguistic violence and he often aids his reader in understanding by way of contradistinction. For example, he explains the difference between offensive and oppressive language by correlating the former to personal hurt and the latter to personal harm.

Dr. Gay distinguishes between three intensifying tiers of linguistic violence: subtle forms, abusive forms, and grievous forms. Subtle forms typically originate without malicious motive but are still subject to developing a vicious slanderous quality. Abusive forms employ offensive phrases that intentionally target and provoke the individual to whom they were directed. Dr. Gay
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clarifies, “both the practitioners and victims are more likely to be aware of the degrading intent of these forms of communication.”

Grievous forms of linguistic violence “often have the intent to silence or even eliminate a social group” and unfortunately, this is the language that has been revealed in the canonical texts of Scientology. In extreme political scenarios, “one finds the attempts at linguistic control by totalitarian regimes [to] manipulate discourse in ways designed to distort people’s perception,” however, such grievous forms of linguistic violence clearly dwell in cultic discourses as well. Hubbard not only conveys a denigrating and demeaning attitude toward a certain group of people, but more than hints at the potential benefits of their total extermination.

Language itself, as a technique of coercion, is inseparable from dynamics of power and it “can facilitate the most violent exercise of power against somebody.” Violence includes a deranged semiotic capacity that serves as a constant mechanism meant to distort perception and influence personal principles. In most applications, this clandestine procedure is robust and unchecked—relying upon “authoritarian, monological, aggressive, and calculative methods” as well as the “institutional use of obedience, suggestibility, idealism and social skills” enacted through language. In a world of domination and exploitation, of war and injustice, language gives a structure to consciousness which guides action and informs perception, influencing our thoughts and resulting behaviors. In short, “language, which is rarely neutral, shapes perception
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and behavior. Language can be used to demean differences and inflict violence or to affirm
diversity and achieve recognition.”89 Although likely a point of contention, Scientology has
“accrued enormous linguistic capital” via “institutionally sanctioned demeaning
terminology…which they generally use to advance their interests to the detriment of the social
masses.”90

By classifying linguistic violence in its “multifarious and nefarious manifestations,” the
oppressive dimension of language becomes so pronounced that it would be negligent to ignore
it.91 Language itself, as a social institution, reflects and perpetuates power. Language is not a
neutral medium for the description of an objective reality but is manipulated to “actively shap[e]
and giv[e] meaning to human experience.”92 Therefore, language communicates ideologies,
which in turn mold group attitudes and justify social practices that likely sustain the use of more
overt forms of violence. Like Žižek, I am taking the position that semiology, as it is absorbed in
all written language, is distorted in a manner that can be traced to an influencer and necessarily
results in exclusion of some sort to some social party. To be succinct, semiology is ideology.

According to Dr. Gay, “language does harm when, with its differential terms, it elevates
one group and devalues another.”93 In Scientology, this is accomplished and codified in scores of
books and hundreds of writings by L. Ron Hubbard, with *Dianetics* serving as the authentic and
authoritative source. The lexicon of *Dianetics* reflects oppressive, institutional covert violence
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insofar as it provides a framework of human behavior reliant upon the “socially sanctioned use of demeaning terms to refer to specific social groups.”94 The language in Dianetics is a set of certain conventions held and recorded by a venerated prophet—they are largely beyond the control of the practitioners “who are socialized and conditioned to passively assimilate it.”95 Dr. Gay authenticates this reality by commenting, “[a]n arena in which abusive language abounds is in the derogatory terminology used to describe the lifestyles of lesbians and gay males. The long-standing, and often physically violent reinforcement of the heterosexism of established discourse often makes an open discussion of sexual orientation quite difficult.”96

One of Dr. Gay’s most resounding charges is that “literacy is elitist and creates significant social class differentiation.”97 Beyond the exorbitant financial expectations for membership, materials, and auditing services within Scientology, there is another layer of inaccessibility in effect. Scientology is dependent upon the careful regulation of privileged and esoteric understanding. The labyrinthine complexity of Scientology-speak (or nomenclature) is inherently elitist—making it wholly inaccessible to the majority because “…discrimination is also practiced against individuals who, although literate, do not understand technical vocabularies.”98 Dr. Gay makes clear “whenever truth is masked or distorted, communication is being used for manipulation.”99 While it can already be said that “normal communication masks the ways in which discourse and power are skewed toward specific educational, professional,
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and racial classes,” Scientology’s more regimented approach to thought reform is particularly effective.\(^{100}\) It takes the concept of communicating “reality” even further because it requires its practitioners to advance to higher levels of knowledge under Scientology’s direct management.

**V. Exegetic Integrity Following Hubbard’s Ultimate Exteriorization (Death)**

Documented changes to Scientology religious doctrine are ambiguous and highly suspect, but not unheard of. The official discourse canon is comprised of all of the writings and recordings, fiction or otherwise, of the “messiah-scribe” of Scientology, L. Ron Hubbard. His words are considered sacrosanct and there is considerable institutional effort to safeguard them. Oddly enough, all of his encompassing materials are copyrighted and trademarked for the supposed purpose of pure, unadulterated preservation—in fact, they have been transcribed on steel plates and stored away in “calamity-proof capsules.”\(^{101}\) Apparently, as a statement of official motive, “it is important to the Scientology religion that its scripture be preserved in perpetuity so future generations have the exact and unerring words of the scripture in their entirety.”\(^{102}\)

To ensure the exactitude and orthodoxy of the scripture, strict regulation is in practice for all published works. The current copyrights are owned by Scientology’s Church of Spiritual Technology (CST). The Church of Spiritual Technology (CST) is a nonprofit religious corporation responsible for the archiving and licensing of all Scientology scripture. These copyrighted materials are then leased to the Religious Technology Center (RTC), which holds the ultimate ecclesiastical authority regarding the standard and proper application of L. Ron
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Hubbard’s religious technologies. RTC grants the Church of Scientology International (CSI), the pinnacle church of the Scientology religion, the entitlement to use the trademarks and to license their use to all other Scientology Churches for the benefit of the religion. The imposed registrations ensure that Scientology scripture cannot be “altered, perverted or taken out of context for improper or harmful ends.”

Theoretically, this concept of orthodoxy in religious practice is absolutely fundamental to Scientology. Thus, any attempt to alter or misrepresent the Scientology scripture is regarded as a most severe breach of ecclesiastical ethics in the eyes of the overarching institution. The direct misapplication and misunderstanding of standard Scientology philosophy is understood as an assault, and outside of the direct purview of the Church. Strangely enough, the act of employing Scientology techniques in a form other than that originally described by Hubbard is referred to within the institution as “squirreling”— and it is considered to be one of the most depraved and reprehensible crimes against Scientology (recall “Free Zone” Scientologists).

In order to fully understand this rationale, now is the optimal time to return to our discussion of charismatic authority. Weber defines a charismatic leader as an “individual endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities.” In a separate text, we are told “we shall understand "prophet" [as] a purely individual bearer of charisma, who by one's mission proclaims religious teaching or divine commandment.” In short, the prophet exemplifies what Weber calls charismatic leadership.
and he draws this direct link by asserting that the authority of a prophet is consistently and instinctively charismatic—perhaps the purest expression or embodiment of the sort. It is not difficult to conceptualize L. Ron Hubbard as a charismatic leader—a science fiction novelist turned religious prophet with claims of divine ability and a potential to accumulate followers for his newfound belief system of alternative psychotherapy.107

L. Ron Hubbard wielded considerable charismatic authority until his bodily demise (although Scientologists believe he willfully discarded the body to pursue higher levels of religious research).108 It has been demonstrated that “the death of a charismatic leader always creates a void of uncertainty” in religious contexts; in response, the dedicated congregate will strive “to ensure the continuance of their policies by institutionalizing them” through an emergent religious elite.109 Max Weber calls this the “routinization of charisma” and with the demise of the absolute and anointed authority, the gravity of the elite suddenly increases.110 Therefore, once routinized, the procedural approach can “evolve in directions that are always hard to predict.”111 With Hubbard’s direct appointment of the current ecclesiastical leader David Miscavige, it would appear that Scientology has been fully routinized through the transference of charismatic authority to another leader by means of succession. Hubbard’s legacy continues as the founder of a twentieth century religious movement that has maintained relevance at the helm of David Miscavige over the past 30 plus years.
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L. Ron Hubbard is lionized as an infallible being and any action against him is seen as a crime against the religion. This is not to say that since Hubbard’s death in 1986 there hasn’t been extreme speculation and considerable distrust of David Miscavige and the new executive order. Although such a complex multi-level mechanism of supervision is in place to ensure Scientology’s religious technologies “are standardly ministered in exact accordance with scriptures and not altered by misappropriation or improper use—there is prevalent and justified skepticism amongst practitioners and adherents of Dianetics.”

In fact, there is reasonable claim to such a stance by Scientologists concerning a disingenuous incentive and counter-effort to forge a departure from Hubbard’s teachings as they once were recorded verbatim.

One of the most conspicuous instances and perhaps the most pertinent is that of Hubbard’s “Second Dynamic.” Shockingly and certainly uncharacteristic of typical institutional oversight, even a keyword search on the official Scientology website for “Second Dynamic” will bring up inconsistent and conflicting definitions. In original material, the Second Dynamic or (Dynamic of Sex) is defined as “the urge of the individual to reach the highest potential of survival in terms of sex, the act and the creation of children and their rearing,” or, in expansion, “the procreation of progeny, the care of that progeny, and the securing for that progeny of better survival conditions and abilities in the future.”

Therefore, it is quite clear that L. Ron Hubbard designated the Second Dynamic as the urge to survive accomplished by the family and future generations as it relates to reproduction and offspring. However, searching the
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term “Second Dynamic” on the official Church website will yield six results…the third link
announces:

The Second Dynamic is CREATIVITY.

Creativity is making things for the future and the Second Dynamic includes any
creativity. The Second Dynamic contains the family unit and raising children as
well as anything that can be categorized as a family activity. It also, incidentally,
includes sex as a mechanism to compel future survival.\textsuperscript{114}

This is a wholly revised and redressed version from what can be found in the first link (which is
much more in line with what is found in \textit{Dianetics} [print]):

The Second Dynamic—is the urge toward existence as a sexual activity. This
dynamic actually has two divisions. Second Dynamic (a) is the sexual act itself.
And the Second Dynamic (b) is the family unit, including the rearing of
children. This can be called the Sex Dynamic.\textsuperscript{115}

Clearly a breach in uniformity is not out of the question, although alarming for L. Ron
Hubbard’s most devout followers. According to the official Scientology website, “the founder’s
writings and recordings are extant and verifiable. Hence, the Church has been able to preserve L.
Ron Hubbard’s legacy and ensure the religion remains pure to his original teachings for all
time.”\textsuperscript{116} However, it would appear that even the most basic tenets are currently susceptible to
modification.

Thinking critically, it is difficult to say whether this covert trend of slight revision could
yield any positive lasting effects, or create potential for more inclusive language in the near
future. At present, amendments are seen as perverse mutations that are not only disruptive, but
corruptive of the true words of L. Ron Hubbard. However, within the organized practice of
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Dianetics, the situation is excessively problematic and perilous; Scientologists of the institutionalized Church would be violently disciplined for even entertaining such an idea of potential modifications and much more so for raising such an accusation against the highest ecclesiastical order.

Dianetics is the system of self-exploration and behavior explanation that laid the cornerstone for Hubbard’s empire and is heralded as superbly adept and unequaled by devotees. As detailed above, within the Church of Scientology, it has long been considered essential that the words of founder L. Ron Hubbard are incontrovertible, and that his works—or “Standard Tech”—must be preserved unaltered. However, many have pointed to a departure or deviation from the founding ideology. Since Hubbard’s death and the takeover of control by successor David Miscavige, there indeed have been many subtle and not-so-subtle alterations and omissions from Hubbard’s texts and even recordings. These alterations have caused controversy both inside and outside the Church, and further distinguish between the many factions that adhere to Scientology and Dianetics in their various degrees of application. Most practitioners of Dianetics whom operate on the periphery of Scientology are extremely critical of the institution, and have postulated that the Church has repeatedly and intentionally altered original Scientology texts to pervert and undermine their intent and effectiveness—thus increasing reliance on The Church itself. Summarized with admirable clarity, “whether these changes represent a major degradation of Hubbard’s original writings, or merely minor edits and improvements that do not change the fundamental thrust of his message, is a matter hotly debated among some Scientologists.”

Some even claim that *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* in particular has been extensively and repeatedly rewritten by the Church of Scientology, along with supposed evidence that points to changes in as many as nine hundred and thirteen other titles listed in the Library of Congress records. I would like to interject by saying that in the research compiled for this particular investigation, I analyzed *three* versions, or editions, of *Dianetics*: 1950, 1967, and 2007. The first printing occurred in 1950, and the publication was on its thirteenth printing by 1967. The publisher has since ceased including exactly *how* many editions have been printed since the first in 1950, however the most recent copy I obtained was copyrighted in 2007 (from the mass-launch seriously promoted by David Miscavige and the Religious Technology Center). All references to sexual perversion appear in identical form in all three versions and I cannot attest to any attempt to “bowdlerize” Hubbard’s hostility toward queerness—nor any operation to remove misogynistic or racist remarks.

I have inserted the above discussion here because I think this reality underscores the improbability of an advanced or dynamic perspective in the static thought structure promulgated by Scientology. Should such a proclivity for total maintenance remain, this perspective will further limit the adaptability of Scientology discourse to liberal modern contexts. It appears that semantic progress will continue to be severely hindered and inhibited by the current and extreme veneration of LRH. It is doubtful that the tenets of Scientology will ever be “compromised” in order to accommodate or assimilate historically marginalized identities like that within the LGBTQIA+ community. This is to say that Scientology has and will continue to demonstrate reluctance to evolve and adapt to the globally shifting social climate, one that is more sensitive to human rights and particularly issues surrounding diversity and inclusion. Certainly, such
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plasticity and versatility is a necessary requisite for any sort of enduring institutional authority in the future. Should such a rigid stance be continued on the precise preservation of Hubbard’s framework of human behavior designed in the first half of the twentieth century, queer bodies will never have a place in the Church—or a place on this planet according to Dianetics.120

VI. Sustained Legacies of Exclusion and Alienation in the Ultra-Liberal Sphere

Dianetics as a technological practice serving religio-spiritual needs was first incorporated by the establishment of the Church of Scientology in 1954, and it would eventually be legally recognized by the IRS as a tax-exempt religious organization in 1957 (to be revoked 10 years later, and reinstated in 1993).121 According to the present ecclesiastical leader, David Miscavige, “the full knowledge of Dianetics and Scientology is contained in 3,000 tape-recorded lectures, 8,000 pages of text, and 29,000 pages of issues. In full, those materials total more than 35,000,000 words.”122 Hubbard actually holds the Guinness World Record for most published works by one author with a total of 1084 titles.123 There is no doubt that the collective canonized scripture of Scientology is remarkably immense and extensive—and this does not even encompass the safeguarded materials of the upper “OT” levels in which the parishioner is granted access to Hubbard’s most esoteric revelations.124

Just two years before his death, L. Ron Hubbard launched a program to provide Scientologists the full legacy of his many years of research and “discovery” into the mind, spirit,

life, purpose, and origin of the human being.\textsuperscript{125} This project was undertaken in order to strategically catalogue and codify all the information he imparted during his lifetime. What would become a twenty-five year program (to be continued by David Miscavige upon Hubbard’s death in 1986) was meant to recover, restore and effectively verify the myriad contributions of Scientology’s founder in perpetuity.\textsuperscript{126} According to the Scientology website, their objective was to “greatly facilitat[e] the chronological and methodical study of these vast bodies of Scripture.”\textsuperscript{127} This process can be regarded as the \textit{salvation of the scripture} of the Scientology religion and it has served to consolidate and fortify the canon to the utmost extent.

The final phase of Scientology’s scriptural verification process executed by the Religious Technology Center was announced by David Miscavige in March of 2005 with the release of prized monumental lectures.\textsuperscript{128} Officially culminating in 2009, this four year final stage has been referred to as the “Golden Age of Knowledge.”\textsuperscript{129} In 2007, Miscavige announced the re-release of L. Ron Hubbard’s \textit{Basics}, the 18 books and 280 lectures that form the foundation of the Scientology canon.\textsuperscript{130} According to him, the clarity and lucidity of the writing had supposedly been enhanced by eliminating all existing typographical errors and optimizing the visual layout.
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Moreover, every book and lecture was reproduced and released in fifteen major languages for a globally expanded audience.\footnote{Ibid.}

The effort of the Religious Technology Center (RTC) to restore “standard tech” or “pure tech” in proper sequence and in unaltered form was an arduous operation. While it does demonstrate the serious degree to which the words of a prophet are venerated and safeguarded in a particular religious movement, it has provoked some to pose queries on the integrity of the endeavor and the present state of the L. Ron Hubbard library. Regrettably, my research has revealed that Hubbard’s remarks regarding homosexuality have not been amended in three fundamental canonical texts in any way, shape, or form since their midcentury inception. By no means is this a comprehensive claim that all the ideas presented in Basic and Beginning Dianetic materials today have not been edited. The claim that distortions, alterations, or perversions of Hubbard’s “truths” lie within Miscavige’s new editions may very well be true.

Needless to say, not all Scientologists were thrilled by the ostentatious exhibition of technological prowess in 2007—in fact, many of Hubbard’s most sincere devotees were apprehensive toward Miscavige’s direction.\footnote{Lewis, James R. Scientology. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. 19.} The ventures of the RTC have been considered controversial, and perhaps even superfluous, by many long-time members. It could be said that this immense scheme is a coercive tactic persuading Scientologists to repurchase all materials, and potentially repeat levels of training that have since been “improved.” Upon release, this repackaged bundle of Basics was priced at the enormous cost of three-thousand dollars—to bolster this allegation, it is reported that cutting edge versions of the “E-meter” are offered at
approximately five thousand dollars each, and auditing sessions typically require thousands of dollars annually for each Church member.133

Although I have digressed, it is worth reiterating that membership in institutionalized Scientology has always been expensive; and, access to Hubbard’s premium material and resources to move up “The Bridge” come with a lofty price tag.134 There is logical comprehension why Scientology has a stronghold in Hollywood among starlets and deep pocket executives. What remains less clear and subject to interrogation is why, up to this point, Scientology has been generally accepted in the ultra-liberal progressive sphere of Hollywood. Celebrities often function within society, albeit in extremely sensational fashions, as champions of human rights efforts— and the vast majority have vocally and vehemently protected gay rights. So, how are the countless reprints of Hubbard’s books, each containing his constructions of sexual perversion/deviancy specifically targeting queer individuals, seemingly enduring without critique from millennial-driven humanistic social initiatives?

To extend the concluding analysis even further, a primary, sensible, and unanswered question likely to have been raised by this point is whether or not L. Ron Hubbard even cared enough to proofread the final versions of his dictated books before their printing and public dissemination. This logic invites two questions: 1) If he did, wasn’t he appalled enough by the egregious errors in his own religious texts (on account of the transcriptionists) that he was moved to swiftly correct them? and 2) If this process was somehow neglected, how could it have possibly taken fifty years to ameliorate such an enormous problem? I do not mean to be generous
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here by assuming L. Ron Hubbard’s postulations on homosexuality were accidental; on the contrary, I firmly believe they were intentional.

To demonstrate and support this position with evidence, I chose to include the account and testimony of two LGBTQIA+ identifying individuals who simultaneously identify as ex-Scientologists, as well as from an ally who left in support of and in solidarity with this community. As stated above, there are countless ex-Scientologists who have felt victimized by the viciously homophobic rhetoric employed in Scientology; however for the sake of this paper, I have isolated three of the most poignant voices, and invited the reader to engage further with their personal narratives. I have also included a discussion of the institutional attempts of the Church of Scientology to appear socially progressive in modern moments of acceptance and inclusivity. I sincerely hope that I have already presented a convincing argument that this shift in ideology is an elaborate yet delicate public relations smokescreen, easily dismantled through a close reading of foundational texts and compounded by the ordained inability of scriptural alteration for the sake of refinement and improvement.\(^{135}\)

To this day, a horrifically anti-queer discourse exists in several locations across the Scientology canon. It will undoubtedly be fascinating to examine Scientology attempt to position itself in the upcoming era: one of civil liberty crusades and a political climate intent on strangling it. While theory has heavily informed this paper to indicate that the discourse conceived by L. Ron Hubbard is well-fixed in the religious canon, it is worth remaining sanguine that a trend of inclusivity and nonviolent language will not only penetrate, but redress, the posture of the Dianeticist toward expressions of queerness.
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