

The email exchange w/the fundraising I/C:

From: Chris xxxx
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2009 2:25 PM
To: Tony DePhillips; Marie-Joe DePhillips

Dear Tony and Marie-Joe,

I wanted you two to know that this Saturday we are going for getting it all named/pledge out and as much of this collected as possible. Yes...it will take some amazing things occurring. But we are also working for these to happen. Anyways -This Saturday is our Excalibur Event.

It would be awesome if you guys would come. You are a huge part of our making it.

This will be one of the most eventful evening and I wanted you to come and share in it with the rest of us.

Your friend,
Chris

From: Marie-Joe Roy [mailto:
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2009 9:02 PM
To: 'Chris xxxx'
Subject: RE:

Dear Chris,

We will not be attending this weekend event. Tony & I have some considerations & disagreements with the strategy. We are all behind getting an Ideal Org in Seattle but not by any means necessary. Here are some of the policies we base our considerations on. I'm sure you are familiar with several of them but I'm sending them to you so you know where I'm coming from.

“The DANGEROUS thing to do is to comply with an off-policy or out-tech order.

“But how would one, who has not studied policy or is not very far advanced in his tech training know when he was being given an off-policy or out-tech order?”

If it seems kind of stupid it is probably off-policy or out-tech. Both tech and policy are anything but stupid. Most off-policy and out-tech orders are stupid because they are at a glance contra-survival.

Require that one be shown in the exact issue or book what the policy or tech actually is.

Read it for yourself and don't listen to any interpretation that seems farfetched.

Be sure the policy or tech you are being shown applies in the matter under discussion.

Ignore anyone who, with no written material or tape, chants at you the dates of policies or bulletins and claims they exist. See it for yourself. HCO PL 13 Jan 79 – ORDERS, ILLEGAL AND CROSS
OEC Volume 0 – Page 538

Here are the references on finances we feel are constantly encouraged & even pressured to violate:

“The basic principle of financial management is a simple one, income must be greater than outgo.

Amongst the principles of financial management are these: One cannot spend money unless he has it. Never contract bills or debts unless the money is immediately in sight to pay them.” HCOPL 3 JUNE 1959 - FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

“But most important, I don’t run up bills if I don’t have the cash in sight to pay them.”
HCO PL 2 JUNE 59 – A COMMENT ON FINANCES OEC Volume 3

*“Make it before you have to spend it.”*HCO PL 28 JAN 65 – HOW TO MAINTAIN CREDIT STANDING AND SOLVENCY Management Series Volume 3 – Page 403

“Never borrow any money from a bank. Make it.” Creating Time and Space – Responsibility, Code of Honor – Part 1, 6 November 1952 Tape #: 5211C06B

Here’s are the references on fundraising & buying buildings:

“We own a tremendous amount of property. We own a tremendous amount of material, and so forth. And it keeps growing. But that’s not important. When buildings get important to us, for God’s sake, some of you born revolutionists, will you please blow up central headquarters. If someone had put some HE [high explosives] under the Vatican long ago, Catholicism might still be going. Don’t get interested in real estate. Don’t get interested in the masses of buildings, because that’s not important.

What is important is how much service you can give the world and how much you can get done and how much better you can make things. These are important things. These are all that are important. A bank account never measured the worth of a man. His ability to help measured his worth and that is all. A bank account can assist one to help but where it ceases to do that it becomes useless.”

Lecture Series: Anatomy of the Human Mind
Tape: The Genus of Dianetics and Scientology
31 December 1960 Tape#: 6012C31

“If the org slumps during this transition period, don't engage in 'fund raising' or 'selling postcards' or borrowing money.

“Just make more income with Scientology.

“It's a sign of very poor management to seek extraordinary solutions for finance outside Scientology. It has always failed.

“For orgs as for pcs ‘Solve It With Scientology’.

“Every time I myself have sought to solve finance or personnel in other ways than Scientology I have lost out. So I can tell you from experience that org solvency lies in More Scientology, not patented combs or fund raising barbecues.” HCO PL 24 FEB 1964 ISSUE II - ORG PROGRAMMING

“In terms of quarters an org can afford just so much expense. Therefore, viability is the first consideration – not how posh or what reputé or what image. Thus we have the policy that: THE FIRSTCONSIDERATION IN PROCURING QUARTERS IS THE VIABILITY OF THE ORG.” ...

... “The safe figure for rent and mortgage payments must not exceed 15 percent to 17 percent of the gross income of the org.” ...

... “Image is a secondary consideration. ““One does all he can by staff work to improve the image. If image is the reason why one must move from an area where the org was viable or had student housing, forget it. Posh up what you have already ... staff pay and food and cheap student housing do more for an org than a posh building.” ...

... “Expensive office equipment is not a first priority.

“Enough desks and chairs and furnishings is far superior to top-grade office furniture. Reserves tied up in furniture is never recoverable. Furniture quality does not influence production.” ...

... “Renovations are destructive if extensive. Don't renovate at vast expense. Use and make it better as you can with your own people.” HCO PL 23 SEPT 1970 - QUARTERS, POLICY REGARDING HISTORICAL

Again we have nothing against having an Ideal Org. We just don't think it should be done by violating so blatantly LRH & depleting so severely the resources of the field. So there it is. Tony & I have written reports up-lines regarding the violation of some of these Policies. The reports were not on you since we know you are just following “Command Intention”. We have gotten no responses. When we have mentioned them to Regges (IAS, Libraries, Ideal Org) or some Staff we have been overtly or covertly been invalidated & labeled as “CI”. It has become very hard for me to attend events & see that people who grossly violate some of these policies by going dangerously in debts to finance the purchase & renos of the building (\$200K+ on credit cards!!!) are revered and people that are trying to apply sound financial policies are looked down upon. Despite the debt we have gotten into ourselves & all the work we were doing in other areas (much

more than most people) we have been given the cold shoulder many times for either not donating \$ we didn't have or not participating on getting others to donate \$ they didn't have. I don't have to give you names you know better than me the field's financial situation & you know that for many it is a very precarious situation.

I know I'm taking some great risks by writing this to you but I cannot go pretending that all is hunky dory. It is actually even a sad state of affair to feel I can get into trouble by showing someone some LRH policies.

I appreciate all you & Sandy do. I've always considered you my friend so I figure you deserve a more honest comm. from me. Have a great event. ARC,
Marie-Joe

(Here's Chris' response with Marie-Joe's response to him in red)

From: Marie-Joe Roy
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2009 9:35 PM
To: 'Chris xxxx'

Hi Chris,
See my response below in red

From: Chris Finn [mailto:
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2009 8:52 AM
To: 'Marie-Joe Roy'
Subject: RE:

Hi Marie-Joe,
Hi Chris,

I did not know you felt so. And was surprised that you have compiled such a list of references. That takes time and intention to do. Not so hard I've been in Scientology for years, started w/working w/WISE, I'm on the BC, far along on the Basics & have attended a few financial seminars. As I run into things that don't seem to make sense to me I try to find what LRH has to say about it. I also learned not to give verbal data so I took the time to give the exact LRH references I'm talking about. Was that wrong?

For me, there is an under-current here that is something HCO should know about and if I were in your shoes I would personally want to get "these views" sorted out. Have you tried taking this subject up with the Org yet? In person? I get the impression that you think I'm bad or should be punished for researching & agreeing with LRH on how one should manage their finances. I don't think it would be the proper line to put this on Tessa's (Day) lines or Mary's (Fnd) lines. As for David and/or Mark's they have plenty on their lines & I'm sure they are very well aware of these references. I think going to the local Org with this would create enturbulation. That is why we have chosen to write it up lines. I'm actually surprised you're suggesting I go to the local Org. Anyways....are you and or Tony sending what you sent to me to others? I sent to Irena a while back just a few of the financial references not the ones on fundraising & building Orgs. She had originated to me that she felt a lot of pressure to go in debt and it was hard for her because it made more sense to her to make it before she spent it. I told her that's what LRH says to do. She asked me where. I email her the few financial references I

sent you. I felt it would have been an offense to not provide her with the references. If anyone comes to me with concerns about their finances or any other area of their lives I will always point them to what LRH's has to say. Are you implying we should ignore those references & deliberately not bring them up? What other references should not be mentioned?

Or putting out any kind of comm or flow to other Scientologists along this line? Have you used Org premises to disseminate this "under-current" as I call it? I have mentioned to the FBO a few months ago that I was very concerned about Scientologists being pressure to violate financial policies. Unfortunately we could not finish our conversation because Larry Cox arrived & I told her that I didn't want to talk about this in front of him. I never brought it up again since I got the idea that she didn't want to hear about it. I also told Lisa Sorensen, when she was trying to convince me to attend an event, that I didn't want to go deeper in debts & that it was breaking my heart to see my friends put themselves in very precarious financial situations & not be able to do anything about it (like writing them an instruct on the financial references).

I have turned all my hats over from the Files project so I can concentrate on my business for the holidays but I have to say it was becoming very hard for me to suppress my considerations. I had an inkling that you & others wouldn't want me to share them. I decided to tell you because I felt it was violating my personal integrity to continue pretending or hide my position.

I hope you get this sorted out (re-evaluated) for you have done a great service via the files project. I have worked really hard to contribute to the Ideal Org probably more than 90% of the public in this area. I'm not looking for validation or recognition but I do resent being invalidated overtly or covertly & receive flows that I'm out-ethics or bad because I choose to straighten up my finances by following LRH's financial policies & refuse to pressure others to donate \$ they have not yet produced. I have nothing against you or the Ideal Org, I am just against the constant pressure to donate beyond what one can afford & the "under-current" that one is out-ethics if he doesn't do so or at least get others to do so. ARC, Marie-Joe

Chris

From: Chris Finn [mailto:
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2009 10:55 PM
To: 'Marie-Joe Roy'

Hi Marie-Joe....Thanks for this comm. Thanks for explaining as you have.

I do get your views here.

OK....!

Chris Finn

When Marie-Joe confronted him with why he had pretended to understand our views but dead filed us, Chris requested the names of anyone we had spoken to. When I caught wind of this email thread and his demands I sent him a scathing email and told him he

wasn't the decision point for who I could or could not communicate with. I sent the following email & the whole previous thread attached to it, to him, a couple of Org executives and about 20 friends as I was sure the whispering campaign was about to start.

Dear friends,

I am sending this email to you so you understand why I have not been going to recent events and in case of any potential third party.

ARC,

Tony DePhillips

Hi Chris,

MJ forwarded to me her email exchange with you and I wanted to tell you my reality.

The main situation is that I do not feel that the C of S allows freedom of speech anymore. If you have a view that doesn't follow "command intention" then you are considered "bad", "disaffected", "out-ethics", etc. Then the whispering campaigns start.

I do not agree with many things about how the Ideal Org strategy is being carried out and haven't from the get go. Despite this MJ and I have donated 125K and both of us have given a lot of time helping the Org & Scientology.

I did not get into Scientology to become a robot and to only parrot off what others say I should. Per the laws of the land I have the right to freedom of speech. But now in this group I apparently do not. I know all the lines that can now be brought up in response to this view. "You can communicate but just to the proper terminals", etc... Well I do not agree with that either. LRH says in *Personal Integrity* reference in the tech vols that nothing in Dianetics and Scientology is true for you unless you yourself have observed it. I will not allow anyone to cut my comm lines or tell me who I can or who I can't communicate with. I have the right to my own thoughts and can share them as I see fit. Scientology says to "think for yourself". Don't you think that Scientologist's should be able to evaluate data for themselves? Or should data be hidden from them because it "could be too hard for them to confront"?

I love the Scientology philosophy but do not agree with everything in it. LRH says I don't have to. So I won't go into agreement with anything that I don't like as that is aberrative. As I went up the Bridge and the dynamics I found for myself that it was ok to confront my own church and decide for myself what I liked and disliked about it. The out-points that I see and that I feel need to be handled are things that I want to communicate about. I communicate them to those who are willing and want to listen. If someone doesn't want to hear it then I don't enforce my comm onto them.

You are not the decision point on who I can communicate with.

I am doing nothing but communicating some ideas that are based largely on LRH. Whether I am right or wrong, it is my viewpoint. If you feel so threatened by my realities then do what you think is right for yourself. I now find that I cannot go to church functions because if someone asks me something, then I cannot give my true view.

Therefore I am no longer going to go to events because I don't want to have to hide my views or lie or give them an "acceptable truth". I am no longer willing to be afraid to communicate. To me Scientology is based on ARC, and communication is the most important part. I can hear someone saying "entheta is not communication" and all the same old stale lines. There is a lot of good in Scientology too and I recognize this and communicate this too. In order for a group to get better people have to be able to speak freely in my opinion. If this is no longer ok in this church then someone can let me know and we can take it from there. As an example I have heard David Miscavige say that "gradients are cancelled". Well, LRH talks about gradients all through the Data series and elsewhere. Do you think it's entheta to mention what LRH says about a subject if it doesn't align with what David Miscavige says? This is a KSW point to indicate where LRH talks about certain subjects and to discuss these things with my friends.

I fully expect to be attacked now because I know how the game works. I already have heard that I have been "blacklisted", whatever that means. I am always willing to communicate to my friends whether they agree with me or not, it's up to them if they want to communicate to me or not. If you are a friend then talk away!!

I am sending this email to a few people that I have had a good comm line with. I do this so they have at least part of my reality in case any third party or black PR is attempted on me or my wife.

ARC,

Tony DePhillips

End of the email exchange. Within about a week I received a non-enturbulation order.