

8 JULY 1984

## Clearwater Sun



### Letters to the Editor

#### In response

Editor:

I read your recent editorial with interest and noted the deep support and warmth that you feel for Mr. Michael Flynn. My concern is that such support is not based on facts. The facts are that Mr.

Flynn was part of a criminal conspiracy to forge a check on the account of L. Ron Hubbard. This has now been turned over to federal authorities as this is a criminal act.

Mr. Flynn may be opposed to several religions and indeed has written a number of lawyers around the country and characterized his personal laws as anti-religious. Certainly none would disagree with his anti-religious characterization of the laws he drafted in Clearwater.

I do not know the religion of the person who wrote the editorial as it is not expressed in the article. I would merely ask if that unknown editor believes that his religion should have the right to practice freely. If so, I would indicate that I would defend to the death his right to practice his religion.

Should Mr. Flynn be indicted for his criminal conspiracy, it does put Clearwater in a rather difficult position. The city can only demand the return of some one \$150,000 or more. It should be

used to solve the traffic problems along the causeway and beach areas. Mr. Flynn should most assuredly pay interest on the monies as well. He owes it to the residents of Clearwater who are the real victims in this fraud.

Mr. Flynn has now saddled the city with suits, and that will cost in the millions. He should also pay those costs or the city could withdraw once Mr. Flynn is indicted. It is a sad state of affairs that he should so poison the well of understanding in the area that the *Clearwater Sun* loses money and customers and has problems in paying interest on its loans (so I hear) all to attack a religion. Why should we quarrel over Mr. Flynn? His animosity to my religion does not give him the license to commit felonies.

He owes money to the taxpayers of Clearwater and should pay it back.

REVEREND HEBER JENTZSCH  
Church of Scientology  
International

#### Scientologist responds

Editor:

I am writing in response to the article on the Church of Scientology's E-Meter, by George-Wayne Shelor in your paper on June 13.

There are several "quotes" from Ron DeWolf in the article expressing his view of the history of the confessional device that have been publicly repu-

diated by Mr. DeWolf himself in sworn statements. DeWolf testified under oath and later retracted those statements in a public repudiation of his testimony. Had Mr. Shelor bothered to check on DeWolf's later statements concerning the E-Meter, quite a different story would have emerged.

For instance, in a sworn affidavit dated Sept. 22, 1969, after testimony regarding the E-Meter in a U.S. Federal Court of Claims case, DeWolf said:

"I testified that the cost of producing a certain type of E-Meter was about \$12.50. First of all, this was merely a guess on my part. I have now examined into the cost of the particular E-Meter to which I had made reference and find that the cost at that time actually was \$60 to manufacture and sold for \$75, as opposed to the about \$12.50 which I had erroneously assumed to be the cost. I know, however, that there was never any attempt by the church to profit excessively by their manufacture."

DeWolf continued in this same affidavit to say that "... I have always recognized that the founder and followers of Scientology sincerely believed in it as a religion."

And further, "I now unequivocally feel that Scientology is a valid religion and that its spiritual practices as developed by my father, L. Ron Hubbard, are a truly effective method for helping mankind."

Was DeWolf merely pulling the wool over Mr. Shelor's eyes, telling him only what he thought Mr. Shelor wanted to hear? I doubt that we will ever know.

RICHARD HAWORTH,  
Public Affairs,  
Church of Scientology  
Clearwater