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ABSTRACT: Ex-Scientologist Jon Atack challenged the article published in The Journal of CESNUR 2(4), “Degrees of Truth: Engineering L. Ron Hubbard,” with three items: a 29 June 1960 letter sent to Inspector Bent in Australia, a 5 August 1964 letter to ANZO Director Peter Williams, and the transcript “An Interview Granted to the Australian Press on January 10th 1963 at Saint Hill Manor,” which he briefly referenced in his book A Piece of Blue Sky. Although used in the Anderson Report and subject of much criticism, the first letter was clearly not written by Hubbard. The second letter was written and signed by Hubbard, but did not conflict with the original paper’s claim that he did not claim to be a B.S. in C.E. The transcript was unverifiable, however. An article in The Sun by journalist Alan Trengrove, and a reference in The Church of Scientology’s 1978 book What Is Scientology?, showed that an interview with L. Ron Hubbard took place at Saint Hill in January 1963. Nevertheless, no audio or transcript records appeared in the United States Copyright Office, nor has the Church of Scientology released an audio tape of this or other audio interviews. The numerous inconsistencies within the attached supporting documents, along with Hubbard’s request the following day to sue the Australian media, also undermine the transcript’s authenticity and accuracy, especially as even The Sun’s article conflicted with the transcript. Accordingly, the authenticity of the transcript cannot be verified. In fact, the context of the incident rather confirms the original article was correct.
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Introduction

After “Degrees of Truth: Engineering L. Ron Hubbard” (Camacho 2018, 28–60) published, ex-Scientologist Jon Atack directly challenged its thesis, which stated that L. Ron Hubbard (1911–1986) never claimed to have graduated at
George Washington University with a civil engineering degree. Atack referred to a transcript titled “An Interview Granted to the Australian Press on January 10th 1963 at Saint Hill Manor, East Hill, England by L. Ron Hubbard, Founder of Dianetics and Scientology and Executive Director of Scientology Organizations World Wide” (Ottmann 2014). Atack claimed that Hubbard confirmed the entry in Who’s Who in the South and Southwest and followed up with a 5 August 1964 letter from Hubbard to Peter Williams and one to Inspector Gary Lindsey Bent (1938–2018) on 29 June 1960 to bolster his challenge.

Despite the fact that the original paper only argued that Hubbard never claimed to have a B.S. in C.E., nor claimed to have good grades or graduated, the transcript and these letters were reviewed for authenticity and analyzed because they dealt with the central premise of “Degrees of Truth: Engineering L. Ron Hubbard.” Although interesting and overlooked items, one letter was obviously not written by Hubbard, the transcript contained numerous errors and discrepancies, which suggest it may have been inauthentic or at best inaccurate, and the last letter supported the paper as its context explained the discrepancies.
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Figure 1. Letter to Inspector Bent, Geelong, Victoria, Australia. Purportedly by L. Ron Hubbard in England on 29 June 1960.
Get Bent

In the files of the 1965 Australian Inquiry was a letter dated 29 June 1960 purportedly sent by L. Ron Hubbard to Inspector Bent of Geelong, Victoria, Australia. The letter bore Hubbard’s name followed by a C.E., PhD. It also had a curious statement, in which Hubbard claimed to been Provost Marshal of Korea; the Australian Inquiry in 1968 and critic Chris Owen later used this document to show that Hubbard lied about being Provost Marshal of Korea (Owen 1999). It would also seem that Hubbard claimed to be a C.E.

Yet, there are three key indicators that this document was not written by Hubbard. The first can be found in the “by CW” below L. Ron Hubbard’s name, which meant that someone else with those initials wrote the letter. There was a similar document in “Degrees of Truth: Engineering L. Ron Hubbard,” which critic Tony Ortega misattributed to Hubbard, despite that it ended with a “/per md” below an obviously forged Hubbard signature (Camacho 2018, 51).

Secondly, despite L. Ron Hubbard’s name appearing at the top of the letterhead with an address at the bottom, which stated that Hubbard sent it from Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex, England, it also contained a note, which stated “Communications can be addressed to Hubbard Communications Office, 157 Spring Street, Melbourne.” Furthermore, the letter also had a stamped receipt date of 30 June 1960 from the Melbourne Chief Secretary’s Office. As Hubbard gave a lecture in London the evening of 30 June 1960 titled “Some Aspects of Help” then he could not have been in Australia on that day (Taylor 1978, 309). Given that the Melbourne HCO was less than three blocks from the Chief Secretary’s Office, and overnight express mail from London to Melbourne did not yet exist, the letter certainly came from Melbourne, Australia, and not Sussex, England.

Finally, its style differed from Hubbard’s letters and particularly the genuine letter to Williams, especially in its length, its formal tone, the use of titles, and that it lacked Hubbard’s signature. It would not have been modified from a telex due to its length and format, nor was a telex used as it stated that it was mailed per the layout.

If Hubbard had sent the letter from England on 29 June, then it would have been impossible for the letter to arrive in Melbourne by the next day, nor would there have been reason for the letter to have a Melbourne HCO return address.
the letter was definitely sent from Melbourne on 29 June, however, the addition of the Sussex, England, address not only was unnecessary, but its tone, format and style differed from other letters, and lacked a signature because Hubbard did not write it. This would also explain the unusual Korean Provost comment, as Hubbard did not write the letter; someone at the Melbourne HCO with the initials CW wrote it instead.

Figure 2. Header of the alleged 10 January 1963 interview transcript.

Authentication Challenges

The only direct Scientology reference to the 10 January 1963 interview appeared in the 1978 edition of What Is Scientology? as “6301C10 Saint Hill Press Interview, L. Ron Hubbard with Australian Press Interview” (Taylor 1978, 312). Although the Church of Scientology never published nor referenced the purported interview again, it appeared under the “Taped Lectures” of 1963 with a tape reel icon, which meant that the transcript should have a corresponding tape. The description under the icon key stated:

Tapes are listed showing tape number, lecture code (where applicable) and title. The tape number is a code for the date as follows. The first two numbers give the year, the next two numbers the month, the C stands for copy, and the last two numbers give the day of the month. The lectures codes, used where the lecture is part of a particular series, are defined in the list of abbreviations [...] These tapes are not simply lectures. They are the ONLY existing record of all the advances which made possible the handling of the human mind. A special unit has been set up at the Flag Land Base, to get all tape lectures transcribed and
published as printed volumes. The project is currently underway and is known as the “Tapes to Books” project (Taylor 1978, 287).

L. Ron Hubbard gave two verifiable recorded lectures on 10 January 1963 as part of the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course (SHSBC), which would have placed him at Saint Hill, East Grinstead, Sussex, England, as the interview transcript title claimed. The listing appeared as if it were a part of the SHSCB lectures in 1963, but as it had no SHSBC designation, it was instead a standalone item and not technically a lecture, which created somewhat of an anomaly.

![1963 Taped Lectures](image)

**Figure 3.** *What Is Scientology?* 1978 entry, showing the 10 January 1963 interview as an available taped lecture.

Atack emphasized that a tape existed as per this reference (Atack, email to author, 19 September 2018). Though a seemingly obvious explanation, the transcript could have ended up in the files and placed on the list without inspection, just as the *Ability* editors had transcribed *Who’s Who* books without verifying and even *Who’s Who* editors carried forward mistakes over successive volumes (Camacho 2018, 34–9). The primary challenge with verifying this transcript was that, without any audio tape to compare it against, one could not be certain that it was either accurate or genuine.
Arguments Against Authenticity

Atack could not (or would not) state from where he got the transcript or who sent it to him. He only stated that he had the document for more than thirty years with the *Who’s Who in the Southwest* entry and HCO Information Letter “Catholic View of Scientology” issued by Peter Hemery (Atack, email to author, 19 September 2018).

Thus, Atack would have received it around the 1980s, or almost twenty years after the transcript was purportedly published. He also did not know of any corresponding audio copy. Interestingly, only his book *A Piece of Blue Sky* cited the transcript, which Chris Owen referenced in his critical analysis *Ron The “War Hero”* (Atack 1990, 403; and Owen 1999).

What further complicated authentication was that no United States Copyright Office records showed either the interview transcript or any audio tape with this description between 1963 (when the interview took place and the transcript supposedly published) through 1978 (when *What Is Scientology?* was published). Considering the Church of Scientology’s reputation for strict copyright control, that neither it nor L. Ron Hubbard had a copyright record for a taped and transcribed interview immediately cast doubt on the transcript’s authenticity. Similarly, no copyright records appeared for Hubbard’s 16 and 17 November 1963 interview with reporter James Phelan (1912–1997) from *The Saturday Evening Post* that November (Taylor 1978, 313). As no transcript for the Phelan interview published, however, not only did the publication of one interview and not the other create an inconsistency, but it made a stronger case for its inauthenticity, given the recency of the interview with Phelan when compared to the 10 January transcript, and the fact that an authentic 10 January interview transcript would definitely have had a copyright date due to its having been published. Unfortunately, The Church of Scientology did not respond to requests for additional information.

There were also contextual issues with the transcript. That the transcript published on 30 November 1963, nearly 11 months after the alleged interview, was both unusual and uncharacteristic of the Church of Scientology regarding any of Hubbard’s materials. Another oddity was that the press release came not from Saint Hill, England, but from “The Founding Church of Scientology […] at The Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.” (Ottman 2014, 1). There would have
been no reason to issue the transcript from the Sheraton Park Hotel as opposed to issuing it from The Founding Church of Scientology, unless Hubbard had presented a lecture there, which he had not. The transcript also stated “A Press Release to:” without anything after the colon, which indicated that the transcript had no addressees. The HCO Information Letter also had an unusual format as it excluded a “From HCO WW,” “For L. Ron Hubbard,” “Issued by [someone] for L. Ron Hubbard,” typist initials or even the typical day-month-year date format which appeared as “March 7, 1963” instead of “7 March 1963.” Without issuance authority, it was virtually untraceable.

In fact, the only issuance mentioned was in the attached HCO Information letter from Peter Hemery (1911–1997). Additionally, it originated from the Hubbard Communications Office in Washington, D.C., whereas Hemery-issued letters had never come from anywhere except London or Saint Hill, as Hemery was located in England and present there in March 1963. Several documents sent from Saint Hill Manor also show that he and Hubbard were in England at the time, such as the HCO Policy Letter (HCOPL) of 6 March 1963 “Selling Techniques Forbidden” and a 6 March 1963 HCO Bulletin (HCOB) titled “Urgent: Correction to HCO Bulletin of February 22, 1963,” an 8 March 1963 HCOB titled “Use of the Big Middle Rudiments” and a 9 March 1963 HCOB titled “Routine 2 and 3M Correction to 3M Steps 13, 14” (Hubbard 1963a; Hubbard 1963b; Hubbard 1963c; and Hubbard 1963d). Furthermore, Hubbard gave a lecture titled “When Faced with the Unusual, Do the Usual” in Saint Hill on 7 March 1963 (Taylor 1978, 312). Hemery, tasked as worldwide secretary, would not have been in Washington D.C. as Hubbard lectured in England.

When contrasted against an earlier HCOB, the HCO Information Letter revealed that it drastically strayed from previous examples originating elsewhere, such as the 6 February 1960 HCOB titled “Effect Scale” and issued by Hemery in Sussex which stated below its title “Originally issued as Sec ED in Washington D.C.” (Hemery 1960). Despite the attached HCO Information Letter of March 7, 1963, the only known Scientology publication to print the Catholic Life article—without the HCO Information Letter—was the June 1963 issue of the Scientology magazine Communication (HASI 1963, 3–7). Beyond these anomalies, “Degrees of Truth: Engineering L. Ron Hubbard” examined the suspect origins of HCO Information Letters which appeared to have originated from a different Peter in Johannesburg, South Africa: Peter Greene (Camacho
2018, 52–3). That *Catholic Life* was also based in Johannesburg not only suggests that the HCO Information Letter came from there, but further supports the previous argument that HCO Information Letters came from other sources than they claimed. Thus, HCO Information Letters remain highly unreliable means of authentication. All of these factors suggested that not only the underlying supporting HCO Information Letter itself was inauthentic, but also that the transcript may itself be inauthentic.

Additionally, no tape copy leaked online nor were the Church of Scientology staff members in Washington D.C. or any independent Scientologists contacted aware of such an interview. Indeed, the HCO in Melbourne had issued a “Stop Press” memo on 11 January 1963 used in the Anderson inquiry (Anderson 1965) evidence as item 301. Its first line stated “L. Ron Hubbard has cabled for us to sue the press, TV and radio” (Cannane 2016, 91 and 346). If Hubbard gave a press interview the prior day for publication shortly thereafter, then he would have had no reason to instruct the Melbourne HCO to sue the press the following day. Atack suggested that Hubbard was angry with the day’s previous interview but given the lack of evidence, it instead suggested that the transcript was inauthentic or at best inaccurate. That even the Anderson Report of Australia, in which the inquiry began on 8 December 1963, did not mention it seemed unusual when considering its recency and relevancy to the “Stop Press” memo, which would have buttressed the investigation. Therefore, other verification methods were needed and employed to authenticate the transcript.

*Trust, But Verify*

The transcript contained three addenda: a) “Reprinted for your information from pages 19 and 20 of ‘Creation of Human Ability’ by L. Ron Hubbard,” b) the 1959 listing of L. Ron Hubbard in *Who’s Who in the South and Southwest*, and c) HCO Information Letter of March 7, 1963: “Catholic View of Scientology.” It also contained an asterisked reference to a 1955 Founding Church of Scientology of Washington D.C. Press Conference on tape. Unfortunately, as no copies of the account of the 1955 Press Conference from The Founding Church of Scientology in Washington, D.C. appeared online nor were publicized by The Church of Scientology, this has been an unverifiable item.
Item A, the citation of pages 19 and 20 in *The Creation of Human Ability* appeared exactly as listed in the original text of the first edition (Hubbard 1954, 9–10). The only difference was that the pagination differed from the transcript supplement citation by a factor of ten pages and gave a 1955 copyright instead of the correct 1954 date.

Item B, the 1959 *Who’s Who in the South and Southwest* listing and its sources were discussed at length in “Degrees of Truth: Engineering L. Ron Hubbard” (Camacho 2018, 8–9). In any event, this was the only fully accurate, authenticated and verified source (Marquis *Who’s Who* 1959, 395).

Item C, the article in *Catholic Life* by Father Peter Emery Haskins (1929–2002), posed a challenge for verification. Yet, Haskins wrote an article about Scientology in the December 1962 edition of *Catholic Life* (Haskins 1962, 6–7). He was also a member of the O.M.I., the Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate, from 1953 to 1970 and held an S.T.L. and Ph.L. from Gregorian University, Rome (Fr. Velichor A. Jerome, O.M.I., 25 September 2018 email to author). Haskins was not a pseudonym of any Scientologist and the underlying article was real, but the HCO Information Letter that cited the article likely originated from South Africa and may have been inauthentic due to its high number of unusual aspects previously mentioned.

![Figure 4. Original article in Catholic Life by Father Peter Haskins.](image-url)
Although this verified most aspects of the supplemental materials, the transcript itself posed a larger challenge. The material was vague, as neither the newspaper or reporter name were mentioned during the interview, and the reporter appeared as either “Rep” or “Reporter.” The only information that the unnamed reporter gave about the paper was, “[W]e have an office in all [Australian] states except New South Wales and they just asked me to see you” (Ottmann 2014, 1). Investigation revealed that only one paper fit this description in 1963: *The Sun*. Indeed, reporter Alan Trengrove (1929–2016) published an article about his interview with L. Ron Hubbard on 16 January 1963, about one week after the date of the purported interview.

![Figure 5. The Sun page featuring Alan Trengrove’s January 1963 interview with L. Ron Hubbard at Saint Hill.](image)

While this discovery did not authenticate the transcript’s contents, the article suggested that Trengrove possibly interviewed Hubbard prior to publication. Even without a tape available to verify the transcript, notably Trengrove wrote,
Behind the doors in a huge room was Hubbard. Around him were all sorts of equipment, including a Telex machine, a “Hubbard electrometer” and a tape-recorder, which I noticed was in motion (Trengrove 1963, 3).

Furthermore, the references in the news report matched virtually every reference made in the transcript. At this point, the more important doubt about the transcript was its accuracy. After all, the transcript was publicized months after the article and could have incorporated the paper’s quotes.

Though not confirmed either way, the transcript and article do provide additional material for alleged claims by Hubbard. For example, Trengrove stated,

The C.E. he put behind his name? Civil engineer, he [Hubbard] said. When he studied at George Washington University nuclear physics was called civil engineering. He said he also studied government at Princeton University (Trengrove 1963, 3).

Trengrove got this incorrect because Hubbard did not claim that he put the C.E. behind his name nor claim that nuclear physics was called civil engineering in the transcript:

Rep: They said you have a C.E. What’s that? You use that?

LRH: Civil Engineer.

Rep: Civil Engineer. At which University was this, I think it was Princeton, wasn’t it? Is this a University degree?

LRH: CE means Civil Engineer, State-side, that’s all (Ottmann 1963, 11).

Furthermore, Hubbard had stated earlier that he had only attended George Washington University:

LRH: I attended George Washington when I was a kid. The degrees they gave out in those days was Civil Engineering, which is relatively unimportant. I’ve also been to Princeton.

Rep: What did you do there?

LRH: Studied government (Ottmann 1963, 9).

This matched the earlier observation that Hubbard downplayed his earlier schooling and his stating that he had studied (military) government at Princeton, a minor point Paulette Cooper hammered in her book (Cooper 1971, 163). In fact, when asked earlier in the interview if he had a degree from George Washington University, Hubbard did not confirm it:

Rep: Now, you said you took nuclear physics as a course. Did you?
LRH: Umhum.

Rep: At Washington. And did you get a degree?

LRH: As far as degrees are concerned, my degree in the field of the mind is a Ph.D. from Sequoia University.

Rep: From where?

LRH: Sequoia ... adult education in California.

Rep: And that’s all for philosophy?

LRH: Umhm (Ottmann 1963, 9).

Hubbard also referenced his studies at George Washington University earlier in the interview in order to explain how Dianetics and Scientology began:

LRH: [...] Well I studied in the east when I was a young man and later on took up Civil Engineering and Nuclear Physics at George Washington University.

Rep: And where is George Washington University?


What Atack based his critique of “Degrees of Truth: Engineering L. Ron Hubbard” on, however, was the following segment, which Trengrove misquoted:

Rep: They said you have a C.E. What’s that? You use that?

LRH: Civil Engineer.

Rep: Civil Engineer. At which University was this, I think it was Princeton, wasn’t it? Is this a University degree?

LRH: CE means Civil Engineer, State-side, that’s all.

Rep: Where did you get that?

LRH: I just told you G.W.

Rep: G.W. Oh, George Washington [University].

LRH: Don’t know where Who’s Who is. You can get all this data out of Who’s Who. So what are you doing? Didn’t you prepare your story?

Rep: Well, no I didn’t I’m afraid. [...] Reporter: As far as I’m concerned, I’ve never seen this but they’ve asked me what is the Ph.D. Where is it and what form does it take.

LRH: [...] If you want to go and look in Who’s Who in the Southwest Division why you’ll find all my degrees and pertinences and clubs and everything else. [...] Here we have ...

Rep: What book is that?

Hubbard only validated the 1959 Who’s Who in the South and Southwest in regards to Trengrove’s question about his Ph.D. Had they read the entry together and Hubbard confirmed the “B.S. in Civil Engring., George Washington U., 1934,” then this would have showed that Hubbard affirmed the B.S. in C.E. in 1934, but as per the full context of the transcript, having already stated “my degree in the field of the mind is a Ph.D. from Sequoia University,” then Hubbard was not referring to having a Ph.D. in C.E. let alone a B.S. in C.E. Hubbard grew increasingly irritated that Trengrove had not done his homework prior to the meeting. This of course, would assume the authenticity of the transcript and its supporting documents, despite the many indictors to the contrary.

Hubbard had a similar written response to yet another Peter, this time Continental Director of ANZO Peter Williams, with a signed letter dated 5 August 1964. The signature and style matched Hubbard’s and he was in Saint Hill, England as he had given a lecture the prior day titled “Summary of Study” and one the next titled “Gradients and Nomenclature” (Taylor 1978, 315). His response remained consistent with all prior references to the C.E. Hubbard explained, “I participated in several survey and engineering projects—civil engineering. C.E. stands for Civil Engineer” (Hubbard 1964).

Regarding the C.E. questions in the transcript and the letter, Hubbard did not state that the C.E. was from a university degree, nor that it was for a nuclear physics course, as Trengrove claimed. In fact, Hubbard referred to his time at George Washington University as a “sojourn” meaning a temporary stay, which is correct because he left college after two years. He continued that he studied at the Engineering School and was one of the first students of nuclear physics in the United States, both of which were also correct and well publicized; Hubbard’s course was “Modern Physical Phenomena; Molecular and Atomic Physics” per his college transcript, a precursor to nuclear physics (NARA 1932). Noticeably, Hubbard did not sign his name as C.E. or Ph.D., consistent with his other signed documents.

Notably, Hubbard referenced to the Who’s Who book in the letter as with the transcript, but gave clearer reasoning: “other biographical information is reasonably accurately reported in such publications as ‘Who’s Who in the [sic] South West’ and the ‘Biographical Encyclopedia of the World.’” As with the
transcript, Hubbard referred to the book regarding “other biographical information,” which for all intents and purposes goes beyond the scope of the original paper, which forwarded the premise that he did not claim a B.S. in C.E. Instead it concluded, “the C.E. meant Civil Engineer, though not necessarily with a degree, but rather through experience and training” which would appear how Hubbard referred to it here (Camacho 2018, 53).

*Figure 6. 1964 Letter from Peter Williams to L. Ron Hubbard.*
Figure 7. 1964 Letter from L. Ron Hubbard to Peter Williams, Item 294 in Anderson 1965.

Survey Says...

In regards to Hubbard’s civil engineering experience, he was recognized in a number of different groups which involved civil engineering. He was both Secretary and President-Elect by the end of his freshman year of the American
Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) student chapter at George Washington University (Weitzel 1931, 1). *The Fiction of L. Ron Hubbard, A Comprehensive Bibliography* explained that in 1931 Hubbard “is secretary of the GWU chapter of the American Society of Civil Engineers” (Widder 2003, 169). The Managing Director of Customer Service at ASCE Rick Tyler also provided evidence of Hubbard’s Secretary position at George Washington University’s ASCE student chapter in 1931–32 (Richard “Rick” Tyler, e-mail message to author, 7 April 2017). By the end of his sophomore year, he was President-Elect (Weitzel 1932, 1). Hubbard alluded to this title in one of his last lectures:

> I have seen notes taken by the Columbian College Association, George Washington University. I wrote their Historical Supplement. I didn’t go there by the way, you know, I merely was a—that’s what they tell people—that’s very funny. Before they lie like that they ought to go in and look at some of their things I used to, I used to write their supplements, like their magazine supplements, and that sort of thing. I always was on the front page. And you go in and find out who was the President of the American Society of Civil Engineers and that sort of thing, in such and such a year, and I got my name up in gold on the wall (Hubbard 1972).

His quote was not entirely accurate; although President-Elect, he dropped out before being sworn in as President. Tyler confirmed that Hubbard never was President of the student chapter nor became an ASCE member (that is, a non-student chapter member), which appears consistent with other data. Nevertheless, the Church of Scientology’s biographies have omitted this fact—as naturally do its critics—, which contradicts one pillar of the hagiography theory.

---

*George Washington University Student Chapter, Organized 1928. (40 Members).*

Prof. John R. Lapshin, Faculty Sponsor; George A. Ricker, Contact Member; Robert J. Afghan, President; L. Ron Hubbard, Secretary, 2124 1 Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

**Figure 8.** 1931 GWU ASCE Student Chapter Contact Information.

Courtesy of Richard “Rick” Tyler at ASCE.

Beyond the ASCE, Hubbard also appeared in the 1932 George Washington University yearbook *The Cherry Tree* with his engineering fraternity Phi Theta Xi (Schaub 1932, 67).
Figure 9. 1932 Phi Theta Xi in The Cherry Tree Yearbook. Courtesy George Washington University Special Collections Department.

Although The Cherry Tree of 1932 failed to mention the ASCE student chapter, the 1931 edition, which Miller also cited, showed Hubbard as a member (Hudson and Herzog 1931, 110). This omission suggested that Miller selectively ignored data here and elsewhere in his book.
Those close to Hubbard, including initial *Dianetics* supporter and editor John W. Campbell, Jr. (1910–1971), also recognized his real-world experience both in school and out of school due to his formal Navy training as a civil engineer. On 13 May 1942, after hearing that author Robert Heinlein (1907–1988) needed to hire engineers for a project, Campbell wrote to Heinlein that “L. Ron Hubbard was in New York, wounded, and might be available, since he was a civil engineer” (Patterson 2010, 308). Campbell described Hubbard in a similar fashion to his
associate Dr. Joseph A. Winter (1910–1955), another initial supporter of *Dianetics*, having emphasized Hubbard’s psychological research:

L. Ron Hubbard, who happens to be an author, has been doing some important psychological research... he’s gotten important results. His approach is, actually, based on some very early work of [Sigmund] Freud’s [1856–1939], some work of other men, and a lot of original research. He’s not a professional psychoanalyst or psychiatrist, he’s basically an engineer. He approached the problem of psychiatry from the heuristic viewpoint — to get results (Miller 1987, 148–49).

Though it is unknown whether Campbell read the 1944 *Who’s Who in the East*, which showed Hubbard’s incomplete college education (Biographical Press 1944, 1150), Campbell recognized Hubbard’s engineering experience and knowledge, regardless of his actual title. Nevertheless, critics have discounted Hubbard’s field experience and the high opinions of other scientists and engineers who recognized his knowledge and experiences.

Furthermore, he was awarded the Explorer’s Club Flag 163 in 1961 for the Oceanographic-Archeological Expedition, and later in 1966 for the Hubbard Geological Survey Expedition, which suggested that he knew enough about surveying in civil engineering to qualify for these Explorer’s Club awards, the ASCE student titles and Navy mission. Critic George Malko noted that others also recognized Hubbard’s engineer and explorer experience:

In explaining the circumstances of Hubbard’s election to the [Explorer’s] club, [Executive Director] Mr. [Ward] Randol [1896–1972] told me in no uncertain terms that he personally knew the members who had sponsored Hubbard and certainly does not hesitate to vouch for their integrity and judgment. What is more, Randol was quite ready to reveal, in 1940 Hubbard made his first expedition as a member of the Explorer’s Club, and was granted the club flag to carry on his voyage, a distinct honor given only when a member’s application and description of an intended expedition has been given the severest scrutiny. “It’s easier to get money from us,” Randol said drily, “than it is to get the flag. The flag is awarded only to members, and is treated rather jealously.” Hubbard’s expedition that year was to Alaska, under the title of the Alaskan-Radio Expedition. In the years since, Hubbard has made two more voyages flying the Explorer’s Club flag, one in 1961, an Oceanographic-Archeological Expedition, and one in 1966, the Hubbard Geological Survey Expedition (Malko 1970, 33–4).

Hubbard described an award and voyage in a 22 June 1961 lecture: “I had a piece of interesting news today. The Explorers Club just awarded me Flag No. 163 for the Ocean [sic] Archaeological Expedition” (Hubbard 1961). If Hubbard were unqualified to lead an expedition, let alone ones involving oceanography,
geology, archaeology and surveying, then the Explorer’s Club would not have allowed him to fly a flag in 1940, let alone 1961 or 1966.

Prior to these expeditions, Hubbard was involved with surveying, an aspect of civil engineering. On the Maine-Canada border in 1932, he “joins a team of surveyors who are sent to verify the U.S.-Canadian border in Maine” with the U.S. Geological Survey (Widder 2003, 169). Hubbard again described his poor grades and lack of interest in civil engineering, which supported the premise of “Degrees of Truth: Engineering L Ron Hubbard” and Melton’s book:

A few years later Ron would provide, in his usual jaunty prose, a picturesque description of how he had become disillusioned with civil engineering: ‘I have some very poor grade sheets which show that I studied to be a civil engineer in college. Civil engineering seemed very handsome at the time. I met the lads in their Stetsons from Crabtown to Timbuktu and they seemed to lead a very colorful existence squinting into their transits. However, too late, I was sent up to Maine by the Geological Survey to find the lost Canadian Border. Much bitten by seven kinds of insects, gummed by the muck of swamps, fed on Johnny cake and tarheel, I saw instantly that a civil engineer had to stay far too long in far too few places and so I rapidly forgot my calculus and slip stick’ [...] At the end of the next semester, Ron’s grades showed no improvement and he remained on probation. He was nevertheless elected a member of Phi Theta Xi, the Professional Engineering Fraternity, and was photographed for the year book in formal evening dress, black tie and starched wing collar, as if grimly intent, like his fraternity fellows, on pursuing a career building bridges (Miller 1987, 50).

He later embarked on the Puerto Rican Mineralogical Expedition in June-September 1932 and the Caribbean Motion Picture Expedition in October 1932-January 1933. Beyond his college time, his Naval records confirm he worked in the Bureau of Navigation’s Hydrographic Office from September to October 1941 (Tiller 1966, 1 and Dyson 1979).

According to the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES), uniform testing and certification did not occur until 1965 and licensure laws were not in effect until 1950 (Corley 2004 and NCEES 2018). The NCEES was still working out its licensure, titles and grandfather clauses and created a gray area as to qualifications. This paper does not take the position that Hubbard graduated from college with a civil engineer degree, but rather that due to his various surveying experiences, civil engineering affiliations, recognition as such by various military and private organizations and the lack of clear licensing laws, the C.E. title was not baseless. Despite this, he did not state that he had a degree or graduated, let alone had good grades, only that he had
participated in several survey projects during his short stay at George Washington University—and had not included the other surveying experiences.

Figures 11 & 12. U.S. Navy letters showing Hubbard’s 1941 Hydrographic Office work.

**Conclusion**

To argue that Hubbard lacked any formal training would be inaccurate as he received training in college toward his declared degree and during his period in the United States Navy. Conversely, to argue that he was an official civil engineer, let alone one with a Bachelor of Science degree, would also be incorrect as he did not complete his schooling nor hold proper engineering licenses. One could argue that he knew just enough about civil engineering to be effective when using it and convinced others that he was capable.

At best, Atack’s claim that L. Ron Hubbard validated the 1959 *Who’s Who in the South and Southwest* in the interview transcript or letter would have to account for all of the counter evidence from the prior paper and the earlier explanations in the transcript, in which Hubbard stated that he had only briefly attended and studied Civil Engineering at George Washington University, that
his only degree was from Sequoia University, which was unrelated to the C.E., and that he never claimed to graduate. Furthermore, without hearing the audio tape itself one cannot have certainty that the interview transcript was even accurate, or even that the interview occurred. After all, Trengrove incorrectly wrote that Hubbard claimed that “nuclear physics was called civil engineering,” when Hubbard never said any such thing in the transcript. Either one or both of these documents are incorrect. Lastly, because the attached HCO Information Letter appeared inauthentic due to its irregularities in issuances, locations, dates, formatting, the fact that it has not appeared elsewhere and that Peter Hemery could not have issued it from Washington, D.C. when he was in England, should cast serious doubt on the authenticity of the supporting documents with the transcript.

Although overlooked in the initial analysis, this interview transcript and letter changed nothing about the prior paper regarding the misattributed B.S in C.E. claims. This authentication project, however, unearthed previously overlooked original Scientology materials and an interview not well-publicized. Though hearing an audio copy of both the 1963 interview along with the 1955 press conference from the Founding Church of Scientology would fully authenticate the transcript, the burden of proof still lies with Hubbard’s critics to prove otherwise and that would include how, where, when and why Atack got a transcript despite no prior publications.
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