The Past Lives of L. Ron Hubbard

(This article appeared in the November 1989 issue of the Scandinavian free Scientology magazine *Vafhcengige Synspunkter* (Independent Viewpoints — edited by Antony Phillips. Address: P.O.Box 78, 2800 Lyngby, Denmark). I hope to hear from people who may have done similar research or from anyone who wants lo comment on the subject — especially old-timers, who knew Ron. Write to the author to above address.) and what can be learned from them. by Knud Eriksen, Denmark

L. Ron Hubbard didn’t “believe” in past lives. He worked with them — used them in the techniques of auditing. They constituted the dominant part of his philosophy, and he is quoted as having said: “I know with certainty where I was and who I was in the last 80 trillion years.” Although this may be slightly exaggerated and a good example of his taste for colouring his stories — to put it diplomatically — there are several facts which indicate that he, himself, was totally certain of at least some of his earlier incarnations.

One of these facts is the well-known *Mission into Time* cruise of 1968, also called *A Test of Whole Track Recall.* This expedition was partly a treas­ure hunt, during which Ron intended to dig up treasures which he had stashed away in past lives — as a captain or sailor in the phoenician navy around 200 B.C. and in the 18th century as a pir­ate, sailing between the Mediterranean and the new world.

Ron was obsessed with gold and cash, according to statements from many of his nearest associates.

A couple of years earlier Ron had carried out an­other treasure hunt — a one-man expedition of 3-4 months duration in Rhodesia.

His double purpose in paying this visit to Rhode­sia in the spring of 1966 was to win a country for Scientology (after the “loss” of Australia and at a time when Rhodesia had just made a Unilateral Declaration of Independence in defiance of the British government) and to find the enormous diamond and gold treasures, which he was con­vinced that the multi-millionaire Cecil John Rhodes (after whom Rhodesia was named) had stashed away.

Ron would be *the* person to know this, since he was certain that he was Cecil Rhodes, in an ear­lier life from 1853 until 1902. From 1902 to 1911 he was a little boy, who drowned. In 1911 L. Ron Hubbard was born. He was so certain that he had been Rhodes, that, during his stay in Rhodesia, he carried on just as if he was the rightful owner of the country, who had returned. He also liked to sport the kind of hat worn by Rhodes.

Neither the treasure hunt in Rhodesia nor the one in the Mediterranean were any great successes for Ron. In July 1966 he was expelled from Rhodesia as an unwanted person, and he later claimed, to have lost Ј200,000 in this adventure. During the Mediterranean cruise no gold was found, either, as far as I know. However, there have been state­ments from members of the expedition (f.ex. Hana Eitringham) to the effect that metal detec­tors gave positive reads where Ron had predicted hidden treasures. However, all the locations were guarded historical ruins. One member (Larry Reeves) claims to have seen a pirate’s chest full of jewels and ancient gold coins in the ship.

## Valuable exposures.

However, I’m not nearly as interested in Rons gold as I am in an examination of his (alleged) past lives. Several people have, by now, studied and brought to light many sections and aspects of his latest life. This has given me a valuable un­derstanding of the philosophy, the organisation, and the way of life which I have known and felt attached to for many years.

An interesting parallel to the exposure-books about L. Ron Hubbard is the present controver­sial book *Intellectuals* by the English historian Paul Johnson. In it many of the fathers and founders of socialist and communist philos­ophies, from the past 200 years, are examined under the magnifying glass. This certainly doesn’t do much for their looks, but just as Paul Johnsons book probably, in most cases, doesn’t remove the basic fascination which socialists have towards socialism and the various founders of it, such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Marx and Berirand Russell, the juicy exposures of Rons life and background haven’t taken away my old wish to continue studies of, and use of his philosophy and techniques. And I am, if anything, more fas­cinated with L. Ron Hubbard, the more I have read about his fantastic life and complex person­ality.

It is this fascination, then, which is the reason why I started to read biographies of Cecil John Rhodes and the other historical persons which Ron claims to have been, to see if there might be any truth in this.

As far as I know no-one has done so yet (if I’m wrong, I’ll be very interested to hear their results).

It has been very exciting to do this, and I feel that I’ve come to understand L. Ron Hubbard better than before.

### Cecil John Rhodes.

First let me give a mini-introduction of him, taken from three different encyclopaedias:

“The life of Cecil John Rhodes (1853-1902), South African financier and statesman and one of the great empire builders, spanned the heyday of British imperialism. When he was born, central Africa was virgin territory, and it was still possible to make a fortune and acquire power by what Rhodes called “philanthropy plus five per­cent”, or to dream of “painting the map red” (to plant the British flag) from the Cape of Good Hope to Cairo. He achieved the first and made advances toward the second. By the time he died, however, the second South African (Boer) War had already exposed the weaknesses of imperial­ism. His notions of the superiority of the Angio-Saxon race soon faded, and his real dreams were never fulfilled. His name survives only in Rhode-sia and the Rhodes Scholarships in Oxford.” *En­cyclopedia Britannica, 1974.*

“Cecil John Rhodes (1853-1902) British politi­cian. Went to South Africa for health reasons and gained widespread influence on the diamond pro­duction in Kimberley. 1881 member of the par­liament in the Cape-province. 1890-95 prime minister, founded, 1889, British South Africa Co. Controlled most gold and diamond mines in South Africa and worked energetically for the ex­pansion of British rule in the continent. Had great visions concerning the British empire. The large area, which was known as Rhodesia until 1964, had been named after him (now Zambia and Zim­babwe)” Lagemann’s *Encyclopaedia, 1986, Denmark.*

“Rhodes, Cecil (John), 1853-1902, British statesman and capitalist. Made fortune in South Africa by monopoly of Kimberley diamond production. Persuaded Britain to annex Bechuanaland in 1881. Formed British South Africa Co. to exploit mining concessions. Prime minister and virtual dictator of Cape Colony 1890-96, he conspired to seize Transvaal; forced to resign after raid of Sir Leander Jameson. Developed Rhodesia. Left for­tune to public service, including Rhodes Scholar­ships (32 for U.S., others for German and British colonies).” *The Columbia Viking Desk Encyclo-pedia,l964.*

A More **Thorough Presentation.** These short presentations are, by and large, correct, but they are, of course, not adequate for an understanding of him and they do not pay him justice.

He was, in fact, a very great and strong person who had sky-high ideals about saving humanity. His conceived means for doing this was the expansion of the British empire to become a universal, civilized rule, which would bring the fruits of biggest raid in the history of the FBI) and it was, at least in part, the reason why he had to live in hiding during the last 9 years of his life.

The last years was a down trip for both men, full of disappointments, where their past and questionable methods caught up with them, as nemesis (Rhodes’ reputation for scheming and bribing etc., Hubbard’s guardian-techniques, including PR-lies about his own achievements).

They both ended their lives, seriously stopped in their plans, largely stripped of the power they used 10 have, surrounded by boot-lickers.

They both became imperious, autocratic and irritable in their old days, and finally both died from heart attack, according to available informations.

### Character.

If you go into detail in order to get a clearer impression of their character and behaviour in everyday living, there are even more striking similarities, especially their “demoniac” characteristic, with an ability to keep an audience spellbound, an ability to obtain total dedication and loyalty, also from great personalities, ability to get solutions to problems through their mere presence, and the apparent carelessness with which they delegated work.

It is interesting also, that they apparently both had advanced spiritual abilities. Rhodes communicated telepathically with his friend. Dr. Jameson *(Something of Myself* by Rudyard Kipling, 1937), although this ability seemed to betray him when he most needed it. Many stories and statements about Hubbard tend to prove, that he had advanced spiritual abilities, including clairvoyance and telepathic communication.

I take it for granted now, that all readers of this magazine know from first-hand experience, how Hubbard impressed people. So, I will go on to give some examples of Rhodes’ character and the way he impressed people he met:

“He impressed his hearers as ‘a good type of English country gentleman’ nervous, un­gainly, but of a most effective frankness. As a speaker he seemed to think, or rather dream, out loud. His vocabulary was poor, although he hit sometimes on a telling phrase; he had moments of discursive obscurity. Yet men who had listened to the famous orators of the world found themselves strangely impressed by his speaking. A strong persuasiveness and candour, helped by his appearance, held any audience. But “fundamental brainwork” had been done before he rose, and when trimmed of excrescences the ordered clearness of his sequences was perfect.” *(EB)*

“...the force of his personality having impressed the High Commissioner, Sir Hercules Robinson...” (so he had his way with him). *(EB)*

“...he went straight to the house of the Boer commandant, Van Niekirk, who had refused to acknowledge Mackenzie as resident. He informed Rhodes that “blood must flow”. Rhodes replied “Give me my breakfast and let us see to that afterwards”. Having dismounted, he stayed with Van Niekirk six weeks, and became godfather to his child.” *(EB)*

“Everything he undertook was on a massive scale. “I like the big and simple — barbaric if you like,” he would say. Men found him both harsh and generous but always pertinacious and persuasive.” *(EB)*

“Though unimpressive as a speaker and contemptuous of parliamentary procedure, he earned respect by his original views.” *(EB)*

“Though Rhodes was no orator, he expressed his large ideas in popular phrases, many of which — : “British dominion from Cape to Cairo”, “painting the map red”, “the imperial factor”, “philanthropy plus 5%” - gained common usage. He combined an almost visionary zeal for British expansion with a frank belief that money was power and that one could always deal rather than quarrel with an opponent. He gained the fervent loyally and friendship of some of his most outstanding contemporaries, but toward the end he became autocratic, imperious, and was surrounded by sycophants.” *(EB)*

The Industrial Revolution plus the other benefits — as he saw it—of the Anglo-Saxon culture to the underfed and barbaric peoples of the earth. Also, this beneficial rule was to gain so great a power, that wars would become impossible in the future. He was, naturally, “a child of his time” and regarded the Anglo-Saxon race as the highest developed and best suited to rule over the rest of the world. It was even, according to the predominant thinking of the time, the solemn duty, “White Mans Burden”.

The first milestone in this project was to be the reunion of all english-speaking areas of the world, and especially reunion with the lost America. The recently discovered lines of communication, telegraph and railroad were the means to speed up the close knitting together of the whole world.

This was far from being a primitive or brutal greed for power. Together with most other imperialists of the period, he saw as equally important to grabbing countries, that the illiterate and poor lower class of Britain itself was advancing, and he worked for a decentralised empire, where countries would have their own way in local affairs.

The British empire grew to include, at its highest point, 1/5 of the worlds land-areas and 1/4 of its entire population. So, his dream in fact proved to be quite realistic and came close to a success.

The question of how the British empire was destroyed as well as the story of how Rhodes’ plans for world peace and welfare were subsequently used/abused, is yet another fascinating subject. I will not go any further into this, apart from mentioning, that the entire financial and political life of the 20th century up till now has been dominated by the basic notion of a united world, where even the methods for obtaining this and the initial financing of key personnel training was taken from Rhodes’ wills, including his “Rhodes Scholarships” in Oxford.

So, he was not a Mr. Anybody, and had the British empire kept and expanded its si/c and power, there would, today, have been statues of him in all parts of the world, and school children would know about his life and regard him as a hero. “The British empire, however, was broken down, as is a well-known fact, during the first half of this century, and today it is not fashionable, but rather bad manners, to speak well of any persons or ideas from that era. Communist propaganda over the years and unfavourable, although unreal, associations to Hitlers attempts to create “the Millenium” are the main reasons for this.

A “Demonk” Idealist. He was a lone wolf his entire life, and opinions for and against him were strong. His opponents accused him of using bribery to reach his goals, and they accused him of feathering his own nest rather than being philanthropic or furthering the ends of the empire. After he died, at the time when his will was disclosed, those who had been foremost in detraction admitted the purity of his motives, he was fully rehabilitated, and his reputation immediately rose to new heights.

In an old edition of Encyclopaedia Britannica is the following characterization of his personality, based on the authors personal knowledge of Rhodes and interviews with contemporaries:

“Rhodes’ impetuosity and impatience in act and speech gave in his lifetime an impression of him which was misleading. Like all statesmen he accepted the conditions of life as he found them, having much to do and little time, as he knew from his malady, to do it in. By nature, he had the shy, sensitive, kindness of a boy. But while his nameless benefactions were many, he affected brutality and hardness, making it his principle to subordinate friendship and all individual claims to his schemes. Yet he was not in troth a hard man. Except in finance, where he was out­distanced by Alfred Beit, his mere aptitudes were not remarkable; in conventional accomplishments he was not well equipped. He had few ideas, but these he had worked for, testing their value by his life’s experience, and wore them, so to say, next to his skin. The ideas and dexterities which most cultivated men of affairs have about them, as it were ready made, were not his. His temperament was unequal, almost incalculable, combining extreme naivete and simplicity with strokes of amazing and unexpected shrewdness. His work in its entire detail seemed to be done by others. While he apparently dreamed, they really and on their own initiative drafted letters, designed meetings and conjunctions, supported or opposed policies, and drew up as it were programmes, which in a little he roused himself to act upon. Yet there was no end to the qualities he held in reserve. He seemed to muse, yet was suddenly alert with the perception of clairvoyance, revealing a grasp of detail in subjects where he had been rashly supposed ignorant He talked anyhow; yet his felicity of phrase after columns of commonplace was uncanny. The subordinates who did so much of his work, were lost without him. He was there, and the rest followed; he was not there, and nothing was done. In a word he was “demonic” and the impression of greatness which he had on his subordinates is reflected in the view now taken of him by his countrymen. His life, however, rightly or wrongly conducted in detail, is seen to have been steadily devoted to impersonal and public service and a cause which was really the greater friendliness of mankind.”

### High point

Wealth was to him not a purpose in itself. His purpose was above all “to paint the map red” and “to be useful to my country”. He became one of the wealthiest men of that time, yet he had always overdrawn his account, primarily to pay for his two pet projects: a telegraph-line and a railroad all the way from the tip of South Africa to Cairo in Egypt. Those were enormous enterprises, considering the tools of the time. He succeeded in building the telegraph line but not the railroad. It was too much for his private purse, big as it might be, and there were insurmountable problems in getting the line through Sudan and German East Africa. A long stretch, however, was built. His third major project was to bring together the English population and the Dutch (Boers) in South Africa, and to unite the prov­inces of the area under the British throne.

He used his great wealth to further these goals, and the main reason why the British government let him do as he pleased in many ways, was just this: that he was about to serve the entire African continent to them on a silver platter, wholly financed by himself.

Apart from this he had a phenomenal ability to handle and be liked by both the english and the dutch. Also, the black workers and tribesmen (the Matabele people) liked him or respected him. These personal abilities made him indispensable in South African politics.

He preferred to deal with opponents rather than fight them, which he called “to square” (buy out), and he believed that every man had a price. This policy, which he deemed necessary to obtain his goals, was mainly what lay behind the accusations for bribery as a working method.

### Low point

The turning point in his career came in 1896, when he — while he was the prime minister of the Cape-province — took part in a conspiracy aimed at overthrowing the beer-president Paul Kruger and conquer the province of Transvaal. Paul Kruger and his motto of “Africa for Afrikaners” (dutch) was in the way of Rhodes’ and British expansion to the north. The conspiracy failed and Rhodes was forced to resign for his part in it.

He could actually have publicly repudiated the failed rebellion/raid, and thus have saved his own neck, as did the colonial minister, Chamberlain and the High Commissioner, Robinson, although they both knew of - and approved - of the attack. He didn’t want to do this, as he would have had to betray his friend for 20 years. Dr. Jameson, who headed the force of 500 men, which had raided “a friendly neighbour” and was now prisoners in Transvaal.

Rhodes tried to stop Jameson by telegraph, when he learned that the insurrection, that had been planned to take place concurrent with the attack, from within Johannesburg, was not going to take place after all. But Jameson continued in spite of this message, and the attack failed.

Rhodes had to resign as director of the British South Africa Co. as well, but he didn’t whimper. He paid all the fines levied by the Boers and concentrated from now on his energy on the development of the North (Rhodesia), particularly the railroad and telegraph line, and he became interested in experimental farming, among other things.

He had lost the possibility to carry to completion his great scheme in its entirety. His power had been curtailed, he lost the support of the Boers and also his own government, with a new High Commissioner, distrusted him from then on. He became a symbol of the scheming British capitalist.

His will, which was changed several times, left his fortune for “Rhodes Scholarships” — to educate young promising students from the colonies and elsewhere — chosen in accordance with elaborate criteria laid down by Rhodes, — in furtherance of the old goal of expanding the empire. But his last years held many disappointments, and toward the end he became autocratic and imperious, and was surrounded by sycophants.

### LRH = CJR ?

Did I then find any basis for an assumption that Ron had in fact been this person? — Yes, I think I found a great deal of “evidence”. The more I read from detailed biographies, the easier I found it to say LRH = CJR. This experience will definitely be stronger if you read such biographies yourself. I’ll recommend *Cecil Rhodes — the Anatomy of Empire* by J.Marlowe, 1972 (the latest I know of).

In the following, however, I will try to indicate some of the similarities between the two men, taken primarily from this biography, abbreviated *AE,* and from several editions of *Encyclopedia Britannica,* abbreviated *EB:*

### Goals in life.

Primarily we have Rhodes’ all-engrossing goal: to save humanity. The way he planned to do it— which was the possibility of his time and what he called his “patent” — was to weld together all English-speaking areas under British rule etc.

L. Ron Hubbard wanted to do the same by disseminating his auditing techniques and thereby “Clearing the Planet”.

They were equally strong and persistent in their attempts to reach the goals.

**Life** cycles.

The life cycles of the two men have strong similarities.

They both worked their way up from modest living conditions to great wealth, and this wealth didn’t mean much, by itself, to either of them. They were both convinced, that the money provided the necessary power to reach their goals.

They were both practical men, self-taught to a large extent, in so far as theoretical knowledge was concerned. They didn’t have much patience to follow a long, tedious study schedule without deviations.

They were both strongly interested in philosophy, but not in a diffuse manner. Only in so far as their personal plan for action was enhanced.

They both stressed the use of communication-lines as their most important tool. L. Ron Hubbard did this with auditing, Rhodes in the use of telegraph and railroads.

They both had controversial, questionable operating policies. Rhodes “bribed” or bought his opponents. Hubbard used intelligence and PR-techniques and court cases (for harassment) against his opponents.

They were both impatient about achieving their goals, Rhodes because he suffered from a weak heart and didn’t expect to live long, Hubbard because he expected an atomic war any day, unless...... and this impatience, in its turn, led both men to further exaggerate their questionable methods of dealing with opponents.

Rhodes attempted to overthrow a “friendly neighbour” through a conspiracy and armed attack. Hubbard’s exaggeration came when he stole government documents through his Guardian office to get an edge on his opponents. This led to raids on three of his headquarters by the FBI (the biggest raid in the history of the FBI) and it was, at least in part, the reason why he had to live in hiding during the last 9 years of his life.

“He was as inarticulate as a schoolboy of fifteen. Jameson and he, as I perceived later, communi­cated by telepathy .... Rhodes had a habit of jerk­ing out sudden questions as disconcerting as those of a child — or the Roman emperor he so much resembled. He said to me a propos of noth­ing in particular: “What’s your dream?” I answered that he was part of it....” *(Something of Myself by* Rudyard Kipling, 1937, p. 149)

“In the Legislative assembly and in his cabinet he established almost as complete a mastery as he had in the board room’s of de Beers and the Chartered Company.” (AE, p.l97)

“He had at his beck and call some of the ablest and most dedicated men, as well as some of the biggest scoundrels of the British empire.” *(AE,* p.212)

“But the scholarships remain. They have indeed been shorn of their imperial significance, and they contribute nothing to the ideals which Rhodes made the basis of his life. But they pro­vide opportunities for useful careers for ordinary, decent men of the type of Pickering, Jourdan and Grimmer whom Rhodes, in his inner heart prob­ably preferred to the brilliant and usually unscru­pulous adventurers who were the indispensable accomplices of his vast and grandiose schemes.... It seems not to have entered his mind that he himself could never have won a Rhodes Scholar­ship.” *(AE,* p.293)

And Finally there are numerous accounts, varying a bit in the details, of lus courage and cleverness at the time when he prevented a war with the Matalicle-people. Accompanied by only a few in­terpreters and scouts he went to the Matopo Hills near Bulawayo to negotiate peace with them. In doing this he deFied the advice of the military and others. He succeeded. He is reported to have said, that it was “one of those moments in life that make it worth living” — referring in particular to the moment, when he was suddenly surrounded by 20-30 Matabele warriors who did not attack but instead started preliminary negotiations with him. He chose the place where it happened for his burial place, and called it “View of the World”.

I found several more resemblances between the two men, and many more could be found through a more detailed study of biographies, especially by people who knew Ron personally. It must be . said, also, that I found apparent differences, but these are outnumbered by at least 10 to I, and have therefore been left out.

A Key to Understanding. Whether L. Ron Hubbard was, in fact, Cecil Rhodes in an earlier life or whether he just believed so himself, I think that we can gain valuable understanding of him through the study of Rhodes. In the first case this is self evident. In the latter case it is due to the fact, that his convic­tion then seems to have been so strong that he took the valence of Rhodes or at least copied him to a large extent. Rhodes, then, is a key to under­standing Hubbard (aided by the fact that many biographies of Rhodes exist and that the histori­cal distance to liim is greater than to Hubbard). And it is obvious that understanding Hubbard is a key to understanding Scientology.

### Other Lives

Ron has furthermore claimed to have been *Buddha* (Siddharta Gautama) around 500 B.C., *the Duke of Medici* in 16th century Italy, when he wrote the famous/notorious “The Prince” (which Ron claims was stolen and published post­humously by Macliiavelli) and *Robespierre,* the famous/notorious revolution leader during the french revolution in the 18th century. Ron has mentioned other incarnations, but these are either unknown persons or persons living so far back in time (and even in non-Earth societies), that no verifiable information exist. Quite a bit of information exist, however, about the above three historical persons, particularly the Duke of Medici/Machiavelli and Robespierre. But even though all information about Buddha are legends, the study of all three is well worthwhile for gaining an understanding of Hubbard.

The claim that Hubbard was Buddha, is stated publicly in the book “Hymn of Asia” by Hubhard. The claims of having been the other two come from private conversations (see Corydon and Miller).

It is no wonder that Ron has been rather quiet as far as those two are concerned, for they are very controversial and despised by many (not the Duke of Medici but Machiavelli).

The very fact that *Ron,* himself, thinks he was them, and the fact that he tells about it gives us important information about him, especially when coordinated with the known facts from the lives of both Rhodes and Hubbard.

For he seems to have acted in accordance with the thoughts and the behaviour of all of these persons.

I have only made a rather superficial study of these three persons. More should be done, but I consider that I have done enough to be able to draw some conclusions.

### Buddha.

Siddharta Gautama lived around 500 B.C. We only have legends about him, but many of these. He is only remembered for the good he did, and he has had an enormous influence on the later spiritual development in the world. There are 500 million Buddhists today. His only “known” negative act was to leave his young wife and newly born son at the age of 29-30. One may assume that they were not happy about that. He was the son of a king and it had been prophesied that he would either become a ruler of the world or, if he left his house, a Buddha (Bodhi, enlightened person). His choice is well known. He became a Buddha and refrained from becoming a ruler of men. His goal was to discover the natural laws of life and to help all human beings find the true happiness.

L. Ron Hubbard’s technology and his stated aims were of the same nature, in the written materials and in its effects. But L. Ron Hubbard didn’t choose between “playing” Buddha and ruler of men. He used means that originated with each of the models. Why?

The Duke of Medici — Machiavelli. Niccolo Machiavelli 1469-1527) is thought to have written *The Prince* in 1513. It was not published till 1532. He is, above all, known as the author of this work. It was a textbook on politics. Machiavelli’s goal was the liberation of Italy, and in the book he claims, that all means are permitted for a prince, who wants to strengthen his own, or more importantly, the state power. A clever prince should be unscrupulous.

It is one of the most hated and attacked writings of history, because of its total cynicism.

Machiavelli had, himself, seen how noblemen would be proclaimed rulers of Italian cities and principalities one year, only to be forced into exile or die through assassination or in battle the next year. It therefore became a central problem how a “new prince” could keep his power. Through his virtue, braveness and generosity the prince would win the loyalty of his subjects — at least he had to give the *impression* that he possessed these qualities. “Numerous modern examples” showed that a prince often had to break promises and agreements and had to use intrigues, treachery and violence in this evil world. To survive the vicissitudes of life you had to combine the strength of the lion with the cunning of the fox, the human with the bestial.

Already in the 16th century Machiavelli had come to symbolise the falsities, immoralities and cynicisms in the world of politics. Frederic the Great and Voltaire wrote anti-Machiavelli books.

At the same time many politicians have voiced great admiration for the cleverness and insights of Machiavelli. Among these are Emperor Karl the 5th., the French Queen Catharina de Medici and Cardinal Richelieu. Modern dictators, such as Napoleon, Mussolini and Hitler have claimed to have further developed the principles set out in *The Prince.* The work is the most influential in the western world alongside “Das Kapital” by Karl Marx.

It is written in a clear and beautiful Italian, and Machiavelli became to Italian prose what Dante became to Italian poetry, the understanding today, of Machiavelli, has become more realistic. He is now seen as a “a child of his age”, who was simply more frank and honest than his contemporaries.

### A Recurring Theme.

Whether L. Ron Hubbard, then, was Machiavelli, or, as he claims, the Duke of Medici, it is this work: *The Prince,* that he claims was his. He has mentioned it more than once, apparently (see Corydon and Miller), and it seems to have been on his mind more than passingly. In his alleged life as Cecil Rhodes he apparently used this power-policy as one guide, but held in check, it seems, by the way of the Buddha *as* the opposite guideline. He probably remained doubtful as to which one was the right. Both had given him trouble. You might call it schizophrenia, but on the other hand, a label doesn’t add much to the understanding,

In the life of L. Ron Hubbard this “schizophrenia” is seen again — the mixing in the same person of the opposed Buddha-methods and Machiavelli-methods as a recurring theme.

Ron didn’t choose between them but used both simultaneously. This was — once again — the case with this last incarnation, that I’m going to present:

### Robespierre.

“Maximilien de Robespierre (1758-94) French lawyer and revolution leader. R., who was an ardent adherent of the ideas of Rousseau, became a member of the National Assembly 1789 and joined the far left. Eloquent and known as incorruptible, he soon gained influence and became one of the leaders of the Jacobins. After the elimination of the kingdom in 1792 he became the leader of the Paris Commune, and together with Danton he made the Welfare Committee of the Convention into the actual government, supported by the armed gangs of the country’s lower class. As the most powerful person in the Welfare Committee after the death of Danton, R. became responsible for the Reign of Terror, which, according to his plans was going to lead to a radical economic reform to benefit the poor. Overthrown and executed *l794.”(Gyldendals Encyclopedia, Deamait.)*

The following are some interesting excerpts from Salomonsens Encyclopedia, danish equivalent to Encyclopaedia Britannica, given to describe his personality:

“He studied law and became a lawyer in Arras. In Paris he had become acquainted with the ideas of Rousseau, at home he acted as a proponent of the ideas of freedom and equality, and he successfully took on several trials as counsel for the defence, through which he gained a reputation for defending the little and poor people.”

“..he probably had no part in the staging of the September-murders, but politically he used the results of them.”

“...however, he didn’t share the militant attitudes of the Jacobins, and he feared a triumphant general; but by speaking against the war he received attention, and through his touching speeches about virtue he became the women’s favourite priest.”

“During the debate concerning the trial of the King, his proposal of 3. December to kill the King immediately was hindered by them, for a while, but the death of the King was a triumph for R.....”

“...being an adherent of Rousseau’s deism he would not tolerate their worshipping of Reason, and in March 1794 they were executed...,”

“The Welfare Committee now became an obedient tool for R.... The police and the courts were placed under R..... and with the support of the armed gangs of Paris, under Henriot, he headed the Reign of Terror from then on. First, he attempted to create the state religion of Rousseau. On May 7, he made the Convention pass a law which proclaimed that the French people acknowledged the faith in the Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul, then followed the Celebration of The Supreme Being on June 8.......”

“....when the Reign of Terror *worsened,* and 1366 executions were carried out between June 10 and July 27 (1794), the enemies of R. in the Convention formed a conspiracy against the Tyrant’...”.

“....R. was not a pioneer in the revolution, in the same way as Mirabeau and Danton. He didn’t possess the strong passions of the blood and flesh, to stir up the masses, and he lacked the power of will needed for great actions. But in his over-particular vanity and his envy he was indefatigable in the striving for power. And after the overthrow of the aristocracy, when the lower-class citizens expected palmy days, he became their ideal; he was, more than anyone else, an embodiment of everything which is fussy in the French national character. Meticulous in the way he dressed, always perfectly powdered and formal, he knew how to impress, and through his sentimentality he won the women. First of all. With his anxious prudence and touchy vanity he became the one to drive the Reign of Terror into the extreme. But the ideas of Rousseau, which he tried to carry out, remained with him barren doctrines. His virtual dictatorship paved the way for Napoleons empire.”

He is the direct source of such opposite subjects as state socialism (communism as practised in this century) and The Declaration of The Rights of Man. Definitely a very controversial and complex personality. Schizophrenic comes to mind again.

### Conclusion

At the end of the much quoted Armstrong trial the judge said in his verdict; “ ....The organization clearly is schizophrenic and paranoid, and this bizarre combination seems to be a reflection of its founder etc....”

Yes, that is true. — Especially after my examination of Rons alleged past lives it has become my understanding — so far, that it was really this unhandled part of his *case* which led to his tragedy and to that of his church. Had he been “cured”, there would have been far more emphasis on tech and auditing and far less policy, control and abuse. More “Buddha” and less “Machiavelli”.

This was the sort of thing that OT 3 was supposed to take care of.

I still don’t know, of course, if Ron really lived these lives, but I find no good reason to doubt it. In many ways his last life was more fantastic and colourful than the lives of Buddha, Machiavelli/Duke of Medici, Robespierre or Cecil Rhodes.

His personality was as strong as theirs. And I consider that I have found many significant resemblances in characters, goals and behaviour. Ron could probably have found some more decent heroes if he only wanted to look good and make PR. And remember — he only claimed the “Buddha” life publicly.