HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 JULY 1974

Remimeo   Issue II

Data Series 34

SITUATION CORRECTION

I have just reviewed a number of attempted evaluations and was struck by the similarity of errors in them. None of these evaluations would have reached any ideal scene or even improved the existing scene.

The real reason for this is that the majority of them had a highly generalized situation such as "Bidawee Biscuit Company Failing" or "Stats down from last year." They then proceeded on a data trail and got a "why."

In these cases the why they found was actually the situation!

Each of them had failed to use the data trail to find the situation. They were using the data trail to find a why!

The evals then had no why.

The handling was just a bunch of orders that were in fact unevaluated orders since no real why had been found.

Like in playing a game these evaluators had started 50 feet back of the starting line and when they got to the starting line (the situation) they assumed it was the finish.

If you look at an "evaluation" that has a generalized "situation" like "Continental products getting fewer" you will find in a lot of cases (not always accurately) that what was put down as the "why" was in fact the situation. This left the "eval" without a why. Thus the Ideal Scene would be wrong and the handling ineffective.

Example: (not in form) "Situation: Gus Restaurant failing." "Data: Customers refusing food, etc, etc." "Why: The food isn't good." "Ideal Scene: A successful Gus Restaurant." "Handling: Force Gus to serve better food, etc, etc." That isn't an eval. That is an observation that if Gus Restaurant is to survive it better get evaluated. It is being evaled because it *isn't* surviving. Now look at this: The data trail led to "The food isn't good." *That's* a situation. Why isn't it good enough? Well it turns out the cook got 15% commission from the store for buying bad food at high prices. And Gus didn't know this. So bang, we handle. Gus Restaurant achieves Ideal Scene of "Gus Restaurant serving magnificent chow."

In this example if you used the situation for a why the who would probably be Gus!

The data trail of outpoints from a highly general "situation" (that is only an observation like failing stats) will lead one to the situation and *then* a closer look (also by outpoints) will lead one to the real why and permit fast handling.

DATA TRAIL

People can get too fixated on the history of something. They can call this a Data trail. Well, all right, if it's a trail of outpoints.

But significances of history have little to do with evaluation.

Let us say you see the Machine Division is failing.

Now if you simply take masses of data about it and just start turning over 10 or 12 sheets at a time looking for outpoints only and keep a tally of what they are and to whom they belong, you will wind up with your situation area and probably your situation without reading any significances at all.

Now that you have your area and situation in it you can start really reading all about it and get that existing scene's data and its outpoints. And your why leaps at you.

SUBSTITUTION

You can't substitute stats for a situation or a situation for a why.

But substitution of one part of an eval for another is a common fault.

Substituting a general hope for the Ideal Scene you really would and could achieve makes a sort of failed feeling in an eval. "Gus Restaurant Being Best in Town" is nice but "Lots of customers very well fed so Gus Restaurant survives" is what you are trying to achieve. That can occur and will be reached if you find the real why.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder