

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 MARCH 1977R
REVISED 8 OCTOBER 1977

Remimeo

Data Series 43R

EVALUATION AND PROGRAMS

CAUSING STATS

I've learned this over the years: The entirety of our stats are internally caused. WE CAN CAUSE STATS AT WILL. External actions don't affect them.

A newspaper can write reams of entheta and it doesn't affect our stats at all. We get good publicity-it doesn't affect our stats. It's totally internal.

The public demand is apparently exactly as great as we put the wherewithal in their hands with which to demand-apparently exactly proportional. You get as great a response as you require.

Therefore, the more efficient your org is, the greater response you will get. It's that elementary.

The test of an evaluator or executive is: "Can you get your org to do a constructive thing at once without any flashback or any nonsense, and will it occur in such a way as to increase stats promptly? If so, you're a good administrator. If you can't do that, we have all kinds of paint to scrape."

It's just that: The guy can produce an effect or he can't.

And if you run a managing body that way, all of a sudden the staff will get happy and cheerful producing effects; everything will be fine-because they'll become at cause.

That is the essence of hatting. The person can then come up to cause and he'll get sane, productive and cheerful.

Actually, it takes a very able guy to do an administrative line. A ditchdigger has to have a solid line of his arm and a shovel, and that's as far as he can produce an effect. That's why he's a ditchdigger.

Now for a guy to produce an effect at 7,000 miles without any solid beam-he has to be right on the ball. He has to know his business.

SPEED OF EVALUATION

There was once a situation in an org which was very interesting. Apparently the ED was stopping the reports of the LRH Comm and Flag Rep, so no one was about to find out what was going on in that org. But if the manager had been on the ball, all he would have had to do was to look at that data file and find those reports missing and know that there was something wrong—and it would have been detected a long time before.

What you're up against is that most of your evaluation is on omission, and the toughest outpost for anybody who is not familiar with the scene to recognize is an omission.

THE SPEED OF RECOGNIZING OUTPOINTS DETERMINES THE SPEED WITH WHICH ONE CAN EVALUATE.

You wonder why it takes people so long to evaluate. It is simply that they are too slow in recognizing an outpost.

THE INABILITY TO RECOGNIZE AN OUTPOINT IS REASONABLENESS.

It's that thing, reasonableness. We've been talking about it for years. That's just the inability to recognize an outpost.

There was a fellow out in the field saying "I think we have done all right in the past"—meaning "without the Data Series"—"in our thinking and planning." He didn't think he had to take a Data Series course or something. Whereas I was literally getting rivers of outposts from him and his area. He didn't recognize them as such.

Well, what he didn't appreciate is that this is a brand new way of thinking. Man prides himself on being logical so that he has never based any system on illogic-except humor. You have to learn to think backwards—you learn to think backwards, and boy can you think forwards. It's like a dichotomy, positive-negative. If everybody omits the negative all the time, they never get to the positive.

A lot of people are on a stuck flow of being sensible and sane—and that winds up in stupidity. So they get reasonable. Their confront of evil isn't up to it—basically, their confront of outposts.

THE ABILITY TO RECOGNIZE OUTPOINTS WILL EXACTLY MONITOR THE SPEED OF EVALUATION AND THE ABILITY TO HANDLE THE SCENE.

An evaluator cannot say, when he hasn't received any reports for 2 1/2 months, that he doesn't know what to do because he hasn't received any reports . . . he'd better be able to recognize an omitted report when he sees one and that there is a situation and he had better take action to remedy that situation NOW.

INACTIVITY

Now, nobody ever does nothing. They never do nothing. You have to look around to find out what he IS doing.

If it's an exec who can't get juniors to produce, he could probably be putting a stop on production lines. A Why is findable to such a situation. That's probably an ethics scene. But you still will find a Why. You always find a Why for the situation. In other words, he's in a personal situation of some kind or another. He might be able to function, himself, as a junior or he might not-but for a guy to sit there with completely idle staff members and not notice it, with their areas wrapped around a telegraph pole-quite reprehensible.

In investigating one inactive Esto, I found out she was operating under an order that she was not to Bait and Badger until she was trained on it-and there were probably many other things she "was not permitted to do." She accepted an illegal order not to do certain Esto actions. Found out one, probably if we had investigated further, why we would find more. In the first place, if anybody has read the Esto Series, he'd find out that you are an Esto (it says it right in the beginning) and that's it. It doesn't matter if the guy has studied it or not studied it, he's an Esto and he's supposed to do the job. So it was a violent policy violation as well as keeping someone from doing her job.

EXPANSION PROGRAM

An expansion program is for getting an org built. It's based on an evaluation for that org. There is a way you could go about this. Suppose you wrote Kokomo and said,

"What should be done about Kokomo?" You get a bunch of answers from the whole staff-compulsory answer, not a couple of guys. Evaluate from that what their level and tone and that sort of thing is. And you could then form up, based squarely on policy and forming the org, an expansion program.

The expansion program is actually a very basic org rudiment function, but which would be adapted to that org, and within the reality of that org. Highly specialized—and it's terminable. The person executing it, when he gets through with the thing-that's the end of that one. Now let's get another entirely new program.

You could actually do it on a blanket basis where each org was treated as an individual org. Then you'd know what policies to get in in this org. You just ask them, "What should be done about Kokomo?" "What should be done about Keokuk?" they'll tell you. Then you could go down to your Data Files and do an evaluation for the expansion program.

You can thus use knowledge of the org's troubles and the staff interviews as the basis for an evaluation.

There has to be an immediate organization for production, according to the Prod-Org system. However, long-range, long-term organization actions have got to be done by somebody because the Prod-Org system tears an org to ribbons. There's got to be somebody putting an org there who's not directly involved in that immediate scene. He's got to put it there adroitly enough so that what he puts there expands its production so as to pay for the additional organization.

It's quite neat, that type of program. As they get executed along the line, they wind up with an increased production. Every three or four targets that are done, why all of a sudden you've got

more production. There could be some good long-range targets like "Get 30 auditors" -probably could take a year or more to exhaust such a target.

But note-such an expansion program wouldn't go on your production program execution lines at all. Your long-term organizational actions go on another line than your immediate production actions.

PRODUCTION PROGRAM

Such a program is something concerned with handling an immediate situation which had to do with immediate production. Right now. Such as:

WHY: Division 6 doing all the sign-ups for Division 2.

HANDLING:

1. Get a Registrar on post in Division 2, right now.
2. Then get an Advanced Scheduling Registrar on post immediately.
3. Then get three letter writing Registrars on post at once.
4. Get them functioning, production, immediately.

It's a "right now" scene.

A short-term production program ought to expire within 30 days-it becomes stale-dated within 30 days. Some of them become stale-dated within 10 or 15 days. So you need a very hot, very fast line of very quick compliance.

It already takes quite a while for the reports to get to the files through the mail so that you know what the situation is. You're already 10 days behind the gun-10 days, 2 weeks late. And then it's going to take maybe another week to get it assembled-to know that there is a situation and evaluate it

and get it through and ready. So you're operating on about a 3-week average comm lag. You have to make up for it at the other

end of the line-get this thing done now-now-now.

And you've got to have someone there to get it done.

The eval probably will not save the bacon of an org for the next two years. It will be lucky if it keeps the stats bolstered for six weeks—then something else will go out. By that time, why Div 6 will have become completely confused because it is not now being permitted to do all the registration of the org, so therefore it would have gone out of existence, and the Registrar would have left, so now we would have to evaluate and handle Division 6.

It goes tick-tock. From one situation to another.

There are different types of evaluation. There'd be a divisional evaluation. There could even be a departmental evaluation. There could be an org evaluation. An executive stratum evaluation. And so on.

You could have several evaluations going at the same time, but they would have to be different divisions or areas, otherwise you'd cross up like mad. Normally speaking and in theory, that would be possible. But in fact a competent evaluation would find the imbalance between divisions.

The operative word is current evaluation. You could push a current evaluation. How wide is present time? Well, that's a matter of judgment, but a year-old evaluation would be pretty much not current.

FIRST TARGET

Your first program target must always be a production target-but you can't, in actual fact, write a pure production target. It would be impossible to write a pure production target because somebody would have to do it, and the moment that you have somebody there to do it you have organization. So there is a certain amount of organization that comes into it.

If I were evaluating an org right now, say its Dept 7, I would have to include in it as its second target, beefing up Dept 7. First target would be for Dept 7 to do anything it could to handle its collections. And the second target would be to beef up that department forthwith, bang bang! Otherwise the production would not continue. It would break.

So, as mentioned earlier, there has to be immediate organization for production.

TERMINABLE TARGETS

Now how do you like a target like this: "Maintain friendly relations with the environment." How do you like that target? It is utterly completely not a doingness target. It isn't a target at all!

Now if it said: "Call on so and so, and so and so and make them aware of your presence . . ." and so forth, it could have a DONE on it.

Targets should be terminable-doable, finishable, completable.

REPEATING TARGETS

There is such a thing as a repeating target. You can accomplish it many times-it's like when you do org rudiments. Every time they do one of those targets a compliance is added to the compliance stat.

This is especially true of some targets in expansion programs.

FOUR-PRONGED ACTION

In operating orgs, you've got a four-pronged action. A division of duties. 133

1. Somebody gunning these orgs up to expand. You have to get in certain structural functional actions for an org to expand. You have to have somebody working on founding and expanding the org against production, for real. You could do an evaluation for an expansion program, and have this person beat it in. This is your long-term organization.

2. Somebody driving in the production programs that remedy the current situation and production actions. Those programs are based on evaluations of the current status of an org from the viewpoint of production. Not from a viewpoint of its organization. You do have to do a certain amount of organization to get any production, but it's short-term organization.

3. You've got the general org being run on its day-to-day basis by what was once known as the Assoc Sec and is now the ED.

4. You've got the Guardian Office handling the public and indispensability of Scientology. Handling the public, handling legal and handling other things. They're outward facing.

There you have your four-pin structure of your org drive. Those lines go very sleek.

Compiled from LRH taped conference
"Programs Bureau and FB Lines and
Functions" 7309TC27 SO

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Assisted by
AVU Verifications Chief

LRH:SH.dr.nf
Copyright © 1973, 1977 by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED