Remimeo

*Data Series 25*

# LEARNING TO USE DATA ANALYSIS

After one has studied Data Analysis he is expected to be able to use its principles easily and swiftly.

The barriers to being able to use Data Analysis are, in the order of frequency:

1. Misunderstood words. One has not gotten the definitions of the words used. This does not mean "new words". It is usually old common words. It is not just long words, it is more usually little ones. To handle this one takes each policy letter (or chapter) in turn and looks it over carefully to see what words he cannot rapidly define. To help in this one uses an E-Meter and "Method 4" word clearing which is the method of using a meter to see if "Are there any words in this policy Misunderstood?" Any upset or antagonism or boredom felt comes only from a misunderstood word or misunderstood words.

2. The person has himself an out-point in his routine thinking. This is found and handled by what is called an "HC (Hubbard Consultant) List". This list assessed on a meter detects and handles this.

3. Lack of knowledge of an existing or an ideal scene. This is handled by observing the existing scene directly or indirectly by reports and for the Ideal, study of the basic policy of the scene which gives one its ideal, its expected products and form of organization.

4. Not having studied the Data Series. Handled by studying it properly.

5. Not having studied Data Analysis from the viewpoint of needing to apply it.

6. Thinking one already knows all about analyzing and data. Handled by looking over some past failures and realizing they could have been prevented by a proper collection of data and analyzing it.

7. Tossing off "reasons" personally on one's own personal area which are usually just excuses or justifications and not Whys. "I was too tired" "I should have been tougher" "They were just bums anyway" which loads up one's own life with wrong Whys. Handled by being more alert to and more honest about the causes and motives of one's life and the scene, and doing a better analysis.

8. Confusing Errors with out-points. Handled by practice.

9. Confusing out-points with Whys. Handled by learning to observe and better study of Data Analysis.

10. Too narrow a situation. Handled by getting more data and observing the scene more broadly.

11. Missing "Omitted data" or particles or people as a frequent out-point. Handled by knowing the Ideal Scene better. What *should* be there and isn't.

## THE BEGINNER

When one begins to apply Data Analysis he is often still trying to grasp the data about Data Analysis rather than the out-points in the Data. Just become more familiar with the Data Series.

Further one may not realize the ease with which one can acquire the knowledge of an Ideal Scene. An out-point is simply an illogical departure from the Ideal Scene. By comparing the Existing Scene with the Ideal Scene one easily sees the out-points.

To know the Ideal Scene one has only to work out the correct products for it. If these aren't getting out, then there is a departure. One can then find the out-points of the various types and then locate a WHY and in that way open the door to handling. And by handling one is simply trying to get the scene to get out its products.

Unless one proceeds in this fashion (from product back to Establishment), one can't analyze much of anything. One merely comes up with errors.

The definition and nature of Products is covered in several P/Ls and especially in HCO P/L 13 Mar 72 Establishment Officer Series No. 5.

An existing scene is as good as it gets out its products, not as good as it is painted or carpeted or given Public Relations boosts.

So for ANY scene, manufacturing or fighting a war or being a hostess at a party, there are PRODUCTS.

People who lead pointless lives are very unhappy people. Even the idler or dilettante is happy only when he has a product!

There is always a product for any scene.

The analyst when he begins may get the wrong product. He may get a doingness instead of something one can have. And he may look upon a half completion or half done thing as a completed product.

All this makes his Data Analysis faulty. As he can't figure out an Ideal Scene, he then has nothing to compare the existing scene to. It is simply a matter of the cost and time involved in not or half getting a product compared to the Ideal Scene of a really valuable product with Exchange value and what it takes to get it. These two things can be worlds apart. The trail that leads to a WHY that will close the gap is plainly marked with one kind or another of out-points. Where the most and biggest are, there is the WHY. Found, the real WHY and actual handling will move the existing toward Ideal.

Hideously enough, what I say about products is true. Even a government could have a product. Like "a prosperous happy country". An Intelligence agency often muffs its product such as "A properly briefed head of state". But to do it the head of state would have to have a product concerning other nations like "Friendly, cooperative allies which are a help and no threat" or some other product. Otherwise the agency would wind up going straight out of the Intelligence business and being required to conduct its business by assassination of foreign notables or other actions to do handlings based on wrong Whys.

As there would be no Product, there could not really be an Ideal Scene. If there is no Ideal Scene then there is no way to compare the existing scene. Thus, outpoints would expose situations but no WHY would really be possible as there's no Ideal Scene to approach. One has often heard some agency or activity say, "Where the hell are we going anyway?" Translated this would be "We haven't had any Ideal Scene set up for us." And translated further, "The policy makers have no product in view." So they aren't going anyplace really and lack of an objective would cause them to go down and lack of a product would cause them to be miserable.

That's the way life has been running.

Parents and others often ask children "What will you *do* when you grow up?" Or "What are you going to *be*?" This is not baffling for a 5 year old, perhaps, but it is a confuser for a child of 12. There are *BE*, DO and HAVE as three major conditions of existence. One must BE in order to DO and DO in order to HAVE. A Product is the *Have*. It is not the DO. Most people give "Do" as "product". A Product is a completed thing that has Exchange value within or outside the activity.

If one asked a 12 year old "What product are you going to make when you grow up?" he'd likely give you the exchange reward as the answer, like "Money". He has omitted a step. He has to have a product to exchange for money.

To "make money" directly he'd have to be the Secretary of the Treasury, Superintendent of the Mint or a counterfeiter!

Only if you cleared up Product and Exchange with him could he begin to answer the question about what's what with growing up.

Let's say this is done and he says he is set on making photographs of buildings. The DO now falls into line—he'd have to photograph things well. The BE is obvious—architectural photographer. The Exchange of architectural photographs for salary or fee is feasible if he is good.

So now we find he is a poor boy and no chance of schooling or even a box camera. That's the existing scene.

The Ideal Scene is a successful architectural photographer making pictures of buildings.

You see the gap between the existing scene and the Ideal Scene.

Now you can follow back the outpoints and get a WHY.

It isn't just that he's poor. That's no WHY as it opens no doors to get from existing scene to Ideal Scene.

We investigate and find his "father" is very religious but an alcoholic and that the boy is illegitimate and his "father" hates his guts.

So we find a WHY that his "father", much less helping him, is not about to let him amount to anything whatever ever.

This opens a door.

Handling often requires a bright idea. And we find the local parson has often shown interest in the boy so an obvious handling is to get the parson to persuade the "father" to let the boy apprentice in the local photo store and tell the boy what he has to do to make good there.

Situations cannot be handled well unless a real WHY is found.

And a real WHY cannot be found unless *the* product is named and an Ideal Scene then stated. This compared to the existing scene gives us, really the 1st outpoint.

In going the other direction, to find a WHY of sudden improvement, one has to locate poor existing scenes that suddenly leap up toward Ideal Scenes. This is done by locating a high product period (by stats or other signs of production) and comparing IT as an Ideal Scene to the existing scenes before it (and just after if there was a slump) and looking into that for a WHY. But one is looking for *Pluspoints*. And these lead to a real WHY for the prosperity or improvement.

A "who" will often be found. Like "James Johnny was shop foreman then." Well, he's dead. So it's not a Why as it leads nowhere. What did James Johnny DO that was different? "He got out products" leads nowhere. We keep looking and we find he had a scheduling board and really kept it up to date and used it as a single difference. Aha "The WHY is a kept up scheduling board!" The handling is to put a clerk on doing just that and hatting the current foreman to use it or catch it. Result, up go the stats and morale. People can look at it and see what they're producing today and where they're at!

So not all WHYs are found by outpoints. The good situations are traced by Pluspoints.

If the high peak is current, one has to find a Why, in the same way, to maintain it.

## STANDARD ACTION

A beginner can juggle around and go badly adrift if he doesn't follow the pattern:

1. Work out exactly what the (person, unit, activity) should be producing.
2. Work out the Ideal Scene.
3. Investigate the existing scene.
4. Follow outpoints back from Ideal to existing.
5. Locate the real WHY that will move the existing toward Ideal.
6. Look over existing resources.
7. Get a Bright Idea of how to handle.
8. Handle or recommend handling so that it stays handled.

This is a very sure-fire approach.

If one just notes errors in a scene, with no product or Ideal with which to compare the existing scene, he will not be doing Data Analysis and situations will deteriorate badly because he is finding wrong Whys.

## THINKING

One has to be able to think with outpoints. A crude way of saying this is "learn to think like an idiot". One could also add "without abandoning any ability to think like a genius".

If one can't tolerate outpoints at all or confront them one can't *see* them.

A madman can't tolerate pluspoints and he doesn't see them either.

But there can be a lot of pluspoints around and no production. Thus one can be told how great it all is while the place edges over to the point of collapse.

An Evaluator who listens to people on the scene and takes *their* WHYs runs a grave risk. If these *were* the Whys then things would be better.

A far safer way is to talk only insofar as finding what the product is concerned and investigating.

One should observe the existing scene through data or through observers or through direct observation.

An Evaluator often has to guess what the WHY might be. It is doing that which brings up the phrase "Learn to think like an idiot". The WHY will be found at the end of a trail of outpoints. Each one is an aberration when compared to the Ideal Scene. The biggest idiocy which then explains all the rest and which opens the door to improvement toward the Ideal Scene is the WHY.

One also has to learn to think like a genius with pluspoints.

Get the big peak period of production (now or in the past). Compare it to the existing scene just before.

Now find the pluspoints that were entered in. Trace these and you arrive at the WHY as the biggest pluspoint that opened the door to improvement.

But once more one considers resources available and has to get a bright idea.

So it is the same series of steps as above but with pluspoints.

## VETERAN

A veteran evaluator can toss off evaluations in an hour or two, mainly based on how long it takes him to dig up data.

A big tough situation may require days and days.

Sometimes luck plays a role in it. The data that was the key to it was being sat on by someone not skilled in the subject and who had no idea of relative importances. Sometimes the datum pops up like toast from an electric toaster. Sometimes one has it all wrapped up and then suddenly a new outpoint or pluspoint appears that changes the whole view of the evaluator.

Example: A firm's blacklist has just been published in a newspaper or as a scandal. Evaluator: "They do *what*?" in a voice of incredulity. "They ship their security files to Memphis in open crates? Because they are saving on postage?" Wrath could dangerously shoot a wrong somebody. The idiocy is not believable. But a new datum leads to personnel who hired a reporter in disguise because it no longer requires or looks up references.

Example: Situation where stats soared. "They used schoolchildren to pass out literature?" That's just a point but a strange one. Turns out they also hired a cashier and had NEVER HAD ONE ON POST BEFORE! Why? Nobody to take money.

Man gets dedicated to his own pet theories very easily. A true scientist doesn't fixate on one idea. He keeps looking until he finds it, not until his pet theory is proven. That's the test of an evaluator.

## STATISTICS

One always runs by statistics where these are valid.

Statistics must reflect actual desired PRODUCT. If they do not they are not valid. If they do they give an idea of Ideal Scene.

From a statistic reflecting the desired products one can work out the departure from the Ideal Scene.

A backlog of product production must reflect in a stat. As a backlog is *negative* production.

From such tools an Evaluator can work.

———————

The use of Data Analysis is relatively easy compared to learning a musical instrument.

You have the hang of how it is done.

So why not just be a veteran right now and DO IT.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder