HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Remimeo HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 DECEMBER 1973

Data Series 32

TARGET TROUBLES
TARGETS JUNIOR TO POLICY

A target given on an evaluation may not set aside management policy or technical releases.

Where such a target is written or misused to supplant policy a great deal of trouble can follow.

Example: Org policy in authorized issues states that accounts for the week must be finalized at 2:00 PM Thursday. Someone writes an evaluation and puts a target in it to end the week on Sunday. People doing the target actions change to Sunday. This is out of phase with all other actions and chaos results.

People tend to take orders from anyone and anything in a poorly organized area.

When they use evaluation or project targets instead of policy the whole structure may begin to cave in.

NO EVAL TGT IS SENIOR TO OFFICIAL ISSUES AND WHERE THESE CONFLICT THE TARGET HAS THE JUNIOR POSITION.

The only way a target can change policy is to propose that such and such a policy be officially reviewed on proper channels or that a new policy be written and passed upon properly by those in actual authority.

Someone attempting to do a target who finds that it conflicts with policy or official technical releases and yet goes on and does the target is of course actionable.

TARGETS OUT OF CONTEXT

CONTEXT: "The Interrelated Conditions in which something exists or occurs."

OUT OF CONTEXT: Something written or done without relation to the principal meaning of a work.

Targets must be written within the meaning of the whole evaluation.

Example: The evaluation is about pie. There is a target that says to polish shoes just because the evaluator

happened to think of it and squeezed it into the program. A program written to increase pies winds up with the ideal scene of polished shoes. No pies get increased so the evaluation fails.

Targets must be DONE within the Context of the evaluation.

Example: An evaluation is done to increase central office collections. It calls for another evaluation to be done on a statistic. The person doing that target reduces the number of items collected upon and crashes central office collections.

The person DID NOT READ OR UNDERSTAND THE WHOLE EVALUATION before he did the target and so did it in a way that accidentally defeats the Ideal Scene.

Example: An evaluation is done to fill up a big hotel of 450 guest capacity. One of its targets calls for project orders sending a team to the hotel. The person who writes the project orders does not look at the evaluation or the hotel plans and specifies 30 guests must be gotten! The evaluation is defeated.

FALSELY EVALUATING

A person who evaluates a situation without chasing up all the data or even looking at the data in his files can bring about a false evaluation.

Example: A person has come back into an organization at a high level. The place crashes. The evaluator does not examine personnel changes at the time of the crash and comes up with "too many football games" as his why and the evaluation fails.

FALSE DONES

False reports that a target has been done when it has not been touched or has been half done at best is actionable in that he is defeating not only the evaluation but the organization.

Example: The evaluator has an Ideal Scene of Repaired Machines that will increase production. The mechanic reports all machines repaired now when he has not even touched them. The evaluator sees production remains low, looks around for a new why. But his why is falsely reported dones on his accurate eval!

PERSONAL CONTACT

Targets seldom get done without personal contact.

Evaluations should carry the name or post of the person who is overall responsible for the completion of the program.

Sitting at a desk while one is trying to get people to do targets has yet to accomplish very much. One can have messengers or communicators or Flag Representatives getting the targets done but these in turn must depend upon personal contact.

A person assigned responsibility for getting a whole program done is not likely to accomplish much without personal contact being made.

This can be done on a via. Mr. A in Location A remote from Mr. C in Location C can get a target done reliably only if he has a Mr. B in that area whose sole duty it is to personally contact Mr. C and have Mr. C get on with it despite all reasons why not. That is how targets get done. That is also how they can be reviewed.

Target troubles are many unless the program is under direct contact Supervision. Even then targets get "bugged" (stalled). But the evaluator can find out why if personal contact is made and the target can be pushed through.

SUCCESS

Therefore the success of an evaluation in attaining an Ideal Scene depends in no small measure on:

1. Both evaluator and target executor realizing policy and technical materials are senior to targets in programs and that targets do not set senior policy aside. One of the best ways to prevent this is to know and refer to policy and technical issues in targets.

2. Targets must be written in context with the evaluation and done in context with the Ideal Scene. The best way to achieve this in writing an eval's targets is to make them consistent with the Why and Ideal Scene. The best way to be sure that targets will be DONE in context is to require that anyone doing a target must first read the whole evaluation (and be word cleared on it) before he does his target so that he does his target in a way to improve the existing scene in the eval not some other scene.

3. To prevent false evaluation one may require that the evaluator attests that all pertinent data and statistics have been examined and to discipline such failures whenever an evaluation fails.

4. To prevent False Dones one must review the evidence of dones and statistics after the program is complete and discipline all falsely reporting persons and reassign the targets or in any way possible get them actually done.

5. The way to get a whole program done, target by target, is through Personal Contact. Supervise it by personal contact with those assigned the targets. Or use a communicator or messenger. Where the people doing the targets are remote from the evaluator one must have someone there to do the personal contact. And be sure THAT person isn't just sitting at a desk but is actually doing personal contact on targets. Thus all evaluations, on the issue itself or by organizational pattern should have some one who can personally contact people getting the targets done fully and completely.

If these points about evaluations and their programs are understood, one can and only then can move things toward the Ideal Scene.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:nt