

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Remimeo HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 OCTOBER 1974

Data Series 39

WHO-WHERE FINDING

You may now and then see an eval that winds up with a who. Very rarely you also find one that winds up in a where. Sometimes you find an "evaluator" who only finds whos or wheres.

If this puzzles you when you see such "evals" or if you land in that situation yourself while evaluating, remember this:

AN "EVAL" THAT ONLY HAS A WHO OR A WHERE AS ITS WHY IS INCOMPLETE.

What has happened is this: The "evaluator" does an outpost count only for who or where. He does not then really investigate or dig up the real data on that who or where but lets it go at that. He says - WHY: Dept 1 not functioning. WHO: Director of Personnel. IDEAL SCENE: A functioning Dept 1. HANDLING: Shoot the Dir Personnel.

Such evals do NOT raise statistics. They do not work. Because they are not complete!

In any eval you have to do an outpost count to find where or who to investigate. This prior outpost count does not appear, always, on the eval form. It's just where to look.

Having gotten the who or where you NOW do a full read out, lift the rocks, pry into the cracks and find the why.

It can even get worse. Having seen something wrong, one puts down a situation. He does a preliminary outpost count for a where or who and then discovers a more basic or even worse situation. In other words his situation can change!

Example: No personnel being hired leads one to Dept 1, Personnel. So one writes the Situation: "No one being hired." Then one can easily dash off "Why: Dept 1 inactive. Ideal Scene: An active Dept 1 hiring personnel." And write up a Handling: "Hire people."

Great, easy as pie. But somehow six months later there are still no personnel! The reason is simple: the "evaluator" never went beyond the who-where. He put down a who-where as his why.

Real evaluation would go this way: 1st observed situation, "no personnel being hired." The who-where comes up as Dept 1. Now and only now do we have something to evaluate. So our situation has changed. It becomes "Dept 1 inactive." And we investigate and lo and behold there is no one in that whole division! Again we could go off too early. It is tempting to say "Why: No one in it!" And say "Handling: Put somebody in it!"

But actually "No one in it" is just data! Certainly the execs who should be screaming for personnel know there is no one in Dept 1. After all, they get cob webs on their faces every time they pass the door! So it is just an outpoint, not a why as it does not securely lead to solution. So we look further. We find seven previous orders to put on a Director of Personnel! The writers of these orders are not the whos but who they were given to are elected. That's seven non-compliances by the Executive in Charge of Organizing! And this turns out to be Joe Schmoe. Now we have a who. So what's with this Joe Schmoe? So we go to anything connected with Schmoe and we locate Board of Directors minutes of meetings and herein he has been stating for 2 years repeatedly that "The organization only makes so much money anyway so if we hire anybody to deliver service we might go broke." As the organization has been going broke for those two years and the last Dir Personnel was fired two years ago we now also have our DATE COINCIDENCE. But this is still just an outpoint - contrary facts, as one has to deliver to stay solvent. So we look up Joe Schmoe even further and we find he is also the Chief Stockholder in a rival company! So here is our Why: "Organization being suppressed by the Chief Stockholder in the company's rival." "Who: Joe Schmoe. Ideal Scene: Organization hiring personnel needed to deliver." Now for the handling. Well, Joe Schmoe could mess things up further if we just fired him. So we better know what we're doing. We have found our organization controls the tin Joe Schmoe's company needs for its cans. So we shut off the tin supply and when Schmoe's stock falls we buy it up, merge the companies and fire Joe. Or so a businessman would do. THAT handles it!

Shallow evals that stop with a who-where on the first inspection don't succeed. Outpoints are usually aberrated and the people there around them usually handle things unless they have depth of mystery.

You have to have a who-where to begin your investigation. Once you find your who or your area, now the outpoints begin to count.

Very few situations in actual fact are caused by active whos. Usually it is inactive whos, confronted with situations they have not grasped and don't see any way through.

A classic case was a situation that did not resolve for over a year until very close investigation discovered a statistic was wrongly worked out and which targeted an area in the wrong direction. One could have shot "whos" by the dozen without ever solving it!

So when you see a who-where as a why, you know one thing: the eval is incomplete.

You can cure someone doing this chronically by making him first list the outpoints that show who-where to look. And then make him go on with the evaluation outpoints that lead to a why, giving two counts of outpoints. The light will dawn.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:nt
Copyright © 1974
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED