

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 MARCH 1985

Remimeo
All Execs
HCO
MAAs/EOs
All Staff
Hubbard EO Hat Crse

RESPONSIBILITY, CONTROL AND DANGER CONDITIONS

(Reference:

HCO PL 16 Jan 66R Rev. 29.11.79	DANGER CONDITION
HCO PL 19 Jan 66 III	DANGER CONDITION - RESPONSIBILITIES OF DECLARING
HCO PL 9 Apr 72R	ETHICS CORRECT DANGER CONDITION HANDLING
HCO PL 18 Feb 72	Executive Series 8 THE TOP TRIANGLE
HCO PL 19 Dec 82 II	REPAIRING PAST ETHICS CONDITIONS)

An executive can tend to occasionally sever somebody's responsibility line. It's a technical point.

As one definition of responsibility is to defend one's control of an area, an exec can sometimes tend to sever that control point.

That's the mechanism of a Danger Condition.

If every time an exec found it necessary to bypass it was accompanied with another Danger assignment and if those conditions were actually done, that would be handled.

That gives us the Why, of how an exec can get repeatedly pulled into an area: It's failure to assign and get executed the Danger Condition. That's the tech that's out. You see, the exec's juniors, by not doing their job, sever their control of their area.

PAST CONDITIONS

I recall a unit that was generating a lot of trouble and flak, and ended up being bypassed. Its stats crashed and they still had never really recovered 6 years later. And the reason was the undone Danger Condition. They were never assigned a Condition of Danger, and so those that had done the bypassing were stuck with this unit on their plates right on up the line. So when you have an area that is continually a source of trouble, a past Danger Condition never assigned can be looked for and repaired.

This is the tech on Danger Conditions when seen against the definition of responsibility. It opens the door to a handling.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Adopted as Official
Church Policy by the
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL

LRH:CSI:rw:sk