

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Remimeo HCO BULLETIN OF 14 DECEMBER 1972

Integrity Processing Series 11

GENERALITIES WON'T DO

The most efficient way to upset a pc is to leave an Integrity Processing question unflat. This is remedied by taking each reading question to an F/N on the question.

The best way to 'miss' a Sec Check question is to let the pc indulge in generalities or "I thought....."

A withhold given as "Oh, I got mad at them lots of times" should be pulled down to when and where and the first time "you got mad" and finally, "What did you do to them just before that?" Then earlier similar if no F/N.

The pc who withholds somebody else's withholds and gives them as answers is a card. But he isn't helped when the auditor lets him do it.

Situation: You ask the pc for a withhold about Joe. The pc who says "I heard that Joe....." should be asked right there, "What have you done to Joe? You. Just you." And it turns out he stole Joe's last blonde. But if the auditor had let this pc go on and on about how the pc had heard how Joe was this or that, the session would have gone on and on and the Tone Arm up and up.

We have pcs who use 'withholds' to spread all manner of lies. We ask this pc, "Have you ever done anything to the Org?" The pc says, "Well, I'm withholding that I heard....." or the pc says "Well, I thought some bitter thoughts about the Org". Or the pc says "I was critical of the Org when....." and we don't sail in and get WHAT THE PC DID, we can comfortably stretch a 5 minute item to a session or two.

If the pc "heard" and the pc "thought" and the pc "said" in answer to an Integrity Processing question, the pc's reactive bank is really saying, "I've got a crashing big withhold and if I can keep on fooling around by giving critical thoughts, rumours, and what others did, you'll never get it." And if he gets away with it, the pc has missed a withhold question.

We only want to know what the pc did, when he did it, what was the first time he did it and what he did just before that, and we'll nail it every time.

THE IRRESPONSIBLE PC

If you want to get withholds off an 'irresponsible pc' you sometimes can't ask what the pc did or withheld and get a meter reaction.

This problem has bugged us for sometime, I finally got very bright and realized that no matter whether the pc thought it was a crime or not, he or she will answer up on 'don't know' versions as follows:

Situation: "What have you done to your husband?" Pc's answer, "Nothing bad". E-Meter reaction, nul. Now we know this pc, through our noticing she is critical of her husband, has overts on him. But she can take no responsibility for her own acts.

But she can take responsibility for his not knowing. She is making certain of that.

So we ask. "What have you done that your husband doesn't know about?"

And it takes an hour for her to spill it all, the quantity is so great. For the question releases the flood-gates. The Meter bangs around.

And with these witholds off, her responsibility comes up and she can take responsibility on the items.

This applies to any zone or area or terminal of Integrity Processing.

Situation: We are getting a lot of "I thought", "I heard", "They said", "They did" in answer to a question. We take the terminal or terminals involved and put them in this blank.

"What have you done that ----- (doesn't) (don't) know about?"

And we can get the major overts that lay under the blanket of 'How bad everyone is but me.'

This prevents you missing an Integrity Processing question. It's a bad crime to do so. This will shorten the labour involved in getting every question flat.

And if your pc is witholdy you can insert this "Have I missed an Integrity Processing question on you?" while doing the processing.

Always clear up what was missed.

A pc can be very upset by reason of a missed Integrity Processing question. Keep them going up, not down.