HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex.
(Re-issued HCO LA)

Dist: Tech
D of P
Staff Auditors

Fran. Hldrs.

HCO BULLETIN OF AUGUST 4, 1960

REGIMEN I

For some time it has been obvious that we needed an auditing procedure that would serve to train auditors using for the first time Model Sessions.

Some weeks ago I developed "Regimen I". This was primarily for use in training HGC auditors. It has been so sweepingly successful that it is here given for general field use.

It must be clearly understood that a complete session would consist of pre-sessioning, the exact use of Model Sessions, and the new technique that are producing Clears. Regimen I then is a stop-gap bridge between old style formal auditing and a complete grasp of pre-sessioning and Model, Sessions.

It is intended when using Regimen I that the auditor comes as close as possible to a Model Session but not be critical of it. As Regimen I is more and more used by the auditor he should continue to study Model Sessions (HCO Bulletin of February 25, 1960) until he can do one letter perfect.

Once he has the Model Session pat he should then study up on pre-sessioning until he has that perfect.

Naturally all the TRs and knowledge of the E-meter go into session. These, with pre-sessioning, the Model Session, gives us an auditing form which should be mastered before complete clearing results becomes inevitable.

REGIMEN I

(Only Regimen I can be used until an auditor has excellent results on several pcs)

a. Assessment - ask the pc what is wrong with him. Take the pc's answer, make it into a general terminal. Run that and nothing else. When it's cooled off, assess again, same way, run that. Don't argue or dispute or change what the pc says except to convert it to a general terminal.

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "My wife"
Auditor: "OK, we'll run a wife."

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "I'm impatient."
Auditor: "Can you think of some-body who was impatient?"
PC: "My Father."
Auditor: "OK, we'll run a father."

Example: Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"
PC: "Well, I think I'm attenuated."
Auditor: " Did you ever know an attenuated person?"
PC: "Yes."
Auditor: "Who was it?"
PC: "George James"
Auditor: (since this is a specific terminal and we want a general one) "What was George James?"
PC: "A loafer!"
Auditor: "OK we'll run help on a loafer, all right?"
PC: "Fine."

When "a loafer" is flat, we do the same assessment again and as above get a new general terminal.

b. Use as a process two way concept help. Example: "Think of a father helping you." "Think of you helping a father.", etc. Flatten it down to a no reaction on meter, (lay meter aside for most of sessions.. Use only to check).

c. For a quarter of any session time run alternate confront. "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not Confront?".

d. For a quarter of every session's time run havingness to end with - "Look around here and find something you could have."

e. Start session with checking for PTPs and ARC breaks. Handle PTP with "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" only.

f. Handle ARC breaks with "What have I done to you?" "What have you done to me?" only.

Regimen I omits pre-sessioning. It does a rough kind of Model Session, as good as one can get but skip being critical of it.

cont'd

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Naturally there are some general requirements which make up the background music, or lack of it, in sessions, and while there may be many of these, four of them are vitally important. These are:-

1. Handle pc pleasantly.
2. Don't chatter at pc.
3. Get pc to execute every command given.
4. Run good TRs.

It also goes without saying that one should follow the Auditor's Code in session as well as the Code of a Scientologist out of it.

So far as the Auditor's Code is concerned, the only modern error which keeps repeating itself and coming to attention is "evaluation". Apparently this is because very few newly trained auditors have a good grasp of what evaluation is. Briefly, evaluation consists of telling the pc what to think about his case. This is something an auditor should never do. It is directly contrary to Scientology practice, and enormously inhibits a pc's gains. Nothing will cause an ARC break like an evaluation. An example of this is to say "Good" with a question mark on it, or to say "All right" as though you don't believe the pc.

Another difficult point in auditing consists of the auditor thinking he has to believe the pc utterly and accept his story completely in order to have any reality with the pc. A little study of this will demonstrate that one acknowledges what the pc believes. He acknowledges it as something which is believed by the pc. The auditor is quite entitled to his own opinion of it and quite ordinarily supposes that the pc will change his idea of it after more auditing, but this does not mean that one should take what the pc says in a state of mind of "Well that's reality for you, but I have my own reality on the situation".

There is at this, late date, now that we have the various TRs, no excuse for command flubs. An auditor should not make errors. If an auditor is found to be making errors he should get himself run on OP Pro by Dup.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js :df