## YOUR CASE

A lecture given on 3 January 1960

Thank you very much.

Well, we approach the last lecture. of this year's congress. And usually, we have messages about the future, and deplore the past, and not-is the present. Usually, we speak from the heart.

I'm going to talk right straight into and out of your case this lecture. I'm sorry to have to do it. You've been making out all right. You've been getting along somehow. You were happy till I came along. You knew all you had to be was more and more irresponsible and you had it made. I know.

Oh, I'm being hard on you.

Scientology and Dianetics have included the upper ten thousand of Earth very easily. If you don't believe that and you're not a professional auditor - if you don't believe that, why, just try some professional auditing some day and just start picking them up at random off of the streets or out of the hospital wards and so forth, and start processing them. And you will find - you will find that you are amongst the upper ten thousand of Earth.

Now, I'm not trying to give you a swelled head. It's true. It's true. You had brains enough to know you didn't know, just like I had sense enough to know that I had to do some tall remembering and reorganization here in order to get anything together, because most of the information had gone zock. And we knew we didn't know, and that made us the smartest people on Earth. Most of the rest of them think they know, and that is the high tide of ignorance. The most ignorant man in the world knows that he knows everything there is to know about everything. When he's that ignorant, why, he's that ignorant.

People used to call it a "divine doubt." A divine doubt was necessary to genius. And then I think some cult or another... I've forgotten what cult. Some cult or another said that all you had to do was sit back and somebody else knew everything, only you could never talk to him.

When you can't do anything else to a population, if you totally fail to give them any information, if you totally fail to help them, if you totally fail to cure any of their ills, if you totally fail to take any responsibility in all directions, you can always invent a god in some cult or another. Cynical statement, isn't it?

And yet it's not cynical; it's actually quite factual. The assignment of total responsibility to another deity than yourself is the most invalidative thing that you can do to you. You recognize it as such, don't you?

You could always get a zing out of handing over all the responsibility in the universe to Zock or - or Cronus or Titan or Batten, Barton, Durstine and Osborn. There's always a certain zing involved. You could get a change.

This fellow is going along one day and he's - you know, there's no emotion, and he's all sort of dead, and things are, you know, not so good. Life is like a stale glass of beer or the inside of a motorman's glove. And somebody could come along and say, "Repent ye, repent ye," or something of the sort, and you could suddenly turn over all the responsibility for everything to somebody else someplace, and there'd be a wheee! The glee of insanity or something -but you'd actually get an emotional zock, an emotional bing, an emotional snick-wh-e-e-w one way or the other. Of course, it went up this way and then z-z-z-r-e-w-w boom. But nevertheless there was - something happened. The individual knew something happened. There was something emotional happened. It was an emotional experience to suddenly throw yourself on your knees in front of the local circuit rider and say, "I got the Word," you know?

And knowledge has had the reputation of being coldly dispassionate. But to knowledge has been imparted the cold dispassion of a bunch of irresponsible scientists who, finding things out, didn't carry them through to their final end. Just in the dressing room a moment ago, we were talking about Einstein and Fermi. Man, somebody's got a case coming up! See, that's a real case because - didn't follow through a responsibility along the developments. You know? Created something and then let somebody else confront it. Only nobody could confront what they developed, see? Nobody could confront the living fire of atomic fission exploding in a city full of women and children.

And the fellow, of course, who - as I've told you in another congress - dropped the A-bomb on Hiroshima, is in a Texas mental institution right now, totally convinced the Japs are after him. But he went mad. He couldn't confront that much of an overt and, of course, the only extant mental assistance didn't have enough sense to run responsibility on the deed. We could save his bacon rather easily. But when it comes down to that much of an overt, I am one to yawn and say, "Why? Why do anything for the guy?" You know, that's just too much overt for me to get - exert myself to get anybody to recover from.

But in that, I am actually making a mistake because, probably, that is the fellow who is keeping in place a lot of this atomic roaw-rrhar, see? He's got the biggest overt, so therefore he'd have it all mixed up on the fate lines or something, you see? And probably somebody ought to blow it.

But I've been in charge of justice and public welfare too often in too many different places boy, that's a downgraded statement - well, anyhow - not to have a sort of an instinct about this sort of thing, you know? I see somebody walk up with a blast pistol and blow some baby's head off, you know, just for a gag, and for some reason or other, I don't have an immediate impulse to go over and console him. Somehow, I just don't.

I know it's something lacking in me. Perhaps it's my training pattern. I have quite a reverse in impulse, you see, and that's to pick up the blast gun and blow his head off slowly. Now, that's a stimulus-response mechanism, of course, but that is the way things have kind of worked. But it's a bum thing - it's a bad thing - the punishment mechanism. If you don't have anything else, however, it's better than nothing. But actually, it worsens the condition, because by punishing him, it puts out of control, and out of his control, the thing he's being punished for, and so tends to confirm it as a continuing crime.

All punishment tends to confirm crimes in a continuing status. You punish a fellow enough for something and there he goes; he'll do it again. You've lessened his ability to control it. You send a man to jail for stealing a car, then don't wonder that when he gets out of jail, in the next forty-eight hours out of jail, he's liable to go steal a car. He knows what he can't withhold: stealing cars. So he goes and steals a car. Get the idea? He knows his area of no-responsibility, so that's his area of no-responsibility. The punishment pointed it out for him.

Instead of helping him recover his area of responsibility and shoulder - help shoulder the burden of responsibility, why, the people who were in charge of law and order, justice, social-conscience, and all that sort of thing, actually made it impossible for this individual to recover and rehabilitate.

But there is that point. You see somebody blow somebody's - blow a little baby's head off with a blast pistol, you just don't have the instant impulse to go fix him up. It's just a little bit too much of an overt. Got the idea?

Well, the reason we don't is because we can't confront overts that easily and that big. Got the idea? I mean, it's just nonconfront on our parts.

If a fellow can't confront an overt that he has done, it of course has to go on automatic. So he'll do it again! And then doing it again, he can't confront it - doubly can't confront it, you see - so he'll do it again. And now he's done it three times, you see, and he didn't confront any part of it, why, he'll, of course, do it a fourth time.

And there we get the whole mechanism of dramatization, which is delineated in The Original Thesis, Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, and on up the line.

Unable to confront an overt, one doesn't take responsibility for it in any way, shape or form, can't even recognize it as an overt; so it goes on an automaticity because he did do it. Then it must be something else that is doing this, and he has set up a false personality which then does things, because he can't confront it, you see? Can't take responsibility for it. Therefore the dramatization can occur again. Therefore, a sickness one gets can happen over and over and over and over. He couldn't confront this sickness in the first place, so he got it. So, having it, couldn't be responsible for it, so got it again. And we get the recurrent nature of illness.

People, by the way, do not have very many illnesses. One given person only has a small package of illnesses, and they're basically the things he couldn't confront. But what couldn't he confront first? He couldn't confront causing the illness, probably, in somebody else. And not being able to confront it in somebody else, then did it to somebody else again, and another overt and another overt. And he kept seeing this thing happen so, what did he do? He restrained himself by giving himself the illness. And that was his last-ditch withhold to keep himself from doing this thing. That's kind of the way it happened. And there's - be a small package of these things, and a guy goes along in the medical profession, invents 8,762 names per square inch for all of these various illnesses and assigns very Latin-sounding, resounding nonsense to these things, and they all come down to an overt. And that's it.

Now, anybody can be a victim. You. You. You. You can be a victim. Now, I have actually done quite a bit for this subject. I, once in a while, will audit somebody or even let myself be audited on some totally reverse process. I had to find out if we had the final run of it and I couldn't, actually, myself, confront putting anybody totally through the agony of being a victim. You know, just audit a person as a victim. Not "What victim can you confront?" you know, or "Where could you communicate to a victim?" or anything like this but just "Be a victim," you know? Naturally, that would key in practically every extant facsimile, accident, burn, roast, zap and everything else just on the whole track, you see? Just "Be a victim." "What kind of a victim could you be?" you know, something like that.

I turned an auditor loose on me and I said, "All right, run it, see? We'll see where I wind up." And I got a subjective reality on it, and I'm talking right straight out of the horse's manger.

So what? Just so what? So you got burned to death, so what? So you threw a mock-up into the atomic fire engine, so what? So they sliced you to ribbons and split your fingernails and braided your teeth. So what? Who cares? You could do it. You could have it happen to you because, basically, you could - you were experiencing it, and that's easy. There's just nothing to cxperiencing something. You can experience anything.

You have to be pretty tricky to figure it out so that you can experience an acre of pain and pretend you aren't mocking it up. Boy, you have to be pretty sly to do something like that. Of course, as I said before here, it doesn't do any good with a fellow with a broken leg to tell him he caused it himself He doesn't appreciate it at all. But the funny part of it is, is you can experience a broken leg. And it - so it hurts, so what? It's happening to you, so that's all right.

It's all right if it's just happening to you. What you don't want to have happen, is happen to the other fellow. Now, that's the tough beef, and that's why being a victim doesn't work in processing. Because a pc can just wallow through any number of gorgeously tuned-up facsimiles on aches, pains, agonies and everything else. He can just go through anything. He'll lie there on the couch in Dispeties and he'll run this and he'll run that and he'll run the'll run that and he'll run that and he'll run that

cut my head off and they did that to me and they did this to me and braided my teeth..." And he runs this and, of course, he gets better because you're knocking out some of the basic facsimiles, and so on. It's the easy one. That's the easy one.

Should be obvious to you that it's the easy one because it's the first process that came up for us, wasn't it? Process - the first process that was workable and broadly runnable was being a victim. You know, "What's been done to you?" All of Book One addresses itself to that, so that obviously must be... Anybody can experience that, because anybody could run that, you see? But confronting doing it, confronting it happening to somebody else, confronting somebody else in agony that you caused, was just a little too much. Hence, we talk about responsibility or cause, people tend to leave us in droves. They won't this time. We've already got the ranks thinned out.

But, you see - you see, we ask these people to experience this, and they can experience it all right. I just - so - I - that's why I went up and down the track, and so forth. And I found out this is a gag, you know? This is just a big gag. This is the easiest thing there is to do. And finally, why, the auditor brought me back up to PT after I'd dug up a bunch of facsimiles I'd forgotten I had on the whole track of a lost identity and all that sort of thing, you know - in PT. Ha-ha! So what? Of course, I thought I had it made one way or the other because I don't have many facsimiles or - if any, for this last life. And I just thought I must be hiding some that I didn't want to experience. No, that wasn't the case at all. The only ones I still had hanging around were the ones I didn't want to see happening to people. Got the idea?

Now, you being here and watching it happen there, is tough. But you being here and watching it happening there and know that you did it and you're causing it - the only answer to that is lessen the overt: "He wasn't - he didn't amount to anything anyhow." Or "Well, I'm not responsible for what I do. You know, I just do this every once in a while. You know, a fellow is standing there and I just pick out a blast gun and shoot him in the stomach, you know? I mean... Just something I do."

You'll have fellows confessing overts to you with great glibidity. You know, they'll say, "Oh, I did this and I did that and I did this and I withheld that and so forth and I did this, that and the other thing and so forth and there's all my overts and - cheers!" Cheers. Boy, the hardest work is ahead of him. He's got to find one part of this that he can take responsibility for - one tiny part that he can really be responsible for. And then they start to go out.

Some people, apparently, aren't being audited at all; they're just bragging.

But anybody can be a victim. That's the lazy thing to be. That's the lazy one to be.

To be causative and to be able to confront the overts one has performed happening to somebody else which one isn't experiencing - these are the rough ones.

Now, when one has been a suicide, he looks back on that lifetime of having been a suicide as though it's an entirely separate thing, and he's apparently now exterior to that lifetime but it's very difficult to look back and realize that he has killed himself. So he tries to interiorize into that lifetime, don't you see, because it's easy to be a victim and it's hard to be up in present time looking back at that overt. So this is the mechanism of track tie-up and how one slips back into identities he has harmed or wronged. That's how one goes backtrack and gets stuck. And the way out of it is just taking responsibility for - as the senior process - or being able to confront - as the junior process - overts happening over there, done by you. Of course, you start coming out of this whole track stuff like mad. Easy to be stuck on the track. It's a rough deal to be in present time and know everything and everywhere you've been. Because you have to sort of confront back, you know? You have to be willing to be responsible for being that much of a knucklehead. And between you and me, brother, you've been a knucklehead.

I know you must have had, because I look back at some of the knuckleheadedness that I've pulled off somewhere along the line and I say, "Boy, whew!" I don't mean to out-create anybody, but...

Not long ago I was looking over a political situation of - right here on Earth - and had to dispassionately sit there and examine all of my decisions with regard to this immediate decision, and exactly where they had wound up and how could anybody be that stupid, you know? How could anybody be so stupid as to make this various series of decisions which wound up in that mess. Nobody... You know? Politics? - this couldn't be politics; it looked more like the type of diplomacy they were using before World War I. And yet, I will say I did have nerve enough to take a look at the decisions that were involved in this little, tiny, two-bit political situation, you know - it all wound up wrong. See? Without saying, "Well, I was sick at the time." Without saying, "Well, you see it's like this; not much was known about politics in those days," or "The reason why I made these decisions was that my intelligence at that time was very poor and it was basically based on a series of letters from my brother who, of course, I'd found out later, was an idiot."

To be able to dispassionately look at what you've done, without writing out eighteen Encyclopaedia Britannicas of excuses as to how it all happened, requires a singular amount of cooled, cold calculation on your part. It's almost too dispassionate for words. You get all involved, you know. You get all involved with irresponsible, irresponsible, irresponsible. "Well, the reason they went across the river at that point and ran into the musketry fire was: It was foggy that night and we hadn't actually had a very good provost marshal in camp, you see? And he didn't pick up some of the spies that were around, so they got intelligence. And we didn't know anything about the fact they had intelligence of the fact that we were going to cross the river at that point..." All of this gobbledygook, all of this nonsense, all this stupid justify, justify, justify, they're to blame, I'm the victim, I'm the victim, I'm the victim. You get the idea? They're to blame - I'm the victim. See? Synonymous statement: They're to blame - I'm the victim. "I didn't know about it. I was perfectly innocent. There I was sitting in my tent and the musketry fired off and killed off all the men. And if I'd known about it beforehand, of course, I..." Who asked them to camp there?

You just never - you just mustn't shut this off in a pc because it gets less and less and he finally grapples with the situation and he says, "Well, it just occurred to me that when I gave the order it sort of seemed to me like that was a very poor place to pitch a camp. And let me see. Oh, oh yes, oh, oh, oh, yes, yes. I remember the day before that I was very angry with the army. Yes. And I sort of wished I didn't have anything more to do with them. Now, what do you suppose that had to do with my selecting that camping place?"

It's only then that the pc starts to catch up with himself It's only then he starts to catch up with himself. And he says, "I done it." But he knows he did it and he was willing to take any consequences of having done it and he could admit causing it, which is the definition of responsibility A person could actually admit causing it. Not causing something fanciful, but actually admit causing what happened. And there's where incidents, and so forth, just break up. There's where lives break up, and so forth. There's where you crack cases.

Now, the individual who just says, "Well, there's my case, and I know I'm responsible for everything. Got it all made." Reels off a lot of things in the incident - says, "I was actually the battery commander at the Battle of the Bulge" or something - you run into somebody up the track somewhere. "I was the person who didn't lay down the barrage and caused all the troops to die and that's it. Well, that incident's clear. Ph-h-o-o-o! Good. Now, let's get on to something more important."

It's about time for you, the auditor, to find out just what he could be responsible for in that battery. You're liable to find the whole confounded incident is fictitious. He's being so irresponsible he isn't even giving you the incident that occurred. And you start delving into this thing and you'll find out it wasn't the Battle of the Bulge at all! He's talking about the first

Battle of the Marne. It was even another lifetime. That's how wrong he is. And boy, when you run into the right one, he won't have anything to do with it. Doesn't matter how glib he was before, he just won't have anything to do with the right one.

Now, a fellow comes oft and he does something like that. He says, "I know nothing... Actually, I know nothing about - about having any acquaintance whatsoever with the manufacturing business. I've never - never had much to do with manufacturing, and so forth. Urn - I know something, however, about United States Steel and their basic Operation, and so forth. Their first president was quite of a guy."

You say, "Well, what was the president of General Electric? What was the first president of General Electric?"

"Well, I don't know that. I don't know that."

"What - what's General Electric all about?"

"Oh, I don't know anything about General Electric. General Electric - that's a company isn't it? Yeah, yeah, it's a company. All right. Well, United States Steel, I do seem to know something about. I've read quite a bit about it in this life and their first president was quite a man. He did this and he did that, and so forth, and so on," and the needle starts banging on the E-Meter and this preclear is very glib about this whole thing, you know? He tells you all about United States Steel and the first president of United States Steel and - and there it is. You see? And the needle goes back and forth.

And you say, "How do you know all this?"

"Oh, a person sh- I just read it, studied it, very interested in the thing."

You say, "Well, what about the National Biscuit Company?"

"Well, what about the National Biscuit Coinpany?"

"Well, do you know anything about the National Biscuit Company?"

"No, I don't know anything about it. Why should I know anything about the National Biscuit Company?"

"Well, how about Carnegie? You know anything about Carnegie?"

"Carnegie? Carnegie? Who's he?"You say, "He's in the steel business. That's who he is. He was one of the early steel magnates."

"Oh, he was? Yeah, well, I was talking to you about the United States Steel, you know, and the president of United States Steel was quite a guy and so on," he reels you off "and of course their production figures for the year of so-and-so and so-and-so were such-and-such and so-and-so and so-and-so," and he on and on and on and on and on, you know?

You say, "Well, were you the first president of United States Steel?" you know, and the needle falls off the pin, the pc says, "Oh, no. No, no, no. Don't know anything about that."

"Well, how do you know so much about this man?"

"Well, psew-read, you know?"

What you've discovered is a very peculiar piece of variable, isolated knowledge that has nothing to do with the price of fish at all. It's the tag hanging out. It's the brass ring for the auditor to eatch. Got the idea? Micelaeed information

Now, that can go two ways. The person knows nothing about any corporation every place and will have no conversation or connection with anything resembling United States Steel. That's just a total shutdown, you see? This person is a perfectly well-educated person. He knows everything that has happened. He's - he studied history in high school and college, and he knows everything about history except he doesn't seem to know a ruddy thing about the Renaissance. "What Renaissance? Oh, he means the Reformation." "No, the Renaissance." "Well, what about the Renaissance? Well, what - the Renaissance. What's the Renaissance?" "Well, the Renaissance was a period in Italian history in medieval-modern area... It's - it's a period!" Yeah, but where? Who? What? The pc is just stupid, see? Just doesn't know anything about the Renaissance. Now look, anybody knows about the Renaissance. But this pc doesn't.

That is looking for and finding the unexplainable as a case analysis. The pc will have something wrong with his knowingness on the subject - meaning, something wrong with his responsibility for the subject. And you look for something odd about his knowingness. Either too much, too little, not at all or so forth, but it's just this: something odd about his knowingness on this particular subject. There's just something goofy about his (quote) "knowingness."

This boy at the age of five could play a violin. Boy, could he play a violin, you know? At the age of twelve, suddenly went stale, could no longer play a violin. Who was he? Obviously, it's the life he's failing at. There's something wrong there someplace. There's a piece of knowingness - you know something about this case that doesn't tally. Therefore, you have to know cases; you have to keep your ears open about cases; you have to look cases over; you have to inspect them very carefully; and no system that I lay down for you is ever going to totally crack a case - you understand? without you adding your sensibility.

Now, fortunately, your blank spots aren't your PC's. Now, if everything he tells you is the total information or addition or contribution you're going to make to the session - it's just everything he says; he says to run this and he says to run that, and he says to... Oh, skip it! Why waste your time? Why waste your time? What's wrong with him has been borne out time after time. Oh yes, he'll tell you some of the things wrong with him - enough so that he gets a little bit better but he really never hits ...

You know I was up till five o'clock this morning auditing? Disobeying the Auditor's Code like mad. Cracked a case right down the middle. Got so darn interested I just kept on auditing it. Didn't actually audit very many hours. It was just one of these things, you know? Just this wonderful glibidity set in on this case, and you just never heard so much glibidity in your life. That was the end of that case. Boom! Only that person knows that's the end of that case. By the way, it's never the end of the case unless the PC knows it is.

But look at this. Here was a piece of knowingness that was hanging out. See, here was somehere was some knowingness that was misplaced. Either the person knew nothing about this particular subject or the person knew everything about this particular subject, but just couldn't take any responsibility for the subject. Do you see that?

The only way you can say it, is when you want to solve a case, you look - something wrong with the knowingness of the case and explore it with an E-Meter. Something wrong with the knowingness of the case. The person knows too much about something or knows too little, and then follow it out through this and explore it and watch that tone arm.

You suddenly start exploring airplane pilots. Airplane pilots - every time you hit airplane pilots it goes on up. And you hit something else and it just cools off. And you hit airplane pilots, you got your tone arm starts registering high, and you can two-way comm on other subjects and cool it off. You're looking at something that has to do with airplane pilots, aren't you?

Now, you'll find there's - if there's also something wrong with the pc's knowingness on the subject of airplane pilots, you've got it made. Either - "Airplane pilots? What an airplane pilot is? Ob. I don't know anything about airplane pilots."

"What are the ranks in the RAF?" See?

"The ranks in the RAF. Well - oh, lieutenant commander, umm - captain, major..." Yeah, what corn. Not one of these is a rank in the RAF. You got the idea?

So you have to be on your toes in order to find a pc out.

Now there are two gags that I can tell you that'll assist you enormously. I've also - already told you about the repeating identity. You know, the Red Comet, the Silver Streak mechanism. That's the craziest thing to run into you ever saw. You're going in contest with yourself you know?

And you'll find out, what the pc sets up as a goal of really wanting to do is something he has already done and if you examine a PC's goals of this lifetime from the time he was a little boy - everything he wanted to do right on up to the present, more or less - somewhere along this line you're going to find the key lifetime he's stuck in and can't confront. Because he's still trying to be what he was, but he doesn't dare be what he was. Now, that's an Assessment by Goals. Find out everything he wanted to be in his whole lifetime and then just sort it out with an E-Meter. And you're going to find him somewhere.

Now, another clue is this - another clue, and a very interesting one, is that the last two or three lifetimes are pure dynamite. And if you can resolve a case, totally, and bring it up the road toward OT by staying with the present lifetime, you're avoiding something as an auditor.

The lifetime immediately before this lifetime is usually far more important than the current lifetime in the resolution of the case. And if there's something wrong with it, the fellow will feel batty all the time. Something went wrong. It's that last lifetime because that's the one which is withheld on all dynamics. Think of that. That's even withheld on the first dynamic. It's a withhold right straight across the dynamics. You have to increase the pc's knowinguess to find out something about this.

And you'll usually find, if the pc's case doesn't run just drrrrrrr very easily, that there's something wrong in the last two or three lifetimes - something really wrong; something really goofy. And don't worry about what wild tales you finally sort out. You'll sort out the right tale eventually. But you'll find some interesting wild tales. For instance, the person wasn't born into his present family at all, but picked up the body in a tonsillectomy at the age of seven. And the rest of it is just pure justification. It's an overt act against his own identity. Goofball things like this happen. This is a - this is not a logical universe. It's merely a created one.

Now, that's a good clue, and that's a good place to go around. You know, just really pin down where the fellow is. "When were you born? When were you born?"

The fellow says, very glibly, "Born? Born? Let's see, born? Uh - let's see now - born in 1925 - 1925."

You say, "Where were you in 1924?"

"Huh?"

"Where were you in 19--?" This is somebody, you see, that doesn't know anything about Scientology, past lives or anything of the sort. The dickens with this patty-cake with his withholds!

I took a fellow the other day that - he was an instrument maker. He came in, and I wanted to show him how an E-Meter worked so he could do some work on an E-Meter for us. So I just sat him up and ran a - picked an incident off the track, found out it was about three billion years

about it. Had him run Responsibility on it. Ran Responsibility on it, a few commands. All of a sudden a picture he'd had his whole life of looking out of a window changed, flipped, he got a terrific sensation of getting up from the thing, rushing over, jumping into a car, and shooting up over the top of a hill. And he got tremendous sensation of motion and, of course, just as he got over the top of the hill, that was when the atom bombs hit the city. And he was the guard, and he evidently hadn't sounded off quick enough.

I just went into a formal session, you know? Just - you know, "Here's the session, goals for the session, what are you looking at?" You know? No patty-cake "This is Scientology, yap, yap, yap," you know? You know? Followed right down the groove, "Now, what are you looking at? All right, that's fine. Now, what part of that scene could you be responsible for? That's what I'm going to run. Going to run it." Ran it as a formal command, and so forth. "Now, let's spot it in time," was what I first did. And - "Spot it in time. How many years?"

"Hundred thousand years? Oh, wait. Ha-ha-ha." You know, you'd think he'd have that reaction. No, no. Oh, no, no. He said, "I don't have any reality on that. I wouldn't know how long ago it was." And I just spotted it on down - no help from the Pc, just totally on the E-Meter. Next time I saw him his eyes were about three times as big. He'd always been walking around kind of this way, you know? Gave him a twenty-minute session to demonstrate to his partner the use of an E-Meter and produced a new man.

That, by the way, is the mechanism to use on a still picture. And that is the Black Case. The Black Case is a dead duck right now. Just turned out a longer bulletin on it. I just mention it in passing. All you have to do is find out what the Pc is looking at and have him run Responsibility on it, and he turns from a Black Case. He turns on pictures. I can just turn on pictures just like that on people now. That was one of the things that stopped us in 1950. It's very easy.

Just remember Responsibility for the scene he's looking at and you get pictures. Because if he says, "No scene."

"Well, could you take responsibility for 'no scene'?"

"Oh, I sure can take responsibility for 'no scene' there."

"Good. That's your first answer to the auditing command. Here's the next auditing command..." Here we go, see? Next thing you know the black just goes vague and goes pink, goes white, a little - something else happens zzowoua - and all of a sudden he's looking at a fountain.

"Well," he says, "I'm looking at a fountain," you know? And run a few more of the same command and you get something else, and so forth, and you'll find him way back, to hell and gone down the track someplace, you know, and he's been stuck in something or other. You're not - don't really run into something bad, just keep running Responsibility, he runs to PT and just kind of skip it. You've got a case that forevermore will have pictures. I mean, that's so easy that we missed it, all of us. What was the matter with you, you didn't give me a hand with that one? Ten years. Anyhow...

Now, the next gag on assessment of cases - and I call it a gag because - it's a colloquialism - that you should look for is transvestitism as the commonest cause of aberration when a case is really rough to run. And when all you have to do is find a case is very rough to run, you had better, at once, explore for transvestitism.

Female voice: What is that?

Transvestitism. You see, I use Chaucerian English - which is what we speak, I guess - and you just don't get it. And I use a proper technical term and you don't know what that is. It's

transvestitism. Men and women swap their clothes, and you get men running around dressed as women and women running around dressed as men. Got that?

Now, here's what happens. A thetan decides that she's a good woman and makes a lousy man, and 50 percent of the bodies that thetan picks up, on the average, the rough average, are going to be male bodies. And yet this thetan knows she is a good woman. Now, she has the task, somewhere very early in life or even before birth, or something of the sort, of flipping this body, or trying to flip it, or fitting (if she can't) a male body into a female role. Got the idea? And earlier on the track, when there were less medical examinations, it was the easiest thing to do you ever heard of. People would go all through their whole life being a woman, while actually being a man - actually a male body dressed and used as a woman.

Everybody looks at me very stunned and says, "Where's this been?" Yeah, who you kidding? All right, this fellow decides that being a man fits his basic purposes and his basic personality, and so forth, and yet 50 percent of the time he picks up female bodies. What's he going to do with them? Just collapse at that point, and everything he likes to do and so forth, and be a female for a lifetime?

It's one of the characteristics of the cases that are tougher for you to puzzle out, that you ask them now - this case is a girl, you know - and you say, "All right, have you ever been a man?" One of the characteristics is to say, "Oh, never. Always been a woman. Never have been a man. Always have been a woman. There isn't a single male body on the track." Oh, oh, that's it, auditor. Let's work it out from there, because 50 percent of those bodies were the other sex. Thetan pays his - no money and takes his chances. They don't even put blue and pink on the cribs anymore to figure it out for you. It's all white in the hospital. When you lay your cotton-picking beams on that body, it's tsk!

Let's say you're doing just fine. You're doing just fine as a man. And you've had it made, and you've gotten it down. You've got it pretty well figured out. You've got the weapons of the period more or less taped, the trades of the period, and you've found you're pretty good at business administrative actions, and you got it pretty well taped. And you settle down to a nice long haul, and then somehow or other you fall off the bridge or run into a rapier, or something of the sort happens, or the wife slips you a little more ground glass than she usually gave you, and you slip on a banana peel or get caught in the rain, and that's the end of that mock-up, see?

Well, you're all set to be a man, you see? And you pick up a female body. Phfeph! You say, "What am I going to do? Learn to cook!" Well, just think - any of you men, right there this moment - just think being suddenly and immediately confronted with the idea of having to do all feminine tasks. You know, knitting and churning butter... Being faced with female sports - yak-yak-yak. Now, you'd darn well try to do something about it, wouldn't you? You'd shift gears on a body somehow or another, and you'd try to bend this one around to your own penchants, your own training pattern, because you're in charge after all, the body isn't.

And you girls, now, just think of it, think of it. All of a sudden you're getting along fine. You know how to cook. You know how to sew. You know how to take care of things. You know how to take care of babies, families. You know how to please men. You've got it all taped, you know? You've got your home economics and other things. You've got women's suffrage. Everything is all squared, see? Everything is all taped and all of a sudden you've got a male body. What are you supposed to do? Learn how to play baseball and shoot with shotguns and get drafted and ... Huh? What about it? It'd be a shock, wouldn't it?

## Audience: Yes.

Well, I'll tell you that in former societies they didn't have medical examinations.

My golly, there was one girl served with Napoleon's Grand Army nearly every campaign straight through. And they consider it startling that she, eventually, was pensioned off - discovered her. How many

were going right straight along in those boots? Pirates: There was Anne Bonny, Mary Read. There have been people in - there have been women, for God's sakes, in the French Foreign Legion. And just as I left Sussex down there, a police contact I have came in and told me rather juicily that they had just arrested a man who had been serving as somebody's wife for eighteen years. And he thought this was peculiar! Because something isn't generally known is no reason it isn't common. It's common. Common as dirt. Particularly earlier societies.

Guy gets all loused up on the second dynamic. He doesn't quite know whether he's coming or going. But after all, it's just one lifetime. He says, "I can put up with it," see? You know, she says, "Well, I can somehow or other get along. But I'm damned if I'm going to learn how to fire shotguns. And I know nothing about close-order drill and I am not going to learn." You get her position now? I mean, a thetan is paying out.

Now, you take somebody with a fairly high level of dedication, who has a fairly dedicated outlying purpose - one character or another, and is doing a certain exact job, going along the billennia, and he walks into this thing, he says, "Well, here we go again, see. Here we go again. How we going to bend this one around?" You do. You do. You'll find your companion-at-arms think you're one of the better looking officers. Once in a while you skid completely and get married to somebody. Boy, how do you figure that one out, you know? Well, you've always got a maid in waiting.

Various peculiar things can occur along this line and, of course, they are the most hidden ones, and they all consist of overts and a person is taking no responsibility for them at all. So, these peculiarities, of course, are the make and break points of cases. I know about three cases right now, in the vicinity of Washington, that aren't running because of just this one fact. They are dedicated to being the opposite sex. But this particular society has totally loaded it on their heads that they've got to be the different one. See, it's against the law now! Evidently the law, whatever that is, has gotten very, very tired of transvestitism. You know, "Women are supposed to be women, you understand? And men are supposed to be men. You understand? And there ain't no thetans."

So you look over a case from these angles - and what I've just given you will probaNy bust up the majority of the rough cases you run into: the famous personality, the transvestite sort of an action. Because, of course, a man being a woman totally hides the maleness, you see? It's a total withhold for whole lifetimes. And vice versa, it's a total withhold of being a woman. You see, a woman is a total withhold and all sorts of peculiar things. Then they come out into the right sex and they carry over some of the withhold, and they get themselves all scrambled up, you see, one way or the other. And you can take cases apart just left and right if you know some of these things. And I want to see you take some of them apart.

Well, basically, I've given you quite a little data at this congress. I hope you haven't considered too much of it condemnatory, because it's offered in a very helpful spirit, let me assure you. If you think I have tried to make you guilty of all of your overts, you're absolutely right. But I haven't done that in any effort to discipline you into being good. I want you to be honest.

I'm very happy with the way things are going. I myself am - I can hardly keep my hands off pes, as I've certainly got no business auditing till five o'clock in the morning, when I've got another congress day coming up the next day. I started to ask myself what do I think I am? A human or a doll or something to keep going like this?

Well, I hope some of this information and material has proven interesting. Has it?

Audience: Yes!

And I hope very much that you can get everything taped out the way you want it' and get life headed in the direction you want it to go, get it under control and firing off just the way you want it. And I know you can.

I'm very happy you came to this congress. For me, this has been one of the most satisfactory congresses we have ever had. That's just from my viewpoint. I hope to some degree it is from yours.