

SURVIVAL

A lecture given on
7 January 1952

The beginning of this lecture is missing from all recordings we have been able to locate, and we have been unable to find any transcript to supply the missing text. The existing recordings start here.

Existence Beyond the First Dynamic

An auditor with his service facsimile in place is obviously incapable of using these higher-echelon techniques. It is a very funny statement to make, isn't it?

Any service facsimile contains in it, to some slight degree, a disposition or predisposition to failure. You wonder why a technique doesn't resolve in some auditor's hands — there it is. He can't succeed; he doesn't dare let himself succeed. That is what his service facsimile is.

It takes only three or four hours to knock out a service facsimile completely with these techniques. The way I am going to work this is I am going to take an auditor here and an auditor there and I myself am going to knock out their service facsimiles or have some auditor that I have just gotten through training do so, and then I will teach them this technique.

It requires an understanding of Dianetics that is very, very broad to get these kind of results. With what a lot of you know, you could still go out and produce very marked results. How fast you will produce them is something else. It may take you fifty hours, seventy-five hours, something like that.

I am actually talking, when I talk about this technique, of the buttoned up package of Effort Processing and all the rest of it applied more or less simultaneously. It works more or less like atom bombs work: they explode. The preclear explodes. You generally audit four hours and get three hours of grief, and that is the end of the case.

I better start putting these auditing sessions on tape for instruction, as I am not going to teach everybody all over again.

So, you have two levels of processing. But the handbook just as it is, plus Effort Processing, will give you very marked results. Evidently this one should now go out on this emanation sphere: it should just go out on that sort of one by one, and we pick it up one by one. And it is going to go by geometric progression, because everybody who has it picked up can teach a couple — pick up theirs and instruct them in the technique. In this way we can secure our auditing corps.

Part of this technique, by the way, after the auditor's service facsimile is out and after they have been instructed, has to do with a war club with a nail through the head of it. And the instructing auditor or myself uses that on the auditor who departs from Dianetic procedures! That is part of the modus operandi.

Another small announcement along this line is I intend to do a few "can'ts to can." I'm not asking for you to locate such cases, but if you just happen to know of somebody that's been in a wheelchair for a while or something like that, and I have a couple of hours of spare time, we will set him on his feet again.

There are so confounded many techniques these days, they really all sum up to just one technique — various parts of one. It is complex to the degree that what you have is a list of Axioms, not a textbook of Axioms.

I had to toss a coin on whether or not I was going to give you a textbook on this or just go out and audit a few preclears. In the next twenty days, theoretically, I should write three more books and produce fifteen or twenty miracles.

I had a nuclear-physicist friend of mine working on a time stretcher. We were trying to get twenty-six hours into the day, and we managed to do it all right but the apparatus is too complicated. What you do is take a stratocruiser and fit it up with reaction motors and you roll it at slightly less than a thousand miles an hour around the world toward the sun. And you will get twenty-six hours a day this way. But it is not practical. I kept telling him this wasn't practical. The other method, of course, is to hitch up the stock pile — wherever the United States has hidden it — of all of this nuclear-fission stuff, point it all in the same direction in a big pipe and then explode all of it. And it would probably slow the world down to a point where you would have twenty-six hours in a day and we could get something done!

But I am afraid in Dianetics we are back up on the level of "it's all got to be done yesterday" again.

Now, I thought it might be an awfully good idea to talk to you about what survival is. As long as we have known about this word survival, I have never given a lecture on it. I have never written anything more about it than is contained in the handbooks or Science of Survival, and perhaps it might be interesting to you to know how and why this word is what it is.

The history of the word is interesting. They used to talk about all knowledge being known in one sentence. Well, back about fourteen years ago or something like that, one sentence was too long. I got things peeled down to

one sentence; then I found out it could be put down in one word. This one word happens to be survive.

This follows a very remarkable tradition. Mathematically, it is very sound to be able to reduce all problems to a single common denominator; that is very sound mathematics. It is also very sound mysticism. The Gospel of St. John begins with "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God." Now, that's interesting that there has been all of this data about a word. There are Persian legends which go back, if I remember rightly, even earlier than the Bible, on one word.

A codification of knowledge contained in a couple of syllables is an interesting attempt. And there is something funny about that word survive. Every time a technique has departed from it or has gone outside its perimeter of definition, the technique has failed and is unworkable. But it becomes workable the moment that it is brought into the area and definition of survive.

Now, the entire package that is Dianetics today, a science of static's and motion, has come all the way round in a circle again and is finally embraced entirely, at last, by that word survive. So perhaps it might help you to know something about it.

I have asked several gentlemen of various faiths, what was the Word in the Bible? Well, oddly enough, several gentlemen of the Jewish faith who know that faith very well tell me that the Word has never been written down but is generally supposed by the church to be known as motion or life as an animate thing. That is supposed to be the Word. That is strange, isn't it?

How long a bridge did you have to build to make the word motion mean anything in a complete scientific sense?

In several Christian churches, you ask what is that word and you draw a blank. They say, "Well, that was the Word. The Word was God."

"And what is God?"

And they say, “Well, that’s Creator or Creation.”

You could also say that this means point of origin or point of creation. And we study origin — origin of what? There is origin of only one thing, according to what we know today in nuclear physics: there is origin of motion. So we get back to the same thing.

You go back in India’s sunny clime and start asking the old boys what this is all about and they say, “Well, it has something to do with motion.” Good heavens! How long has man known this? I see it going clear back pre-Vedic hymns — that far back — and coming forward along this track.

In science, when they had studied physics — they had studied natural philosophy (the ancient Greeks had, the Romans had, and they applied it; they were good engineers) — up through the Middle Ages, on into all of the periods of philosophy that we have gone through here in the last few hundred years, you find in each and every case that they were reducing the universe to motion. Sometimes they do it with mathematics and sometimes they do it with an explanation and sometimes they do it with a parable. But each

time they reduce it to motion. And today your nuclear physicist with his cyclotrons, his particles, his speed of light, his vanishment of time and all this sort of thing — motion.

What is in matter? Incredibly enough, it is motion. That is all. It has to do with a particle of energy — which is motion itself but has weight and mass because of a vibrational point — that is surrounded by several electrons, protons and neutrons, which forms an atom. And these atoms form into molecules — or just form in the structure as atoms — and make compounds. A piece of metal is simply motion. It is fields of motion making up small bits of matter — very interesting. Motion is something that takes place in time and space, and time and space are evidently reducible themselves to motion. Fascinating business.

Now, you look over life. What is life? Life has a quality of animating matter. You can see plainly that life animates matter. A man is alive, he can move and he can move things, and then you shoot him and he is dead and he can’t. That is a very simple proof: that life and living organisms have the power to move matter, and when they no longer have life in them they no longer have the power. That is what is known as one of these open-and-shut cases — very simple proof.

The life static and the origin of life must be, then, something which merely has the power of handling motion. We go back up the track and we look at the various old philosophies and so on, and we find “Creator” or “origin point” or “motion” — it’s motion handling.

Now, although it took an awful long time to button up this package, it is nevertheless very true and apt that man, strangely enough, has been on this trail — solidly on the trail which is Dianetics — for thirty-five hundred years of known time. He has been writing about it, he has been talking about it and trying to get the pieces to move into place so that he would have a bridge — that is to say, so that he could use exactly-and-correctly all of the pieces that made up the problem. And if you could use all of these pieces, then you could produce very marked and interesting effects with regard to life and also with regard to the physical universe.

We are not yet to a point where we can say “That store across the street will disappear” — even if it’s owned by a psychiatrist, it won’t disappear if we say that. But we can at this point say to an aberration, a psychosomatic “illness,” “Disappear!” and it will. That is pure magic.

If you took the techniques which you have in Dianetics and went back down the time track about two thousand years and sat in on a powwow with some savage tribe someplace in the world — three thousand years, fifty thousand years — they would have you enshrined. They would say “Gosh!” because all they have been trying to do with this knowledge was get better themselves, think better, live better and generally survive in this material universe. That is what they have been doing. And it takes this knowledge to do a very good job of it.

So a lot of data has been amassed and aligned. It is not necessarily true that this data is new, but it certainly is true that this data is evaluated. Better values can still be put on some of this data.

If you want to know what evaluation of data does: Several months ago all the data which we have today was in existence — every bit of it. But it took a reevaluation of that data and a careful sorting of it and an assignment of value to each datum in the whole science to suddenly whip together the techniques which were presented at the conference, to deliver something like the handbook and to develop these second-echelon techniques which will be taught to auditors individually.

The alignment, the evaluation, is far more important, because one drop of water in the sea is like every other drop of water in the sea unless it has an evaluation tag on it. And facts and data about the mind and about human beings all down through the centuries were about in the same state: each datum was about in the same shape as a drop of water in the sea. There was this drop of water, but there were also eight hundred billion more drops of water. One of them was right. Now, how did you pick out the right drop of water?

The whole problem was very simple. Historically, all you had to do was just invent the entire science without any relationship to any of the data anywhere known before — just invent it out of whole cloth — and wonder whether or not this compared with the real universe, apply it to the real universe, extrapolate some new values and fit those together, and that was it. It was very simple!

But it never would have been done (and I can assure you of this very solemnly) by picking up and examining phenomena first and then going over and finding out what the phenomena meant. It was a reverse procedure: You found what the phenomena meant and that it probably existed, and then went and looked and there it was.

For instance, Effort Processing, emotional curves — all of these various things — were extrapolated out of whole cloth from the Axioms. There were the Axioms, if this phenomena existed. Therefore, if this phenomena exists, why, this phenomena exists and we had better go look for it. We looked for it and cases started falling apart.

In other words, mathematics and Dianetics have a great deal in common in that Dianetics will predict the existence of actual phenomena. And believe me, we have not even begun to reach the end of the amount of phenomena which can be discovered from the original word survive and the subsequent Axioms. We have not begun to discover the phenomena discoverable.

With the word survive in the space of fourteen years I have discovered over two hundred entirely new phenomena about the human mind — over two hundred. Prior to that date there weren't very many known. There were a few. People said men thought — phenomena. They said, "It's human

to err" — not phenomena. They said, "Men go crazy and act harmfully to themselves and to others" — phenomena. "Men are sane, and sometimes they are happy and sometimes they are sad" — phenomena. That was nearly the whole package, because there is no unconscious mind, and the use of the word reactive mind in the first handbook is just an analogy, and it even says so in the handbook — an analogy.

People were talking so long about the unconscious mind, I couldn't get them to think, actually, about anything but the unconscious mind, so I said we would change its name. So we did. There is no such animal. Now, we have proven definitely that there isn't even a faint reactive mind. I mean, there is the stimulus-response mechanism of engrams and human behavior as established by engrams — all true phenomena. The only reason we are not processing engrams these days is because we have more workable techniques; we have techniques that are faster. You cut the engram off and kick it loose rather than try to knock it out.

It is a strange thing, however, that all of these techniques go immediately back to “In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was . . .” That word is motion or it is life — animate life. That is very peculiar. You put the word survive in there and it means, actually, more or less what they meant by it; but the whole problem falls apart.

How is life operating? How is life operating in this physical universe? What is it doing? The answer to that question: it is surviving.

Now, the second question is, how is it surviving and what are the outermost limits of survival? It gets to be a very interesting picture — very fascinating.

It is like a pyramid. We have Lord knows what data: gods, demons, devils, sciences unheard of — anything, everything. Below this level we have what is relatively true and is considered by man to be relatively true. He accepts these things as workable truths. With these workable truths he can go out and start automobiles and haul wood and keep warm and build houses and wear clothes and buy chocolate ice-cream sodas. Those are workable truths. Also into this field some religious practices fall. They are workable. Somebody comes in and he feels sad. He is told that he is forgiven and he feels good. He is not sad now. That as far as a practice is concerned is workable.

What part of religion is above that, I do not know. (And by the way, anybody who misquotes me and says “Well, Hubbard is an atheist” or something — they are full of malarkey. They are probably atheists themselves. They don’t believe in themselves, obviously.)

So here is this triangle, this pyramid. Right at its peak we have the entering point of knowledge. From this point down we know some things which are relatively workable, useful and true. And above this point, for our purposes, we know nothing. That doesn’t mean we can’t find some things out

up here. But this point of entrance is the word survive. That is survive.

Now, you can start asking questions of the physical universe and the behavior of life in it. Of course, you can just go on saying rather idiotically “Well, the reason he does that is it’s got a survival value. It’s got a survival value. It has a survival value.” You can just keep on saying this about everything, but it won’t make very good sense because it doesn’t fit in with the rest of the physical universe. Survival is behind and above these actions, but you have to know some more about it.

What is the action of survival? That is a sort of curve: An individual gets born and he grows for a while and he is happy and he gets married, and then he goes along and he gets old and he kicks off. Well, that is one cycle of survival for one person: conception, birth, growth, stagnation and decay. That is one cycle.

How long the individual stays on this cycle has a lot to do with how high his level of survival is — in other words, what good health he stays in and what his hopes and ambitions are.

In other words, survival is a plot against time. Above this level there is no time and below this level there is time. So survival means a continuation in time, in a good state of repair, on all eight dynamics.

Now, what are the dynamics? This is what a person is surviving for. And here is an emphasis point; here is an evaluation point. We ask around the society and we ask everybody, “Well, why are these people surviving? I mean, why is a person living? What is he living for?”

And people say, “Well, he’s living for himself, obviously. Every human being is very selfish. The first person is the most used word in the language, and everybody is selfish and he’s surviving only for himself, and that’s the way it is.”

That isn't the way it is. Very, very fortunately for man, that is not the way it is. In the first place, there is a terrific interdependency between man, life and the physical universe. I'll demonstrate this interdependency: What if you didn't have a world to sit on right now? You see, then, you are dependent on the sixth dynamic — MEST. You are dependent upon it. If you didn't have a world, the weight of that world — its gravitic pull — would not keep in your strata of air and your carbon-oxygen motors would then not operate. You have an interdependency, then, on Earth. You have also an interdependency on the stars, very definitely — if it's only to keep astronomers in money and astrologers in work.

The whole universe out there with its island universes and so on is a terrifically complex structure. Somebody told me one day that the world has eight motions, eight separate and distinct motions: the world is going around and around, it tips this way and that, and so forth. I don't know where they studied their astronomy. There are some 850 motions that Earth has, which is just a little bit over, because he had not taken into account the galaxy — the motion of the galaxy, the motion of this galaxy in relationship to its island

universe and the relationship of the island universes to the island universes and so on out, practically ad infinitum. The nearer stars up there effect a motion on Earth; they actually do. They effect a motion on the sun. It is a very, very complex business, this physical universe that we are looking at, but a man is to some degree dependent on it.

You are dependent on the sun, for instance. If the sun doesn't shine you get gloomy; if the sun didn't shine at all you would be dead, because the basic cellular forms on Earth are composed of nothing more than sunshine and minerals. It reduces that simply.

All right. So you have a dependency on the physical universe.

Well, you emanate from a point which motivates matter; you are an emanation point; you are a life — you are alive. This whole setup we call the seventh dynamic.

There are actually only seven dynamics, really, as far as dynamics are concerned, but we throw the eighth one in just so we will have infinity to coast on. We don't want to be challenged and suddenly have something else turn up and say we didn't take care of that. It is like some secretaries' "miscellaneous" file. (That is the way most filing systems are run, I understand.)

Now, you have a dependency on this static, because if it didn't exist, you wouldn't be alive. And oddly enough, you have a dependency on other animal life and on other organisms.

If you were to start out as an individual to make yourself a pair of shoes and a suit of clothes such as you have on right this moment, you would be pretty busy for quite a while. You are dependent on the physical-universe MEST — for instance, machines which are animated by the brains and skills of others, and on all sorts of production (cotton, raising sheep, all sorts of things) in order to get one pair of shoes and one suit of clothes. Of course, you really have a terrible time getting those; you have to give some of your time, nine till five. You have got a terrific economic system — very complex — that demonstrates your interdependency. But you could take out this economic system and just lay it over there someplace and you wouldn't be doing very well.

I knew a couple of Scouts one time. They went up into the wilderness. The first one went up with just a skinning knife. That was really cheating, because he had on boots with hobnails and he had on warm clothes and he had a skinning knife, and he was going to survive for two weeks. He came out at the end of about ten days and he was only partly starved. The other one went up and stayed for two days and then they picked him up wandering practically delirious along a stream bank.

This was pretty hard to do. Yet they were in an area which was full of game. They were boys who were actually trained in the manufacture of deadfalls, in the building of fires out of nothing — training which very few people in this society really have.

Rousseau and the rest of the boys used to talk about this terrific pastoral proposition where they were all going to go out and live happily ever after in sylvan glee. However, nobody took them up on it, fortunately. The French Revolution was fought, not to establish pastoral sylvan glee with everybody playing on panpipes — I don't quite know why it was fought, but it was fought, I guess, to put Danton in or something. But nobody went charging out to those fields and everybody did not become shepherds. It doesn't have any appeal for people to be on their own, actually. The reason it doesn't have any appeal is it is non survival — very non survival — to produce everything and anything which you have.

But it's worse than this. What would you do for any moisture in this atmosphere, really, if it weren't helped out by trees, grass? One acre of trees produces a terrific amount of upward rise of moisture into the atmosphere (much more than a body of open water, by the way). In order to have soil you have to have lichen and moss to work on volcanic ash — forms of life at work producing soil. The interdependency there is enormous. There are life forms — the fifth dynamic.

Now let's look at the fourth dynamic. Man as a species will stand up for man. He has, many times in the past. There is a good story about that. There was a bunch of Cossacks that were riding around saying "God bless the Bolsheviks," and they were attacking a railroad guard of American doughboys (that was 1921; there were doughboys then) who were guarding the Trans-Siberian Railway. And the Cossacks were busy shooting into the camp and the doughboys were lying there shooting back at the Cossacks.

You know, we fought a big war with Russia; everybody forgets that. It was very important to the Russians and we don't have it in our history books — one of the reasons Russia is mad at us: we have forgotten about it.

So anyway, there was a terrific interchange of shots going on, and a big pack of wolves, completely undismayed by the shooting, swept in on the group. The Cossacks promptly ran in and jumped back of the parapet where the doughboys were and they shot down all the wolves. They sat around and built a fire and had some tea and vodka. Man engages in fights, but they are sort of like fights between a husband and wife. You as a third party leave them alone. The fourth dynamic: People will stand up for a species, man — unless very aberrated — before they will stand up for another dynamic.

Now, the third dynamic: your operation of your community, your clubs, your family itself, your interpersonal relationships. Only a mad monk would go out and bury himself in a hillside cave. You go out and look at some of the boys that bury themselves away from civilization and, boy, could they use an auditor!

It is very funny — most activities which man finds to be fun or happy activities are group activities, not solo activities. You check it over — although it might not strike you that way at first till you think about it. You think of parties and clubs and activities. A fellow is never quite as elated as

when he belongs to a group which has very good esprit. He goes well up. But one person all by himself can't maintain this esprit.

I tell you out of experience — out of experience — because in 1938 I knew this package on survive was pretty well buttoned up, and I was elated enough about the whole thing and excited enough about it so that I wrote the basic book on this subject in six days. I was really wrapped up. Food — none of these things had any great significance to me. It was just the idea. But after four or five months, I had seen enough people who weren't on that plane, I wasn't up there anymore. But left all to my own devices I wouldn't have stayed up there either, because I

started coasting off rather rapidly. So I know what I am talking about on trying to maintain one's own level as very high on number one; he can't do it.

On the second dynamic we have the future — the future race — and people are very interested in the second dynamic. If you don't believe they are, there is a campaign going on right now called the March of Dimes; everybody is throwing money into it. A very short time ago people were coming around on community chest. What is the appeal? Little kids on crutches.

If I go out here and do a few miracles, what will be the miracle that appeals? Well, it will be some kid throwing away his crutches. The future generation — but that future generation has to be furnished with architecture, economic stability and a lot of other things. And the restlessness of individuals in this society against present government or modus operandi is not for themselves; it is for the future, it is for their kids, because they see one way or the other, kids are going to grow up in this society, or not. The big danger of that atom bomb is not that it is going to knock off you or me, but the fact that it is going to knock out architecture, technologies and so forth for your and my kids. And that is why any dog that would use it is a dog. I don't want to use hard words: His mother ate bones!

You will find hand in glove with a block on the second dynamic something about children. They won't like children if they are low on the second dynamic. Children, future and sex are the same operation.

Now, all of that ought to survive, and then there is number one.

All of these things are that for which a person is surviving: one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight — or one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, infinity. That is what he is surviving for. How many people have this interpreted this way: number one is interested in groups so number one can survive; and the first dynamic is interested in the second dynamic so number one can have some fun; and the interest in mankind is so that the individual himself can be secure, or so that one can let life go on so that one goes on. Rats! It isn't true! This is the most grisly thing that has happened to man down through the ages — that somebody laid this one off into him that a person survives for the first dynamic.

Now, you could extrapolate all of these things into each one of these

dynamics if you wanted to. You could demonstrate how a person survives only for mankind or he survives only for the second dynamic (Freudians psychoanalysis). Communism — only for the third dynamic. Various philosophies, idiocies, ideologies (I was talking about communism — idiocies), pick up one or more of these dynamics and say, "A person only survives for this," and then they shove it down somebody's throat. But it is true enough — that is to say, it has enough workable truth in it — so everybody sparks up and says, "Well, that's so."

In 1938 I figured out it wasn't so, and by 1946-47 it obviously wasn't so, but I didn't have a way to prove it. Well, the second-echelon technique I have been talking to you about has something to do with this. Prove it! Brother, do you want to explode? That is about the level of action in that proof.

You don't give a damn about number one! Isn't that funny? What a grim joke! The least important dynamic is the first. And that is why you are all fouled up: because you go out helping this one and helping that one and helping somebody else and you forget to help number one. Then you finally say to yourself, "Well, let's see, I helped this fellow and he's dead and therefore I'll continue his life. And he ought to have food, clothing and shelter, so therefore I'll eat. I've got to take care of this fellow's life continuum."

People say, "Oh, well, you know her. She's always dressing up and putting on fancy clothes." Who does she put them on for? You. That's funny, isn't it? If you get down to the basic on it, why do people keep themselves in pretty good state of repair?

You take an individual who has nothing he can do to help another individual, and his recognition of this and his death are so close together that it is like a double shot from a .45 automatics. The realization, if it occurred to any of you, that you were no possible use to any other human being or any other dynamic — if it had truth (demonstrable truth in your eyes) to it, you would not survive it.

Now, it is a funny darn thing. What do you live for? You live to help others.

You take some preclear and you say, “Well now, we’re going to get you well,” and you start working with this preclear. After a while the preclear becomes restive and gets extroverted or something of the sort and walks off. He hasn’t come up the tone scale to the point you know he should have come up; he stopped working on you. Try this on him (I tried it this afternoon; I got some big enthusiasm; I got enthusiasm right away): I was talking about “I ought to process you” to this lady and she said, “Oh, well . . .”

“Well,” I said, “the reason I’d like to process you is so that your husband might see you get well and it might make him feel better.”

“When can we start?” — all cheered up.

You have pointed out a method by which she could help him. She feels helpless right now.

The only trouble is, would her husband get well just because she is better? Only if I went in and told him “I’m going to do you a favor, and you can do what you want for me. But I’m going to do you a favor: I’m going to fix your wife up so she’s well — for you.” I mean, as a gift to her or something of the sort like that, he would pick it up. Otherwise he would go into a decline, because he would look at her and he would say, “Somebody else had to help her.”

You know what jealousy is? That is a horrible thing, jealousy. You pick up the newspaper and it has really got blood on the front page.

Jealousy — what is the anatomy of jealousy? This could be a big subject, only it isn’t. In any case of jealousy that you try to take apart, you will find the individual who is being jealous is trying to help the other person. He has this feeling only he can help her, or only she can help him, and the other person is saying no and letting somebody else come in to help them. It hasn’t got anything to do with the second dynamic. You don’t solve jealous cases by solving the second dynamic. You just solve it on that basis: “How many times have you tried to help your wife or your husband and been balked?” And if you really want to hit a computation on a marriage, ask them this question: “When did you try to help your marital partner and somebody else stepped in and helped them instead?” Boom!

Help: you are all trying to help everybody. As a matter of fact, the biggest service Dianetics could actually do the world is to get you fixed up so that you have helped yourself so you can help others. Matter of fact, sometimes people get mad at me in Dianetics, and the reason they get mad at me is, I will take ahold of a case they have been working on or crack it or something of the sort, and they had elected themselves to help this case and here is interference from here.

And there are a lot of people out there that have elected to help the human race, and they say, “Well, Hubbard with Dianetics is helping them — but I’m the one that’s supposed to help them!” So they turn out “GMQ therapy” and “walky-talky-ism” and they are all mad at me. I could repay the favor — if I weren’t up the tone scale a little bit — and get awful mad at them: “What’s the idea of you trying to help the human race? I’m the one that’s supposed to help the human race!”

Under past definition it goes on this basis: The husband is jealous of the wife because he believes that it is an insult to his importance and his intelligence if some other fellow comes along and looks at her. That is the general definition. Well, there is only one thing interesting about the definition: it does not lead to a solution of a case. You start in on this other definition,

that it is because one partner is trying to help the other partner — and is failing, by the way (there has to be some feeling of failure in there; “I’m trying to help her but I’m failing”) — and somebody else comes along and helps her: jealousy! And you try a jealous preclear on that one, and that case will go bang! So easy.

Now, horrible things are done by human beings if they cannot assist the survival of these other dynamics — horrible things. And when a person offends against one of these dynamics, it is only after he has decided to help the dynamic, has failed, has dropped down the tone scale, and then offends against it because it isn’t permitting him to help it. He wants to get it down to a level on the tone scale where it has to be helped. That’s a funny computation, isn’t it? But that happens to be the interplay of the dynamics of survival.

Well, we are right down here on rock-bottom fundamentals in Dianetics, and worked out this way, cases resolve. Worked out on the basis of “What did you do to yourself?” they won’t solve, but worked the other way, they will: “What have you done to help others?”

By the way, how many of you have failed when you tried to help somebody else? Everybody is so busy helping everybody, nobody has time to be helped!

Actually, your church derives its revenue as an occupant of that station. They will take some of your money and distribute it to people who they say need help. And they will distribute it, and the needy and the starving and the sick and so forth will get assistance. So you go in and donate to the church. And you will even sometimes buy the idea that you are giving that church money for your own salvation.

An individual doing a life continuum thinks of himself as the other person. He is still trying to help this other person although this other person is dead! That is how ridiculous it can be. Now he tries to go on helping this other person: he tries to help himself to that degree.

An individual will actually set himself up as an effect so that he is somebody to be helped, just to help you by being somebody to be helped. He will say, “I’m so sick.” That makes you feel good: now you can help him.

You resolve cases in this fashion and you will get there. And you try to resolve cases on “the reason why this guy is not getting well is because he wants something for himself,” and the case will not resolve. You could process it a long time.

Now, you get the overt act: A person makes what he believes to be an overt act against any one of these dynamics — except number one: overt acts against number one are kind of “so what?” But from two on up the line, any overt act whereby the individual hurts an entity on any one of these dynamics results in instant aberration, particularly if he notices he has hurt it. He looks at it and he sees he has hurt it. All of a sudden he feels sympathy. The only reason he will feel sympathy for anything is that he hurt it in the first place.

Now, any of you that are very, very sympathetic toward kittens have probably killed one someplace on the track. And any of you that feel very super sentimental about dear little babies have probably knocked one off in some life or other. And any of you that can’t stand to have a woman leave or

something of the sort have probably bumped one off. Very simple. It is ridiculously simple. There is the viewpoint.

Where a person fails to help, he will very often offend. He offends in an effort to get the other dynamic down to a point where it needs help. And when he gets it that low he will give it sympathy and help but he will realize that he hurt it, and when he realizes that he hurt it, then he has got to do something about it. He has got to thereafter defend it. And so anything else that offends against that dynamic now repeats his first act, but he has to defend this dynamic against

himself and defend the dynamic against these others. It is very, very simple. I said it rather rapidly, but it is a simple equation.

So, what is survival? Do not send to find for whom the bell tolls; you don't care if it tolls for you, but you hope it's not for the rest of the dynamics. Now, that is the truth of the matter. Cases resolve just bang! if you start looking at them from this angle. What has this person done to help somebody else? Why is he sick?

I talked to a gentleman today that is very, very sick. When did he get sick? Somebody else got sick and he wanted to help so badly that he got sick. He is in their place now; he is doing a beautiful life continuum for somebody else. Examine the chain of this individual and you will find out that it is a solid chain clear to the bottom of the same act. I suppose as a photon converter's he was busy trying to help other photon converters.

So, here is survival. Evidently this physical universe survives — and all of its life entities, compartments of life and so on survive — so long as there is this interplay and urge to assist, and as long as individuals haven't gotten to the point where they don't believe they can help anymore.

How do you establish the height on the tone scale of a society in two minutes? Walk down the street and ask an individual whether he thinks his vote is any good or not. And if the bulk of the replies are "Well, I'm only one and there are so many," that society is going out through the bottom.

In 1870, if you had walked into a country store and said "What are your votes worth, boys?" — "Well, huh! I guess there couldn't have been a president at all if I hadn't been a-votin' last time!" He was important. He could help in the society on the third dynamic. But you don't consider your vote very valuable, because I have conducted this test lately.

As a matter of fact, I got disgusted about it. I saw somebody is beating the drum for Eisenhower. Of course, he isn't running; he just gave a television-broadcast report on Europe and its armed or unarmed or disarmed condition, simultaneously with his being announced as appearing in the New Hampshire primaries. This simultaneousness was very interesting and looked coincidental, but they shouldn't have run it in double columns, side by side, in the same newspapers.

Also, just to make sure that somebody's vote is worth something, I'm against Eisenhower. I've got nothing against him, but might as well be

against him. I'm hoping somebody will elect a candidate that you can be for. But at least we will make the vote against.

Now, I am tired of people telling me there isn't anything you can do with this government. It started in the war. Everybody would come around in the navy and say, "For God's sakes, we've got to make up this mound of papers to get one pound of baloney!" They would say, "Well, it's a big navy. It's so big it's hard to run." They are giving you the same thing about votes now: "There are so many votes and your vote doesn't mean much, and how could you influence the presidential nomination?" The tone scale on the third dynamic — national — is very low. You don't believe that you can help on a national governmental level.

That is because the national government went out into an all-help everybody move from 1932 to 1945: "Let's help everybody — even if we have to kill 'em, murder 'em, shoot 'em, maim 'em, we're still going to help 'em. We're going to help the poor people and we're going to help the world and we're going to help everybody this way and that way." And boy, we went on an all-out, on that one. It didn't work out so well, mostly because it was a little bit premature.

The United States right now thinks of “those poor people over there in Russia under the tyrant heel of Joseph Stalin.” And that is why you are mad at Russia: because you think the Russian people are getting a bad deal. There are slave camps, workers have their chains and so forth.

They are meeting over there in their schoolhouses right now and they are saying, “Those poor Americans, wearing those chains under those dirty, fat, greasy capitalists who smoke these big cigars. And now we’ve got to kill off those capitalists, even if we have to destroy half of the population of America, to free the workers from their chains.” They are going to help you!

But do you know that if a channel were opened up so the United States could actively help Russia (because Russia needs lots of help in her reconstruction) and if Russia did have something with which it could help the United States and there could be a free interchange of that assistance — war? Phooey. Very interesting.

Well now, there is another point on survival. An individual survives as long as he can be of assistance on the other dynamics. He stops surviving when he stops being of assistance and recognizes it.

And an individual high on the tone scale, high in survival, with high potentialities, helps on the other dynamics honestly and as best as he possibly knows how, aboveboard — no underhand stuff at all. The higher an individual’s level of potential survival is, the higher his morals and ethics are.

Morals are just a bit below ethics. Ethics could be described as something which is an innate fairness, an innate rationalness concerning the situation, which tries to make it work out. Morals are codified rightnesses. Somebody in the past has figured out that something was harmful, therefore

there should be a law against it, there should be a moral code which would protect the bulk of the society. This is not reasonable, but it was put up and served as a moral code. And believe me, you wouldn’t get very far without a moral code here and there, for there are three or four people in this society that aren’t completely rational.

Now, morals and ethics and good physical well-being, mental balances of rightness and a high appreciation for aesthetics — all of these things go together. And a society can be measured as to its potential survival into the future by its individual health, its morals, its ethics and its consent to be beautified or its effort to beautify itself.

Survival is done in various and peculiar ways as far as the modus operandi is concerned. It would be good enough to say that just one life was lived, that a person simply started in at conception and went through and w took off after death and was not heard of again.

Mark Twain used to have a hard time trying to figure this out. He counted up the number of people — in Captain Stormfield’s Visit to Heaven — and he started giving people some kind of an idea of how many souls there were up there and what a job it would be putting these souls to work, and he had a hard time of it. Did you ever read Captain Stormfield’s Visit to Heaven?

You do get people taking off of this line, but evidently what happens is you get consecutive lives, not reincarnation — just get consecutive lives. A person gets in more trouble, in more trouble, in more trouble, in more trouble, and keeps living again and again and again, and getting in more trouble, and more aberrated, and more trouble.

Finally he gets processing and takes off!

Anyway, here is this modus operandi. We know what life is doing;- we know how it tries to do it. We look over the characteristics of animals, the habits of men. We find out, as we trace these things back, that each of them has a survival value. And we find out that the only conflict

on survival that comes into being, the only real conflict comes in on the basis of everybody is — as far as man is concerned — trying to help everybody and nobody is really very willing to be helped. Even that, however, furnishes a certain randomness. And without randomness — which is to say, crossed purposes, different directions, different goals and so forth — you wouldn't have any motion in life. And as a very ancient Greek said, "That mixture which is not shaken stagnates." Well, that society which doesn't have conflicts has no randomness and it will perish, because no randomness is no motion. If everything were perfect in this society, it would fall — it would stop right there. It is just as somebody predicted: If you got up to the speed of light, you would stop; you would be the size of the universe, but you would stop and you would never move thereafter, because time is zero at that point. It is one of these impossibles. It is a static and that is an emanation point.

Now, that is survival. When we talk about survival, we are not talking

about bare necessity. It isn't even in the dictionary with that definition, as number-one definition. Barest level of existence or something like that would be the lowest level of survival. Unfortunately, because we didn't have Dianetics before, we don't have the perfect word in the language. Surgical is as close as you can get to it. It is just a little more full-blown than survival, but it is still survival.

An individual who does not have abundance has no slack in his survival. This poor guy who goes out here and he punches a time clock and he goes to work and he draws his pay and he goes home and the groceries cost the exact amount of pay, and he goes and he punches the time clock then he comes back home, the groceries cost the exact amount of pay — that isn't good enough.

That individual really survives best who has twelve or fifteen Cadillacs and an eighty-five room house. Individuals who believe that you should live a simple life for your own happiness are just negating against the material universe because of their failures.

You get a person wound up so that he is really taking off and so on, and he insists on twelve Cadillacs. And that is a healthy frame of mind: A Cadillac to match every suit.

Now, that is good survival — that's good survival. If you get eleven Cadillacs with flat tires, you still have a twelfth! Practical!

But no kidding. If you as a farmer raised a bushel of wheat for your own consumption for every week in the year, and you set out to raise one bushel of wheat for each week in the year and you were going to consume one bushel of wheat for each week in the year, you are not going to finish that year. You will be dead! Because the grasshoppers come along and this happens and that happens; the Democrats win the election, the income-tax people come along. (The society maybe gets up to a point of where there's one tax collector per taxpayer, which is the "optimum"!) And he has to have 52 bushels of wheat to live that year, too. So right away, the farmer has to have 104 bushels of wheat, not 52.

Now, we find out, then, the farmer who raises ten thousand acres of wheat and puts them in a granary — he survives, and the fellow who does 52 bushels does not.

Survival would be a bountiful amplitude. Good survival is "lots of." Of course, this isn't quite on the order of the Boy Scout who goes out for his first week's camping and he takes with him a full locker and his father's hunting rifle, and eight hunting knives and twelve sets of flashlight batteries and so forth, and he expects to carry all these things on his back. He gets tired.

So good survival should mean that you should be able to pick up goods and survival time; you should also be able to throw them away whenever you didn't want them. You are generally holding everything you own for somebody else anyhow.

This life-continuum thing: if you really look over your wardrobe, you can spot the dead that would have worn these suits. That's right, even if the dead were goldfish or something.

So, anyhow, that is survival in bounty, and that is survival on the dynamics.