



Conclusion of “On Ramtha, Bashar, Used Dictionaries And a Revised Peter Principle” from last issue

[Ed. note: This article is from *The New Thunderbird Chronicle*
Mar.-Apr. 1992 Vol. 2 No. 10, pages 6-11. By Michael Topper.]



[Ed. note: The first part of this article is not available to this transcriber, so it is not included.]

For purposes of continuity we reprint the concluding paragraph of last issue's exciting installment, wherein we earnestly seek to determine under what conditions the T-Bird readership will see fit to use a dictionary (and under what conditions it'll just guess)...

...the topic of *this* particular creative diction, which most stamps and characterizes the presence of the *given* adept (and which you have found to be both insightful, wisdom-filled and potentially boring) is a much more fruitful subject to consider at present than the self-interested question of the disposition of souls at harvest time; for any such questions as to *whether* the given consciousness is harvestable, *whether* the body must first die or *whether* natural longevity is compatible with the harvesting “event”, are intimately and inextricably tied-up in the first place with the basic question as to *how* true spiritual instruction is ultimately *received* here.

A Word from Our Wording

Thus we note your appreciation of the contents; we put a placemark at the point you find us potentially “boring”; what we *do* take exception to, however, is the observation that the MT writings are a “strange mix” of “rare wisdom” and “collegiate educationalist jargon”. Noting what we've just described as the authentic function of imagination in creatively conveying the necessary contents of true Spiritual adeptship, it may at least be recognized at this point that the diction isn't casual, an accumulation of old college habits, but is deliberate. You must ask, then, why that's so first of all, and not immediately ask that it be changed for one's convenience.

Right off the top, our Funk and Wagnalls defines “jargon” in a couple ways, i.e. “gibberish”, “confused unintelligible speech”. The T-Bird Tongue may of course seem so to some — but manifestly not to you, Peter, for you could hardly discern “rare wisdom” in gibberish. Let's try the next definition: “The technical or specialized vocabulary or phraseology used among themselves by profession, sect, or similarly restricted group; cant; lingo.” Here seems the more intended use of the term. In this case “jargon” is the agreed upon language-expression of a specialized group, which would therefore sound much like gibberish to anyone outside the group.

If *se habla* jargon here, it can't however be *New Age* jargon (it'll be a cold day in hell before MT ever “accesses” information). Perhaps the reference is to the *scientific* terminology to which we have occasional resort in the more technical passages of our texts (there's nothing that quite lays open the psychic wound in the general readership like the clanking sound of chainlink physics-diction being dragged in the door). But the *use* of and *references* to physics terminology etc., is always kept to sufficiently-common principles and staple terms of the “genre” that by now ought to have leaked into the general vocabulary, or come to decorate the accessible

storefront of physics so that a large portion of the consumer public has had occasion to at least linger there and windowshop on the way to making real purchases down the block at *Newsweek*.

Indeed we usually couch those marginally-painful words in explanatory context; but in any case, their usage is always a subtle *provocation* to the readership to go *familiarize* itself a little more with terms that ought not to be so “alien” by now, since they are used by the accepted secular priesthood to *define your very life*.

Beyond that, however, we can't — strictly speaking — be considered to be employing those general terminologies as “jargon” since we don't *incorporate* them from the viewpoint of the specialized scientific fraternity; rather, they are *incorporated into an overarching* diction, that has been forged over the span of a decade and a half *expressly* in order to communicate the all-but-unknown knowledge of direct esoteric wisdom which alone furnishes the *resolving context* for all such disciplines, studies and practical sciences.

Therefore we *address* the theoretical physicist, the microbiologist, the psychiatrist, the electronics engineer; and to that extent may be said to occasionally incorporate the lexicon of specialization. But we don't speak *from* the cloister of their specialized reference itself where the characteristic diction *does* become delimiting, and the vessel of a cliquish self-enclosure.

Thus if anything we may be said to *open up* those “specialized” fields to the general public in the context of a larger and encompassing Resolution, rather than *close down around* those fields. There's a big difference. And while it's true therefore that we do speak specifically to those specialists in *one* respect (and indeed are subscribed to by physicists, psychiatrists, electronics experts, amateur scientists etc.) we also and at the same time speak to the grocery clerk and traffic cop, the t.v. cameraman, housewife and yardgoods salesman (check it out; they're all on our subscription list). We've always pointed out that within each article and from article to article there's a *range* of style and approach, right down to the semi-regular comic strip, which touches the closest point of accessibility for a large variety of people. Everyone notices that we expect the readership to *stretch*; yet who considers how surpassingly *different* that is, for a periodical presenting itself for free on the bookstall floor? (What “presents itself ‘for free’ on the bookstall floor” in this domain, is an uninterrupted block of *advertising*.) Just who *is* it, who presents material that often seems to run from the popular to the abstruse in a single paragraph; *expects* the readership that casually picks it up off the floor to devote the extra expenditure of cerebral tissue on its contents; and who patiently goes over *this very issue* periodically, on behalf of those who most probably haven't read previous essays addressing the matter of the unprecedented *T-Bird* flightpath? (Cf. Vol. 1, no. 5, December '89, *TNTC*, for instance, “Editorial Reply and PHC Manifesto” beginning with the by-now famous line “The ‘vernacular’, Penny, is English.”).

For consideration, go back over the passages above in which

we've summarized certain of the points in Ramtha's teaching which, we feel, coincide with features of our own; where Ramtha has been *paraphrased* rather than directly quoted, you'll find ideas that seem fairly reasonably shared but expressed in the *characteristic* diction of our own teaching work, i.e. "...the *energy* dimension of spiritual development is a *requirement* since the standard mind-body level subsists at a characteristic — 3rd stage — degree of integration profoundly insufficient to the necessary degree of sustained *awareness*...such a minimum threshold intensity of sustained awareness is *required*, to cancel those cognitive/perceptual patterns mentally structuring the allowable harmonics of the low-level integral lockin regulating subconscious energy-processes".

While we don't suspect the use of a variant diction to express ideas attributed here to Ramtha would elicit objection from that source, e.g. that we'd failed to faithfully convey *his* meaning while wrapping the concepts in our typifying style, it will certainly be noted that the terms employed in our specific diction have a constant *overecho* exciting subliminal reference to the Whole of the Southern Crown framework-*metaphysique*, on the large and small scale, as though every sentence secretly functioned holonomically owing to the internested structure, style and rhythm — the same versatile vocabulary capable of being used, therefore, in macro-extension as a "telescope" taking the measure of the Stars, or conversely as a retractable tube able to focus on the minutest reflection of those stars in the subtle dew-light dancing in microcosmic fields.

It will be noted that the selection of words is echoed and reflected through the greater body of our work, and is used in a wide variety of contexts so as to provide a unifying terminology and *thinking structure* (once one gets used to it) which serves to conceptually unify and *draw to a commonality of cognition* a diversity of subject matter; it is used very consciously to homogenize heretofore-refractory fields and areas of study which, owing to their having been "brought up" separately and through the conditioning of very diverse thinking patterns (i.e., physics and metaphysics) conventionally refuse to "go evenly" into one another, missing — as they seem to be — the common divisor.

Since such difficulty in cross-communication is always largely a problem of the respective grammars through which such subject matters address themselves, the proper forging of a flexible diction or descriptive lexicon truly conceived through the spirit of the Resolving, universal denominator was in *this* teaching considered indispensable — since, according to the aerial *T-Bird* view of Southern Crown there is no part of being which "is not of the very Gods".

Indeed, if our diction can in any way be considered "jargon" in the second dictionary sense as a lexicon current to special group use, it is so *not* because *we* adopted it from ready-made materials or absorbed it osmotically for the sake of convenience; on the contrary, it could only be lingeringly presumed so because *other*, higher-dimensional sources of (primarily) channeled variety have subsequently taken to the diction and made it more generally familiar than was originally the case when first forged at this — incarnate — end, during the '70s decade, by the incipient adeptship of Southern Crown.

On Parakeet Paracletes

If forms of expression such as "mind/body integral harmony", "perceptual grid-network", "coordinate loci", "harmonic

alignment" or "compound focal resolution" seem off-handedly familiar or at least conceptually "comfortable", it's because such terminology (or parallel forms modeled after the additional elasticity and abstract resonance belonging to that style of expression) crept into channeled vocabularies which were of decidedly *different* diction *before* the seminal work of language-reconstitution performed at this end.

Beginning with the demonstrable existence of a *mound* of expository writing accumulated over the '70s decade (which collectively would buckle the locked door of a considerable bedroom, and that constitutes the foundation-work of the Southern Crown teaching as generated between AAA and MT), all one need do is trace the speech-patterns of such publicly-significant entities as Seth over the course of Jane Roberts' channeling career to note the decisive modification of descriptive palettes taking place abruptly with the publication of *The Individual and the Nature of Mass Events*, 1981 and *Dreams and Projection of Consciousness*, in 1986 (note that 1979-83 is the span of the Process described in "What Is The Mother Current?", and in Chapter VI of "T-Bird Meets The Phoenix" in *T-Bird vs. The Flying Saucers*). Since Seth only *begins* using the exact or similar phrases, sentence constructions, expository devices etc. as noted above, with the advent of these books so manifestly different in tone and stylistic approach to the matter published previously, it is not possible that MT *appropriated* these very distinctive phraseologies from the Seth teachings — deliberately or otherwise. Because the *Southern Crown* writings were not widely circulated, and were used primarily in relation to a private group of students during that time, there is *zero*-likelihood of Jane Roberts having encountered and subliminally appropriated the typifying diction on behalf of "Seth".

As we've had occasion to note, even more *aggressively* comparable uses of the SC diction have subsequently surfaced, most particularly in channeled sources — since, within the last decades, such sources have assumed the *de facto* lead in "educating" consciousness, for better or worse (cf. the Review of *Peace at Last, The After-Life Experiences of John Lennon, TNTC*, vol. 1, no. 5). Since many such sources, with the acceptance-quotient of New Age novelty, have found easy print before the *T-Bird* advent, the typology belonging to the language of the latter may not have seemed as disconcertingly novel in its emergence as it might otherwise, the ground being psychically prepared at least to an extent by those anticipatory heralds of the *new descriptive consciousness* prior to July of '89 (although many others, including the above-mentioned *Lennon* work sounding magnificently more *T-Bird*-like, certainly came out *after*).

We speak here mainly about the authentic *channeled* sources, since it is they alone who *chronologically* seem to have begun publicly employing parallels of the language-constructs in question before the formal appearance of Southern Crown and the *T-Bird*. There are of course the innumerable and usually ephemeral "New Age" sources of the perfectly incarnate, 3rd-stage type who came out with or noticeably *adopted* the *T-Bird* diction after-the-fact, and necessarily so, since the use in these cases is purely imitative (and, unlike the better channel sources, manifestly without comprehension). Indeed, Peter, in the *latter* you'll find a "simplified" adaptation of the teaching themes and styles of SC, appropriated under the presumption that the *T-Bird* itself was an abstruse source that would remain safely

unfamiliar to the larger public so that a “popularized” simplification would go unnoticed for what it was, and prove profitable owing to the creative profusion of “sounds” or emergent themes which could be quietly tapped at leisure and turned to public coinage (it would be hard to count how many times our exact *ideas*, in either graphics or themes, sometimes even in precise linguistic expression, have “shown up” not a month after first publication in the *Bird*, on posters, in pamphlets, on t.v. or *TV Guide* ads, covers etc. — we *are* right here at the greedy little advertising groin of Hollywood, after all, where the free-flying *Bird* winds up on the virtual doorstep of the creatively-indigent executive class...isn’t that right, David).

Do we mean to imply, then, that such Sources as Seth etc., have been “looking over our shoulder” and “borrowing” as well? since in the *overall* chronology, our original *forging* of the current language-conventions is a documentable fact...

Borrowing from the Middle Column

We may say that channeled sources “borrow” from us, and necessarily so, in this one sense. The higher-dimensional source does *not* in this case do so because it’s bereft of creativity. Yet, such a source is, by the *nature* of the methodology, in a large measure limited to the encoded-mnemonic thought-patterns, rhythms and language-structure of the channeling personality. It is the *channeler’s* “cognitive grid” through which the entity necessarily expresses; *within* that ordinary limitation, the channeling entity may work *very* creatively with the vocabulary and linguistic typology at hand, as witnessed by the Seth writings. Nonetheless, in order for a diction *awakened* to the focal field in which it functions to come to direct expression, it would be necessary that the *indirect* or reflective method through the mirroring medium of the 3rd-stage “unawake” channeling-presence, be overcome in some way.

There is a *very great difference* in the organizational patterns belonging to the thought-process of the Awakened being, and the basically unawake being, and this fact is hardly understood at all. The *channeling* entity as a rule is only able to use the organizational thought-patterns belonging to the specific instrument of the *channeling vehicle* (remember, the truly Awakened being, *would not be channeling*. Period.) On the other hand, a being incarnate *in* 3rd density who constitutes an *awakened* focus of consciousness at that polarity, is *directly aligned* with the higher densities through which the channeling entities communicate. Such a being brings to bear — through the Awakened agency—all the values belonging to the higher densities *to* which he’s awakened, upon the incarnated field of focus.

This direct correspondence and Identity allows a *creative* interrelationship to take place between the consensual keys of the focal thought-process, and the higher-dimensional magnitudes of consciousness *through* which they’re tacitly patterned and projected. Those higher-dimensional magnitudes of consciousness may therefore express themselves with optimum creative facility in *directly* modeling the symbol-vocabulary through which they communicate; for in this case there’s no discrepancy between the vehicle of communication, and the whole-being values of which that vehicle is the expositor. But the *existence* of such an awakened focus at the negative or incarnate polarity, establishes the necessary “ground” for consciousness-at-large to be able to draw upon a style of

expression forged in direct identity and alignment with it.

Without the existence of such an Awakened agency, no such connection could be made. It’s not that the channeling entity ceases channeling through its chosen agency, and turns to “channel” instead through the *awakened* agency. Rather, the *very fact* of an awakened agency at the “negative” polarity or incarnate, 3rd-density level, makes of that agency’s thought-patterns and modes of expression a form of resonance-harmonic compatible with Whole-being Value, effectually existing *in direct continuity* with that Value and so available to the Awakened Whole even *while* the channeling consciousness is *technically* talking through the mouth of a “Jane Roberts”, a “Jason Leen”.

This is how “our” style and general diction appeared, through Seth and then others, a few years in chronological advance of the *T-Bird’s* public debut.

A Palatable Palette for the Palate, With A Little Alliteration

There’s another point to consider: if the direct resonance-correspondence or overall, cognitive orientation between *T-Bird* and the channeled chorus is less apparent than it might otherwise be through syntactical comparisons alone (owing to the richer/denser medium in which the *Bird* characteristically comes packed) the discrepancy should be understood as the product of the respective functions. The channeled sources, even *after* resonance-coupling to the cognitive rhythms of awakened *incarnate* agency, necessarily retain the operative structure with which they began.

This means that they continue to float down from subtle, shifting currents of the probability-streams like oceanic birds on wings of a tricky draft, alighting gently to the barnacled backs of half- slumbering physical leviathans; they perform their pecking, disjointed work in symbiosis on those glistening-oblivious humps and then — necessarily — loft abruptly up again, in anticipation of the sudden sounding of the fantailing herd as it absently plunges on a foam of distraction to the subconscious depths of its erratic attention span.

Thus those *channeling* “birds”, unlike the Mighty materially-manifested *T-Bird*, must bear the inbuilt implication of that continued symbiotic relationship; they’re necessarily dependent on, and their communicating rhythms are structured by, the fluxing caliber of concentration and sidewise-slipping focus in the scarcely consolidated attention of the 3rd stage ego-complex — i.e. the definitionally *unawake* presence of the incarnate channeler.

Though their corresponding station in the channeling stratosphere may be of a “higher density”, they’re severely compromised in their functional capacity to adequately *transmit* the multidimensional richness and inbuilt “paradox” of such levels; they’re severely restricted, by their efficient form, in exerting optimum concentrative effort at conveying the real complexity and richly-dense Simplicity of their own degree of Whole-being Consciousness (to the true, tensile limits of the linguistic medium) owing to the fact that their *modus operandi* is — effectively — one of maintaining dialogue on the back of a fitful Bottleneck.

Factors of continuity, relative efficiency of focus, lapse between Thought and the available cognitive program, overall disjunction of identity between the channeler and channeling-entity furnish a *constantly fluxing background* for the

presentation of matters at best *refractory* to 3rd density consciousness, *easily betrayed* through the facile thought-constructs substituting *simplifications* for simplicity (owing to hasty extemporizations of the available stage-props by the “production manager” maneuvering in the wings).

The matter being presented by the — better — channeling entities is *advanced* matter, of higher-density consciousness, comprising the irreducible platform upon which any resolution of the dichotomous conditions of 3rd-density consciousness must take place; but by that token, it's intrinsically *incompatible* with the compulsively shifting focal apparatus at the far end of the transdimensional viewfinder. It's intrinsically incompatible with the “allowable” states and conditions generated through the organizational degree of 3rd-stage ego-mentality — which is *all* a channeler ever is.

The matter communicated by true consciousness of the higher densities necessarily models *global* forms of cognition — thus the salient of that matter must draw flat 3rd-density consciousness into progressively more stable conformance with *its* character — not collapse down on the conventional limits of linear tolerance presented by the latter.

Yet in order to do this, the language and symbol-structure of the 3rd-density frame of reference must be subjected to uninterrupted *transformation* through a concentrative, Whole-being Light that never lapses, and which maintains uninterrupted continuity of awareness between the 3rd-density cognitive frame and the higher densities of Whole-being Consciousness.

This, the channeling entity cannot provide, despite the fact that in itself It abides through the state of that very consciousness; the medium of the essentially *unawake* channeler interrupts the circuit. The shifting relations between the complex probability-streams along which the entity channels, and the egregiously *moving target* of the channeler's chronically flickering flame of attention, constitutionally *prohibits* the necessary work of *converting* the symbolic and linguistic forms of 3rd density toward *wholesale representation* of the new and larger framework. The channeling entity is structurally prohibited from doing what it knows ideally must be done, and which it *would do* were it not for the grazing mind of the dreaming, leviathan herd on which it must provisionally settle in order to tap out the Morse-of-its-message around the rim of the unpredictable blow-hole.

It knows that It needs the “time” (the “compressed” time of transdimensional concentration, not the drawn-out linear clock-time of the conventional framework) to exert the steady, gentle but persuasive pressure of an uninterrupted *Breathstream* from the beyond, necessary in order to “glass-blow” the fragile/crystalline model of the new global Form, the shimmering Bubble of Natural Philosophy delicately reflecting a prism of concurrent facets through itself...

It knows what It needs, It knows what It ought ideally to Create as the communicative Bridge and cognitive Symbol-vessel for the transition of 3rd-density consciousness — but like the drunk whose “body” won't respond precisely to the conceived requirements, emits an unfortunate turn of phrase through scarcely-synchronized lips just when searching for the apt expression to bail it out of its embarrassingly uncoordinated appearance.

Indeed the only “place” where there's to be found that minimal threshold coordination and harmonization-of-identity

between intending Consciousness and functional Vehicle physically-focused, is in the presence of the awakened/incarnate adept. For the general, knee-jerk distrust such shared presence tends automatically to provoke, may be traded the real power to forge the “local” symbol-language into an adequate multidimensional expression able to accommodate the Octave airtight.

Thus we do not “sound” so much like these channeled sources to untrained 3rd-density ears (without comparative content-analysis etc.); nor should we really. The latter are, by force of their restricted format, furnishing obliquely-deposited *sketches* or black-out *tableaus*, bare *propaganda-pamphlets* of what they'd otherwise furnish whole and complete. We on the other hand are demonstrating the very function that may be performed when that higher-dimensional, Whole-being consciousness is Incarnated Live and Onstage, right along with *you*. Yet, if we're using the symbol-structure and language-palette operative through this density *as* an Awakened agency, we're necessarily employing it in a form that tests and extends its limits *in direct congruence* with Whole-being value — not as an indirect, reflective and distorted *interpretation* of what 3rd-density consciousness in itself could *conceive* that Value to be.

It is still, however, *your* symbol-system and *your* language, Peter. Notice how there's nothing concealed in the palm, and nothing ever leaves the Magician's hand. Thus you can *recognize* all the notes, just as everyone reading this, you can identify all the chords and keys; yet the overall tune that's played *hasn't* quite been heard before, it grates the ear of expectation — even superficially, to some, seems identical to that *authentic* mumbo-jumbo being played by pretenders down the street.

Written at 78, Read at 33.3

By way of answering your request/suggestion that MT put out a special 90 minute tape devoted to people's most prominent questions — over and above the fact that the tapes advertised in the *Thunderbird* constitute thorough discussions of the ideas and topics which *initiated Consciousness* would most want *you* to know (thus being intrinsically more valuable than the satisfactions-of-curiosity that would be obtained from the reverse format), the larger matter looms that a careful line by line word-and-sentence-structure analysis between MTs printed and recorded work would objectively show very little difference. In fact, the spoken word of the tapes employs the very same language (sometimes in even more complex phraseology juggling related ideas in one sinuous, spiraling syntax aerial-mapping a single-sentence runway!). Since, by student concurrence on the subject this is manifestly the case, why doesn't the spoken word *seem* to you as difficult? why indeed does it seem comparatively concise, thoughtfully considered etc.? Here we have the very *core* of the issue, Peter, and understanding this will help considerably in the required orientation — indeed here's where we'll find you may have performed quite a service for the general readership.

Since, in listening to the tapes, one is in essence listening to the extemporized counterpart of the very same diction presented here in abstract markings (only the UFO tapes I and II, and Meditation/Visualization tapes I and II are spoken from prepared materials) why does the former seem so soluble to understanding compared to the latter (in your stated opinion)?

In *listening* to the same expository prose, one necessarily passes in attention along with rhythms, pauses and “diacritical

markings” that aren’t punctuations of one’s own internal “reading” patterns, but which instead *enforce* a patterning harmony across the ongoing interpretive “decoder” of the brain/mind. Having to follow the enforced flow of another’s spoken verbal-patterns, the mind makes rapid bridges and *gestalt* connections across occasional gaps in the connective slats where an unfamiliar word or tricky turn-of-phrase intrudes. In mentally coupling to the cadences of the overall speech-pattern the encompassing *context*-of-meaning in which those potential disruptions appear, closes around and overwhelms the little gaps (which, in *reading* the same substance, would enjoy no comparable thrust so that each such gap would comprise a static moment subject to indefinite pause, and irritated magnification to any inflationary stop).

Listening to the tape, however, the possible gaps of comprehension are more like tiny pebbles in a stream around which the waters implacably flow, and over which they close in a *general* consolidation of meaning derived from context.

In this way the *illusion* that the spoken word is “easier” gradually installs itself.

Even the gothically-winding sentences employed as a “spring-loaded” delivery device for a nest of related concepts, that tends to characterize both written and oral SC presentations, seems more lucid in the latter format. The compressive concept-stacking of such trademark delivery-systems as MT’s luxuriating — or wantonly sprawling — compound sentence-structures, may seem to the given “consumer” more effective in transmitting the art of multidimensional mind-juggling (thus effecting the intended transparency of multiple, coherently-ordered ideas) when structured by rhythms of the *spoken* word. What comprises a visual-verbal maze upon the *page*, in which the unprepared may easily get lost, is a sinuous pulsing *music* when spoken — resonating its meanings rhythmically into one another so that they all reach the “exit” at the same time.

Indeed, even the language-structure engaged on the printed page would easily appear as a deliberate, cognitive music to the subjective-verbal faculty following its cadences, were it not for the fact that language is a peculiar kind of music conveying two *concurrent* kinds of meaning — one to be found in the rhythms and resonances of the speech-pattern, one to be found in the *content*. Since everyone is familiar with the requirement of *content* value, but too few are familiar with the parallel art of “musical” value contained in the actual language *rhythms*, the general mind tends to dwell disproportionately on the literal significance of *content* and, by and large, fails to deduce the *whole* meaning through overall cadences of *context*.

Indeed, few *writers* understand this principle at all — yet many of these same writers babble on inanely about the need of a “multidimensional” perception, demonstrating pure monovision of the narrowest type in their very act of expression.

Emulating *this* speech-pattern to demonstrate differently, is beside the point. Even were one to *grasp* the overall “phraseology” in terms of *content* and rhythmical *context* creating a characteristic “music” — with its identifiable refrains and motifs — in peristaltic stretches, throbbing punctuations as distinctive as the “speech” of Prokofiev in the field of instrumental music, there would be no percentage in adopting the diction to demonstrate “the same” multidimensionality of vision. We’ve already seen the attempt in several cases, in which the autopsy has always shown “death by syntactical drowning”.

Therefore: do not attempt these high-wire multidimensional verbal contortions at home.

We may establish, then, that grouching over the requirement of a dictionary in fortifying the occasional foray through these pages, indicates the protest of the mind being *interrupted* in its subliminal effort to lock into the flow and cadence of meaning contained in the *syntax*, by the concurrent demand of meaning contained in the *content*. One’s unfamiliarity with the actual *terms* employed, creates a pause outside the language pattern being “played” — which is a subliminal *affront* to those potential pleasures beginning to accumulate in the gathering shape of rhythms and harmonic cadences. This abrupt breaking-up of the otherwise-sensed rhythms by the obtruding *content* (presented in some such word as “tendentious” or a concept like the “Coriolis effect”, hmmm?) is a *contretemps* peculiar to *verbal* music; no such similar intrusion happens in *aural* music, (hardly ever even in *Opera* or *Rap* since you need the program, in any case, for either one) — thus the specific “demon” of one’s communicative art, eh Pete?

The solution is actually simple, and has to do with something we’ve been liberal in pointing out all along: the *T-Bird*, as more and more people come to find out, isn’t written and published as a throw-away leaflet every other month; we have the utterly unwarranted expectation that it will be kept and treated as an ongoing reference guide, teaching source, companion *educator* through the inevitable travails of these times, valued precisely as the Transcendental Source you identify it to be. The solution is therefore to *pick up the dictionary*, put in some work and familiarize yourself with the terms, go back and *back again* to the *T-Bird* pages — indeed those very passages that gave so much grief — and read them over as you’d listen to a *piece of music*, over and over again so that progressive familiarization with the strictly mechanical business of *content* will ensure proportionately less breakup in the building pleasure of flowing, yes, cascading with us down the splashing falls and crystalline slopes of our happy linguistic slalom! This is all *multidimensional Shakespeare*, dude, frozen out of general recognition only by the paralytic tendency of ego-convenience that really need be thawed next to the cozy fire of open-hearth Consciousness. C’mon, Peter, everyone — if MT doesn’t “see ya no more in this world”, meet him in the next one — and don’t be late!

An Inverse Peter-Principle: Resolving to Higher Competencies of One’s Own Being

If this teaching work is properly understood, the occasional objection to its “diction” should proportionately slacken. But in any case, the function of this work *is* always that of a transformative teaching, and it is sold short by the casual reader whenever it’s taken as something less than that. In *this* light, Peter, what’s important is not that you identified some difficulty in style between yourself and the *T-Bird* pages, nor (in itself) that you identified something of value or of wisdom in them. What’s important is whether, *having* perceived something of uncommon value in (and at the same time being nonplussed by the uncommon style of) the given material, the subject in question allows *one or the other* consideration to prevail. Having *perceived* the value of the one, is the subject yet willing to *exert the effort* he now feels is required in order to overcome that identified quotient of *difficulty*? Will he allow the specific *coefficient of inertia* he feels to obtain between

“potential value” and “effort required” to set an *ultimate limit*, or establish an *invigorating challenge*?

That’s the only question worth considering. It’s a test of the wisdom of the reader, not of the writer.

Since you *manifestly* put in the effort to get through *T-Bird vs. The Flying Saucers*, you’ve made a tacit declaration with respect to your desire to learn. For certain others of our readership these particular things you cite haven’t been hard but on the contrary, have drawn appreciative expressions of simple delight; however, what in our work might for *you* be relatively transparent and easy, might for those same others prove personally refractory, and in *every* case the only questions worth asking are: *do* you identify something here which, as you yourself have said, reflects “rare wisdom” and elicits such expressions even as your desire to “live closer” so as to attend every class? and, having identified something of such admittedly uncommon merit or relevance to your own spiritual growth (to the degree of eliciting “thanks” for the teaching presence and materials) *are* you willing to engage your own private factors of inertia and resistance in order to *elicit the most from it*, and so promote an actual *self-surpassing* — a practical transcendence of present personal “limit” so as to subtly alter the very, *psychically-encoded basis of your mind/body structure*?

For it is the latter which the *T-Bird* teaching, right down to the very, apparently-casual circumstance of its “different” diction, is designed to effect. And it *may* so effect, in any who pass the (tacit) student challenge through confrontation with that unique, inbuilt quotient of specific personal inertia (the real “adversary” in every case of spiritual development).

There are those, just like yourself, who have already written “defensively” on behalf of the *T-Bird* in response to the occasional, published cavil re “style” or degree of difficulty; opinions from people just like yourself have avowedly found us “easier to read than Ra”, or “more comprehensible than the Edgar Cayce material”, or “more coherent than the Theosophical writings” (these asseverations are usually appended with “at least”). Juxtaposed with contrasting observations such as yours, where does this place any testimony, pro or con, with regard to the *Bird’s* flight-style — or, for that matter, with regard to the “degree of difficulty” potentially contained in any of the works above cited?

Let’s not forget that the same person who may find the *style* a breeze, can and often does get impaled on the *content* which he’s been able to comprehend so easily. In light of these considerations it ought to become apparent that what counts is *whether* anything of value is identified here, through intellect or intuition, feeling or gut-level knowing, and whether then the *fact* of such identification in relation to the soul’s yearning for real spiritual instruction will prove to weigh more in the balance of the ego’s judgment than the potential friction anticipated from aspects of style or content.

Don’t forget how you yourself phrased the observation, Peter: “*If it wasn’t for the uncommon wisdom*” you identified in these teachings the “educationalist jargon” would be “most boring”. *Would be*. But since, in this very phrasing, it seems your valuation of the “rare wisdom” of these teachings renders the diction in which they’re framed something other than or not quite “boring”, just *what is it?* MT is serious about this. If it isn’t *actually* boring, what *is* it you’re detecting in your relation to the material that *would* make it boring, if it weren’t for...(?). Does it become more apparent now that what you’re sensing,

in the, phraseology “*would be quite boring*”, is nothing but the subliminal pressure felt *through* the present configuration of the ego-complex (with all its specific tolerances and tacit equations of “input/reward”) finding itself caught between its undeniable identification of *usable spiritual merit*, and its allowable self-standard of “consumer efficiency”?

The “ego” is the mind/body complex’s organizational instrument, and functional referent; yet owing to chronic, one-to-one identification *with it* in this masked 3rd density framework, the reduction of whole-being consciousness to the conditioned and arbitrary proportions of the *ego’s current inventory* — or present capacitance — makes of the latter the absolute standard and admittance-gauge of the universe. What you’ve felt, is the fact of having run up against the ceiling of that implicit standard; yet the pressure of being borne on a fount of identified spiritual knowledge pushing you right into and *through* that resistive ceiling (owing to your vexatious, even puzzling adherence to that part of Spirit within you which identifies and *flows along with* the waters of that Fount), confounds the ego’s acceptable tolerances and causes it, like a hungry belly that’s been asked to postpone immediate gratification for a more rewarding meal later, to growl in vague complaint.

If, then, you “almost wore out your dictionary” reading *T-Bird vs. The Flying Saucers*, *congratulations*. You’ve proven so far that the part of Spirit in you is stronger than the part of ego-identification which can *always* come up with reasons why it hasn’t time for “work” over a certain tolerance-level, why its time is methodically rationed and expended according to efficiency tables of the profit-index...Yes, congratulations, Peter! You’ve run up against, and perhaps even passed the first test of, what Ramtha — precisely Ramtha, the very source about which you’ve asked us — has identified as the challenge of the “altered ego”.

Hasn’t *Ramtha* said that there’s no true spiritual growth without “blowing out” the pieces of that ego-complex? How do you suppose that’s done? Is it done according to the *ego’s* timetables, the ego’s convenience schedule, the *ego’s* presuppositions, the gauge of the *ego’s* specific tolerances? Does it happen when the *ego* says “ready”? Does it happen when the ego pays for a course so that a so-called spiritual teacher can “challenge” the ego by all the rules of Hoyle in a nice, pat, paid-for context with prescribed steps for the ego’s staged “self-surpassing”? No. It happens when the ego *isn’t looking*. It happens when the personality complex isn’t paying attention, isn’t expecting the blow and hasn’t “personally” called upon it (so as to retain the ego-supportive illusion of control). No, it happens, interestingly enough, on just such occasions as this, when the personality has presumed that, in exchange for “information” heartily appreciated it would reciprocate with advice on how such information might be presented in a more personally palatable way. It happens when, in the course of being what the personality feels is “helpful”, a Spiritual Lesson like a cannonshot out of all proportion to the proprietary tennis-ball delivered with so civil an intent, comes blasting back over the net.

And you yourself, Peter, (as so often happens in such cases) have furnished the captioned *narrative* to all the recorded action of the interchange! After all, didn’t you yourself read it? Hasn’t it already been said to you, through material in which you find merit? What do you suppose “the Ram” meant, and to

whom do you suppose — all this time — he was speaking, when he said “Do you know you have to earn the right to absorb knowledge?” page 109. “Don’t you know you have to have an interdimensional mind to know one?” “In order to connect to a great mind, you have to *have* a great mind.” “You wish to understand a truth that is a seed that has been handed down for millions of years. You have to be worthy of the seed, and to do that you have to turn the way you perceive things inside out, and make it abstract, not personal. Otherwise, your personal reality will only allow you to see what is subjective to yourself.” “You have to *earn* the right to learn, and earning has everything to do with having an objective mind when you gain knowledge.” Page 110.

Is it not amazing that you use a term, “boring”, the very character of which is *already addressed* and interpreted for your understanding in the material you identify as valuable? Then, why didn’t you find merit in *this*? “It is not within the human nature to be bored; boredom is death to the human spirit.” “That is why civilizations are historically ‘history’, because they repeat the same things, because they stay caught in the image. They never evolve.” Page 211. How can one evolve, how can one desire everything implied in “evolving”, while reluctant to pick up a dictionary?

Again: “The unknown is, I assure you, not boring.” Page 237. If “boredom” is unevolved repetition of the same things, why would you want wisdom stated only in the terms, ideas and vocabulary you already know?

Here, you may have already shown the better part of a beginning spiritual wisdom on your own behalf, Peter; having admittedly “waded” through *T-Bird vs. The Flying Saucers*, you willingly took up a kind of work which self-confessedly grinds against the ego’s habit, and framework of limitation. Spiritual development does not, and *cannot ever come* when the imperative is imposed from without (cf. our first Letter To The Editor, this issue). If the work of spiritual development is in a sense a steady grinding and wearing at the ego’s margin of preference, its personal comfort zone, the impetus for that work must originate in *personal volition*: and such an act of *will* can only come about when the personality values its potential spiritual awakening and the development of “great mind”, in Ram’s terms, more than it values its chronic identification-patterns, to the degree that the *resultant work* and its *product* confesses the true ratio in real mounds of ego-dust piled before the grindstone.

Listen, Peter, ol’ MT is hardly happy with everything that comes flying out of this pen. As a boxer might say when he’s just had his face beat in, “no excuses, but I took this bout on short notice” — many of these pieces, nay, *all* these pieces, are written a week or two before deadline invariably — seldom is it that one has something just “hanging around”, written and refined long before, that fits in perfectly with the requirements of the monthly text. Indeed owing to that very fact, and even though these pieces must necessarily be published “as is”, at the time, MT isn’t curtailed from a constant work of reviewing, refining, altering or adding where necessary in order that the possible *future* publication of these pieces in another format (as what happened with *T-Bird vs. The Flying Saucers*) will find the content tightened to the rhythm, the rhythm further adjusted to reinforce the procession of content etc.

MT is always attentive to, and in the process of, changing and refining the *T-Bird/SC* texts, Peter (every new printing of

T-Bird vs. The Flying Saucers, for instance, is slightly different owing to subtle, ongoing modifications here and there); but the kinds of improvements with which MT would typically be concerned (apart from pure grammatical considerations) have to do with greater abstract precision of expression, subtle shavings of phrase, the aforesaid adjustments between content-delivery and rhythm, and would not be identifiable by the conventional standard of “digestible ease” — wouldn’t be *noticeable* to that standard at all.

The latter, in fact, exactly serves to define the point at which the “personal devil” of the ego-complex, its permissible tolerance-quotient, shall collide with the old *Thunderbird* head on — where, indeed, in the tumult of flying pinfeathers the arrangement of dust and settling debris upon the ground will determine, like an augury by entrails, whether the given personality shall have had its “pilot” light on at the time so as to be able to properly identify the character of the creature with which it crashed, and secondly whether *in* that identification it had found the Will to make the necessary personal adjustments so as to ultimately secure a happy, free ride on the great Bird’s back.

You see, Peter, you needn’t really “be here”, and no one need really wait till the formalism everyone assumes is *de rigueur* for spiritual tutelage; the real Teaching function is always working on your behalf, whether you identify it or not; for the authentic spiritual adept, the teaching function is not a 9 to 5 job. It makes no calculations according to “business sense”. It greets you like a large, eager friend, indeed with such unrestrained exuberance utterly unmindful of distance or any of the rules of propriety that, (having only a moment before stated your wistful regret at not being closer so as to have it for a personal teacher) you are now quite liable to bolt for the exit at its unaccountably uncomfortable *nearness*.

Wherein MT Magnanimously Takes Peter On As A Long-distance Student, After All

As a new (albeit however brief) student, Peter, MT may as well give you a little tip with respect to the work on, and wiles of, the “altered ego”, a tip which would otherwise just as readily come from observing what student/initiates *do indeed* do in the course of formal classes. The all-too-typical response of the ego identification-pattern is *self-preservation*; and the structure through which it functions is based on the tacit idea of *validation*. The ego *in itself* doesn’t want to be awakened, but validated. It *always* moves to confirm itself. The hardest thing for the subject to understand is “you are *not the ego*.” Even more difficult than the canard “you are not the body”, the dictum that “you are not the ego” seems extraordinarily difficult to digest, and act upon. It seems surpassingly hard for the subject to understand (even though he may assent *abstractly*) that he’s neither limited to, defined or obliged by, anything that the “ego” is, anything which it asserts as its descriptive “self-sense”. The ego is simply an inventory of arbitrary and changeable predicates attached to the “subject”, but any given predicate may seem to function as the whole and absolute reality of what the “self” is. Thus the “self” will struggle to *validate* that arbitrary and changeable predicate, with a ferocity so deep-dredged that it doesn’t even *recognize* the monumental virulence with which it does so.

Typically then, in confrontation with just such a trial as this (so common a trial for the soul of this dimension) the

personality will *automatically* fail to mark it as grist for the spiritual grindstone but press on by lurid light of the unnoticed ideal, “validation”. It will immediately object that “that wasn’t what I said”, or “that wasn’t what I meant”, or “how I meant it”. It will protest that it was “misinterpreted”, then restate the self-same thing in terms that seem better “caulked”.

(Here we address “everyone in general”, not specifically Peter): The grand free spiritual advice is — spare yourself the trouble of trying to salvage the situation by shuffling the shells around so that the *gestalt* looks different, but the pea’s in the same place. As is *always* really the case with patterns of ego-identification, that *was* what “you” said and what you *meant* to say. “You” really *do* know *what* you said; and “you” *did* say what you *meant*. But “you” have to *understand* what it was that you said — and for this the ego would, in itself, always prefer to substitute justification or rationalization, thus — for the millionth time — avoiding what might have proven to be a valuable key of insight whereby to do the real work of *releasing* potent powers of the total, mind/body magazine from the chronic lockin and tight, self-enclosed shutdown of compulsive ego-validation.

Once More Unto the Breach (of Etiquette) Dear Friends

Ultimately, Peter, there’s something more going on here than “information” anyway. A spiritual adept doesn’t just “teach”, or “transfer knowledge”, through *any* of the forms in which he may function. A true spiritual adept always *promotes your Awakening* — is always developing and working through various *means* toward that Awakening. And this above all reasons is why 3rd-density consciousness tends to find itself *falling asleep* — not in response to a soporific, but out of defensive *recoil* instinctively closing over its chronic narcolepsy against a Presence producing *friction* by virtue of its very, antithetical quality (and thus requiring the application of *work* in overcoming general resistance).

The *T-Bird* and *all* the agencies, direct or indirect, of Southern Crown, aren’t just instruments of teaching or the transmission of knowledge but are the living keys of an Awakening Process; and the two functions are *inseparable*. In conjunction with free public features as the method of Charger Breathing, the more esoteric instruction of the tapes or direct Empowerment of our periodic Initiation-work, the “information-content” and style/format of the SC writings serve to conduct a *current of Transformation*; they promote, and excite, and act as continuous ferment of, such a Transformation.

They aren’t, therefore, meant to bring information-content *down* to the digestible level of ordinary, 3rd-stage focal fixation (as is virtually everything else you’ll find presented even in terms of “higher-consciousness stuff”); they’re meant to promote the *much more prodigious* and millennially-significant occurrence of awakening consciousness *out* of its chronic, linear



lockin (utterly inadequate to the slightest dimension beyond it), bringing that consciousness *directly up to* and in alignment with those levels through which the Content itself is organized. They’re designed, calculated, *consecrated* to raising the 3rd-stage/stranded level of consciousness to threshold degrees of its own latent genius, dedicated to unlocking *commensurate magnitudes* of spiritual

potency direct from the subject’s being rather than diminishing the brightness of such spiritual potency in order to accommodate its Value to the acceptance-level of the very brain-pattern that keeps it suppressed and in thrall.

With reference to a wry comment in this month’s Letters to the Editor, it is most-certainly *not* too extravagant to say that the object of the SC teachings and *T-Bird* texts is to “raise the I.Q.” by 50 points — or more. The matter of “I.Q.” is much misunderstood to begin with; that “I.Q.” is fixed, in any case, is a lie. It’s only as “fixed” as you insist on keeping your own conscious framework and focus. It’s as “fixed” as your *kundalini*, holding and regulating the allowable patterning-processes of the mind/body form. Where *kundalini* becomes less fixed, is *roused* from its chronic nuclear lockin the overrated “I.Q.” becomes less fixed as well. It becomes progressively evident that Intelligence *does* belong to the province of Spirit, and that the only true custodians of intelligence are those who’ve found the means through heart and mind to *keep* the Spirit-lamp brightly burning.

Conversely, it should be evident to you by now that there’s a concerted, virtually *collective* effort being mounted in the other direction. It should be evident that there’s a conscious *and* unconscious thrust toward promoting the *retardation* and *decay* of consciousness; that there exists an almost perverse delight at both conscious and unconscious poles in valuing and expediting the *disintegration* of mind, the *trashing* of consciousness and spirit, and a certain *aggressive insistence* that the general psyche remain flatly fixed, distractedly focused and shut down upon progressively-diminished states of its own basic wholeness so as to style it to the optimum of conditioned predictability. It’s precisely this blanket atmosphere and ubiquitous programming (of the ambient free energy and of the airwaves, of *em* modulations and geomagnetic currents) that SC and the *T-Bird* specifically serve to counteract; for there is not just a general “lagging” through regular reluctance of the heart to move from “what it knows”, but a deliberate weighting and sultry saturation of the psychic atmosphere pressing *against* the building of any forward, developmental momentum.

You’re either tending to come awake, or you’re busy falling asleep. Look around and see for yourself how many are *really* in the process of awakening, and how many are merely *dreaming* that they’re awake while actually fast asleep. It’s only fitfully-sleeping consciousness that persists in requesting the wattage of the vigilant Night-light be damped, so that it can be “accommodated” at the eyes-shut level where no light enters at all. Ω