

## (Editorial Reply and PHC Manifesto)

### The "vernacular", Penny, is English.

Oh, we realize people have heard and read it so seldom in recent years that it is indeed hard to identify. In fact when we first sat around hatching *The New Thunderbird* format, all the copy editors and artists, writers and production assistants, gaffers, electricians and sound crew pondered deeply whether we shouldn't effect the standard, chatty-Cathy meandering-anecdotal diction that characterizes published prose whether in newsprint or the product of august old publishing houses (you know, the kind of Procrustean format of style and substance publishers have insisted upon in the last decades which, in the manner of all self-fulfilling prophecy has served to create in the flesh the abstract model of the statistical-average reader toward whom all their prospectus and profile seemed to be pointing). We sat around deciding over tea and cookies whether we were going to pander to the lowest common denominator in that mythic, statistical cross-section, whether we'd "do the right thing" and talk down to the reader taking every little coddled cell of consciousness a baby-step at a time along a pabulum-paved version of the Road on which the initiatic knowledge of our presiding Editorship had graciously set our feet....We sat around wondering whether we should effect a "Ken-Wilber" style prose, a kind of uneasy alliance between conversational quasi-English and the traditional ivy of footnote scholarship; or whether we should go for the truly discardable, the real dogfood of gelatinous slop served up out of the ground chicken-feet and indescribable remnants filling the general journalistic trough - which, by modern alchemy, mysteriously transmogrifies into the sole available means of "bringin" home the bacon".

So we sat around for 30 seconds wondering...until there arose a spontaneous chorus from the assembled multitude of the paper's prolific staff: "naaaaawwww!"

You see, since we value your thought at a solid gold Penny, we give the whole readership (and that readership ranges *widely* in general educational and economic background) all the benefit of the doubt - and, judging from the response we've received thus far both by mail and through our overwhelmingly positive reception at the Expo, we have not been foolish in assuming that people are, in fact, tired of being taken for granted at far less than they're worth; people do *not* enjoy being babied, treated in condescending manner, talked-down-to as if the infantile diction dribbling their way in unending flow actually pandered to everything they stood for in terms of expectation, desire or capacity.

More than that, people seem to have long-since got the point that such baby-talk uniformly directed their way does not represent the sad "compromise" which must be struck between the depth of the author's *real* expertise and the step-down operations he's forced to effect for the sake of your dim collective comprehension - indeed it represents the *writer's* level quite succinctly, and only serves to cloak his actual *lack* of any greater personal capacity under pretext of the general assumption that he's "forced" to express himself this way.

People have seen, on a much larger scale than you'd suppose, that the consumer-packaged, easy-open poptop dispensable-container-way of communicating *does not result in anything*. It's just what it always seemed to be: discardable junk, good for nothing, bearing nothing whatever that can nourish a real Being through the uncompromising terms of his real life!

Even Penny's letter is *not a pejorative reflection*; note how she expressed it: "Although the vernacular with which your publication is written is somewhat difficult to decipher"..*Although* it is, she nonetheless seems to have taken the time to familiarize herself with its contents even to the extent of *taking personal interest in it* and passing it on to someone else! That's not the letter of a "blase consumer" who refuses to be bothered. If "deciphering" is what's required, then "deciphering" is what, at least to an extent, she seems

to have done. And "deciphering" certainly involves more effort, attention, will and concentration than any quick scan of easily-swallowed, easily-passed mental junkfood.

You don't *have the time*? Sure you do, you always do...if it's important enough to you. And there are obviously many who are now sensing that, in some way, this material *is* that important to them.

Again, many readers have expressed, by mail or in person, the actual surprise that - unaccustomed as they may have been these cumulative years to any such diction addressing them in plain view, right out on the everyday street - the meaning yields quite easily to a little attention, a little rereading. And certainly everyone's noticed that all things aren't written at the same level of compactness or complexity (not even, necessarily, in the same article). You can always break yourself in on the Power Breathing articles, the cartoon, the Cheers and Jeers items, etc. You can always sneak up on it from one of these accessible angles.

Obviously, no one would ask or expect you to do it, if it wasn't already assumed that it was important enough, crucial or significant enough *to warrant* your doing it. And so *many* of our readership seem, gratifyingly, to *already understand* and accept this.

The idea of "difficulty" is a much more variable one, anyway, than most people assume on the surface. You've probably noticed how, at one time or another, you've positively *plowed* through some book or article gobbling it up, absorbing and digesting it thoroughly - and looking back you're taken with how technically "difficult" such a piece actually was...yet somehow it didn't bother you, didn't once elicit the usual "it's too difficult" protest that would ordinarily be accorded any such work presuming upon your patience or your general SAT level - and then you realized that it was the *intrinsic interest* which the content or subject matter of the piece held for you that accounted for your unhesitant absorption. It always seems, somehow, so much "easier" to move through even a technically "difficult" or complex piece where the fire of high-interest is already kindled.

We've seen (enough times to have rendered it a predictable spectacle) how those who tend to balk when bumping up against the first firm paragraph may be found some time later roaring feverishly through the entire article, gulping it down whole, assimilating it with fearsome speed, and recounting it with acerbic exactness - all because somewhere in that interval they glimpsed a slice of content that was eminently understandable simply because it contradicted or contested some long-held part of personal wisdom and had thereby so infuriated the mind that was ready not to be bothered with something so "unnecessarily difficult" as to excite its precipitous plunge without a backward glance into the major current of the text. (And, like Donald Duck, such a mind only surfaces for air at the other end of the channel, sputtering its indignation and general displeasure having broken the record without noticing for "crossing a major turbulent body".)

No, we've already credited everyone from the beginning - and, obviously, justifiably so - with the acumen to recognize (once exposed again to a kind of creativity in art, writing and editorship passionately interested in engaging all the higher, most spiritually-renewing levels of your attention, your mind and heart) the caring toward you of a real and impartial Love. And along with that recognition, we credit an implicit appreciation of the simple, self-evident truth that the standard of "simple" doesn't condone the "simplistic"!

As MT has noted, there's nothing wrong with something "simply" expressed, nor is there anything wrong in itself with simplifying; the real problem comes about through the fact that a widespread deficiency in the requisite skill or *care* has all too often permitted the reductive equation between the "simplified", and the "*simplistic*". Most writers have just never been able to maintain a balance on the fine line that distinguishes the two.

Simplistic writing is often confused with *concise* writing; in fact, the two are polar opposites. Simplistic writing *obscures* every issue in the name of simplifying, so that ultimately much more energy, time and trou-

ble is put out (by anyone conscientious enough to pursue it) in trying to clear the muddied picture. A truly concise expression, on the other hand, whether apparently "simple" or complex in phraseology, is *packed*. Though setting a *central* meaning at the forefront, a writing of power and precision is actually multi-dimensional, bursting at the seams with implication and connotative "halation" that comes pouring forward on each deeper digging into its construction. Any such writing invites repetitive perusal. It *expects* to be gone over again, supplemented where necessary by the treasures to be obtained from investigative resort to dictionary or other awaiting reference. It encourages your continued *companionship*; it *hopes* you hold onto it, refer to it again and again in order to extract the subtler and surrounding meanings, the overflow implications issuing from closely considered phraseology supporting a philosophical edifice of ascendingly integrated "stories". The proper source of such multidimensional expression, packing a universe of teaching implication in each unit, is a *multidimensional consciousness*.

After all : didn't Jose Arguelles tell us with respect to the widespread celebration-event of Harmonic Convergence that one of the effects to be anticipated as a result, was the appearance of living Teachers functioning from the "higher stages" who would respond to that great collective "pull" of human consciousness and show themselves, make themselves known so as to advance the real business of spiritual renewal that constituted the substance of the Call? Didn't Jose predict this? And have we "forgotten all about" Harmonic Convergence and what it was supposed to represent to the New Age? or do we still honor the value of the Spirit it kindled and quickened in humanity's collective heart?

And if the latter , we should have been asking by now: where *are* those predicted Teachers? From where would they come? and in what manner would they make t h e i r appearance? And who would presume in advance to say j u s t how or through what means any such Appearance would be made?

Another important question that people should be (and have all along been) asking in regard to the theme of real spiritual teachers....if such "live", incarnate teachers do appear from time to time, why has there - at least in modern times, in the era of instantaneous international media-renown-been such scarce evidence of the type of free-bestowing Beneficence or divine largesse t h a t has been represented traditionally as characterizing such a Presence? Why has there instead seemed only to be *the promise* of such a grace of Bestowal, quickly collapsing upon the familiar repetitive scene of cash business and cultism trading for "spiritual wares" (that prove meretricious, to boot, upon purchase!) When - if ever-would we see clear evidence of such a Teaching Grace and gratis Bestowal, poured so freely with no hidden surcharge out upon the shabby (yet-still-somehow-dignified) upturned topper of t h e hopeful requesting World?

With the monthly presence of the T-BIRD and i t s free ongoing *POWER BREATHING* series (as well as the continuous content and significant instruction of its other features and articles) there is no cause to ask any longer *where* that Presence is, from whence it would come or the manner in which it would choose to appear. For it should be understood by the public at large (if t h a t public is to value it at a level sufficiently high as to encourage t a k i n g advantage of it) that the instruction given in these pages is not throw-away exercise, no marginal tid-bit from a grab-bag of tricks containing the "good stuff at the bottom that can only be reached by cash or credit - certainly we offer tapes and literature at a reasonable price for the further instruction of those sufficiently interested; but a *central Key* in the New Dispensation of your 11th hour awakening is given quite without charge, as a matter of course, monthly in these pages. Just as breath is *central* to your continued l i f e in this world, so the Power Breathing instruction is central to your ongoing spiritual and mind/body transformation in the critical transition- period of this world-order.

The question is no longer, therefore, whether any such real Teacher or authentic instruction is ever going to be forthcoming, but whether the public can actually identify, rightly value and take proper advantage of such an instruction when it appears. The question is whether the public can really appreciate and value an authentic teaching given *literally free*, without overt or hidden charge, every single month with the easy availability of picking paper off a floor - or whether it has by now been so conditioned to make the Pavlovian equation between "free of charge" and worthlessness that it will persist in patronizing only those who pick its pockets, mistaking its real Lover for a beggar on the street. Ω